A RETRIAL FOR THE PČELA

WILLIAM R. VEDER


The publication republishes the editio princeps, based on three manuscript copies, of Semenov 1893 (reprinted with a new introduction and indices by Tchižewskij 1968) with its original pagination, relegating the current pagination in brackets to the footer. It adds the following:

• a survey of the studies of the text (p. 7–9),
• an assessment of the relationship between, one the one hand, the three copies edited by Semenov 1893 and, on the other, four more copies, which demonstrates that Semenov’s edition gives an invasively copy–edited version of the text (p. 10–23, with extensive lists of variant readings),
• a survey of the salient grammatical features of the text (p. 23–30),
• idem of the salient lexical features of the translation, which can be interpreted to testify that the translation was made in Russia (p. 30–38),
• an updated bibliography (p. 38–41),
• an exhaustive description of cod. Moskva RGADA F.181 nr.370 (p. 563–578),

The following reflections on the art of studying and editing Slavonic texts are prompted by a new edition of the Pčela, the translation of a Greek gnomology of Biblical, patristic and secular philosophical sentences, compiled not before 660 and not after 800, made from an abridged version compiled not before 900 (Speranskij 1904: 250; Richard 1962: 492–494, however, dates the full text to the 10–11th c.):
• the full transcript of the text in that copy with copious paleographic annotations (p. 579–882).

The second volume provides – for the first time in the history of the study of this text – comprehensive indices: Slavonic–Greek (p. 12–397), Greek–Slavonic (p. 398–571), inverse by word class (p. 572–624), Biblical quotations (p. 625–633) and Biblical quotations and reminiscences in patristic sentences (p. 634). All indices are first and foremost to Semenov’s edition; additional items in cod. Moskva RGADA F.181 nr.370 are listed separately. The great care taken to mark all erroneous or dubious readings deserves special mention.

2.

Although this publication marks a major step forward in the study of the Pčela, it falls short of what Mario Capaldo would consider une recherche poussée à fond.

The first problem to be addressed is that of the witnesses. Speranskij 1904: 265–277 listed 13 full copies (to which must be added the Sofijskij and the Carskij copies of the July volume of the Velikie Minei Četi, S.–Pb. RNB Sof.1323 and Moskva GIM Sin.182) as well as 7 defective or selective copies; of these, nrs. 6 and 9–20 remain outside the investigation without explanation. Especially to be regretted is the exclusion of the selective copies: they might have provided unexpected evidence complementary to the directly transmitted text.

A second problem is that of fragmentation. The text is scattered not only over two separate publications (which, owing to their inclusion in a single volume, cannot be readily juxtaposed), but it must be complemented with the readings adduced in the separate introductions of Pičxadze (p. 10–17 and 18–23) and Semenov (p. 77–101 = xxxi–lv), as well as with their interpretation provided in the word index (vol. 2, p. 12–397). This problem is complicated by the fact that Semenov’s edition contains a number of errors and misprints, for the correction of which one has to turn to p. 103–112 (= lvii–lxvi) and to the word indices; three additions to the Greek text by Speranskij 1904: 284 are printed on p. 9 instead of p. 249 and 251 (= 137 and 139), where they belong.

A third problem is that of reference. The basic text is referenced to pages and lines of Semenov’s edition, but the additions in cod. Moskva RGADA F.181 nr.370 are referenced to folia and line of the manuscript. Since the transcription of the latter contains beside its own foliation the pagination of Semenov as well, and since the format of the references to both is the same, one is easily led astray.

3.

The three problems noted above are none but manifestations of a single overarching problem: how to evaluate the testimony of the witnesses. One can
consider it either as in principle trustworthy, or as in principle untrustworthy. In the first case, the testimony is taken at face value and its diverging versions cannot be but juxtaposed; in the second, it is collated and evaluated against other evidence, errors of substance are expurgated and a composite picture of reliable facts is established. The former approach to texts and their witnesses may well be labeled ‘manuscript–centred’, the latter ‘text–centred’.

