Thomas Daiber
Justus Liebig University Giessen
Giessen, Germany
thomas.daiber@slavistik.uni-giessen.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4185-294X

MS 45 OF VITA CONSTANTINI-CYRILLI: POLITICALLY CORRECT TEXTUAL INTERVENTIONS

Abstract

Saint Constantine-Cyril died in 869; shortly afterwards, and certainly before 882, the Life of Constantine-Cyril was written in Greek by an anonymous author. The original Greek text of the Life (Vita Constantini-Cyrilli, hereafter VC) appears to be lost, and we possess only a translation into Old Bulgarian that is Old Church Slavonic (hereafter OCS), which very probably originated also in the 9th century. The original Greek text of VC had been translated into OCS by means of a highly literal translation technique, and the resulting Grecisms in the OCS version made the text virtually incomprehensible to the Slavic copyists, who produced a wealth of variant readings in the OCS text. The situation is further complicated because the earliest preserved copy of VC is known only from a manuscript dated 1469, and consequently, any discussion of its content demands detailed philological analysis.

In this article, we keep the philological commentary to the minimum and concentrate on a single manuscript, distinguished by its content – VC (manu-

script no.45 = MS 45). The special variant readings in MS 45 are unique in the history of the textual transmission of VC and consist of substantial additions and reformulations of entire sentences. The variants did not originate from attempts to resolve linguistic difficulties in the text, as can be observed in other copies of VC, but rather the variant readings of MS 45 appear to constitute a deliberate redactional reframing of the text. The interventions in MS 45 focus exclusively on Constantine-Cyril's Moravian mission, his invention of Slavic letters, and his role as apostle to the Slavs. The additions of MS 45 emphasize his theological and political competence and the cultural importance of his work for all Slavic countries. Ultimately, the variant readings of MS 45 connect the events of the 9th century anachronistically with features of the Muscovite culture of the 16th–17th centuries. The study polemically asks if the textual interventions in MS 45 can be viewed in the light of translation theory after its "ideological turn", which acknowledges politically motivated changes in texts.

Keywords: *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli*, variant readings, redactional intervention, cultural appropriation.

1. Introduction

The production of a text and its publication are regularly associated with redactional work, which aims to optimize the reception of the text. In the context of translation, however, redactional intervention becomes an ambivalent matter. On the one hand, shaping of textual content with regard to the assumed receptive resources of a target audience may be necessary if the source text includes culture-specific information that the audience for the target text would hardly understand. On the other hand, translation is considered to be a *faithful* representation of the *original*, which excludes any textual interventions by the translator. The distinction between the 'proper' redactional work of authors and the 'improper' redactional interventions of translators is, however, no longer commonly acknowledged. After the *linguistic turn* in translation theory in the 1970s, which called for pragmatic, not merely lexical, equivalence between source and target text, and after the *cultural turn* in translation theory around 1990, which focusses on the 'fortune of translated texts in the receiving culture' (Bassnett, 2007, p. 16), the contemporary *ideological turn* in translation studies 'refers to a changed perspective of seeing translation as a means of ideological resistance' (Leung, 2006, p. 130). According to these theories, translation can be seen as a means of altering the colonising representation of

the world in the source text by giving voice to the suppressed views of the colonised in the language of the translation.

2. Theoretical and Methodological Background

The manual handwritten transmission of Church Slavonic texts necessarily always implied a degree of partial translation. As Church Slavonic became an exclusively written language, in contrast to the spoken vernaculars of the respective Slavic communities, and as the lexical and grammatical norms of the *Slavonic* language grew increasingly obscure, the copyists of Church Slavonic texts were challenged to either reproduce lingual utterances that were no longer productive in their own language, or to give the text a linguistic editorial reworking in order to reduce the distance to their contemporary language. Such editorial intervention by scribes (including occasional errors or other disruptions in the text transmission) makes it necessary to critically review variant readings in the manuscript documents of a given text and try to establish an assumed original reading. While philology provides the methodological background for editorial work, text linguistics supplies the methodological foundation to analyse the redactional work of the old scribes.

This paper analyses the redactional work of a scribe who not only linguistically transferred the text of *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli* (hereafter VC) into an Eastern redaction of Church Slavonic, but who also introduced extensive editorial changes to the text. The philological problems of VC are not the focus of this article; only the basic information necessary to understand the scribe's interventions is supplied.

The Greek original of VC was written between 869 and 'avec certitude à la fin de 882' (Meyvaert and Devos, 1955, pp. 435, 437), but it was soon lost. We have good reasons to believe that the Old Church Slavonic (OCS) translation of the Greek original was produced in the ninth century as well, but the transmission of the OCS text is attested only from as late as 1469. The linguistic transmission of VC underwent 600 years of silence, and because the Slavic scribes struggled with a Slavonic text, which was highly dependent on underlying Greek morphosyntactic structures, they introduced a variety of variant readings which, in many cases – because of 600 years of undocumented text transmission – cannot be unified anymore. However, one relatively late copy of VC stands out from all other copies of VC, showing lengthy additions to the text that cannot be classified as mere variant readings. We will document (3)

and discuss (4) the textual additions of MS 45, and conclude with a critical remark on the ideology of textual interventions (5).

3. Data

A manuscript copy of VC from the the late seventeenth century, written by a Russian scribe and presenting the text of VC according to the variant readings of its South Slavic redaction,[1] is numbered 45 in the chronological ordering of manuscript copies as established by Mirčeva (2014, p. 44). Formerly, this manuscript had been listed as no. 16 (e.g. in Grivec and Tomšič, 1960) according to the chronological sequence of scholarly publications of VC copies. MS 45 is unique in that it displays lengthy additions to the text which are not found in other copies of VC. Nevertheless, it may be speculated that these additions in MS 45 were not made by the scribe himself. Some passages show problematic morphology (XV: 18-22 *на своемъ сѣдалищѹ* instead *сѣдалищи*[2]), lexical semantics (XIV: 2 *богомъ наѹстими* = 'incited/ persuaded by God'[3]) or morphosyntax (XV: 2, a rather enigmatic passive construction *и абїе по пророческ'мъ словѹ исполнилсѧ* = ('suddenly he [Constantine-Cyril] had been fulfilled?'), all of which suggest that the additions presented by MS 45, may already have been inserted in an earlier manuscript copy. However, we have no evidence of such a peculiar text transmission. It is noteworthy that no linguistic archaisms demand to date the additions in MS 45 back to the ninth century. Rather, it can be suggested that the additions display information and wording, which point to an East Slavic origin not earlier than the sixteenth century.

Apart from occasional variant readings of single lexical units (or minor rearrangements of sentential units, as in XVIII: 13) MS 45 exhibits some major additions to the text[4] of VC, starting with chapter XIII. The following

---

[1] See for example the finite sentences with да in XV: 1. The distinction between an East and a South 'redaction' of VC refers to linguistic peculiarities, not to redactional reworking of text content. Regarding content the proximity of the additions in MS 45 and in the Life of Cyril as given in the Reading Menologion of Dmitrij Rostovskij (feast: May 11th) has already been mentioned (Diddi, 2004, p. 69), however the textual connection between has still to be established. Rostovskij's reworking of VC is not treated in this paper.

[2] Judging by the lemma *сѣдалище*, SJS: 380 did not include the additions of MS 45 into the vocabulary.

[3] SJS: 323 lists the verb only in a negative meaning 'incite, instigate, persuade' (without reference to VC).

[4] OCS text of VC edited by Grivec and Tomšič (1960), chapters are quoted with roman and sentences with arabic numerals. The edition serves as textual base in Daiber (2023), (*see for a critical discussion of variant readings*).

table contains all additions in MS 45, which may be described as redactional interventions.

