Since the German publication of Athanasius’ Greek text of *Oratio III contra Arianos* (written between 339 and 345) in 1998 and 2000 there have appeared several Old Slavonic editions of individual manuscripts that contain this writing. Drawing from my own research aimed at preparing a critical edition of *Oratio III contra Arianos* based on all existing manuscripts known today, I would like to offer a discussion of two specific questions as a way of broadening our knowledge of Athanasius’ reception in the Old Slavonic tradition. The first of these questions will concern the time and circumstances in which *Oratio III contra Arianos* were translated into Old Slavonic, and the second question will consider the way this writing was transmitted in Medieval Russia.

Why Was the Translation Made?

The most essential information regarding the translation of *Oratio III contra Arianos* into Old Slavonic comes from the Bulgarian colophon found in most of our manuscripts. In the best manuscript (St. Petersburg, RNB Pog. 968, f. 208v), this colophon reads as follows:

Since this study is a research funded by the Czech science Foundation as the project GAČR 17-07880S “Athanasius of Alexandria, *Oratio III contra Arianos*: Critical Edition of the Old Slavonic Version”.

The content of this colophon has been examined by a number of scholars, and for our purposes it will be important to highlight several points. First, the colophon allows us to recognize that the translation of Athanasius’ *Orationes* was done by Constantine of Preslav (9th-10th c.), who is said to have been Methodius’ disciple. This means that Constantine found himself in the midst of a grand translation program that started with the invention of the Old Slavonic letters by Methodius’ brother Cyril-Constantine, and continued with an incredibly effective follow-up by Methodius and his disciples. This work began in Moravia but achieved its biggest results afterwards in Bulgaria. In this context, Constantine’s translation of Athanasius represents one of numerous other projects that included a translation of Scriptural and liturgical texts, as well as patristic authors. The latter primarily included such church fathers as Gregory of Nazianzus (16 selected *Orationes*), Basil of Caesarea (*Homiliae in hexaemeron*), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheticae orationes quinque*, *Catechesis Mystagogica*), John Chrysostom (numerous *Homilies*), Cyril of Alexandria (various commentaries), John of Damascus (*Expositio Fidei Orthodoxa*), and some others.

Second, the colophon informs us that Constantine’s translation was commissioned by the Bulgarian prince Symeon and copied by the monk Tudor Duksov whom scholars identify as a brother of the first Christian prince of Bulgaria Boris, also known as Michael after Baptism. Tudor Duksov, who

---


4 On the person and translation work of Constantine of Preslav, see P. Penkova, *Vtoroto Slovo protiv arianite*, cit., pp. 66-76.


6 For a discussion about Constantine’s translation work in the context of a much larger project of providing the Slavic nations with the Christian texts in their own language, see Ibidem, pp. 107-125.

7 Regarding the translation work of various patristic texts into Old Slavonic, see Ibidem, pp. 136-139.

added the colophon by his own hand, tells us that he did the copying work in the “New Golden Church” at the river Tyča known today as the Kamchiya that flows through Velikij Preslav. While it is not clear how we can interpret the phrase πετρατια (denoting probably the year 6372 = 864) referring to the time when Boris baptized the people of Bulgaria, there is a general consensus that the dates for the translation of Orationes (the year 6414/10th indict = 906 = ͜ vida. γi. ωνω, ι.) and their further copying (the year 6415/11th indict = 907 = ͜ιενο, ωνω, ι.) are confused. It has been established that this confusion has to do with the fact that the later scribe who copied this translation misread the Glagolitic numbering while transliterating the dates with the Cyrillic letters. This was a common mistake that scribes made, and it is also reflected in our Athanasian manuscripts. They offer us the following readings of the dates (the manuscripts’ description, numbered from 1 to 10, is presented in the second half of this article):

Translation dates:
- ͜ιενο, ωνω, ι. [MSS 1, 3, 10]
- ͜ιενο, ωνω, ι. [MSS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]

Copying dates:
- ͜ινα, ωνω, ι., ωνω, ι. [MSS 1, 3]
- ͜ινα, ωνω, ι., ωνω, ι. [MSS 4, 5, 7, 8, 9]
- ͜ινα, ωνω, ι., ωνω, ι. [MS 10]