The manuscript–centred approach works very well with expert witnesses, i.e. autographs and purposeful editions of texts: they state what they intend to say. But it does not work with non–expert witnesses, i.e. straightforward copies of texts (which more often than not serve the purpose of acquiring literacy, see Veder 2006a): they merely transmit what they have been able to decipher. Moreover, it is hardly applicable before 1479 (the autograph of Vladislav Gramatik’s Homily on the Translation of the Relics of St John of Rila, see Guergova 1996), when purposeful editions of texts are few and far between (notable exceptions being the independent compilations of the long and subsequent short version of the Prologue ca. 1200, see Prokopenko 2009).

In the case of a text and its witnesses, the textual critic/textologist is both prosecutor and judge: he alone is in a position to produce or prevent a miscarriage of justice. His guiding principle should be the old adage testes caveas ‘beware of the witnesses’, as so impressively visualised by Elia Kazan in his film Boomerang (1947), the story of a murder committed in public, in the presence of a plethora of witnesses. Their testimony leads to the arrest of a suspect, and he is put on trial. As it progresses, the prosecutor becomes convinced that the evidence against the defendant is utterly unreliable and, in his closing argument, cannot but propose to exonerate him. A journalist covering the trial puts two and two together and slips a note to the person whom he suspects to be the true culprit. The man commits suicide then and there.

4.

Manuscript–centred textology does, indeed, give too much credit to the witnesses, as the word indices to the new edition reveal.

These corruptions are patterned.¹

1. A alternates with τ and with λ. The alternation A ← λ cannot be explained on phonetic grounds, and its co-occurrence with λ ← τ (see 104:23 κατὰς ΑΠΥ → ΔΑΚΑΝΤΥ, Φ with metathesis) indicates that that alternation should not be explained phonetically either. Both alternations rather have a single trigger: the difficulty of distinguishing the Glagolitic letters ος ← ας ← α. The same difficulty is manifest over the entire length of the text, and it is interesting to note that the manuscripts are not unanimous in handling it: 2:2 ουκάδιτ Φ → ουκετις ΑΠΥ, 15:11 Δήλων Π → τέλος ΛΦΥ, 40:17 πρέπειντε Φ → πρέπειντε ΑΠΥ, 79:28 ΔΑΛΜΑ Α → ΔΑΛΜΑ ΦΠΥ, 126:30 κόδα ΒΔΑΑ (κόδα ΑΑ) → κόδα ΤΑ ΦΠΥ, 146:20 ζάδε Α → ζάδε ΦΠΥ, 229:7 χόδα ΑΥ → κότα ΦΠΥ και 298:4 κόδανιαν Υ → κότανια Α (κότανίαν ΦΠΥ). That this problem is native to the Glagolitic script is proven by the fact that the Glagolitic Codex Clozianus corrupts 8a21 σονά ἡλιος Α → σονά ἡλιος ΦΠΥ (see the paper by Spasova & Veder 3:57 in this issue); the Πέλα has the same corruption 144:16 της γαδέ Α → της γαδέ ΦΠΥ, and it is inversely paralleled in the Izbornik of 1076 (a direct transcription from a Glagolitic antigraph, see Veder 2008b:1 18) τις γαδέ και της γαδέ (unit 188, Kotkov 1965: 259).

2. Ε alternates with ο and ώ, and all three alternate with η and ζ/θ. One can, of course, cling to the traditional explanation that these alternations represent the direct influence of the dialect spoken by the scribes, but the fact that they occur in Greek proper names practically excludes such influence. Here, too, a single trigger can be identified: the difficulty of distinguishing the Glagolitic letters ο ← ε ← η ← α. The same difficulty is manifest over the entire length of the text, the manuscripts again not handling it unanimously: 3:1 ροζανισάκα ← ροζανισάκα

¹ Semenov’s manuscripts are Φ (S.-Pb. RNB F.p.1.44), Π (Moskva GIM Sin.579) and Υ (Moskva RGB F.310 nr.195); Pičxadze’s manuscript is Α (Moskva RGADA F.181 nr.370).

² References are to page:line of Semenov’s edition.

