The Slavic Rendition of Greek Speech Reporting Verbs in Chrysostom's Homilies in the *Codex Suprasliensis*: A Case Study into the Transmission of Diatribal Discourse Organization*

Славянский перевод греческих глаголов речи в гомилиях Златоуста в «Супрасльском сборнике»: исследование по передаче диатрибической организации дискурса

Simeon Dekker
University of Bern,
Bern, Switzerland

Симеон Деккер
Бернский университет,
Берн, Швейцария

Abstract

Chrysostom's homilies are characterized by a high degree of dialogicality. Multiple voices are not only expressed in lively quotes, but in enacted confrontations with fictitious opponents, such as Biblical characters, Jews or heretics. Chrysostom 'plays' both his own part and the opponents' voices, who are

thus not just quoted, but 'enacted'. In order to demarcate the different voices, linguistic means can be employed; these are often fixed formulae that have occurred in Greek since the Hellenistic period as part of the 'diatribal' style.

This article identifies a number of Greek diatribal formulae that were taken over into an Old Church Slavonic translation in the *Codex Suprasliensis*. The main focus of the article is on the function of *verba dicendi* in the 'assignment' of the different voices in the discourse. The distribution of *verba dicendi* is presented quantitatively, but also analysed qualitatively. The present study allows us to evaluate the extent to which the dialogical features of the diatribe have been preserved in translated Old Church Slavonic texts. This, in turn, serves as a starting point for a further assessment of diatribal influences in other translated and original Slavic texts.

Keywords

Diatribe, *verba dicendi*, translation, Old Church Slavonic, *Codex Suprasliensis*

Резюме

Гомилии Златоуста характеризуются особым богатством диалогических дискурсивных построений. Разные голоса не только выражаются оживленным способом цитирования, но и оформляются в виде споров с воображаемыми оппонентами, такими как, например, библейские персонажи, иудеи и еретики. Златоуст выступает не только в собственной роли, но и в роли оппонентов, которые не просто цитируются, но «исполняются» им. Для разделения разных персонажей употребляются языковые элементы: чаще всего это касается устойчивых выражений, которые в греческом языке употреблялись с эллинистических времен в рамках так называемого «диатрибического» стиля.

В данной статье выявляется несколько главных греческих диатрибических формул, перенесенных в старославянский перевод, который вошел в состав «Супрасльского сборника». Основное внимание сосредоточено на функции глаголов речи при разделении различных персонажей в дискурсе. В работе не только представляется количественное распределение глаголов речи, но и проводится их качественный анализ. Настоящее исследование позволяет нам оценить, в какой мере диалогические элементы диатрибы сохранились в старославянском переводном тексте. Это, в свою очередь, послужит отправной точкой для дальнейшего рассмотрения различных диатрибических влияний в других славянских источниках (как переводных, так и оригинальных).

Ключевые слова

Диатриба, глаголы речи, перевод, старославянский язык, «Супрасльский сборник»

Preliminary remarks

This article is devoted to the reception of Greek dialogical strategies in the orthodox Slavic realm, exemplified by a number of Chrysostom's homilies in the *Codex Suprasliensis* (henceforth: *Supr.*). More specifically, these dialogical strategies can be classified under the umbrella of the 'diatribe', i.e. a dialogical

mode of exposition consisting of a set of rhetorical devices used mainly in polemical and didactical texts from the Hellenistic period onwards. The reception of diatribal strategies translated from Greek in medieval Slavic sources has not, to this day, been sufficiently investigated. The present article serves as a case study into the viability of conducting a textual analysis along the lines of diatribal influence, using methodology in the field of historical pragmatics.

This article consists of two main parts. In the first part, the phenomenon of the diatribe and some of its most salient features (diatribal formulae) are introduced and illustrated (§§1–3). In the second part, I shall investigate one specific feature of the diatribe in some of Chrysostom's homilies contained in *Supr.*, viz. the use of speech reporting verbs (§4). More specifically, I shall investigate the correspondence between the Greek verbs and their Old Church Slavonic (henceforth: OCS) translation. This is a first step initiating a line of research that will provide us with more insights into the reception of diatribal formulae in medieval Slavic literature. In order to gain an insight into the extent to which diatribal strategies of formulation have taken root in medieval Slavic *original* texts, it is imperative to first of all gain a clear vision of the way in which diatribal features are transmitted in *translated* texts. This article serves as a first step on this road. *Supr.* shows us *one* outcome of this transmission in a set of translated texts, viz. the extent to which diatribal features had been integrated into the manuscript tradition of the homilies in question.

The field in which the present study is to be situated is that of historical pragmatics. Благова [1966: 77] already notes that researchers' interest in the *Uspenskij sbornik* has largely been limited to its graphical, orthographical, phonetic and, to some extent, morphological peculiarities. The same could be said about *Supr.*, and not much has changed in the meantime. Just as a historical-pragmatic perspective is rare in Slavic linguistics as a whole, this void applies even more blatantly to sources of the canon of OCS literature.[1] Within historical pragmatics, a philological method is used: the quantitative analysis of diatribal features is supplemented by an equally important qualitative analysis on the basis of close reading.

1. Introduction

The diatribe is a dialogical mode of exposition that emerged in the works of Hellenistic philosophers, most notably Teles, and became increasingly popular in Roman times, most notably through the works of Epictetus. In the New

---

[1] The only extensive studies that have appeared so far, i.e. Collins [2001], Lazar [2014] and Dekker [2018], largely deal with Old Russian data. A pragmatic investigation of 'low' language use in this medieval vernacular was certainly imperative and has been fruitful, but the general focus on 'language from below' in historical pragmatics should not be taken to imply that the investigation of texts from the 'higher' domains could not meaningfully contribute to the development of this field within Slavic studies.

Testament, it is mainly used by the apostle Paul; besides that, it is strongly attested in works belonging to the Second Sophistic. These are the strands of influence that continue to the Church fathers, who on the one hand heavily leaned on Paul, while at the same time being reared in the aftermath of the Second Sophistic.

The specific context in which diatribal strategies occur tends to be a fictitious polemic within a didactical genre. Therefore, other voices enter the discourse. This is witnessed by an abundance of reported speech, but, importantly, the other voices in the discourse are not just *reported*, but *acted out*. The speaker (preacher) takes upon himself several roles or voices.

A fundamental study of the diatribe in Paul's epistles, laying the groundwork for further investigations, was conducted by Bultmann [1910]. He drew attention to the similarities between Hellenistic philosophers and Paul's epistles in terms of their rhetorical use of dialogical exchanges with a fictitious opponent. The first really in-depth follow-up study of the diatribe was conducted by Stowers [1981] and is concerned specifically with Paul's letter to the Romans. Although he builds on Bultmann's [1910] work, he also added some necessary corrections. For instance, Bultmann did not attach much importance to the strategy of addressing an imaginary interlocutor [Stowers 1981: 115–116]; this is an important feature of the diatribe that Stowers draws attention to and that we shall indeed encounter in many of our examples from Chrysostom's homilies below. For further details about the diatribe in Greek sources generally, the reader is referred to the overview article by Capelle and Marrou [1957]. More recently, especially Paul's epistles have been at the forefront of attention, e.g. in monographs by Song [2004] and King [2018].

Many of Chrysostom's homilies have long been recognized to contain a heavy load of diatribal features. As some of his homilies are the main topic of the second part of this article, a number of diatribal strategies will first be illustrated using examples from the same set of homilies that will be investigated below.

Chrysostom's homilies are widely recognized to have been delivered extemporaneously and recorded tachygraphically [Goodall 1979: 66]. This is to be maintained contra Baur [1929: 222–223], who claims that Chrysostom's works are rather of a written origin. Thus, Baur exaggerated the extent to which Chrysostom employed conscious strategies of creating rhetorical means of persuasion. These features were rather woven into the discourse as the homily unfolded spontaneously. Of course, Chrysostom's classical education ensured that he was well-versed in rhetoric and, therefore, his use of diatribal strategies cannot be considered coincidental, either.[2]

---

[2] As will become clear below, among the investigated homilies is also a Pseudo-Chrysostomic one. However, this homily was regarded in the Middle Ages as a genuine Chrysostomic one, and therefore treated with the same respect and, accordingly, translated using the same principles as in the case of the real Chrysostomic homilies.

Nor is it a coincidence that diatribal features can be found so abundantly in *homilies*; they constitute a genre in which the diatribe could typically flourish. In fact, Bultmann [1910] almost conflated diatribe and preaching (cf. Stowers [1981: 25]), so that diatribe and preaching are very compatible categories, taking into account that both are meant to "generate a calculated change in the audience for the better, at least as the speaker envisioned it" [King 2018: 106]. Nevertheless, homilies (sermons) are not typically associated with dialogicality. Koch and Oesterreicher [1985] regard a sermon as one of the most prototypically "distant", and therefore monological, text types. As will be shown in the examples in §2, diatribal structuring of sermons can very well result in a variety of voices to be enacted in one and the same sermon.

One of the problems in considering diatribal techniques in Slavic translations from Greek is that not much preparatory work has been conducted on the Greek originals of Chrysostom's homilies and other patristic writings (i.e. in terms of their diatribal features). However, as the present study focuses on Slavic, it can provide no more than a cursory glance at the specific issues in Greek linguistics. A second problem, viz. the absence of a truly critical edition for the Greek source material, cannot be taken as an argument against undertaking a comparative study of the Greek original and the Slavic translation, either. If one version of the Greek material is taken and compared to one version of an OCS translation, this provides a basis to assess the diatribe in both traditions, as well as their relation to each other; we can determine whether the general characteristics of the diatribe have been transferred into Slavic and have been preserved in the Slavic discourse tradition, of which *Supr.* is one manifestation. The focus of the further studies can subsequently be broadened into a wider array of texts and, thus, contribute towards an overview of the extent to which the diatribe flourished in the Orthodox Slavic realm. Thus, I do not exactly investigate the translation technique of one specific translator, but I make a comparison between a Greek and Slavic textual tradition insofar as it has come down to us in a specific manuscript. Possible manuscript variation, especially in Greek, but perhaps also in Slavic, always remains a caveat. Differences between Greek and Slavic may originate in the translator's choice, but they may also be due to manuscript variation in either language. In spite of this caveat, *Supr.* provides a first reference point against which the influence of the diatribe in the Slavic realm can be measured. It exemplifies the diatribe as it had crystallised into this manuscript witness, and as such shows us the specific manifestation of the diatribe with which its Slavic readership was confronted.