	MS 45: additions to (+) or paraphrases of (=) sentences in the [common text of VC][5]
XIII:1	[Философь же иде въ Царіградь.] + и дошедъ и приѧтъ его царь радостію велїею, такожде и патрїархъ и весъ свѧщенны҆ чинъ. [The philosopher went to Constantinople.] + and having come there[6] the Emperor (immediately) received him with great joy, as well as the Patriarch and all clerical order.
XIV:2	[Растислав’ бо морав’скы кнеѕь богомь оустимь съвѣтъ сътвори съ кнеѕы своими моравлѧни и посла къ цароу Михаилу́ глаголѭ] = ростиславъ бо и свѧтополкъ, кнѧѕѣ моравскїи и ту́ровскїи и всеи россїи, богомь на́устими быша, совѣтъ сотвориша со кнѧѕи своими моравскими, такожде и кнѧѕь панонски’ коцлѧкъ, велїею радостію совѣту́ ихъ помощникъ имъ бысть. и послаша къ царю михаилу́ до цариграда кнѧѕеи своихъ, глаголюще сице, благочестивыи царю и велики кнѧже. [Rastislav, the Moravian prince, informed by God, held a council together with his Moravian princes, and he sent to the Emperor Michael, speaking] = Rastislav and Svatopolk, the princes of Moravia and of Turov and of whole Russia, were informed by God; they held a council with their Moravian princes, and also the prince of Pannonia, Kocak, was with great joy a helper to them for their council. And they sent their princes to the Emperor Michael to Constantinople, speaking so 'Righteous Emperor und Great princes'.
XIV:4	[то посли ны, владыко] = молимъ тѧ, владыко, благоволи о насъ и посли намъ [епископа и оучителѧ такого] [so send us, o Lord] = we plea to you, o Lord, have mercy on us and send us [a bishop and such a teacher]

---

[5] I have been asked to translate the additions of MS 45 into English (German translations see in Daiber, 2023): I use only one form of proper names (e.g. Rastislav, not Rostislav) and look for the most neutral meaning in translating the titles of actors (prince, emperor and so on) regardless of historical circumstances; as the redactional interventions of MS 45 have the form of additions to and insertions into already grammatically saturated utterances, they often produce controversial syntactic constructions, which I could not conceal in the translation. Lastly, I did not unify the translations in this section with those found elsewhere in the paper, because the translations are only meant as a guide for understanding the OCS text and cannot replace it.

[6] The participle preterite active *дошедъ* can formally also be related to the Emperor, as if the sentence runs 'and going towards him ‚and' the Emperor immediately received him …', which would be a (as it seems to me, more rare) heterosubjective variant of the syndetic use of the participle with the possible modal meaning 'immediately'; see footnote 8.

XIV:6	[събрав' же соборъ царь и призва Костан'тина философа и сътвори слышати рѣчь сию и рече] = и доидоша ко цариградⰂ божїим поспѣшенїемъ и возвѣстиша царⰋ михаилⰋ, о какови вещи доидоша моравлⱑне. собравъ же царь соборъ со патрїархи и з болⱑри своими, такожде и со константиномъ философомъ и совѣщаша благо, царь же и патриархъ сътвори слышати речъ сїю всѣмъ и нача вѣщати ко философⰓ. [after having gathered a council the Emperor called Constantine the philosopher and let him hear this speech and spoke] = and they went right to Constantinople, quickened by God, and explained to the Emperor Michael, for which purpose the Moravians had come. The Emperor, after having gathered a council together with the Patriarchs and with his powerful, as well as with Constantine the philosopher, they concluded benevolently; the Emperor and the Patriarch let everybody hear this speech and they began to explain it to the philosopher.
XIV:12	[твеща юмоу пакы царь и съ Вар'дою и оумомь своимь] + и мⰓдростїю аггелскою, лⰓчше божїею [after that answered him the Emperor together with his uncle Bardas[7]] + and (inspired by) angelic, better to say, Godly wisdom
XIV:13-14	[шьдъ же философь по прьвомⰓ ѡбычаю на молитвⰓ се наложи, и съ инѣми поспѣш'ныки. 14: въскорѣ же ѥ юмоу богъ ꙗви, послоушаю молитвь своихь рабь и абие сложи писмена и начеть бесѣдⰓ писати еѵаггел'скⰓ] = по томⰓ же обычаю во полⰓнощи молитвⰓ дѣꙗше, и абїе воскорѣ послⰓшавъ молитвⰓ своего раба, отверзъ ем ⰊⰂмъ и вшедъ во храминⰓ и отверзъ кънигы и сложи[8] бⰓквы славенскы и начатъ бесѣдⰓ писати еуаггелскⰓ [after having gone, the philosopher, according to his proper customary behaviour, resorted to prayer, together with other comrades. 14: And quickly God revealed this to him, Who is attentive to the prayers of His servants, and immediately he formed letters and started to write the speech of the Gospel] = according to this custom he produced a prayer at midnight, and quickly, having been attentive to the prayer of His servant, [God] opened his reason and, after having gone to his chamber and having opened the books, he [= the philosopher] formed Slavic letters and began to write the speech of the Gospel

---

[7]   See Daiber 2023: 287: the utterance *и оумомь своимь* is a corrupted from **вуюмъ своимъ* 'his uncle'; although *оумомь своимь* is in the correct case to follow preposition *съ* = 'with', it is impossible in Slavic to express instrumental meaning 'with the help of his reason/ by using his mind' by a comitative construction 'with', therefore I chose the paraphrase 'inspired by'. The syntactic impossibility led in some mss. to variant readings with the proper noun 'Bardas', but only MS 45 is adding more terms to support the concept 'reason'.

[8]   The mostly tautosubjective construction 'participle + conjunction + finite verb' (here: *отверзъ … и сложи*) can be a modal marker for an immediate chain of events (see upcoming article in *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*), but is a rather frequent and semantically bleached construction in Middle Bulgarian and Old East Slavic due to the decreasing morphological productivity of participles. According to the author (Daiber, 2023), the preserved text of VC has suffered (sometimes beyond repair) from six centuries of undocumented

XIV:15	возвѣсти же и патриархѹ о сложенїи бѹкъвъ + [възвесели же се царь …] He [given the textual nature of an addition, most probably: the Emperor] reported also to the Patriarch about the creation of letters + [the Emperor rejoiced …]
XIV:19	[подобно великомоу царѹ Кон'стан'тинѹ] + абїе ꙗтсꙗ пѹти философъ [similar to the great Emperor Constantine] + immediately the philosopher set out on his way
XV:1	[Дошьдьшѹ же ѥмоу Моравы] + прїꙗли его кнꙗзїе ростиславъ и свꙗтополкъ (,) во свои палати его воведоша и великѹю честь емѹ даша. онъ же совѣщалъ сꙗ со кнꙗзи да быша емѹ ѹченикь собрали да врѹчить имъ бѹквы в наѹченїе. [[Constantine], after having come to Moravia] + the princes Rastislav and Svatopolk received him, escorted him into their palaces and did him great honour. He discussed with the princes, that they would assemble pupils in order that he would hand over to them letters and teaching.
XV:2	[въскорѣ же вьсь црьковныи чинь прїимь] = оны же воскорѣ повелѣнное имъ сотвориша и совокѹпиша младцовъ патдесꙗть [sic], онъ же благослови ихъ и дасть имъ бѹквы. овыи младци божїею благодатїю преспѣвахѹ в наѹченїи едины въ славенскомъ, дрѹзии же в греческомъ да бы разѹмѣли силѹ книги. и ихъ изѹчи [наоучи ѥ оутрьници и часовъмь и вечер'нїи и павечер'ници и таинѣи слоуж'бѣ⁹] + и тамо остави и инии ѹченїꙗ грамматикїю и мѹсикїю. пребысть тамо во моравѣ мѣсꙗцеи четиридесꙗть и абїе по пророческ'мъ словѹ исполнилсꙗ. Quickly he accepted the whole Church service] = they quickly did what had been ordered to them and gathered around 50 young boys, he then blessed him and gave them the letters. Those young boys, by the grace of God, very successfully received the teaching, the ones in Slavonic, the others in Greek, in order to understand the meaning of the Book. And he taught them [the morning, the mid-day and the evening Hourly services and the Eucharist Service] + and he stayed there and taught them other teachings, grammar and music. All in all he was in Moravia for forty months and (?) immediately was fulfilled according to the word of the Prophet.
XV:18-22	[м͡ же месець створи въ Моравѣ и иде свести оученикы своꙗ. 19. прѣꙗт' же ѥго идоуща Коц'лы, кнезь панон'скы, и възлюбль вел'ми словен'скыи книгы наоучити се имь и въда до н͡ оученикьь оучити се имь. 20. велию чьсть ѥмѹ сътворь, мимо проводи и. 21. не възят' же ни ѿ Растислава ни ѿ Коц'лꙗ ни злата ни сребра ни иноѥ вещи, положивь еѵагг'ельскоѥ слово и бес пище. 22. тъкмо плѣн'никь испрошь ѿ обию ѳ͡ съть и ѿпоусти ихь.] = и тако наѹчивъ ихъ страхѹ и законѹ божїю и паки ꙗтсꙗ пѹти ко царствѹющемѹ градѹ. кнꙗзи же его со великою честїю опровождахѹ и даваша емѹ много злата и сребра, онь же не хотꙗше не токмо злата и сребра, ни инныꙗ вещи, положивъ еуаггелское

