



Slavonic Quotations  
from Athanasius'  
*Orations against the  
Arians* in Joseph  
Volotsky and  
Metropolitan Daniil\*

Цитаты из  
славянского перевода  
Афанасиевых «Слов  
против ариан»  
у Иосифа Волоцкого  
и митрополита  
Даниила

**Viacheslav V. Lytvynenko**

Charles University,  
Prague, Czech Republic

**Вячеслав Владимирович  
Литвиненко**

Карлов университет,  
Прага, Чехия

Abstract

This article identifies a set of Slavonic passages from Athanasius' *Orations against the Arians* quoted by Joseph Volotsky and Metropolitan Daniil in opposition to the heresy of Judaizers. These writers are two of the three men (the third one being Zinoviy Otenskiy who is examined in a separate study) that cited Athanasius' work as originally written in Greek and translated to Slavonic in 907 (today preserved in ten manuscripts of Russian origin). This

---

\* This study represents research funded by the Czech Science Foundation as the project GAČR 22-08389S "Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria, *Oration on the Celebration of Easter*: Critical Edition of the Old Slavonic Version", and by the Charles University Research Centre program No. UNCE/HUM/016.

---

Citation: Lytvynenko V. V. (2021) Slavonic Quotations from Athanasius' *Orations against the Arians* in Joseph Volotsky and Metropolitan Daniil. *Slověne*, Vol. 10, № 2, p. 76–96.

Цитирование: Литвиненко В. В. Цитаты из славянского перевода Афанасиевых «Слов против ариан» у Иосифа Волоцкого и Митрополита Даниила // *Slověne*. 2021. Vol. 10, № 2. С. 76–96.

DOI: 10.31168/2305-6754.2021.10.2.4

study is aimed at exploring the significance of this fact, and it also provides a transcription and analysis of all the quotations by comparing them with the text of the *Orations* in all known manuscripts.

#### Keywords

Athanasius of Alexandria, *Orations against the Arians*, Joseph Volotsky, Metropolitan Daniil, Archbishop Gennady, heresy of the Judaizers

#### Резюме

Настоящая статья рассматривает выявленные у Иосифа Волоцкого и митрополита Даниила цитаты из Афанасиевых «Слов против ариан». Их сочинения являются двумя из трех источников русского Средневековья (к третьему относится Зиновий Отенский, анализируемый в отдельной работе), в которых цитируется данный текст, переведенный с греческого на славянский в 907 г. и сохранившийся в десяти русских списках. В статье показано, что взятые из него цитаты были использованы в полемике с ересью жидовствующих. Главной целью настоящего исследования является рассмотреть значение этого факта, а также представить непосредственный текст цитат и сопоставительный анализ по всем известным нам спискам, содержащим «Слова против ариан».

#### Ключевые слова

Афанасий Александрийский, Иосиф Волоцкий, митрополит Даниил, архиепископ Геннадий, ересь жидовствующих

It is commonly recognized that the Slavonic translation of Athanasius' *Orations against the Arians* in our possession today was first copied to counter the so-called heresy of the Judaizers active in Veliky Novgorod and Moscow in the late 15th and early 16th centuries. It is much less known, however, that there seem to be only three people who cited this writing around that time: Joseph Volotsky (1439–1515), Metropolitan of Moscow Daniil (1492–1522), and Zinoviy Otenskiy (d. 1571/2). Today, Athanasius' *Orations* are preserved in ten MS witnesses ranging from the late 15th to the mid-17th centuries, and this study is aimed at exploring the issue of reception of this writing in Joseph Volotsky's and Metropolitan Daniil's own works. For the reception of *Orations* in Zinoviy Otenskiy, I would like to refer the readers to my other work in co-authorship with Mikhail Shpakovskiy.<sup>1</sup> In the present article, I will examine the context in which Joseph and Daniil used the *Orations* and the purpose for which they quoted this work. In the Appendix, I provide the extensive quotations cited by Daniil next to the Greek text of *Orations* and the specific MS from which he quoted Athanasius.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Lytvynenko, Shpakovskiy (forthcoming)].

1. *Orations against the Arians* and the Heresy of the Judaizers

Among the many works of Athanasius of Alexandria (ca. 296/298–373), by far the largest and most significant theological work is the *Orations against the Arians*, CPG 2093 (written between 339–345; henceforth *CA I, II, III* [Metzler, Savvidis 1998; Idem 2000]). In the year 906, this writing, along with Athanasius' *Epistle to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya*, CPG 2092 (written around 356; henceforth *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* [Metzler, Hansen, Savvidis 1996]), was translated from Greek to Slavonic by Constantine of Preslav in Eastern Bulgaria.<sup>2</sup> Since then these texts circulated in the form of a single corpus and under the same title *Orations against the Arians*,<sup>3</sup> in which *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* was given the name of the *Fourth Oration*.<sup>4</sup>

Originally, Athanasius' *Orations* were written to combat the so-called Arian heresy that appeared in Alexandria in the early 4th century. Very soon, that teaching spread throughout the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, denying Christ's divine nature and the Trinity [Behr 2004: 61–122]. In medieval Russia, the same doctrines were rejected by the heretical movement known in the church terminology as the heresy of the Judaizers. According to Alexeyev:

Во-первых, жидовствующие отрицали божественность Сына и Святого Духа и догмат о Святой Троице («Едино господство, едино божество въ Троицы»), но при этом признавали Бога-Отца («да не последуеши тем, иже во Отца веруют, а в Сына не веруют»). Во-вторых, еретики отрицали догмат о боговоплощении Христа в человеческий образ и, следовательно, возможность изображения и почитания иконного образа («и поклоняемся иконе Спасове, во плоти написаному человеколюбцу Богу нашему, ни привидением, ни мечтанием, но истинным вочеловечением подобен нам по всему, разве греха») [Алексеев 2012: 285–286].

The fact that both Arians and the Judaizers rejected the same fundamental doctrines led scholars to believe that the initial copying of Slavonic *Orations* in medieval Russia was related to the rise of the heresy of the Judaizers (e. g. [Сморгунова 2001; Горина 2012]). Several facts substantiate this point. First, Athanasius' name figures in the letter of the Novgorodian Archbishop Gennady (1410–1505), in which he inquired of the former Archbishop of

<sup>2</sup> The *First Oration* (based on two MSS) is published by [Vaillant 1954]. The *Second* and the *Third Orations* (based on two MSS) are published by [Пенкова 2015; Eadem 2016]. The *Second Oration* (based on all known MSS) is published by [Lytvynenko 2019]. One later ms [Sin994] is published by [Weiher et al. 2007].

<sup>3</sup> In addition to the four *Orations*, the Old Slavonic corpus includes a pseudo-Athanasian text *Epistle on the Celebration of Easter*, published by [Penkova 2008: 279–303]. This writing is a translation of the *Homily on Easter VII* (CPG 4612) attributed to John Chrysostom. The Greek edition is available in [Floëri, Nautin 1957: 111–73].

<sup>4</sup> Not to be confused with the disputed Greek *Oration IV* in CPG 2230.

Rostov and Jaroslavl' Iosaf (died in 1514) about whether he had “Athanasius of Alexandria” among his books. The letter (sent in the year 1489) expresses his concern over the increasing growth of the Judaizers, and in the frequently-quoted passage Athanasius comes second in the list of twelve other books:

да ѿ ли Ѹ ва в кириловѣ, или в фарафотовѣ, или на каменнѣ, книги, селивестръ папа рйскы, да афанаси Александрйскы, да слово кѡмы прозвѣтера, на новогавльшдѣ ересь на богѡмилю. да посланиѣ фотѣва патрїарха, ко кнсю борисѸ болгарьскомѸ. да прѣрчьства. да бѣла. да цртва, да прѣчи. да менаандръ. да ѿбѡ ѿраховѣ. да логика. да дечнисеи дрепаугѣи. занѣ тѣ книги, оу еретикѣ ѿ [Tro730: 252v].<sup>5</sup>

While the passage does not mention the *Orations* (referring only to the name “Athanasius of Alexandria”), it is quite likely that Gennady meant precisely this work, for he had it copied by Dmitry Gerasimov (preserved in Pog968)<sup>6</sup> in the same year as he wrote his letter to Iosaf.<sup>7</sup> The letter states that “heretics have all these books” (занѣ тѣ книги, оу еретикѣ ѿ), which probably implied that having the same titles among the faithful was all the more important.

Second, we have an important piece of information recorded in the colophon of the scribe Timofey Veniaminov, who made another copy of the *Orations* in Novgorod in the same year, 1489 (preserved in Vol437).<sup>8</sup> It says that the work of copying was occasioned by the rise of heretics that attacked the doctrines related to Christ’s deity and the Trinity:

<sup>5</sup> This passage has been published multiple times (e. g. [Томеллери 1999]). Since no answer from Iosaf has survived, scholars dispute whether Gennady’s letter was intended to request these twelve books from Iosaf, or rather to provide them to him if he lacked any [Ibid.]. In my view, the second of these options looks more likely: instead of requesting the books, Gennady wanted to check which of them Iosaf already had, so that he could provide those that were lacking. This can be supported from the fact that Gennady commissioned his scribes to make copies of different writings and then sent them to the main monastic centers in Russia.

