

## A RETRIAL FOR THE *PČELA*

WILLIAM R. VEDER

АЩЕ ХОЩЕШИ ПРАВЪ СЪДЪ СЪТВОРИТИ:  
НИКОГОЖЕ ОТЪ ТЪЖЪЦНИХЪ СЪ ТВОРИ СЪ ЗНАНА:  
НЪ ТЪКЪМО САМЪ ПЪРЪНЪ:  
ΑΓΙΣΙΛΛΟΥΣ

### 1.

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.):

Anna A. Pičxadze, Irina I. Makeeva. *Pčela. Drevnerusskij perevod*, 2 vols. Moskva: Rukopisnye pamjatniki Drevnej Rusi, 2008, 882 + 634 p., hard cover, ISBN 978–5–9551–0271–9 and –0272–6.

The publication republishes the *editio princeps*, based on three manuscript copies, of Semenov 1893 (reprinted with a new introduction and indices by Tschizewskij 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, on 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 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 Čet’i*, 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.

Proper names listed there occur massively in corrupt and conflicting forms (superscript numerals indicate frequency, underlining marks features to be discussed): Αἴσιπος: αισιπ<sup>2</sup>; Ἀντισθένης: αντιστε<sup>n</sup> ~ ινδιστε<sup>n</sup>–; Ἀντιφάνης: αντιφ<sup>n</sup> ~ νατιδαν<sup>z</sup>; Βίας: βια<sup>z</sup> ~ βια<sup>z</sup><sup>11</sup> ~ βια<sup>z</sup><sup>2</sup>; Γελβουέ: γολzβουε<sup>v</sup>–; Δημήτριος: διμιτ<sup>r</sup><sup>2</sup> ~ δzμιτ<sup>r</sup><sup>3</sup>; Δημόναξ: διμονακε<sup>z</sup><sup>3</sup> ~ τιμονακε<sup>z</sup><sup>10</sup>; Ἐπαμινώνδας: επαμινδα; Ἐπίκουρος: επικο<sup>r</sup><sup>8</sup> ~ ωπικο<sup>r</sup>–; Εὐριπίδης: εβριπιδ<sup>–</sup><sup>12</sup> ~ αβριπιδ<sup>–</sup>; Ζωνναῖος: μιν<sup>β</sup>ι; Ἡράκλειτος: ιρακλι<sup>n</sup> ~ αρακλιτ<sup>z</sup>; Θαλλός: zαλλ<sup>z</sup>; Θάρρα: φα<sup>z</sup>α; Θεαγής: φεαγε<sup>n</sup>z; Θεμιστοκλῆς: φεμιστοκε<sup>z</sup>; Θεόγνις: δεογνι<sup>n</sup>z ~ φεογε<sup>n</sup>z; Θεοδώρητος: φεοδοριτ<sup>z</sup>; Θεόκριτος: φεοκριτ<sup>z</sup>; Θεόπομπος: φεοπομ<sup>z</sup>βεο<sup>z</sup>; Θεότιμος: φεοτιμ<sup>z</sup>; Θεοφύλακτος: φεοφιλακετ<sup>z</sup>; Θεσπίδης: φεσπι<sup>z</sup> ~ φεοπι<sup>z</sup>σι;

Θουκυδίδης: φουκουδῑα<sup>-2</sup> ~ κουδι<sup>М</sup>; Θρᾱξ: φρακсии-; Ἰακώβ: ιακωβз ~ ιακωвз; Ἴπποκράτης: ιποκριтз; Ἰώβ: иов-<sup>5</sup> ~ иев-<sup>3</sup>; Κάτων: κατωνз<sup>6</sup> ~ λακωνз; Κλεάνθης: клеандии ~ клеонифи; Κυρηναίος: куриνηвискзи ~ куриνηвискзи; Λευκίππης: леукип-<sup>3</sup> ~ левкыи ~ лвькп-; Λουκιανός: лυкииандз ~ лυкииандз; Λυκούργος: лυкуург- ~ лυкуург- ~ лυкуурьг-; Λύσανδρος: дусандрз; Μάρθα: марфа<sup>2</sup>; Μιλτιάδης: мелдиадз; Ξάνθος: ксандз ~ ксандфз; Ξενοφάνης: ксенефонтз; Ξενοφών: ксенефонтз ~ ксенефонтз<sup>9</sup> ~ ксенедонтз<sup>2</sup>; Πάμφιλος: памфил-; Πελοπίδας: пелепидз; Πυθαγόρ-: пидαгор-<sup>4</sup> ~ пифагор<sup>-14</sup>; Ρωμύλος: ромулз ~ ερμιалз; Σοφοκλῆς: софокл-<sup>5</sup> ~ содокл-<sup>4</sup>; Σπαρτιάτης: спартиадькскии; Συνέσιος: суньсии; Ὑπερίδης: иперидз ~ ипиридз; Φιλόξενος: φιλοксонз. (these are the forms in Semenov's base manuscript Φ;<sup>1</sup> for the distribution in the other manuscripts, one must consult Semenov's apparatus and Pičxadze's transcript).

