1. Introduction.

During the 15th-early 16th centuries, a number of historical, philosophical, scientific, and Biblical texts were translated from Hebrew into East Slavic (Ruthenian). These texts had been connected to the Heresy of the Judaizers, a movement that arose in Novgorod in late 15th century, and was ultimately suppressed in 1504. Our knowledge of the heresy is limited to 1) the writings of the opposition (most notably Gennadij, the Archbishop of Novgorod, and Iosif Sanin); and 2) the texts themselves.

While a fair amount has been written about the heresy’s history, some basic questions remain unanswered. First, the very connection of Jews and Judaism to the movement is debated. Second, there is an ongoing argument about the heretics’ worldview, religious beliefs, and motivations. Third, there is no agreement among scholars as to which translated texts can be reliably connected to the heresy.

Lacking new historical evidence, one wonders whether any new discoveries can be made about the heresy. In this article, I argue that linguistic analysis focusing on translation method can be successfully applied to these texts. It is crucial to examine both the source language(s) and the language(s) of the translation, but many philologists -primarily Slavists- working with the corpus over the years have been set back by insufficient knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic.
In this article, I will focus on one linguistic phenomenon prominent in these translations, namely deictic shifts. In many of these translations, third-person pronominal reference in the original Hebrew is replaced with second- and first-person reference in the Slavic translations. I will examine these deictic shifts and show how they can shed light on the translations’ origin, the texts’ connection to Jews, as well as their connection to Slavic scribes.

I will start with an overview of the heresy’s troubled history (2.1), and the translated texts’ controversial connection to the movement (2.2). I will then discuss the phenomenon which is the focus of this article: deictic shifts. In section 3, I will show how deictic shifts can signal the Jewish worldview of the translators. In section 4, I will discuss deictic shifts in reported speech, since in many texts, indirect discourse of the original is often translated as direct discourse. I will argue that this change is not necessarily connected to the Judaizers, but rather constitutes a Slavic scribal convention. In section 5, I will show that two of the most prominent texts associated with the Judaizers (Logika and Tajnaja Tajnyx) undergo a complete reframing of the narration using a deictic shift from third person (indirect discourse) to first and second person (direct discourse), and argue that this change is deliberate and likely has to do with the translators’ motivations and target audience. The last section (6) wraps up the discussion and presents conclusions.

2. The Heresy of the Judaizers

2.1. Historical Background

The heretical movement that first appeared in Novgorod the second half of 15th century is commonly known in the literature as the Heresy of the Judaizers, but its connection to Jews and Judaism is still debated. The name itself is but a later artifact, coined almost 200 years after the heresy’s appearance (Pliguzov 1992: 269).
Our knowledge of the heresy comes from two main sources: 1) the corpus of astronomical, biblical, philosophical and historical texts translated from Hebrew into East Slavic around this time; and 2) the contemporary opponents and persecutors of the heresy, most notably the archbishop Gennadij of Novgorod (1484-1504), and the abbot of Volokolamsk, Iosif Sanin (1470-1515).

Archbishop Gennadij, who was the first to discover the movement in Novgorod, accused the heretics of being “жидовская мудръствующие” in an epistle sent to Moscow in 1487, but in later epistles he appears unsure of the exact nature of the movement, connecting it to Marcionite and Messalian heresies. Iosif Sanin, who denounces the heresy in his Prosvetitel’, is adamant in connecting the Novgorodian heresy to Judaism, but his account does not appear until 1492, and his first-hand knowledge of the heresy is likely to limited.

Lack of solid historical evidence regarding the heretics’ beliefs and practices have led modern-day scholars to dispute the connection of the heresy to Jews and Judaism, with opinions as far-ranging as Luria’s, who denies the connection (AFED), to Taube’s assertion that “the Muscovite Principality in the second half of the 15th century may well have been on the brink of succumbing to a Jewish conspiracy to proselytize Muscovy from the top, a plan orchestrated by learned Jews from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth” (Taube 2005: 185).

The connection of the heresy to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is much better established. In the later part of 15th century, the Muscovite State underwent a period of consolidation under Ivan III. This was also a period of intense struggle between the Lithuanian and Muscovite parties for influence in still-independent Novgorod. The Lithuanian party was briefly victorious in 1470, when the Prince Mikhailo Olel’kovich of Kiev was invited to Novgorod. He arrived in November 1470 with a large retinue, which included, according to Gennadij’s epistle to
Metrololitan Zosima (1490), a certain heretical Jew: был в Новгороде князь Михаило Оленкович, а с ним был жидовин еретик, да от того жидовина распростерлась ересь в Новгородской земли (AFED: 375). According to Iosif Sanin’s Tale of the Newly-Appeared Heresy, the name of this Jew was Skharia. This heretical Skharia succeeded in converting several priests of the lower white clergy.

Mikhailo Olel’kovich and the Lithuanian party left Novgorod in March 1471. In the following conflict between Moscow and Novgorod, Moscow emerged victorious; Ivan III arrived in Novgorod in June 1471 and appointed a governor, thus ending the city-state’s long period of independence (Vernadsky 1933: 438). The fate of the Jew(s) who may have arrived with the Lithuanian prince is unclear; however, the heresy persisted in Novgorod.