3. а alternates with іa/ʌ, e with іe, і with і, and ъ with ъ (only the first attested in the proper names above). This feature, too, is explained by single trigger: the absence of a mark for iteration of vowels or palatalisation of consonants in Glagolitic, which is complemented by the absence of vowel and consonant epenthesis where the phonotactic rules of Slavonic would suggest it (see Veder 2008a). The introduction of Cyrillic іa(ʌ), ie, іe, ъ and A, ъ A was purposeful, and the greater length of the text, the greater the chance of inconsistency. Like the preceding, these alternations can be observed over the entire length of the text, the manuscripts varying: 4:1 зѣмѧнъ – АФП → зѣмѧнъ – У, 31:20 нѣдѧва ФПУ → нѣдѧва A, 60:15 зѣмѧнъ – АФП → зѣмѧнъ – АФПУ, 73:23 пѣдлауъ → пѣдлауъ A, 74:5 вѣлѧнѣгъ ФПУ → вѣлѧнѣгъ A, 75:9 извѣлы АПУ → извѣлы Ф, 96:18 вѣ нѣдѧ → вѣ нѣдѧ ФПУ, 144:21 вѣлѧнѣгъ → вѣлѧнѣгъ AФПУ → вѣлѧнѣгъ AФП, 162:7 нѣдѧуъ → нѣдѧуъ AФП, 231:24 пѣдѧвѧ ФПУ → пѣдѧвѧ A, 245:7 тѣрѧнъ ФПУ → тѣрѧнъ A, 252:2 прѣклѧнѣгъ ФПУ → прѣклѧнѣгъ A, 265:13 прѣслѧвъ → прѣслѧвъ AФПУ, 273:24 вѣлѧнѣгъ ФПУ → вѣлѧнѣгъ A, 361:24 тѣрѧнъ → тѣрѧнъ A → тѣрѧнъ ФПУ, 427:27 пѣдѧвѧ АПУ → пѣдѧвѧ A, 428:17 пѣдѧвѧ → пѣдѧвѧ AФПУ; cf. also in Ф ізѣ­5 ~ ізѣ­, іздѧ(же)⁵⁰³ ~ іздѧ(же)⁴⁰⁰, іздѧ – іздѧ, іздѧ → іздѧ, іздѧ → іздѧ (for the distribution in the other manuscripts, see Semenov’s apparatus and Pičxadze’s transcript).

4. ф alternates with а. This alternation can, of course, be interpreted phonetically (Slavonic has no θ), but its trigger is to be located, once more, in Glagolitic, which had only a single letter ʃ for both θ and f. The introduction of Cyrillic ф required of the transcribers conscious effort. Beyond proper names, this alternation occurs e.g. in 233:13–14 прѣслѧвъ, прѣслѧ Ф → прѣслѧвъ, прѣслѧ A → прѣслѧвъ, прѣслѧ π → прѣслѧвъ, прѣслѧ У.

гнющење ФΠУ → гнющење А (the alternation is attested in the Slavonic translation of the Narratio Aphroditiani, in the title of which АФПУ алтнеств with АФПУ, see Bobrov 1994). б. А ↔ и (ι ↔ Cyrillic ι), also attested in 7:8 πωρονικα A → πωρονικα ΦΥ → πωρονικα Π, 54:28 πατициа → πατициа ΦΥ (πατици АП), 235:4 душиа → души ФΠУ (души Α), 282:3 λάκα → лаки ФΠУ (лаки Α), 358:21 крица → крици ФΥ (крици АП), 394:25 κολα → κολ ΦΠУ (κολ Α) and well known from the direct transcription from Glagolitic of Antiochus Monachus Pandectes, see Popovski 1989. с. τи ↔ ι (ι ↔ ι) in the definite desinence, 190:9 курициеви ФΠУ → курициеви А, also attested in 361:12 κυριάδινы ФΠУ → κυριάδινы А, known as well from the transcription of the Pandectes. d. Isolated are 437:8 κυριά → κυριά ΑΦΠУ and 342:23 δαλα → дала ФΠ (omitted ΑΥ), which are surely better explained as misreadings of в and η than in any other way.

