Larysa Dovga
Roman Kyselov

Principles of Quoting the Holy Scriptures in Works by 17th Century Ukrainian Authors: Approaching the Issue

1.   *General Considerations*

This article deals with a question that has been somewhat overlooked by scholars of Early Modern Ukrainian culture, namely how, from which sources, to what extent and in which cases 17th-century Ukrainian scholars and thinkers quoted from or referred to the Holy Scriptures[1]. This is by no means a secondary issue if we are to understand the process by which the culture of that period took shape and evolved in Ukraine.

Firstly, the attitude towards the Scriptures, and the ways in which they were quoted and referred to, indicate the specificity of the Ukrainian intellectual culture and the range of freedom that this culture sets as a frame for its own development. It also indicates the possible range of sources considered as the most authoritative argument in any dispute. This is especially important for the Baroque period which was dominated by conceptism, rhetoricity, disposition to accumulate quotations, a tendency to prove the validity of new ideas by referring to their 'antiquity', emphasizing the hidden sense of certain words and searching for etymological roots.

Secondly, by verifying quotes based on manuscript copies and printed editions of the Holy Scriptures[2] in different languages (Church Slavonic, Latin, Polish or Old Ukrainian / *prosta mova*) and within various confessional canons (Orthodox, Catholic or Protestant Churches), we can discover which particular texts were most widely used by Ukrainian intellectuals, whether and to what extent they were tied to a particular language and/or tradition, how far 'Latin erudition' influenced the theological discourse of the Orthodox Kyjivan Metropolitan Church and its leading representatives.

---

[1]   However, Vasyl Simovyč had already paid attention to this problem back in 1930 analyzing the language of Joanykij Galiatovs'kyj, and comparing his quotations from HS with the Ostroh Bible (1581). He pointed out that quotations were not literal and may have been written 'from memory'. For details, see Simovyč (1930). Some observations concerning sources of quotes from the HS in the works by Meletij Smotryc'kyj were offered by American researcher David Frick (1995). The Italian Slavist Marcello Garzaniti briefly addressed the issue of quoting and translating HS (Garzaniti 1999) in the same author's works, however some of his findings are controversial, as will be discussed below. German scholar Hartmut Trunte paid special attention to quoting from the HS and other methods of referring to the Bible in *Perlo Mnohocinnoje* by K.T. Stavrovec'kyj (Trunte 1985: 249-263).

[2]   Hereafter the Holy Scriptures will be referred to as HS.

Larysa Dovga (National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy) – l.dovha@ukma.edu.ua
Roman Kyselov (National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine) – kyselyov@yahoo.com
The author declares that there is no conflict of interest

Thirdly, and this is perhaps the most interesting point, by elucidating the principles of quoting from the HS, we may better understand how Early Modern Ukrainian authors interpreted and rendered the Bible texts[3]. This problem was key for culture all over Europe in the 16th-17th centuries, when Protestantism spread through numerous countries, debates about the canonicity of sacred books and levels of their interpretation were renewed, numerous translations of the Bible into vernacular languages appeared and the right to read and understand the Bible independently was acknowledged even for the laity. At the same time, the widespread use of references to the HS in works of inter-confessional polemics required theologians to adopt a particularly scrupulous approach to their choice of fragments for quotation and to the way these were presented[4]. The need to translate, verify and edit fragments of the HS[5] or the writings of the Church Fathers for printed editions urged representatives of various theological schools and confessions to evaluate what was more important when working with sacred texts: to follow them 'to the letter' (to quote or translate literally), or to render the meaning accurately[6]. Moreover: should (and can) one

---

[3]   In this case we are not talking about the scholastic principle of the four levels of interpretation of the HS, used by theologians of the Baroque era (one of the first detailed descriptions of this principle can be found in the homiletic manual *Nauka, al'bo sposob zложenja kazanja* by Joanykij Galiatovs'kyj [Kyjiv, 1659]; see: Jakovenko 2017: 273-280), but about different textual issues connected with the purpose and process of translation. In relation to Ukrainian or, more generally, Kyjiv Metropolis literature, this question, as far as we know, is still almost unexplored. Perhaps the only work that sheds some light on this issue is the article by Svetla Matchauzerova (Matchauzerova 1976), in which the author briefly refers to the Kyjivan tradition of translation and interpretation of the text when analyzing Simjaon Polacki's views. See also: Uhlenbruch 1983 (especially p. 118). On the broader context of the meaning of biblical images and citations from the HS in the late medieval and early modern Orthodox literature, see also: Picchio 1977, Naumow 1983, Garzaniti 2008, Marcialis 2008.

[4]   The response of the Catholic Church in the debates on the trustworthiness of books of the Old Testament was the peremptory declaration of the authority of *Vulgata* by the Council of Trent (1546) and the preparation of its most accurate canonical version for print (the so-called *Vulgata Clementina* published in 1592 gained the status of such edition).

[5]   It should be mentioned that several Polish translations of the HS were still being published within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th century: the *Bible of Leopolita* (1561) and Jakub Wujek's *Bible* (1599) within the Catholic canon; the *Bible of Brest* (1563) and Symon Budny's *Bible* (1572) within canons of protestant confessions. The Kyjivan Orthodox Church did not stay aside from the European mainstream: the first complete and corrected Church Slavonic *Ostroh Bible* was published in 1581. The translations of biblical books into *prosta mova* (i.e. the literary version of Ukrainian and Belarusian spoken languages) were related to protestant ideas. These include the handwritten *Peresopnytsia Gospel* (1556-1561), the *Krekhiv Apostle* (after 1563), the *New Testament* translated by V. Nehalevskyj (1581), the printed *Gospel* edited by Vasyl Tyapynskyj (1570s).

[6]   For the European context of this issue cfr. for example Vanhoozer 1998 and Vdovina 2009. The latter includes a lengthy review of literature on the subject, and the most comprehensive list of relevant publications.

retell the sacred texts in one's own words, or should they just be quoted without insertions, reductions or other formal changes within the phrases?

Late 16th and 17th century Ukrainian printed books offer a certain amount of information on this subject. Such information appears in the prefaces to editions of translated literature, where translators or editors explained to the readers how the book was prepared for print, why this particular work was chosen, what reasons determined the choice of the language for translation, what principles were essential for a translator in his attempt to reproduce the original content most accurately, how a potential recipient had to read a book to gain the greatest benefit[7]. Unfortunately, we failed to find any reflections directly concerning rules for quoting the HS in the Ukrainian editions of the time.

Obviously, a single article is not enough to discuss all these issues in detail. Our goal here is to raise the problem and check the adequacy of some theoretical premises, rather than obtain final results. To start with, we will look for answers to the following questions: a) to what extent were quotations from the HS literal? b) which editions served as a source of quotations for the intellectuals of the Kyjivan Metropolis?[8] c) how frequently did the Kyjivan erudites quote the HS and which factors influenced that frequency? d) how were fragments of the HS connected with the author's main text? (here we will only consider quotations properly documented by the author and will ignore hidden citations), e) which "techniques" did authors apply when paraphrasing HS fragments?

The main work analyzed in this article is Inokentij Gizel's treatise *Myr s Bohom čoloviku* (Kyjiv 1669). By way of comparison we will also refer to a range of other editions published in the Kyjivan lands in the first half of the 17th century. These include, in particular, *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje*[9] (Krylos 1606; in general this text corresponds to the JU published in Zabludiv, 1569), JU translated by Meletij Smotryc'kyj (Vievis 1616, republished by Petro Mohyla in Kyjiv, 1637), JU by Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj (Rochmaniv 1619) and *Zercalo Bohosloviji* by the same author (Počajiv 1618). We have also made a selective analysis of the HS quotations in the collections of sermons *Věnec' Chrystov* by Antonij Radyvylovs'kyj (Kyjiv 1688) and *Oběd duševnyj* by Simjaon Polacki (Moskva 1681). We purposely chose texts of different types and different times of creation, because this approach allows us to follow not just random features inherent to a particular writer, circle of authors or a particular genre, but the continuing trends that essentially determine the type of intellectual tradition.

---

[7]   Cfr. for example the second preface to *Anthologion* (Kyjiv 1619), and the first and second prefaces to *Běsědy na 14 poslanij sviataho apostola Pavla* by John Chrysostom (Kyjiv, 1623), both republished in Titov 1924: 20-23, 53-64.

[8]   Probably some Ukrainian authors/translators used also manuscript copies of the HS books as a source of quoting, including the *Peresopnytsia Gospel*, but in this article we refer only to printed books.