Returning to Novgorod in 1478, Ivan III invited two priests associated with the heresy, Alexej and Denis, to assume important positions in Moscow: Alexei became the archpriest of the Cathedral of the Assumption, whereas Denis received a less prestigious, but still prominent priestly appointment to the cathedral of the Archangel Michael. The center of the heresy shifts to Moscow, where some prominent members of Ivan III’s court become involved, most notably Feodor Kuritsyn, Ivan’s chief diplomat and protégé, who served as secretary of Foreign Affairs, and who subsequently became the leader of Muscovite foreign policy as well as the leader of the Moscow heretics. Ivan III’s daughter-in-law, Elena, also sympathized with the heresy.

The Lithuanian connection emerges here again, as Elena was a direct cousin of Prince Mikhailo Olel’kovich of Kiev. She was also the mother of Prince Dmitrij, who officially became Ivan III’s heir in 1498. This connection prompts Taube to speak of the heresy as “a family affair” (Taube 2005: 186).
Archbishop Gennadij of Novgorod, having discovered the heresy in 1487, began persecuting the Novgorodian heretics, but his attempts to engage the Muscovite See in the prosecution were relatively unsuccessful until a special Sobor was convened in Moscow in 1490. The heretics received ecclesiastical punishment and were sent back to Novgorod (Pliguzov 1992: 276). This mild verdict did not satisfy Gennadij, who argued for their burning at the stake after the fashion of the Spanish inquisition (of which he learned from G. von Turn, an envoy of the Romano-German emperor who visited Novgorod in 1490). Gennadij’s efforts continued throughout the 1490s, strengthened by the passionate polemical involvement of Iosif Sanin. In the 1490s, the heretics’ party suffered two serious blows: the deposition of the metropolitan Zosima, whom some historians describe as a sympathizer to the heresy (1494), and the death of Feodor Kuritsyn (1498). In 1502 Elena and her son Dmitrij were imprisoned. In 1504, another Sobor was convened, with Iosif Sanin demanding death for the Judaizers. The Sobor condemned the heretics to be burned at the stake, and Volk Kuritsyn, the brother of Feodor, was among the executed.¹

2.2 Texts

One strong connection to Jews and Judaism that appears in this period is a corpus of texts translated from Hebrew into East Slavic. Among the translations are astronomical, historical, philosophical and biblical texts.² Scholars debate the existence of translations from Hebrew in Rus’ before this period, with Mescherskij (1958) and Alekseev (1987) among others asserting that some pre-Mongol translations exist. These scholars cite two pieces of evidence of the early translation practice from Hebrew: the book of Esther, and Josippon, a Hebrew language rendering of Josephus Flavius’ Jewish War.³
Lunt and Taube’s thorough philological analyses of the Slavonic book of Esther (Lunt and Taube 1988; 1998) prove that Esther was not translated from Hebrew, but rather from a lost Judeo-Greek manuscript. Although Taube cautiously groups Esther under “Literature of the Judaizers: Early period,” its connection to heresy seems tenuous.  

The situation with *Josippon* is more complex. Two *Josippon* texts have been translated from Hebrew to Slavic:

- Fragments embedded in the *Hypatian Chronicle*, under the year 1110.
- A larger fragment in the *Ellinsko-Rimskij Letopisec Vtoroj Redakcii*. This fragment is known as *Plenenie Ierusalima Tretje Titovo*, and it is translated from a special later Hebrew reworking of the Hebrew *Josippon*, done sometime between 10th and 15th centuries.

*Plenenie*, the Slavic translation in the *Hellenic and Roman Chronicler*, is dated to the 13th-14th century by Tvorogov (1975, 2001), but this dating is disputed by Taube, who argues for the translation to have been made in the late 14th or early 15th century (Taube 2008; Taube 2005). Although Taube includes the Josippon fragments under the rubric “The Literature of the Judaizers: early period,” their connection to the heresy is unclear (Taube 2005: 188-9).

The second group of texts, which Sobolevskii (1903) titled “The Literature of the Judaizers” and which have been traditionally associated with the heresy, includes such works as Emmanuel Bar Yaakov Bonfils’ *Shestokryl*, the so-called *Logika*, the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Tajnaja Tajnyx*, and the Vilnius Codex 262, which contains a collection of nine Old Testament hagiographa, five of which were published by Altbauer (1992). In addition to these, the so-called Laodicean Epistle, a short text containing the so-called *Poem of the Soul* in 8 lines, circulated widely in Muscovy and is associated with Feodor Kuritsyn. This text lies outside of the current discussion.
due to its brevity, lack of direct or indirect discourse, and lack of an attested Hebrew source that could be used for comparative analysis (however, see extensively Taube 1995, 1998).

Even though the association of the second group of texts with the heresy is traditional, only two texts – *Shestokryl* and *Logika* – are connected to the heresy by Gennadij, who mentions both books as being in the heretics’ possession.

