Simeon Dekker

University of Bern,
6, Hochschulstrasse, Bern, 3012, Switzerland
simeon.dekker@issl.unibe.ch

Features of the "diatribe" in the writings of Iosif Volotskii*

This article investigates to what extent features of the "Cynic-Stoic diatribe" (a dialogical mode of exposition encountered in polemical-didactic writings, which originated in Hellenistic Greek) are reflected in the writings of Iosif Volotskii (Joseph of Volokolamsk), most notably in his main polemical treatise against the so-called "Judaizers", known as the "Prosvetitel'" ("Enlightener," henceforth: P). The phenomenon of the diatribe will first be briefly introduced, both as regards its Greek origins as well as its transfer into Old Church Slavonic and its further development in Orthodox Slavic writings from the 10th century onwards. Next, some attention will be devoted to Iosif's background and the context of P. Some of the main features of the diatribe in P will then be presented and their use will be compared to Slavic translated texts as well as their Greek originals. It will be shown that the features of the diatribe in P. occur in an attenuated form and thus can be considered a residue of the diatribal mode of discourse organization. At the same time, some of these features clearly serve a pragmatic purpose of subjectivizing the discourse. This latter issue will be discussed on the basis of terminology developed by Fr. Récanati (1997), H. Clark (1996) and others.

Keywords: diatribe, Iosif Volotskii, historical pragmatics, parenthetical verbs, subjectification.

The Cynic-Stoic diatribe

The Cynic-Stoic diatribe is a dialogical mode of exposition, consisting of a set of rhetorical devices typically used in texts of a polemical-didactic character. The diatribe originated in Hellenistic times, most notably in the works of popular philosophers such as Bion (c. 335–245 BC) and Teles (fl. c. 235 BC), and became increasingly popular in Roman times, most notably through the works of Epictetus (c. 50–135 AD). Diatribal texts are not to be classified as a separate genre, though, but rather as a mode of discourse organization that can be encountered in texts of various genres. Typically, diatribal discourse is characterized by a dramatically performed discussion with an imagined interlocutor, whose views are strongly refuted as being logically flawed, morally inconsistent, heretical, etc. The diatribe remained popular in the Greek-speaking world over several centuries and was implemented in Biblical and Patristic writings, too, most notably by the apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans and the church father Chrysostom in many of his homilies. Through the widespread translation of these writings into Slavic from the 9th/10th century

---

onwards, the diatribe entered the Orthodox Slavic realm many centuries after its initial use in Hellenistic times[1].

The main impulse to the study of the diatribe in Biblical texts was given by R. Bultmann's [Bultmann 1910] analysis of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Follow-up studies, such as the one by S. K. Stowers [Stowers 1981] and A. J. Malherbe [Malherbe 1980], also concentrate on Paul's epistles. The implementation of the diatribe by Greek-speaking Patristic authors has so far been investigated rather scantily[2] Yet, in Patristic writings, the diatribe was deemed especially suitable to enter into a crusade against the various heresies that were around at the time by the intermediary of a fictitious opponent. The main characteristic of diatribal style, viz. the dramatic performance of a lively dialogue with a fictitious interlocutor, results in two levels of communication that need to be distinguished in the light of their discursive and rhetorical functions. One is the fictitious level, on which the author addresses his heretical opponent. The other is the real-life level, on which the author addresses his actual audience, e. g. a preacher addresses his hearers in church or the author of a book addresses his intended readership. This is important to underline, as censoring, reproving utterances are not intended for the actual audience, but for the fictitious, heretical interlocutor. To demarcate the two levels, parenthetical verbs are often used, most notably φησί(ν) in Greek and *рече* or *речеши* in Slavic. This will be discussed in more detail below, e. g. on the basis of example (14).

Even though the Greek Patristic sources have been understudied in regard to the use of diatribal strategies, research into its implementation in Slavic cannot be left in abeyance until a full study of the phenomenon in Greek is on its way. The main linguistic manifestations of the diatribe in Greek and Slavic are presented in tabular form (Table 1).

Table 1. **Diatribal formulae in Greek and Slavic**

Greek	Slavic	Function
ἀλλά "but…"	нъ	(as part of a "contradiction", the objection of the imaginary opponent)
τί οὖν "what then?"	что оу́бо	(to introduce a false conclusion)
μὴ γένοιτο "far be it from me"	не бѫди	(to rebut a false conclusion)
ὁρᾷς "don't you see?"	видѣ ли / видиши ли	(addressed to the imaginary opponent)
(ὦ) ἄνθρωπε "(o) man"	ꙗловѣче	(addressed to the imaginary opponent)
εἰπέ μοι "tell me!"	рьци ми	(to elicit a response from the imaginary opponent)
parenthetical φησί "says (he)"	рече / речеши	(to demarcate the opponent's "contradiction")

---

[1] Its most conspicuous exponents that have been identified so far are the 1073 "Izbornik" [Kakridis 2020] and Chrysostom's homilies in the "Codex Suprasliensis" [Dekker 2021a] and the "Zlatostruj" collection [Dekker 2021d]. The authoritative nature of Biblical and Patristic writings ensured a successful uptake of the diatribal style in a wide variety of original Slavic works as well. Consequently, the diatribe surfaced e. g. in the writings of John the Exarch, most notably in his "Hexaemeron" (including its original parts) [Dekker 2021b], but also in some of the homilies attributed to him [Dekker 2021c].

[2] Studies which address the use of the diatribe in Severian of Gabala and Anastasios Sinaites were conducted by K.-H. Uthemann [Uthemann 2005: 381–418; 2015: 333–367]. For more information on the diatribe, see [Capelle, Marrou 1957], which is a somewhat older, but full account of the diatribe in its Hellenistic and Patristic setting. For more recent applications of the concept to the epistles of Paul, see Ch. Song [Song 2004] and J. King [King 2018].

It should be noted that these Greek formulae have been selected from the most 'classical' exponents of the diatribe, such us Epictetus, the apostle Paul, etc. This does not mean that a text is only diatribal if all abovementioned features occur in it. In fact, some distinctly diatribal texts show only some of these formulae, most notably parenthetical *φησί/ рече/речеши*, and are still exponents of the diatribe.

It should be specified at this point that the ultimate aim of the present investigation is not rhetorical, but linguistic. Whereas D. Goldfrank [Goldfrank 2020] has laid the groundwork for a rhetorical investigation of Iosif's works, I want to examine the **linguistic** manifestations of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. This does not include a detailed analysis of each line of argumentation from a rhetorical perspective. Rather, I investigate to what extent the prototypically diatribal formulae are used in their original function, from a pragmatic perspective; in other words, I investigate how much of their original **pragmatic** functionality, as seen in Greek, was left intact in Iosif's original Slavic compositions. C. Ilie [Ilie 2018: 92] succinctly formulates a relevant distinction between rhetoric and pragmatics, viz. that "pragmatics focuses on language as it is used by human beings, whereas rhetoric focuses on human beings as they use language". In that light, the **rhetorical** function of the diatribal formulae, though important, remains in the background.

The historical background to Iosif's polemical writings

P[3] is not explicitly dated. Its exact year of writing is still a matter of debate, as all evidence is circumstantial. A. I. Alekseev [Alekseev 2019: 325] adduces indirect evidence for his thesis that the main core of the Long redaction of P, consisting of 13 chapters, was written in 1499–1502 and three more chapters were added between 1502 and 1506. The Short redaction consisting of 11 chapters is considered to be secondary. I shall, therefore, investigate the text of the Long redaction.

The immediate historical background to the emergence of P is the rise of a social and religious movement, which its Orthodox opponents in retrospect came to designate as *eres' zhidovstvuiūshchikh* "heresy of the Judaizers." The movement initially gained ground in Novgorod, and afterwards in Moscow, too. The exact nature of the heresy remains somewhat unclear, because P is the main source of information about the Judaizers. Their own "heretical" writings have not survived, as the heretics were persecuted and eventually eliminated from the Russian lands. The polemical tone of P has given rise to the suspicion that the Judaizers' point of view might have been rendered in a skewed and prejudiced way. Goldfrank [Goldfrank 2018: 555] notes that P "cannot and should not at all be considered [a] reliable source for the dissidents".