[9]   Hereafter the text and editions of the *Jevanhelije učytelnoje* will be referred to as JU.

To check quotes from the HS we used the *Ostroh Bible*[10] (1581) and the following editions: *Jevangelije* (with narrow fonts) (Moskva 1553-1554), *Jevangelije* (with medium-sized fonts) (Moskva 1558-1559), *Jevangelije* (with wide fonts) (Moskva 1563-1564), *Jevanhelije* (Vilnius 1575), *Novyj Zavět i Psaltyr* (Ostroh 1580), *Jevanhelije* (Vilnius 1600), *Jevangelije* (Moskva 1606), *Novyj Zavět i Psaltyr* (Vievis 1611), *Biblija* (Moskva 1663). There are generally very few differences in the texts of these publications, on both lexical and syntactic levels, and in terms of content. For verification and comparison we also used the Polish texts of the *Leopolita Bible* (1561), the *Brest Bible* (1563), and the *Bibles* of Symon Budny (1572) and Jakub Wujek (1599), as well as the canonical Latin *Vulgata*.

In actual fact, the most complicated part of this research proved to be the 'technical' aspect, namely identifying fragments of the HS in the texts analyzed and identifying the editions (sources) from which the quotations were taken (especially in cases of non-literal citations or incorrect margin references).

2.   *Literal Quotes*

The most fitting text for our analysis is the edition of Inokentij Gizel's treatise *Myr s Bohom čoloviku*[11] (1669) which was published as a reprinted version in 2009 (Gizel' 2009) and in Ukrainian translation in 2012 (Gizel' 2012) with an index of quotations from the HS.

Myr numbers about 700 pages, it contains 1055 different references to almost all of the Old and New Testament books, including 720 literal quotations, 711 of which coincide with the text of *Ostroh Bible* while 9 were drawn from the *Vulgata* (apparently, the author of the treatise independently translated them from Latin into Church Slavonic). Literal matches are found both in very small portions, not exceeding a few words, and in lengthy fragments occupying several lines. Precise quotes are not usually related to liturgical readings (which the author could have known by heart), and a significant part of the longer quotes were taken from the books of the Old Testament. We can thus confirm that the author / compiler of *Myr* collated them with existing printed versions.

Further on, we will examine why the Orthodox theological treatise quoted from the HS of the Catholic canon. Now we will focus on fragments borrowed from OB.

The concentration of quotations in the body of the treatise is not uniform. There are sections and pages that are packed with quotations, to the extent that it is hard to distinguish the author's 'original' text. In other cases, there are hardly any quotations for anything up to 10 pages. So far, we have failed to find a consistent principle of quotation usage that might clarify in which cases the compiler of *Myr* felt the need to prove his own thesis through the authority of the sacred text and when, on the contrary, he thought he could ignore it. This question may become less obscure when we have unveiled the entire web

---

[10]   Hereafter it will be referred to as OB.

[11]   Hereafter referred to as *Myr*.

of quotations and all the *Myr* sources[12]. A preliminary analysis indicates that the author selected most quotations from the HS autonomously and because he wished (or needed) to offer solid documentation from the HS in the parts of the treatise containing postulates which might appear new, unusual or non-Orthodox to the meticulous scrutiny of Eastern Christian theologians[13].

In support of this hypothesis, we will give a few examples. In the "Preliminary remarks" (Gizel' 2009: 22-24), which consider the nature of "conscience, will, grace, justification and merit", the whole page of the text concerning 'conscience' (the presentation is consistent with Orthodox views) is devoid of quotes from the HS; explaining the notion of 'will', the author uses a quote from the HS only to confirm the postulate about free will as a cause of good acts (that thesis was not quite in tune with contemporary Orthodox doctrine, which considered free will as a motive rather for evil than good deeds); while explaining the nature of 'active grace', 'justification' and 'merit' (less than one page is devoted to the discussion of all three issues), i.e. concepts mostly borrowed from Catholic moral teaching, the author uses as many as 10 references from the HS, and 6 of them are full-sized literal quotations from Psalms and the New Testament. The same is true of the explanation of nature and gradations of sins (Gizel' 2009: 34-35), which are not only divided into original and active but also into mortal and venial – a doctrine which is unusual for Orthodox theology. In that case, a half-page text has no fewer than nine quotations from the HS.

The need to draw heavily on the HS was felt especially when discussing theses of special social significance, but that Orthodox believers might view with some mistrust. A telling example may be offered by the requirement for laity "to ensure a decent profit for priests" (the fourth commandment of the Church)[14]. Interestingly enough, especially large quotations accompany the third paragraph of comments on this commandment where material benefits received by believers (good harvests, a quiet peaceful life, etc.) are considered to be the result of having provided proper maintenance for pastors. On the other hand, it also names possible calamities (God's punishment), which may strike those who ignore the commandment. The whole fragment takes up 20 lines, 12 of which are quotations from the HS.

A more detailed analysis of cases and ways of quoting the HS to confirm or illustrate the statements of *Myr* requires a separate article and goes beyond our purpose. We would just like to point out that there is sufficient proof that mid-17th century Kyjivan intellectuals made use of precise quotations from the HS as irrefutable arguments which allowed them: a) to deny allegations of possible deviation from Orthodox doctrine or revision of Orthodox dogma; b) to convince laity, that the 'duties of conscience' mentioned in

---

[12]   Among the sources which were certainly or probably used by Gizel' one should remember the *Summa Theologiae* by Thomas Aquinas, the *Roman Catechism*, works by Mikołaj Mościcki and several other Catholic authors of the late 16th-early 17th centuries. For details, see Korzo 2010.

[13]   The fact that the treatise contains ideas borrowed from "foreign authors" was openly stated by Gizel' himself in the preface to *Myr* (Gizel' 2009: 21).

[14]   *Ibidem*: 66-67.

Myr do not contain excessive requirements, do not contradict Church tradition and are grounded in Biblical texts.

Let us now focus on the few cases where quotations are given not from ob, but following the *Vulgata*.

Preliminary observations indicate that a) some or all quotes translated from the *Vulgata* were selected by the compiler of *Myr* himself or, at least, they are not to be found in the texts that the latter surely used as a fundamental source[15]; b) quotations from the *Vulgata* appear only when the text of the latter and relevant fragments of ob considerably differ, or when the Church Slavonic translation does not convey meanings which are useful for illustrating *Myr*'s moral instructions The reason for the substantial differences between the *Vulgata* and ob is mostly that the latter was a translation from a different source and language, i.e. the Greek redactions of the *Septuaginta*. As mentioned above, we have identified only 9 cases belonging to this typology out of 720 documented quotations.

Among the most interesting examples we mention the following.

1. The first quote from the *Vulgata* appears when, describing the "seven main deadly sins", the author considers dizziness as the first consequence of gluttony:

> Єгда кто дымовъ ради и паръ, ω(т) излишнихъ снѣдей и питїй… помраченну иматъ главу, сице, яко бываетъ слабъ, и sѣло немощенъ, до дѣлъ разума ко сп(асе)нїю прислушающихъ: якоже до истязанїя совѣсти, предъ исповѣдїю или пре(д) сномъ, до М(о)л(и)твы съ Вниманїемъ, до поятїя разумомъ яковых вещей сп(асе)нныхъ, или до помнѣнїя ихъ, и про(ч). В коихъ всѣхъ дѣлех къ стяжанїю м(уд)рости потребно єстъ воздержанїе, по сему єже рече Єкклесїастъ: *Мышляхъ в(ъ) с(е)рдци моемъ, воздержати ω(т) вина плоть мою, да с(е)рдце мое пренесу къ мудрости* (Eccl. 2) [italics in all citations ours][16].

This translation from Ecclesiastes can certainly be defined as made by the compiler of *Myr* from the Latin original since it literally corresponds to the text of the *Vulgata*: "Cogitavi in corde meo abstrahere a vino carnem meam, ut animam meam transferrem ad sapientiam". The corresponding fragment in the Church Slavonic translation of the Bible substantially differs: "и созрѣх(ъ) да с(е)рдце мое оставитъ ω(т) вина плоть мою, и с(е)рдце мое наставитъ мя мудрости" (Eccl. 2:3). Indeed, ОВ (as well as later Ukrainian translations, namely those by Pantelejmon Kulish, Ivan Ohijenko, Ivan Chomenko, Rafajil Turkonjak) suggests that the person deliberately indulges in drinking in order to grasp and evaluate the essence of thoughtlessness[17]. However, a treatise on moral theology would be unlikely to give believers this sort of advice: it would rather encourage them to abstain from sin, while its negative effects were to be learned not from their own experience, but from descriptions or from the experience of other sinful people. Consequently, letting aside the issue of an adequate hermeneutical interpretation of this passage, we can reasonably assume that the author of *Myr* could reject the version of ОВ because it was not clear enough and might have been wrongly perceived as an indirect encouragement to personal knowledge of the disastrous nature of drunkenness. Therefore he chose the *Vulgata* version, which clearly articulated the notion of not drinking.