<sup>6</sup> В лѣтѣ г҃ѣ. ѿ. ѿ. зѣ при великыи князѣ; иваннѣ и иванѣ сѣбѣ его. при архїепїсѣпоу горюдицѣо генадїи. написана бѣ книга сѣа аданасїи александрскы. в великомѣ новѣгородѣ вѣ владычнѣ дворѣ. повелѣнїемъ дїакона герасима поповки. а писалъ братъ его мѣгла. а писана съ списка сѣ старыи книги сѣ болгарьскїе. а писати еси велѣлъ слово вѣ слово. вѣ пречѣстнѣю швнтель прѣчѣтые бѣгомїтри, и чюдотворца кирила. г҃нѣ игѡменѣ макариѡ, и зѣ братьено. герасимецѣ поповка чело бїю. поманїте ма вѣ сѣи свой мѣлъа а написано в спискѣ вѣ. ѿ. словѣ о пражнїцѣ пасхы. This colophon has been published multiple times (e. g. [Фонкич 1977]: 33–34]). For the ms description, see [Vaillant 1954: 12–14; Пенкова 2015: 126–145].

<sup>7</sup> The letter is published with a brief introduction and ms description in [Казакова, Лурье 1955: 315–320; the passage in question is on p. 320]. The dating of this letter to the year 1489 is based on the only surviving MS that contains this letter [Tro730: 252v], stating: В лѣто сѣ. ѿ. ѿ зѣ оверѣ, кѣ. кѣ. кѣ. препїсакъ сѣ посланиѣ.

<sup>8</sup> This MS is often inaccurately dated to the year 1488 based on the colophon in [Vol437: 217v], stating that the scribe “wrote it on October 16th in the year 6997” (писѣ послѣнено сѣа зѣ г҃ѣ; дѣз го октѣмвриѣ. ѿ.). However, since besides the year (6997), there is a clear indication of the month (October), our starting point should be the year 5008 = 1489, not 5009 = 1488. On this system of chronology, see: [Бережков 1963: 28–41].

В ТО ЛѢТО ЗДЕСЕ ВЪ ПРИЕМЪНИТѢ ТЪ НЕДОЛЕУС(Е) МНОЗИ СЦЕННИКЫ И ДІАКОНИ; И Ѡ ПРОСТѢ  
ЛЮДІИ ДІАКИ ІАВИЛИСА СКВЕРНИТЕЛИ НА ВЪРЪ НЕПОРОЧНЮЮ ВЕЛИКА БѢДА ПОСТИГЛА ГРѢ СЕН  
И КОЛИКА ТМА И ТЪГА ПОСТИЖЕ МѢСТО СЕ СЪТЮ ВЪРЪ ПРАВОСЛАВІА ЧТО ЗАПЕЧАТАВША СЪТИ  
ЩІИ СЕДМЪ СЪВЪР; ПРОПОВѢДИЮ ЩІА И СНА И СЪГО ДХА ВЪ ТРЦИ ЕДИНО БЖТВО НЕРАЗДѢЛИМО  
[Vol437: 237<sup>v</sup>].<sup>9</sup>

The passage ends by stating that the heresy was exposed by Gennady who set out to confront it: НЪ ВЪСКОРЪ ИСПЛЪНИСА О БЪЗѢ ВЛѢТИ; ДХА СЪГАГО. ПРЕСЦІННЫ ДРХІЕПИСКО  
ГЕНАДІЕ; ОБНАЖИЛЪ Й ЕРЕТИЧЕСТВА ЗЛОДѢИСТВО [Vol437: 237<sup>v</sup>].<sup>10</sup>

## 2. *Orations against the Arians* in Joseph Volotsky's Writings

After Gennady's death, his cause against the Judaizers was taken up by Joseph Volotsky, who is also our main source of information on this movement [Алексеев 2012: 292–382]. He clearly recognized that they considered Christ to be less than God (СОДѢЛАХЪ ХЪЛЕНІ І ОУНИЖЕНІ НА ХЪ БГѢ) and rejected the equality of the persons of the Trinity (САМОПРОИЗВОЛНЪ ѠВЕРГШАСА СЪТІА ЕДИНОСЦІННЫА ТРЦИ) [*Просветитель* 1896: 516, Слово 15]. Apparently, based on this fact he treated the heretics as new Arians (Аріе новын) [*Просветитель* 1896: 42, Сказание], complaining that they brought back the old heresy. Taking support from the *Life of St. Anthony* (another major text composed by Athanasius and available in Slavonic as early as the 9th century) [Литвиненко 2017], Iosif sought to condemn the heretics in the same way as Anthony did the Arians in his own time:

ІАКО АЩЕ НЕ ПОДОБАЕТЪ ИНОКѢ ОСЪЖАТИ НИ ЕРЕТИКА НИЖЕ ѠСТЪПНИКА, ТО КАКО ВЕЛИКІИ  
АНТОНІИ ОСЪЖАШЕ ИХЪ; ГЛАШЕ БО О ЕРЕТИЦѢ, ІАКО СЛОВЕСА ИХЪ ЛЮТЪИША ІАДА ЗМІИНА:  
ОУЧНИКИ ЖЕ СВОА ВСЕГДА НАКАЗДА, ІАКО ДА НИ КОЕГО ЖЕ ПРІОБЩЕНІА ИМЪТЬ С МЕЛЕТІАНЫ И  
СО ДРІАНЫ И С ПРОЧИМИ ЕРЕТИКИ [*Просветитель* 1896: 498, Слово 15].

Naturally, Athanasius' *Orations* would have perfectly fit the occasion if Joseph felt the need to use this work as a prooftext against the Judaizers. For what it is worth, he quotes Athanasius fourteen times (of which half is from his genuine texts and half from the pseudographia), and he mentions the name "Athanasius" over thirty times [Lytvynenko 2015–2016]. Yet, he makes only two references to the *Orations*. The first one is rather indirect, retelling the account of Arius' death of which Athanasius writes in his *Fourth Oratio* (= *Ep. Aeg. Lib.* 19):

<sup>9</sup> See the photographs of this colophon in [Фонкич 1977: 32].

<sup>10</sup> See the photographs of this colophon in [Ibid.].

<p>Просветитель 1896: 524–525, Слово 15</p>	<p>Fourth Oration = Ep. Aeg. Lib. 19 (from [Vol437: 212v–213r])</p>	<p>Ep. Aeg. Lib. 19 [Metzler, Hansen, Savvidis 1996: 59]</p>
<p>И свидѣтельствоветъ блжнныи Алѣксандръ патриархъ Константѣна града, иже баше в постѣ терпѣливъ всегда, и в мѣлтвахъ пребываа вынѣ. Ѣгдаже бысть соборъ на злочестиваго Арїа, и по извержѣнїи его начатъ каатиса лестно, а не истинно, и блгоутиваго цѣра Константина молаше, яко да повелитъ прїати его на покаянїе, цѣрь же повелѣ Алѣксандрѣ прїати Арїа на покаянїе, Алѣксандръ же, вѣдыи Арїево злодѣйственное ї злочестивое коварство, не смѣлаше прїати его на общенїе и цѣра преслѣшати таковаго не хоташе, и в недоумѣнїи баше, і абїе мѣлтвами и вѣдѣнїемъ и слезами теплѣвишими и постомъ вывлетъ мѣлтвеникъ ко бжцѣ хѣ, яко да сотворитъ полезное, оуслышана же бысть мѣлтва его, і абїе разсѣдеса Арїе.</p>	<p>кончина же арїева. емаже не въ постѣ бы. того дѣлама и повѣсти достойна ѣ. енсевіевъ во чѣ прѣтацимъ вѣвести его въ цѣрков. епискѣ же константина града алѣксандръ прѣлаше. арїи же повѣлаше нѣжею; и преценми енсевіевыми. сѣбота же вѣлаше; и надѣлашеса на сѣтрїа в литѣргїю прїити. многа сѣбо тѣга. w нѣмъ сѣбо престацимъ. алѣксандрѣ же молашѣса. нѣ гѣ сѣдїи бывъ; вѣзрѣ на внѣдашї. не сѣбо сѣлнїце зашло вѣлаше. и въ едїно шѣ захода дѣлама тѣ спадѣса. и wсеого. комканїа же и живота; абїе лишенъ бысть.</p>	<p>τὸ δὲ τέλος Ἀρείου, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἀπλῶς γέγονε, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ διηγήσεως ἀξίον ἐστὶ. τῶν γὰρ περὶ Εὐσέβιον ἀπειλούντων εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὁ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἀλέξανδρος ἀντέλεγεν. ὁ δὲ Ἄρειος ἐθάρρει τῆ βία καὶ ταῖς ἀπειλαῖς Εὐσεβίου· σάββατον γὰρ ἦν, καὶ προσεδόκα τῆ ἐξῆς συναέσθαι. πολὺς τοῖνον ἀγὼν ἦν ἐκείνων μὲν ἀπειλούντων, Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ εὐχομένου· ἀλλ' ὁ κύριος κριτὴς γενόμενος ἐβράβευσε κατὰ τῶν ἀδικούντων. οὐπω γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος ἔδυ καὶ χρείας αὐτὸν ἐλκυσάσης εἰς τόπον ἐκεῖ κατέπεσε καὶ ἀμφοτέρων τῆς τε κοινωνίας καὶ τοῦ ζῆν εὐθύς ἐστερήθη.</p>

From the above table, it is clear that Joseph's account is lacking the fact that the story took place on Saturday and that Alexander was threatened by the Eusebians who intended to force Arius back into the church. On the other hand, Joseph's version adds a few elements that are missing in the *Oration*: it says that the event took place immediately after the Council's condemnation and that Arius repented (though not sincerely), pleading to the Emperor Constantine to restore him. The motif of repentance is also missing in the classical patristic descriptions of Arius' death: Athanasius' *Epistle to Serapion on the Death of Arius* [Opitz 1940: 178–180], *Panarion* of Epiphanius of Salamis [Holl 1933: 146–147], and Rufinus' *Church History* [Schwartz 1908, 1.13–14]. Nothing is said of Arius' repentance in the two *Lives of Athanasius*, of which at least one was familiar to Joseph, who directly mentions it [Просветитель 1896: 442, Слово 11]. The one

text that does refer to Arius' repentance is the *Chronicle* of George Hamartolos [Истрин 1920: 344] (available in Slavonic since the 11th century), but there is no evidence that Joseph used it for his account of Arius' death.