The heresy emerged in close interaction with the heightened eschatological expectations of the day, fed by the fall of Constantinople and the end of the 7th millennium according the then current calendar. According to the Orthodox calendar, the theologically significant year 7000 (reckoned from the creation of the world) was expected to dawn in 1492. The vivid expectation of the approaching end of the world led to an existential

---

[3] In its 16th century copies, P does not have a title. It was known simply as "the book of the venerable Iosif" [Alekseev 2019: 207, fn. 1], which shows its indisputable prominence as the major work written by Iosif. Its extraordinary popularity is evidenced by the fact that P has come down to us in at least one hundred manuscript copies. A complete critical edition is yet far from being realized. The first scholarly edition of P was provided by I. IA. Porfir'ev in 1857 on the basis of seven manuscripts. For the present investigation, the third edition, published in 1896, is used.

crisis of values, which opened the door for various heterodox movements to gain ground among both clergy and laity. The heterogeneous nature of these movements led Iosif to posit various charges of — among other things — a Jewish, iconoclastic and anti-Patristic nature (cf. [Goldfrank 2018: 556, fn. 39])[4].

However convoluted the exact origins of the heretical movement may be, there must, of course, have been a real-life reason why Iosif decided to write a polemical-didactic treatise. The fact that there were (perceived) heretics is undisputable. The statesman (grand-princely clerk) Fëdor Kuritsỹn is mentioned more than once in P, together with protopope Alekseǐ and pope Denis. As such, the main proponents of the heresy were Iosif's real, not imaginary, opponents. I will leave the question unresolved as to the real or perceived influence of Jews on Orthodox clergy and laity in Novgorod and (later) Moscow. However, although it is probable that Iosif rendered the heretics' teaching in a biased way by means of literary framing, we can safely state that Iosif's anti-Judaic polemic writings were not just a literary form, as is sometimes claimed in older research about anti-Judaic polemic in Christian literature in general (e. g. A. Harnack [Harnack 1883: 63–74], as cited by Alekseev [Alekseev 2019: 330]), but were provoked by historical events (though not necessarily by direct Jewish influence).

As was noted already above, the diatribe surfaces in polemical-didactic texts. Both elements are very clearly present in P: its function is twofold. Although it is a polemical treatise that denounces the ideas and practices of the heretical Judaizers, its name "Prosvetitel'" also betrays its function as a didactic "manual" of Orthodox doctrine, intended for the instruction of Orthodox believers (cf. [Akekseev 2019: 331]). Thus, its double objective is both didactic and polemical. This is important to maintain in order to justify our analysis of P as a possible exponent of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, which always shows these two objectives, too. Alexéiev [Alexéiev 2015: 35] emphasizes that the increase in polemical literature indicated that the polemical function of texts became increasingly important. At the same time, he admits that the anti-Judaic writings were intended for the instruction of Orthodox believers and, possibly, potential Jewish converts to Christianity [Alekseev 2019: 330]. This underscores the fact that their didactic function remained indispensable, too.[5] In fact, the treatise was probably never meant to be read by

---

[4] Alekseev [Alekseev 2019: 334] decries the tendency that arose in "liberal" historiography to characterize Iosif as a conservative inquisitor and Orthodox bigot and reassures his readers that nothing is further from the truth. At the same time, he [Alekseev 2019: 152, 167] is unwavering in his conviction that Iosif's polemic is a phenomenon to be analyzed as profoundly medieval, rather than as part of a broader humanistic reform movement in Early Modern Europe. The latter position is maintained by, e. g. C. G. De Michelis [De Michelis 1993]. An opposite position, formulated by T. M. Seebohm [Seebohm 1977] and recommended and summarized by M. Taube [Taube 2016: 44–45], maintains that the heretical movement started within the Russian church without direct Western influence, but then became a "Bildungsbewegung" in rationalistic circles of secular administration. Taube [Taube 2019: 44] decries the fact that this interpretation has been neglected by both Soviet and Western scholars. Alekseev [Alekseev 2019] is adamant that there must have been a real, direct Jewish influence. Hösch [Hösch 1975] is far more critical of this perceived influence. It seems to be a safe middle way to conclude that "there is as yet little consensus as to which external teachings influenced it [i. e. the heresy of the Judaizers]: Rabbanite Jewish, Karaite, Waldensian, Hussite, 'Humanist', Bogomil, *Strigol'ničestvo*; or if it was an overall 'Krise der Tradition' within Orthodoxy" [Pereswetoff-Morath 2002: 103].

[5] Goldfrank [Goldfrank 2018: 555, fn. 39] also distinguishes a third function, viz. a (partially) inquisitorial one: "Iosif's doctrinal charges in *Prosvetitel'* against the alleged heretics make sense as polemical and pedagogical devices for a partially accusatory-apologetic, partially positive theological, and partially inquisitorial treatise." He seems to draw some parallels of this latter aspect with the Spanish Inquisition,

the heretical opponents, but by Orthodox believers who were to be warned against the dangers of Judaizing influences. Although recognizing the twofold function of treatises against the Jews, Alexéiev [Alexéiev 2015: 35] emphasizes the polemical function at the detriment of the didactic one, because he overemphasizes the real-life encounter with Jews in medieval Rus'. Reference to the perceived Jewish influence is more probably a rhetorical device that is used to discredit the heretical opponents. It does not necessarily refer to real adherents of Judaism. This means that the didactic purpose of the text supersedes its polemical purpose. In other words: polemical enactment only serves the purpose of didactic instruction.

Iosif's epistolary heritage consists of about 30 letters ("Poslaniia", henceforth: Posl.). Not all of them are polemical in character. Some of his polemical letters were written after and to some extent based on P [Alekseev 2019]. Although homilies and exhortatory treatises may be more susceptible to display diatribal features, a diatribal constellation of an epistolary enacted dialogue is not unheard of. One example are Chrysostom's letters to Olympias, in which he uses diatribal strategies to simulate a conversation. Thus, it will prove useful to incorporate Posl. into the investigation, too, although, as we shall see, the manifestation of the diatribe is less pronounced in Posl. than in P.

A final, brief remark about the language of Iosif's writings. It can be situated along a continuum between Russian Church Slavonic and vernacular Old Russian. The language of P leans more towards Church Slavonic, Posl. show more elements of the vernacular.

The development of the diatribe in Slavic

The diatribe was firmly established in Slavic texts translated from Greek in the Middle Ages. A significant array of diatribal elements has been proven in a number of Chrysostom's homilies as preserved in the "Codex Suprasliensis" [Dekker 2021a]. Furthermore, John the Exarch's "Hexaemeron" and some of his homilies show distinctly diatribal formulae, especially a variety of parenthetical verbs [Dekker 2021b; 2021c]. A similar array of parenthetical verbs has been identified in the 1073 "Izbornik" [Kakridis 2020]. The presence of diatribal texts in Slavic translation even led to further indigenous developments of diatribal style on Slavic soil, independently from the Greek originals, as is evidenced by the later manuscript traditions of the "Zlatostruj" collection of Chrysostomic homilies [Dekker 2021d]. They show a distinctly Slavic development in the use of parenthetical verbs to distinguish the fictitious opponent's voice, so that besides the 3SG. AOR *рече* the 2SG.PRES *речеши* also developed into a well-established diatribal formula in Slavic. In the earlier research just mentioned, it has been established that there was a transfer of Greek elements of discourse organization that were adopted in Slavic translation. Thus, these typical diatribal formulae, translated from Greek, allow us to regard the texts in question not just as dialogical in a general sense, but as heirs to the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. Furthermore, we have observed their consolidation and further development in Slavic manuscript traditions. The next stage of research is to investigate the presence of diatribal features in original Slavic works. More specifically, the question is: How many elements

---

with all the negative connotations it carries (something even Archbishop Gennadij already did implicitly in his time, though without mentioning the term, in his epistle to Zosima; see [Kazakova, Lur'e 1955: 378]). Goldfrank's approach smacks of a 'progressive', Western bias, lecturing us about the primitive nature of Iosif's convictions ("still very much medieval", [Goldfrank 2018: 549]).

of this diatribal style are retained in original, i. e. non-translated, writing in late medieval Rus', of which Iosif's writings are a prominent example?

Iosif's writings were indeed largely original, for P was written to meet specific demands of the then current situation, as the Orthodox church was seeking ways to respond to the heresy of the Judaizers. This does not mean that P in its entirety is completely original in the modern sense of the word. Iosif blends in a lot of quotations from Chrysostom and other church fathers, which he often marks explicitly. He certainly belonged to a cultural circle that was heavily influenced by Patristic writings. Thus, his use of diatribal elements does not come from anywhere.