In view of discrepancy between the dates of the year and the corresponding indicts, it has been suggested that we need to add one more year for these dates to be correct. Thus, we need to change the year 6414/10th indict = 906 (for the translation) and 6415/11th indict = 907 (for copying) to the year 6415/10th indict = 907, and 6416/11th indict = 908, respectively. The mistake in the dating was first noticed by two Russian scholars A. Gorskij and K. Nevostruev, and later examined by French slavicist A. Vaillant, who comments it as follows:

Ce précieux colophon d’époque vieux-slave remonte sûrement au premier copiste Théodore Doksov. Les années 6414=906 et 6415=907 ne concordent pas avec leurs indictions, qui sont 9 et 10: il faut lire 6415=907, indication 10, et 6416=908, indication 11, c’est-à-dire donner aux lettres ι et ι la valeur numérique qu’elles ont, non en cyrillique, mais dans l’alphabet glagolitique; le texte a été composé dans la glagolite ancienne, et le copiste qui l’a transcrit en cyrillique, lisant en glagolite *πιζξι, *πιζι, a naturel-

---

9 A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, Opisanie slavjanskih rukopisej, cit., 2.2, p. 33. say that this phrase is unexplainable. According to A. Vaillant, Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase, cit., pp. 7-8, this phrase has a Turkish-Bulgarian origin, and he believes that it can be translated as meaning the year 6372=864.

10 A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, Opisanie slavjanskih rukopisej, cit., 2.2, p. 33.
lement modifié le chiffre des mille, mais il a d’autant moins pensé à le faire pour celui des unités que les deux autres chiffres restaient sans changement. 11

Scholars point to several possible reasons that might have led Constantine to undertake the translation project of Athanasius’ Orationes. Of course, the most obvious one is related to the fact that the work itself was commissioned by the Bulgarian prince Symeon, as it follows from the data in the colophon. Symeon (864-927) received excellent theological and philosophical education in the University of Constantinople and was himself engaged in the translation work from Greek into Old Slavonic. 12 However, what made him commission the translation project of the anti-Arian polemical writing is not very clear because we have no direct indications as to whether the Church in Bulgaria was threatened by Arianism. 13

In this regard, one reasonable suggestion, proposed by P. Penkova 14 and further supported by my own research, 15 is that Constantine’s translation could have been occasioned by the filioque controversy. We know that Patriarch of Constantinople Photius (820-896) was outraged by the fact that the Frankish missionaries taught the doctrine of the Holy Spirit’s double procession (filioque) in Bulgaria. 16 In his Epistula Encyclica, written on that occa-

11 A. Vaillant, Discours contre les Ariens de Saint Athanase, cit., pp. 7.
13 A. G. Kuzmin, Zapadnye traditsii v russkom christianstve, in Vvedenie christianstva na Rusi, M., Myśl, 1987, advances a hypothesis that Methodius was influenced by Arianism and that Symeon commissioned the translation of Athanasius’ Orationes in view of the threat of Arianism coming from Ohrid. This hypothesis was rejected by F. J. Thomson who convincingly argued against it in his article Les cinq traductions slavonnes du ‘Libellus de Fide Orthodoxa’ de Michel le Syncelle et les mythes de l’arianisme de saint Méthode, apôtre des Slaves, ou d’Hilarion, métropolite de Russie, et de l’existence d’une Église arienne à Kiev, “Revue des études slaves”, 63 (1991), pp. 22-35. The rise of bohomilism in Bulgaria (whose teaching perceived Christ as a mere tool of God the Father similar to the way Arius understood Christ) is dated by the time of prince Peter (927-969) when the translation of Orationes had already been completed (cf. the Arian characteristics of bogomilism in D. Angelov, Bogomilstvo, Sofia, Bulvest, 1993, p. 171.
14 P. Penkova, Vtoroto Slovo protiv arianite, cit., p. 23.
session in early 867, he calls *filioque* a new heresy and argues that it contradicts the teaching of Athanasius. On the other hand, we see that adherents of the *filioque* in the Carolingian West – Aeneas of Paris (died in 870) and Ratramnus of Corbie (died in 870) – appeal to Athanasius in order to argue precisely the opposite, namely, their own doctrine of the *filioque*. Admittedly, the writings from which they quote are the ones that today scholars recognize as pseudo-Athanasian: *De incarnatione contra Apollinarem* (PG 26.1093-1166), Sermon *maior de fide* (PG 26.1263-1294), *Interpretatio in symbolum* (PG 26.1231-1232), *Dialogi contra Macedonianos* (PG 28.1291-1338), *Dialogi de sancta Trinitate quinque* (PG 28.1115-1286), *De Trinitate Libri XII* (PL 62.237-334), and *Symbolum Quicumque* (PG 28.1583). Even then, however, the very fact that “Athanasius was one of the most authoritative of the Greek Fathers for the Carolingian theologians”, is significant enough to...