Another reference to the *Orations* comes when Joseph considers the issues of biblical interpretation. This time, Joseph clearly refers to the statement from the *First Oration* 1.54, but instead of giving a direct quote, he paraphrases it:

<i>Просветитель</i> 1896: 406–407, Слово 15	<i>First Oration</i> (from [Vol437: 54r])	<i>First Oration</i> 1.54 [Metzler, Savvidis 1998: 164]
Пвтрѣбнвн оубо естъ. иже божественна писанїа разжмвѣти хотѣща. глѣтъ великїи афонасе, истѣзати съ многымъ впадѣствомъ плоды и лица и оумъ глѣбощаго. сего ради глѣтъ вжѣтвеннїи дѣлѣтъ, яко писмв ѡмрыцьвалѣтъ.	пѣбаеѣт же якоже. о все бжїѣ книга. лѣво ѣ творити. и нѣжа ѣ. такоже и в се мѣсто в неже время рѣ дѣл. и лице и притча. еаже рѣ написалъ ѣ вѣрно разжмѣвати.	δεῖ δέ, ὡς ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς θείας γραφῆς προσήκει ποιεῖν καὶ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα καθ' ὃν εἶπεν ὁ ἀπόστολος καιρὸν καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα διόπερ ἔγραψε πιστῶς ἐκλαμβάνειν.

Joseph modifies Athanasius' triplet *время и лице и притча* (*καιρός, πρᾶγμα, πρόσωπον*) by changing the first and the third words to his own: *плоды и лица и оумъ*. Whether deliberately adjusting this passage or borrowing an already revised version from elsewhere, it is evident that Joseph had the same concern as Athanasius: ignoring these three aspects could lead one to heresy.

While the evidence that Joseph used the *Orations* is quite scarce, we do know that one of the ten mss containing this text (i. e. *Vol437*, copied in 1489)<sup>11</sup> used to belong at some point to the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery directed by Joseph from 1479 to 1515. Written initially in Novgorod, this very ms was later used by Joseph's disciple and successor in the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery, Daniil, who later became the Metropolitan of Russia (1522–1539).

### 3. *Orations against the Arians* in Metropolitan Daniil's Writings

Sometime either in the 1520s<sup>12</sup> or 1530s,<sup>13</sup> Daniil composed the so-called *Sobornik* in which he placed five extensive quotations from Athanasius' *Third Oration* (see Appendix, col. 3). In the year 1531, he used the same quotations to draw up a polemical writing, conventionally called *Sudnoe Delo Vassiana Patrikeyeva* (see Appendix, col. 4). The context in which Daniil quoted Athanasius was his polemic with Vassian Patrikeyev (ca. 1470—after 1531), whom

<sup>11</sup> First described by [Иером. Иосиф, 1882: 73–74], and later by [Фонкич 1977: 26–37].

<sup>12</sup> This date is suggested by [Журова 2020:145].

<sup>13</sup> This date is suggested by [Стариков 2014а: 12, п. 13] and [Жмакин 1881: 321].

he accused of teaching a heresy that believed Christ's body to be immortal before his resurrection (ересь неτλѣннонмиоую). According to Daniil, that heresy undermined the reality of Christ's Incarnation, and he argued for a doctrine that recognized Christ as fully God and man: да никтѣ воудѣ еретикъ. и да никтѣ прїимѣ злоую и пагоубноую ересь. неτλѣннонмиоую. но да всакъ вѣроуѣ и исповѣдает, сзвѣршена тѣ бѣга, и сзвѣршена тѣ ѿлка [Sob197: 121v].

Today, Daniil's *Sobornik* is preserved in nine MSS, of which the best one is *Sob197*, and it is available in the edition by Zhurova [Журова 2020: 471–836]. The text of *Sudnoe Delo* was published by Kazakova from *Sud17* [Казакова 1960: 285–318], and it is our only source that contains this text. Even though Daniil's quotations are too fragmentary for a thorough collation, they have given me enough evidence to establish the fact that he cited them from *Vol437*.

As it is shown in the first set of examples marked with the MSS sigla for the twelve witnesses that contain Athanasius' *Orations*,<sup>14</sup> Daniil's quotations (MN) follow the group *DEFGHKL*, in which *D* is the MS from the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery:

Quot. 2	ѣко въ овоѣ снѣ] ABC, ѣко omitted in <i>DEFGHKL MN</i> , ὅτι ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τούτων
Quot. 2	писано естъ] ABC, естъ писано <i>DEFGHKL MN</i> , γέγραπται
Quot. 2	си аже] ABC, сѣа <i>DEFGHKL MN</i> , ταῦτα ἄπερ
Quot. 3	твораштѣ дѣла отъ ѿд] ABC, ѿдѣа творашѣ дѣла <i>DEFGHKL MN</i> , ποιῶντος ... τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς
Quot. 4	Слово во плзть бысть] ABC, во omitted in <i>DEFGHKL MN</i> , “ὁ” γὰρ “Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο” γινώσκετε
Quot. 5	тѣ во паѣ достоинѣ] ABC, во omitted in <i>DEFGHKL MN</i> , ἀξιόπιστος γὰρ οὗτος γινώσκετε

Whenever *D* offers readings that are different from *EFGHKL*, Daniil's quotations keep following *D*:

Quot. 1	к тоидъ вестѣтѣна] <i>ABCD MN</i> , ктѣ вестѣтѣна <i>EFGHKL</i> , λοιπὸν ἀπαθῆς
Quot. 1	по своемѣ спѣтѣтѣтѣ] <i>ABCEFGHKL</i> , по своемѣ сѣтѣтѣтѣ <i>DMN</i> , κατὰ τὴν αὐτῆς φύσιν
Quot. 3	миѣ не вѣроуете] ABC, не вѣрѣете ми <i>DMN</i> , не вѣроуете <i>EFGHKL</i> , ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύετε
Quot. 4	аште лѣ творитѣ] <i>ABCD MN</i> , аще лѣ творѣ <i>EFGHKL</i> , εἰ δὲ ποιῶ
Quot. 4	видите] A, видѣте <i>BHL</i> , видите <i>CDMN</i> , видѣ <i>EGK</i> , видит <i>F</i> , γινώσκετε
Quot. 5	ѿаша] <i>ABCD MN</i> , ѿаши <i>EFGHKL</i> , τὸ ποτήριον γινώσκετε

<sup>14</sup> Pog968 (A); Ovč791 (B); Nik59 (C); Vol437 (D); Sin20 (E); Sol63 (F); Sof1321 (G); Tsa180 (H); Sin994 (K); Ovč99 (L); Sob197 (M); Sud17 (N).



This situation reflects the results of my fuller collation of the entire *Third Oration*, from which Daniil borrows the quotes. First of all, my collation shows that *ABCD* were independently copied from the now lost Old Bulgarian protograph, and second—of these four, *D* is the protograph for *E*, and *E* is the ms that forms the group of five other witnesses that ascend from it: *FGHKL* (Lytvynenko 2019: 37–48). When we add Daniil's quotations to the picture, we find the material that is of secondary importance for establishing the protograph (due to it being a descendant of *D*), but of vast importance as a witness to the history of the text. To appreciate Daniil's quotations as this type of witness, we should briefly look into the way they function in his *Sobornik* and *Sudnoe Delo*.

In *Sobornik*, the quotations appear within the *Oration on the Incarnation of Christ* (ω взыпощенїи ꙗ́а нашего і́са х́а), which is the fifth and largest *Oration* out of the other sixteen in that writing (ff. 119–204). According to Starikov, this *Oration* can be divided into three major sections [Стариков 2014а: 10–16]. It begins with the idea that Christ assumed true human nature as opposed to a belief that he only seemed to be human. This point is supported with biblical and patristic texts that speak about Christ having a true human soul and the fact that his body was mortal before he was raised from the dead, yet immortal immediately after. This is followed by the second section, where Daniil offers a detailed analysis of various heretical movements, in particular, Gnostics, Marcionites, Manicheans, Arians, and Monophysites. They are said to have distorted the doctrine of Christ's Incarnation and for that were condemned by the conciliar decisions of the Church. In the concluding section, Daniil discusses the so-called hypostatic union (a Christological formula concerning Christ's two natures united in one person from the Chalcedonian Definition in 451), as well as the Incarnation, with relevant support from the Church Fathers.

Within this structure, Athanasius is quoted twice, and all the passages come from the *Third Oration* (see Appendix, col. 3). First, we have a passage from *CA III.57.30–58.1-8* (ff. 129r–129v) in the first section of Daniil's writing. Here, he uses Athanasius to argue that resurrection rendered Christ's human body immortal. The next place where Daniil quotes Athanasius is in the third section. This time, he cites a set of passages placed one after another in the following sequence: *CA III.56.1–11* (ff. 176r–176v); *CA III.55.11–16* (ff. 176v–177r); *CA III.32.1–19* (ff. 177r–177v); *CA III.34.1–14* (ff. 177v–178v). These quotes are employed to explain how Christ, being God, could experience bodily passions and undergo sufferings necessary for the salvation of man. In this scheme, Daniil appropriates the Athanasian texts with a twofold purpose: first, to affirm the traditional doctrine of Christ's two natures united in one person; and second, to explain how this relates to the doctrine of salvation. In short, Daniil wanted his opponents to realize that incorrect Christology (first quotation block) inevitably led to an incorrect soteriology, making the salvation of man impossible (second quotation block).