Features of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe in Iosif's writings

Let us now move on to the way in which the diatribe surfaced in terms of specific linguistic elements in Iosif's writings. Goldfrank [Goldfrank 2020: 129] observes that the main component of Iosif's logical strategy was its "rhetorical efficacy". The question is now: to what extent does this rhetorical efficacy crystallize as "canonical", prototypical elements of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe? So far, no one has ever explicitly linked Iosif's writings to the diatribe. Goldfrank [Goldfrank 2020: 119] identifies several features of Iosif's polemical and syllogistic reasoning in terms that remind one of the major features of the diatribe, e. g. the question *do you see* or "the contradictions of his imagined opponents". A closer look into possible parallels to the diatribe is thus justified (see Table 2, 3). I shall first present the (potentially) diatribal features I have identified in P and Posl. in tabular form. In the subsequent paragraphs I shall discuss the most significant observations on the basis of these data.

It should be noted that the three last formulae are completely absent from Posl. The reasons for this discrepancy will be discussed below. It can be stated at this point already that those formulae that do occur in Posl. can more easily be used in a non-diatribal sense, too. Therefore, although they were ultimately derived from the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, the

Table 2. **Diatribal formulae in P, arranged by chapter (*slovo*)**

Slovo →	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
Parenthetical verb (diatribal)	1			2			2	2	1		1				1	1	**11**
Parenthetical verb (quotative)	9			1				2	2		4				1	1	**20**
Видиши ли / зриши ли	2					1		3			1	1					**8**
Зри/виждь	4	1	4	4	3	8	9	6	1	1	7	3	1	1	1		**54**
Никакоже / да не будетъ (etc.)	3	2	1		1	5	1	1		3	3						**20**
Что оубо	1			1	1		1			1			2	1			**8**
Чл(овѣ)че							1	1	2								**4**
All formulae	**20**	**3**	**5**	**8**	**5**	**14**	**14**	**15**	**6**	**5**	**16**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**3**	**2**	**125**

Table 3. **Diatribal formulae in P and Posl. compared**

	P	Posl.	Total
Parenthetical verb (diatribal)	11	1	**12**
Parenthetical verb (quotative)	20	9	**29**
Видиши ли / зриши ли	8	7	**15**
Зри/виждь	54	20	**74**
Никакоже / да не будетъ (etc.)	20	0	**20**
Что оубо	8	0	**8**
Чл(овѣ)че	4	0	**4**

way in which Iosif implemented them in Posl. and, to some extent, in P, too, deviates from their classical setting in Hellenistic, New Testament and Patristic texts, as well as in translated Slavic texts. Before elaborating on this claim, we shall first turn to the other major diatribal formulae which occur in both P and Posl.

Before proceeding, however, it is important to note that not all chapters of P show an equal number of diatribal features. This allows us to make an additional statement about the composition of P. As is evident from Table 2, the last five chapters have far fewer formulae that originate in the diatribe than the rest of P. This is a significant argument in favour of Alekseev's hypothesis that, although the Long redaction is primary, its final chapters were added at a later point, at a time when the polemical aspect of the conflict with the Judaizers was less pressing, and the didactic or devotional function had become more prominent. The rhetorical character of the latter part of P is, therefore, less pronounced.

We can now proceed to a discussion of the major diatribal formulae. I shall start with a rather typical and prominent feature that has been well identified as diatribal in Slavic texts translated from Greek [Dekker 2021a; 2021b; 2021c], viz. the question ὁρᾶς / *видѣ ли / видиши ли* "do you see," used reprovingly in the sense of "don't you see?" that occurs 15 times in Iosif's writings under consideration. (Alternatively, the verb ὁράω "to see" can occur as an imperative (ὅρα) — on its own or in combination with other imperatives; cf. example (5) below.) It is a well-attested diatribal formula in Chrysostom's homilies, including their Slavic translation in e. g. the *Codex Suprasliensis* (cf. [Dekker 2021a]):

(1) **Ὁρᾶς, ὦ ἀνόητε Ἰουδαῖε**, πῶς ἐκ προοιμίων τοῦ λόγου αἰσχύνην ὑμῖν προκαταγγέλλει ὁ προφήτης διὰ τὴν ἀπείθειαν ὑμῶν;
Видиши ли невѣрънꙑи ѽ жидовине· како ꙇⷭ прьва словесе· стꙑⷣѣниѥ вамъ прѣжде повѣдоуѥ пророкъ· ѡслоушаниꙗ дѣлꙗ вашего·
'**Do you see, o foolish** [OCS: **unbelieving**] **Jew**, how from the opening of [his] word the prophet announces beforehand shame for you because of your disobedience?' (Supr. 325, 25–28).

The vocative makes it very clear that the utterance functions on the fictitious level: Chrysostom obviously does not address his hearers in church as foolish Jews. This fictitious level is an important diagnostic criterion for the diatribe. The preacher dramatically performs a lively exchange with an imagined Jewish opponent. The addressee's identity is less obvious in the next example from P, where is seems that Iosif used the phrase видиши ли to address his readers in a more general way:

(2) И пакы: є̇да ꙗ̇мъ маса ю̇нꙋа; и̇ли кровь козлїю пїю; Но̑ пожри Бг҃ꙋ жертвꙋ хвалѣ. Самъ Бг҃ъ
сыи, которомꙋ Бг҃ꙋ велить пожрети жр҆ътвꙋ [sic] хвалꙋ; ви̇диши ли̇, како О̑ц҃ь здѣ Сн҃а
ꙗ̇вꙗꙗеть и Ст҃аго Дх҃а, и велить Имъ пожрѣти жерт҆вꙋ хвалѣ, а̇ не жерътвꙋ крови ю̇нꙋа и̇
козлїа;

And again: "Shall I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats? But offer unto
God a sacrifice of praise"[6]. Himself being God, to which God does he command to of-
fer a sacrifice of praise? **Do you see** that the Father here brings in the Son and the Holy
Spirit, and commands to offer them a sacrifice of praise, and not a sacrifice of blood of
bulls and goats?(S1, P68, R52)

This passage shows that the phrase *видиши ли* is preceded by a Biblical quote by
which Iosif seeks to make his point that the concept of the Trinity was already present in
the Old Testament. This is a pattern of usage that surfaces in all hitherto investigated dia-
tribal texts, too. Evidence is adduced in the form of a quote and then *видиши ли* is used
to hammer home the validity of the author's conclusion. Thus, an important function of
this diatribal formula has been preserved in spontaneous, original Slavic writing. Still, the
formula does not seem to occur in the context of an extended and dramatically performed
dialogue with a fictitious interlocutor. This would mean that the most fundamental crite-
rion for the diatribal use of this formula has not been met. We shall see that this applies to
other diatribal formulae in P, too.

The lack of dramatic performance becomes even more obvious in Posl., where the au-
thor uses the classic diatribal formula *видиши ли* in a derived, non-diatribal sense. It does
not seem to function on a fictitious level at all. We can thus analyze the following example
as an 'improper' implementation of an originally diatribal feature, which now only serves
as a fixed formula, but without its original diatribal setting:

(3) **Видиши ли**, господине, коли обет благодати пришед исплънити, и он съвръшин-
не [sic] явися Аврааму, того ради являя ему благодать свою, что от семени его хо-
тяща родитися Христос.
Do you see, lord, how, having come to fulfil the promise of grace, He manifested him-
self perfectly to Abraham, showing him His grace because from his seed Christ was to
be born?(Posl. p. 142)

This example clearly shows that the 2sg form *видиши ли* is addressed to the letter's
addressee, viz. Archimandrite Vassian, who is addressed as *господине* "lord, sir" through-
out the letter. Thus, Iosif adopted a well-known diatribal formula, but detached it from
its original diatribal setting and used it in non-layered discourse, i. e. consisting of the
real-life level only. The fact that this letter is of a polemical character may have served as
an incentive to use a diatribal phrase. We must, of course, keep in mind that a letter is a
completely different genre than a homily or a theological treatise. Nevertheless, the dia-
tribe was used in letters in Antiquity, too, e. g. by Chrysostom in his letters to Olympias. In
this way, the two levels are conflated. This also happens in homilies, where it is sometimes
left implicit or ambiguous (on purpose) whether an utterance is addressed to a fictitious
opponent or to the actual hearers in church. Thus, the two functions of the diatribe (po-
lemical and didactic) are held closely together.

A final word about this diatribal formula is to show an anomalous example:

---

[6] Psalm 50:13, 14 (in Slavonic 49:13, 14).