---

17 Ep. Enc. (V. Laourdas, L. G. Westerink, hsr., *Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia*, cit., p. 45): Οπωσδήποτε τοις εἰρήμενοις ἀποπηματίσας καὶ τὸ ιερὸν καὶ ἄγιον σώματον, ὡς πάση τὸς συνοδικός καὶ οἰκουμενικος γιγαντίαν ἄμαχον ἔχει τὴν ἴσχυν, νόθους λογισμοὺς καὶ παρεγγράμματος λόγους καὶ δράσεως ἑπεχείρησαν (ὡ τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μυχανημένον), τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἄγιον οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμεθα καινολογήσαντες... αὕτη [i.e. *filioque*] κατὰ τὸν ἐδαγγελέαν ἵσταται, πρὸς τὰς ἁγίας ἀπομαχόμεθα συνόδου, τῶν μακαρίων καὶ ἁγίων παραγράφεται πατέρας, τῶν μέγαν Ἀθανασίων, τῶν ἐν θεολογίᾳ περίβοητον Γηγώργου, τῆς ἱερᾶς στόλης, τῶν μέγαν Βασιλείων, τὸ χριστὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης στῶμα, τῆς σοφίας πέλαγος, τοῦ ἁληθοῦς Χρυσοστόμου. It is worth noting that Photius mentions Athanasius in his personal letter to the prince Boris written just before the rise of the controversy in 865 or middle of 866. For the Greek text of this letter, see V. Laourdas, L. G. Westerink, hsr., *Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia*, cit. The Old Slavonic translation of this letter is published by T. Slavova, *Slavjanskijat prevod na Poslanieto na patriarh Fotij do knjaz Boris-Michail*, Sofjia, Universitetsko izdatelstvo Kliment Ohridski, 2013. English translation is provided by D. S. White, J. R. Berrigan, trans., *The Patriarch and the Prince: The Letter of Patriarch Photios to Khan Boris of Bulgaria*, Brookline, Mass., Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982. Most frequent references to Athanasius (no less than 24 times) are found in Photius' two homilies devoted to Arianism. These anti-Arian homilies are numbered XV and XVI in *Photii Epistulae et Amphilochia*, cit.; and 36 and 37 in ԁ. Արեատարիչ, էջ., Λόγοι και σμαραγδός του θαυματουργοῦ Κωνσταντινοπολίτη, 1900.

18 For a helpful discussion of the *filioquist* polemic of these two authors, see R. Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy*, Belmont, Massachusetts, Nordland Publishing Company, 1975, pp. 101-121; and V. Leppin, Der Westen, in *Athanasius Handbuch*, hsr., P. Gemeinhardt, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2011, pp. 421-424.

19 For the discussion of these pseudo-Athanasian texts in Aeneas of Paris and Ratramnus of Corbie, see R. Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians*, cit., p. 185-187.