In a simplified form, the same motifs that we find in Daniil's *Oration on the Incarnation of Christ* are reiterated in his *Sudnoe Delo*. He changes the order of his arguments and shortens the quotations from the Scriptures and Church Fathers, though not from Athanasius. It is possible that such modifications had to do with the nature of this work written as a type of stenographical record from the court trial against Daniil's opponent Vassian Patrikeyev [Стариков 2014a: 19–21]. He cites the same passages as in his *Sobornik* but arranges them differently (see Appendix, col. 4). The first set of quotations appears in the midst of other patristic texts directed against the heresy of monophysitism: CA III.56.1–11 (ff. 355v–356v); CA III.55.11–16 (f. 356v); CA III.32.1–19 (ff. 356v–357v); CA III.34.1–14 (ff. 357v–358v). The second passage quoted from Athanasius is CA III.57.30–58.1-8 (f. 423v). It comes in the very last folio of the codex and ends abruptly, preserving only part of the text. Daniil uses this passage to support his claim that Christ possessed two natures united in one person.

It is worth noting that Daniil consistently selects the quotations from Athanasius' *Third Oration*, and not from either the *First* or the *Second Orations*. In contrast to the first two *Orations*, whose emphasis is distinctly Trinitarian, the *Third Oration* is much more focused on the issues of Christ's Incarnation. During the Christological controversies in the 5th and 7th centuries, chapters 25–56 of the *Third Oration* circulated in Byzantium as a separate writing [Mereschini, Norelli 2005: 34]. Therefore, the fact that Daniil drew from the same chapters for his own Christology should not be surprising. Rather, in citing these passages, Daniil followed a well-established tradition that saw Athanasius as a helpful resource for resolving the Christological issues.

In conclusion, both Joseph Volotsky and Metropolitan Daniil provide some beautiful examples of the reception of Athanasius' *Orations against the Arians* in medieval Russia. Their careful selection of quotes from the *Orations* shows that a 4th-century text was able to serve the purposes of the new context, in which the heresy of the Judaizers undermined the same doctrines that were denied by the Arians. My collation of Daniil's quotations has shown that he drew them from the Volokolamsky MS, which was probably available to him during the time he served as abbot at the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery. Be it as it may, the fact that both Joseph and Daniil found it helpful to employ the *Orations* shows that Gennady's desire to make Athanasius available in the first place proved to be highly effective.

## Appendix

The table below offers five quotations from Athanasius' third *Oration* in two works of Metropolitan Daniil: *Sobornik* and *Sudnoe Delo*. They are placed in col. 3 for *Sobornik* (marked as M) and in col. 4 for *Sudnoe Delo* (marked as N). For comparison, the same passages are also given from the Metzler–Savvidis

Greek edition in col. 1, and from *Vol437* in col. 2, which I believe to have been the codex from which Daniil copied his quotations. Unlike Zhurova [Журова 2020: 571–572, 603–605] and Kazakova [Казакова 1960: 302–304, 318], who published Daniil's texts in modern Russian script, I transcribed Daniil's quotations in Slavonic, keeping them exactly as they appear in the manuscripts.

## QUOTATION 1

CA III.57.30–58.1-8 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 370]	<i>Vol437(D)</i> : 185v–186r	<i>Sob197(M)</i> : 129r–129v [Журова 2020: 1–572]	<i>Sud17(N)</i> : 423v [Казакова 1960: 318]
<p>Περὶ τούτου καὶ Δαβιδὸς φάλλει: “οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν”. Ἐπρεπε γάρ, φθαρτὴν οὖσαν τὴν σάρκα, μηκέτι κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν μένειν θνητὴν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἐνδυσάμενον αὐτὴν Λόγον ἀφθαρτον διαμένειν. Ὡς γὰρ αὐτός, γενόμενος ἐν τῷ ἡμῶν σώματι τὰ ἡμῶν ἐμιμήσατο, οὕτως ἡμεῖς δεξάμενοι τοῦτον τῆς παρ' ἐκείνου μεταλαμβάνομεν ἀθανασίας. Μάτην τοίνυν σκανδαλίζεσθαι προσποιῶνται καὶ μικρὰ νοοῦσιν οἱ Ἀρειομανῖται περὶ τοῦ Λόγου, εἰ γέγραπται, “ἐταράχθη” καὶ “ἐκλαυσεν”. Ἐοίκασι γὰρ μηδὲ ἀνθρωπίνην αἰσθησὶν ἔχειν, ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν καὶ τὰ τούτων ἴδια· διὸ καὶ μάλλον ἔδει θαυμάζειν, ὅτι ἐν τοιαύτῃ πασχούσῃ σαρκὶ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ οὕτε ἐκώλυε τοὺς ἐπιβουλεύοντας οὕτε ἐξεδίκει.</p>	<p>[185v] О том же и дѣлѣ поѣ не оставиши дшѣа моа въ адѣ нѣ даси же прѣбноиѣ своемоѣ видѣти истлѣнїа. поѣаше во тлѣннѣ сѣщи плоти; Ѥже не метати еи  по своемоѣ сѣщїствѣ сѣртнѣ. но за овлекшаго са в нѣ словесе, вес тла пребывати. ѣкѣ во сѣ  вывѣ в нашѣ тѣлѣ; наше все дѣражалѣ ѣ. тлѣ коже мы приемише его; весѣртїа его причащаемса  без ѣма ѣво творатса блазнь прїимати. и хѣдѣ разѣмѣтѣо арїоненствонїи w словеси  аще писано ѣ взметеса и паккаса. мнѣ ли во сѣ". ни ѣлѣскаа естества имѣща; не ра зѣмѣтѣоце стрѣти ѣлѣкїа. и своа н. и же дѣ лма паѣе достоаише ѣодитнїса ѣко въ тлѣ кои страждѣщи плоти, вѣаше слово. и не въз вранилѣ ѣ въстаюцїим на нь; нїѣ.</p>	<p>[129r] велї кѣ афанасїа ѣ слова ѣ на арїаны   О том же и дѣлѣ поѣ. не оставиши  дшѣа моа въ адѣ. ни даси же прѣбно моу своемоу видѣти истлѣнїа. поѣ ваше во тлѣнне соущї плоти, оу ж  не метати еи по своемоу сѣщїствѣ  сѣртнѣ. но за овлекшагоса в ню  словесе вѣ тла пребывати. ѣкѣ во  [129v] самѣ вывѣ в нашѣ тѣлѣ наше все по дѣражалѣ естѣ. такоже и мы прїем ше его. весѣртїа его причащаемса. ве з оума оубо творатса блазнь прїимати, и хоу дѣ разоумѣтѣо арїане злѣ чїтнїи w словеси. аще писано ѣ. въз матеса и паккаса. мнѣ ли бо соу т  ни ѣлѣ скаа ѣтѣа имоуцїа. не разоу мѣтѣоце стрѣти ѣлѣкїа; и своа и хѣ.   и же дѣ лма паѣе достоаише ѣодитнїса. ѣко в тлѣ коѣи страждѣщи  плоти вѣаше слово. и не възврани  естѣ</p>	<p>[423v] Великѣ  афанасїа ѣ слова еже на арїанѣ ны дѣѣз поетѣ. не ѣтлѣвши дшѣ шоу мою во адѣ ни даси же прѣ подѣномоу своемоѣ вїтїи нї тлѣнне. Подоваше во тлѣннѣ  соущѣ плоти оуже не ѣтлѣти  еи по ѣоемоу сѣщїствѣ  сѣртнѣ но за ѣлекѣшегѣ а  в ню словесе. вѣ тлѣа пребы ваетѣ. ѣкоже во самѣ вывѣ в нашѣмѣ тѣлѣ нїше все по ро жалѣ ѣтѣ тлѣ дѣ и мы прїе мише его вѣмртнїе его прича щаемѣзса вѣ оума оубо творатѣса блѣ анѣ прїимати  и хѣѣ разоумѣтѣо арїане</p>

<p>CA III.57.30–58.1-8 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 370]</p>	<p>Vol437(D): 185v–186r</p>	<p>Sob197(M): 129r–129v [Журова 2020: 1–572]</p>	<p>Sud17(N): 423v [Καζακοβα 1960: 318]</p>
<p>κατὰ τῶν ἀναιρούντων καίπερ δυνάμενος ὁ ἄλ- λους κωλύσας ἀποθα- νεῖν, καὶ ἀποθανόντας ἐγείρας ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἀλλ' ἠνείχετο πάσχειν τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα. “Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἐλήλυ- θεν”, ὡς προεῖπον, ἵνα σαρχὶ πάθη καὶ λοιπὸν ἀπαθῆς καὶ ἀθάνατος ἢ σὰρξ κατασκευασθῆ</p>	<p>мишаше ѡбвива юциѣ, а и могоу възвранивыи нигьмь ѡмерѣти; и ѡмерши възставивъ из мѣртвь. нѡ поплѣциаше [186r] страдати своемѡ тѣлѡ. того бо дѣла ма и приде ѣакѡ рекѡ: Да плотѣю постраждѣт.   и к томуѡ вѣсѣртна и вѣсмѣртна плѡ сѣтворена  бѡде</p>	<p>въстаюцимъ на нь. ни мица ше оубживаюциѣ, а и могои. възра нивыи нигьмъ оумрѣти. и оумер ши възставивъ из мѣртвь. но поплѣциаше страдади своемоу тѣлѡ. то  дѣлама и приде ѣакѡ рекѡ. да плотѣю постраждѣ. и к томоу вѣсѣртна  и вѣсмѣртна плѡ сѣтворена вѣдѣ.</p>	<p>[MS abruptly ends here].</p>