Supr. is the largest codex of texts from the Old Church Slavonic 'canon' (containing 285 parchment leaves); it is a so-called March *menologion*, containing a

It also exhibits the same principle of diatribal discourse organisation as the genuine Chrysostomic homilies under consideration. The present investigation concerns the diatribe, not Chrysostom as such.

collection of saints' lives and homilies (sermons) to be read in church services during the month of March (cf. Вечерка [1994: 22]). There are various opinions about the date of *Supr.* Some Bulgarian scholars link it to the 'Golden age of Bulgarian literacy' during the reign of Tsar Simeon (893–927) [Заимов 1982: 5], but this probably refers to the initial translation (protograph), not to *Supr.* as a manuscript copy (cf. Marguliés [1927: 4]; Krustev, Boyadjiev [2012: 18]). In any case, we should distinguish between the origin of the protograph and the one specific copy of a possibly heterogeneous group of translations that has come down to us. *Supr.* as a manuscript has often been dated around the turn of the 10th and 11th centuries. In more recent articles, e.g. Kotseva [2013: 25, 37] and Мирчева [2019: 13], a slightly earlier timeframe is assumed: the writing and composition of *Supr.* is now related to the middle of the 10th century, up to the 970s. All scholars agree that *Supr.* was written in the Preslav literary centre of Northeastern Bulgaria [Krustev, Boyadjiev 2012: 18]. The manuscript was largely written by one scribe, a certain Retko, who mentions his name in a note in the margin [*Supr.* 207], but about whom no additional information is available [cf. Marguliés 1927: 10]. *Supr.* is certainly a copy of an earlier Cyrillic manuscript [Ibid.: 149], and at any rate the homiletic part was probably recopied at several removes from at least two different sources [Ibid.: 151–152, 205–206, 212ff.]. A further discussion of the Greek textual transmission and the various translation layers in *Supr.* would go beyond the confines of the present investigation, as we are presently concerned with the final result of the transmission of diatribal elements as preserved in one particular textual monument.[3]

English translations of the examples given below have been prepared by the present author, with due attention to existing translations by Prevost, Riddle [1888], Lysaght [1988], Malingrey [1994] and Papadopoulos [2015]. The translations are based on the Greek version; in cases where the OCS translation differs substantially from the Greek original, the OCS variant is added to the translation in square brackets. References refer to the edition of *Supr.* by Заимов, Капалдо [1982–1983].[4]

2. Speaker metalepsis as a feature of the diatribe in Chrysostom's homilies

A helpful tool for analysing dialogical features of the diatribe is the concept of metalepsis, which is here used in the sense of Genette [2004]. His term was originally meant to function in a rhetorical framework but has over time been

---

[3] See Keipert [1980] for a possible approach to the contamination of multiple OCS translations in one section of *Supr.* Similar investigations would be desirable for the whole of *Supr.*

[4] Compare also the electronic editions made available on-line by David Birnbaum at http://suprasliensis.obdurodon.org/ and Jouko Lindstedt / Jost Gippert at http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/slav/aksl/suprasl/supra.htm.

'annexed' by narratology [Ibid.: 7]. In Genette's original concept, metalepsis refers to a communicative constellation in which the narrator traverses the boundary of his narrative and starts interacting with his characters. In the context of Chrysostom's homilies, this can mean that the preacher recounts e.g. a Biblical narrative and then suddenly steps into this narrated world by addressing one of the characters.

Genette's theory of metalepsis finally becomes a grotesque caricature of itself, as at the end of the day he views *any* kind of utterance phrased in the first person as metaleptic [Ibid.: 110], thus stretching the definition so far that it ultimately becomes meaningless. The term 'metalepsis' is, therefore, useful for our purposes only in its primordial meaning of "l'auteur s'ingérant dans sa fiction (comme figure de sa capacité créatrice)" [Ibid.: 27].

The term 'speaker metalepsis' is useful for present purposes insofar as it elucidates the various roles one and the same speaker can assume. The author enters into the fictitious world created by his own discourse. This implies that the author displaces himself: although maintaining his own deictic origo (in other words, the 'I' still refers to the speaker, i.e. Chrysostom), he envisages himself in a fictitious encounter with persons from salvation history, Biblical authors, Jews, heretics, etc. This displaced discourse can also be addressed to an abstract (and therefore fictitious) generalisation of the hearers of the sermon into one individualized specimen.

One important class of speaker metalepsis is addressed to characters from the Biblical narrative, also known as persons from salvation history. I provide one example:

(1) Ὁ δὲ Νάθαν αὖθις· Καὶ Κύριος ἀφεῖλε τὸ ἁμάρτημά σου, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃς. Ὦ Νάθαν, τί ἐτόλμησας ἀποφήνασθαι; Μέλλεις γὰρ ὑπὸ Ναυάτου ἐγκαλεῖσθαι ... Τῷ Θεῷ ἥμαρτεν ὁ Δαυΐδ, αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξωμολογήσατο· πόθεν οἶδας, εἰ συνεχώρησε; Πρῶτον μάθε, καὶ τότε μετάδος. Ὁ δὲ Νάθαν φησίν· Ἐμοὶ ἐνεχείρισεν ὁ Θεὸς τελείαν τὴν τοῦ Δαυΐδ περιοδείαν.

и наданъ тоу абию рече· господь остави съгрѣшение твое не имаши оумрѣти. Ѡ надане чимъ дръзнѧвъ· отъвѣштати хоштеши· наватомъ поиемиемъ· къ богоу съгрѣши даоуйдъ· томоу са исповѣда· чимъ вѣси прости ли иего или не прости· прѣжде· въикнити тъгда оучи· и наданъ рече· мьнѣ порѫчи бъ· соугоубь даоуйдовъ пѫть·

But Nathan said immediately: "The Lord has also taken away your sin; you shall not die."[5] O, Nathan! What have you dared to declare? You are about to be accused by Novatian. David sinned towards God and to Him he confessed; whence do you know that He forgave [him] [OCS adds: or did not forgive]? First learn, and then pass on [OCS: teach/impart]. And Nathan said: God entrusted me with the entire way of David.

[*Supr.* 360, 26–30; 361, 1–4]

---

5   2 Sm 12:13.

This is a prime example of a lengthy stretch of displaced discourse addressed to the Biblical character Nathan, as well as Nathan's fictional reply. The main point here is that the utterances of both parties in a fictitious dialogue with a Biblical character are enacted in the homily for rhetorical ends, viz., in this case, to prove that forgiveness of sins should be obtained by confessing to a priest (as follows from the wider context not quoted here). By addressing Nathan, the preacher enters into the world of his (Chrysostom's) own discourse; the primary function of this type of speaker metalepsis is to draw out a reply from the (fictitious) character, so that a dialogue ensues. At the end of our example, after Chrysostom's speaker metalepsis, Nathan's reply is acted out. His reply is marked in Greek by the *verbum dicendi* φησίν, which is rendered in Slavic by ρεүε, which is the most common translation of φησίν.[6] We shall come back to the role and translation of φησίν in the second part of this article.

The next category of individuals addressed by speaker metalepsis concerns the authors of Biblical books. The preacher addresses, e.g., the evangelist Matthew, in response to a quote from Matthew's gospel [*Supr.* 410, 6–16]. Another category of address that can be classified as speaker metalepsis concerns personifications, i.e. non-living objects, phenomena or vices that are addressed as though they were persons, who are subsequently enacted as answering the preacher's address. Thus, for instance, envy or materialism can be addressed as vices, or death as an evil power. In his homily on the raising of Lazarus (cf. John 11), Chrysostom discusses the question whether Lazarus was raised because Jesus prayed to the Father, or rather because He cried 'Lazarus, come forth!' In this context, he acts out a dialogue with death, which is presented as a power that only cedes its influence when ordered to do so [*Supr.* 310, 16–24].

Most instances of speaker metalepsis in Chrysostom's homilies concern stretches of discourse that are addressed to heretics (or rather, to an abstracted, fictitious heretic). Their deviant theological positions provide Chrysostom with a fitting framework for enacting a polemical encounter with a fictitious heretic, which is used in the homily for didactic purposes, i.e. to instruct the hearers in church. Although they are not strictly speaking heretics, among the most prominent opponents Chrysostom takes issue with are the Jews. Thus, in example (2), he contests the celebration of the Old Testament Passover, again displacing himself, no longer speaking to his congregation, but addressing a fictitious Jew who is singularized, i.e. singled out as an abstract individual, who is taken to represent the whole of his nation:

(2) Πῶς, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖς, ὦ Ἰουδαῖε; Ὁ ναὸς κατέσκαπται, ὁ βωμὸς ἀνῄρηται, τὰ Ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων πεπάτηται, πάσης θυσίας εἶδος λέλυται· τίνος οὖν

---

[6] We can note in passing that in the first phrase of this example, OCS ρεүε is also used to quote Nathan's words, but in this case, it does not have a Greek precedent, at least not in the printed edition. Thus, the OCS version is more explicit than the Greek one.

ἔνεκεν ταῦτα τολμᾷς τὰ παράνομα πράττειν πράγματα; […] Τί λέγεις; τὴν ᾠδὴν
Κυρίου οὐκ ᾄδεις ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλλοτρίας, καὶ τὸ Πάσχα Κυρίου ἐπιτελεῖς ἐπὶ γῆς
ἀλλοτρίας; Εἶδες τὴν ἀγνωμοσύνην· εἶδες τὴν παρανομίαν;

како повѣждъ ми пасхѫ твориши· ѽ жидовине· црькъı раскопана· трѣбишта разметана·
свата҃ѣ свата҃ıихъ запърана· вьсѣкоа трѣбъı жрьтва прѣтръже сⷶ· ⷱⸯсо дѣлма о сихъ
дръзаѥ́ши безаконьнъıихъ дѣлесехъ· […] Ѵто глагол҄еши пѣсни ли господьна не
поѥ́ши· на земи штоуждей· а ли пасхѫ господьнѫ твориши на земи штоуждей· видѣ
ли ю҃родьство видѣ ли безаконие·

Tell me, o Jew, how do you celebrate Passover? The temple has been wrecked,
the altar destroyed, the holy of holies trampled, sacrifices of every kind have been
abolished; why then do you dare to carry out these lawless acts? […] What do you
say? You do not sing the Lord's song in a strange land, but you celebrate the Lord's
Passover in a strange land? Do you see the folly? Do you see the lawlessness?

[*Supr.* 418, 12–17; 419, 1–4]

The quoted passage begins with two questions addressed to a fictitious Jew.
Importantly, it should be noted that the Jew is addressed in 2sg forms, which
underlines that it is not a real-life, but a fictitious character that is addressed.
The Jew's argument is then rephrased as a question, which is a very common
rhetorical strategy in diatribal discourse. In this way, the author does not take
responsibility for the utterance, which is already questioned. He then goes on
to dismiss this point of view by two more questions that are meant to reprimand
the Jew; ultimately, however, these questions are addressed to the hearers of the
sermon and are meant to ensure a didactic outcome from the preceding enacted
dialogue. They are also phrased in 2sg forms, because Chrysostom addresses
a prototypical, abstracted hearer (see below). The different addressees of the
questions in this example show how context-dependent the interpretation of
this lively discourse is, and how easily a switch can be made from a fictitious
opponent to an abstracted hearer of the sermon.