(4) Зри́ши ли, ꙗ҆ко ст҃ымъ Дх҃омъ вяза́ти и҆ разрѣша́ти и҆ ѿставла́ти грѣхѝ и҆ держа́ти.
Do you see that [they are to] bind and loosen by the Holy Spirit and to forgive sins and retain [them]? (S12, P469, R347)

This instance is rather unusual; I have encountered only one more example in a diatribal context, viz. in a homily by Grigorij Camblak [VMČ 1915: 888]. It cannot be considered a normal Slavic diatribal formula and we need a specific explanation for it. The author may have intended to write *зри* "see!" but then changed his mind and turned it into a question *зриши ли*. This reflection leads us to the next feature that occurs frequently (54 times) in P, viz. the imperatives *зри* and *виждь*. Their use in translated texts can be traced back to the Greek diatribal formula ὅρα 'see!' Their rhetorical function is roughly similar to that of *видиши ли*, i. e. it tends to occur after a quote, to hammer home the conclusion that the author draws from the quote. In the following example, after two lengthy Biblical quotes, intended to show that a law and a covenant are actually one and the same thing, this statement is once again explicitly made following *зри*:

(5) Зрѝ, ꙗ҆ко и҆ зако́нъ и҆ завѣ́тъ є҆ди́но є҆.
See that a law and a covenant are one! (S3, P124, R93)

Зри and *виждь* are far more frequent in P than *видиши ли*, but at the same time their function is less prototypically diatribal. They may be considered diatribal-like formulae only in a derivative sense. At the same time, their function is profoundly determined by pragmatic considerations that map the dynamic interplay between the heretical opponents and the Orthodox readers of the treatise. Using Récanati's [Récanati 1979] terminology, formulae like these belong to a double "margin", not to the "proposition"[7]. Similar underlying ideas behind this terminological distinction can be found in slightly different wordings in various authors' theories, e. g. Clark [Clark 1996], who posits the existence of two different "layers of action". Applied to the diatribe, it means that a fictitious and a real-life layer overlap simultaneously in the discourse. Layer 1 is intended for the readership of the book (or, in the case of a sermon, for the hearers in church). Layer 2 serves to uphold the fiction of an imagined, heretical interlocutor. Thus, the second margin, or Layer 2, is conducive to a felicitous transmission of the proposition. A formula like *видиши ли* or *виждь* is a metalinguistic utterance, showing that the proposition following it is to be taken for granted. At the same time, it is more than a metalinguistic comment, as it indicates that the following proposition cannot be the subject of any further discussion. These formulae can be considered a manifestation of the diatribe if they are addressed to a fictitious interlocutor, with a side glance at the reader of the treatise or hearer of the homily.

In all hitherto discussed examples, the author raises a claim as to the validity of the proposition. This shows the twofold character of utterances like this: it refers to itself and to the situation in the world; it has both a subjective and an objective dimension. This potentially makes it meet the demands of diatribal discourse. Thus, the imperative *зри* does not add anything to the propositional content of the ensuing proposition, viz. *a law and a covenant are one* in our example (5). It does, however, position the proposition vis-à-vis the context in which it is uttered. Thus, the margin is "un indicateur par lequel

---

[7] The term "margin" can be taken quite literally in some medieval manuscripts, where *зри* is actually inserted into the margin by a later scribe to mark passages deserving attention or approval.

l'énoncé… se pose de façon explicite comme affirmation" [Récanati 1979: 138]. What is more, "on *indique* que cette affirmation… n'est pas susceptible d'être discutée" [Récanati 1979: 140]. This is exactly the function of phrases like *видиши ли* and *зри* in the diatribe. The fictitious opponent's opinion is brusquely repudiated and the audience is reminded that the Orthodox statement is beyond doubt, so that the dispute is considered to be settled ("ils ont pour fonction de rappeler des vérités établies" [Récanati 1979: 140]). The status of the utterance is indicated in the margin by a metacommunicative marker; it is an authoritative declaration. A declaration is only felicitous if the speaker is invested with the appropriate authority. On the fictitious level, the author shows his superiority by his valid reasoning. On the real-life level, the author uses his position as an Orthodox cleric to ensure his readership's uptake. On both levels, the margin serves to underline the authoritative status of his utterance. It hammers home a final "settlement" of the preceding discussion. The above discussion is applicable to both *видиши ли* and *зри*. Although the former sounds slightly less rigid than the imperative, yet its function is very similar[8]. The (imagined) opponent's position is ridiculed, so that the Orthodox reader is not supposed to come to any other conclusion than the one preconceived by the author.

Moving to a discussion of the next formula: the use of the vocative *чловѣче* in Slavic diatribal discourse is obviously dependent on the Greek diatribal formula *(ὧ) ἄνθρωπε* 'o man'. It occurs three times in P as part of a quote from the epistles of the apostle Paul. However, it occurs only once in an original section, in reply to an opponent's objection that there is no need to go to church, because one can also pray at home:

(6) Аще же кто глеть, ꙗко и въ домꙋ помолитиса могꙋ, прельщаеши себе, ꙋлꙋе. Помолитиса ꙋбо в домꙋ възможно: сице же помолитиса, ꙗкоже въ цр҃кви, не възможно, идеже оц҃евъ мнѡжество, идѣже пѣнїе е҆динодш҃ьно къ Бг҃ꙋ всылаетса, і единомыслїе, и съгласїе, и любве съоузъ. И въ врема ѡно, любимиче, не ꙋлци тоꙋю въпїю страшнѣиши | ѡнъ вопль, но и А҃гг҃ли припадають Вл҃цѣ, і А҆рхагг҃ли молꙗса.

But if anyone says that he [literally "that I"][9] can also pray at home, you deceive yourself, o man! It is possible to pray at home: but it is not possible to pray in the same way as in church, where there is a multitude of fathers, where a song is sent up to God with one accord, [where there is] like-mindedness, harmony, and a bond of love. And in that time, **o beloved one**, not only men cry out that most fearful cry, but also angels fall before the Lord and archangels pray (S7, P309–310, R224).

---

[8] In Greek diatribal texts, both the imperative *ὅρα* and the question *(οὐχ) ὁρᾷς* are rendered by the same verb *ὁράω* "to see." The distinction in Slavic may have to do with the semantics of *зрѣти* "to watch, to look" as opposed to *видѣти* "to see." The former can more easily be used as an imperative, i.e. a command to "watch," whereas "seeing" cannot be forced on anyone by way of a command. The opponent or reader either sees it, or he does not.

[9] This deictic orientation of the verb form *могꙋ* 'I can' raises interesting questions about the distinction between direct and indirect speech, which cannot be determined according to syntactic criteria in (Old) Church Slavonic and Old Russian (cf. D. E. Collins [Collins 1996; 2001]; S. Dekker [Dekker 2018: 74]). The only criterion is a switch of referential perspective, which is clearly given here, in spite of the syntactic dependence of the subordinate clause, signalled by *ꙗко*. This is, of course, nothing unusual in Slavic, in analogy to the widespread use of Greek *ὅτι* introducing direct as well as indirect speech. For an analysis of the development of *jako recitativum* in Russian Church Slavonic, see Th. Daiber [Daiber 2009] and E. A. Vlasova [Vlasova 2016]. Daiber regards *jako recitativum* as a pragmatic marker of direct, but not *verbatim* reported speech [Daiber 2009: 384]. This observation can be linked with the diatribal distortion of the opponent's voice for rhetorical ends: his position is rendered in a skewed way.

In prototypically diatribal texts, vocatives like these function on the fictitious level, being addressed to a fictitious opponent. Is that the case here, too? The opponent is introduced in a 3sg form in the first phrase of our example, *if anyone says that…*[10]. Clearly, this is not the average Orthodox reader of Iosif's treatise, but an opponent, who is then directly addressed by the 2sg form *прельщаеши себе* 'you deceive yourself' and the vocative *чл҃че* "o man." This latter diatribal formula tends to have a rather brusque, repudiating tone to it. The next vocative in this example is the more pastoral *любими-че* "beloved one," which is more appropriate for addressing Iosif's Orthodox followers. The difference between these two vocatives shows that the line between actual audience and fictitious interlocutor can be thin, even within one and the same stretch of discourse. The pragmatic function of both vocatives is that they subjectify the discourse: the proposition is explicitly embedded into both the polemic with this particular opponent (be he fictitious or not) and the didactic instruction of the Orthodox readership. Both functions are diatribal, although only the first vocative (*чл҃че*) directly derives from the diatribal tradition. The most important feature is, however, the switch from a 3sg to a 2sg form, by which the author as it were inserts himself into a direct exchange with his opponent. We shall see a similar switch in examples (8) and (11).