20 This is the conclusion of the study of Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians*, cit., p. 185, which I share. For a view that doesn’t take *filioque* as a major issue during this time, see...
make us think that he could be an essential part of the ammunition with which East and West did their battle against each other. If this was really so, then Constantine’s translation of Athanasius’ *Orationes* into Old Slavonic could be perceived as one of the means of countering *filioque* in Bulgaria. Be that as it may, the benefits of having these theological writings in the Old Slavonic language were undoubtedly immense for a country that had just converted to Christianity.

**Transmission of Orationes in Medieval Russia**

Today, the only extant manuscripts of Constantine’s translation are the ones that were copied in Velikij Novgorod and Moscow primarily in the 15th and 16th centuries. Apparently, the reason Athanasius’ *Orationes* were copied there had to do with the rise of the so-called heresy of the Judaizers (židovstvujuschie) that appeared in the second half of the 15th c. This teaching denied (among other things) the divine nature of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. 21 We possess two direct witnesses that relate the copying of Athanasius’ *Orationes* to the fight against this teaching conducted by the Novgorodian Archbishop Gennadij (1410-1505). The first one is found in Gennadij’s letter to the former Archbishop of Rostov and Jaroslavl’ Ioasaf (died in 1514) sent in the year 1489.22 In this letter Gennadij expresses his concern over the rise of a new teaching that rejects (among other things) Christ’s divine nature and the doctrine of the Trinity. At one point he inquires of Ioasaf as to whether he has twelve specific books needed for countering that teaching. The second of these books is called simply “Athenasius of Alexandria”:

---

21 The reconstruction of the teaching of the Judaizers is quite complex because almost nothing has survived of their own writings. The best treatment of this issue is found in a recent study by A. I. Aleksejev, *Religioznye dvizheniya* na Rusi poslednej treti XVI-načala XVI v.: *strigoluki i židovstvujuschie*, M., Indrik, 2012.


23 RGB, Tro. F.304, 730, f. 252v.

---
Of course, having just the name “Athanasius” rather than a specific title makes it difficult to know whether Gennadij really meant *Orationes contra Arianos*. However, based on the fact that *Orationes* were copied in the same year at Gennadij’s Archiepiscopal Yard/Scriptorium in Velikij Novgorod (preserved in the manuscript St. Petersburg, RNB Pog. 968),24 we can suppose that it was precisely this writing. At the end of his letter, Gennadij notes that “heretics have all these books”, which made it all the more important that Christian apologists would have them as well.

Since no answer from Ioasaf has survived, scholars argue as to whether Gennadij’s letter was intended to request these twelve books from Ioasaf, or rather provide them to him in case he did not have some.25 In my view, since we know that one year prior to Gennadij’s letter (1489)26 one copy of *Orationes* had already been made in Velikij Novgorod (1488),27 there was no need for him to request this writing from his colleague. Instead, it looks quite likely that he wanted to check which books Ioasaf had, so that he could provide those that were lacking. In fact, this is exactly what we find Gennadij doing throughout his career of fighting the Judaizers’ teaching. He commissions his scribes to make copies of different writings and then sends them to the main monastic centers in Russia. Thus, Gennadij’s deacon Gerasim Povpokva makes his brother Dmitrij Gerasimov copy Athanasius’ *Orationes* in Velikij Novgorod, and then sends this manuscript to the Kirillo-Belozerskij Monastery in 1489.28 One year earlier in 1488, another scribe, Timofej Veniaminov, copies Athanasius’ *Orationes* at Gennadij’s Archiepiscopal Yard/Scriptorium in Velikij Novgorod, and later this manuscript makes its way to...

---

24 Κ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΥ ΑΑ...
the Iosifo-Volokolamskij Monastery. As it will be shown in my brief overview of the Athanasian manuscripts, most of the existing codices were copied in Velikij Novgorod, and the earliest and most important ones were in some way connected with Gennadij’s strategy to combat the heresy.