2. Another case concerns the sin of ultimate impenitence. In *Myr* we read:

> И того ради Ап(осто)л якоже за вышшій грѣхъ ожесточенія, сице и за сей конеч-наго непокаянія, претитъ тако: по жестокости твоей и непокая(н)ному ср(д)цу со-бираеши себѣ гнѣвъ на д(е)нь Гнѣва, и ω(т)кровенія пр(а)в(ед)наго суда Б(о)жія. (Рим. 2) Іеронѵм же с(вя)тый также(д)е ω семъ грѣсѣ конечнаго непокаянія толкует словеса Б(о)жія реченная Амосомъ: *За три без(ъ)честія Дамаску, и за четыри не ωбращу егω* (Ам. 1)[18].

---

[17]   In ОВ the cited phrase continues as: "и єже дръжати въ веселїи, дондеже вижу кое бл(а)-го с(ы)номъ ч(е)л(овѣ)ч(ес)кимъ, єже творятъ по(д) с(о)лнце(м)". The word веселїе, which in the version of ОВ denotes the aim of drinking, corresponds to "ἀφροσύνη" in *Septuaginta* and "stul-titia" in *Vulgata*. Although the Greek version presents it as an object of a trial (καὶ τοῦ κρατῆσαι ἐπ' ἀφροσύνη), the *Vulgata* clearly tells about the desire to avoid foolishness (devitaremque stultitiam). In later Ukrainian translations we have "придержуватись і сієї дурниці" (Kulish), "буду держатись глупоти" (Ohijenko), "віддаватись дурощам" (Khomenko), which all mean "to stick to foolish-ness". To compare, Russian Synod translation also gives it as "придержаться глупости", in the King James Bible and the Standard English Bible we have a rather ambiguous "to lay hold on folly", while in International Standard English version one reads: "I decided to indulge in wine, while still re-maining committed to wisdom. I also tried to indulge in foolishness, just enough to determine whether it was good for human beings under heaven given the short time of their lives".

[18]   Gizel' 2009: 190. "Therefore the Apostle both for the previous sin of insensibility and for this one of ultimate impenitence reproaches with these words: "По жестокости твоей и не-покаянному с(е)рдцу, собираеши себѣ гнѣвъ на д(е)нь гнѣва, и ω(т)кровенія пр(а)в(е)днагω

Here again the author chooses the *Vulgata* as a source and this option is related to the semantic context of the treatise. In ов we read: "И рече Г(оспод)ь на три бесчестїя дамаска, и на четыри не ω(т)вращуся ихъ" (Am. 1:3). The expression "не ω(т)вращуся ихъ" here means 'I will not leave them (бесчестїя) undetected', or, to paraphrase, 'I won't close my eyes to them'. Translations into modern Ukrainian were similar, namely the ones by P. Kuliš ("я не пощаджу" – 'I will not spare them'), I. Ohijenko ("цього не прощу" – 'I will not forgive that') and I. Chomenko ("не попущу того" – 'I will not overlook that'). Instead, the *Vulgata* reads: "Haec dicit Dominus: Super tribus sceleribus Damasci, et super quatuor non convertam eum, eo quod trituraverint in plaustris ferreis Galaad". Here "non convertam eum" means 'I will not convert (correct) them': perseverance in sin (the author of *Myr* considers 'ultimate impenitence') prevents God from guiding the sinful to moral recovery. The Polish translations in the Leopolita and Wujek *Bibles* follow the *Vulgata* and interpret this fragment in the same way: "nie nawrócę go". Moreover, in these two *Bibles*, God promises different punishments for impenitent sinners.

3. The next fragment of *Myr* concerns slanderers and detractors. By spreading gossip and slandering their neighbors, they fall into the sin of calumny considered here in the context of the mortal sin of envy and interpreted as one of its most disgusting fruits. This sin characterizes both those who slander, and those who listen to such stories. In *Myr* we read:

> Вѣдати подобаетъ въконецъ, яко не токмо клеветати, но и послушати клевещуща(го), грѣ(х) є(ст). И того ради запрѣщае(т) сїе Соломо(н) [по Зводу Іеронѵма с(вя)т(о)го]: *Ниже съ оклеветающими смѣсися, внезапу бо востанетъ погибель ихъ, и паденїе ωбою кто извѣсть?* (Prv. 24:21-22)[19].

This quote is literally translated from the *Vulgata*: "et cum detractoribus non commiscearis; quoniam repente consurget perditio eorum, et ruinam utriusque quis novit?" The corresponding verses in ов read: "Бойся Б(ог)а с(ы)ну и ц(а)ря, и ни едíному же ихъ противися. Внезапу бо стяжетъ нечестивыи, мученїя бо обою кто извѣсть" (Prv. 24:21-22). The last variant does not mention slanderers or detractors at all, although within the chapter we can find general recommendations which may imply the need to avoid sinners of that kind: "не радуися о злодѣющи(х), и не ревнуи путемъ грѣшныхъ. Не пребуду(т) бо внуци лукавныхъ, свѣтило же нечестивы(х) оугаснетъ" (Prv. 24:19-20). It is evident that the formulation of the *Vulgata* illustrates the meaning of this moral teaching in *Myr* much better.

суда Б(о)жïа" (Rom. 2). Also saint Jerome relates the words of God, spoken by Amos to this sin of ultimate impenitence: "За три без(ъ)честïя Дамаску, и за четыри не ωбращу єгω" (Am. 1).

19 Gizel' 2009: 169. "Finally one should know that not only calumny itself, but also listening to a calumniator is a sin. Therefore Solomon forbids it (according to Jerome's code), saying this: Ниже съ оклеветающими смѣсися, внезапу бо востанетъ погибель ихъ, и паденïе ωбою кто извѣсть?" (Prv. 24:21-22).

4. The following example shows that the author (or compiler) of the treatise felt free to combine the version of the *Vulgata* with the version of the ов just for reasons of clarity or semantical exactness, according to his own understanding. The quote from Ecclesiastes

> Туга житїя. Єгда кто тужит якѡ въ мірѣ сем и живет, видя яко єлико множае живетъ, толико паче за свою лѣно(ст) Заповѣди Божїя оставляетъ, къ чесому могутъ прислушати сїя Єк(к)лесїастова словеса: *Возненавидѣ(х) живот(ъ) мой, видя зла быти вся по(д) с(о)лнцемъ* (Eccl. 2:17)²⁰.

corresponds to the text of the *Vulgata*: "Et idcirco taeduit me vitae meae, videntem mala universa esse sub sole", but in this case Gizel's variant may be considered a contamination with the ов: "И възненавидѣхъ живот, яко лукавно мнѣ сътворенїе сътворено по(д) с(о)лнцемъ". Perhaps, the Latin adjective *malus* 'bad; evil; worthless', translated here as *злый* 'evil', was felt as more appropriate to describe the perception of a person who, because of constant apathy or spiritual despair, has become indifferent to any moral values. The Church Slavonic lexeme *лукавный* was probably felt to be less suitable for this purpose.

5. Of special interest are the cases where the author compares two variants of the нs translation. Let us examine the fragment

> Приставници убогихъ, или наданїй шпиталныхъ, согрѣшаютъ: аще приходо(в) бывающи(х) на убѡги(х), не иждиваю(т) на ихъ токмо требованїе, но на иное єже сами хощут(ъ)? Чесого запрѣщает(ъ) Сира(х): *Чадо живота нищаго не лиши* (Sir. 4). Инъ Звод(ъ) пишет(ъ): *М(и)л(о)стынѣ убогаго не ѡбиди* (Sir. 4)²¹.

The first quote corresponds with ов, while "another code" indicates the *Vulgata*. The author of the treatise probably considered the phrase from the Latin Bible "Fili, elemosynam pauperis ne defraudes" (Sir. 4:1) as more precise or more understandable, because "живота не лиши" ('do not deprive of life') can refer to both the illegal withdrawal of maintenance and to murder. We maintain that for the author of *Myr* it was important to emphasize the connotations of both versions. So he gives two parallel translations in order to underline that depriving the poor of charity is equivalent to depriving them of life.