The previous example (6) also shows that the heretics are explicitly introduced, before a dialogical exchange is performed on the fictitious level. This introduction can be formulated by means of a general phrase like *if anyone says that…* (as in (6) and (8)), but another frequently employed strategy is that the heretics are mentioned as such more explicitly:

(7) Но е́ретици съпротивятсѧ, и́же жидовьскаа моу́ръствꙋюще, А́лексеа гл҃ю протопопа и́ Дениса попа и́ Феодора кꙋ́рицина и́ е́диномоу́дреныꙗ и́мъ, гл҃ющихъ, ꙗ́ко пѡдобаѐ оу́бо нн҃ѣ законъ Мѡѵ́сеовъ дръжати и храни́ти и́ жертвы жрети и о́брѣзати. Но сі́и оу́бо свѣ́томь о́гна и́хъ да хѡдꙗть, и́ пламенемь, е́гѡ̀ ражжегоша себѐ, в то̀ да згорꙗть. Мы́ же, А̀пл҃ьскымъ вѣрꙋ́юще преданіємъ и про̑ръ́ьскыхъ пѡслꙋ́шающе писаніи, и видимь, ꙗ́ко зако̑ Мѡѵ́сеовъ оу́празн̑иса.
But the heretics, who think Jewishly, resist; I mean protopope Aleksei and pope Denis and Feodor Kuritsyn and their confederates, who say that it is appropriate now to keep and adhere to the law of Moses and offer sacrifices and be circumcised. But let them go in the light of their fire, and let them burn in the flame which they have kindled for themselves. But we, who believe the apostolic tradition and who listen to the prophetic writings, see that the law of Moses has been abrogated [S3, P122, R91–92].

This is a maximally explicit strategy to denote the opponents; nothing is left to the context. I have observed this strategy before, viz. in John the Exarch's "Hexaemeron" [Dekker 2021b: 245]. First, the opponents are introduced; then, they are engaged in a fictitious exchange. A slightly more abstract strategy is to generalize the opponent:

(8) Аще лѝ кто гл҃еть, ꙗ́ко Ноеви оу́бѡ и́ А̀враамоу не законъ, но завѣ́тъ даль ѐ Бг҃ъ: Гл҃еть бо къ Ноеви: сѐ а̀зъ возвижꙋ́ завѣ́тъ Мои с тобою и́ с сѣменемь твоимъ и́ всею землею: и́ А̀враамоу О̀брѣзаніе предастъ, а̀ не законъ: ино бѡ законъ, и ино завѣ́тъ. Нⷯѡ да слышить таковыи, ꙗ́кѡ и́ зако̑ и́ завѣ́ть то̑ є́сть. ре̑ бо писаніе, ꙗ́ко гл҃еть Бг҃ъ къ А̀враамоу… Зри, ꙗ́ко и́ законъ и́ завѣ́ть є́дино ѐ.

<hr />

[10] A similar strategy had been known since the early stages of Slavic writing, though not necessarily in connection with the diatribe, e. g. in the monk Khrabr's (Hrabar's) treatise "On the letters" (9th/10th century): «аще ли кто речеть ꙗ́ко… ѿвѣтъ речемь симь…» [Lavr. f. 104v.] (cf. [Vaillant 1968: 60]). In this instance, Khrabr does not make the switch to 2sg direct address, though.

> But suppose anyone says that God gave Noah and Abraham not a law, but a covenant. For He says to Noah: behold, I will establish my covenant with you and with your seed and the whole earth. And to Abraham He gave circumcision, but no law: for a law is one thing, and a covenant is another. But let such a one hear that both a law and a covenant are the same thing. For the Scripture said, that God says to Abraham: […]. See, that a law and a covenant are one thing! [S3, P123–124, R92–93]

After a lengthy Scriptural quote, the fictitious opponent is enjoined to come to the same conclusion (*See!*). This is a strategy which also occurs frequently in diatribal texts. Yet, the passage as a whole cannot be classified as properly diatribal due to the lack of dramatic performance. Importantly, in P the arguments from both sides are **quoted**, i. e. not performed dramatically. This puts the exchange, strictly speaking, outside the scope of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. The opponent's voice is first rendered in a subordinate clause introduced by the complementizer ꙗ́ко. His voice is then given in free direct speech in the next few phrases. Then again there is a metacommunicative phrase containing a 3sg form (*let such a one hear that…*), which leaves no room for ambiguity that there is a change of speaker. Yet, importantly, towards the end of the section quoted there is a change from the 3sg to the 2sg imperative *see*. This is a crucial switch that testifies to the existence of a second, fictitious layer which is so typical for the diatribe.

A fundamental question should be raised on the basis of these examples, viz. when these exchanges are not performed dramatically, which is a distinctive feature of the diatribe, but are just quoted, to what extent can they still be dependent on the tradition of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe? It may be claimed that these examples are rather to be analyzed in the light of general theories in the field of dialogicality or orality, but not specifically of the diatribe. However, the lack of dramatic performance does not mean that the abovementioned formulae completely fall outside the sphere of influence of the diatribe. The formulae stem from the diatribal tradition as it was established in the Slavic realm by means of the widespread translation of Patristic texts. Yet, it remains true that their pragmatic functionality is less clearly embedded in a dramatically performed dialogue.

The objection might be put forward that the presence of an imagined, i. e. fictitious, interlocutor, which is so central to diatribal discourse, is attenuated here, too, because Iosif was writing against specific persons, whom he mentions by name. However, even though they (had) existed in real life, these opponents function in the same way as an "imagined" opponent, in the sense that the author presents them in a distorted, skewed way on the fictitious level. From a slightly different angle, the opponents can be called fictitious insofar as Iosif probably never encountered them in real life and was thus free to present them in a light that did not necessarily correspond to reality. Thus, in the context of the diatribe, even an existing opponent is considered fictitious because he functions exclusively in the secondary communicative situation (cf. [Kakridis 2019: 137]), i. e. on Clark's Layer 2. In a similar way, diatribal dialogues can be performed with Biblical characters or authors, e. g. by Chrysostom or John the Exarch with the evangelists Matthew or John or the apostate disciple and traitor Judas [Dekker 2021a; 2021c]. Therefore, investigating whether these dialogues fall within the framework of the diatribe is justified.

Τί οὖν / *что оубо* "what then" is often used in the diatribe to introduce a heretical opponent's flawed conclusion, which is then rebutted by *μὴ γένοιτο* "may it not happen." This specific combination is not encountered in P or Posl. The phrase *что оубо* does occur in

P, though, and indeed as introducing an absurd conclusion. This flawed conclusion is then not sternly rebutted, however, but invalidated by a positive statement:

(9) Добро є́сть й полезно въ всакомъ мѣстѣ молитиса, й часто въздыхати ѿ грѣсѣхъ: тако бо й Корнилїю молацѹса, пришедъ А҃гг҃лъ гл҃аше: мл҃тва твоа й мл҃тна взыдоша на память прѣ Б҃га. Да что оу́бо Корнилїа вреди домовнаа мл҃тва; Что ли Фарисѣювби ѹспѣ цр҃квьное прѣстоанїе, величанїа й презорьства исполнено; Велїе ѹбо бл҃го є́сть ⸺ мл҃тва, а́ще смирен-нымъ ср҃цемъ й съкрѹшенымъ дх҃омъ й мыслїю бл҃годарною быва́є.

It is good and useful to pray in every place, and to sigh often about [one's] sins: thus also an angel came to Cornelius when he was praying, and said: your prayer and alms have come up for a memorial before God.[11] **What then?** Did the domestic prayer harm Cornelius? Was it of any use to the Pharisees to stand in the temple, full of arrogance and pride? For prayer is a great good, if it is [pronounced] with a humble heart and a contrite spirit and a grateful mind [S7, P320, R232].

This formula *что оубо* is also a metacommunicative statement, functioning in the margin, as it does not add anything to the proposition; it only indicates that the opponent's opinion is flawed. Therefore, it functions on the subjective level, i. e. not making a propositional, theological statement, but helping the readership to discern the "right" position and demarcate it from the "wrong" one. Although we can thus distinguish the subjective from the objective level, this distinction does not coincide with that between the fictitious and real-life level observed in diatribal texts elsewhere, both Greek and Slavic. Again, the formula itself is diatribal in origin, but does not function in a properly diatribal setting.