Gennadij’s fascination with *Shestokryl*, an astronomical treatise that contained calculations of moon phases, was motivated by eschatological concerns. According to the Russian Orthodox calendar, the end of the world was expected in the year 7000 AM (1492AD). Anticipating this cataclysmic event, the Orthodox calendar was calculated only until the summer of 1492. Gennadij talks about *Shestokryl* extensively in a letter to Prokhor (1487; AFED 410-411). In this epistle he accuses the heretics of “stealing years” from the calendar using Jewish calculations (… которые лета украли у нас еретици жировскими числы …) that are contained in *Shestokryl*. According to Pliguzov, “it is unclear where Gennadij obtained *Shestokryl*, whether from the heretics or elsewhere” (Pliguzov 1992: 270); however, the connection of *Shestokryl* to the heretics seems clear, since Gennadij mentions the heretics studying this text in order to confuse Christians (а что Шестокрыл они себе изучив, да тем прельщают христианство); both Gennadij and the heretics were interested in the correct dating of the end of the world, and both parties seem to have been using *Shestokryl* to argue their points.

The second translation from Hebrew mentioned by Gennadij is *Logika*. In his letter to Ioasaf (1488), the archbishop provides a list of 12 books available to the heretics. Among the texts mentioned are biblical books, collections of aphorisms, and polemical writings against various heretical movements. *Logika* is the only text mentioned which is unarguably associated with the Judaizers:
‘да есть у вас в Кириллове или в Фарафонтове или на каменном книге: Сильвестр папа Римский, да Афанасий Александрийский, да Слово Козмы прозвитера на новоявлиющуюся ересь на богумилю, да послание Фотея патриарха ко князю Борису Болгарскому, да Пророчества, да Бытия, да Царства, да Притчи, да Менандр, да Иисус Сирахов, да Логика, да Деонисей Ареопагит? Зане же те книги у еретиков все есть’ (AFED 320).

The text known as Logika is, in fact, a compilation of two separate treatises, Al-Ghazālī’s Intentions of the Philosophers, and Moses Maimonides’ Logical Vocabulary (on Logika, see Taube, forthcoming, and Taube, 2005).

An additional text associated with this group is the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise Secret of Secrets, or Tajnaja Tajnyx, with a number of interpolations by Maimonides and Rhases. Though most scholars accept this text as a part of the Judaizers’ corpus, Luria in particular resisted its inclusion:6

[нет] основания для того, чтобы включать в число памятников, относящихся к новгородским еретикам, и другие переводы еврейской научно-философской литературы, предпринимавшиеся в Западной Руси одновременно с переводом «Шестокрыла» и «Логики», например […] апокрифическое сочинение «Тайная Тайных», о котором ни словом не упоминает ни Геннадий, но какой-либо другой источник. (AFED 144)

If not the heresy, it is unclear what else could have motivated the translation of Tajnaja Tajnyx at this time, since no new scientific or philosophical translations from Hebrew appeared before the heresy or after its demise. However, my argument concerning Tajnaja Tajnyx is textual/linguistic, augmenting the historical argument for inclusion of this text in the corpus.
As I will show in the discussion below, a certain textual feature, namely translating indirect discourse as direct, unifies the translations from Hebrew into Slavic. Even more specifically, both *Logika* and *Tajnaja Tajnyx* show a reframing of the text involving direct discourse, which points at these texts’ common origin, and likely a common addressee.

Table 1 summarizes the texts used in the article, and the abbreviations used to refer to them.

Table 1. Texts with Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Translated Slavic Text</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josippon (Hebrew, 10th century, translation and adaptation of Josephus Flavius’ <em>Jewish War</em>, Latin)</td>
<td>HJos</td>
<td>Fragment in the <em>Hypatian Chronicle</em></td>
<td>SlJos-Hyp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reworking of Josippon (Hebrew, 10-15th cent) Huntington MS 345 in the Bodleian</td>
<td>HJos-Hunt</td>
<td>Fragment in the <em>Ellinsko-Rimskij Lepotisec</em> of the 2nd redaction</td>
<td>SlJos-EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll of Esther (Judeo-Greek, translated from Hebrew – presumed to exist but not attested)</td>
<td><em>JGEsth</em></td>
<td>Slavonic Book of Esther</td>
<td>SlEsth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll of Esther (Septuagint, Greek – translated from Hebrew)</td>
<td>GEsth</td>
<td>Maxim Grek’s translation of Esther</td>
<td>SlEsthMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll of Esther (Hebrew Bible)</td>
<td>HEsth</td>
<td>Translation in Viln.Cod.262</td>
<td>SlEsth262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of Daniel (Hebrew Bible)</td>
<td>HDan</td>
<td>Translation in Viln. Cod. 262</td>
<td>SlDan262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maimonides, Logical Vocabulary</td>
<td>HLog</td>
<td>first part of <em>Logika</em></td>
<td>SlLog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sod HaSodot</em>, translated into Hebrew</td>
<td>HSS</td>
<td><em>Tajnaja Tajnyx</em></td>
<td>SITT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Change of Deixis, I: Signaling worldview