---

²⁰   Gizel' 2009: 184-185. "Melancholy of life. When someone regrets even his living in this world, seeing that the longer he lives, the more he neglects God's commandments due to his laziness. These words of Ecclesiastes may be applied to him: Возненавидѣ(х) живот(ъ) мой, видя зла быти вся по(д) с(о)лнцемъ" (Eccl. 2:17).

²¹   Gizel' 2009: 222. "Administrators of donations for the poor and for hospitals commit sin: Don't they spend funds intended for the poor not only on the latters' needs but also as they wish themselves? What Sirach prohibits: Чадо живота нищаго не лиши (Sir. 4). Another code [сводъ] says: М(и)л(о)стынѣ убогаго не ѡбиди (Sir. 4)".

6. Apparently, similar reasons inspired the author of *Myr* to contaminate the versions of ОВ and *Vulgata* in the following case as well:

> Подобает(ъ) женам(ъ) быти ч(е)стним (или сты(д)ливы^м), не клеветливы(м), не навадница(м), трезвеннымъ, вѣрнымъ ѡ всемъ.

In the ОВ we have: "[...] женамъ же такоже чистам(ъ) не клеветивамъ, не нава(д)-ницамъ, трез(ъ)венамъ, вѣрнымъ о всемъ" (1 Tm. 3:11); in the *Vulgata*: "Mulieres similiter pudicas, non detrahentes, sobrias, fideles in omnibus". Perhaps, in the context of the moral prescriptions of *Myr*, the author considered it too general and ambiguous to characterize a woman just as *чистая*, 'pure', as the ОВ has it, while the adjective *честный* – which Gizel' uses in the fragment mentioned instead of *чистый* and translates/interprets in brackets ("или стыдливымъ") – corresponds rather to *pudicus* 'shy, chaste, modest'.

This may complete the review of нѕ quotations that correspond to the text of the *Vulgata*. What do the resulting examples indicate? First of all, that, a) Kyjiv Orthodox theologians used both Orthodox and Catholic canons of the нѕ simultaneously; b) they had an attentive and critical approach when reading the sacred books, they verified them and felt entitled to choose whichever text seemed more relevant or accurate; c) we may assume that, in the case of *Myr*, most of the quotations from the нѕ were originally selected from the *Vulgata* (or taken from the texts of Catholic authors), while their equivalents were added from the ОВ *only later*; the *Myr* author/compiler translated the quotations that had no exact equivalents in ОВ directly from Latin; d) the authors did not see the ОВ as a canonical text that could not be reviewed; e) they felt entitled and sufficiently competent to read and interpret the нѕ independently and considered this kind of work as a fairly pious activity.

These observations, although very preliminary, show how little we still know about the creative methods of the 17th century Kyjivan Orthodox intellectuals and to which unexpected results research in this field may still lead.

3.   *Non Literal Quotes*

Non literal quotes may generally be reduced to: a) quoting with additional explanations from the author; b) contamination of several quotations; c) more or less accurate paraphrasing of нѕ fragments with indication of the corresponding Bible fragments in the page margin.

However, let us begin with a case which does not fit into any of the above categories: the author makes use of a phrase which is quite close to the text of the Gospel of Matthew (Mt. 11:12), but is not indicated by any reference. This happens in the first chapter of the first part, where, among numerous quotations (literal and approximate) with the corresponding indications, we meet a cryptoquote. The fragment mentioned in full reads:

Єстъ на земли путь онъ тѣсенъ, и узкая врата въводящая въ животъ (Mt. 7 [with reference to the source]), и дающая нуждикомъ восхитити Ц(а)рствїе Н(е)б(е)-сное [Mt. 11:12, no reference given]"²².

The ᴏʙ says:

Что оуз(ъ)скаа врата и тѣсенъ путь, в(ъ)водяй в животъ, и мало ихъ есть иже обрѣтаютъ его (Mt. 7:14);

ω(т) дни же Іоанна Кр(е)ст(и)т(е)ля доселѣ, ц(а)рьствїе н(е)б(е)сное нудится, и нужници въсхищаютъ е (Mt. 11:12).

Neither piece of the sentence is literal quotation from the Gospel, but in one case no reference is given. Such "cryptoquotes" are not common in the treatise: this case may simply be an oversight on the part of the compiler or printer.

Apart from this specific case and literal quotations, the most common way to draw on the ʜꜱ in *Myr* is the contamination of several fragments. For example:

Радость бываетъ Аггелω(м) на Н(е)б(е)си, ω єдиномъ грѣшницѣ кающемъся, нежели ω девятьдесяти и девять пр(а)в(е)дникъ, иже не требуютъ покаянїя (Lk. 15 [reference of the author])"²³.

ᴏʙ says:

Гл(агол)ю вамъ, яко тако радость будетъ на небеси о єди́номъ грѣшницѣ кающемъся, нежели о девятьдесятихъ и девять праведъникъ, иже не требую(т) покаанїа (Lk. 15:7);

Тако гл(агол)ю вамъ, радость бываетъ пре(д) агг(е)лы б(о)жїи, о єди́номъ грѣшницѣ кающимъся (Lk. 15:10).

The same page also includes literal quotations from the Psalms and the Gospels of Luke and Matthew. Indeed, it is important to underline, that all the above ways of quoting from ʜꜱ – literal quotations, contaminations, paraphrases and cryptoquotes – may be found not only within a single page, but even in the same paragraph. Moreover, quotations and paraphrases of the ʜꜱ located within the same sentence or paragraph usually concern the same book of the ʜꜱ. This may be interpreted as a deliberate construction of the text by the author, who wanted to avoid overloading the text with oversized quotations. In no case can this circumstance be interpreted as a careless approach to the ʜꜱ or its quotations by early modern Kyjivan authors. One of many examples of such combinations is the beginning of the second chapter of the first part of *Myr*²⁴ where, among five quotations, four are

---

²² Gizel' 2009: 25.

²³ *Ibidem*: 24-25.

²⁴ Gizel' 2012: 83.

transferred literally from the ов, and one is a paraphrase of a fragment from the Acts of the Apostles (with appropriate marginal reference).

The logic of giving the treatise a rational structure also explains the reason for another way of drawing on the нѕ. By this we mean quotes which very briefly indicate some fundamental theses accompanied by the appropriate reference. This approach can be explained by the author's desire to be laconic and by his attempt not to conceal the presentation of moral teachings behind excessive quotations. This was especially suitable in the case of liturgical Gospel readings, which were obviously familiar to potential recipients of *Myr* and did not need the whole episode to be repeated: an eloquent example is offered by the reference to the Parable of the Publican and the Pharisee (Lk. 18)[25]. Yet, in other cases, a paraphrase of Gospel parables might also be supported by short literal quotes (Lk. 18)[26].

Another method of quoting is to break a quote from the нѕ with the author's comment, explaining the sense of the fragment. Interestingly enough, such explanations do not always match the original meaning of the quote exactly. Here is an example:

> Аще быхом(ъ) себе разсуждали, *сі естъ сами себе казнили* [our italics], не быхомъ оубѡ ѡсуждени были" (1 Cor. 11)[27] (ов: "Аще бо быхомъ себе разсужали, не быхомъ оубо осуждени были".)

We also need to underline the difference in meaning between the epistle to the Corinthians and *Myr*: the former does not deal directly with self-punishment or penance, but tells only about judgment, i.e. about a fair assessment of people's deeds that urges them to act according to God's will, and thus to avoid His condemnation; in the latter the quote concerns the explanation of the nature and necessity of penance, which is treated as a kind of deliberately accepted punishment for sins committed. Thus, the extension added to the quotation ("this means if we punish ourselves") does not aim to clarify a problematic phrase of the нѕ, but rather to properly harmonize the selected quotation with the content of the treatise.

The latter method of quoting includes cases when a part of a quote is given literally, while its completion is closely adapted to the author's text. A telling example is offered by the citation of Rom. 14:23, where one word is replaced by another. The quote has been included in the context of the doctrine of conscience in order to confirm the importance of a steady conscience in matters of salvation. In *Myr* we read: "а сомняяйся аще **творитъ** ѡсуждается"[28]. Instead, ов says: "а съмняйся аще **ястъ**, осуждается". As we can see, there is a significant change at the end of the quote (Rom. 14:23) due to the verb *ясти* ('to eat') being replaced with the verb *творити* ('to do'), which denotes any action. The idea that

---

[25]   *Ibidem*: 86.

[26]   *Ibidem*: 87.

[27]   Gizel' 2009: 31.