QUOTATION 2

<p>CA III.56.1–11 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 367–368]</p>	<p>Vol437(D): 183v–184r</p>	<p>Sob197(M): 176r–176v [Журова 2020: 603–604]</p>	<p>Sud17(N): 355v–356v [Καζακοβα 1960: 302–303]</p>
<p>Ἔδει δὲ ἀκούοντας μὲν αὐτοὺς, “Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμὲν”, μίαν ὄρᾱν τὴν θεότητα καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀκούοντας δὲ τὸ, “ἔκλαυσε” καὶ τὰ ὅμοια ταῦτα τοῦ σώματος ἴδια λέγειν, μάλιστα ὅτι ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τούτων ἔχουσι τὴν ἀφορμὴν εὐλογον, ὅτι τό μὲν ὡς περὶ Θεοῦ γέγραπται, τὸ δὲ διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ σῶμα λέγεται. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἀσωμάτῳ τὰ τοῦ σώματος ἀν ἐγεγόνει, εἰ μὴ σῶμα λαβῶν ἦν φθαρτὸν καὶ θνητόν – θνητὴ γὰρ ἦν ἡ ἁγία Μαρία, ἐξ ἧς ἦν καὶ τὸ σῶμα. Διὸ καὶ ἀνάγκη ἐν πάσχειν σῶματι καὶ κλαίοντι, καὶ κάμνοντι γενομένου αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ</p>	<p>[183v] Пѡбаше же им слышашем. азъ и ѡцѣ едѣ но есѣѣ. едѣно бѣтѣво видѣти по своетвоу  естества ѡца. слышаше же. еже плакала са; и пѡбныѣ. тѣ своа телеси глѣти пачѣ въз ѡ бой сѣ имѡтъ винѡ ѣако и погоднѡ ѣако ѡво ѣа коже ѡ бѣѣ ѣ писано. ѡвоже за ѣлѣскаго тѣла  его глѣтса. не бываѡ во въз вѣсплотѣе; плѡскаа.   аще не бы тѣло възалъ тлѣбно и смѣртно. смѣрт тнаа бо еѣаше еѣаа ма риа; ѡ неа же бѣ и тѣ ло. тѣмже и нѡжа ѣ. въз страждѣци тѣлѡ и плѣ ци и трѣждаючиса бывшѡ</p>	<p>[176r] Подобаше же им   слышашѣ, азъ и ѡцѣ едѣно есѣѣ. едѣ но бѣтѣво вѣдѣти, по своетвоу  еѣтѣва ѡца. слышашѣ еже плакала са и подобныѣ тѣ своа тѣлеси глѣтѣ.  пачѣ въз обоѣ си хъ имѡу виноу ѣако по добноу. Понеже ово ѣако ѡ бѣѣ пѣ сано ѣ. ѡвоже за ѣлѣскаго тѣла его  глѣтса. не бываѡ во вѣ весплотѣи  плѡскаа. аще не бы тѣло възалъ [176v] тлѣбно, и смѣртно. смѣртнаа бо вѣ аше еѣаа мѣ риа. ѡ неа же бѣ и тѣло хѣо  тѣмже и ноу жа еѣт вѣ страждѣцѣ </p>	<p>[355v] Великѡ афонасна ѡ сѡ ѣже на а рианы. Подобашѣ имъ слыше циѣ. азъ ѡцъ едѣно еѣѣ едѣ но бѣтѣво вѣтѣи по бѣист вѡ [356r] ѡца слышецѣ. еже плакала са. и  пѡбныѣ тѣ своа тѣлеси глѣти.   паче же во ѡбой сѣ имѡтъ винѡ   ѣако пѡбнѡ. поне  ово ѣако ѡ бѣѣ  писано еѣт, ово же за ѣлѣскаго  тѣла. его глѣтѣѣ. не бываѡ   во во бѣсплотѣи  плѡскаа.   аще не бы тѣло въз тлѣбно  и смѣртно смѣртное во баше  еѣаа ма рие дѣца ѡ неѣ  вѣ   тѣло хѣо тѣмъ ѣ и ноу жа ѣ   во тѣра жѣцие ѣ.</p>

CA III.56.1–11 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 367–368]	Vol437(D): 183v–184r	Sob197(M): 176r–176v [Журова 2020: 603–604]	Sud17(N): 355v–356v [Καζακοβα 1960: 302–303]
λέγεσθαι μετὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ταῦτα, ἀπερ' ἐστὶν ἴδια τῆς σαρκός. Εἴ τε τοῖνον ἐκλάσσε καὶ ἐταράχθη, οὐκ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, ἢ Λόγος ἐστὶν, ὁ κλαίων καὶ ταρασσόμενος, ἀλλὰ τῆς σαρκός ἴδιον ἦν τοῦτο· εἰ δὲ καὶ παρεκάλεσε “παρελθεῖν τὸ ποτήριον”, οὐκ ἦν ἡ θεότης ἡ δειλιῶσα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ἦν ἴδιον καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος.	εμδ. τογο γ̄λατисα  и сз т̄блани; и с̄а с̄д̄тъ плоти своа. ац̄е д̄во  [184г] или плакалас̄ ѣ̄ и с̄матеса. не б̄ваше слово. а ц̄е слово ѣ̄ см̄д̄цаемое и плагаса; но плоти т̄д̄  б̄ваше свое. ац̄е ли же и молилас̄ ѣ̄ пр̄ити γ̄а ши не б̄ѣ б̄ж̄тво боац̄еѣа; но γ̄л̄ц̄т̄ва б̄ѣ своа  и та с̄т̄р̄тъ.	т̄блѣ, и плаг̄ици, и тр̄д̄жаициса  б̄выши емоу. тогн̄ γ̄латиса и с̄ т̄бл̄д̄.  и с̄а соӯ плоти своа. ац̄е оӯбо или пла кал̄ са̄ ест̄е и с̄матеса. не б̄ваше сло во см̄оуцаемо и плагаса. но плоти то б̄ваше свое. ац̄е л̄ӣ и молилас̄ ѣ̄.  пр̄ейти γ̄аши. не б̄ѣ б̄ж̄тво боац̄е̄.  но γ̄л̄в̄ѣт̄ва б̄ѣ своа та с̄т̄р̄тъ.	т̄бле. И плаг̄и ци и тр̄оӯжаиц̄ӣна б̄выз ше емоу того г̄л̄д̄т̄и и с̄з т̄б лоμз. I с̄а соӯ̄ плоти своа̄.  ац̄е оӯбо или плак̄са̄ есӣ.  не б̄аше слово см̄оуцаемо̄   плаг̄ѣ̄ но плоти то̄ б̄аше̄.   свое ац̄е ли же и молӣса̄ ѣ̄н̄.  пр̄ӣдӣ ти γ̄аши. не ве б̄ж̄ѣт̄во̄ боац̄е̄на̄ но γ̄л̄в̄ѣт̄ва б̄ѣ своа̄  [356v] та с̄т̄р̄д̄т̄

