Within the overabundant and extremely complex textual tradition of the Slavonic Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem (CPG 2257; henceforth QAD)\(^1\) there is one place where one can find order and consistency: five text witnesses from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, kept in the Russian State Library in Moscow – four from the collection of the Trinity Monastery of St Sergius (F.304), one from the Moscow Theological Academy collection (F.173) – present us with a particular variant of the Slavonic QAD. This version has a stable tradition and matches a particular Greek text witness almost perfectly, both in its structure – the number and sequence of the question-and-answers (QAs) – and in its readings. It has 120 out of the original 137 QAs and it closely reflects the collection of QAs found in the Greek Cod. Oxoniensis Bodleianus Auct. F.4.07 (Misc. 106) of the early sixteenth century, ff. 198\(^{r}\)-256\(^{r}\), which in previous research has been referred to as M97 or 97.\(^2\) Here is an overview of the Slavonic manuscripts, henceforth called the T group:

---


COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SLAVONIC T GROUP AND 97

The Greek tradition of the QAD shows much variation in the structure of its corpus, which originally contained 137 QAs: whereas the order of the QAs is relatively stable, their number varies greatly. In most witnesses, a certain number of QAs fell out. This is also true of the structure of 97 – its corpus of 120 QAs with some transpositions (viz. QA25 after QA26 and QA120 after QA131) is unique within the Greek tradition. However, the Slavonic manuscripts reflect this unique structure with only one minor deviation (viz. the omission of QA97-101 in T66), as is clear from the following table.

3 Descriptions and digital reproductions of these manuscripts are available online on http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts. Four additional witnesses to this version of the QAD can be found here as well, viz. codd. Mosquenses, RGB F.113, nrs 512, 522, 529 and 645. However, these manuscripts – all of the 16th century and previously kept at the Dormition Monastery of St Joseph of Volokolamsk – have a text that depends on that of T22, viz. they do not bear independent witness to the text. For the present article they have been excluded from the collations. As far as can be guessed from the brief descriptions in Kuev [see note 1] – viz. from the indicated titles, incipits and number of QAs – some twenty more QAD witnesses may belong to this group.


5 Contrary to what is suggested in the listing of QAs contained in the T witnesses in DE VOS – GRINCHENKO, Quaestiones [see note 1], pp. 110-111, QA17 is missing in all T manuscripts (so also in T50 and T66), and QA120 is not found after QA119 in T22 and T50 but always after QA131.
The stability of the group’s characteristics and its indebtedness to a Greek exemplar close to 97 can be shown at a textual level as well. As an example, a collation sample is presented below. The first line contains the reading of 97, the second the reconstructed (and orthographically standardised) archetypal text of group T, established on the basis of the transcriptions of the individual T witnesses presented underneath; as a basis for comparison, we also present the Greek majority reading (Gr) as well as the Slavonic text of the so-called *Lavrentiev sbornik* of 1348 (L), the most important representative of the other major branch within the Slavonic tradition, henceforth called version L.  

---

6 The term “majority reading” is a generalisation, as it basically represents the text as it is found in the *PG* edition of the *QAD* (*PG* 28, 597-700) insofar as the *PG* is in line with the majority of the Greek text witnesses. The rendering of the Greek under “Gr” has no other pretensions than to demonstrate that L follows another Greek text than T.

7 We know that the *Lavrentiev sbornik* – a florilegium now kept in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg as cod. F.I.376 – was copied in 1348 for the Bulgarian Tsar John Alexander (1331-1371); a version of the *QAD* with 124 QAs is found on ff. 105v-155r. See the edition by KUEV, *Sbornik* [note 1], pp. 244-287.

In previous research, the larger group of witnesses linked to the L version of the *QAD* has been called the “heterogeneous group”, as opposed to the “homogeneous group”, to which the T witnesses belong; see DE VOS – GRINCHENKO, *Quaestiones* [see note 1], pp. 110-111. In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>97</th>
<th>T group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>1-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-51</td>
<td>27-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-77</td>
<td>55-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-96</td>
<td>79-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-101</td>
<td>97-101 (om. T&lt;sup&gt;66&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-105</td>
<td>103-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107-111</td>
<td>107-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-119</td>
<td>115-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-124</td>
<td>121-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-131</td>
<td>126-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1*
οὕτω καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ· οὐ δι ἑτερόν τινα τρόπον τὰς εἰκόνας ἀσπάζονται.

T

οὐ δι ἑτερόν τινα τρόπον τὰς εἰκόνας ἀσπάζονται.

T

οὐ δι ἑτερόν τινα τρόπον τὰς εἰκόνας ἀσπάζονται

M

οὐ δι ἑτερόν τινα τρόπον τὰς εἰκόνας ἀσπάζονται

Gr

οὕτω καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ· οὐ δι ἑτερόν τινα τρόπον τὰς εἰκόνας ἀσπάζομεθα.