[28]   *Ibidem*: 37.

an action may become sinful not as much by the fact itself, but rather by doubt as to its correctness, implicitly contained in the given phrase of the Epistle to the Romans, becomes a generalized saying in the variant of the author of *Myr*.

However, in many other cases, the meaning of the нѕ fragments which have been epitomized or elaborated in some detail is reproduced in *Myr* rather accurately. For example, when it comes to differentiating between deadly and venial sins, the author explains that "є(ст) грѣ(х) къ см(е)рти, и є(ст) грѣ(х) не къ см(е)рт(и)"²⁹, referring to 1 Jn. 5:16-17. ов says:

> Аще кто оузрит(ъ) брата сългрѣшающа грѣхъ не къ смерти, да проситъ, и дастъ ему животъ съгрѣшающи(м) не къ смерти. есть грѣхъ къ смерти, не о томъ гл(агол)ю да помолится. всяка неправда грѣхъ есть, и есть грѣхъ не къ см(е)рти (1 Jn. 5:16-17).

Also the interpretation of Rom. 1:32 is quite accurate when it considers a sin the very act of approving it: "Не точïю (рече) иже сами творя(т) злая, но иже и соизволяютъ творящимъ, достойны суть смерти"³⁰. The fragment in ов sounds: "Нѣцыи же и оправданïе б(о)жïе разумѣвше, яко иже таковая творящеи достоини смерти суть, не точïю (же) сïя творятъ, но и волю дѣю(т) творящимъ".

Sometimes large fragments from нѕ are given literally but with significant gaps, though not distorting the meaning of a quote. Such cases also belong to the category of quoting and not just referring to the нѕ. Here are some examples:

a) Почто [...] прослави сыны своя паче мене [...] се днïе идутъ, и потреблю сѣмя твое, и племя дому отца твоего, и не будет старца в дому твоемъ [...] (1 Sm. 2:29-32)³¹.

Here is the corresponding full text in ов:

> Почто же ты призрѣ на ѳïмïямъ мои, и на жрътву мою лукавнымъ окомъ, и прослави с(ы)на своя паче мене. еже благословити исперва, всяку жрътву въ i(зра)или, предо мною. Сего ради сице рече г(оспод)ь б(ог)ъ i(зра)илевъ гл(агол)я рекохъ домъ твои, и домъ ѡ(т)ца твоего, преидетъ предо мною до вѣка, но н(ы)нѣ рече г(оспод)ь никакоже не буди то въ мнѣ якоже прославляющаго мя прославлю, и оуничижаяй мя без чести будетъ. Се д(ь)ни иду(т) и потреблю сѣмя твое, и племя дому ѡ(т)ца твоего, и не будетъ старца в дому твоемъ, и узриш(ъ) противника твоего въ храмѣ с(вя)том(ъ) въ всѣхъ бл(а)гостехъ i(зра)илевыхъ. И старца не будетъ в дому твоемъ въ вся дни и ни всяка мужа (1 Sm. 2:29-32).

---

²⁹ *Ibidem*: 34. "There is a sin [leading] to death, and not [leading] to death".

³⁰ *Ibidem*: 39. "Not only those who do evil, he said, but also those praising them who do so, deserve death".

³¹ *Ibidem*: 40. Here we mark the gaps in citations with ellipsis in square brackets while there are no signs for these phrasal contractions in the original.

b) [...] Оболстисте мя [...] якѡ десятины и начатцы с(ъ) вами суть [...] лѣто се ско(н)-
часѧ, и внесосте всѧ стѧжанїѧ въ сокровища, и расхищенїе нищагѡ в(ъ) домы
ваша: обратѣте же сѧ о семъ [...] аще не ѡ(т)верзу вамъ хлябїй н(е)б(е)сныхъ;
и излїю вамъ бл(агосло)венїе мое, дондеже оудоволитесѧ, и разнствую вамъ во
брашна, и не имамъ изтлити вамъ плодъ земныхъ, и не имуть изнемощи вамъ
винограды селныя [...] и ублажат(ъ) вы вси ѧзыци [...] (Mal. 3:7-12)[32].

The corresponding text in оb reads as follows:

> Зане вы обольстисте мѧ. и рѣсте, о чесомъ обольстихомъ тѧ. ѧко десѧтины и начат-
> т(ъ)цы с(ъ) вами суть, и възирающе вы възираете на нѧ, и мене бо обольщаете, лѣто
> се искон(ъ)часѧ. и внесосте всѧ стѧжанїѧ въ сокровища, и расхищенїе нищаго въ
> домы ваша. обратите же сѧ о се(м), гл(агол)етъ г(оспод)ь вседръжитель. аще не ѡ(т)
> верзу вамъ хлябїи н(е)б(ес)ныхъ, і излїю вамъ бл(агосло)венїе мое дондеже оудово-
> литесѧ. и разньствую вамъ въ брашна, и не имамъ истлити ва(м) плодъ земльны(х).
> и не имуть изнемощи вамъ виногради селнїи, гл(агол)етъ г(оспод)ь вседръжитель.
> и ублажатъ вы вси ѧзыцы, зане будете вы землѧ изволена (Mal. 3:7-12).

c) In other cases, a long narrative passage taken from the нs to confirm a thesis of *Myr*, is
rendered in just a few words. Here are some examples: *i*) for the statement that responsibi-
lity for deadly sins (in particular murder) lies not only with the person who committed
it, but first of all with the one who induced the wrongdoer to commit the crime: "Сице
Д(а)в(и)дъ оуби Урїю, аще и не своима рукама, но чре(з) писанїе, повелѣваѧ да на
брани оубїе(н) буде(т)"[33] (2 Sm. 11); *ii*) concerning the need to refrain from giving a bad
example: "Пачеже и сам(ъ) Х(ристо)с, дабы другихъ не соблазнилъ, дань даѧше, аще
и не долженъ бѣ"[34] (Mt. 17); *iii*) about the duty of honoring clerics and providing them
with appropriate income[35] references are made to Nm. 16; 2 Sm. 1; 2 Sm. 2; Zec. 2; Lv. 23;
1 Cor. 9; *iv*) when it is necessary to give an example of an act or an event from the life of
any biblical character, the нs is not usually quoted literally, but only with a hint at some
event or mention of some personal name, with a proper reference on the margin of the
printed page. For example: "єже собыст(ь)сѧ на богатомъ Єv(анге)лскомъ (Lk. 16), оу
негоже ѧкѡ Лазаръ не оупроси крупицы..."[36]; "аще бы онаѧ въ с(вѧ)томъ Писанїи
помянутаѧ Сусанна (Dn. 13), боѧщисѧ ѡклеветанїѧ, изволила на прелюбодѣѧнїе..."[37].

---

[32] *Ibidem*: 67.

[33] *Ibidem*: 39. "Thus David killed Uriah, though not with his own hands but per letter order-
ing that he would be killed in a battle".

[34] *Ibidem:* 48. "Even Christ himself paid the toll, so that others wouldn't be tempted, al-
though it was not His duty".

[35] *Ibidem*: 66.

[36] *Ibidem*: 136. "...which came true in the case of the Gospel's rich man (Lk. 16), whom Lazar
begged from without success..."

[37] *Ibidem*: 127. "As if, for example, Susanna, mentioned in the нs (Dn. 13), being afraid of
calumny had agreed to adultery".

4.   *Practice of Other Authors*

Was Inokentij Gizel' original in the ways he quoted from and referred to the HS compared to other Ukrainian intellectuals of the 17ᵗʰ century? A convincing answer to this question requires separate research. Here we will present only some results of a selective analysis of the texts published before and after the publication of *Myr*. They will not allow us to reach any final conclusions, but may indicate some common trends of the time.

The earliest text we have referred to was *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje*, translated into Church Slavonic and published in Zabludiv in 1569. It contains sermons allegedly written by Patriarch Kallistos. It is important to note that neither liturgical Gospel fragments nor other quotations from the HS are accompanied by marginal references in this edition, and therefore we cannot strictly call this practice 'quoting'. Sermons were not supplied with appropriate Gospel fragments at the beginning, only the name of the Gospel was provided (for example, "Поученїе в недѣлю сырную Євангелїе от Матфея, слово 4")[38]. Quotes are indicated in the text by the phrase "the Lord said", without any other references. For example: "рече Г(оспод)ь: аще оставляете ч(е)л(овѣ)комъ прегрѣшенїя ихъ. оставитъ и вамъ ω(те)цъ вашъ н(е)б(ес)ныи прегрѣшенїя ваша"[39].