_____

South and East Slavic text transmission, it is hard to decide whether the appearance of the construction 'participle + conjunction' in VC is due to the later text transmission, or eventually indicates an original modal meaning, in this case: 'having opened the books, he immediately formed letters …'.

⁹ The OCS text, quoted according to its appearance in the mss., is damaged; see comment at the end of section 4.3.

слово и без пища, но токмо испросивъ грековъ плѣненныхъ отъ обо(и)хъ девѧть сотъ и отпꙋсти ихъ, самъ же иде пꙋтемъ, радꙋѧсѧ со ꙋченики своими, да ꙗвить цареви и патриархꙋ отъ плода трꙋда своего. но идꙋщꙋ емꙋ пꙋтемъ, кнѧзь панонскии коцьлꙗкъ со своими болꙗры честь емꙋ велїю сотворъ и возлюбль велми книги словенскїа и наꙋчи сѧ отъ него и вда до тридесѧтъ ꙋчениковъ, и мимо провождъ его и даꙗше емꙋ много богатства, онъ же не хотꙗше. егда же приходꙗше ко цариградꙋ, тамо же емꙋ во срѣтенїе патриархъ со причтомъ своимъ и со болꙗры сотвориша. дошедъ до царꙗ, велїю честь прїꙗтъ и сѣде на своемъ сѣдалищꙋ малое времѧ, и паки на благовѣстїе ꙋтверждает сѧ на славенскїе страны. дошедъ же во свои градъ, таможе родивсꙗ, оттꙋдꙋ во далныꙗ страны, даже до рыма.

[Forty months he was active in Moravia and he went to take/ consecrate[10] his pupils. 19. While he was on his way, Kocak, the prince of Pannonia, received him and he very much loved the Slavonic books to be instructed by them and he gave him 50 pupils to teach them. He did him great honour and escorted him (through his country). 21. He did not take, neither from Rastislav, nor from Kocak, neither gold, nor silver, nor another thing, laying down the word of the Gospel without taking advantage. 22. He only asked for 900 prisoners from both and those he set free.] = And so he taught them the fear and law of God and then set out again on his way to the city of the Emperor. The princes escorted him with great honour and constantly offered him much gold and silver, but he did want not only no gold and no silver, but also no other thing, laying down the word of the Gospel without taking advantage, and only having asked for 900 Greek prisoners from both he sat those free. He himself went his way, rejoicing with his pupils, that he may present to the Emperor and the Patriarch from the fruits of his labour. But while he was on his way, the Pannonian prince Kocak together with his powerful did him great honour and he loved very much the Slavonic books and let himself be instructed by him, and he gave him 30 pupils, and escorted him (through his country) and they constantly offered him much riches, he would not want it. When they came to Constantinople, there the Patriarch with his clergy and the powerful had prepared to meet him. After having come to the Emperor, he received great honour and he sat on his chair (as professor) for a short time, and then again was dedicated to preaching in the Slavic lands, having gone to his town, where he was born, and from there on to regions far away, even to Rome.

XVII:1-2	[И оувѣдѣвъ и римскыи папа посла по нь] = и ꙋвидѣвъ андриꙗнъ, римскии папа, моленїе посла честными мꙋжи и философи, дабы дошелъ в римь. и егда доидоша посланныи папою молиша его, онъ же преклонисѧ ко моленїю. [и дошд҃шꙋ юмꙋ въ Римь] = егда приближисѧ во римъ [изыде самь апостолыкь] + и папа [Андрѣꙗнь …] [And having learned of it the Roman Pope sent for him] = and having learned of it, Adrian, the Roman Pope, sent a plea through honourable men and philosophers, that he should go to Rome. And when the approached him the Papal envoys implored him, he was inclined to their plea. [And after having come to Romer] = When he came nearer to Rome [the Apostolic father himself came out] + and the Pope [Adrian …]

---

[10] Cf. comment in Daiber 2023: 315.

4. Results and discussion

The additions of MS 45 to VC have the character of deliberate redactional work. Notably, they are found only in the text's final third. Chapter XIII recounts Cyril's profession as a professor in Constantinople, who is (Chapter XIV) entrusted by the Emperor to lead the Moravian mission and, as a prerequisite to this task, he invents the first Slavic script (Chapter XV). There are no redactional interventions found in Chapter XVI, which, however, is for the most part a translation of 1 Cor 14:5-39. At the beginning of Chapter XVII, we find the next (and final) paraphrasing addition. The topics 'invention of the Glagolica' (XIV), 'resistance of the Western clergy' (XV) and 'acceptance of the Slavic translation by the Pope' (XVII) are the principal concerns of the redactional activity in MS 45. Remarkably, the anonymous scribe of MS 45 shares his focus with the majority of scholarly literature about VC and, to an even greater extent, with the popular remembrance of Cyril and Method, the 'Apostles of the Slavs', to this day.

At first glance, it is obvious that the additions in MS 45 serve to emphasize the political importance of Constantine-Cyril's mission. A closer reading singles out three recurring topics, which may be labelled 'national hegemony', 'cultural importance' and 'Eastern Orthodoxy'. These topics are intertwined, as national hegemony is framed in terms of a certain concept of governance that in turn carries cultural and theological implications. We do not discuss individual additions from different points of view, but rather classify them according to their dominant argumentative function.

4.1. National hegemony

When Constantine-Cyril returns to Constantinople (XIII:1), all manuscripts of VC relate that he continued with his life as a professor 'after having seen the Tsar'. However, MS 45 narrates that the Emperor, together with the Patriarch and all the clergy of the city, expressed great respect upon Constantine-Cyril's arrival. Depending on the question to which person the preterite participle in this sentence refers, there is even room for the interpretation that the Emperor himself actively proceeded towards Constantine-Cyril in order to mark his arrival ceremonially. In any case, the addition in MS 45 indicates that, on the occasion of Constantine-Cyril's return to Constantinople, an official reception had been arranged. In chapter XVII: 2-4 we are presented with practically the same situation. When Constantine-Cyril arrives in Rome, the Pope himself 'together with all inhabitants carrying candles' is prepared to meet him. Yet