L

tako καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ· οὐ δι ἑτερόν τινα τρόπον τὰς εἰκόνας ἀσπάζομεθα

97 ei μὴ διὰ πόθον τὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἅγιοι, ὤν ἐμφανίζομεν

T

βασιλεὺς λουκεῖας βαδίν οὐκ εἰς σβατθύνην ἤσκε 10 ἱαβαλεμίν.

T

βασιλεὺς λουκεῖας βαδίν οὐκ εἰς σβατθύνην ἤσκε 11 ἱαβαλεμίν

M

βασιλεὺς λουκεῖας βαδίν οὐκ εἰς σβατθύνην ἤσκε 11 ἱαβαλεμίν

VEDER, Einfluss [see note 1], p. 103, L is said to belong to “version b” while the text of the T group is called “version a”. Linguistic features as well as considerations concerning the transmission of the text have led the authors to believe that L represents the more ancient layer within the Slavonic QAD tradition.

Another witness that belongs to the L group has been included in some of the collations presented below, viz. T⁴ = Cod. Mosquensis, RGB F.304 (Troice-Sergieva Lavra) nr. 204, 16th c., ff. 187r-213v.

8 For the Slavonic witnesses, our collation draws on the groundwork of William Veder, to whom we wish to express our gratitude. It needs to be stressed that the results presented in this article are to some extent preliminary – the number of collated witnesses is far from being complete and not all QAs have yet been investigated in depth.

9 Secondary readings that bring the T text more in line with the “majority Greek” / with the Slavonic L version are typical of T⁶⁶, see L. SELS – I. DE VOS, On the Icons, the Cross and the Donkey. Questions 39-41 of the Slavonic Quaestiones Ad Antiochum Ducem, in CH. DENDRINOS, B. ROOSEN, P. VAN DEUN (forthcoming).

10 The reading ἤσκε in the reconstructed T text is supported by a reading ἄκε, found in an additional witness Pr, on which see below; the reading ἄκε explains the East Slavonic variant ἤκε of all T witnesses and can itself be explained by a common confusion between ἤκ and ἄκ (Middle Bulgarian nasal change).

11 The addition of reflexive σα to the verb ἱαβαλεμίν in T⁶⁶ and T²² is due to confusion with demonstrative σα (Gr. τοῦτο) in the phrase that follows.
An important question that needs to be addressed is that of the nature of the Slavonic T text, viz. the question whether we are dealing with an independent Slavonic translation of the *QAD* or with a mere redaction, viz. a revision of an existing Slavonic text based on a comparison with a Greek version close to 97. Contrary to what has been argued before, important parallels between T group readings and readings from the other main branch of the Slavonic tradition here represented by L allow to suppose a common origin and to consider the T text a revision of an earlier version of the Slavonic *QAD*. The complex problem of the relation between T and the L version cannot be dealt with here in detail, though some of the collation samples below may give a first impression.

**The Slavonic T Redaction and the Greek Tradition**

For the development of our present argument, it is important to situate 97 within the larger context of the Greek tradition of the *QAD*, which counts 250 witnesses from the tenth to the nineteenth century and in which five distinct branches can be discerned (A to E). As demonstrated elsewhere, 97 belongs to branch B,

---

12 In *De Vos – Grinenko, Quaestiones* [see note 1], p. 113 it has been argued prematurely that the “homogeneous group” / the T-group bears witness to an independent translation, distinct from that reflected in the “heterogeneous group” (cf. note 7).

13 Analysis of QA39 (*PG* 28, 621.12-51), which is attested in ninety-seven Greek witnesses, has revealed that branch A (at least for this QA) consists of two sub-branches, viz. A1 and A2. The Arabic tradition of the *QAD*, the oldest witness of which was copied in 885 in the Monastery of Mar Saba – viz. the Argentoratensis, *Bibliothecae Nationalis et Universitatis* or. 4226 (arabe 151), on which see G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur I: Die Übersetzungen* (ST, 118), Città del Vaticano, 1944, pp. 312-313 –, as well as the Georgian tradition and a quotation from QA39 found both in the anthology appended to John of Damascus’ *Oratio de imaginibus* III 59 (*CPG* 8045) and the *Doctrina Patrum* (*CPG* 7781) are related to sub-branch A1. A Latin translation of the same QA was made on the occasion of the Synods of Rome in 731 held under the authority of Pope Gregory III to defend the practice of icon veneration. It has been preserved in the tenth-century *Codex Londinensis, Bibliothecae Britannicae*, Add. 16413 (ff. 4r-6v, for an edition see L.
and more in particular to a small sub-group here called group B, after its earliest witness, an Athonite manuscript of the first half of the tenth century referred to as 131 (see the stemma, Fig. 1). However, 97 occupies a particular position within this small group, as it is characterised by a large set of unique variant readings as well as by traces of contamination with the A branch of the Greek tradition.