The simplest and nevertheless striking examples of deixis change in our corpus occur when the translator replaces the text-internal viewpoint for his own, indicating his affiliation and biases. Thus in example (1), the Jewish affiliation of the translator is signaled by the inserted
personal deictic pronoun ‘our’ to change *enemies* to *our enemies* in the phrase discussing the fall of Jerusalem:

(1) **HEB.**

va-ismexu ojvim al-mišbate-ha

and-rejoiced.3pl enemies on-capture-her

‘And enemies rejoiced over its downfall’ (HJos-Hunt)

**SLAV.**

i radovaša sja vrazi naši paguby ego radi

and rejoiced REFL enemies our downfall his for.the.sake.of

‘And our enemies rejoiced over its downfall’ (SIJos-EL2)

Similarly in (2), an example from the biblical Scroll of Daniel from the Viln. 262 Codex, text-internal personal deictic pronoun *them* is exchanged in translation with a text-external *us*, signaling once again the translator’s Jewish affiliation:

(2) **HEB.**

ve-ihi ba-hem mi-bnej jehuda daniel xanania mishael ve-azaria

and-was in-them of-sons Judah Daniel Xanania Mishael and-Azaria

‘And there were among them from the sons of Judah, Daniel, Hanania, Mishael and Azaria’

(HDan 1:6)

**SLAV.**

i bylo meži nami ot synov ţ iudinyx daniel ţ xananya mišaľ ţ azarja
and was among us from sons Judah.GEN.PL. Daniel Hanania Mishael Azaria

‘And there were among us from the sons of Judah, Daniel, Hanania, Mishael and Azaria’

(SIDan262)

The nami ‘us’ in example (2) might seem like a misspelling of nimi ‘them’, especially in such an otherwise extremely faithful translation as Daniel and Cod.262 in general (on the verbatimness of Cod. 262 translations c.f. Altbauer 1992); however, another occurrence of changed deixis in Daniel supports my view that (2) is not a scribal error.

In example (3), another excerpt from the book of Daniel, the original sentence uttered by the king reads: ‘truly your god is the god of gods and the king of kings’ (referring to the god of the Hebrews); in the translation, the sentence is changed to ‘truly our god is the god of gods…’ – a substitution that does not make sense text-internally; it reflects the Jewish translator’s worldview rather than the speaker/king’s worldview in the original:

(3) ARAMAIC.

ענה מלכא לדניאל ואמר מן קשט די אלהכון הוא אלה אלהיו ומרא מלכין

answered king to-Daniel and-said truly god-yours he god gods and-lord

malkin

kings

‘The king answered to Daniel and said, truly your god is the god of gods and the lord of kings’

(HDan 2:47)

SLAV.П†твbreшта црь и реｉ данилови въ тицету бъ нашь це бъ бгомъ и гъ господем црь црёмъ
answered king and said daniel-DAT in truth god ours that-one is god gods.DAT and gospodь gospodem tsarь tsaremь
lord lords.DAT king kings.DAT
‘The king answered and said to Daniel, truly our god is the god of gods and the lord of lords and the king of kings’ (SlDan262)

The changes of pronominal reference discussed above are quite clearly motivated by the translator’s worldview. The reference in the texts is changed from text-internal orientation of the speakers to the text-external orientation of the translator.

4. Change of Deixis, II: Reported Speech

In a larger group of examples in the corpus, deictic shifts occur specifically in reported speech, and the motivation for such a change is not an obvious one. Texts included by Taube in his “first chronological group” associated with the heresy especially exhibit this phenomenon. This includes Plenenie and two Josippon fragments in the Hypatian Chronicle, as well as the Slavonic Esther translated from Judeo-Greek, the association of which with the Judaizers is unclear.

In the Slavonic translation of the Judeo-Greek Esther, direct discourse is introduced and emphasized where indirect discourse and/or impersonal pronominal reference exists in the Hebrew (which is the source of the lost Judeo-Greek text). Thus in example (4), the Hebrew has an impersonal third-person plural reference.
And the king’s young men, his servants, said, let us look for good-looking maidens for the king’ (HEsth)

The Slavic translation of the Judeo-Greek Esther transforms the impersonal third-person reference into first-person plural reference. Here, the task of finding appropriate maidens is reassigned from some hypothetical persons to the speakers themselves:

(5) SLAV. И рыша отроци цареви слугы его да поискали быхомъ цареви дѣвыхъ девиць добровзорных

i rēša otroci carevi slougy ego

and said youths king.Gen. servants his
da poiskali byxomъ carevi děvyxъ dēvicъ dobrovzornyx

let search be.1pl king.Dat. virginal.Acc. virgins.Acc. good-looking.Acc

‘and the king’s youths, his servants, said, let us look for good-looking maidens for the king’ (SlEsth)