6. Alternations not represented in the proper names above are: а. π ↔ в (ρ ↔ ε), e.g. 169:7 πωρονικα → πωρονици АФΠУ, which has inverse parallels in the Izbornik of 1076 πωρονици, πωρоныци → πωρоныци, πωрοныци (units 183 and 207, Kotkov 1965: 257, 273). б. ι ↔ ι (ρ ↔ ρ ↔ ε), e.g. 379:28 το Α → το ФΠУ, 399:6 πράκтои А → πράκтои ФΠУ, known also from the transcription of the Pandectes. с. ι → η, e.g. 54:20 ιεά ΦΥ → ιεά ΑΦΠУ, 80:28 ιεά ΑΦΠУ → 177:26 ιεά ΑΦΠУ, 157:11 ιεά ΑФΠУ → ιεά ΑФΠУ, 244:5 ποσαλυμα → ποσαλυμα ΑΠУ → ποσαλυμα Ф, 269:14 ιμεννημα ΑΥ → ιμεννημα ФΠ, 376:10 ιμεννημα А → ιμεννημα ФΠУ, which can, of course, be interpreted phonetically, but its trigger is definitely to be located in the visual similarity of π and ι, as proven by the reading ιυβυκτεν → ιυβυκτεν in the direct transcription from Glagolitic of Evagrius Ponticus De oratione, c. 42 in cod. Beograd NBS DeCani 93 (Russian, 12–13th c.), f.181, which reflects a misreading ιμεννημα → ιμεννημα in its antigraph. д. η ↔ η (ά → η), e.g. 35:12 δερτά ΦΠУ → δερτά Α, 312:2 пοσαλυματοι ΦΥ → пοσαλυματοι ΑΦΠ; ε. ι ↔ ι (ι ↔ ι ↔ ε) in 325:8 пοσαλυματοι ΦΠУ → пοσαλυματοι ΑΥ, 320:24 προθυματοι → προκυπτεν ΑΦΠУ; ε (probably interpreted as a lopsided д) is frequently rendered as ι, e.g. 54:28 πατιциа → патици А (πατιци ФΠУ), 235:4 душиа → души (души ФΠУ), 281:28 патициа → патици ΑΦΠУ, 282:3 лακα → лаки А (лаки ФΠУ), 358:21 крица → крици АП (крици ФУ), 394:25 κολα → κολ Α (κολ ΦΠУ).

7. The noteworthy incidence of ι (= Glagolitic ι) in initial, interconsonantal and final position (e.g. 107:3 фоукоуиди Ф, фоукоуиди Α, фоукоуиди ΠΥ and 222:17 юмη ΦΥ, юмη Α, юмη Π), as well as the noteworthy absence of Cyrillic ζ and ω provide additional evidence that the text of the Pčela was transcribed from a Glagolitic antigraph.

The readings that oppose A to ФΠУ, including the difference in text length, reflect, to all probability, independent transcriptions of the Glagolitic antigraph; whether ФΠУ reflect one or more such transcriptions remains to be established in conjunction with the witnesses hitherto neglected.
The graphic/orthographic evidence is complemented by textual evidence. The 118 verses of Ecclesiasticus in the Pčela were not retranslated, but culled from the same Slavonic text, from which the compiler of the Knjažij Izbornik ca. 930 took his selection of some 450 verses (see Veder 2008b and forthcoming). Since the latter book is a Glagolitic compilation, the text of Ecclesiasticus was Glagolitic as well (on its Slavonic translation, see most recently Nikolova 2007 with good bibliography). The 235 other Biblical quotations in the Pčela may also have been collated against the full Glagolitic Biblical text, but this remains to be established.

The divergences of the 61 verses of Ecclesiasticus that occur both in the Pčela and in the Knjažij Izbornik fit the pattern of innovative copy–editing vs. more conservative transmission, established for the cycle of Chrysostomian homilies for Holy Week in the Codex Suprasliensis et al. vs. the Codex Clozianus et al. (see the paper by Spasova & Veder in this issue), the Knjažij Izbornik siding with the former, the Pčela with the latter.