14 SELS – DE VOS, On the Icons [see note 9].
15 131 = Cod. Athous Vatopediou 38, first half 10th c., ff. 1r-32r (QA1-2, 10-19, A2, QA3-9, 29-35, A19, QA20-25, 27-29, 35-48, 50-73, 79-100 – the order of the folia has been disturbed), see E. LAMBERZ Katalog der griechischen Handschrifthaten des Athosklosters Vatopedi, Band 1, Codices 1-102 (Κατάλογοι Ελληνικών Χειρογράφων Αγίου Όρους, 2), Thessaloniki, 2006, pp. 168-183. The other witnesses to this group, apart from 97, are 114 = Cod. Florentinus Mediceus Laurentianus, Conv. Soppr. 627, 13th c., ff. 80v-92v (QA1-25, 27-48, 50-137; see E. ROSTAGNO – N. FESTA, Indice dei codici greci laurenziani non compresi nel catalogo del Bandini, Firenze – Roma, 1893, pp. 172-176) and 115 = Cod. Florentinus Laurentianus, Plut. 59.13, 15th-16th c., ff. 165v-211v (QA1-6, 8-25, 27-48, 50-137; see A. M. BANDINI, Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Laurentianae, tomus secundus, Firenze, 1768, coll. 517-524). The kinship of the witnesses of group B is confirmed by a number of important common variants, such as the addition of τὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους after πόθον in QA39 (PG 28, 621.26) and the omission of ως ἄργα ταῦτα ήγεῖσθαι ξόλα καὶ in QA41 (PG 28, 624.19).

16 Variant readings found exclusively in 97 include the addition of ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τῆς ἀμπέλου after οἶνος in QA34 (PG 28, 617.19) and the abbreviation of the entire question in QA41 (PG 28, 624.10-15), viz. τίνος χάριν, πιστοὶ μὲν ἄπαντες, σταυροὺς ἀντίτυπους τοῦ χριστοῦ ποιοῦμεν, τὸν δὲ ἄλλον οὐ ποιοῦμεν instead of τίνος δὲ χάριν οἱ πιστοὶ ἄπαντες σταυροὺς μὲν ἀντίτυπους τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ ποιοῦμεν, τῆς δὲ ἀγίας αὐτοῦ λόγχης ἢ τοῦ καλάμου ἢ τοῦ σπόγγου ἢ κατασκευάζομεν. For a more elaborate list, see DE VOS – GRINCHENKO, Quaestiones [see note 1], p. 117.

Some variants found in 97 point in the direction of contamination with sub-branch A1 (on which see note 13), such as προηγουμένος instead of α’ (the numeral “one”) in QA1 (PG 28, 597.38), τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐνεκεν instead of τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐνέγκαι in QA14 (PG 28, 605.37)
An example – a sample from the collation of the Greek witnesses of B\textsuperscript{131} together with the Slavonic T redaction (QA 39 and 41) – illustrates the fact that T also reflects the text of 97 in instances where the latter is at variance with the other witnesses of the B\textsuperscript{131} group (as is the case with the specific structure of 97’s corpus of QAs, as mentioned above).

QA39, PG 28, 621.32-33 and 41-42

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{T}\quad \textit{ιηδεις ηε ρακαδιατωνα ςα χησοιλως και κρυστου γε}\n\item 97\quad τὸ μὴ προσκυνεῖν τὰς εἰκόνας καὶ τὸν σταυρόν,
\item 131\quad προσκυνεῖν τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἁγίων
\item 114\quad προσκυνεῖν τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἁγίων,
\item 115\quad προσκυνεῖν τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἁγίων,
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{T}\quad \textit{ες ρακαδιατωνα ςα ημιας ιελαβαδητωνα ςα ημιωγ’}
\item 97\quad ἐν μιᾶ οὖν τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἐπιφαίνεται αὐτῶ
\item 131\quad ἐν μιᾷ οὖν φαίνεται αὐτῶ αὐταῖς ὅψεσιν τὸ πνεῦμα
\item 114\quad ἐν μιᾷ οὖν φαίνεται αὐτῶ αὐταῖς ὅψεις τὸ πνεῦμα
\item 115\quad ἐν μιᾷ οὖν φαίνεται αὐτῶ αὐταῖς ὅψεις τὸ πνεῦμα
\end{itemize}