while only MS 45 records an official reception of Constantine-Cyril in Constantinople, the official reception marking his arrival in Rome is attested in all manuscripts and is historically far more credible. Pope Adrian together with the peoples 'went out' and met the Orthodox missionaries when they entered Rome or its immediate vicinity. The Slavic utterance *изити* (*изиде самъ апостольікъ Андрїюнь*, XVII:2) is probably rendering Gk. ἐξέρξομαι (τινι), 'to go out towards someone' (Bauer and Aland, 1988, p. 555), but both Greek and Slavic leave it to the context to indicate what distance must be covered for the meeting to occur. In the case of Constantine–Cyril's arrival in Rome, the Pope met the Slavic delegation at one of the city gates at least, for the ceremonial meeting is not, in fact, directed at Constantine-Cyril or any other living person in his company, but at the relics of pope Clement I, which Constantine-Cyril had discovered in Kherson (VIII: 16) and was now bringing back to Rome. The Latin Lives of Constantine-Cyril, without exception, consider the translation of Clement's relics as his most important achievement,[11] and the information in XVII:2 about a ceremonial reception of Constantine-Cyril in Rome is fully credible from a historical point of view. In comparison with the reception in Rome, the official reception of Constantine-Cyril in Constantinople attended by the Emperor, the Patriarch and 'all the clerical ranks', is not only an individual addition of MS 45 to XIII:1 but also appears rather exaggerated in the context of the narration, since the mission to the Khazars, from which Cyril was returning, had not been a success. The Khazars, the majority of whom were of the Jewish faith, did not officially accept Byzantine orthodoxy as state religion: only 200 scholars (XI:41) converted to Christianity, indicating that the Khaganate did not wish to tie itself too closely to the Byzantine Empire, apart from statements of friendship (XI: 41, 44) and the occasional use of military expertise (cf. Daiber, 2023, p. 266, commentary). The narrative context of XIII:1 does not support the idea of a triumphal return to Constantinople in the presence of the entire clergy. On the contrary, the addition in MS 45 seems to have intended to create a parallel between the honouring of Cyril in West (XVII:2) and in the East (XIII:1). It is therefore consistent that, in the same manner, MS 45 also embellishes the welcoming reception of Constantin-Cyril in Moravia (XV:1), adding the detail that he was accommo-

---

[11] Commenting on the content of the recently discovered documents about Constantine-Cyril in the Latin sphere: 'As regards the Latin sources, the motif of the translation of the relics of Pope Clemens Romanus by Constantine-Cyril rests at the basis of practically all discoveries of greater importance made during the last five decades' (Bărlieva, 2007, p. 94).

dated in the palaces of the rulers with great honour (*во свои палати его воведоша и великую честъ ему даша*).

Passages earlier in the text (XII:1, XV:1), which were reworked to correspond with a later one (XVII:2), are signs of deliberate redactional work. In XIV:2, the scribe of MS 45 also includes information that does not appear in the original text until XV:19. The ruler of Pannonia, Kocak, may have been in political alliance with the rulers of Greater Moravia, Rastislav and Svatopolk. Unlike Greater Moravia, however, Pannonia, and more broadly, the small kingdoms in this area, which came into existence after Charlemagne had defeated the Avars in 803, were already more or less tied to the Papal see.[12] That Kocak may have wanted to seek Byzantine economic and military assistance to resist the expansion of the East Frankish Empire is possible; yet the claim that he accepted the diplomatic initiative of Greater Moravia 'gladly as a helper' is not supported by historical evidence. The addition in MS 45 reveals no certain diplomatic intention on Kocak's part but describes the actors' intentions through the cliché 'with great joy' (XIII:1, XIV:2). The historically dubious idea that Kocak was a 'helper' of Rastislav and Svatopolk seems to serve another cliché as well, namely 'Slavic brotherhood'. The idea of Slavic brotherhood is expressively evident in the anachronistic claim that Svatopolk could have been 'prince of Moravia and of Turov and of whole Russia' (note: not 'Rus'). The scribe connects the Moravian mission of the year 863 with the Christianisation of the Kyivan Rus' in 988, when Turov, one of the more important cities in the East Slavic realm in the tenth century, is also first mentioned.[13] The anachronistic and spatial 'fake news' in the addition to XIV:2 lead to the conclusion that the scribe of MS 45 conceptualises the historical events surrounding the Moravian mission of Constantine-Cyril, firstly, as a

---

[12] The problem is historically difficult and cannot be deepened here. Suffice it to say that Hadrian II later appointed Method, Constantine-Cyril's brother, as bishop in the region of Pannonia, which would not have happened if these areas had been suspected of turning away from Rome towards Byzantine. For details concerning Kocak's possible motives, connected with the Patriarchate of Venice, see Verkholantsev (2012).

[13] Under the year 980: *Бѣ бо Рогъволодъ пришелъ и[з] заморья, имяше власть свою в Полотьскѣ, а туры Туровъ, от него же и туровци прозвашася* (PVL, p. 54). I have no idea how the additions in MS 45 make a connection between the proper Name Koc[lj]ak and russ. *тур/* tur 'bull', unless 'Kocak' is etymologically interpreted as a form of protoslavic **котьсь* 'cage' resp. Old Polish kociel 'cage for domestic animals' (Derksen, 2008, p. 241) and thus fits the information of PVL that the city name Turov came into being, because it had been the cage for bulls (tur).

broad Slavic movement, which is connected, secondly, with the dominant position of the Orthodox Church in the Eastern Slavic Area, to which, thirdly, the scribe belongs himself. He imagines that the rulers of Moravia and the Byzantine Emperor would have addressed each other by the title 'Grand Prince' (*великий князь*).This title is specific to the East Slavic regions, first appearing in Kyiv (Melnikova, 2011, p. 115), but finally it will be the grand prince of Moscow who will be grand prince and 'tsar' as the supreme leader of the emerging Russian Empire. Indeed, when the scribe lets the Moravian ambassadors approach the Byzantine emperor as 'very honourable Tsar and Grand Prince' (*благочестивыи царю и велики кнюже*) would have been appropriate for addressing the Muscovite Grand Prince, who had officially assumed the title *Tsar* since the reign of Ivan IV.[14] Additionally, the title 'Grand Prince' places the Byzantine Emperor on the same level with the Russian Tsar, which is exactly the point of view of the famous ideology of 'Moscow – the third Rome'.[15] If we add to this the passage in XIV:12, which portrays the Byzantine emperor as acting not merely rationally (as in the original text of VC), but under the influence of 'angelic, to be precise divine wisdom' (*мѹдростїю аггелскою, лѹчше божїею*), we have a direct expression of the theological foundation of caesaropapism (as upheld, again, by Ivan IV). As a final remark connected with the topic of the implicit concept of '(Russian) national hegemony' in the additions of MS 45, I would like to draw attention to the verb *благоволити* in XIV:4. The verb *благоволити* is primarily known from Mt 17:5 (*сеи есть сынъ мои [возлюбленныи], о немже благовилихъ*[16]) and, with the exception of Izbornik 1076 (*… не вьсѧка доушѧ въ всемь благоволить*[17]), it is predominantly used in reference to a Person of the

---

[14] There is a serious discussion about the nature of the title and the political resp. theological ideology connected with it (see Filyushkin, 2006); the year of the coronation of Ivan IV. in 1547 often serves as the historical reference point for the official career of the title.

[15] The concept of the 'Third Rome' is widely disputed, particularly regarding the extent to which it was truly a dominant political doctrine of Moscow, rather than merely a rhetorical cover for Russia's imperial claims (see, for example, the cautious approach in Laats 2009). This question has renewed relevance today, as evident in the sermons of Russia's political and ecclesiastical elites.

[16] Ostrog Bible (1581), see an added възлюблены in Codex Marianus (OCS, 11th c.) resp. возлюбленный in Elizabeth Bible (1751, quoted after 4th ed. 1762).

[17] 9 examples for благоволити in NKRJa <ruscorpora.ru/>, of which 7 are connected with God and 2 display the quoted sentence from the Izbornik (24.03.2025). – Likewise, SUM XVI/ XVII 2: 93 shows *благоволити* ('to show favour') resp. *благоволеніє* in a specifically 'religious' sense. I am grateful to the first reviewer of my article for this hint.