This observation leads us to our final category of speaker metalepsis,
which is also the subtlest one. It concerns cases where Chrysostom addresses
a singularised specimen of the hearers of his sermon. The hearers are usually
addressed in 2pl forms, i.e. viewed collectively in their real-life context, as the
congregation to which the sermon is delivered:

(3) Ὀλίγα ἀνάγκη σήμερον πρὸς τὴν *ὑμετέραν* ἀγάπην εἰπεῖν· ὀλίγα δὲ ἀνάγκη
εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ τῷ πλήθει τῶν λεγομένων *ὑμεῖς* βαρύνεσθε· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν
ἑτέραν πόλιν εὑρεῖν οὕτως ἐρωτικῶς πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν τῶν πνευματικῶν λογίων
διακειμένην […]

Мала ноужда дьнесь къ *вашей* любьви сьвѣштати· мала же ноужда сьвѣштати· не
понеже множьство глагол҄емъıихъ *въı* отажьчаваѥ́те си· не бо ѥстъ ино꙼г҄о града обрѣсти·
сице любьзнѣ· на послоушание доуховьнъıихъ словесъ прилежаштъ·

'Today I must say a little to *your* love.[7] I must say a little, not because *you* would be wearied by the multitude of what is said; for there is no other town to be found that is so lovingly disposed towards hearing spiritual words.'

[*Supr.* 405, 7–13]

What our discussion of speaker metalepsis has shown us is that there are two levels on which the communication in the homily proceeds. Clark [1996: 354, 390] calls this "layers of action", each of which occurs in its own "domain of action" [Ibid.: 355]. Thus, layer 1 represents the actual situation in which the sermon is delivered: Chrysostom is preaching to an actual audience in an actual church. Layer 2 concerns the imagined situation in which Chrysostom enacts a fictitious discussion with a fictitious participant in a fictitious domain of action. Thus, on layer 1, Chrysostom is speaking to his congregation; on layer 2, he is addressing e.g. Nathan, Matthew, death, a fictitious Jew, or an abstracted hearer in church. In the latter case, he enacts a dialogue that might have occurred with any one individual from among his audience. However, it does not actually occur, but it is construed by Chrysostom. Therefore, it is to be situated on Clark's layer 2. I shall clarify the distinction between the layers by the two following examples.

(4) Ἀκούσατε δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πραγματείαν. Ἴστε γὰρ πάντες σαφῶς, ὅτι συκοφαντίᾳ τῆς Αἰγυπτίας τὴν φυλακὴν οἰκήσας [...]

ℕ и ѥште послѹшайте ѥго дѣлесъ ихъ· вѣсте бо вьси авѣ· ꙗко обаждениїмъ госпожда си въ тьмницꙙ въврьженъ бꙑстъ·

'Hear, too, his other activity. For you all know clearly that by the slander of the Egyptian woman, having lived in prison, [...]'
[OCS: 'Hear, too, his other deeds. For you all know clearly that by the slander of his mistress he was thrown into prison.']

[*Supr.* 367, 6–9]

The imperative ἀκούσατε / послѹшайте is plural, indicating that Chrysostom addresses all his hearers in church (i.e. on layer 1). This is reinforced by the following phrase ('for you all know'), which can only refer to the hearers of the sermon. The whole passage is to be located on layer 1. The issue is somewhat different in the following exchange:

(5) Ἵν' οὖν μάθῃς ὅτι οὐ μαθητὴς ἁπλὸς αὐτὸν προῦδωκεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς δοκιμωτάτης τάξεως εἷς, διὰ τοῦτό φησιν· Εἷς τῶν δώδεκα. Καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνεται ὁ ταῦτα γράψας Ματθαῖος. Τίνος ἔνεκεν οὐκ αἰσχύνεται; Ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι πανταχοῦ μετὰ ἀληθείας πάντα φθέγγονται, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀποκρύπτονται.

ℕъ да навъꙑкнеши ꙗко не простꙑи ѥго ѹченикъ прѣда· нъ отъ избранааго радѹ ѥдинъ· сего дѣльма рече ѥдинъ отъ двою на десꙙте· и не стꙑдитъ сꙙ матѳеи се пиша·

---

7 'Your love' is to be understood metonymically, i.e. as 'beloved ones'.

ꙟСО ДѢЛМА НЕ СТꙐДИТЪ СѦ· ДА НАВꙐКНЕШИ ꙗКО ВЬСѪЖДЕ ИСТИНѪ ВЬСЕ ГЛАГОЛѪТЪ· А҃
НИꙟСОЖЕ НЕ ПОТАА́ТЪ·

'But in order that you (sg) should learn that not just a simple disciple betrayed him, but one from the most excellent [OCS: chosen] rank, for this reason he says: "One of the twelve." Neither was Matthew ashamed to write this. Why was he not ashamed? So that you (sg) should learn that everywhere all [i.e. all evangelists] speak the truth and hide nothing.'

[*Supr.* 409, 12–19]

In this example, an individual is addressed by means of 2sg forms (μάϑης / НАВꙐКНЕШИ). This fictitious individual is to be distinguished from the actual hearers of the sermon, not only because of the singular forms, but also because he is enacted as asking a question ('why was he not ashamed?'). This does not really happen on layer 1: in other words, a hearer of the sermon does not actually stand up and ask Chrysostom a question. It is only enacted on layer 2, in the same way as when the objection of a fictitious opponent is rendered. Thus, we can have a singularisation not only of heretics, but also of the hearers (cf. §3 on vocatives). In this way, the distinction between a fictitious opponent and an abstracted hearer can sometimes become blurred, because both function on the fictitious layer 2.

3. Rhetorical means of the diatribe as expressed by linguistic features

Having illustrated some typical examples of speaker metalepsis in a diatribal context, we can now proceed to some of the main expressions by means of which a diatribal dialogue is formulated. Five main linguistic elements of diatribe (or diatribal formulae) can be distinguished (some of which we have already encountered in the examples above), each of them with its own specific function:

Table 1. **Diatribal formulae**

Greek	*Slavic*	*Function*
ἀλλά 'but…'	НЪ	(as part of a 'contradictio', the objection of the imaginary opponent)
τί οὖν 'what then?'	ꙟТО ОУБО	(to introduce a false conclusion)
μὴ γένοιτο 'far be it from me'	НЕ БѪДИ	(to rebut a false conclusion)
ὁρᾷς 'don't you see?'	ВИДѢ ЛИ	(addressed to the imaginary opponent)
parenthetical φησί 'says (he)'	РЕꙟЕ	(as part of a 'contradictio')

Of these elements, the last one is of predominant interest for the present investigation. It will be dealt with in more detail in the second half of this

article. The other four elements certainly also occur in our sample of homilies; some representative examples will be presented below.

A prominent feature of the diatribe is the use of the question ὁρᾷς / видѣ ли / видиши ли 'do you see', used reprovingly in the sense of 'don't you see?'. Alternatively, the verb ὁράω can occur as an imperative (ὅρα), on its own or in combination with other imperatives. Bultmann [1910: 86] already notes that only those imperatives belong to the diatribal repertoire that have a rhetorical colour to them ("wenn sie irgendwie rhetorisch gefärbt sind"). His somewhat imprecise formulation can be specified as follows: only those imperatives are relevant which are directed at a fictitious opponent in a metaleptic mode of address. So, whether we see the imperative ὅρα or the question ὁρᾷς (or εἶδες), in the diatribe both are addressed either to a fictitious opponent or to an abstracted, singularised hearer.

(6) Ὁρᾷς πῶς τὸ κακῶς παθεῖν ἔχει μισθὸν καὶ ἔπαθλον τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν; Ἄκουσον πῶς τὸ κακῶς ποιῆσαι κόλασιν φέρει καὶ τιμωρίαν. Εἰπὼν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι Τὸν Κύριον ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ τοὺς προφήτας ἐδίωξαν, ἐπήγαγεν· Ὧν τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν. Εἶδες πῶς οἱ μὲν διωκόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν λαμβάνουσιν, οἱ δὲ διώκοντες τὴν ὀργὴν κληρονομοῦσι;

видиши ли ꙗко ѥже ꙁъло страдати· имать мъꙁдꙗ й даръ цѣсарьствиꙗ небесьнааго· слꙑши ꙗко ѥже ꙁъло сътворити мꙗкꙗ приноситъ й страсть· рекъ бо паулъ о жидовѣхъ ꙗко господа ѹмориша· й пророкꙑ отъгнаша· приложи ихъ коньць· бꙑдетъ по дѣлесемъ ихъ· видѣ ли колико ихъ гоними цр҃ьствиѥ въꙁемьꙗтъ· а гонꙗштий гнѣвъ приѥмьꙗтъ·

Do you see how suffering evil has a reward and a prize — the kingdom of heaven? *Hear* how doing evil carries punishment and vengeance. Paul, having said of the Jews that they "killed the Lord and persecuted [OCS: drove out] the prophets,"[8] adduced [OCS: added] "whose end shall be according to their works."[9] *Do you see* that the persecuted receive the kingdom [OCS: Do you see how many of them[10] receive the kingdom, being persecuted], but the persecutors inherit wrath?

[*Supr.* 406, 14–22]

We see a question here ('do you see'), reinforced by an imperative ('hear'); then evidence is provided by means of a Biblical quote; again we see a question ('do you see'). Two different verbs are used in Greek: ὁρᾷς corresponds to the present tense видиши ли, whereas εἶδες was translated by the aorist видѣ ли.[11]

---

8 1 Thes 2:15.

9 2 Cor 11:15.

10 This rendition is due to the translator's confusion of πῶς οἱ 'how the' with πόσοι 'how many'.

11 We encounter the same distribution a bit later on in the same homily no. 36 [*Supr.* 419, 3–9]. However, in homily no. 39, we find a different distribution, where εἶδες translates

These questions are enacted to show that the heretics are to be brought to their senses, while at the same time they are meant to strengthen the hearers of the sermon in the rightness of their convictions. In the same homily (36), this feature (видиши ли) occurs frequently, in one passage even three times within three lines [*Supr.* 410, 8–10].