If we compare the Zabludiv JU with the printed Church Slavonic versions of the Gospels edited before 1569[40], we see that the compiler of Zabludiv JU does not worry too much about literal correspondence (although not showing any significant semantic deviations from translations of the HS existing at the time). For example, we could not find an exact equivalent of the above-mentioned fragment (Mt. 6, "*začalo*" 17). The version of the printed Gospel is as follows: "Аще бо ω(т)пущаете ч(е)л(овѣ)ко(м) согрѣшенїя ихъ, ω(т)пусти(т) и вамъ ω(те)цъ вашь н(е)б(ес)ныи. аще ли не ω(т)пущаете ч(е)л(овѣ) ко(м) согрѣшенїя и(х), ни ω(те)цъ вашь ω(т)пуститъ ва(м) согрѣшенїи вашихъ"[41]. The replacement of *ω(т)пущаете* with *оставляете*, or of *согрѣшенїя* with *прегрѣшенїя* does not affect the understanding of the fragment, at the same time indicating that the printed text of the HS was not subject to that specific reverence which would require a perfectly literal quotation from it.

An almost literal repetition of Zabludiv JU is a book published in 1606 in Krylos. However, there is one significant difference between them: the Krylos edition provides marginal references for each fragment or quotation from the HS, so we may assume that quotations were collated, possibly with OB. However, lexical differences in quotations are not corrected, which also indicates that the authors of this JU learned new (Western?) rules of working

---

[38]   JU 1569: 20 v.

[39]   *Ibidem*: 21 v.

[40]   *Jevangelije* (with narrow fonts) (Moskva 1553-1554), *Jevangelije* (with middle size fonts) (Moskva 1558-1559), *Jevangelije* (with wide fonts) (Moskva 1563-1564).

[41]   Jevangelije 1563-1564: 16. Later editions in Church Slavonic have identical text. These are: *Yevanhelije*, Vilnius 1600; *Novyj Zavit i Psaltyr*, Ostroh 1580 and so on.

with borrowed texts: they provided source references and did not feel the need to reproduce the text of the ʜꜱ literally, considering that the meaning is more important than the verbal identity. Finally, many of the early 17ᵗʰ century religious thinkers of the Kyjivan Metropolis participated in verifying the text of the Bible during preparation for printing it in Ostroh; so we may assume that they did not (and could not) have the same reverential attitude towards the Church Slavonic version of the Bible which was to appear much later with respect to the printed version of the ʜꜱ. Even Gizel', who was very attentive to the literal authenticity of quotes, does not mention 'canonical' and 'non-canonical' texts of the ʜꜱ, but only different 'codices' ("своды"). This implies the existence of differences in the sacred text, differences which, however, did not affect the credibility (canonicity?) of its versions.

Other collections of Sunday and festive church sermons named *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje* were printed in the first half of the 17ᵗʰ century. They substantially differ from Krylos ᴊᴜ and Zabludiv ᴊᴜ. Let's take a brief look at how the ʜꜱ was quoted in these works.

In his *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje* printed in Rochmaniv in 1619, Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavro-vec'kyj often refers to specific places in the Bible. However, he offers a paraphrase of almost all the biblical fragments, so that they cannot be defined as quotations. Even more often, marginal notes just point at the places in the Bible that can serve as proof or illustrations of the author's thoughts. The real quotations are the readings from the Gospel, given in Church Slavonic at the beginning of each sermon. By collating the texts of these readings in three sermons (namely on Cheesefare Sunday, on the first and second Sundays of Lent) with the corresponding ᴏʙ text, we found some differences (mostly in the use of functional words, such as prepositions, conjunctions etc., and sometimes in grammatical forms), which show that the author most probably used other Church Slavonic sources, or – maybe – he did not pay much attention to the literal accuracy of quoting. Anyway, the number of lexical differences is limited, hence there is no reason to assume that in these particular cases Stavrovec'kyj translated the text of the Gospel from the *Vulgata* or some Polish sources.

Yet in the sermon on Cheesefare Sunday there are a few places that might indicate deliberate changes that Stavrovec'kyj made in the existing Church Slavonic text of the Gospel. For example, a quote from Mt. 6:16, about hypocrites who like to show off that they are fasting, the Rochmaniv ᴊᴜ has a phrase "яко ѿстоатъ мзды своея" (Stavrovec'-kyj 1619: 31), which can be translated as "because they are far from their reward". Instead, in both ᴏʙ and *Vulgata*, as well as in all Polish printed translations of the 16ᵗʰ century, the corresponding phrase says that, for hypocrites, their demonstration of fasting is already a reward, while the idea that – for this reason – they will lose more valuable rewards, is not explicitly expressed: "яко въспрїимутъ мзду свою" (ᴏʙ); "quia receperunt mercedem suam" (*Vulgata*); "iż odnoszą zapłátę swoję" (*Bible* of Budny); "iż wzięli zapłátę swoję" (*Bible* of Wujek), and other similar[42].

---

[42]   The anonymous referee of "Studi Slavistici" pointed out that the source and reason for this change might be the Greek text, which has "ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν", with ἀπέχω meaning "to have", as in the Latin version, but also "to hold back, keep off, prevent", "to be absent, distant" and

In the same evangelical passage Stavrovec'kyj writes: "идеже будетъ сокровище ваше, ту будетъ сердце и душа ваша" (Stavrovec'kyj 1619: 31; Mt. 6:21). The words "и душа" ('and soul') seem to have been added by the author himself. Indeed, all the sources mentioned speak only of the heart: "идѣже бо есть сокровище ваше, ту будетъ и сердце ваше" (ob); "Ubi enim est thesaurus tuus, ibi est et cor tuum" (*Vulgata*); "Gdzie bo jest skarb wász, tám będzie i serce wásze" (*Bible* of Budny); "Abowiém gdzie jest skarb twój, tám jest i serce twoje" (*Bible* of Wujek) and similar.

An analysis of the references to the HS in Stavrovec'kyj's work *Zercalo Bohosloviji* (Počajiv 1618) shows that in this work the author does not resort to direct quotations, although he gives many references to the HS in the page margins. The fragments of the HS indicated may easily be identified and are coherent with the meaning of the author's theses. In *Zercalo Bohosloviji* one can trace the following methods of 'working' with a text of the HS: a) a rather close paraphrase of the HS fragment indicated on the page margin; b) an allusion to the semantic dominants of a certain chapter or a verse; c) free interpretation of meanings embedded in a text of the HS (it may be even a wordplay); d) an allusion to certain evangelical parables or narrations without direct semantic links; e) use of HS metaphors (e.g. metaphor of the Holy Mountain). All this may confirm H. Trunte's conclusion that in Stavrovec'kyj's *Perlo Mnohocinnoje,* the author considered only the meaning, not the literal text (Trunte 1985: 263) to be sacred.

Another work to be considered here is Meletij Smotryc'kyj's Old Ukrainian translation of *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje* published in Jevje (now Vievis in Lithuania) in 1616. The sermons of this book are also attributed to patriarch Kallistos, although this edition is not identical to Zabludiv and Krylos JU, neither in contents nor in structure. According to D. Frick, Smotryc'kyj's Ukrainian translations of Gospel fragments were heavily dependent on the Polish translation of the HS by the Protestant Symon Budny: "Smotryc'kyj 'translated' the Gospels by providing a corrected Ruthenian version of Budny's Polish text" (Frick 1987: XII-XIII). Garzaniti supported this opinion (Garzaniti 1999: 176), but the argumentation of both differs. Frick's statement, as it was presented, is based on only one sentence from Smotryc'kyj's text which is both grammatically and lexically identical to Budny's version, while at the same time being very close to the *Bibles* translated by Leopolita and Wujek. On the other hand, Garzaniti compares about two dozen arbitrarily selected lexemes and phrases with the corresponding units of Budny' translation and that of the Church Slavonic text of the Moscow edition of JU from 1686. In actual fact, none of the examples provided by Garzaniti confirms Smotryc'kyj's dependence on Budny's text: in most of them there is no coincidence[43], and in the few cases where a coincidence does

---

"to hold one's self off, abstain". Hence the lection "ѿстоатъ" instead of "въспрїимутъ". We thank the referee, whose explanation of the case looks quite convincing.

[43]   For example (Budny's and Smotryc'kyj's versions correspondingly): "v sobie / особно (Smotryc'kyj); daleko / ополаль; zszedł / отишо(л); na drugi brzeg / в дальший берегъ; pozdychały / потонули; y co było z opętánemi / и што сѧ стало з бѣсноватыми etc." (Garzaniti 1999: 177-178).

exist[44], it derives not from a textual relationship, but from the Ukrainian-Belarusian-Polish joint area of lexical fund, which is still considerable now and was huge in Smotryc'kyj's day. This applies to both the vernacular and the two literary languages, i.e. Old Polish and the Ukrainian-Belarusian literary language called *prosta mova*. Scholarly methodology would also require Smotryc'kyj's translation to be compared not only with Budny's version, but with other Polish Bibles edited by that time as well.