As was mentioned above, another formulaic expression that unequivocally originates in diatribal discourse is the negated optative *μὴ γένοιτο* 'may it not happen'. Bultmann [Bultmann 1910], Malherbe [Malherbe 1980] and Stowers [Stowers 1981] have clearly shown the diatribal use of this formula by the apostle Paul, most notably in his epistle to the Romans. Its function is to rebut the fictitious opponent's heretical or morally flawed objections to the author's line of reasoning. Y. Kakridis [Kakridis forthc.] has identified the "canonical" equivalent *да не боудетъ* in the Slavic "Apostolos", as well as, among other things, the alternative *никакоже*, encountered in Franciscus Skorina's translation. Both formulae also occur in P (2 and 12 times, respectively). Both instances of *да не боудеть* in P are preceded by *никакоже*, so that they can be seen as a combined formula:

(10) Є́да оу́бо съпротивнаа гл҃еть Д҃въ Мо́ѵсеѡви; никакѡ́, да не боудеть сего бѣмѣстїа!

Does then David say things contrary to Moses? No way, may this absurdity not be! [S3, P129, R96]

More often, however, *никакоже* occurs on its own. Its use is clearly inspired by the diatribal formula *μὴ γένοιτο*. The typical layering of diatribal discourse may or may not be present. In the following example, the participants' role in the discourse is rather explicit:

(11) А́ще лй кто рѐтъ, ꙗ́ко не вѣмы, что ѐ по́ножїе ногѹ є́го; сїе йнъ Пр҃ркъ сказалъ ѐ, гл҃а ѿ лица Бж҃їа: нбо Мнѣ пр҃тлъ, земла́ по́ножїе ногама Моима. И Д҃въдъ оу́бо повелѣва́є покланатиса по́ножїю ногъ Бж҃їй. Дрѹгый пр҃ркъ сказоуеть, ꙗ́ко земла ѐ по́ножїе ногъ. Ѐда оубѡ Д҃въдъ ве-лить земли поклонитиса; Никакѡже. Нѡ є́гⷶ слышиши: земла́ по́ножїе ногама Моима, не мни є́го ѿ земли то́ю гл҃юща ѡ є́динои, є́аже й мы всѣ́га попираемь.

---

11 Acts 10:4.

If anyone says "we do not know what the footstool of His feet is", another prophet has said this, speaking from the face of God: "heaven is my throne, and the earth the footstool of my feet"[12]. For David also commands to worship the footstool of God's feet. Another prophet says, that the earth is the footstool of [His] feet. Does David then command to worship the earth? **In no way!** But when you hear: "the earth is the footstool of my feet," do not suppose that he only speaks about the earth on which we always walk. [S6, P228, R165]

The fictitious opponent is introduced in the rather explicit way we have already identified above. His objection is then rebutted by means of a Biblical quote from Isaiah, which is reinforced by more references to David and "another prophet". A false conclusion is then drawn, which is strongly rebutted by *никакѹже* 'in no way!' The fictitious opponent is then addressed in 2SG terms. This exchange implies that a layered discourse is acted out on the fictitious level, which is the main characteristic of the diatribe.

Parenthetical verbs are a theoretically more fundamental feature of the diatribe, as they illustrate (a) the relation between the real-life level and the fictitious level of discourse, and (b) the relation between the theological statements and the didactic strategy by which they are conveyed to the readership (or, in Récanati's terms, between the text and the margin). They are formally less distinctive, though, because most parenthetical verbs of speech are used in their ordinary quotative function. This concerns primarily the 3SG aorist *рече* (cf. [Kamchatnov 2004]). Especially when it comes to Biblical or Patristic quotes, which form the majority of quotes overall in P, it is obvious that the texts are quoted to support the author's line of argumentation:

(12) Пакы̀ рече: не косни́ть Гꙗ̀ ѡ̑бѣтова́нїа, ꙗ̑коже нѣцїи косне́нїе мнꙗ́ть, си́рѣ: не того̀ ради є̑ще не прїи́де Гꙗ̀ сꙋди́ти, ꙗ̑ко закосне́лъ є̑сть, нꙋ̀ се̑ ради не прїи́де, рече, ꙗ̑ко долготерьпи́ть на нꙗ̀, нехота̀ нѣкыꙗ погꙋби́ти, нꙋ̀ вса в покаа́нїе вмѣсти́ти.

Again he says: the Lord does not delay the promise, as some count of delay. That is to say: the Lord has not yet come to judge, not because He delays, but He has not come, **he says**, because He is longsuffering towards us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance[13] [S9, P366, R267].

The use of parenthetical verbs in diatribal discourse is, however, to be distinguished from their purely quotative function. Accordingly, Kakridis [Kakridis 2019; 2020] distinguishes "quotative *рече*" from "diatribal *рече*". A diatribal parenthetical verb serves to identify another voice that is used not to support the author's own argumentation, as in the quotative ones, but to identify a fictitious opponent's voice that is blended in in order to be rebutted by the author. What is more, a parenthetical verb can only be called diatribal if its use is combined with the essential criterion of dramatic performance. The parenthetical verb serves to demarcate the opponent's performed voice from the speaker's own discourse. The verb itself is not part of the fictitious opponent's dramatically performed voice, but of the speaker's own authorial voice. In this way, the fictitious level is "interrupted" by a disambiguating element on the real-life level.

For Récanati [Récanati 1979: 146], "incidental" and "parenthetical" are synonyms. In this way, the parenthetical verb is part of the margin. Récanati, following J. O. Urmson, restricts himself to 1SG.PRES parenthetical verbs that modify a proposition by adding the

---

[12] Isaiah 66:1.
[13] Cf. 2 Peter 3:9.

speaker's subjective stance. In the diatribe, 3SG and 2SG forms are more relevant. The "implied claim to truth" to which Récanati [Récanati 1979: 147] refers, applies to 1SG parentheticals, like *I believe*. In the case of the diatribe, however, when the fictitious opponent's voice is identified by a 3SG or 2SG parenthetical verb, what is implied is not a claim to truth, but a distancing and disambiguating mechanism: the verb serves as a signal that the author disagrees with the proposition and wants his readership to know that he is not rendering his own voice, but that of his fictitious opponent. This is still in tune with the basic observation that parenthetical verbs convey the speaker's attitude towards the proposition uttered (cf. [Récanati 1979: 148]).

Now, to what extent are these features present in P and Posl.? There is a total of 29 quotative parenthetical verbs (cf. Table 3); these do not interest us specifically, but they show that the use of parentheticals as such was a relatively prominent strategy that Iosif used. This makes the question whether he also used parentheticals to demarcate his opponents' voices all the more pressing. I have listed 12 instances in Tables 2 and 3. We shall now look at some of the most salient ones, to see whether their use also corresponds to the diatribal and pragmatic functions discussed above.

(13) …ѿ нѝже нн҃ѣ ѿ є҆ди́номъ рече́мъ, є҆же ѻ҆ни зл҃ѣ гл҃ютъ. Є҆да̀ оу҆бо не можаше, ре́, Бг҃ъ сп҃сти Ада́ма ѿ а́да и соу́щихъ с нꙗ̀, и є҆да̀ не имѣ́аше нб҃ныꙗ си́лы и Пр҃ркы и пр҃вникы, є҆же посла́ти и҆сполни́ти хотѣ́нїе свое; но̀ Са́мъ сни́де, ꙗ҆ко нестꙗжа́тель и ни́щь, и въѹ҆лъвса̀ и пострада̀ и сꙗ̀ прехы́три дїа́вола; не пѡ́баеть оу҆бо̀ Бг҃оу тако твори́ти! Мы же ѹ҆бо и҆мамы свѣдѣ́тельство ѿ Бж҃твеныꙗ Писа́нїи, ꙗ҆ко вса̀ възмо́жна соу́ Бг҃оу.

Iosif: …of which we shall now speak about one thing, which **they say wickedly**.

Opponent: For could God, **he said**, not save Adam from hell and those that were with him, and did He not have heavenly hosts and prophets and righteous men, whom He could send to fulfil His will? But He came down himself as a non-possessor and poor [one], and became a man and suffered and thereby overcame the devil? For it is not proper for God to act thus!

Iosif: But we have the testimony from the divine Scriptures, that all things are possible to God [S4, P145, R109].