A second important rhetorical strategy that belongs to the spectrum of diatribal features is the use of vocatives. Especially the vocative ἄνθρωπε can be called a typical diatribal formula, which has been recognised in Paul and Epictetus since Bultmann (cf. Stowers [1981: 81]); it is used to characterise an abstracted, fictitious opponent before engaging in a debate with him. In this way, the vocative functions as an important clue to signal the presence of a diatribal dialogue. If this vocative is misunderstood, then probably the whole section is misconstrued.[12] In some instances, the use of the vocative ἄνθρωπε occurs in the rather mild context of protreptic (cf. King [2018]), where the fictitious addressee is gently instructed in order to be persuaded:

(7) Χρησώμεθα δὲ καὶ μετρίῳ ὑποδείγματι πρὸς σαφήνειαν τῶν λεγομένων· Ὑπόθου μοι, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, ὁ τῆς μετανοίας ἀντίπαλος, τίνα ἄνθρωπον σφαλέντα καὶ καταδίκη ὑπὸ ἄρχοντος βληθέντα καὶ μέλλοντα αὐτὸν ἢ ἐν ἐξορίᾳ, ἢ ἐν ἄλλη τινὶ τιμωρίᾳ παραπέμπεσθαι· μὴ ... δι' ἑαυτοῦ πρόσεισι, καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα παρακαλεῖ τῆς συμφορᾶς ἀπαλλαγῆναι;

Вьзьмъ же и маломь съказаниемъ· на ꙗвьѥниѥ глаголѥмъиймъ· съкажи ми ѡ уловѣуе· ѥже са твориши покаанию съпротивьникъ· Съкажи ми кого уловѣка съгрѣшивъ҃ша· и въ тьмницѫ въврьженоу бъивъшоу старѣйшиноѭ· и хоташтаа ѥго или камо испоустити· или въ кѫѭ мѫкѫ прѣдати· дѣѥши ли приходитъ самъ къ старѣйшинѣ ти молитъ са· да бъи напасти иꙁбъилъ·

Let us use a small example to clarify what is said. Suggest to me [OCS: Tell me], *o man*, [you who are] opposed to repentance—mention [to me] some man who has committed some offence, and has been thrown into prison and who is about to be sent into exile or to be subjected to some other punishment; does he approach by himself, and call upon the authorities to be released from the disaster?

[*Supr.* 361, 9–18]

In other cases, the element of censure is more prominent, in which case the translator could decide to use a singulative suffix. Цейтлин et al. [1999: 782] characterise the lemma 'уловѣуинъ' as "уничижительное", which supposes

---

as видиши ли [*Supr.* 441, 9]. This kind of variation would provide interesting material for another case study into the translation of diatribal formulae.

[12] Cf. *Supr.* 358, 25, for which Lysaght [1988] provides a defective translation, not recognising ἄνθρωπε / уловѣуине as part of a diatribal structure: "But *a man* who deludes himself with haughty and false words and grieves God with his folly and his conceit: do you really go to such a man (to confess your sins) or do you receive remission of your sins from such a man?"

a pejorative connotation. This would be in accord with Stowers's [1981: 79, 87] notion of "indictment", where the fictitious opponent is repudiated rather more brusquely and roughly:

(8) Διὸ περιττολογεῖς, ἄνθρωπε, οὐ δικαιολογεῖς, ὁ λέγων ὅτι ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ ἀνάγκης ὑπῆρχεν εὐλαβὴς καὶ ἀνεξίκακος.

да без оума оубо обилиѥмъ бесѣдоуѥши ѿ ꙩловѣчине· а не правьдоѭ· глаголѭ ꙗко їꙍсифъ ноуждъма бѣ добръ й бе ꙃълоби·

For this reason you speak superfluously, *man*, you do not speak rightly, saying that Joseph was cautious and patient [OCS: good and guileless] out of necessity.

[*Supr.* 365, 12–15]

The use of a singulative suffix to attain a pejorative connotation is not explicitly discussed in any OCS grammar. Accordingly, it is probable that the pejorative connotation is not due to the singulative suffix as such. Instead, there is a better way in which the singulative can be connected to the diatribe, viz. to the strategy of categorising a fictitious opponent by singling him out from the whole of the group to which he belongs. This is a prime function of the singulative. Nevertheless, the use of the singulative suffix –инъ attached to the lemma ꙩловѣкъ is a rarity in OCS: it occurs only twice in *Supr.*, and nowhere else (cf. Hauptová et al. [1997: 881]: "occurrit in Supr"). The vocative singular ꙩловѣче is the far more normal form (which occurs 9 times in *Supr.*, cf. Meyer [1935: 286], as Vaillant [1948: 163] also observes: "de ꙩловѣци "hommes", le Suprasliensis tire un singulier voc. ꙩловѣчине 358²⁵, 365¹³, pour l'usuel ꙩловѣче." Thus, ꙩловѣчине is to be treated as an exceptional form.[13] Bräuer [1969: 126–130] discusses singulative forms extensively but does not mention ꙩловѣчинъ. The lemma ꙩловѣкъ does not necessitate the use of a singulative suffix from a purely morphological point of view, as an ordinary singular form ꙩловѣкъ is already available. This situation suggests that an explanation is to be sought in terms of its pragmatic relevance, rather than its grammatical expediency.

A similarly pejorative nuance can be remarked in the vocative жидовине 'Jew'. We have already encountered one instance in our example (2) above; an even more vividly diatribal context emerges in the following example:

(9) Ὁρᾷς, ὦ ἀνόητε Ἰουδαῖε, πῶς ἐκ προοιμίων τοῦ λόγου αἰσχύνην ὑμῖν προκαταγγέλλει ὁ προφήτης διὰ τὴν ἀπείθειαν ὑμῶν;

Видиши ли невѣрънꙑи ѿ жидовине· како їс прьва словесе· стꙑдѣниѥ вамъ прѣжде повѣдоуѥ пророкъ· ꙩслоушаниꙗ дѣлꙗ вашего·

---

[13] Cf. Diels [1963: 166], who calls it a 'very rare' form: "zu ЧЛОВѢЦИ 'Menschen' (von ЧЛОВѢКЪ 'Mensch') wird ein neuer vsg. gebildet, doch sehr selten: ЧЛОВѢЧИНЕ *Supr.* 358, 25f. 365, 13."

'Do you see, o foolish [OCS: unbelieving] *Jew*, how from the opening of [his] word the prophet announces beforehand shame for you because of your disobedience?'

[*Supr.* 325, 25–28][14]

The pejorative element is unmistakably evident here. However, the difference with ꙉⰾⱁⰲⱑⱍⰻⱀⰵ is that the lemma ⰶⰻⰴⱁⰲⰹⱀⱏ does not have a primary singular form. Thus, in this case, the pejorative colour certainly does not reside in the singulative suffix as such, but rather in the general polemical context of the diatribe in which the vocative occurs. On the other hand, we cannot assume that the use of the singulative suffix in ꙉⰾⱁⰲⱑⱍⰻⱀⰵ is haphazard; its presence must be explained. The most fruitful approach may be to analyse the singulative suffix in ꙉⰾⱁⰲⱑⱍⰻⱀⰵ through the lens of the characterizing function of vocatives in diatribal discourse (i.e. to single out an abstract specimen of a heretical opponent). This is in line with Stowers's notion of indictment. Thus, the idea of one (abstract) specimen of the heretics is enhanced by the use of a morphologically redundant singulative form. The result is a very emphatic singularisation: from among the whole of mankind, one specimen is singled out.[15] The author then engages in a polemical exchange with this fictitious individual. The same way of reasoning can be applied to the hearers in church. They are sometimes addressed collectively (e.g. as 'beloved'), but they can also be generalized into one abstract specimen, as was indicated already above.

4. *Verba dicendi*: φησί against the background of its alternatives

The next part of this study is devoted to the question to what extent the switch into displaced discourse is marked explicitly by means of speech reporting verbs (*verba dicendi*). More specifically, we shall investigate the distribution of some Greek speech reporting verbs and their OCS correspondences. The Greek verb lemmata chosen for this investigation are λέγω, ἐρῶ, εἶπον and φημί.[16] Some marginal Greek *verba dicendi* have not been taken into consideration; the amount of material would have to be much larger to bring these into the discussion as well.[17] The main focus of interest is on the parenthetical, diatribal use of φησί as a quotative marker. The question is: how is it rendered in Slavic? To answer this question, we need to consider some other background

---

[14] This example has been taken from Homily 28 'On Palm Sunday', which falls outside the scope of the rest of this article.

[15] Ефимова [2006: 91–92], mentioning the two instances in *Supr.*, considers the suffix "избыточным", which is true from a purely morphological point of view, but, as I have shown, the suffix is not superfluous when viewed from a pragmatic perspective.

[16] The first three of these are sometimes joined into one lemma, viz. λέγω. I have chosen here to keep them apart for the sake of clarity.

[17] This concerns, e.g., the verb forms of φθέγγομαι 'to utter', which occurs only 5 times in our sample of five homilies, and is translated there with a form of ⰳⰾⰰⰳⱁⰾⰰⱅⰻ. I do not intend to draw any conclusions from the use of such weakly attested verbs.

parameters, e.g. how φησί is rendered generally, and how this relates to the rendition of λέγω.

The five homilies that have been selected for this investigation belong to Chrysostom's most pronouncedly diatribal homilies in *Supr.* The numbering of the homilies refers to the sequence in which they occur in *Supr.*:

    a.   Homily 26: On Lazarus dead for four days

    b.   Homily 30: On the parable about the fig tree (by Pseudo-Chrysostom)

    c.   Homily 31: On fasting, on David, on priests, on Joseph and against Novatian

    d.   Homily 36: On the treachery of Judas

    e.   Homily 39: On Mt 27:62–64

The five homilies show a total number of 262 *verba dicendi* pertaining to the abovementioned four lemmata. I have divided them into five types, according to the 'provenance' of the reported speech that is introduced by these verbs.[18] The number of tokens for each category is indicated as well.

1. Bibl. = Biblical quote (24 verbs). These do not necessarily concern us in the present investigation, as they occur *within* quotes from sacred texts, so that the author does not necessarily choose a certain verb here, but rather leans on an already existing text.[19]

2. Quote (136 verbs). This means that a *verbum dicendi* is used to introduce a (Biblical) quote. It can also be that the author does not quote an actually existing text but produces a fictitious quote that he attributes to one of the Biblical characters. Both types of quotation are subsumed under the same category.

3. Opp. = Opponent(s) (35 verbs). This is the most interesting category for present purposes, as it concerns *verba dicendi* that are used to introduce the (heretical) opponents' point of view, which, as we have seen above, is a cardinal feature of the fictitious dialogue that is so typical of diatribal texts.

4. Self-ref. = Self-reference (15 verbs). Here the author (preacher) refers to his own utterances in the sermon. This type is not particularly relevant for our purposes.

---

[18] Какридис [2019: 143] distinguishes two categories of φησί, viz. quotative and diatribal. Quotative has to be understood in a narrow sense here, as in principle any stretch of reported speech can be introduced by a quotative marker. The definition leans on the question as to what the origin of the report is: is it a (Biblical) quote or is it a fictitious opponent's utterance? These two categories correspond to my categories of 'Quote' and 'Opponent'. The other categories I have distinguished ('Biblical', 'Self-reference' and 'Other') serve to exclude irrelevant data from the present analysis.

[19] This does not mean that the author always reproduces Biblical quotes verbatim, though (cf. Заимов [1982: 8], who states that Biblical quotes are often rendered from memory and are, therefore, not necessarily an adequate reproduction of the original texts). Moszyński [1980: 50] proposes that the translator(s) used an OCS version of the Scriptures that has not survived until our time. In any case, the degree of 'verbatimness' of Biblical quotes, both in the Greek originals and in the OCS translation of *Supr.* is a subject that is too vast to be treated in this article.

5. Other (46 verbs). This concerns all other instances of *verba dicendi* that cannot be incorporated into any of the aforementioned categories.