In order to verify the above assertion that Smotryc'kyj translated the evangelical texts from Budny's edition, we collated two arbitrarily selected Gospel readings from JU 1616 – on Cheesefare Sunday and on the second Sunday of Lent – with the OB text and several Polish versions: *Leopolita Bible* (1561), *Brest Bible* (1563), Symon Budny's *Bible* (1572) and Jakub Wujek's *Bible* (1599). Taking these two readings as the basis for comparison, we can conclude that Smotryc'kyj's translation was done from the Church Slavonic text, precisely in the version of OB. It is a literal translation from Church Slavonic in *prosta mova*, preserving the exact word order and all the syntactical features that could be reproduced by the Ruthenian language of the time. Due to lack of space, we have illustrated it with just two quotes from Mark (2:3-4)[45]:

> JU 1616: А ото пришли до него несучи паралижем зараженого, которого несли чотыри. А не могучи приближити ся до него для мнѡзства народа, розобраши [!] дахъ где былъ: и стелю пробравши, звѣсили ложко, на которомъ ро(з)слабленый лежа(л)[46].

> OB (1581): И прїидошя к нему носяще раслаблена жилами, носима четырми. и не могуще(м) приближитися к нему народа ради, ѡ(т)крышя покровъ, идѣже бѣ, и прокопавше, свѣсишя одръ, на нем(ъ) же раслабленыи лежаше.

> *Leopolita Bible* (1561): I przyszli do niego niosąc páráliżem záráżonego, ktorego czterzej nieśli. A gdy go nie mogli wnieść do niego przed tłuszczą odárli dách tám gdzie był (Christus) á otworzywszy, spuścili łoże ná ktorym leżał on páráliżem záráżony.

> *Brest Bible* (1563): Tedy przyszli k niemu niektorzy niosąc powietrzem ruszonego, ktorego nieśli czterzej. A gdy się k niemu przycisnąć nie mogli dla zgromádzenia, oddárli dach tam gdzie był, á oddarszy, ná powroziech spuścili łożko, ná ktorym on powietrzem ruszony leżał.

> Symon Budny's *Bible* (1572): I przyszli k niemu niosąc powietrzem ruszonego, ktorego nieśli czterzej. A gdy się k niemu przycisnąć nie mogli dla tłuszczej oddárli dách tám gdzie był, á oddárszy, ná powroziech spuścili łożko, ná ktorym powietrzem ruszony leżał.

---

[44]   For example: "do nieba podnieść / поднести на небо; бил w persi swoe / билъ перси свои; z iych granic / з границъ ихъ; zachowan (był) świat prezeń / захован бы(л) свѣ(т) чере(з) него" (Garzaniti 1999: 177-179).

[45]   All quotations from Polish Bibles are taken from the site <https://ewangelie.uw.edu.pl/>.

[46]   JU 1616: 51 v.-52.

Jakub Wujek's *Bible* (1599): I przyszli do niego niosąc powietrzem ruszonégo, którégo nieśli cztérej. A gdy go nie mogli przedeń przynieść dla ciżby, odarli dách gdzie był: á uczyniwszy dziurę spuścili łóżko, ná którym powietrzem ruszony leżał.

The comparison of the quoted texts gives no evidence of any kind of dependence of Smotryc'kyj's translation from one or more Polish versions among the ones we cited above, neither in the selection of lexical equivalents, nor in syntactic structures. Smotryc'kyj's text is an almost precise translation from the ов. It is interesting, however, that the translator allows himself to clarify the word *прокопавше*, indicating that it concerns not the roof where the first hole was made, but another hole in the ceiling ("стелю пробравши"): he thus introduces additional information to the biblical text. In actual fact, in all Polish versions only one and the same hole in the roof is mentioned, while in the Church Slavonic version (*прокопавше*) and in the *Vulgata* (*patefacientes*) the text is really ambiguous, it is not clear whether the evangelist speaks of the same hole, or of a new one in the ceiling. Noteworthy in Smotryc'kyj's translation is also the definition of the illness that affected the man who was to be the object of the miracle. The Polish version of the *Brest Bible* as well as Budny's and Wujek's variants all use the form "powietrzem ruszony", while in the *Leopolita Bible* the man is "páráliżem záráżony", like in Smotryc'kyj's Ukrainian text. However, there are no reasons to interpret this detail as a dependence on the Polish translation because the word "паралижъ" ("паралѣжъ") was a regularly used lexeme of the Ukrainian language in the 16th-18th centuries[47].

On the other hand, it is reasonable to assume that, when translating from Church Slavonic, Smotryc'kyj could at the same time look at Polish translations of the Bible: he himself wrote in Polish and 17th century Polish was considerably closer to Ukrainian than today, especially in lexis. It is normal for a translator to take an interest in the ways and means applied by his colleagues. However, this is not proof in itself that he referred to Polish translations of the Bible to the extent that his text could be qualified as being significantly dependent on or a kind of hybrid of other versions. It is also highly unlikely that Smotryc'kyj would choose the translation of the protestant Budny as his main source for quotations. At least no one ever provided sufficient arguments for such textual dependence. As D. Frick has shown with a number of examples, in the Polish written *Threnos* (Vilnius 1610), Smotryc'kyj usually quoted the Bible from Catholic translations by Leopolita and Wujek (Frick 1995: 363-367).

It is also worth mentioning that in 1637, with the blessing of Petro Mohyla, the Kyjivan Cave Lavra printing house produced a new edition of Smotryc'kyj's ju. In both editions (Vievis 1616 and Kyjiv 1637) the texts of the sermons are identical, including translated fragments of the нs. In the preface to the 1637 edition, however, which is written in Old Ukrainian, almost all the quotations from the нs already follow literally the Church Slavonic ов: out of nine cases only one fragment of the нs is given in Ukrainian para-

---

[47]   See, for example, Tymčenko 2003: 85.

phrase, all the other eight fragments are literal quotations in Church Slavonic[48]. These facts indicate that a) Kyjivan authors of the first half of the 17th century considered it normal to operate with sacred texts in different ways even within one edition of a work, b) it was acceptable to translate the HS into the Old Ukrainian language, which could also be understood by ordinary lay believers.

This is not the place to dwell on texts by Kyjiv-educated writers of the second half of the 17th century. Preliminary research, however, indicates that *Věnec' Chrystov* (Kyjiv 1688) by Antonij Radyvylovs'kyj and *Oběd duševnyj* (Moscow 1681) by Simjaon Polacki still show the same tendency. Radyvylovs'kyj and Polacki, as well as Gizel' and the author of the preface to the Kyjiv JU of 1637, usually quoted HS fragments literally from the OB, but paraphrases, associative references, use of symbolic images and other kinds of elaboration of the Bible were also accepted.

5.   *Conclusions*

In order to summarize the results of our observations, we can distinguish the typology and methods of quoting from the HS as follows:

1.   Direct and literal quoting after OB[49].

2.   Quoting the HS in precise Ukrainian translation from OB (as in JU 1616, JU 1637).

3.   Quoting after other HS versions than OB (*Vulgata*, Leopolita and Wujek Bibles, sometimes also after other Polish editions of the HS).

4.   Contamination of several closely situated phrases from the HS in order to transfer the idea of the whole fragment, sometimes with the addition of new nuances or new meanings.

5.   Free paraphrasing of the ideas taken from the HS (usually with a precise reference to a book, a chapter or liturgical fragment).

6.   Non-indicated quoting without reference to the books of HS.

7.   Generally precise quotation being a considerable fragment from the OB with one or more replaced words, which can introduce new connotations or meanings into the fragment quoted.

8.   Quoting a piece from OB exactly with the addition of one or more words from other versions of the HS inserted in brackets, sometimes with the remark "following another code".

---

[48]   JU 1637: f. [7-8].

[49]   Some authors could also have used the Bible printed in Moscow in 1663, but that edition, except for a few corrections of minor importance, just reproduced the text of OB.

9.   Quoting a fragment from OB exactly but with the addition of an explanatory phrase incorporated in the quote. Usually this addition is not marked in any way (this may probably be explained by the lack of a normalized system of punctuation).

10. Quotation with an erroneous reference to the book of HS.

What do these observations indicate if we consider Early Modern Ukrainian intellectual culture in more general terms?