QA41, PG 28, 624.17-19

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{T}\quad \textit{μοχελως οτις άρετεβ δαίσαλωτι και ομβραψ κρυστωμαι δαβαρετω’}
\item 97\quad δυνάμεθα τὰ δύο ξύλα χωρίσαι καὶ τὸν τύπου τοῦ σταυροῦ διαλύσαι
\item 131\quad δυνάμεθα τὰ δύο ξύλα χωρίσαντες καὶ τὸν τύπου τοῦ σταυροῦ διαλύσαντες
\item 114\quad δυνάμεθα τὰ δύο ξύλα διορίσαντες καὶ τὸν τύπου τοῦ σταυροῦ διαλύσαντες
\item 115\quad δυνάμεθα τὰ δύο ξύλα διαιρήσαντες καὶ τὸν τύπου τοῦ σταυροῦ διὰ λύσανσαντες (sic)
\end{itemize}

However, to state that 97 was the exemplar for the Slavonic T redaction would be misleading: some proper readings of 97 are not reflected in T, which in these instances follows the other witnesses of group B\textsuperscript{131}. This is a clear indication that both Slavonic T and 97 go back to a common Greek ancestor, here called

\textit{\textsuperscript{sic}}
Gr\textsuperscript{97/T} (see the stemma, \textit{Fig. 1\textsuperscript{17}}), which apparently contained the readings common to 97 and T but not those found only in 97.

QA39, \textit{PG} 28, 621.20 and 21-23

\begin{verbatim}
T  ὅθεν πολλάκις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος λειανθέντος
Gr\textsuperscript{97/T} ὅθεν πολλάκις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἄλλοιωθέντος
97  ὅθεν πολλάκις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἄλλοιωθέντος
131 ὅθεν πολλάκις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος λειανθέντος
114 ὅθεν πολλάκις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος λειανθέντος
115 ὅθεν πολλάκις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἄλλοιωθέντος

T  Ἡκὼξε οὖν Ἡακὼβ ἥρα οὐμρήται κραίειν καλὰ ἠκισθάνα
Gr\textsuperscript{97/T} ὅσπερ οὖν ὁ Ἡακὼβ μέλλον τελευτάν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου τοῦ Ἰωσήφ
97 ὅσπερ οὖν τοῦ Ἡακὼβ μέλλον τελευτάν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥαύδου ὁ Ἰωσήφ
131 ὅσπερ οὖν ὁ Ἡακὼβ μέλλον τελευτάν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου τοῦ Ἰωσήφ
114 ὅσπερ οὖν ὁ Ἡακὼβ μέλλον τελευτάν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥαύδου τοῦ Ἰωσήφ
115 ὅσπερ οὖν ὁ Ἡακὼβ μέλλον τελευτάν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥαύδου τοῦ (τῆς a.c.) Ἰωσήφ

TWO ADDITIONAL WITNESSES: PR AND P

As has been argued up to this point, archetype T can be reconstructed from the witnesses T\textsuperscript{22}, T\textsuperscript{66}, T\textsuperscript{50}, T\textsuperscript{90} and M\textsuperscript{T}. However, two more manuscripts that bear witness to the same redaction deserve special attention. The first is a manuscript kept in the Czech National Museum in Prague; it is dated to the late fourteenth century (thus antedating the T manuscripts) and the only South Slavonic witness. The second is an early eighteenth-century Russian codex from the Transfiguration Monastery at Solovki, now kept in Saint Petersburg. The latter’s version of the \textit{QAD} – which, apparently, is a descendant of the text found in Pr, as will become clear below – has been published by Porfir’ev in 1890.

Pr \textit{Cod. Pragensis slav. IX F 15}, late 14\textsuperscript{th} c., Bulgarian orthography, ff. 148\textsuperscript{r}-173\textsuperscript{v} (Kuev nr. 3).\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{17} Note that the location of T (viz. the reconstructed archetype of the T-redaction) on the timeline, viz. around the 14\textsuperscript{th}-century, cannot be but tentative. We will return to the question of the dating of T further on. The position of Gr\textsuperscript{97/T} just above T is not meant to imply an indication of its date.

\textsuperscript{18} J. VAŠICA – J. VAJS, \textit{Soupis staroslovanských rukopisů Národního Museu v Praze}, Praha, 1957, pp. 224-228; A. JACIMIRSKIJ, \textit{Opisanie južno-slavjanskich i russkich rukopisej...
A first element that points to the problematic nature of Pr and P is their structure, which deviates from that found in 97 and T in that they both have thirteen additional QAs, presented in bold in the following table.²⁰

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>97 &amp; T</th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-51</td>
<td>27-51</td>
<td>27-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-54</td>
<td>52-54</td>
<td>52-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-77</td>
<td>55-77</td>
<td>55-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-101</td>
<td>79-101</td>
<td>79-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-105</td>
<td>103-105</td>
<td>103-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107-111</td>
<td>107-111</td>
<td>107-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-119</td>
<td>115-119</td>
<td>115-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>121-122</td>
<td>121-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-130</td>
<td>126-130</td>
<td>126-130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

zagraničnych bibliotek, vol. I (Sbornik Otdelenija Russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti rossijskoy Akademii Nauk, 98), Petrograd, 1921, pp. 727-741. Images of folia from this codex are reproduced below (Figs 2-3) with the permission of the National Museum of Prague, for which we wish to express our gratitude.