Unlike in the translation of Esther from Judeo-Greek, the other two translations of Esther (the Cod.262 Esther translated from Hebrew, and the Esther in the Ostroh Bible, translated from the Septuagint by Maksim Grek) retain the impersonal 3rd plural reference:
(6) Slav. 1 И рекли младенци царя слуги его поискали бы царю молодицы дъвокъ добровидны³

and said youths king,GEN servants his

search. PL CONJ king.DAT maidens.ACC virgins.ACC good-looking.ACC

‘and the youths the king’s servants said, let them search for good looking maidens virgins

for the king’ (SlEsth262)

Slav.2 И рѣша да взьштут царя дѣвиць нерастлѣнны красны зракомъ

and said.3PL let find.3PL king.DAT maidens.ACC uncorrupted.ACC

beautiful.ACC sight.INSTR

‘and [they] said, let them find for the king uncorr upted maidens, beautiful to see’

(SIEsthMG)

Even more striking are the deictic changes found in the two Jossipon texts, which constitute a historical narration. In (7), an example from Plenenie, the Hebrew has indirect discourse, whereas in the Slavic this clearly changes to direct discourse:

(7) Heb. ויתחנן אליהם ענני לא להחיותו כי אם לקברו

ve-ithanen alei-hem ananii lo lehahiot-o ki-im lekavr-o
and begged to them Ananii NEG live-him but bury-him

‘And Anani begged them not to keep him alive but to bury him’ (HJos-Hunt)

SLAV. И моли са имъ ананиа глап убййте ма нъ толико погребите ма

i moli sjq im Anania glagolja oubijte mjaj

and prayed.AOR REFL to.them Anania saying kill.2PL.IMP me

пъ толико погребите mjaj

but only bury.2PL.IMP me

‘And Anania begged them, saying “Kill me, but only bury me”’ (SIJos-EL2)

In (8), both Hebrew and Slavic have first-person narration. However, the Hebrew renders the speaker’s admonition with an infinitival indirect discourse ‘to capture them alive,’ while the Slavic has the more dramatic direct discourse:

(8) HEB.

veetsak la-hem letafsa-m hayim

and-shouted-1SG to-them to capture-them living.PL

‘And I shouted to them to capture them alive’ (HJos-Hunt)

SLAV. И глаголъ имъ вдаите са живы

i glagolaxomъ imъ vdaite sjq živy

and said.1SG them.DAT give.2PL.IMP REFL alive.PL

‘And I shouted to them, “Surrender yourselves alive”’ (SIJos-EL2)
Out of eight instances of indirect discourse in the Hebrew, seven are rendered as direct in Slavic; however, one example of indirect discourse remains unchanged:

(9) **HEB.**

\[\text{ve-ithanen ela-v od lehitvadot}\]

and-begged to-him more to confess

‘and he begged him to confess some more’ (HJos-Hunt)

**SLAV.** И моли се моу пакы да бы са далъ ему исповѣдати преа смѣртно ищ

\[\text{i moli sja emu paky da by sjq dalb emu ispovѣdati pred smertiju ix}\]

and prayed REFL him.DAT so that CONJ REFL allow him to confess before deaths them.GEN

‘and he begged him to allow him to have a confession before their deaths’ (SIJos-EL2)

The tendency of the Josippon translator to introduce direct discourse sometimes leads him astray, as in (10), where the change of deixis results in a major meaning shift:

(10) **HEB.**

\[\text{u-kho tomru le-bnayahu asher natan nafš-o be-jad ojva-v}\]

and-thus say.2pl to-bnayahu that gave soul-his in-hand enemies-his

and-lead.3pl-him in-captivity

‘and tell so to Bnayahu, that gave his soul [surrendered] to his enemies and they led him into captivity’ (HJos-Hunt)

**SLAV.** Речете же к нему тако, яко даше дѣю свою в руцѣ врагъ своихъ и ведоша и в плѣнь
rečete že k nemu tako, jako daste dušju svoju

tell.2PL EMPH to him thus that give.2PL soul.ACC.SG self.ACC.SG

v rucě vragů svoixů i vědoša i v plěně

in hands.ACC.PL enemies.GEN.PL self.GEN.PL and led-3PL him in captivity

‘And tell him thus, that you would give your souls into the hands of your enemies, and they led him into captivity.’ (SLJos-EL2)

Direct discourse translates indirect discourse not only in Plenenie, but also in the Hypatian Chronicle fragments. The only example of indirect discourse in this short fragment is rendered into direct discourse:

(11) HEB.

ve-yatsa ve-ivakesh ha-melekh mi-hakohen lidrosh et ha-elohim ba-ado

and exited and-asked the-king from-the-priest to ask PRON the-god for-him

al-pi ha-orim vehatumim im yilekh le-milxama al daryavesh

by the-orim and the-tumim whether goes.3SG to-war upon Daryavesh

‘And he went out and asked the [Great] Priest to ask God about him by divination whether he should go to war against Darius’ (HJos)