Before we proceed to a quantitative analysis of the data, one more terminological distinction needs to be made at this point; it concerns the difference between parenthetical and non-parenthetical verbs. A definition of parenthesis can be given in two ways. One is of a syntactic nature, i.e. the parenthetical element (such as a *verbum dicendi*) is deemed to lie outside of the syntactic unit of the sentence. Non-parenthetical *verba dicendi*, on the other hand, are embedded into the grammatical structure of the sentence; this usually means that the quote is a "clausal constituent" that functions as a direct object (cf. Verhagen [2005, 78ff.]). In ordinary quotes, this syntactic criterion is the only one that can be used. However, when the other voice is not just quoted, but *enacted*, as is so typical for the diatribe, we can also use another criterion, which is not of a grammatical, but of a pragmatic nature. This distinction can best be explained—once again—with reference to Clark's layers of action, as discussed in §2 above. A *verbum dicendi* belongs to layer 1, whereas the enacted quote belongs to layer 2. A parenthetical *verbum dicendi* is inserted in the middle of an enacted quote, so that layer 2 is 'interrupted' by an element of layer 1. The author uses the parenthetical verb to indicate (a) that he is performing another voice than his own and (b) that he distances himself from the contents of the enacted quote. Thus, the parenthetical verb functions as a "pragmatic marker", which does not affect the propositional meaning of the sentence but serves to organize and structure the discourse and indicate the speaker's attitude [Fraser 1996: 168]. I shall illustrate this distinction by discussing the following examples (10–13) below.

We start from the hypothesis that the most typical Slavic correspondence of diatribal φησί is the 3sg.aor form ρєчє. This hypothesis comes true in *Supr.* (see Table 3), and its validity has been demonstrated for other medieval sources, too (cf. Какридис [2019, 2020], Dekker [forthc.]). Accordingly, there is no urgent need to take variant readings in other manuscripts into account, as it concerns an already well-established hypothesis. However, deviations from this general rule are more interesting from a pragmatic point of view; they need an explanation. The deviations that will be discussed in examples below will, therefore, be checked against two other Slavic manuscripts containing the same homilies, so that we can establish with a higher degree of certainty that the translations that deviate from the norm φησί → ρєчє are really a result of the translator's choice, and not due to incidental changes over the course of Slavic manuscript transmission.

As shown in the list of categories given above, the category of Quotes (136 verbs) vastly outnumbers the other categories. Chrysostom's extensive use of quotes (largely of Biblical provenance) shows many other voices entering the

discourse, though these are not enacted (as in diatribal dialogue), but merely quoted. Although the *verba dicendi* used in this category show a great deal of variation, Greek φησί is the most common one (37 out of 136), usually translated as ρєчє (33 out of 37). This shows clearly that the use of φησί as such is not restricted to diatribal discourse. Greek φησί as well as OCS ρєчє can be used either parenthetically or non-parenthetically. I provide an example of both.

(10) Λέγει αὐτῷ· Κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανέ μου ὁ ἀδελφός. Καὶ νῦν, *φησίν*, οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν Θεόν, δώσει σοι.

> гл҃голаꙗ̈ше ѥмоу· г҃и ӓ бы былъ сьде не бы ӧумрълъ ми братъ· и̇ нꙑнꙗ *ρєчє* вѣдѣ ꙗ̈ко ѥ̈же просиши ӧу ӧтьца дастъ ти·

'[She] (i.e. Martha) says [OCS: said] to Him: "Lord, if You had been here, my brother would not have died. And now," she *says* [*OCS: said*], "I know that whatever You will ask God [OCS: the Father], He will give to You."[20]'

[*Supr.* 306, 23–26]

The quote is initiated by what I propose to call a *primary* (i.e. non-parenthetical) speech reporting verb (λέγει / гл҃голаꙗ̈ше); φησίν / ρєчє then serves to reinforce the continuance of the quote, and hence is a *secondary* speech reporting verb, used parenthetically. The verb is not part of the syntactic structure and is inserted in the middle of the quote. Hence, the parenthetical 3sg verb form is on its way to becoming a quotative particle, which is further demonstrated by its numerical non-congruence with plural referents, as evidenced by other examples, such as (14), (17) and (18) below. In the following example, the same verb (φησίν / ρєчє) is used, but now in a non-parenthetical position:

(11) Ἰδοὺ καθίστημί σε σήμερον ... μὴ ἐν ὡρισμένῃ ἡμέρᾳ λάμβανε, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἰς ἀεὶ καὶ πάντοτε, καθὼς *φησιν* ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος· Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, [...]

> Се поставьꙗю̈ тѧ дьньсь· не въ ӧуреченꙑй дьнь разоумѣваи· нъ въ инѫ и̇ присно· ꙗ̈коже *ρєчє* св҃тꙑй паулъ· дьньсь ӓште гласъ ѥ̈го ӧуслꙑшите· не ӧжестите срьдьць вашихъ· ꙗ̈ко въ прогнѣваниі·

'"See, I have set you today."[21] Do not understand [this] as a particular day, but as ever and always, as also the blessed Paul *says* [*OCS: said*]: "Today, if you hear His voice, do not harden you hearts, as in the provocation."[22]'

[*Supr.* 357, 20–24]

---

[20] Jn 11:21–22.

[21] Jer 1:10.

[22] Heb 3:8.

The verb has an explicit subject and is syntactically embedded in a full sentence. It functions, therefore, as a fully fledged verb, just like so many others. There are indeed other *verba dicendi*, such as εἶπεν, that can only be used as primary speech act verbs, i.e. never parenthetically.

(12) Ἄξιον δὲ κἀκεῖνο ζητῆσαι, ποῦ *εἶπεν*, ὅτι· Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρομαι.

достойно же и оного въꙁискати· кде гла́гола по трехъ дьнехъ въстанѫ·

'It is due then to inquire into that [point], where [He] *said*: "After three days I [will] rise again."[23]'

[*Supr.* 440, 18–20]

The parenthetical use of a speech reporting verb is, thus, limited to φησίν / рєчє; it is justified to consider this a Greek convention that was imported into Slavic.

As I indicated already, in the context of its diatribal use, the parenthetical nature of φησίν / рєчє can be analysed on a pragmatic level, too. I shall illustrate this with the following example:

(13) Κἀκεῖνος μὲν οὐδ᾽ ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ σοῦ παρῃτήσατο· σὺ δὲ οὐδὲ ὀργὴν ἀφεῖναι τῷ συνδούλῳ σου [...] οὐκ ἀνέχῃ; Ἐπηρέασέ με γὰρ, *φησί*, καὶ τὰ μέγιστα μὲ ἐπλεονέκτησε. Καὶ τί τοῦτο; Εἰς χρήματα πάντως ἡ ζημία·

оумрѣти ꙁа тѧ не отъвръже сѧ· а тꙑ ни гнѣва оставити клеврѣтоу своѥмоу хоштеши· пакость бо ми *рєчє* сътвори великѫ· и ѕѣло мѧ прѣйꙁноури· да что тоу· аште и ѕѣло иманий жладьба·

A: 'He did not refuse even to die for you. But you do not want to remit anger to your fellow-slave?'
B: 'He has done me great harm, *he says* [*OCS: he said*], and defrauded me greatly.'
A: 'So what? The loss is only material.'

[*Supr.* 422, 9–14]

The preacher (A) is enacting a dialogue with a fictitious opponent or an abstracted hearer (B). The whole dialogical exchange is to be situated at layer 2, with the exception of the parenthetical verb φησί / рєчє. The latter indicates that segment B is not part of the preacher's own voice. It is a clarification that is made to the actual hearers of the sermon (layer 1), in order to make the enactment of the dialogue (layer 2) felicitous. The preacher uses it to separate the voices from each other and to distance himself from the contents of segment B. At the same time, the main disambiguating burden rests on the enactment of the different voices in their logical sequence. In other words, the segments A—B—A follow each other in a logical sequence, so that the question

---

[23] Mt 27:63.

as to who is the speaker of which segment is solved by the principle of consecutive turn-taking. Simultaneously, φησί / речє serves as a supporting element, used to underscore the 'otherness' of segment B.

Having clarified some necessary terminological issues, we can now proceed to a quantitative overview of the *verba dicendi* in Greek and OCS in our five homilies. Koch [1989: 99] already indicates that the correlation between Greek verbs in the *Vorlage* and Slavic verbs in *Supr.* is weaker and less predictable than in the OCS gospel texts[24]. Nevertheless, there are some general rules to which the majority of tokens adhere. I shall first provide a general overview of the lemmata in Table 2:

Table 2. **Correspondence of Greek and OCS *verba dicendi* (lemmata)**

	рєшти	глаголати	Other	Total
φημί	46	1	2	49
λέγω	17	98	14	129
εἶπον	46	5	17	68
ἐρῶ	10	1	5	16

This distribution is largely in accordance with the traditional division of labour of aspectual functions between рєшти and глаголати. We do need to be careful with this type of verbs, though, as Kamphuis [2020: 194] remarks that "*verba dicendi* have some specialised aspectual functions." What is more, the aspectual system was not yet so fully fledged in OCS as it is in the modern Slavic languages; this realisation precludes strong statements. Traditionally, рєшти and глаголати have been considered a suppletive aspectual pair (respectively perfective and imperfective) [cf. Vaillant 1948; Eckhoff, Janda 2014: 243]. Alternatively, рєшти can be considered a perfective tantum verb [cf. Koch 1988: 274]. More recently, Kamphuis [2020: 159] has classified both verbs as anaspectual (i.e. neither perfective nor imperfective), although he concedes that their "division of labour [...] is equal to that of an aspect pair" [Ibid.: 161].

As we move on to some of the most frequent individual verb forms (Table 3), we shall restrict ourselves to 3sg forms.

---

[24] It should be borne in mind that his main object of study concerns narrative gospel texts [Koch 1988, 1989]. The same is true for Сато's [1995] study on *verba dicendi*; he does not take the main diatribal verb form φησί into account, simply because it rarely occurs in the text of the canonical gospels.

Table 3: **Correspondence of individual 3sg verb forms**

	ρєчє (aorist)	глагола (aorist)	глаголааше (imperfect)	глаголєтъ (present)	Other	Total
φησί(ν) (present)	41	0	0	0	5	46
λέγει (present)	6	0	1	5	0	12
ἔλεγε(ν) (imperfect)	2	2	17	0	1	22
εἶπεν (aorist)	26	4	0	0	4	34
Other	5	0	0	3	0	8
Total	80	6	18	8	10	122

Quantitatively speaking, the most typical correspondences are εἶπεν = ρєчє, ἔλεγε(ν) = глаголааше and λέγει = глаголєтъ. In these cases, unsurprisingly, the Greek tenses are 'mechanically' reproduced in OCS. The most notable exception is the present tense form φησί(ν), rendered almost exclusively by the aorist form ρєчє. This demands an explanation, be it in grammatical terms (tense-aspect), or in pragmatic terms.