²⁰ On the problematic nature of Pr, see DE VOS – GRINCHENKO, Quaestiones [see note 1], pp. 125-126.
Naturally, the question arises whether these QAs are interpolations or whether Pr and P reflect an older and fuller collection that has subsequently been abridged in T. Considering the link that undeniably exists between the T group and 97, both at a structural and at a textual level, the first option is the most probable: as Pr and P have the same textual features as T (and 97), one would expect them to have the same structure as well. The hypothesis that we are indeed dealing with interpolations is supported by a marginal note on f. 150v of Pr (see Fig. 2a), viz. underneath QA17, the first of the supplementary QAs, which in Pr is written in the lower margin.

The note reads: Τι εδώ και εδώ ελέγκθη εμπόδιο. Τα γαλτιν ήμα ρίθ που μετέχει – “This I have found in another exemplar;21 read or write these things according to the notes.” This is a clear indication that the scribe of Pr – who apparently was well aware of the fact that his copy would not only be read but would also be used as

---

an model – copied QA17 from another version of the QAD in the lower margin. In all probability, he took the subsequent additional QAs from this “other exemplar” as well, this time inserting them directly into the main text (and not, as QA17, in the margins) without further mention.

Another striking piece of proof for the interpolated character of Pr is found on that same folio 150v: a considerable part of QA18 is also written in the margins, viz. on the left hand side of the main text (see Fig. 2b); in P the fragment is integrated in the running text. Collations show that this part of QA18 is missing in 97 as well as in all T witnesses. This suggests that the added text has been taken from the “Δρογτα ἰςωδον” as well. The text version found in this other exemplar henceforth will be called version X.

Fig. 2b: Pr, f. 150v (detail 2: left margin, rotated)

To support our argument, collation samples are provided for both the marginal addition and the fragment of QA18 that immediately precedes it in the running text of Pr.

QA18, PG 28, 608.34-37

Gr

λέγω δὴ ἐξ αἵματος καὶ φλέγματος καὶ χυμοῦ καὶ χολῆς· ἤγουν ἐκ θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ καὶ ξηροῦ καὶ υγροῦ, τούτης ἐκ πυρὸς καὶ ύδατος καὶ ἀέρος καὶ γῆς.

T

γлаголик же отъ кръвь и хракотины и уръны и жалъвы жалъны, рексише отъ теплажо и стъденаго и съхаго и мокраго, сирѣчь отъ огна и воды и въздуха и земли.

Pr

гѣа же, ὃς кръвь и хракотины, и уръны, и жалъвы жалъны.

P

глио же. ὃ крове, и флегма, и черныя, и желтыя желчи, рекси ὃ теплого и стъденаго, и съхаго и мокраго.

L

гѣа же ὃ крѣвь и гѣна и хыма и жалъны.
Marginal addition in Pr (inserted in the running text in P):

QA18, PG 28, 608.37-40

Gr Τὸ μὲν γάρ ὁμιὰ ώσπερ θερμόν (…), δῆλον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πυρός· ὁ δὲ χυμός, ὡς ύγρός, πρόδηλον ὅτι ἐξ ἀέρος· ἡ δὲ χολή ὡς ξηρά πρόδηλον ἀπὸ γῆς:

97 om.

T om.

Pr κρύστη δὲ τοπαλ, ἱατρὲ δὲ ὡς οὐγνη. χίμως ἥκι ιακὸ μοκρῆ, ἱατρὲ ιακὸ ὡς θάλασσα, καλλύν ἥκι ιακὸ σαῦχα, ἱατρὲ ιακὸ ὡς ζεῦλα. χριστοῦνα ιακὸ στα’δένη, προδέλεντε ὡς βοδῆς.

P кровь убо яко тепла, явъ яко ὡ огна. хима же яко мокро, явъ яко ὡ возздаха, железъ же, яко сдаха, авъ яко ὡ земли. флегма же яко ст’дена. праялено, яко ὡ боды.

L κρύστη δὲ τοπαλ ιατρὲ ιακὸ ὡς οὐγνα καὶ χιμα ιακὸ μοκρῆ, ιατρὲ ιακὸ ὡς θαλάσσα· καλλύν ἥκι ιακὸ σαῦχα· β’δομε ιακὸ ὡς ζεῦλα·, γλασъ δέ καὶ ιακὸ στα’δένη· δοσ’πλ ιατ´ρε ιακὸ ὡς βοδῆς.

It is clear that Pr and P follow T up to the point of interpolation, while the text added in the margin offers a text that is close to version L. P clearly has the same mixed character as Pr, on which it ultimately depends, even if the traces of the interpolation (viz. the marginal additions and notes) have disappeared.