Trinity. It is only in Muscovite Russia, e.g. in the writings of Maksim Grek, that the verb appears to have become usable in relation to the tsar. This is, of course, a subjective impression which could be demonstrated objectively only through rigorous corpus study; however, the humble plea to the Emperor in XIV:4 is pragmatically different from the language used in VC, being more characteristic of the East Slavic or Russian usage in the sixteenth century.

4.2. Cultural importance

In this section, we comment on information in the additions to MS 45, which expand Constantine-Cyril's profile as a theological scholar to include political competence and broad erudition. Firstly, in underlining the states-manlike abilities of Constantine-Cyril, we find him on a par with the most powerful rulers of his time (XIV: 6, XV: 1), who (against the original text of VC) do not take decisions without consulting him. The scribe is eager to em-phasise this point even against the logic of the narrative. When the Emperor discusses his plans with the Patriarch and 'also with philosopher Konstantin; (XIV: 6 *такожде и со константиномъ философомъ*), MS 45 is forced to construct the textual cohesion with the subsequent reported speech of the Tsar by asserting that, although Constantin-Cyril was allegedly present at the con-sultation, the Tsar and Patriarch later had to inform him about the outcome. The scribe is clearly aware of the narrative inconsistency and seeks to cover it through a change in the linguistic register, as if Cyril's knowledge of the as-sembly's decision nevertheless had to be officially 'explained' (*вѣщати*) to him.

Apart from Constantine-Cyri's political competence, MS 45 also seeks to emphasise the universal erudition of the Saint. In the addition to XV:2 we are told that Constantine-Cyril not only taught his Moravian students the Office of the Hours and the Eucharistic service, but also instructed some of them in 'Greek, in order for them to understand the meaning of the book' (*друзии же в греческомъ да бы разꙋмѣли силꙋ книгы*). In mentioning the need for knowledge of Greek, the addition is, of course, not intended to assess the qual-ity of the new Church Slavonic Bible translation. I see two possible motiva-tions for the remark, and both are anachronistic with regard to VC.

The first possibility is that the addition in MS 45 seeks to emphasise that Orthodoxy is connected with theological writings in Greek rather than Latin, which are, on the contrary, associated with Catholicism. However, translations from Greek, apart from those that came to Greater Moravia in the context of

the Byzantine Moravian mission, are not well documented in the West Slavic domain. The Church Slavonic texts of the Czech redaction are predominantly translations from Latin (Vepřek, 2013), and even when they contain quotations from the Bible, the influence of the Vulgate is notable (e.g. Čermák, 2013). The claim that Constantine-Cyril might have introduced Greek (translation) studies in Greater Moravia is not supported by the character of Church Slavonic texts of Western origin.

The other possibility is that the addition in MS 45 frames the events of the Moravian mission within a Russian context. During the century-long handwritten transmission of Church Slavonic, which is, linguistically, Old Bulgarian, writings in the East Slavic realm, the grammatical norms of the native East Slavic language of the copyists had become so different from South Slavic Old Bulgarian, that the copyists committed numerous language errors. Finally, in the seventeenth century, Patriarch Nikon saw fit for a 'correction of the books' (*книжная справка*) by revising the Church Slavonic texts on the basis of their Greek originals. Not until the establishment of the 'Slavic Greek Latin Academy' in 1682/1685 in Moscow had there been any serious Greek studies in Russia.[18] The addition of MS 45 seems to reflect an increased interest in Greek in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Russia rather than the historical situation in Greater Moravia. When it is added that Constantine-Cyril taught his pupils 'grammar and music' (*грамматикїю и мѵсикїю*), one is again reminded of Russian cultural circumstances, in which the anonymous Serbian tractate 'On the eight parts of speech' (Weiher, 1977) was circulating as a work attributed to Constantin-Cyril. Concerning music, there seems to be no specific text ascribed to Constantine-Cyril (cf. Vladyshevskaja, 2006), however, Church Slavonic liturgical books (e.g. the Triodion) containing musical notation could have motivated the association.

---

[18] 'Здесь впервые в истории страны сформировалась плеяда просвещенных людей, в чьих образовании и опыте сочетались традиционная культура православных книжников с познаниями в гуманитарных науках своего времени и классических языках' [Here, for the first time in the history of our country, there formed a Pléjade of enlightened people, and in their education and experience came together the traditional culture of orthodox book scholars with knowledge in the humanitarian disciplines of their time and with knowledge in the classical languages.] (Ramazanova, 2024, p. 103). We would like to add that the Greek brothers Ioannikios and Sofronios Lichudis (Podskalsky, 2015) served as executives of the Academy, but many teachers had been recruited from the Kyivan Theological Academy, founded by Petro Mohyla as early as 1632; most of the intellectual input into Russia's 17th century came from the periphery of the Empire.

4.3. Orthodoxy

We will examine information from the additions in MS 45 that particularly underline the difference between Catholic and Orthodox Christianity. Similar to the use of *благоволити* (XIV: 4, see 4.1), stressing the Moravian rulers' submissive attitude towards the Byzantine emperor, MS 45 depicts the Roman Pope addressing Constantine-Cyril in an exaggeratedly humble, almost petitioning manner (XVII: 1-2). While the original text of VC relates that the Pope ordered the Byzantine missionaries to come to Rome, the addition in MS 45 imagines a high-ranking delegation travelling to Greater Moravia and asking Constantine-Cyril to meet the pope in Rome, which in the end Constantine-Cyril is 'inclined' to do (*преклонисѧ*). Historically, the Pope had no reason to plead with the Byzantine missionaries but, on the contrary, was fully entitled to demand a justification of their actions within a domain belonging to Roman authority. No one was allowed any missionary venture within the Roman domains without first being ordained as a missionary bishop, a position to which Method was later promoted to. The veneration that Pope Adrian II eventually expressed towards Constantine-Cyril, by laying him to rest in the sarcophagus originally manufactured for his own funeral (XVIII: 19), can hardly be responsible for the exaggerated plea attributed to Pope Nicholas I. The anonymous author of the additions may not have known, or it may have made no difference to him, that it had been Pope Nicholas I, who summoned the Byzantine missionaries to Rome in November 867, but after Nicholas's death on 13 November the same year, Pope Adrian II received them. The Pope's humility in inviting the Byzantine missionaries is historically unfounded, and so is the addition to XVII: 1-2 of the anticipation of the reverence that Adrian II later showed at the funeral of Constantine-Cyril (XVIII: 19). Rather, the addition intends to present Constantine-Cyril as an acclaimed theologian to whom even the Catholic Pope was obliged to show reverence. Constantine-Cyril's authority, according to the additions in MS 45, has transcendental foundations. The addition to XIV: 19 depicts him as reacting immediately (*абїе ѩтсѧ пѫти философъ*) to the suggestion that he should fulfil the task, once begun by Roman Emperor Constantin, nota bene, the namesake of Constantinople as successor to the 'first' Italian Rome; it all fits this long perspectives of 'first' and 'second' Rome that Constantine-Cyril is enacting a 'prophetical saying' (*по пророческ'мъ словѹ*, XV: 2). The addition does not specify exactly which prophecy is meant, as the number '40' occurs many times in the Old Testament and the Gospels, but surely, the alleged prophecy concerns the mission of bringing Orthodoxy to the Slavs, even to those within the Catholic domain.

The strongest intervention in the text of VC, which considerably weakens its narrative cohesion, is the long addition found in XV: 18-22, which serves to downplay any connection of Constantine-Cyril with the Catholic sphere. Contrary to all other copies of VC and to all historical evidence, the addition claims that immediately after his activities in Greater Moravia, Constantine-Cyril travelled back to Byzantium (*паки ꙗтсꙗ пꙋти ко царствꙋющемꙋ градꙋ*), istopping briefl with Pannonian ruler Kocak (*идꙋщꙋ емꙋ пꙋтемъ, кнꙗзь панонскии коцьлꙗкъ со своими болꙗры честь емꙋ велїю сотворъ*), before finally reaching Constantinople, where the Patriarch, the clergy, and state officials prepared an official reception for him (*емꙋ во срѣтенїе патриархъ со причтомъ своимъ и со болꙗры*). Constantine-Cyril received great honours from the hand of the Tsar, then 'sits for a short while on his professorial chair' (*сѣде на своемъ сѣдалищꙋ малое времꙗ*), until he starts travelling through the 'Slavic lands' (*славенскїе страны*) in order to preach the Gospel (*на благовѣстїе*). Eventually, Constantine-Cyril visits his native town of Saloniki, from which he heads off to 'remote countries' (*дал[ь]ныꙗ страны*) and finally 'even' comes 'to Rome' (*даже до рыма*).