These corruptions are patterned:<sup>2</sup>

1. Δ alternates with τ and with λ. The alternation Δ ↔ λ cannot be explained on phonetic grounds, and its co-occurrence with Δ ↔ τ (see 104:23 κατωνз АПУ → λακωνз Ф 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 ѡ ↔ ѣ ↔ ѥ. 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 ουβѣдѣ Ф → ουβѣсть АПУ, 15:11 дѣломъ П → тѣломъ АФУ, 40:17 пригъкнетъ → придъкнетъ А (прикоснетъ ФПУ), 79:28 διατι А → διαти ФПУ, 126:30 вѣда (вѣда А) → вѣа та ФПУ, 146:20 зѣа А → зѣа ФПУ, 229:7 χοδα АУ → хота ФП и 298:4 вѣзданиѣ У → вѣданиѣ А (вѣ вѣданиѣ ФП). That this problem is native to the Glagolitic script is proven by the fact that the Glagolitic *Codex Clozianus* corrupts 8a21 ѡѣ ѣѣѣѣ → ѡѣѣѣѣ ѣѣ (see the paper by Spasova & Veder 3:57 in this issue); the *Pčela* has the same corruption 144:16 тѣ гѣаъ А → тогѣа сѣ ФПУ, and it is inversely paralleled in the *Izbornik of 1076* (a direct transcription from a Glagolitic antigraph, see Veder 2008b/1: 18) тогѣа → тѣ гѣа (unit 188, Kotkov 1965: 259).

2. ε alternates with ο and ου, and all three alternate with и and з/ь. 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 э ↔ з ↔ а ↔ в ↔ я. The same difficulty is manifest over the entire length of the text, the manuscripts again not handling it unanimously: 3:1 ραζοκзиηχз → ροζοκзиηχз

<sup>1</sup> Semenov's manuscripts are Φ (S.–Pb. RNB F.p.I.44), Π (Moskva GIM Sin.579) and Υ (Moskva RGB F.310 nr.195); Pičxadze's manuscript is A (Moskva RGADA F.181 nr.370).

<sup>2</sup> References are to page:line of Semenov's edition.

ФПУ → роскы<sup>x</sup> А, 16:19–20 распадетъ, оутверженѡ ФПУ → распадоутъ, оутверженъ А, 22:14 мѣдлостью А → мѣдлестью ФПУ, 29:25 мѣдлостью АП → мѣдлостью ФУ, 44:23 инѣм А → ѡнѣмъ ФПУ, 86:13 зѣнницю ФПУ → зѣнницю А, 96:15–16 акъже, такъже ФПУ → акоже, такоже А, 138:19 съдравъ о → съдравыѣ<sup>m</sup> А, съдравинѣ ФПУ, 191:15 ѡбонемъ ФПУ → ѡбѣемъ А, 207:17 пользуеѣтъ ФПУ → пользуютъ А, 269:18 въздадеѣтъ А → въздадеѣ ФПУ, 308:26 замъкъъ → за мѡкъѡу АФПУ, 358:16 такоже ФПУ → такъже А, 377:17 помѡлившю А → помѡловдѣвшю ФПУ, 421:1 печалѡ А → печаль ФПУ, 428:5 лъжею ФПУ → лжою А, 432:1 доумѡу ФПУ → домоу А, 432:7 хѡпава ФПУ → хѡпава А, 438:16 всѡкъъ А → всѡко ФПУ; cf. also in Ф даже<sup>4</sup> ~ дажь<sup>9</sup>, єдин<sup>70</sup> ~ ѡдин<sup>19</sup>, єдъва<sup>7</sup> ~ ѡдъва<sup>4</sup>, єльма<sup>3</sup> ~ ѡльма and the conjunction єже<sup>9</sup> ~ иже<sup>16</sup> ~ ѡже<sup>29</sup> (for the distribution in the other manuscripts, see Semenov's apparatus and Piĉhadze's transcript).