In spite of the fact that the addition in QA18 is indeed close to the reading of L, we will argue – summarily here and more at length elsewhere – that the text found inserted in Pr does not belong to the L version of the QAD (even if it is bound to L by many corresponding readings). To illustrate this point, a collation from QA17 – the only QA to have been introduced from the “other exemplar” with absolute certainty – is presented here.

QA17, PG 28, 608.21-23

Gr Πόθεν δὲ δῆλον ὅτι ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ θανάτου οὐ συναποθνήσκει μετὰ τοῦ σώματος ἢ ψυχῆ; τινὲς γὰρ οὐτω νομίζουσιν.

97/T om.
It is clear from the example that the text of Pr (and P), though similar to the L text (here represented by witnesses L and T), adheres much closer to the Greek than L. As a consequence, it cannot have been derived from the latter, at least not through simple transmission by copying, that is, without consultation of a Greek copy (cf. the calque ἐξ-οὐγιαρέστα for συν-ἀποθνήσκει ς simple verb οὐγιαρέστας in L; the marked word order ἐξ τῆλομη ὡς ἰδια as in Greek μετὰ τοῦ σώματος ἡ ψυχή ὡς ἰδια ἐξ τῆλομη in L; ἰδια ὡς τῆλομη ς not ἰδια ὡς τῆλομη in L; literally renders Greek τινὲς γάρ οὕτω νομίζουσιν, while ἰδια ὡς τῆλομη ς not). Similar observations – viz. some overlap with version L besides notable differences and a markedly closer adherence to the Greek – can be observed in the other QAs present in Pr (and P) but not in T. If the “other exemplar” is assumed to have had an L text (X = L), it must have been thoroughly revised by the scribe of Pr on the basis of a Greek copy. A more likely explanation for the unique features of Pr (and P) is provided by the assumption that the “other exemplar” contained a different redaction of the QAD (X ≠ L).  

On the basis of the evidence presented above, it might be assumed that the scribe of Pr followed the T redaction for the QAs that are present in T, while drawing upon a not yet further defined version X (viz. the version found in the “other exemplar”) for the additional QAs. However, the situation is even more complex: Pr and P have readings that deviate from T in some of the QAs that are available in the T text. This allows for the assumption that the scribe of Pr, in compiling the text, in places preferred to follow version X even if he had the

22 A close look at QA24 – one of the QAs missing in T but present in both L and Pr/P – immediately reveals that the text of Pr/P cannot have been derived from L (nor the other way around) without consultation of a Greek copy: some readings in L and Pr/P reflect different Greek variants or a different reading of the Greek text (e.g. Pr ἐκεῖνος ~ δύσπιστα vs L ἀκολούθων ~ δύο+πιστά; Pr ἐρασιμλακας ~ ἱκ νυνιόμενος vs L παρεβήν ~ ἱκ νυνιόμενος; Pr ἐκεί ~ ὅπερ vs L ἰακό ~ ὅπερ).
T text at his disposal, or that he altered the original T text on the basis of version X. The image that comes to mind is that of a scribe sitting in front of two exemplars, now copying from the one, then from the other and perhaps occasionally mixing up both. To support this view, a collation sample is offered from QA41, which is present in T’s corpus of QAs:

QA41, PG 28, 624.17-19

\[
\begin{align*}
Gr^{97/T} & \text{ δυνάμεθα τὰ δύο ξύλα χωρίσαι καὶ τὸν τύπον τοῦ σταυροῦ διαλύσαι} \\
T & \text{можемъ овъ древъ раздѣлить и образъ крѣтный разорить} \\
Pr & \text{може дѣть въ древъ раздѣлить и образъ крѣтный разорить.} \\
P & \text{можемъ два оныя древа раздѣлить и образъ крѣтный разорить,} \\
Gr & \text{δυνάμεθα τὰ δύο ξύλα χωρίσαντες καὶ τὸν τύπον τοῦ σταυροῦ διαλύσαντες.} \\
L & \text{можемъ въ древѣ раздѣлить и образъ крѣтный разорить.} \\
T^4 & \text{тоже може овъ древъ раздѣлить образъ крѣтный разорить.}
\end{align*}
\]