The long addition resumes the ceremonial receptions of Cyril, his pan-Slavic intentions, and his superior erudition. Moreover, Cyril is pictured as the 'Apostle to the Slavs', who travels through the Slavic countries, and eventually, coming from his Greek home town, reaches Rome as the geographical extreme. The layout is significant: Greek as the point of origin, the Slavic realm as the space of transmission, and Rome as the ultimate, and somehow improbable ('even'), border where Constantine-Cyril encounters the Catholic 'Other'. It is possible, that the noun *боляр*/ Boljar[19] in the addition indicates again that the scribe is conceptualizing the Moravian Mission from and within a Russian perspective.

The geographical layout of the addition to XV: 18-22 is similar to the geographical layout in the legend about Apostle Andrew (cf. PVL, p. 12). Andrew, preaching in Sinop and intending to go to Rome, somehow strays from his route: first, he prophetically founds Kyiv, then going up the Dnieper, he reaches Novgorod, where he witnesses curious bathing rituals, and finally he comes to Rome and then returns to Sinop on the Black Sea – the exit point of his

---

[19] Appearing several times in OCS (SJS, p. 136), *болꙗръ* is numerously documented in Church Slavonic texts of the Eastern (Russian) redaction, while Old Russian *бояринъ* gradually becomes the prominent form (Vasmer, 1986, p. 203). Besides its use in the Eastern realms, the term was also used in the South Slavic areas.

travel route. Andrew, much to the delight of PVL's tenth-century recipients, travels the whole Rus', and, likewise, Constantine-Cyril travels the Slavic lands. Like Andrew, Constantine-Cyril also reaches Rome, and in both stories nothing can be said about the vertex of the elliptical route. It seems to me that the additions to XV: 18-22 are an intertextual reminiscence of the travelling apostle Andrew in PVL.

From the viewpoint of text linguistics, the long addition to XV: 18-22 could potentially serve as the final part of the text. The remark that Constantine-Cyril made it 'even' to Rome sounds like an unfounded and hardly credible tale, which does not encourage further elaboration. We have no knowledge of a text transmission of VC that ends the story in this way, but the addition of MS 45 could have ended the whole narration here.

Apart from paraphrasing formulations from the common text of VC, the addition to XV: 18-22 conveys the unexpected information that Constantine-Cyril, instead of accepting earthly riches, could have asked for the liberation of 'Greek' prisoners (*испросивъ грековъ плѣненныхъ*). The liberation of prisoners is a recurrent motif in hagiography and occurs three times in VC (Daiber, 2023, p. 75), but only once (XI: 45), when he takes his leave from the Khazars, does Constantine-Cyril ask for 'Greek' prisoners, which is plausible, because some may have still remained in the area after earlier Khazar-Byzantine wars (ibid., p. 266). Asking for Greek prisoners in Pannonia is not supported by historical evidence, and one may speculate if the scribe wished to suggest that Pannonia, having experienced Constantine-Cyril's missionary activity, tended to become a Byzantine ally and therefore released the former enemy's soldiers. Such a reading gives the next sentence, in which Constantine-Cyril is eager to report the 'fruit of his labor' (*плода трꙋда своего*) to the Byzantine Emperor, a political undertone: namely, that the mission was accomplished by accepting one more ally into the Orthodox ranks.

The account of Constantine-Cyril's invention of the Slavic letters, which we will finally consider, shows a clear sign of monastic culture. On the one hand, the additions to XIV: 13-14 and 15 are unremarkable, because they only embellish the common version of VC with some expected details, but, on the other hand, it is rather unexpected that Cyril had prayed 'at midnight'. Let us look at this in more detail. The common text of VC tells us that Cyril, 'according to his long-established[20] habit, resorted to prayer' (*по прьвомꙋ*

---

[20] OCS *по прьвомꙋ ѡбычаю* should hardly be translated literally 'according to first behaviour', because it translates into an expression with Greek ἀρχαῖος, which means 'original, genuine' (Bauer and Aland, 1988, p. 223).

ѡбычаю на молитвѹ се наложи) before he sat down and invented the Slavic letters. That a monk should have a habit of praying (e.g. VII: 4, VIII: 24) is unsurprising, but in the context of his linguistic achievements, the formulation of XIV: 13 recalls the passage VIII: 12, where Constantine-Cyril sat down and prayed before successfully reconciling the variant readings in the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch.[21] The common text of XIV: 14 even makes a lexical reference to VIII: 24 by repeating the utterance 'resort to prayer' (*на молитвѹ се наложи*), although this may have been unintentionally caused by the fact that VC is a translation, and in Greek there may well have been an idiomatic utterance with τίθημι (see the meaning 'to resort to', Bauer and Aland, 1988, p. 1627). MS 45 does not repeat the utterance 'resort to prayer', but has *молитвѹ дѣꙗше*[22], thus employing a more idiomatically Slavic phrasing. Yet, MS 45 creates its own intertextual connection by informing the reader that Constantine-Cyril prayed *во полѹнощи* ('in the midst of the night').The same detail is also highlighted in XV: 2, where the common text of XV: 2 relates that Cyril taught his pupils 'the service of the morning hour and the lunch (hour) and the evening (hour)', expressed syntactically as three coordinated objects (*оутренъ годинъ ... обѣднꙗи ... вечернꙗи*), congruent in case (dative) and number (singular). The nominal objects are not related to OCS construction *учити* + accusative, but to the underlying Greek construction παιδεύω + dative.[23] Some manuscripts, however, expand the line of original dative objects by inserting the accusative object *павечерʼници* (= gr. ἀπόδειπνον „after the evening meal") , and the accusative shows that that the term was secondarily inserted to agree with *учити*. Some scribes, among them the scribe responsible for the additions in MS 45, insist that Constantine-Cyril taught the Service of the Hours, including midnight prayer. However, not everyone, e.g. members of the secular clergy, could pray at night, and so a certain custom evolved already in the Carolingian period.The daytime prayers had to all be observed,

---

[21] Cf. Daiber 2023: 186 and commentary p. 194; the story does not tell a linguistic miracle, as if Cyril had been enabled to understand a book written in Hebrew, but the story displays his theological-hermeneutical abilities.

[22] The verb *деꙗти* 'to do, make' in the meaning of a *verbum dicendi* is not unusual (Daiber, 2023, p. 19).

[23] The wording of VC requires a thoroughly philological approach, because the singular dative objects are, one the one hand, all present in the manuscripts, but, on the other hand, not all together in one manuscript (Daiber, 2023, pp. 297, 306).

and the three main hours (the ones mentioned in VC) were to be recited under all conditions.The night prayers, however, could be merged with the neighbouring hours, either immediately following Compline (evening prayer) or preceding Matins (morning prayer). Scheduling of the nightly hourly services had been determined with regard to the secular clergy, 'denn für diese war naturgemäß der Nachtgottesdienst kaum durchführbar' (Feiler, 1901, p. 31). Praying at midnight, in the literal sense of the term, was characteristic only of ascetic monks or monks who lived under strict monastic rule and were not obliged to do daily work. The addition of Cyril's midnight prayer in XV: 2 can be singled out philologically as a secondary addition, and the addition of MS 45 to XIV: 13 is secondary per se. The secondary additions, which emphasise the 'midnight prayer', reveal more about the monastic scribes of VC than about historical reality.[24]

4.4. Summarizing the observations

Together with the repeated attempts in the additions of MS 45 to emphasise the importance of the Patriarch alongside the Byzantine Tsar (XIV: 15), we may conclude that these additions were made by a Russian monk who presents Constantine-Cyril as the political and cultural eminent Apostle to the Slavs. The scribe of the additions is proud of Eastern Orthodoxy, in sharp contrast to 'Rome', and agrees to Muscovite caesaropapism and its pan-Slavic claims. Moreover, the scribe displays an awareness of linguistic problems associated with Church Slavonic translations from Greek. The peculiarities of the additions in MS 45 allow to locate and date their origin most probably somewhere in Russia between the mid-sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries.