3. а alternates with ѡ/а, є with ѡ, ѡу with ю, and з with ь (only the first attested in the proper names above). This feature, too, is explained by single trigger: the absence of a mark for iotation 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 ѡ(а), ѡ, ю, з and а, т, л was purposeful, and the greater the 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 зѣмын– АФП → зѣмлен– У, 31:20 ндр[ав]а ФПУ → нрава А, 60:15 зѣмын– АФПУ → 356:7 зѣмлен– АФПУ, 73:23 палдѣемъ У → палдѣемъ АФП, 74:5 възвранитъ ФПУ → възвранитъ А, 75:9 изреци АПУ → издѣрьци Ф, 96:18 въз немъ А → въз немъ ФПУ, 144:21 разгардѣетъ → разгардѣтъ АФПУ, 145:10 зѣмын– АФ → зѣмлен– ПУ, 162:7 юности → ѡуности АФПУ, 231:24 порѡтиша А → порѡушиша ФПУ, 245:7 трдпезѡу ФПУ → трдпезѡу А, 252:2 преклонитъ ФПУ → преклонитъ А, 265:13 просъпи → просыпи АФПУ, 273:24 ѡстоупитъ ФПУ → ѡстоупитъ А, 361:24 трдпез– А → трдпез– ФПУ, 427:27 пард АПУ → пард Ф, 428:17 распалдѣемъ → распалдѣемъ АФПУ; cf. also in Ф ѡзъ<sup>6</sup> ~ дзъ<sup>64</sup>, ѡко(же)<sup>503</sup> ~ дкы(же)<sup>40</sup>, ѡможе ~ дможе<sup>2</sup>, єст–<sup>628</sup> ~ єст–<sup>51</sup> (for the distribution in the other manuscripts, see Semenov's apparatus and Piĉhadze's transcript).

4. ф alternates with ѡ. This alternation can, of course, be interpreted phonetically (Slavonic has no  $\theta$ ), but its trigger is to be located, once more, in Glagolitic, which had only a single letter ꙗ for both  $\theta$  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 порѡфиръ, перѡфира Ф → перѡфуръ, перѡфюра А → перѡуръ, перѡфира П → перѡиръ, перѡира У.

5. More incidental alternations are: а. а ↔ є (ѡ ↔ ѡ), also attested in 40:15 приѡщениѣ ФПУ → приѡщениѡ А, 47:27 сътажаниѣ → сътажаниѡ ФПУ (стажениѡ А), 256:17 въздѣниѡ → въздѣниѣ АФПУ, 320:24 дарованиѣ господьнѣ → дарованиѡ господьнѡ АФПУ, 341:2 паденьемъ ФПУ → падниѣ<sup>m</sup> А, 372:20



## 5.

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:

<i>T 46:16</i>	ФАРИСЕИ ДОУМОУ СТВОРИША	<i>T 46v:9</i>	ДОУМЪИ НЕ СТВОРИСТЕ
<i>S 396:11</i>	ФАРИСЕИ СЪВЪТЪЗЪ ТВОРИША	<i>S 397:2</i>	!ВЪТА НЕ СЪТВОРИСТЕ
<i>T 46v:7</i>	НЕ ЗДОУМАСТЕ		
<i>S 396:20</i>	НЕ СЪВЪЩАДВАДАСТЕ СА		