The homily for Wednesday in this cycle (Suprasliensis ch. 35, addressed by page:line) is lost in the Clozianus, but its version has been identified by Maria Spasova in the Troickij Sbornik nr. 9, ch. 16 (see its reproduction @www.stsl.ru; addressed by folium:line). There one reads the following divergence:

\[
\begin{align*}
T 46:16 & \text{ фарисеи дѹмѹ створиша} \quad T 46v:9 & \text{ дѹмы не створисте} \\
S 396:11 & \text{ фарисеи съветъ творишꙙ} \quad S 397:2 & \text{ съвета не створисте} \\
T 46v:7 & \text{ не сдѹмасте} \\
S 396:20 & \text{ не сътворишꙙа са}
\end{align*}
\]

The same divergence is observed between the Pčela and the Knjažij Izbornik (addressed by chapter:gnome):

\[
\begin{align*}
P 431:1 & \text{ рәдꙋмꙙи дѹмꙙ} \\
K 6:340 & \text{ рәдꙙимꙙи съветъ} \\
P 328:23 & \text{ не дѹми} \\
K 6:275 & \text{ не съветꙙи}
\end{align*}
\]

It is inconceivable that an editor at Preslav before the Holy Week of the year 899 would have altered сѫветꙙ → дꙋмꙙ and сѫветꙙ[ꙙ]ꙙати → [ꙙ]дꙋꙙꙙати. Rather the innovative editors/compilers of the Codex Suprasliensis and the Knjažij Izbornik substituted дꙋмꙙ → сѫветꙙ and [ꙙ]дꙋꙙꙙати → сѫветꙙ[ꙙ]ꙙати, the root дѹмꙙ– being a West–Slavic borrowing from Old High German tuom ‘sense’ (continued as suffix –tum for abstract nouns, parallel to the Romance suffix –ment from mens ‘mind’), extinct in modern Czech and Sorbian, but alive in the Moravian dialect, in Slovakian, Ukrainian and Russian (in Bulgarian, the loss of the meaning ‘idea’ is recent, see Gerov 1975: 377).

Another West–Slavic borrowing can be identified in the text: 358:21 крица ‘scrap [of iron]’ (from Old High German *kriz, attested in the derived kreiz ‘circle
[scored for a duel]’ and in modern kritzen ‘score’), extinct in Czech, Sorabian and Slovakian, but alive in Ukrainian and Russian. And finally, a Macedonian dialectism is present in ș2:15 мъскъ or мъска ‘mule’ (probably of Albanian provenance), which never gained currency outside of its area of origin (Max Vasmer labels Russian, Ukrainian мекъ as a borrowing from Slavonic); it is attested in one very early Preslav translation (see Spasova 2008) and in the first Cyrillic edition of the Scete Patericon (Ohrid, before 971) where it replaces осълъ.

6.

It should now be evident that 116 years of trial have bred an utter miscarriage of justice, despite the warnings of Thomson 1993 and Veder 1987. Prosecutors and judges all were biased towards the witnesses, whom they regarded as experts, while their testimony now appears to be, at best, second-hand. The Pčela should not have been sentenced to life behind Russian bars and must be given a proper retrial.

The first step to such a retrial is to assemble a new team of prosecutors and judges, who will pledge allegiance to the text and give assurance to question the witnesses with proper care and critical distance.

The second step is to round up all the witnesses and collect their testimonies uniformly and in one place, where they can be critically evaluated.

The third is to set aside the inappropriate manuscript–centred framework of evaluation and edition (much like a dentist would abandon his customary conservative approach when ubiquitous decay calls for restorative treatment) and produce synthetic texts of both the Greek and its Slavonic translation. These should be freed from the shackles of the manuscripts they are contained in and reflect the original division of the text in 71 numbered chapters; within the chapters, the gnomes should be numbered consecutively, the longer, if need be, subdivided into verses. In addition, they should be freed of the heterography of the manuscripts and be cast into a form that will satisfy the highest standard of grammar and lexicography. This ensures that a jury can examine and debate the consistency of the evidence and of the case as a whole.

It is only when the retrial of the Pčela is over and done with, when the text of the translation is reliably established by consensus of as many informed readers–jurors as possible, that one can begin fruitfully to investigate the question, what East–Slavic features the witnesses have overlaid over the text.

Is it too much to hope that the retrial of the Pčela will also highlight the greatest contribution of Kievan Rus’ to the cultural history of the Slavia slavonica: the full transcription and preservation in Cyrillic of Preslav’s Glagolitic library?
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