Not every reader, however, may agree with my interpretation, considering the conclusions somehow exaggerated given the scarcity of information available in the additions of MS 45. Interpretation is made within a hermeneutic circle, and other readers may come to different contextualisations. For the purposes of this paper, I consider this interpretation satisfactory, and I would regard it as refuted only if it could not be accepted that the additions of MS 45 are anachronistic and intentionally compromise the integrity of the original narration.

---

[24] Historically, the Moravian lands had already been christianised by Western clergy and were under Catholic rule; without being consecrated as a bishop, nobody, not even a Byzantine missionary, could ordain his pupils as priests, and so, most probably, Constantine-Cyril educated his pupils to serve as secular clergy.

5. Conclusions and discussion

It is well known in medieval studies that scribes, in the process of copying texts, occasionally commented on them. Teeuwen (2016)[25] observes that additions made in margins or blank space became a default feature of medieval texts from the Carolingian period onwards. The scribes' behaviour has been explained by a certain view on mediality. Handwritten texts, unique in their graphical appearance, descended from book scrolls readable only in linear sequence and contributed to the concept that a text stores the visible outline of its author's unique 'voice', which can be revived by a reader who, in articulating letters, makes the silent voice of the author audible again. This concept (present also in VC III: 17) seems to have provided sufficient motivation for a dialogical interplay between the author's voice and that of the scribe. However, the seminal article on 'voces paginarum' (Balogh, 1927, p. 234) already cites evidence from the the fifth century suggesting 'daß die klösterliche Abschreibearbeit nur mehr die Vernunft, die Hände und die Augen beschäftigte, die Stimme aber nicht mehr'. We should be careful about treating the concept of 'text as voice (nota bene, still used metaphorically today) as a sufficient motivation for the author of the additions in MS 45 significantly altering the narrative of VC.

Medieval comments in manuscripts were added 'for clarifying the meaning of words'[26] and appear visually distinct from the text itself. As long as the comment is clearly distinguishable from the base text, it is disputable to consider glosses an 'appropriation' of the text (Teeuwen, 2018 passim, no definition of the term 'appropriation' offered), even when the marginal commentaries exceed the extent of the original text.

Drawing on material from the East Slavic tradition, Shaimerdenova (2012) distinguishes between marginal, interlinear, and intertextual glosses,[27] all of

---

[25] 'The vast majority of manuscripts that survive also contain annotations and additions, which reflect how these manuscripts were read, used, extended, summarized or criticized by their circles of copyists and readers' (Teeuwen, 2016, p. 1).

[26] Shaimerdenova, 2012, p. 22 on the example of the 11th c. Ostromirovo Evangelije.

[27] Shaimerdenova, 2012: 1. marginal glosses, 'by far the earliest form of gloss' (ibid., p. 21), 2. interlinear glosses, which are 'found … much rarer than marginal glosses' and are mostly used for lingual annotations, and finally disappear with the introduction of book printing (ibid., p. 27); 3. intertextual glosses, 'the most widespread type': 'Such glosses are, from an orthographical perspective, absorbed into the main text.' They 'may be found both before (prepositional) and after (postpositional) the word requiring a gloss' (ibid., p. 28).

which are mainly used to explain the meaning of uncommon or foreign words. The additions in MS 45, however, are not concerned with explaining existing information, but with introducing new information. Shaimerdenova (ibid., pp. 71–73) refers to these additions as 'editorial glosses',[28] which, 'as a rule … are found in great number in works of ecclesiastical literature'.The editorial glosses are 'related to the correction and editing of Church Slavonic literature' and also frequently appear in translations, where they can be detected only by 'comparing the translation with its original text'.

Neither the concept of 'text as voice', nor the common practice of medieval scribes to comment on the text they copied by producing interlinear, inserted or marginal glosses entail editorial interventions which cannot be detected by a reader. However, Shaimerdenova's observation that editorial work is often found in 'works of ecclesiastical literature' applies to the additions in MS 45 and supports their dating to sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Russia. We will leave aside the question of whether the editorial work in MS 45 shares characteristics with redactional interventions in East Slavic book production (e.g. in Makarij's *Great Menology*), but take it for granted that the scribe of the additions in MS 45 made, probably, his textual interventions in accordance with the conventions of his time, and believed his text interventions to be a good thing, even though readers might not distinguish between his additions and the original text.

Altering the wording of a text is an indication of the editor's view of how the text should be used. While the medieval custom to insert glosses in manuscripts serves the purpose of clarifying, supporting, or commenting on the argumentation, the insertion of redactional paraphrases and ahistoric information serves to reframe a text in order to promote its empathic reception among contemporary readers. The scribe of the additions in MS 45 conceived of the *Life of Constantine-Cyril* not so much as a work of historical information, but as a work of 'edification'. Again, we leave aside the question of to what extent hagiographical texts are written with an edifying intention, a question that would lead to a historical discussion of how VC is related to other hagio-

---

[28] It is disputable whether interventions in a text, be it abridgement, paraphrase or addition of sentences, should be called 'glosses' at all, especially when they can only be detected by comparing original and 'glossed' (= altered wording). The term 'editorial intervention', as used in this paper, seems to better denote the fact: reworking of an original text.

graphical works of the ninth century.[29] We emphasise only that the scribe of MS 45 shifts the intended use of VC even further towards the pole of 'edification'. He does so from the standpoint of his time: The Moravian mission of Constantine-Cyril, in the eyes of ninth-century observers, was a local affair, yet it ultimately caused a historical movement of continental and epochal significance. The rise of the Kyjivan and the Muscovite empires respectively is not conceivable without it.

The intentions and the stance of the scribe who produced the additions in MS 45, remind us of similar tendencies in our time. The didactic intention in the redactional reworking of texts has been a topic for discussion in theories of bilingual text transmission, which thought of translation as a 'space' where cultural differences are to be negotiated. Prunč (2002) surveys various theories that call for and legitimise textual interventions in order to produce a target text sensitive to the cultural values and societal circumstances of its intended audience, even when such interventions involve alterations of the text not detectable without comparison of the translation with its source.[30] These theories, mostly from the 1990s, have become reality in our time when translations or reworked editions of texts appear with politically correct wording (e.g., the removal of the 'n-words' from Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn*) or with paraphrases and omissions (e.g., the exclusion of Mohammed in Dante's *Inferno*). All these textual interventions are performed in the conviction that they serve a higher goal. However, such good intentions can appear as a dialectical mirror of the supremacy against which the measures are directed, a phenomenon which was noted in the field of translation theory in

---

[29] Byzantine hagiography displays recurrent textual units that were fully developed during the reworking of the Lives by Metaphrastes (10th c.). VC lacks certain such units (e.g. *captatio benevolentiae* of the scribe), which are already attested in the 9th c. (see an example in Pratsch, 2012, p. 24). Since VC, being considered an original Slavic work, has not been treated as an example of Byzantine hagiography, we cannot summarise here therefore the intentions of the Greek author of VC. It can only be said that VC is based on the textual records of Constantine-Cyril's disputations with various interlocutors (Tachiaos, 2005, pp. 46, 48, 280 Anm.), which allows us to suggest, that the Greek author's intention in composing the text was strongly connected with its use for historical documentation.