It is to be noted that this exchange is, again, not fully diatribal in the prototypical sense of the word. It is not a fully-fledged exchange on the fictitious level. The opponent's voice is introduced by a 3PL metacommunicative phrase (*which they say wickedly*). It may be argued, therefore, that the subsequent sentence merely contains an instance of quotative *рече*. However, there is again a significant switch from 3PL to the more abstract 3SG form *рече*. It does denote a fictitious opponent's voice, so it might be an intermediate category, which I have termed "Quote (opponent)" earlier [Dekker 2021b], where the opponent's words are quoted, but not enacted dramatically. The next example illustrates the problem rather sharply:

(14) Ꙗ҆коже и нн҃ѣ мно́зи пострада́ша Новгорѡ́дцы гл҃ю є҆рети́ковъ, А҆лексѣ́а протопопа̀ и Дени́са попа̀, и Ѳедо́ра Коу́рицина и всѣ̀, и҆же такоже мр҃ствоу́ющихъ, и҆же мно́га разврацєнїа и боу҆есло́вїе и҆зъгла́ша и в̀ мно́гы є҆реси впадо́ша, ѻ҆ ни́хже нн҃ѣ рече́мъ, є҆же ѡ҆ни зл҃ѣ гл҃ютъ, ꙗ҆ко и́ноци, рече, ѡ҆ста́виша за́повѣдь Бж҃їю и пр҃ръскаа и Е҆ѵа́льскаа и А҆п҃льскаа писа́нїа, и самосмышле́нїемъ и самооу҆че́нїемъ и҆зѻ҆брѣ́тоша себѣ̀ житїе, и дръжа́ть преда́нїе ѹ҆ло̀.

Thus now, too, many have suffered. I mean the Novgorodian heretics: protopope Aleksei and pope Denis and Feodor Kuritsyn and all those who think in the same way, who have uttered a multitude of corrupt and daring words and have fallen into many

heresies, about which we shall now speak. **They say wickedly** that monks, <u>he said</u>, have abandoned God's commandment and the prophetic and evangelical and apostolic writings, and have designed a life for themselves according to their own minds and teaching, and adhere to human traditions [S11, P407, R294–295].

We see a hybrid form between quotation and dramatic performance here. There is a dialogue with opponents, but it is narrated, rather than performed. Thus, the numbers of diatribal parenthetical verbs in Tables 2 and 3 need to be qualified by this caveat. The verbs look diatribal, their use is certainly derived from the diatribe, but (in spite of the significant switch from 3PL to 3SG) they are not part of the heritage of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe in its strictest sense, as it is delineated by dramatic performance.

Parenthetical *речеши* is an innovative Slavic diatribal formula that gained increasing popularity over the course of the developing manuscript traditions of Chrysostom's homilies in the Zlatostruj collection [Dekker 2021d][14]. There is one instance of parenthetical *речеши* in Posl.[15] The question is now, again: is it also diatribal?

(15) Сказывал ми, господине, нашъ слуга, что есми, господине, к тебе писал о твоемъ человеце, и ты, де, господине, прочетши грамоту, да почелъ говорити: а срезалъ ми деи, **речеши**, головы.
Your servant told me, lord, that I, lord, have written to you about your man, and allegedly you, lord, having read the letter, began to say: and he allegedly cut off, **you say**, my head[Posl. p. 149].

Clearly, as we have to do with an epistolary genre here, the 2SG referent is not a fictitious opponent, but the letter's addressee, in this case an unnamed prince. Thus, although parenthetical речеши is of diatribal origin in the Slavic realm, it is not used here in a diatribal sense. Thus, a feature of the diatribe was generalized into a discursive marker beyond its original setting.

One final observation: according to the rendition in the modern Russian translation, there is an instance of parenthetical diatribal *скажꙋть* in the phrase *Прⷪ҇ци скажꙋть*, which is translated as *мне ответят: пророки* (S1, P63, R48). This is, however, an unusual form for a diatribal verb. A closer look reveals that the phrase is to be interpreted differently, viz. *the prophets will tell us*. An exact parallel to this construction is found further on in S1: "Who is the rock? The divine Paul will tell [us]. For he says: the rock was Christ" (P77, R59). This underlines the importance of investigating the original, rather than a modern translation.

Concluding remarks

The main diatribal characteristic which we have substantiated in Iosif's writings is the frequent switch from third-person to second-person forms. Initially, the heretics and their views are described in 3SG or 3PL terms. Subsequently, a switch is made and one of

---

[14] The use of a 2SG instead of a 3SG form makes the discourse even more lively and dramatic. As was shown in Dekker [Dekker 2021d], this was a distinctly Slavic innovation: it constitutes a further development of the diatribe that occurred independently from the Greek sources, which used predominantly the 3SG. PRES *φησί(ν)*. In theory, diatribal *рече* could also represent a 2SG.AOR form instead of a 3SG.AOR one, thus forming a parallel to the use of 2SG.PRES *речеши*. This is not very likely, though, as *рече* is also widely used as a quotative marker for e.g. Biblical quotes, where the use of a 2SG form is outright impossible.

[15] There are five more instances of *речеши* in P (S7, P301–302, R218–219), but although they identify the opponent's voice, they are not parenthetical and, therefore, not, properly speaking, diatribal.

the heretics (or an abstract specimen of the heretics) is addressed directly in a polemical vein. We have also seen that some iconic features of the diatribe are implemented in an attenuated way. The author had no doubt encountered these in translated texts, had internalized some of the most distinctive diatribal formulae, but did not apply them in the same way as they originally functioned in the works of the Cynic-Stoic philosophers and the Biblical and Patristic textual traditions. Thus, Iosif had appropriated the most distinctive diatribal forms, but not their pragmatic and discursive functionality. This observations runs to some extent counter to Goldfrank's [Goldfrank 2018: 566] claim that "Iosif's clever syllogisms were largely of the rhetorical type that a super-smart person can master by imitation." That may be true in general, but when we limit our view to the diatribe, we see that Iosif's imitation and appropriation of the Cynic-Stoic rhetorical and linguistic strategies was but partial[16]. Thus, looking back on the use of diatribal elements in P and Posl., they can be described as an iconic residue at best; they do not necessarily function in the way they were envisaged in their original Cynic-Stoic setting. This indicates that the formulae themselves had gained ground in the Orthodox Slavic realm, but not necessarily their corresponding discursive functions.

If we briefly compare these findings to an earlier hybrid translated/original piece of Orthodox Slavic literature, viz. John the Exarch's "Hexaemeron," some parallels stand out. The original parts were written by John the Exarch himself; the translated parts were taken from Patristic homilies. It is no surprise that the original parts do not show any (!) instances of spontaneous use of diatribal parenthetical verbs. The Exarch successfully translated them into Slavic when prompted to do so by his homiletic sources, but apparently he had not completely internalized their use or he did not consider this an appropriate strategy for his own written discourse. In the same vein, the lack of truly diatribal parenthetical verbs in Iosif's writings does not mean that Iosif did not know or appreciate the use of *рече*, *речеши* and similar verbs as a diatribal strategy[17]. The prevalence of diatribal elements in well-known Slavic texts translated from Greek (as demonstrated in earlier research by Kakridis [Kakridis 2019; 2020; forthc.] and Dekker [Dekker 2021a; 2021b; 2021c; 2021d]) was too strong for Iosif to have been unfamiliar with them. A passive reception of these elements in translated works did not necessarily lead to their active implementation in original works, though.

Yet, the influence of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe on Iosif's original compositions cannot be completely dismissed, either. For that, his use of iconic formulae that derived from the diatribe is too prominent and obvious. Thus, the remnants of the diatribe in texts produced in 16th/17th-century Russia show the persistence of a popular discursive tradition even far beyond the confines of its initial transfer into the Slavic realm by means of texts translated from Greek.

One final remark about the composition of P. As was discussed when presenting Table 2, the last five chapters have far fewer formulae that originate in the diatribe than the rest of P. This was considered a significant argument in favour of Alekseev's hypothesis that the final chapters of the Long redaction were added at a later point, at a time when the

---

[16] The term "imitation" is not meant to imply that Iosif used a specific Greek model for his writings. Rather, being well-versed in Patristic writings, he had internalized the diatribal strategies which he encountered there frequently.