First: Kyjivan scholars of the 17th century used almost all the methods that we use today for adapting and introducing such an authoritative source as the Bible into the body of a new text.

 Second: The HS was treated by Ukrainian religious intellectuals as the most authoritative source for legitimizing new ideas and concepts which were adopted from the texts of non-Orthodox authors and were to be integrated in the Orthodox theological discourse.

Third: Authors did not feel too much reverence towards any of the printed versions of HS and admitted independent translations (from Latin, Church Slavonic, Polish) as well as the possibility of replacing certain words or specifying meanings, and what is most significant – comparing different 'codices' of the HS in search of the one they considered most favorable for their goals: Ukrainian authors felt free to choose the HS 'codex' whenever it seemed more accurate in a certain case or better suited to formulating their moral instructions.

All this testifies to the considerable intellectual freedom of Kyjivan theology. In addition, it shows that Ukrainian authors were skilled enough to feel semantic peculiarities of lexemes or concepts and were able to manage lexical ambiguities, nuances, semantic parallels and similar ways of expression. Attention to and understanding of semantics (i.e. of the correlation of the sign and the signified) is consistent with the philosophical trends of the so called 'second scholasticism' (Vdovina 2009).

Our observations do not embrace all the information potential of analyzing the principles of quoting the HS in the texts written by Ukrainian religious thinkers of the 17th century. In this paper we have just tried to outline the problem and give some examples taken from a few important texts. Further investigation of various kinds of records from 17th century erudite literature will help to enrich our knowledge and to outline some specificities of the whole of Ukrainian cultural history.

Abbreviations

Jevangelije 1563-1564:   *Jevangelije* (with wide fonts), Moskva 1563-1564.

JU 1569:   *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje*, Zabludiv 1569.

JU 1616:   *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje*, transl. by M. Smotryc'kyj, Vievis 1616.

JU 1637:   *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje*, transl. by M. Smotryc'kyj, Kyjiv 1637.

OB 1581:   *Biblia, syrěč knyhy Větchaho i Novaho Zavěta*, Ostroh 1581.

Literature

Frick 1987:   D.A. Frick, *Meletij Smotryc'kyj's Ruthenian Homiliary Gospel of 1616*, in: *The Jevanhelije učytelnoje of Meletij Smotryc'kyj*, Cambridge (MA) 1987 (= Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts, 2), pp. IX-XVI.

Frick 1995:   D.A. Frick, *Meletij Smotryc'kyj*, Cambridge (MA) 1995.

Garzaniti 1999:   M. Garzaniti, *Učitel'noe evangelie Meletija Smotrickogo v kontekste cerkovno-slavjanskoj tradicii evangel'skoj gomiletiki i problema perevoda evangel'skich čtenij*, in: G. Brogi Bercoff, M. Di Salvo, L. Marinelli (a cura di), *Traduzione e rielaborazione nelle letterature di Polonia Ucraina e Russia. XVI-XVIII secolo*, Alessandria 1999, pp. 167-186.

Garzaniti 2008:   M. Garzaniti, *Biblejskije cytaty v literature Slavia Orthodoxa*, "Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury", LVIII, 2008, pp. 28-40.

Gizeľ 2009:   I. Gizeľ, *Myr s Bohom čoloviku*, Kyjiv 1669 (reprinted in: I. Gizeľ, *Vybrani tvory u 3 tomach*, red.-upor. L. Dovha, I/2, Kyjiv-L'viv 2009).

Gizeľ 2012:   I. Gizeľ, *Myr z Bohom čoloviku* (Ukr. transl. by R. Kyseľov, apparatus by L. Dovha), in: I. Gizeľ, *Vybrani tvory u 3 tomach*, red.-upor. L. Dovha, I/1, Kyjiv-L'viv 2012.

Jakovenko 2017:   N. Jakovenko, *U pošukach Novoho Neba. Žyttja i teksty Joanykija Galiatovs'koho*, Kyjiv 2017.

Korzo 2010:   M. Korzo, *"Myr z Bohom čoloviku" Inokentija Gizelja v konteksti katolyc'koji moral'noji teolohiji kincia XVI-peršoji polovyny XVII st.*, in: I. Gizeľ, *Vybrani tvory u 3 tomach*, red.-upor. L. Dovha, III, Kyjiv-L'viv 2010, pp. 195-262.

Marcialis 2008:   N. Marcialis, *Reminiscencija, parafraza, citacija: o principach ispoľzovanija istočnikov v moskovskoj polemičeskoj literature XVI veka*, in: A. Alberti, S. Garzonio, N. Marcialis, B. Sulpasso (a cura di), *Contributi italiani al XIV Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti (Ohrid, 10-16 settembre 2008)*, Firenze 2008, pp. 167-178.

Matchauzerova 1976:   S. Matchauzerova, *Dve teorii teksta v russkoj literature XVII veka*, "Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury", XXXI, 1976, pp. 271-284.

Naumow 1983:   A. Naumow, *Biblia w strukturze artystycznej utworów cerkiewnosłowiańskich*, Kraków 1983.

Picchio 1977:   R. Picchio, *The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of "Slavia Orthodoxa"*, "Slavica Hierosolymitana", 1, 1977, pp. 1-31.

Simovyč 1930:   V. Simovyč, *Sproby perekladiv Sviatoho Pysma u tvorach J. Galiatovs'koho*, "Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni T. Ševčenka", 1930, 99, pp. 51-80.

Stavrovec'kyj 1619:   K.T. Stavrovec'kyj, *Jevanhelije Učytelnoje*, Rochmaniv 1619.

Titov 1924:   Ch. Titov, *Materialy dlia istoriji knyžnoji spravy na Vkrajini v XVI-XVIII vv. Vsezbirka peredmov do ukrajins'kych starodrukiv*, Kyjiv 1924.

Trunte 1985:   H. Trunte, *Gott und seine Schöpfung bei Cyrillus Tranquillus: Kap. I. Quellen der Theologie; Kap. II. Die Lehre von Gott*, in: C.T. Stavroveckij, *Perlo Monohocěnnoje (Černěhov 1646)*, Herausgegeben und kommentiert von H. Trunte, II. *Kommentar. Literarischer und theologischer Kommentar auf dem Hintergrund der Geschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, Wien 1985, pp. 355-423 (Ukr. transl. *Boh i Joho tvorinnja v Kyryla Trankviliona*, in: B. Krysa, D. Syrojid [red.], *Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj – propovidnyk Slova Božoho*, L'viv 2017², pp. 242-321).

Tymčenko 2003:   J. Tymčenko, *Materialy pysemnoji ta knyžnoji ukrajins'koji movy XV-XVIII st.*, red. V. Nimchuk, H. Lysa, II, Kyjiv-New York 2003.

Uhlenbruch 1983:   B. Uhlenbruch, *Emblematik und Ideologie. Zu einem emblematischen Text Simeon Polockijs*, in: R. Lachmann (Hrsg.), *Slavische Barockliteratur*, II. *Gedenkschrift für Dmitrij Tschižewskij (1894-1977)*, München 1983, pp. 115-127.

Vanhoozer 1998:   K. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in this Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge,* Grand Rapids (MI) 1998.

Vdovina 2009:   G. Vdovina, *Jazyk neočevidnogo. Učenija o znakach v scholastike XVII veka*, Moskva 2009.

Abstract

Larysa Dovga, Roman Kyselov
Principles of Quoting the Holy Scriptures in Works by 17ᵗʰ Century Ukrainian Authors: Approaching the Issue

Ukrainian attitudes towards the holy scriptures, and the ways in which they were quoted and referred to, indicate the specificity of the Ukrainian intellectual culture and the range of freedom that this culture set as a frame for its own development. The Bible quotations used in the selected 17ᵗʰ century texts in Old Ukrainian (*prosta mova*) and Church Slavonic show that the scriptures were treated by Ukrainian religious intellectuals as the most authoritative source for legitimizing new ideas and concepts which were adopted from the texts of non-Orthodox authors and were to be integrated in the Orthodox theological discourse. At the same time, the authors did not feel excessive reverence towards any of the printed versions of holy scriptures and admitted independent translations (from Latin, Church Slavonic, Polish) as well as the possibility of specifying meanings. What is most significant was the comparison of different codices of the scriptures in search of the one they considered most favorable for their goals. It is worth emphasizing that the Church Slavonic translation of the Bible served as one of the possible versions and not as a sacred literary canon. If needed it was quite acceptable to translate the holy scriptures into the Old Ukrainian literary language, based on vernacular practice and easily understood by ordinary lay believers.