We have to conclude that quotative ρєчє is used not because of its aspectual characteristics that would link it with φησί, but because of the function it had developed (or was in the process of developing) as a quotative particle. The aspectual discrepancy can thus be dismissed because particles do not have aspectual features. But the question remains: why did exactly *this* verb develop into a particle? And why its aorist form? Theoretically, глаголєтъ could have developed into a quotative particle. That would have made the tense-aspect features coincide with Greek φησί. The fact that this did not happen may be traced back to two motives. Firstly, although it is debatable whether diatribal φησί is, strictly speaking, a historical present, the translator may have perceived a similarity with the historical present, which is usually rendered by an aorist in OCS [Kamphuis 2020: 191].[25] A second, more mundane reason may be connected to the four-syllable length of глаголєтъ. ρєчє is conveniently short, just like φησί. It corresponds prosodically to the Greek form.

What does not follow from Table 3 is that ρєчє occurs in all 5 categories defined above, and that the 80 instances of ρєчє are a possible OCS rendition of

---

[25] According to Koch [1989: 83], the rendition of the historical present λέγει by the aorist ρєчє is extremely rare in the gospel texts, but surprisingly frequent in *Supr.*, which he considers to be an anomaly, as opposed to the expected rendition глагола [Ibid.: 100]. This discrepancy may first of all have to do with the difference in genre. In addition, the scribe of *Supr.* might have been biased towards ρєчє because of the diatribal character of many of the homilies.

9 different Greek verb forms (though predominantly φησί(ν), viz. 41 out of 80, and εἶπε(ν), viz. 26 out of 80)[26]. Thus, ρєчє is far broader in its range of usages than the Greek verb form φησί(ν), which occurs exclusively in our categories Quote and Opp.

As follows from Table 3, the OCS verb form corresponding to φησί(ν) turns out to be almost invariably the 3sg.aor ρєчє. The few exceptions to this rule (five tokens, four of which occur in the same homily no. 39) are interesting enough to warrant a discussion. The first two occur in one stretch of discourse:

(14) Ἐμνήσθημεν, φησίν, ὅτι, εἶπεν ὁ πλάνος ἐκεῖνος ἔτι ζῶν· Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρομαι." Καὶ εἰ πλάνος ἦν, καὶ ψευδῆ ἐκόμπαζε, τί δεδοίκατε καὶ περιτρέχετε, καὶ τοσαύτη κέχρησθε σπουδῇ; "Δεδοίκαμεν, φησί, μήποτε κλέψωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἀπατήσωσι τοὺς πολλούς."

поманѫхомъ рѣша ꙗко глагола льстьць онъ ѥште живъ сꙑ· по трехъ дьнехъ въстанѫ· да аште льстьць бѣ и лъжєнѫ прѣлиштааше· что сѧ боите и риштете· и толико спѣшєниѥ творите· боимъ сѧ рѣша· ѥда како оукрадѫтꙑ и оучєници ѥго· и прѣльстатъ многꙑꙗ·

"We remember," *he says* [*OCS: they said*], "that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I [will] rise again."[27] Yet if he were a deceiver, and boasted of a falsehood, why are you afraid and run around, and use so much diligence? "We are afraid," *he says* [*OCS: they said*], "in case perhaps the disciples steal Him away, and deceive the multitude."[28]

[*Supr.* 443, 8–14]

This is not an individualised, abstract, fictitious opponent who is quoted. These instances of φησί(ν) identify quotes from actual personages from one of the gospels. This may be a reason why the more abstract and depersonalised ρєчє was considered less appropriate (where the person-number is not taken into account). It also shows that the highly formulaic φησί had not yet become equally formulaic in Slavic. Over the course of the Middle Ages, it is to be expected that φησί was translated ever more faithfully with the formulaic ρєчє, but this is a hypothesis that needs to be tested by further research that the present author is currently conducting. First observations on some other texts have recently been made by Какридис [2019]. The rendition by рѣша is not an exceptional feature of *Supr.* only, as it also occurs in two other manuscripts that contain the same homily in Slavic (*Tr. 9*, fol. 64v, and *Usp.* 214а-б).

The third example of φησίν not being rendered by ρєчє occurs in the following passage:

---

[26] The other verb forms are ἐρῶ, εἰπεῖν, εἴπῃ, ἔλεγε and ἔφη.

[27] Mt 27:63.

[28] Mt 27:64.

(15) Τί τὸ ὄφελος, εἰπέ μοι, τῶν λίθων τῶν τιμίων τούτων, καὶ τῶν χρυσοπάστων ἱματίων; Χαίρει τούτοις, φησίν, ἡ ψυχή, καὶ εὐφραίνεται. Ἐγώ σε τὸ κέρδος ἠρώτησα· σὺ δέ μοι τὸ βλάβος εἶπες.

къіи оуспѣхъ повѣждъ ми ѵьстьнааго камениꙗ сего· й ꙁлатомъ шьвенꙑйхъ риꙁъ· радоуйѥтъ сѧ глаголѥши ѻ сихъ дша й веселитъ сѧ· аꙁъ тебе ѻ приѡбрѣтении въпрашахъ· тꙑ же ми врѣдъ повѣдаѥши·

What is the profit, tell me, of these precious stones and these gold-spangled garments? [My] soul is pleased with them, *(s) he says* [*OCS: you say*], and rejoices in them. I asked you the profit; but you have told me the harm.

[*Supr.* 447, 8–12]

In this passage, φησίν (3sg) is translated as глаголѥши (2sg). In our sample of homilies, this is the only time φησίν is translated with a 2sg form; it is, therefore, not to be taken as a typical OCS variant of a diatribal formula. Nevertheless, its occurrence here needs to be explained. It is likely to be attributed to the initial translator, as two other manuscripts containing the same homily also show the form гл[агол]еши (*Tr. 9*, fol. 67r, and *Usp.* 216a). The reason for this specific translation might be that the 2sg makes clearer that this is not just a quote, like so many instances of 3sg forms, such as ρεϥε, are. The 2sg indicates that the phrase functions in a dialogical exchange with the fictitious interlocutor. This translation, therefore, results in a somewhat greater explicitness to ensure a correct interpretation. A "formulaic cliché" (i.e. φησίν) is replaced by a more explicit variant.[29] This shows that the translator was aware, at least to some extent, of the way in which diatribal strategies were employed in the Greek original. He is able to use this formulation without infringing the principles of the diatribe, as 2sg forms do tend to occur to introduce the opponent's objection (e.g. the pair λέγεις / глаголѥши occurs three times in our sample of texts). In this particular case, the use of the 2sg глаголѥши may also have been influenced by the presence of another 2sg form (εἶπες) a little bit later on, at the end of our example, where the imaginary opponent is addressed again, and her fictitious utterance is quoted as a narrative report of a speech act.[30]

There are two instances in our sub-corpus where a *verbum dicendi* is absent in Slavic, although φησί is present in the Greek text provided by the

---

[29] In the context of a different text corpus, Stern [2018: 244] asks the legitimate question: "[w]hy would the translator violate his leading principle of literalism if nothing is gained in return?" This implies that a non-literal rendition or an additional explication must be accounted for in terms of its pragmatic function. Stern [Ibid.: 244–245] connects changes that result in a "pragmatic over-explicitness" to the use of "formulaic clichés" that serve to provide "ease of perception" for the audience. In our case, however, the situation seems to be the reverse, i.e. an ambiguous but fixed formula (φησίν) is changed into a more explicit but less common form (глаголѥши).

[30] Cf. Dekker [2018: 82–85] for a discussion of this speech reporting strategy in Old Russian.

editors. This does not necessarily mean that the translator chose to ignore the verb and omit it in the translation; it can also be due to Greek manuscript variation. Both cases concern Biblical or fictitious quotes.

(16) Ἠγέρθη. Πόθεν δῆλον; Καθὼς εἶπεν. Ὥστε κἂν ἐμοί, φησί, διαπιστῆτε, τῶν ἐκείνου μνήσθητε ῥημάτων, καὶ οὐδὲ ἐμοὶ διαπιστήσετε.

въста· отъкждоу ꙗꙻкоже *рече*· аште и мнѣ не вѣроуѥꙺта· то того словеса помѣнѣта· да и мнѣ не не вѣроуѥꙺтѣ·

"He is risen." Whence is it evident? "As He *said*." So that even though you disbelieve me, *he says* [*absent in OCS*], remember His words, and neither will you disbelieve me.

[*Supr. 445, 15–17*]

In this instance, the εἶπεν is part of a Biblical quote (Mt 28:6), where an angel is speaking, which then immediately merges into a fictitious quote, i.e. a fictitious extension of the words of the angel. The repetition of yet another *verbum dicendi* may therefore have been deemed superfluous, either by a Greek copyist or by the Slavic translator or copyist. In any case, the OCS version is less explicit, i.e. a higher interpretative burden is left to be resolved by the context.

A large amount of quantitative data alone does not tell us very much about the quality of the translator's correct interpretation and OCS rendition of diatribal strategies. Each instance of each speech reporting verb has to be investigated in its own right, in order to see whether it forms part of the inventory of strategies that belong to the diatribal tradition. This implies that the traditional philological labour cannot be made redundant by methods of quantitative corpus linguistics. Having reviewed all occurrences qualitatively in this light, it turns out that we have 7 cases of parenthetical φησί(ν) 'says (he)' as part of a 'contradictio', as mentioned above. Of these, 6 are translated with рече, thus corresponding to the hypothesis in Table 1.[31] The remaining one has been discussed already as example (15) above.

It is timely now to say a few words about the way φησί functions in combination with the other *verba dicendi*, most importantly λέγει (3sg) and other forms of the lemma λέγω. One observation to be made is that parenthetical φησί can be used to supplement other, non-parenthetical *verba dicendi*, as can be seen in the following example:

(17) Πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν αἱρετικῶν λέγουσιν, ὅτι οὐχ ὅμοιος ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρί. Διὰ τί; Ὅτι ἐδεήθη [...][32] προσευχῆς ὁ Χριστὸς εἰς τὸ ἐγεῖραι τὸν Λάζαρον· εἰ μὴ γὰρ προσηύξατο, οὐκ ἂν ἤγειρε τὸν νεκρόν. Καὶ πῶς ἔστι, φησίν, ὅμοιος

---

[31] Viz. *Supr.* 303, 13; 304, 10; 310, 1; 346, 15; 407, 8; 422, 12.

[32] Φησίν is found in at least one Greek manuscript, viz. *BAV Ott.gr.14*. We cannot tell whether the translator chose to leave its OCS equivalent out or whether he had a Greek version without φησίν. The last option seems more probable.

ὁ προσευξάμενος τῷ δεξαμένῳ τὴν ἱκεσίαν; ὁ μὲν γὰρ προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ τὴν προσευχὴν παρὰ τοῦ ἱκετεύοντος ἐδέξατο. Βλασφημοῦσι δὲ μὴ νοοῦντες [...]