SLAV. И пришёлъ вопроси ерѣвъ иду ли на дарьа

i prišedъ vprosí erʹevě idu li na darja

and come.3SG.PPART asked priests.ACC.PL go.1SG INTERROG upon Darij

‘And coming, he asked the priests, “should I go against Darius?”’ (SIJos-Hyp)
What motivates these substitutions? One possible answer involves the status of indirect discourse in early Slavic. While indirect discourse appears in Old Church Slavic translations from Greek, some scholars claim that indirect discourse was only a calque, nonexistent as an independent construction in Slavic (Xaburgaev: 1986, among others). On the other hand, Collins (1996) argues for the attestation of indirect discourse in Old Church Slavic by showing multiple examples of such discourse in various translated sources. Collins asserts that indirect discourse in Early Slavic existed as an independent grammatical feature. Voloshinov, examining original Old Russian texts, notes that indirect discourse is “extremely rare” in the chronicles (Voloshinov 1973:120ff). The findings of Perelmutter (2009) support this: I show that indirect discourse in the original Old Russian *Primary Chronicle* appears only six times out of 752 instances of reported speech counted in that text. These findings indicate that 1) indirect discourse is marginal in the Russian Primary Chronicle, but 2) despite its rarity, indirect discourse as an original construction is extant in East Slavic as early as the 12th century.

As examples (6) and (9) attest, indirect discourse is also found in translations from Hebrew – thus, the deictic changes in the Judaizers’ corpus cannot not be explained simply by unavailability of indirect discourse in the target language. On the other hand, medieval Slavic translations tend to closely follow the original in form and meaning. Altbauer (1992), writing about the Judaizers’ translations of Biblical scrolls contained in Vilnius Codex 262, calls our attention to the “slavish, literal manner of the translation” (1992:16). When a translator has a choice of following the original faithfully, and instead repeatedly – though not exclusively – chooses another option, the question of motivation becomes crucial.
One way to account for the substitution of indirect discourse with direct is to suggest that direct discourse might be a feature of the historical register. Evidence of the original historical material points this way: as discussed above, Voloshinov suggests that indirect discourse is rare in the original Old Russian chronicles, and I found this to be correct for the *Povest’ Vremennykh Let*. The historical register hypothesis is supported by findings in the current corpus: in the historical *Josippon* translations, indirect discourse is systematically rendered as direct. On the other hand, in Biblical texts such as those contained in Cod.262, as well as in Biblical translations from Greek (including SlEsthMG), indirect is not, as a rule, replaced with direct discourse.

The Slavonic book of Esther, translated from Judeo-Greek, might be the exception, as it exhibits deictic shifts despite being a Biblical translation. However, I hypothesize that the earliest translation of Esther from Judeo-Greek was not perceived as a Biblical text, but rather as an historical one. Lunt and Taube, in their critical edition of Esther (1998), note that this translation was often placed in MSS alongside other historical Old Testament books, and could even be included in a Special Chronograph (Хронограф особого состава) alongside Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Hamartolos:

“The compilers of the chronographs and various types of Paleja obviously regarded these OT books as historical sources, to be used in whole or in part to retell events of the past”


My hypothesis is further supported by the evidence of the Slavic translation of *Hamartolos*, described by Istrin as a reliably faithful, even verbatim, translation: “Обыкновенно он [the translator-RP] следовал довольно точно своему оригиналу, переводя слово за слово” (Istrin
However, multiple renderings of indirect as direct discourse appear in this text and are remarked upon by Istrin (Istrin 1922, vol.2: 218). Thus in example (12),

(12) GREEK. δηλοί Κύρω, ἢ παραχωρήσαι αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν Περσῶν ἢ δέξασθαι τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐν πολέμῳ
dēloi             Kurōi         ē         paraxōrēsai   autōi       tēn basileian declare. 3SG Cyrus.DAT either yield he.DAT the kingdom.ACC
Persēn                 ē     dexasthai tēn parousian autou     en   polemōi Persian.GEN.PL or receive the arrival.acc he.GEN.SG in war.DAT.SG
‘he declares to Cyrus either to yield to him the kingdom of the Persians, or to receive his arrival in war’

SLAV.
Посла къ Коуроу: любо встанисц црства своєго, аще ли ни, да придоу на та войною
posla k  Kouru: ljubo ostanisjä carstva svoego, ašte li ni, sent to Cyrus: either remove.REFL kingdom self.GEN, if SUBJ not,
da pridu na ýq vojnoju let come.1SG upon you war.INDR
‘[he] sent [a letter] to Cyrus: ‘abdicate, and if not, I will go to war with you’.
(Hamartolos, v.2, 218)

Based on the examined evidence, the register hypothesis seems to suggest that the substitution of indirect for direct discourse is not localized in translations from Hebrew, but is also attested in translations from Greek.
5. Change of Deixis, III: Reframing

In section 4, I suggested that the translation of indirect discourse as direct in the Slavic might be a convention of the historical register, a convention that is not dependent on the language of the translation. In this section, I will discuss two texts translated from Hebrew in the late 15th century that use direct discourse to reframe the translated text.