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

<i>P 431:1</i>	РАЗОУМЪТИ ДОУМОУ
<i>K 6:340</i>	РАЗОУМЪТИ СЪВЪТЪЗЪ
<i>P 328:23</i>	НЕ ДОУМАИ
<i>K 6:275</i>	НЕ СЪВЪЩАИ

It is inconceivable that an editor at Preslav before the Holy Week of the year 899 would have altered СЪВЪТЪЗЪ → ДОУМА and СЪВЪЩ[АВ]АТИ → [СЪ]ДОУМАТИ. Rather the innovative editors/compilers of the *Codex Suprasliensis* and the *Knjažij Izbornik* substituted ДОУМА → СЪВЪТЪЗЪ and [СЪ]ДОУМАТИ → СЪВЪЩ[АВ]АТИ, the root ДОУМ– 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 Sorabian, 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 82:15 *мѹаѹъ* or *мѹаѹа* ‘mule’ (probably of Albanian provenance), which never gained currency outside of its area of origin (Max Vasmer labels Russian, Ukrainian *мечк* 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 *осѹаѹъ*.

## 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?



*Deerfield IL*

## REFERENCES

- Bobrov, Aleksandr G.  
1994 "Apokrifičeskoe 'Skazanie Afroditiāna' v literature i knižnosti Drevnej Rusi." S.–Peterburg.
- Gerov, Najden  
1975 *Rečnik na bālgarskija ezik*, 1. Sofia.
- Guergova, Emilia  
1996 *Zapadnobālgarskite anaxoreti v starobālgarskata literatura*. Sofia (dissertation).
- Kotkov, Sergej I (ed.)  
1965 *Izbornik 1076 goda*. Moskva (a new edition by A.M. Moldovan et al. (eds.) *Izbornik 1076 g. Vtoroe izdanie, pererabotannoe i dopolnennoe*. Moskva. is scheduled to appear in 2009).
- Nikolova, Svetliina  
2007 "Koj e prevodačāt na knigata na Iisus, sin Siraxov?" *Kirilo–Metodievski studii* 17: 530–542.
- Popovski, Josif  
1989 *Die Pandekten des Antiochus Monachus, Slavische Übersetzung und Überlieferung*. Amsterdam (dissertation).
- Prokopenko, Larisa V.  
2009 *Lingvotekstologičeskoe issledovanie Prologa za sentjabr'skoe polugodie po spiskam XII – načala XV v.* Moskva (dissertation @ <[www.ruslang.ru/doc/autoref/prokopenko.pdf](http://www.ruslang.ru/doc/autoref/prokopenko.pdf)>).
- Richard, Marcel  
1962 «Florilèges spirituels grecs». *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, vol. 5. Paris.
- Semenov, Viktor A.  
1893 *Drevnjaja russkaja Pčela po pergamennomu spisku*. S.–Pb. (= *Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti* 54/4).
- Spasova, Marija  
2008 "Tekstologičnata istorija na slavjanskija prevod na «Nadgrobno slovo za Vasilij Veliki» ot Grigorij Bogoslov." *Preslavska knižovna škola* 10: 125–164.
- Speranskij, Mixail N.  
1904 *Perevodnye sborniki izrečenij v slavjano–russkoj pis'mennosti*. Moskva.
- Thomson, Francis J.  
1993 "Made in Russia. A Survey of the Translations alledgedly made in Kievan Russia." In: G. Birkfellner (ed.) *Millennium Russiae Christianae*. Köln–Weimar–Wien: 295–354.
- Tschizewskij, Dmitrij I.  
1968 *Melissa. Ein byzantinisches Florilegium griechisch und altrussisch*. München 1968 (= *Slavische Propyläen* 7).
- Veder, William R.  
1987 "Über Kompilationen, die altrussischen Literati zugeschrieben werden." In: G. Birkfellner et al. (eds) *Sprache und Literatur Altrußlands. Aufsatzsammlung*. Münster (= *Studia Slavica et Baltica* 8): 241–244.

- 2006a "La letteratura di traduzione tra Slavia Latina e Slavia Slavonica." In: M. Capaldo et al. (eds.) *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo, 3: Le culture circostanti, vol. III: Le culture slave*. Roma: 705–723.
- 2008a "The Glagolitic Barrier." *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 34: 489–501.
- 2008b *Knjažij izbornik za vāzpitanie na kanartikina, 1–2*. Veliko Tārnovo.
- forthcoming "Pčelata i Sirax." *Preslavska knižovna škola* 11(2009), in print.