МНОЅИ БО ѠТЪ ИНОВѢРЪNЪИИХЪ ГЛАГОЛ҄ѪТЪ· ꙗКО NЕ ТЪ҄ѢNЪ СЪ̈NЪ ѠТЬЦОУ· ПОУТО· ꙗКО ТРѢБОВА МОЛИТВЪI Х҃С ВЪСТАВИТИ ЛАЅАРА· А̀ БЪI БО NЕ МОЛИЛЪ СА NЕ БЪI ВЪСТАВИЛЪ МРЪТВААГО· ТО КАКО ꙖСТЪ *реγе* ТЪ҄ѢNЪ МОЛИВЪ̈I СА ПРИИМЪШОУГ̈ОУМОУ МОЛИТВѪ· СИЙ БО МОЛИ СА· А̀ ѠNЪ МОЛИТВѪ ѠТЪ МОЛАШТА҅ГО СА ПРИꙖ· БЛАЅNАТЪ ЖЕ СА NЕ РАЅОУМѢꙖ҄ШТЕ·

For many of the heretics actually *say* that the Son is not equal to the Father. Why? Because [...] Christ needed to pray in order to raise Lazarus; for if he had not prayed, he would not have raised the dead one. And how, *he says* [*OCS: he said*], is the one who prayed equal to the one who receives the prayer? For the one prays, but the other received the prayer of the one who approaches in prayer. But they blaspheme, not knowing [...].

[*Supr.* 303, 9–17]

A question is put into the mouths of the fictitious opponents, which is indicated by a parenthetical φησίν. This does not happen, however, until after the opponents have been explicitly introduced and characterised and another statement has been attributed to them using the more explicit, primary speech act verb λέγουσιν / ГЛАГОЛ҄ѪТЪ (which is more explicit in the sense that it is not parenthetical and corresponds grammatically to the person and number of the referents).

In the next example, a stretch of displaced discourse is first introduced by a 3pl verb form, then reinforced by the 3sg φησί / реγе.

(18) Ταύτην τὴν συκῆν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἑρμηνέων *εἰρήκασι* τῇ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῇ παρεικασμένην εἶναι, ἐφ᾽ ἣν ἦλθε, φησίν, ὁ Κύριος, ζητῶν ἐν αὐτῇ καρπὸν πίστεως·

Сей СМОКВИ МНОЅИ СЪКАЅАТЕЛꙖ *рѣша* о̀ ЖИДОВЬ̈СТѢ СЪБОРѢ ПРИЛОЖЕNЪ БЪ̈ТИ· КЪ N҄ЕЙЖЕ *реγе* ПРИДЕ ГОСПОДЬ ИШТА NА N҄ЕЙ ПЛОДА ВѢРЪ̈·

Many of the interpreters *have said* this fig tree is to be likened to the synagogue of the Jews, to which the Lord went, *he says* [*OCS: he said*], seeking the fruit of faith in it.

[*Supr.* 346, 13–16]

This is a typical example of how parenthetical φησί functions as a secondary speech reporting verb. The primary ones are those non-parenthetical verbs that explicitly introduce quotes or opponents' voices, while they are syntactically integrated and correspond in person and number to the quoted referents (e.g. εἰρήκασι / рѣша is a 3pl form, in accordance with the main clause's syntactic subject οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἑρμηνέων / МНОЅИ СЪКАЅАТЕЛꙖ). A secondary speech reporting verb, on the other hand, is parenthetical, i.e. it does not conform to the person/number of its referent, as can be seen from our example, where the second clause still represents the point of view of the 'interpreters' (pl), whereas the 3sg

form φησίν / рєчє is used. Its function is that of a quotative marker, used to reinforce the continuity of the enacted opponents' point of view. Thus, the preacher distances himself from the contents of the reported phrase. This is a disambiguation strategy to delimit the others' point of view from his own discourse.

5. Concluding remarks

The first half of this investigation has allowed us to underpin the dialogical and diatribal character of Chrysostom's homilies under consideration, by identifying some of its iconic markers. The notion of speaker metalepsis and the ensuing dialogical exchanges have shown the diversity of voices that are enacted in these homilies. The Slavic rendition of a number of typical diatribal formulae in *Supr.* has been outlined. This has led us to the second part of the article, where the different voices have been linked to the use of *verba dicendi*.

The OCS *verbum dicendi* that stands out as a parenthetical quotative marker is рєчє, which in many respects corresponds to Greek φησί. We have to conclude that the use of and correspondence between φησί and рєчє is not as uniform as expected, though. The functional spectrum of use of рєчє is broader than that of any Greek *verbum dicendi*. Although рєчє is indeed one of the main Slavic diatribal formulae, its use is not limited to the diatribe: it also occurs in 'ordinary' quotes and narrated reports. Its mere occurrence can, therefore, not serve as an unmistakable sign of the presence of diatribal discourse. The classification of a text as diatribal should always be supplemented by other markers, such as those identified in the first part of this article.

What is more, although рєчє is the most common OCS quotative marker in general, the spectrum of verbs used to introduce the opponents' point of view has turned out to be far more diverse than just рєчє. In fact, рєчє is far from dominant in the context of quoting or enacting an opponent's point of view. Most strategies (e.g. the use of primary speech-reporting verbs, vocatives, characterization of the opponents) are more explicit than just a parenthetical рєчє. Once these more explicit strategies have been employed, though, рєчє can be used as an additional marker of 'otherness', by which the author distances himself subjectively from the contents of the opponents' objections. In this way, рєчє serves to reinforce the disambiguation of the different voices in the discourse on a pragmatic level.

At the same time, the meaning and usage of рєчє is broad enough to leave much of the interpretative burden to be derived from the context. Thus, рєчє is a supporting element, often a parenthetical, secondary speech reporting verb, used to characterise the enacted segments as such, but rarely providing an explicit clue as to whose voice is enacted. This is in accordance with its broad meaning and the non-propositional nature of pragmatic markers. It functions most felicitously in interaction with turn-taking strategies.

212 |
The Slavic Rendition of Greek Speech Reporting Verbs in Chrysostom's Homilies in the
Codex Suprasliensis: A Case Study into the Transmission of Diatribal Discourse Organization

In sum, diatribal ρεчε can only be analyzed in the context of the other parameters we have identified in the first part of this article; otherwise, the manifold other functions of ρεчε would overshadow its diatribal function. For a further assessment of the presence and scope of the diatribe in the Orthodox Slavic realm, the results of the present investigation are to be embedded in a broader range of texts to be investigated, both translated and original.

Bibliography

Greek Manuscripts

BAV Ott.gr.14
    Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Ott.gr.14

Slavic Manuscripts

Eg. 833
    Russian State Library (РГБ), собрание Е. Е. Егорова, фонд 98, № 833 Синаксарь и Торжественник, 15th c.

Tr. 9
    Russian State Library (РГБ), собрание Троице-Сергиевой лавры, фонд 304.I, № 9. Триодный четий сборник, late 14th c.

Editions

Supr.
    Codex Suprasliensis, according to the ed.: [Заимов, Капалдо 1982–1983].

Usp.
    Успенский сборник, according to the ed.: [Котков 1971].

Literature

Baur 1929
    Baur C., *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 1, München, 1929.

Bräuer 1969
    Bräuer H., *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft*, 3: *Formenlehre*, 2, Berlin, 1969.

Bultmann 1910
    Bultmann R., *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, Göttingen, 1910 [reprint: Göttingen, 1984].

Capelle, Marrou 1957
    Capelle W., Marrou H. I., Diatribe, Th. Klauser, ed., *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, 3, Stuttgart, 1957, 990–1009.

Clark 1996
    Clark H. H., *Using Language*, Cambridge, 1996.

Collins 2001
    Collins D. E., *Reanimated Voices: Speech Reporting in a Historical-Pragmatic Perspective* (= Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 85), Amsterdam, 2001.

Dekker 2018
    Dekker S., *Old Russian Birchbark Letters: A Pragmatic Approach* (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 42), Leiden, 2018.

Dekker forthc.
    Dekker S., Parenthetical verbs as elements of diatribe in John the Exarch's Hexaemeron: Greek continuities and Slavic innovations, *Die Welt der Slaven*, 2021, (in progress).

Diels 1963
    Diels P., *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik: Mit einer Auswahl von Texten und einem Wörterbuch*, 1: *Grammatik*, 2nd ed., Heidelberg, 1963.

Eckhoff, Janda 2014
    Eckhoff H. M., Janda L. A., Grammatical profiles and aspect in Old Church Slavonic, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 112/2, 2014, 231–258.

Fraser 1996
    Fraser B., Pragmatic markers, *Pragmatics*, 6/2, 1996, 167–190.

Genette 2004
    Genette G., *Métalepse: De la figure à la fiction*, Paris, 2004.

Goodall 1979
    Goodall B., *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon: Prolegomena to an Edition* (= Classical Studies, 20), Berkeley, 1979.

Hauptová et al. 1997
    Hauptová Z. et al., eds., *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, 4, Praha, 1997.

House 2018
    House J., Translation studies and pragmatics, C. Ilie, N. R. Norrick, eds., *Pragmatics and its Interfaces* (= Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 294), Amsterdam, 2018, 143–162.

Kamphuis 2020
    Kamphuis J., *Verbal Aspect in Old Church Slavonic: A Corpus-Based Approach* (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 45), Leiden, 2020.

Keipert 1980
    Keipert H., Eine Übersetzungskontamination im „Codex Suprasliensis", Й. Заимов, ред., *Проучвания върху Супрасълския сборник: Старобългарски паметник от X век*, София, 1980, 18–35.

King 2018
    King J., *Speech-in-character, Diatribe, and Romans* 3:1–9: *Who's Speaking When and Why It Matters* (= Biblical Interpretation Series, 163), Leiden, 2018.

Koch 1988
    Koch C., Zum Aspekt des Paradigmas aksl. *rekǫ rešti*, *Die Welt der Slaven*, 23, 1988, 248–282.

———— 1989
    Koch C., Zur Kritik des aksl. Evangelientextes: Der Wechsel der Paradigmen *rešti* und *glagolati*, *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie*, 19, 1989, 63–107.

Koch, Oesterreicher 1985
    Koch P., Oesterreicher W., Sprache der Nähe—Sprache der Distanz: Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte, D. Jacob et al., eds., *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 1985, 15–43.

Kotseva 2013
    Kotseva E., Notes on the date of the tenth-century *Codex Suprasliensis*, *Scripta & e-scripta*, 12, 2013, 25–40.

Krustev, Boyadjiev 2012

    Krustev G., Boyadjiev A., On the dating of *Codex Suprasliensis*, A. Miltenova, ed., *Преоткриване: Супрасълски сборник старобългарски паметник от X век = Rediscovery: Bulgarian Codex Suprasliensis of 10th century*, Sofia, 2012, 17–23.

Lazar 2014

    Lazar M., *Von Geld und guten Worten: Entwicklung des russischen Geschäftsbriefes als Textsorte* (= Slavolinguistica, 19), München, 2014.