Both the Slavic version of the *Logika*, and the Slavic version of *Tajnaja Tajnykh*, rework indirect discourse as direct. Like other texts that transform indirect to direct in translation, these texts are secular (philosophical, scientific and historical) in nature. Another group of texts translated from Hebrew in this period, namely the Biblical hagiographa contained in Viln.262, do not exhibit this phenomenon.

While the evidence of indirect discourse being replaced with direct in *Logika* and *Tajnaja Tajnykh* seems to support the hypothesis advanced in Section 4, the situation here is more complex. Unlike in *Josippon*, where replacing indirect discourse with direct is done by default and does not change the tone and composition of the work, *Logika* and especially *Tajnaja Tajnykh* change the very frame of the text.

Reported speech in the original Hebrew philosophical texts grouped in Slavic under *Logika* (Rambam’s “Words of Logic”, Al-Ghazali’s *Philosophical Intentions*, and supplementary medical texts such as *De Ashthmate*) is present exclusively in the beginnings, where the text is framed as indirect discourse produced by the philosopher/narrator. All those instances of indirect discourse were translated as direct in the Slavic. The example below illustrates the change of deixis in *Logika*, which begins:
Amar rabej-nu moshe ben karamza”l shaal sar ahad

mi-baalej ha-xokhmot ha-toriot

of-owners the-wisdoms the-knowledge

u-mi-anšej ha-tsaxut u-melitsa be-lašon ha-arav

and-from-people the-purity and-flourish in-language Arab

le-ish ayen ba-malekhet higayon ve-ivaer lo
to-man look in-craft logic and-explain to.him

‘Our rabbi Moses Maimonides said, a certain lord, wise and eloquent in Arabic asked for a man to study philosophy and explain to him…’ (HLog)

SLAV. Рече моисеи египтанинъ пыталъ ма пань единъ премдръ и ръчникъ арабскій о премудрости словеснои иже нарицаема логика,

абыхъ ему розсказал...

reče moisej egiptjaninь pytаль mja panь edinь premudrь

said Moses egyptian asked.3sg me lord one wise

i rečnikъ arabskij o premudrosti slovesnoj jaže naricaema logika

and speaker Arabic about wisdom wordly that.ACC called logic

abyxъ emu rozskazal

so.that.1sg.subj him tell
'Moses the Egyptian (e.g. Maimonides) said, I was asked by a certain lord wise and a speaker of Arabic, about the wisdom of words that is called Logic, so that I would explain to him…'

Even more striking is the case of *Tajnaja Tajnykh*, a volume of advice to kings attributed to Aristotle, who is advising Alexander the Great. In the Hebrew version of this text, indirect discourse is not frequent; rather, advice appears in a series of gnomic impersonal statements such as ‘it is appropriate for the king to do X.’ In Slavic, the volume has been reframed as a conversation between Aristotle and Alexander. Direct discourse replaces all gnomic utterances, and is, moreover, inserted liberally in places where it does not appear in the original. Example (14) illustrates a replacement of an impersonal third-person aphorism with a second-person admonition to Alexander:

(14) HEB. כל מתיות הוא גדולה על המלך להרגיל עצם לכל גדרי כוחו כל חולם מבלי שיעוף.

because in the beginning what that-appropriate on the-king to accustom himself to-honor all restrictions faith-his

kulan mibli she-yaaazov mi-injaney-hem davar u-mi-azhara-tam

all without that-leave.3SG of-things-their thing and-from-warnings-their

ve-yar’e le-khol hamon emunat-o

and-show.3SG.FUT to-all multitude faith-his

‘Since first the king should school himself to honor all restrictions of his faith, all
[of them,] without forgetting a single restriction or warning, ‘and to show his faith to the people’ (HSS)

SLAV. а честовала бы еси все вѣтви закона своего а не отпускаи ничего заповѣдеи закона, дабы видѣлъ весь народъ вѣрованіе твое

a čestovalъ by esi vsi větví zakona svoego
and honor.SG.PAST.PART SUBJ be.2SG all branches law.GEN.SG self.GEN.SG

a ne otpuskai ničego zapovědej zakona
and NEG leave nothing commandments.GEN.PL law.GEN.SG

daby vidělъ vesь narodъ věrovanie tvoe
so that see.3SG all nation belief yours

‘and you should honor all branches of your law, and do not slack in any
commandments of the law, so that the whole people could see your faith’ (SITT)

In Tajnaja Tajnykh, direct discourse does not simply replace direct – it is introduced massively, reframing the text as an advice manual from the first-person narrator, the wise philosopher, to the second-person royal addressee. The reframing of Logika and accompanying scientific texts is less massive, but nevertheless can also be interpreted as a reframing of the work – in Slavic, it becomes a lesson in philosophy directly addressed to the highborn recipient.