## QUOTATION 3

CA III.55.11–16 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 366–367]	Vol437(D): 183r	Sob197(M): 176v–177r [Журова 2020: 604]	Sud17(N): 356v [Καζακοβα 1960: 303]
ὁ καὶ τὸ σῶμα παθητὸν δεικνύς ἐν τῷ ἀριέναι κλαίειν καὶ πεινᾶν αὐτὸ καὶ τὰ ἴδια τοῦ σώματος ἐν αὐτῷ φαίνεσθαι. ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων ἐγνώριζεν, ὅτι Θεὸς ὢν ἀπαθὴς σάρκα παθητὴν ἔλαβεν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἔργων ἐδείκνυεν αὐτὸν Λόγον ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ὑπερον γενόμενον ἀνθρωπον λέγων· κἄν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε βλέποντες ἀνθρώπινόν με περιβεβλημένον σῶμα, ἀλλὰ κἄν τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε, ἵνα γνῶτε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί.	[183г] и пока завыӣ т̄б̄ло с̄т̄р̄тно; еже пош̄д̄цатӣ еμд̄. пла катиса и алкати. и своа̄ телесӣ на нем̄ пока зоватиса. симӣ во̄ знаемз̄ б̄ваше̄. іако̄ б̄ѣ̄ сы̄  в̄с̄т̄р̄тенз̄; плоть̄ с̄т̄р̄тно̄ю̄ пр̄іа̄тз̄. ѿ̄ д̄ѣл̄ же  плоть̄ с̄т̄р̄тн̄д̄ пр̄іа̄тз̄; ѿ̄ д̄ѣл̄ же̄ показашеса  слово̄ с̄д̄ц̄е̄ б̄ж̄іа̄. и посл̄ѣ̄д̄же̄ б̄выша̄ γ̄л̄ка̄ γ̄л̄а̄.  ац̄е̄ не̄ в̄бр̄д̄ете̄ ми; вид̄ац̄е̄ ма̄ в̄з̄ γ̄л̄ѣ̄к̄ское̄ т̄б̄ ло̄ в̄елз̄к̄з̄шаса̄. но по̄н̄ѣ̄ д̄ѣл̄ѣ̄ м̄он̄мз̄ в̄бр̄д̄ им̄ѣте̄. да̄ раз̄д̄м̄в̄ете̄ іако̄ аз̄з̄ в̄з̄ ѿ̄ци; ӣ ѿ̄ц̄ѣ̄ в̄з̄ м̄н̄ѣ̄.	[176v] тог̄ѣ̄  показавыӣ и т̄б̄ло̄ с̄т̄р̄тно, еже пла катиса и алкати. и своа̄ т̄б̄лесӣ на  н̄е̄ показоватиса. симӣ во̄ знаемз̄  б̄ваше̄. іако̄ б̄г̄з̄ сы̄н̄ в̄с̄т̄р̄тенз̄,  пл̄ѣ̄ с̄т̄р̄тно̄ю̄ пр̄іа̄тз̄. ѿ̄ д̄ѣл̄з̄ же  показовашеса̄ пл̄ѣ̄ с̄т̄р̄тно̄ю̄ пр̄іа̄̄.  ѿ̄ д̄ѣл̄з̄ же̄ показоваше̄ слово̄ соӯц̄е̄  б̄ж̄іе̄. ӣ посл̄ѣ̄ж̄е̄ б̄выша̄ γ̄л̄б̄са̄. γ̄л̄а̄.   ац̄е̄ не̄ в̄бр̄д̄ете̄ м̄н̄ѣ̄ вид̄ац̄е̄ ма̄  [177г] в̄з̄ γ̄л̄в̄ѣ̄кое̄ т̄б̄ло̄ в̄бол̄к̄з̄ш̄а̄. но по̄ д̄ѣ л̄ѣ̄ м̄он̄мз̄ в̄бр̄д̄ им̄н̄ѣте̄. да̄ раз̄оӯм̄ѣ̄те̄ іако̄ аз̄з̄ в̄з̄ ѿ̄цӣ ӣ ѿ̄ц̄ѣ̄ в̄з̄ м̄н̄ѣ̄.	[356v] Тоγ̄ѣ̄. Показавыӣ т̄б̄  т̄б̄ло̄ с̄т̄р̄д̄тно̄ еже попоуца тӣ емоӯ плака̄т̄ӣна̄ ӣ алз̄ка ти. ӣ своа̄ т̄б̄лесӣ. на̄ м̄н̄ѣ̄ по казоват̄ӣна̄. симӣ во̄ знаемз̄  б̄ваше̄ іако̄ б̄ѣ̄ сы̄н̄. в̄ε̄т̄р̄д̄ тенз̄. плоть̄ с̄т̄р̄д̄тно̄ю̄  пр̄ӣа̄тз̄. ѿ̄ дел̄з̄ же̄ показова ш̄ӣна̄ плоть̄ с̄т̄р̄д̄тно̄ю̄  пр̄ӣа̄тз̄ ѿ̄ д̄ѣл̄з̄ же̄ показова ш̄ӣна̄. слово̄ соӯц̄е̄е̄ б̄ж̄іе̄. ӣ  по̄ле̄ же̄ б̄выз̄ш̄а̄ γ̄л̄б̄са̄  ац̄е̄ н̄ѣ̄ вероӯѣ̄т̄ѣ̄ м̄не̄. вид̄ац̄е̄  ма̄. во̄ γ̄л̄в̄ѣ̄к̄ское̄ т̄б̄ло̄ в̄болз̄ к̄з̄ш̄ӣна̄. но по̄ дел̄омз̄ м̄о̄ӣ̄ вероӯ̄ ним̄н̄ѣ̄. ӣ раз̄оӯм̄в̄ӣте̄  іако̄ аз̄з̄ во̄ ѿ̄цӣ. ӣ ѿ̄ц̄ѣ̄ во̄ н̄е̄.

## QUOTATION 4

CA III.32.1–19 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 342–343]	Vol437(D): 165r–165v	Sob197(M): 177r–177v [Журова 2020: 604]	Sud17(N): 356v–357v [Казакова 1960: 303]
<p>τῆς σαρκὸς πασχούσης οὐκ ἦν ἐκτὸς ταύτης ὁ Λόγος· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται καὶ τὸ πάθος· καὶ θεϊκῶς δὲ παιοῦντος αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐκ ἦν ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ ἢ σάρξ, ἀλλ’ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι ταῦτα πάλιν ὁ Κύριος ἐποίει. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος ἔλεγεν· “εἰ οὐ ποιω̅ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, μὴ πιστεῦτέ μοι· εἰ δὲ ποιω̅, κἀν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις μου πιστεῦετε καὶ γινώσχετε, ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ”. Ἀμέλει ὅτε χρεία γέγονε τὴν πενθερὰν Πέτρου πυρέσσουσαν ἐγείρει, ἀνθρωπίνως μὲν ἔξέτεινε χεῖρα, θεϊκῶς δὲ ἦν παύων τὴν νόσον. Καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλοῦ ἀνθρώπινον ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἠφίει πτύσμα, θεϊκῶς δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤνοιγε διὰ τοῦ πηλοῦ· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Λαζάρου φωνὴν μὲν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀνθρωπίνην ἠφίει, θεϊκῶς δὲ ὡς Θεὸς τὸν Δάζαρον ἠγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Ταῦτα δὲ οὕτως ἐγένετο καὶ ἐδείκνυτο, ὅτι μὴ φαντασία ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς ἔχων ἦν σῶμα· ἔπρεπε δὲ τὸν Κύριον ἐνδιδυσχόμενον ἀνθρωπίνην σάρκα, ταύτην μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων</p>	<p>[165r] плоти страждѣци; не бѣ кромѣ еа слово.   того ради того глѣтса и стрѣтъ. и бжескы же томоу   ѿ҃а творациѣ дѣла не бѣ свѣне его плоть. нѣ в томъ   тѣлѣ иже пакы гѣ твораше того во дѣлма и члѣкы бывъ глаше. аще не твора дѣла ѿца моего; не имѣ   те ми вѣры. аще ли же творѣ аще мнѣ не имете вѣ   ры; дѣламы мой вѣрѣ имете. и видите иако вѣ мнѣ   ѿць; и азъ в нѣ: Тѣмже потреба бы   тециѣ петровѣ   волациѣ вгнѣ члѣскы же простеръ рѣ   коу; бжескы же стави недѣг. и о роженнѣм слѣ   пѣ члѣско ѿ   плоти испѣциаше плеваніе; бжескы   же ѿверзаше вреніем. о лазари же гласъ иако   члѣкы; члѣскы же испѣциаше; бжескы же иако бѣ ла   зарѣ вѣздвиже из мртѣвѣ. сеже сице бы   и показано бываше. иако не приви   дѣнїем; но по истиннѣ бѣ   имѣа тѣло. Пѣбашѣ гї вѣ члѣскѣ пѣ   вблѣ҃а҃циѣ   са вѣ всѣ</p>	<p>[177r] То҃ѣ: плоти оубо страждѣци, не бѣ кромѣ   еа слово. того рѣ   того глѣтса и стрѣт.   и бжескы томѣ ѿ҃а творациѣ дѣла.   не бѣ кромѣ его плѣт. но в тѣ   тѣлѣ   иже пакы гѣ твораше. тогѣ во дѣ   лма и члѣкѣ бывѣ. глаше аще не   творю дѣла ѿца моего, не имѣ   те ми вѣры. аще ли же творю. аще мнѣ   не имѣте вѣры, дѣла мой вѣроу   имѣте. и видите иако вѣ мнѣ   ѿць   и азъ в немъ. тѣмже потреба бы   тециѣ петровѣ   волациѣ вгнѣ вѣста   вити. члѣскы прострѣ роукоу. бжескы же оустави недоу҃гъ. и о роженѣ   слѣпцѣ члѣско ѿ   плоти испѣциаше   плеваніе. бжескы же ѿверзаше вреніемъ. о лазарѣ   глѣ иако члѣкѣ члѣскы   [177v] испѣциаше. бжескы же иако бгѣ   ла   зарѣ вѣздвиже из мртѣвѣ. сеже си   це бысть. и показано бываше. иако   не приви   дѣнїемъ, но по истиннѣ   бѣ имѣа тѣло. пѣбашѣ гѣ   вѣ члѣскоу плѣ   обла҃҃а҃циѣ   са вѣ всѣ</p>	<p>[356v] То҃ѣ. Плоти оубо страждѣци не бе кромѣ слова. того ради глѣтѣа. и стрѣтъ. и   бжѣки томоу ѿ҃҃е творацие   [357r] дѣло не бѣ кромѣ его плѣт   но вѣ   тѣлѣ. иже пакы гѣ твораше.   того во дѣма. и члѣкѣ бывѣ глаше   аще не творю дела ѿца моего   не имете ми веры аще ли же творю   аще мнѣ не имѣте вѣры. дѣлѣ   монимъ вероунитѣ. и вѣтѣ. иако   во мнѣ ѿць   и азъ в немъ   темѣ   потреба бытѣ. тѣмоу петѣ   роуоу волациоу о҃немъ   вѣта   вити члѣки   ꙗ прѣтре рѣкоу   бжѣки   же оустави недоу҃г.   на роженомъ слѣпце. члѣско   ѿ плоти. испѣциаше   плѣтва   ние. бжѣки   же ѿверзаше   вреніемъ о лазари   же глѣ   иако члѣкѣ члѣки   же ꙗпоуца   ше бжѣки   же иако бѣ   лазарѣ   вѣдвие   и мртѣвѣ   се же сице   бытѣ. и показана бываше.   иако не приви   нїемъ. но по и҃ти   ннѣ [357v] бѣ   имѣа тѣло   пѣбаше   же дати   проплати   и мртѣ   и доу҃҃а҃га   немѣци   тѣлѣныа.</p>