Lysaght 1988

    Lysaght T. A., *English translation of Greek and Latin Source Material Used in the Compilation of Codex Suprasliensis*, n.p., 1988.

Malingrey 1994

    Malingrey A.-M., ed., *Jean Chrysostome. Sur l'égalité du Père et du Fils: homélies VII–XII* (= Sources chrétiennes, 396), Paris, 1994.

Marguliés 1927

    Marguliés A., *Der altkirchenslavische Codex Suprasliensis*, Heidelberg, 1927.

Meyer 1935

    Meyer K. H., *Altkirchenslavisch-griechisches Wörterbuch des Codex Suprasliensis*, Glückstadt, 1935.

Moszyński 1980

    Moszyński L., Cytaty ewangelijne w tekście kodeksu supraskiego, Й. Заимов, ред., *Проучвания върху Супрасълския сборник: Старобългарски паметник от X век*, София, 1980, 43–50.

Papadopoulos 2015

    Papadopoulos K., Ps.-Chrysostom *In parabolam de ficu* (PG 59: 585–590 = CPG 4588): Draft translation, (cited according to: https://www.academia.edu/32022846/Ps_Chrysostom_In_Parabolam_De_Ficu_PG_59_585_590_CPG_4588_Draft_Translation).

Prevost, Riddle 1888

    Prevost G., Riddle M. B., eds., *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Gospel of St. Matthew.* Transl. by Rev. Sir G. Prevost, Baronet, M. A., [etc.] (= A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 10), Edinburgh, 1885 [reprint 1978].

Song 2004

    Song C., *Reading Romans as a Diatribe* (= Studies in Biblical Literature, 59), New York, 2004.

Stern 2018

    Stern D., Copying Greek into Slavonic? The Slavonic branch of the Greek tradition of the *Life of Abraham of Qidun*, L. Sels, J. Fuchsbauer, V. Tomelleri, I. de Vos, eds., *Editing Mediaeval Texts from a Different Angle: Slavonic and Multilingual Traditions, Together with Francis J. Thomson's Bibliography and Checklist of Slavonic Translations* (= Bibliothèque de Byzantion, 19), Leuven, 2018, 225–250.

Stowers 1981

    Stowers S. K., *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, (= Society of Biblical Literature: Dissertation series, 57), Chico, 1981.

Vaillant 1948

    Vaillant A., *Manuel du vieux slave*, 1: *Grammaire*, Paris, 1948.

Verhagen 2005

    Verhagen A., *Constructions of Intersubjectivity: Discourse, Syntax, and Cognition*, Oxford, 2005.

Благова 1966

    Благова Э., Гомилии Супрасльского и Успенского сборников, Л. П. Жуковская, Н. И. Тарабасова, ред., *Исследования источников по истории русского языка и письменности*, Москва, 1966, 77–87.

Вечерка 1994

Вечерка Р., Описание старославянских рукописей, Р. М. Цейтлин, Р. Вечерка, Э. Благова, ред., *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков)*, Москва, 1994, 13–25.

Ефимова 2006

Ефимова В. С., *Старославянская словообразовательная морфемика*, Москва, 2006.

Заимов 1982

Заимов Й., Предговор, Й. Заимов, М. Капалдо, ред., *Супрасълски или Ретков сборник: В два тома*, 2, София, 1982, 5–8.

Заимов, Капалдо 1982–1983

Заимов Й., Капалдо М., ред., *Супрасълски или Ретков сборник: В два тома*, София, 1982–1983.

Какридис 2019

Какридис J., *Аргументација код православних словена у Средњем веку*, Ниш, 2019.

———— 2020

Какридис Я., Кто говорит? Цитативное и диатрибическое φησι(ν) в Изборнике 1073 г., *Црквене студије,* 17, 2020, 257–266.

Котков 1971

Котков С. И., ред., *Успенский сборник XII–XIII вв.*, Москва, 1971.

Мирчева 2019

Мирчева Е., Супрасълският сборник и старобългарските чети-минеи, *Palaeobulgarica = Старобългаристика*, 43/3, 2019, 13–44.

Сато 1995

Сато А., *Глагола* и *рече* в старославянском языке, *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies*, 16, 1995, 47–93.

Цейтлин et al. 1999

Цейтлин Р. М., Вечерка Р., Благова Э., ред., *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X-XI веков)*, 2-е изд., Москва, 1999.

References

Baur C., *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 1, München, 1929.

Blagova E., Gomilii Suprasl'skogo i Uspenskogo sbornikov, L. P. Zhukovskaia, N. I. Tarabasova, eds., *Issledovaniia istochnikov po istorii russkogo iazyka i pis'mennosti*, Moscow, 1966, 77–87.

Bräuer H., *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft*, 3: *Formenlehre*, 2, Berlin, 1969.

Capelle W., Marrou H. I., Diatribe, Th. Klauser, ed., *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, 3, Stuttgart, 1957, 990–1009.

Clark H. H., *Using Language*, Cambridge, 1996.

Collins D. E., *Reanimated Voices: Speech Reporting in a Historical-Pragmatic Perspective* (= Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 85), Amsterdam, 2001.

Dekker S., *Old Russian Birchbark Letters: A Pragmatic Approach* (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 42), Leiden, 2018.

Dekker S., Parenthetical verbs as elements of diatribe in John the Exarch's Hexaemeron: Greek continuities and Slavic innovations, *Die Welt der Slaven*, 2021, (in progress).

Diels P., *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik: Mit einer Auswahl von Texten und einem Wörterbuch*, 1: *Grammatik*, 2nd ed., Heidelberg, 1963.

Eckhoff H. M., Janda L. A., Grammatical profiles and aspect in Old Church Slavonic, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 112/2, 2014, 231–258.

Efimova V. Staroslavianskaia slovoobrazovatel'naia morfemika, Moscow, 2006.

Fraser B., Pragmatic markers, *Pragmatics*, 6/2, 1996, 167–190.

Genette G., *Métalepse: De la figure à la fiction*, Paris, 2004.

Goodall B., *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon: Prolegomena to an Edition* (= Classical Studies, 20), Berkeley, 1979.

House J., Translation studies and pragmatics, C. Ilie, N. R. Norrick, eds., *Pragmatics and its Interfaces* (= Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 294), Amsterdam, 2018, 143–162.

Kakridis J., *Argumentacija kod pravoslavnih slovena u Srednjem veku*, Niš, 2019.

Kakridis Ya., Kto govorit? Tsitativnoe i diatribicheskoe *fēsi(n)* v Izbornike 1073 g., *Church Studies*, 17, 2020, 257–266.

Kamphuis J., *Verbal Aspect in Old Church Slavonic: A Corpus-Based Approach* (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 45), Leiden, 2020.

Keipert H., Eine Übersetzungskontamination im „Codex Suprasliensis", I. Zaimov, ed., *Prouchvaniia vurkhu Cuprasulskiia sbornik: Starobulgarski pametnik ot X vek*, Sofia, 1980, 18–35.

King J., *Speech-in-character, Diatribe, and Romans 3: 1–9: Who's Speaking When and Why It Matters* (= Biblical Interpretation Series, 163), Leiden, 2018.

Koch C., Zum Aspekt des Paradigmas aksl. *rekǫ rešti*, *Die Welt der Slaven*, 23, 1988, 248–282.

Koch C., Zur Kritik des aksl. Evangelientextes: Der Wechsel der Paradigmen *rešti* und *glagolati*, *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie*, 19, 1989, 63–107.

Koch P., Oesterreicher W., Sprache der Nähe—Sprache der Distanz: Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte, D. Jacob et al., eds., *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 1985, 15–43.

Kotkov S. I., ed., *Uspenskii sbornik XII–XIII vv.*, Moscow, 1971.

Kotseva E., Notes on the date of the tenth-century *Codex Suprasliensis*, *Scripta & e-scripta*, 12, 2013, 25–40.

Krustev G., Boyadjiev A., On the dating of *Codex Suprasliensis*, A. Miltenova, ed., *Rediscovery: Bulgarian Codex Suprasliensis of 10th century*, Sofia, 2012, 17–23.

Lazar M., *Von Geld und guten Worten: Entwicklung des russischen Geschäftsbriefes als Textsorte* (= Slavolinguistica, 19), München, 2014.

Lysaght T. A., *English translation of Greek and Latin Source Material Used in the Compilation of Codex Suprasliensis*, n.p., 1988.

Malingrey A.-M., ed., *Jean Chrysostome. Sur l'égalité du Père et du Fils: homélies VII–XII* (= Sources chrétiennes, 396), Paris, 1994.

Marguliés A., *Der altkirchenslavische Codex Suprasliensis*, Heidelberg, 1927.

Meyer K. H., *Altkirchenslavisch-griechisches Wörterbuch des Codex Suprasliensis*, Glückstadt, 1935.

Mircheva E., Codex Suprasliensis and the Old Bulgarian Menologion, *Palaeobulgarica*, 43/3, 2019, 13–44.

Moszyński L., Cytaty ewangelijne w tekście kodeksu supraskiego, I. Zaimov, ed., *Prouchvaniia vurkhu Cuprasulskiia sbornik: Starobulgarski pametnik ot X vek*, Sofia, 1980, 43–50.

Sato A., Glagola i reče in Old Church Slavonic, *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies*, 16, 1995, 47–93.

Song C., *Reading Romans as a Diatribe* (= Studies in Biblical Literature, 59), New York, 2004.

Stern D., Copying Greek into Slavonic? The Slavonic branch of the Greek tradition of the *Life of Abraham of Qidun*, L. Sels, J. Fuchsbauer, V. Tomelleri, I. de Vos, eds., *Editing Mediaeval Texts from a Different Angle: Slavonic and Multilingual Traditions, Together with Francis J. Thomson's Bibliography and Checklist of Slavonic Translations* (= Bibliothèque de Byzantion, 19), Leuven, 2018, 225–250.

Stowers S. K., *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (= Society of Biblical Literature: Dissertation series, 57), Chico, 1981.

Vaillant A., *Manuel du vieux slave*, 1: *Grammaire*, Paris, 1948.

Vecherka R., Opisanie staroslavianskikh rukopisei, R. M. Tseitlin, R. Vecherka, E. Blagova, eds., *Staroslavianskii slovar' (po rukopisiam X–XI vekov)*, Moscow, 1994, 13–25.

Verhagen A., *Constructions of Intersubjectivity: Discourse, Syntax, and Cognition*, Oxford, 2005.

Zaimov I., Kapaldo M., eds., *Suprasŭlski ili Retkov sbornik: V dva toma*, 2, Sofiia, 1982–1983.

Zaimov I., Predgovor, I. Zaimov, M. Kapaldo, eds., *Suprasŭlski ili Retkov sbornik: V dva toma*, 2, Sofiia, 1982, 5–8.

Simeon Dekker, PhD
Universität Bern
Institut für Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen
Länggassstrasse 49, 3012 Bern
Schweiz / Switzerland
simeon.dekker@issl.unibe.ch