The collation sample above provides several insights: (1) Pr and P have readings different from T, viz. their text does not reflect the particulars of Gr$^{97/T}$ as does the text of T: while both 97 and T have infinitive verb forms ($\chiωρίσαι \sim \rhoαζάλωσιν; \ διαλύσαι \sim \ ραζορωτινι$), Pr and P have participles, as does the majority Greek reading ($\chiωρίσαντες \sim \ ραζάλωσινες; \ διαλύσαντες \sim \ ραζορωτινες$) and the Slavonic L witnesses ($\chiωρίσαντες \sim \ ραζαμεши; \ διαλύσαντες \sim \ ραζормыше$); (2) Pr and P deviate from the witnesses of version L in their use of the verb ραζάλωσιν instead of ραζαμη, but they do have the same verbs (ραζαμη and ραζормыше) as the T witnesses, albeit in a different form (viz. participles instead of infinitives). It remains to be established whether the agreements between the text of Pr/P and T are due to a common textual history of versions X and T,\(^{23}\) or to a mixture of X and T elements in these passages in Pr (and P).\(^{24}\)

This can be represented schematically as follows:

\[\text{[Schematic representation of text comparison]}\]

\[\text{[Footnotes]}\]

\(^{23}\) That is, if the scribe of Pr more or less faithfully copied text blocks from the one or the other exemplar, not mixing up both.

\(^{24}\) That is, if the scribe of Pr blended features of both X and T within one and the same text block. We will address this issue in SELS – DE VOS, On the Icons [see note 9] (forthcoming).
From the above it follows that, from a text critical point of view, the text of Pr needs to be treated as a conflation – Pr is a witness to two different layers of the QAD tradition and a distinction needs to be made (insofar as possible) between Pr^T and Pr^X. For the additional QAs in Pr (and P) – viz. the QAs not available in T – we may assume that they belong to version X of the “other exemplar”, that is, to the extent that the scribe did not interfere with the latter’s text. For the QAs in Pr (and P) that are present in the T group it remains to be established exactly which (parts of) QAs truly belong to the T redaction and which are influenced by or belong to version X.

THE HYBRID NATURE OF P (Solovki 129/1064)

It has already been pointed out that P depends on Pr: while the marginal notes discussed above identify Pr as the starting point of the contamination, its conflated nature is reflected in both the structure and the text of P. The corpus of QAs found in P closely follows that of Pr, with few exceptions (see Table 2 above): for reasons that are unclear QA123 fell out; QA120 is put between QAs 130 and 131; interestingly, P restores the correct order of QAs 24-26, which may be linked to an admonition found as a marginal note in Pr: on f. 152 the following phrase can be found, written in the upper margin as an addition to QA25: “Πρεσανα γνωρι ου έχεις παρά έκκλησε έῃ παλαια, κα η άντε η λόγιον τω τλαγά το δοξα έξω” – “First read this question-and-answer, and after that: And if these things are so [viz. the beginning of QA26, which, in Pr, precedes QAs 24 and 25]” (see Fig. 3a).
QAs 134 and 135 fell out in P, which, however, features QAs 113 and 114 in final position; these have been taken from a text of the L-version, as already noted by Veder.\(^{25}\) From this fact, as well as from the replacement of the T type title found in Pr by a title of the L type,\(^{26}\) it is clear that the scribe of P (or of one of its ancestors) had access to an L text. Further scrutiny of P’s text proves that the scribe had recourse to L on other occasions as well. To support this claim, another collation sample is offered as an example.

**QA1, PG 28, 600.5-6**

Gr\(^{97/77}\) οὗτε εἰς ἐστὶ τῇ ὑποστάσει ἀνθρωπόμορφος, ὡς οἱ Ἑλλήνων παιδεῖς μυθεύονται,

T


Π


Gr


\(^{26}\) The title Ἐλληνος ἄνθρωπος αἰσθήτως ἀνθρωπόμορφος καὶ Ἀντίπαθες κακός ... is typical of both T and Pr (viz. of the “homogeneous group”), but in P we read Ἰδίως ὑπό στράτευσεν oura of the Aphanasia archiæckoa Λεγενζζικακα to Ἀντιπαθες κακος, which reflects the title of L. To judge from Kuev’s list [see note 1], at least eight more East Slavonic copies, dated from the 15th up to the 18th century, combine features of the T group with this L type title, which suggests that they all have a conflated version of the QAD as the one found in P.

\(^{27}\) ἐστεκέντα, which was written after σοτα, is crossed out, and ἢ is added s.l.

\(^{28}\) Ἰδίως is obviously a mistake for Ἰδίως.
The collation above clearly shows that in the first part of the phrase P follows the reading of the T group and Pr (сставляем уловкиобразны and not ипостасник уловкиобразны as in L), while for the second part P borrows the reading from version L (жидовство отроции and not юдевский зраком as in T and Pr). The text offered by P is a revision of the – already conflated – Pr text, which has been infused with L readings and minor innovations (some of which – as the introduction of the Graecism флегма for χρᾶκτινα in QA18 – are probably due to a comparison with a Greek version of the text). To summarise, P is a heavily contaminated text, consisting of the layers Pr (= T+X) + L, as visualised in the schema below.