CA III.32.1–19 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 342–343]	Vol437(D): 165r–165v	Sob197(M): 177r–177v [Журова 2020: 604]	Sud17(N): 356v–357v [Καζακοβα 1960: 303]
<p>παθῶν αὐτῆς ὅλην ἐνδύσασθαι, ἵνα ὡσπερ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ λέγομεν εἶναι τὸ σῶμα, οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ σώματος πάθη ἴδια μόνον αὐτοῦ λέγεται, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἦπτετο κατὰ τὴν θεότητα αὐτοῦ. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐτέρου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκείνου ἂν λέγοιτο καὶ τὰ πάθη· εἰ δὲ τοῦ Λόγου ἢ σάρξ – “ὁ” γὰρ “Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο”, – ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς πάθη λέγεσθαι αὐτοῦ, οὗ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ἐστίν. Οὗ δὲ λέγεται τὰ πάθη, οἷά ἐστι μάλιστα τὸ κατακριθῆναι, τὸ μαστιγωθῆναι, τὸ διψᾶν καὶ ὁ σαυρὸς καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τοῦ σώματος ἀσθένειαι.</p>	<p>съ своими еа стѣрми вблещиса. да ѿ коже своемѣ глѣмо еѣще тѣло; такоже и тѣла стѣрти.  своа емѣ тоуѣно глѣотса. аще и не касачѣса емѣ;  по вѣтѣвѣ его. Аще ѡбо иногѣ вѣ тѣло; того  да глѣоса и стѣрти. аще ли плѣт словеси; слово  плѣт вѣ. и ѣжа ѣ и плотскѣа стѣрсти; того глѣоса.  егѣ и плотѣ ѣегоже ли глѣоса стѣрти каки  [165v] сѣ. еже вѣдженѣ вѣгги. еже вѣненѣ вѣгги еже жадати;  и пропатѣе и смѣртѣ. и дрѣгѣа немощи телесныа.</p>	<p>съ своими еа стѣрѣтми облещиса. да  ѿкоже свое емѣ глѣмо соуще тѣло.  такоже и тѣла стѣрѣти своа емоу тоуѣно глѣотса. аще и не касачѣса емѣ  по вѣтѣвѣ его. аще оубо иногѣ вѣ  тѣло. того да глѣотса и стѣрѣти.  аще ли плѣт словеси. слово плѣт высть.  ноуѣжа есть и плѣтскыа стѣрѣти того  глѣатиса егѣ и плѣт есть. егоже ли  глѣотса стѣрѣти. какиа же соуѣ еже  ооуженѣ вѣгги, еже оубѣноу вы ти. еже жадати. и пропатѣе  и смѣртѣ. и дрѣугѣа немощи тѣлѣсныа.</p>	<p>же  гѣи во члѣвѣоу во плѣтѣ ѡлоуѣаѡуѣа  во всю своимѣ стѣрѣтми ѡлѣ ѣина. даѣа же свое емоу глѣмо  соуще тѣло. такоже же и тѣло  стѣрѣти своа емоу тоуѣно  глѣатѣа. аще и не касачѣоуѣ  емѣ по вѣтѣвоу его аще и нѣ  вѣ тѣла. того да глѣотса  и стѣрѣтѣ. аще ли плѣт словеси.  слово плотѣ вѣ. ноуѣда егѣ  и плѣтскыа стѣрѣти. того глѣ тѣи егѣ же и плѣт ѣтѣ егѣ ли глѣо тѣа стѣрѣти. какиа же соуѣ  еже вѣоуженѣоу вѣгги. и ѣ  вѣноу вѣгги. еже</p>

## QUOTATION 5

CA III.34.1–14 [Metzler, Savvidis 2000: 345]	Vol437(D): 156r–157v	Sob197(M): 177v–178v [Журова 2020: 604–605]	Sud17(N): 357v–358v [Καζακοβα 1960: 303–304]
<p>Ἴνα δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπαθὲς τῆς τοῦ Λόγου φύσεως καὶ τὰς διὰ τὴν σάρκα λεγομένας ἀσθενείας αὐτοῦ γινώσκων τις ἀκριβεστέρον ἔχη, καλὸν ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου· ἀξιόπιστος γὰρ οὗτος γένοιτ’ ἂν μάρτυς περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος· γράφει τοίνυν ἐν τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ λέγων· “Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί”. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ὅταν λέγεται</p>	<p>[156r] да вѣдѣтѣи възнѣ всакъ вѣ стиннѣ. и вѣстрастнѣо еѣтѣтѣа словесе; и глѣ мыа плотнѣо немощи его. добро ѣ слышати бла женнаго петра. тѣ паѣе достоинѣ съвѣдѣтѣ ль о вѣдѣ епѣ. пишет же ѡбо вѣ епистоли  глѣа хѣ оубо пострадавшѣ насѣ дѣлама плотнѣо.  тѣвмже и егда глѣтса</p>	<p>[177v] да вѣдѣтѣи же възнѣ всакъ  [178r] вѣ истиннѣ и вѣстѣрнѣо соуществѣ  словесе. и глѣмыа плотнѣо немощи его.  добро ѣ слышати блженнаго петра.  тои паѣе доствиннѣ свѣдѣтѣль боу дѣ о епѣ. пишѣ во вѣ епистоли  глѣа. хѣ оубо пострадавшѣ нѣ дѣлама плѣтнѣо.  тѣвмже и егѣа глѣтса</p>	<p>[357v] ведати же имаѣтѣ всакъ  воитѣ ннѣоу и вѣстѣрѣтнѣо соущѣ тѣво словеси и глѣмыа  плотнѣо [358r] немощи его. дрѣо ѣ слышетѣ  блжннѣо петра тои паѣе дрѣот итѣ свѣтѣль о епѣе пишѣтѣ  во епѣ толи  глѣа. хѣ оубо пѣстѣра давѣшѣоу нѣ дѣлыма плотнѣо  темъ же и егда глѣтѣ</p>





## Bibliography

## Abbreviated Names of Libraries, Archives, and Depositories

- BAN Библиотека Российской академии наук—Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences  
 GIM Государственный исторический музей—State Historical Museum, Moscow  
 RGB Российская государственная библиотека—Russian State Library, Moscow  
 RNB Российская национальная библиотека—Russian National Library, Saint Petersburg

## Manuscripts

*Nik59*

RGB, Collection of N. P. Nikiforov, F. 199, No. 59, late 15th century and early 16th century; described in an unpublished RGB catalog, p. 20 (<http://new.search.rsl.ru/ru/record/004724331>).

*Ovč99*

RGB, Collection of P. A. Ovchinnikova, F. 209, No. 99, mid-17th century; described in an unpublished RGB catalog, p. 21 (<http://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01004724424>).

*Ovč791*

RGB, Collection of P. A. Ovchinnikova, F. 209, No. 791, 15th century; described in an unpublished RGB catalog, p. 169 (<http://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01004724424>).

*Pog968*

RNB, Collection of M. P. Pogodin, No. 968, 1489; described in [Vaillant 1954: 12–14; Пенкова 2015: 126–145]; various parts of the codex are published in [Vaillant 1954 (*First Oration*); Пенкова 2015 (*Second Oration*); Eadem 2016 (*Third Oration*); Lytvynenko 2019 (*Second Oration*)].

*Sin20*

GIM, Synodal collection, No. 20, late 1480s and early 1490s; described in [Горский, Невоструев 1859: 31–41; Фонкич 1977: 32–34].

*Sin994*

GIM, Synodal collection, Usp. No. 994, VMČ, no later than 1552; described and published in [Weiher et al. 2007].

*Sob197*

RGB, Collection of Moscow Theological Academy, F. 173.1, No. 197, 1520s; most of the codex is available at <http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts>.

*Sof1321*

RNB, Sofiyskoe Collection, No. 1321, VMČ, no later than 1541; described in [Абрамович 1907: 94–95].

*Sol63*

RNB, Collection of the Solovetsky Monastery, No. 63, 16th century; [Порфирьев, Вадковский, Красносельцев 1881: 224–225].

*Sud17*

BAN, Osnovnoe collection, No. 17.13.11, late 16th century; published in [Казакова 1960: 285–318].

*Tro730*

RGB, Collection of the Troitse-Sergiev Monastery, F. 304, No. 730, 1489; described at <http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts>.

*Tsa180*

GIM, Synodal collection, Tsa. No. 180, VMČ, no later than 1554; described in [Горский, Невоструев 1886: 170].

*Vol437*

RGB, Collection of the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery, F. 113, No. 437; described in [Иером. Иосиф, 1882: 73–74; Фонкич 1977: 26–37].

## Editions

## Floëri, Nautin 1957

Floëri F., Nautin P. (ed.), *Homélie pascales III. Une homélie anatolienne sur la date de Pâques en l'an 387* (= Sources Chrétiennes, 48), Paris, 1957.

## Holl 1933

Holl K. (Hrsg.), *Epiphanius: Ancoratus und Panarion* (= Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Band 3), Leipzig, 1933.