6. Discussion and conclusions

Deictic changes are prominent in many of the translations from Hebrew, but the changes are of different types. Not all types are present in all of the texts. Table 2 summarizes the findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>ID &gt; DD</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLY</td>
<td>SIEsth</td>
<td>yes, 3 instances</td>
<td>Historical (Biblical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Deictic Changes</td>
<td>Worldview</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlJos-EL2</td>
<td>yes, all ID &gt; DD except one (8 instances); in addition, examples of deictic changes that signal worldview</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlJos-Hyp</td>
<td>yes, all ID &gt; DD (one instance)</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDAIZERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlEsth262</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Biblical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlDan262</td>
<td>no (but examples of deictic changes signal worldview)</td>
<td>Biblical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Sl262 texts contained in Altbauer (1992)</td>
<td>upon cursory investigation, no (but examples of deictic changes signal worldview)</td>
<td>Biblical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITT</td>
<td>yes, massive reframing; even impersonal gnomic advice is reframed as a conversation</td>
<td>Secular/Advice to Kings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SlLog and three supplements</td>
<td>yes, all occurrences (ID occurs in these texts only in the beginnings, introducing the narrator) – a less striking example of reframing</td>
<td>Secular / Philosophy and Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe that in order to answer why the deixis was changed, we should first ask ourselves who changed it.

Taube convincingly demonstrates that translations from Hebrew into Ruthenian were a collaborative endeavor: “the Jewish translator has in front of him the Hebrew version, or several Hebrew versions of the text to be translated, and he dictates it to his Slavic collaborator, who puts it down in writing, occasionally “correcting” it according to the scribal conventions he is accustomed to” (Taube 2005: 190). Since two people (and their two representative cultures) are involved in the process of translation, the motivation for deictic changes would come from one of these sides.

It is possible to hypothesize that such a translation-as-performance could easily lend itself to the observed reorientation of reported speech. Direct discourse is usually perceived as more dramatic than indirect, thus Lunde remarks that direct discourse allows the narrator to create vividness (enargeia) in a text (Lunde 2004:10). However, since not all texts exhibit the change of indirect to direct, the performative aspect of the translations alone does not account for this phenomenon.
Based on the data above, three separate motivations for deictic changes suggest themselves. First, the deictic changes discussed in section 3 are conditioned by the worldview of the Jewish translator, which is reflected in the substitutions.

Second, the translation of indirect as direct in texts of historical nature are most likely motivated by linguistic conventions of the historical register, which must have been known to the Slavic scribes as they collaborated with the Jewish translators. However, since this phenomenon is observed in the earlier texts, whose association with the Judaizers is unclear, this data does not necessarily shed new light upon the heresy.

Third, the reframing of Logika and Tajnaja Tajnykh presents a separate interesting case. Logika is known to belong to the corpus of the Judaizers from Gennadij’s letters. The deictic changes in Logika are not massive enough to undoubtedly classify as a reframing – one can argue that Logika, like Josippon, is a secular text in which the shift from indirect to direct discourse is conditioned by genre conventions. However, this then implies that trained Slavic-speaking scribes knowledgeable about these conventions were collaborating with the Hebrew translators, and such a collaboration cannot be accidental. This would imply that, in addition to Jew(s) arriving to Novgorod, some trained Slavic scribes traveled back to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and collaborated with Jews to produce Logika for their Novgorodian clients.

On the other hand if, as I believe, the changes in Logika constitute a reframing, then the reframing of Tajnaja Tajnykh is especially significant in comparison. The reframing textually links these two texts and suggests that the texts were translated with a noble, even royal addressee in mind. Ivan III is a likely candidate, since, by the end of the 15th century, he was certainly aware of the heresy, may have been among it sympathizers, and constituted a likely target for proselytizing.

Seebohm (1977) examined many of the Judaizers’ texts in order to analyze the heretics’ ideological makeup and their connections to Judaism. According to Seebohm, the heretics were interested in scientific and philosophical rather than religious literature. The choice of texts to translate, as well as some editorial emendations in the translations, suggest that reason was regarded by the heretics as the main foundation of a religion. The translated texts were of Jewish origin and emphasized a monotheistic worldview, which could easily be interpreted by the Church as anti-Trinitarian. It is therefore not surprising that the Russian Church saw the movement as Judaizing and sought to eradicate the movement.

Josippone is not an exact rendering of Flavius’s text, but a translation from another Latin version. This Latin version is based on Josephus Flavius but has many added Christian elements, and is attributed to Hegesippus in the 2nd century AD (some scholars dispute the attribution to Hegesippus, attributing it instead to a Pseudo-Hegesippus working around 370AD). In the 10th century a Jew from southern Italy translated portions of this account from Latin to Hebrew, removing many Christian elements and adding details from other Jewish sources.

The connection of the Esther translation from Judeo-Greek to the heresy is doubtful especially considering the fact that Esther was translated again twice in the 15th-early 16th century: from Hebrew, as a part of Viln. 262, a manuscript associated with the Judaizers; and once again from Greek by Maxim Grek; it seems that the Slavonic Esther translation from Judeo-Greek satisfied neither the heretics nor the Orthodox Christians.

A single 15th century manuscript of this Hebrew reworking is located in the Bodleian library (Huntington 345 manuscript).

In a similar vein see Klier 1997, who attributes the translation of Tajnaja Tajnykh to “the percolation of pseudo-Aristotelian works into Russia” (Klier 1997:339).
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