It is certainly challenging and of some interest to investigate the textual history of this remarkable hybrid. However, to use P as a witness to any particular version of the QAD is not without peril. This observation retains all of its relevance in light of Veder’s assessment of P as a text witness: Veder writes about the latter that its text is older than that of version $a^1$ (viz. the hyparchetype of T$^{66}$ and T$^{22}$) and $a^2$ (viz. the hyparchetype of T$^{50}$ and T$^{90}$) and that it “füllt ihre Auslassungen und erklärt manche ihrer Verderbnisse [viz. of $a^1$ and $a^2$ – LS & IDV]”. To the extent that version L, part of the multilayered tissue of P, is most probably older than, it is possible that P offers a more ancient text – that is, in places and always with the possibility of considerable contamination.

---

29 VEDER, Einfluss [see note 1], p. 101.
What has previously been called the “homogeneous group” within the Slavonic tradition has proved not to be homogeneous at all. On the contrary, it testifies to the existence of two separate versions of the Slavonic QAD.

Redaction T – found in the five witnesses of the T group as well as in PrT (and the corresponding text parts of its descendant P) and shown to be based on the consultation of a Greek exemplar Gr^97/T – is a nice example of the symbiosis of the Greek and the Slavonic traditions. A better understanding of the version of the QAD that was at the basis of redaction T will shed more light on the revision process and on the textual layers incorporated in the T text. It is tempting to situate the origins of this redaction on Mount Athos in the vibrant fourteenth century. The roots of the Greek branch of this tradition seem to be Athonite and the terminus ante quem – the dating of the earliest witness Pr (late 14th c.) – does not contradict such a hypothesis. Moreover, the linguistic characteristics of T and the close adherence to its Greek exemplar point to a late rather than to an early date.

It would be premature to make firm statements on the nature of version X of the “other exemplar”. To our present knowledge, this text version is only found in the interpolated parts of Pr (and P) – so in PrX (and the corresponding passages in P). It is clear that it is not an isolated version but one tied firmly to the other branches of the Slavonic QAD tradition. At the same time, it has its own characteristics and particular choice of wording not found elsewhere in the witnesses collated so far – that is, if Pr indeed offers a faithful reflection of X. As this remains to be established, the possibility should be left open that the unique characteristics are proper to Pr itself and not to X. The first task that imposes itself to begin answering these questions is the delineation of text parts in Pr (and P) that clearly do not belong to redaction T, that is, the delineation of PrX.

---

30 DE VOS – GRINCHENKO, Quaestiones [see note 1], pp. 110-111 and passim.
31 The question of the language and the translation technique will be addressed in more detail in SELS – DE VOS, On the Icons [see note 9] (forthcoming).
To conclude

Cod. Pragensis slav. IX F 15 can be concluded to be an important witness to the text tradition of the Slavonic QAD: (1) Pr is the earliest witness to the T redaction and in the text parts that clearly belong to T, viz. in PrT, it seems to be the most reliable witness from a genealogical point of view. (2) Where its text deviates from T, Pr may be assumed to reflect the text of a "Δρούγι Πανακλήσ", another exemplar mentioned by the scribe in the margins. Whether Pr offers a faithful rendering or an adapted version of this exemplar’s text (version X) remains to be established. (3) Pr’s marginalia allow for a glimpse of the scribal compilation process and they identify Pr as the starting point of the new conflated version found also in P in a form marked by further contamination.

In spite of Pr’s being a key witness to the Slavonic QAD, its conflated nature compels us to use it with utmost caution for the constitutio textus of redaction T or any other part of the Slavonic QAD.

The more general conclusion to be drawn from the preceding argument is that it is necessary to study both the Greek and the Slavonic traditions of the QAD in depth, as the latter cannot be understood properly if the repeated revision of its text based on the consultation of Greek exemplars is not taken into account.
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Summary

The late fourteenth-century Codex Pragensis slav. IX F 15 (Pr) is considered a key witness to the textual tradition of the Slavonic Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem, as it contains an almost complete set of questions-and-answers (133 QAs). It is argued, however, that this corpus is the result of a conflation of two distinct versions of the Quaestiones, viz. redaction T and version X.

Redaction T, found in five witnesses from the 15th–16th c., is the result of a revision of the Slavonic QAD based on the consultation of a Greek exemplar: both the structure (viz. the number and sequence of the QAs) and the textual particulars of the Slavonic T witnesses are in almost perfect agreement with those of the Greek Quaestiones in Codex Oxoniensis
Bodleianus Auct. F.4.07 (Misc. 106). Version X is much more enigmatic; apparently, QAs from this further unknown version of the Slavonic QAD were introduced in the Prague codex to complement the T redaction’s corpus of 120 QAs.
Fig. 1: Stemma B^{131} group and Slavonic T redaction
Fig. 2: Pr, f. 150° – courtesy of the Czech National Museum, Prague
Fig. 3: Pr. f. 152r – courtesy of the Czech National Museum, Prague