## Lytvynenko 2019

Lytvynenko V. (ed.), *Athanasius of Alexandria, Oratio II Contra Arianos: The Old Slavonic Text and English Translation* (= Patrologia Orientalis, Tome 56, Fascicule 3, No. 248), Brepols, 2019.

## Lytvynenko, Shpakovskiy (forthcoming)

Lytvynenko, Shpakovskiy, (eds.) *Zinoviy Otenskiy as a Source on the Trinitarian Polemic in Sixteenth-Century Russia: Introduction, Texts, and Translation* (forthcoming in Brill).

## Metzler, Savvidis 1998

Metzler K., Savvidis K., Hrsg., *Orationes I et II contra Arianos Libyae* (= Athanasius Werke, Die dogmatischen Schriften, Band I, Teil 1, Lieferung 2), Berlin, New York, 1998.

## ——— 2000

Metzler K., Savvidis K., Hrsg., *Oratio III contra Arianos Libyae* (= Athanasius Werke, Die dogmatischen Schriften, Band I, Teil 1, Lieferung 3), Berlin, New York, 2000.

## Metzler, Hansen, Savvidis 1996

Metzler K., Hansen U., Savvidis K., Hrsg., *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* (= Athanasius Werke, Die dogmatischen Schriften, Band I, Teil 1, Lieferung 1), Berlin, New York, 1996.

## Opitz 1940

Opitz H.-G., Hrsg., *Epistula ad Serapionem de morte Aarii* (= Athanasius Werke, Die Apologien, Band 2, Lieferung 5), Berlin, New York, 1940.

## Penkova 2008

Penkova P., ed., "On the Authorship of Съзание о празднице Пасхы Attributed to Athanasius of Alexandria", *Scripta & e-Scripta*, 6, 2008, 279–303.

## Schwartz 1908

Schwartz E., Hrsg., *Eusebius Werke 2: Die Kirchengeschichte, die lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus*, Leipzig, 1908.

## Vaillant 1954

Vaillant A. (ed.), *Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase, Version slave et traduction en français*, Sofia, 1954.

## Weiher et al. 2007

Weiher E., et al., Hrsg., *Die Großen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij: Uspenskij spisok, 1.–8. Mai* (= Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, fontes et dissertationes 51, Band I), Freiburg, 2007.

## Журова 2020

Журова Л. И., ред., *Даниил, Митрополит Московский. Сочинения*, Москва, 2020.

## Истрин 1920

Истрин В. М., ред., *Книги временные и образные Георгия Мниха: Хроника Георгия Амартола. Текст, исследование и словарь, том 1–2*, Петроград, 1920.

Казакова 1960

Казакова Н. А., ред., *Вассиан Патрикеев и его сочинения*, Москва, Ленинград, 1960.

Казакова, Лурье 1955

Казакова Н. А., Лурье Я. С., ред., *Антифеодалные еретические движения на Руси в XIV — начале XVI вв.*, Ленинград, 1980.

Пенкова 2015

Пенкова П., ред., *Св. Атанасий Александрийски, Второ Слово против арианите в старобългарски превод*, Том 1, София, 2015.

— 2016

Пенкова П., ред., *Св. Атанасий Александрийски, Трето Слово против арианите (изследване и издание на текста)*, Том 2, София, 2016.

Просветитель 1896

*Просветитель, или Обличение ереси жидовствующих*, Казань, 1896.

## Literature

Behr 2004

Behr J., *Formation of Christian Theology: The Nicene Faith*, vol. 2, part 1, New York, 2004.

Лутвыненко 2015–2016

Lytvynenko V., *Anti-Arian Arguments in Iosif Volotskij's Polemic against the Judaizers, Parrésia Revue pro východní křesťanství*, 2015–2016, 9–10, 53–75.

Mereschini, Norelli 2005

Mereschini C., Norelli E., *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature. A Literary History: From the Council of Nicea to the Beginning of the Medieval Period*, trans. from Italian, Peabody, MA, 2005.

Абрамович 1907

Абрамович Д. И., *Описание рукописей Санкт-Петербургской духовной академии. Софийская библиотека*, 2, С.-Петербург, 1907.

Алексеев 2012

Алексеев А. И., *Религиозные движения на Руси последней трети XIV в. — начала XVI в.: стригольники и жидовствующие*, Москва, 2012.

Бережков 1967

Бережков Н. Г., *Хронология русского летописания*, Москва, 1967.

Горина 2012

Горина Л. В., *Болгарские книги во владычном дворе архиепископа Геннадия, Almanach 'Via Evrasia'*, 2012, 1, 79–89.

Горский, Невоструев 1859

Горский А. В., Невоструев К. И., *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки, отдел 1, часть 2*, Москва, 1859.

— 1886

Горский А. В., Невоструев К. И., *Описание Великих четых миней Макария митрополита всероссийского, с предисловием и дополнениями Е. В. Барсова*, книга 1, отделение 2, Москва, 1886.

Жмакин 1881

Жмакин В. И., *Митрополит Даниил и его сочинения*, Москва, 1881.

Иером. Иосиф 1882

Иером. Иосиф, *Опись рукописей, перенесенных из библиотеки Иосифова монастыря в библиотеку Московской духовной академии*, Москва, 1882.

Клосс 1980

Клосс Б. М., *Никоновский свод и другие русские летописи XVI–XVII вв.*, Москва, 1980.

Литвиненко 2017

Литвиненко В. В., Рецепция антиарианской тематики Афанасия Александрийского в славянской средневековой традиции. Часть 2: Житие Антония Великого, *Palaeobulgarica*, 2017, 4 (41), 27–54.

Порфирьев, Вадковский, Красносельцев 1881

Порфирьев И. Я., Вадковский А. В., Красносельцев Н. Ф., *Описание рукописей Соловецкого монастыря, находящихся в библиотеке Казанской духовной академии*, часть 1, Казань, 1881.

Сморгунова 2001

Сморгунова Е. М., Составители и писцы Геннадиевской Библии, *Библия в духовной жизни, истории и культуре России и православного славянского мира. К 500-летию Геннадиевской Библии. Приложение к журналу «Страницы», Сборник материалов международной конференции. Москва, 21–26 сентября 1999 г.*, С.-Петербург, 2001, 92–118.

Стариков 2014a

Стариков Ю. С., Приемы литературной антиеретической полемики в иосифлянкой книжности (на примере «Слова о воплощении» митрополита Даниила), *Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия II: История*, 2014, 2 (57), 9–22.

——— 2014b

Стариков Ю. С., *Литературное наследие митрополита московского Даниила в идейно-политической борьбе первой половины XVI века*, диссертация на соискание степени кандидата исторических наук, Москва, 2014.

Томеллери 1999

Томеллери В. С., Заметки о деятельности Геннадиевского кружка, *Russica Romana*, 1999, 6, 11.

Фонкич 1977

Фонкич Б. Л., *Греческо-русские культурные связи в XV–XVII вв. (греческие рукописи в России)*, Москва, 1977.

## References

Alekseev A. I., *Religioznye dvizheniia na Rusi poslednei treti XIV v. — nachala XVI v.: strigol'niki i zhidovstvuiushchie*, Moscow, 2012.

Behr J., *Formation of Christian Theology: The Nicene Faith*, vol. 2, part 1, New York, 2004.

Berezhkov N. G., *Khronologiia russkogo letopisaniia*, Moscow, 1967.

Fonkic B. L., *Grechesko-russkie kul'turnye sviazi v XV–XVII vv. (grecheskie rukopisi v Rossii)*, Moscow, 1977.

Gorina L. V., *Bolgarskie knigi vo vladychnom dvore arkhiepiskopa Gennadiia, Almanach 'Via Evrasia'*, 2012, 1, 79–89.

Kloss B. M., *Nikonovskii svod i drugie russkie letopisi XVI–XVII vv.*, Moscow, 1980.

Lytvynenko V., Anti-Arian Arguments in Isosif Volotskij's Polemic against the Judaizers, *Parrésia Revue pro východní křesťanství*, 2015–2016, 9–10, 53–75.

Lytvynenko V., Reception of Athanasius of Alexandria's Anti-Arian Motifs in the Old Slavonic

Medieval Tradition (Part 2: Orations against the Arians), *Palaeobulgarica*, 2017, 4 (41), 27–54.

Mereschini C., Norelli E., *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature. A Literary History: From the Council of Nicea to the Beginning of the Medieval Period*, trans. from Italian, Peabody, MA, 2005.

Smorgunova E. M., Sostaviteli i pistsy Gennadievskoi Biblii, *Bibliia v dukhovnoi zhizni, istorii i kul'ture Rossii i pravoslavno slavianского mira. K 500-letiiu Gennadievskoi Biblii. Prilozhenie k zhurnalul Stranitsy Sbornik materialov mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii. Moskva, 21–26 sentiabria 1999 g.*, St. Petersburg, 2001, 92–118.

Starikov Iy., The Reception of Literary Disputes against Heretics in Josephite Literature (based on "The Word about the Incarnation by Daniel Metropolitan"), *St. Tikhon's University Review. Series II: History*, 2014, 2 (57), 9–22.

Tomelleri V. S., Zаметki o deiatel'nosti Gennadievskogo kruzhka, *Russica Romana*, 1999, 6, 11.

**Литвиненко Вячеслав Владимирович**, Ph.D.,  
Evangelická Teologická Faculta,  
Univerzita Karlova  
Pilařská 123/2, Satalice, 19015  
Praha 9, Czech Republic  
vyacheslav.lytvynenko@gmail.com

Received July 17, 2019