[30] Cf. Prunč, 2012, pp. 80 (functional translation), 263 (translation as active re-reading and re-writing admits openly to manipulate the source text and show off the signs of its manipulation, on the example of feminist translation), 266 ('foreignizing translation' as a form of post-colonial translation).

the 1990s by Prunč (2012, p. 266[31]) and is noted today, in the field of post-colonial theory (Uffelmann, 2020, p. 147[32]). Text interventions that attempt to eliminate unwanted features in historical documents follow a paradoxical logic where they eliminate the historical facts, which are the motivation for their intervention, in the first place. The additions to the text of VC, as found in MS 45, display the scribe's intention to sharpen the difference between Orthodoxy and Catholicism, and, if I am not mistaken, these were made at a time when Muscovite culture found itself in opposition to influences from Catholic Counter-Reformation. The text interventions in MS 45 can be compared to the text interventions, proposed by ideological translation theory, in that both interventions are politically motivated. MS 45 demonstrates that framing historical events in order to reshape them according to contemporary political identity is an act of cultural appropriation. While there is nothing objectionable in openly presenting one's own perspective, the manipulation of wording and information to promote a politically intended use of the given text does not open a dialogical space, but rather closes it.

---

[31] 'Was als Rebellion konzipiert ist, wird in den mächtigen, aufgrund ihrer selbstproduzierten Übersättigung stereotypisierten Literaturen zur literarischen Innovation. Dadurch wird das System nicht untergraben, sondern dynamisiert …' [What is conceptualized as rebellion, becomes a literary innovation within the mighty and, because of self-produced supersaturation, stereotyped literatures. This does not undermine the system, but dynamizes it …]

[32] Uffelmann recommends "(1) to again and again confine postcolonially inspired research to heuristic and negative dialectical use, which (2) allows preventing necessary local adoptions from falling into structural epistemic nationalism or methodological 'autonomism'."

References

Balogh, J. (1927). Voces Paginarum. Beiträge zur Geschichte des lauten Lesens und Schreibens. *Philologus*, *82*, 88–109, 202–240.

Bărlieva, S. (2007). The Cyrillo-Methodian Tradition in the Latin Hagiography. Recent Research Topics. In J. Michalov, M. Hetényi, P. Ivanič, Z. Taneski (Eds.), *Poznávanie kulturného dedičstva sv Cyrila a Metoda* (pp. 94–107). Nitra.

Bassnett, S. (2007). Culture and Translation. In P. Kuhiwczak, K. Littau (Eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 13–23). Multilingual Matters. (= Topics in Translation 34).

Bauer, A. = Bauer, W. (1988). *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. 6th edition (K. Aland and B. Aland, Eds.). De Gruyter.

Čermák, V. (2013). Žaltářní citáty v českocírkevněslovanském překladu Čtyřiceti homilií na evangelia (Besědy) Řehoře Velikého. *Slavia. Časopis pro slovanskou filologii*, *82* (1/2), 53–68.

Daiber, T. (2023). *Vita des Konstantin-Kyrill. Altkirchenslavischer Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Harrassowitz.

Derksen, R. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Brill. (= Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 4).

Diddi, C. (2004). Materiali e ricerche per l'edizione critica di Vita Constantini. II. La tradizione del grupo dei testimoni serbi. *Ricerche slavistiche*, *2* (48), 67–127.

Feiler, E. (1901). *Das Benediktiner-Offizium, ein altenglisches Brevier aus dem 11. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Wulfstanfrage*. Winter.

Filyushkin, A. (2006). *Tituly russkih gosudarey*. Alyans-Arheo [in Russian].

Grivec, F., & Tomšič, F. (Eds.) (1960). *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses. Fontes*. Staroslovenski institut. (= Radovi staroslovenskog instituta 4).

Laats, A. (2009). The Concept of the Third Rome and its Political Implications. *KVÜÕA toimetised*, *12*, 98–113.

Leung, M. Wing-Kwong. (2006). The ideological turn in Translation Studies. In J. Ferreira Duarte, A. Assis Rosa, T. Seruya (Eds.), *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines* (pp. 129–144). Benjamins.

Melnikova, E. (2011). "Knyaz" i "kagan" v ranney titulature Drevney Rusi. In G. Glazyrinoy & T. Dzhakson (Eds.), *Drevnyaya Rus i Skandinaviya. Izbrannye trudy* (pp. 114–122). Univ. Dmitriya Pozharskogo [In Russian].

Meyvaert, P., & Devos, P. (1955). Trois énigmes Cyrillo-Méthodiennes de la "Légende Italique" résolues grâce à un document inédit. *Analecta Bollandiana*, *73*, 375–461.

Mirčeva, B. (2014). *Opis na prepisite na slavjanskite izvori za Kiril i Metodij i technite učenici*. Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite. (= Kirilo-Mefodievski Studii 23) [in Bulgarian].

Podskalsky, G. (2015). Lichudis. *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (online)*. Brill.

Pratsch, T. (2012). *Der hagiographische Topos. Griechische Heiligenviten in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit*. De Gruyter. (= Millennium-Studien 6).

PVL = Lihachev, D., & Romanov, B. (Eds.). (1950). *Povest vremennyh let. Chast pervaya: tekst i perevod*. AN SSSR [in Russian].

Prunč, E. (2002). *Einführung in die Translationswissenschaft*. Vol. 1 Orientierungsrahmen. 2nd. ed. Graz.

Ramazanova, D. (2024). Ucheniki Ioannikiya i Sofroniya Lihudov konca XVII – nachala XVIII veka i razvitiye knigopechatnogo dela v Rossii v 1691–1740 godah. In S. Mengel, & L. Rossi (Eds.), *Language and Education in Petrine Russia*. FS Maria Cristina Bragone (pp. 103–127). Firenze. (= Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici 59) [in Russian].

Shaimerdenova, N. (2012). *Glosses in Russian Manuscripts from the 11th to 18th Centuries*. Aitmatov Academy.

SJS = Kurz, J., & Hauptová, Z. (Eds.) (1958–2015). *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. ČSAV.

SUM XVI/XVII = Hrynchyshyn, D. (Ed.). (1974). *Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy XVI – pershoi polovyny XVII stolit* (Tom 2). Natsionalna Akademiia Nauk Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].

Tahiaos, A.-E. (2005). *Svyatyye bratya Kirill i Mefodiy. Prosvetiteli Slavyan*. Duhovnaya akademiya [in Russian].

Teeuwen, M. (2016): Writing in the Blank Space of Manuscripts: Evidence from the Ninth Century. In B. Crostini, G. Iversen, & B. M. Jensen (Eds.), *Ars Edendi. Lecture Series* (Vol. IV, pp. 1–25). Stockholm. (= Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 62).

Teeuwen, M. (2018). Practices of Appropriation: Writing in the Margin. In E. Kwakkel, & R., Thomson (Eds.), *The European Book in the Twelfth Century* (pp. 139–156). Cambridge Univ. Press. (= Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature).

Uffelmann, D. (2020). Postcolonial theory as post-colonial nationalism. In M. Albrecht (Ed.), *Postcolonialism Cross-Examined. Multidirectional Perspectives on Imperial and Colonial Pasts and the Neocolonial Present* (pp. 135–152). Routledge.

Fasmer, M. (1986–1987). *Etimologicheskiy slovar russkogo yazyka* (O. Trubachev, Transl.). 4 t. Progress [in Russian].

Vepřek, M. (2013). *Církevněslovanské památky českého původu s latinskou předlohou*. *Slavia*, *82* (1/2), 240–250.

Verkholantsev, J. (2012). St. Jerome, Apostle to the Slavs, and the Roman Slavonic Rite. *Speculum, 37*, 37–61.

Vlayshevskaya, T. (2006). *Muzykalnaya kultura Drevney Rusi*. Znak [in Russian].

Weiher, E. (1977). Die älteste Handschrift des grammatischen Traktats "Über die acht Redeteile". *Anzeiger für Slavische Philologie*, *9*, 367–427.