The second, and perhaps most clear, witness about the way Athanasius’ *Orations* were copied for a very specific purpose is the information in the colophon of the scribe Timofej Veniaminov, whom I have just mentioned. It tells us that the work of copying Athanasius was done in Velikij Novgorod and occasioned by the rise of heresy. That heresy was promoted both by clergy and laypeople, and had to do with their attack on the most fundamental Orthodox beliefs, specifically the doctrine of the Trinity:

> εν τω λατρεία της νεοδολικής καινουργίας και διάκονες, και άλλοι προφήτες λεγοντάς διάκονι
> άστυνηγτών ιερών θείων και θεοποιημένου έξω άχον και κοινωνικά
> τού και τούτουμ Στρέκον  γε τυλόν τηρέζε Προκλάδες άστους δούλους
> και καθαρίζειν πρόλογον ούτω και ούν και άρτην αχαν και τρίτην εμφανώ τρόπον

Right after this statement, it is said that the task of fighting the heresy was taken up by the Novgorodian Archbishop Gennadij whom God granted grace to expose the wickedness of those heretics: Νά θεασθεί ιππολίτη ο θεός
> άξιον και μεγαλουργίας αναγοράς ο άρκατος
> αναγοράς άρκτος αρχιεπίσκοπον γένος
> και ορθής δίδαξα ιερατικού

A major part of how Gennadij countered the heresy (besides copying Athanasius and other books) was to produce the first complete Old Slavonic Bible (in the year 1499) in his scriptorium. It was an event of major significance, and my own research (yet to be published) has allowed me to conclude that Timofej used Gennadij’s Bible to correct certain Biblical passages in the text of Athanasius’ *Orations*.

Of course, apart from the question of why *Orations contra Arianos* were copied in Novgorod, it is legitimate to ask how this writing appeared there in the first place. So far, this issue has received the most attention from P. Penkova, and she suggests that it could have been brought there from the scriptorium of the Evergetida monastery in Constantinople. She argues that the second *Oratio* demonstrates similar variants found in the two Greek manuscripts (Patmiacus A 4 and Patmiacus A 3) that came from that scriptorium. In addition, she points out that “from the Evergetida monastery comes the famous Novgorod ‘dogmatic’ Icon ‘The Annunciation of Ustyug’, 11th c.”, and she believes that “the geographical path to transfer the copy of Constans-
tine’s translation to Novgorod was via Constantinople because the icon illustrated Athanasius’ doctrine of the Logos”.31

It is possible that Athanasius’ *Orationes* may not have appeared in Russia till they were needed by Gennadij.32 The earliest record that shows the presence of this writing in Russia (apart from the witness of our ten manuscripts) is 16th c. This record appears in the so-called *True Books Indices* that represent Russian monastic catalogues of recommended literature (somewhat similar to the Western *Decretum Gelasianum* in PL 59, 157-179), and scholars believe that they are indicative of what was and was not available in medieval Russia. We possess 87 manuscripts of such *Indices* from the 15th c., and 42 manuscripts from the 16th and 17th c., but the only records that make a direct mention of *Orationes contra Arianos* are 31 manuscripts from the 16th c.33

It is worth noting that the only genuine writings of Athanasius that were spread in Russia besides *Orationes* are *Vita Antonii*, *Epistula ad Amun*; *Epistula ad Rufinianum*; “Bible canon” from the 39th *Epistula Festales*, and *Epistula ad Marcellinum de interpretatione Psalmorum*. In our study with I. M. Gricevskaja,34 we point out that pseudo-Athanasian writings (including those that are not witnessed in Greek) had a much bigger popularity among the Russian Slavs than his genuine and more sophisticated theological writings. We have been able to identify around 50 of such writings in the manuscripts that range from the 12th through 17th c., and we argue that they shaped a very different profile of Athanasius from the one found in Greek. One particularly interesting feature of the Old Slavonic Athanasius in Novgorod and the nearby city Pskov is that he was prayed to on occasions of epidemic and military threat from the enemy. Athanasius was believed to have stopped the epidemic in Novgorod (1390) and Pskov (1407), as well as to have thwarted the Mongol troops, and thus save the Novgorodian people from the sudden invasion in 1238.35 On such occasions, several churches were built and named after Athanasius.36

36 Ibidem.
We possess 10 mss. of Constantine’s translation with Russian orthography ranging from the 15th to 18th centuries and kept in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Five of them were found by A. Vaillant,²⁷ nine are listed by P. Penkova,²⁸ and I have added one.²⁹ As a way of concluding this study, I would like to offer a brief overview of each of the 10 manuscripts in our possession today:

[1] St. Petersburg, RNB Pog. 968, year 1489.⁴⁰ Based on the information in the colophon on f. 222v,⁴¹ this manuscript was copied by Dmitrij Gerasimov who is called Mitja (Μιττά) word-by-word (λόγοι επ' ελλήνικα) from the Old Bulgarian codex (πεντε επισκες στα ρωμαϊκά της Παλαιολόγω). The work was commissioned by the scribe’s brother Gerasim Popovka (who also wrote the colophon), and the manuscript was prepared within the circle of scribes at the Archepiscopal Yard/Scriptorium of the Novgorodian Archbishop Gennadij (γενναδιώτης Αρχιεπίσκοπος). After this manuscript was completed in 6997 (¼ 1489) (which is said to be the time of the great prince of Moscow Ivan III and his son Ivan – ιωάννης ο δεύτερος), it was sent to the Kirillo-Belozerskij Monastery. The colophon ends by informing us that the fifth writing in the manuscript is Oratio on the Celebration of Easter (η πρώτη στην εορτή της Πάσχας). This is the only instance where this writing is referred to as Oratio rather than Epistle (επιστολή) as in all other manuscripts.

[2] Moscow, RGB Ovč. F.209, 791, 15th c.⁴² Based on the ex libris (αυτοκόλλητος ιεραρχικός) that precedes the text of the first Oratio, this manuscript belonged to the library of the abbot Dosifej Soloveckij (died after 1514).⁴³ It is possible that this very manuscript was described in the inventory record of the books (αναφοράς δέκα) in Solo-

²⁷ In the order: (1) St. Petersburg, RNB Pog. 968; (2) Moscow, GIM Sinod. 20; (3) Moscow, GIM Sinod. Tsa. VMČ 180; (4) St. Petersburg, RNB Sof. VMČ 1321; (5) St. Petersburg, RNB Sol. 63.

²⁸ In the order: (1) St. Petersburg, RNB Pog. 968; (2) Moscow, GIM Sinod. 20; (3) Moscow, RGB Vol. F.113, 437; (4) Moscow, RGB Ovč. F.209, 791; (5) Moscow, RGB Nikif. F.199, 59; (6) St. Petersburg, RNB Sol. 63. (7) Moscow, GIM Sinod. Usp. VMČ 994; (8) St. Petersburg, RNB Sof. VMČ 1321; (9) Moscow, GIM Sinod. Tsa. VMČ 180.

²⁹ Moscow, RGB Ovč. F.209, 99.

⁴⁰ This ms. is described by A. Vaillant, Discours contre les Ariens, cit., pp. 12-14.

⁴¹ In the content of Dosifej’s library and his ex libris, see N. N. Rozov, Solovetskaja biblioteka i ego osnovatel igumen Dosifej, “TODRL”, XVIII (1963), pp. 294-304.
vetskij monastery (where Dosifej was the abbot) made in the year 1514. This record mentions Athanasius (святъй афонськъ монастырь Атанасиев) among 46 other books.\footnote{Z. V. Dmitrieva, E. V. Krušelnitskaja, M. I. Mil'čik, Opisi Solovetskogo monastyrja XVI veika, SPb., Bulanin, 2003, p. 34.}

Given the fact that Dosifej ordered many of his books from Velikij Novgorod and was a close associate of the Archbishop Gennadij, Novgorod is the most likely place for the copying of this manuscript.\footnote{N. N. Rozov, Solovetskaja biblioteka i ego osnovatel igumen Dosifej, cit., pp. 294-304.}
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Abstract
Old Slavonic Translation of *Oratioes Contra Arianos.* Reasons for Translation and the Issue of Transmission
This article examines the Old Slavonic translation of Athanasius’ main theological work *Oratioes Contra Arianos* by discussing the reasons for translation and the issue of transmission. It also provides a brief description of all existing manuscripts known today that preserve this translation originally made by Constantine of Preslav in 907 in Bulgaria.
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