[17] In a very strict sense, we cannot properly distinguish diatribal from quotative verbs because the main precondition for diatribal usage (dramatic performance as opposed to mere quotation) has only partially been met in Iosif's written treatise (P), and even less so in his epistles (Posl.).

polemical aspect of the conflict with the Judaizers was less pressing, and the didactic or devotional function had become more prominent. The rhetorical and diatribal character of those chapters is, therefore, less pronounced. Thus, investigating linguistic features that testify to the rhetorical heritage of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe can help us fine-tune issues in the realm of textual history, too. In this way, linguistics, rhetoric and philology can mutually inform each other.

Abbreviations

Lavr. — Lavrenťevskiĭ sbornik
P — Prosvetitel'
Posl. — Poslaniïa
R — Russian edition of P; see Sources
S — Slovo
Supr. — Codex Suprasliensis

Sources

Lavr. —*Lavrentiy's Miscellany (Tsar Ivan Alexandăr's Miscellany of 1348): Phototype Edition*. Zashev E. D. (ed.). Sofia: Cyrillo-Methodian Research Centre Publ., 2015.

P — *Prosvetitel', ili ōblichenīe eresi zhidovstvūiushchikh. Tvorenīe prepodobnagō ōtsa nashegō Iōsifa, Igūmena Volotskagō. Izdanīe tretīe*. Kazan': Tipo-litografiia Imperatorskago Universiteta Publ., 1896. (In Church Slavonic)

Posl. — *Epistles of Joseph Volotsky*. Zimina A. A., Lurʼe Ia. S. (eds). Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR Publ., 1959. (In Russian)

R — Prepodobnyi Iosif Volotskii. *Prosvetitel'*. Moscow: Institut russkoi tsivilizatsii: Rodnaia strana Publ., 2016. (In Russian)

Supr. —*Suprasălski ili Retkov sbornik: V dva toma*. Zaimov I., Kapaldo M. (eds). Sofiïa: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademiïa na Naukite Publ., 1982–1983. (In Bulgarian)

VMČ 1915 — *Velikīia Minei Četīi, Aprielʼ. Tetradʼ III, Dni 22–30*. Moscow: Sinodalʼnaia Tipografiia Publ., 1915. (In Church Slavonic)

References

Alekseev 2019 — Alekseev A. I. *"A zealous warrior of Christ": Joseph Volotsky and his writings in the light of the data of modern science*. Moscow; St Petersburg: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ Publ., 2019. (In Russian)

Alexéiev 2015 — Alexéiev A. La conversion au judaïsme et les «hérésies» dans la *Rous* médiévale. *Slavia occitania*. 2015, (41): 31–41.

Bultmann 1910 — Bultmann R. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. (reprint). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

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

Clark 1996 — Clark H. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Collins 1996 — Collins D. E. The pragmatics of indirect speech in Old Church Slavonic and other early Slavic writings. In: *Studies in South Slavic and Balkan Linguistics*. Barentsen A. A. et al. (eds). Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi Publ., 1996. P. 21–86.

Collins 2001 — Collins D. E. *Reanimated Voices: Speech Reporting in a Historical-Pragmatic Perspective*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001.

Daiber 2009 — Daiber Th. Direkte Rede im Russisch-Kirchenslavischen: Zum pragmatischen Wert des *jako recitativum*. In: *Text — Sprache — Grammatik: Slavisches Schrifttum der Vormoderne. Festschrift für Eckhard Weiher*. Besters-Dilger J., Rabus A. (eds). München: Otto Sagner, 2009. P. 363–386.

De Michelis 1993 — De Michelis C. G. *La Valdesia di Novgorod: «Giudaizzanti» e prima riforma (sec. XV)*. Torino: Claudiana, 1993. (In Italian)

Dekker 2018 — Dekker S. *Old Russian Birchbark Letters: A Pragmatic Approach*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018.

Dekker 2021a — Dekker S. The Slavic rendition of Greek speech reporting verbs in Chrysostom's homilies in the Codex Suprasliensis: A case study into the transmission of diatribal discourse organization. *Slověne*. 2021, 10 (1): 186–216.

Dekker 2021b — Dekker S. Parenthetical verbs as elements of diatribe in John the Exarch's *Hexaemeron*: Greek continuities and Slavic innovations. *Die Welt der Slaven*. 2021, 66 (2): 238–267.

Dekker 2021c — Dekker S. Die Übersetzung griechisch-diatribischer Formeln beim Exarchen Johannes: Am Beispiel seiner kompilativen Homilie zum Evangelisten Johannes. In: *Sub specie aeternitatis: Sbornik nauchnykh statei k 60-letiiu Vadima Borisovicha Krys'ko*. Ladyzhenskiĭ I. M., Puzina M. A. (eds). Moscow: Azbukovnik Publ., 2021. P. 568–585.

Dekker 2021d — Dekker S. The translation and transmission of 'diatribal' verbs in the textual traditions of the Zlatostruj collection. *Russian Linguistics*. 2021, 45 (2): 175–200.

Goldfrank 2018 — Goldfrank D. The "Judaic-reasoning Novgorod heretics" and some echoes of Spain in late medieval Russia. *Russian History*. 2018, 44 (4): 547–569.

Goldfrank 2020 — Goldfrank D. Iosif "Syllogistikos": An Analysis of *Prosvetitel'*. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*. 2020, 54 (1–3): 99–133.

Harnack 1883 — Harnack A. Die Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani, nebst Untersuchungen über die anti-jüdische Polemik in der alten Kirche. *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. 1883, (1): 1–136.

Hösch 1975 — Hösch E. *Orthodoxie und Häresie im alten Rußland*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Publ., 1975.

Ilie 2018 — Ilie C. Pragmatics vs rhetoric: Political discourse at the pragmatics-rhetoric interface. In: *Pragmatics and its Interfaces*. Ilie C., Norrick N. R. (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2018. P. 85–119.

Kazakova, Lur'e 1955 — Kazakova N. A., Lur'e ĨA. S. *Antifeodal'nye ereticheskie dvizheniĩa na Rusi XIV — nachala XVI veka*. Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR Publ., 1955. (In Russian)

Kakridis 2019 — Kakridis J. *Argumentacija kod pravoslavnih Slovena u srednjem veku: Uvod u problematiku*. Niš: Međunarodni centar za pravoslavne studije, Centar za vizantijsko-slovenske studije Univerziteta u Nišu, 2019. (In Serbian)

Kakridis 2020 — Kakridis ĨA. Kto govorit? Tsitativnoe i diatribicheskoe phēsi(n) v Izbornike 1073 g. *Crkvene studije, Niš*. 2020, (17): 257–266.

Kakridis forthc. — Kakridis Y. Das sei ferne! Eine diatribische Formel und ihre Äquivalente im Apostolos von Franciscus Skorina. (Manuscript)

Kamchatnov 2004 — Kamchatnov A. M. The form of the aorist as a sign of citation in ancient Russian texts. *Drevniaia Rus'*. 2004, (15): 14–16. (In Russian)

King 2018 — King J. *Speech-in-Character, Diatribe, and Romans 3:1–9: Who's Speaking When and Why It Matters*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Malherbe 1980 — Malherbe A. J. Μη γενοιτο in the diatribe and Paul. *Harvard Theological Review*. 1980, 73 (1–2): 231–240.

Pereswetoff-Morath 2002 — Pereswetoff-Morath A. *A Grin Without a Cat 2: Jews and Christians in Medieval Russia — Assessing the sources*. Lund: Department of East and Central European Studies, Lund University, 2002.

Récanati 1979 — Récanati Fr. *La transparence et l'énonciation: Pour introduire à la pragmatique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1979.

Seebohm 1977 — Seebohm Th. M. *Ratio und Charisma: Ansätze und Ausbildung eines philosophischen und wissenschaftlichen Weltverständnisses im Moskauer Rußland*. Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 1977.

Song 2004 — Song Ch. *Reading Romans as a Diatribe*. New York: Peter Lang Publ., 2004.

Stowers 1981 — Stowers S. K. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.

Taube 2016 — Taube M. *The Logika of the Judaizers: A Fifteenth-Century Ruthenian Translation from Hebrew. Critical Edition of the Slavic Texts Presented Alongside Their Hebrew Sources with Introduction, English Translation, and Commentary*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities Publ., 2016.

Uthemann 2005 — Uthemann K.-H. *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe: Themen der frühen Kirche als Beiträge zu einer historischen Theologie*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Uthemann 2015 — Uthemann K.-H. *Anastasios Sinaites: Byzantinisches Christentum in den ersten Jahrzehnten unter arabischer Herrschaft*. 2 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter Publ., 2015.

Vaillant 1968 — Vaillant A. *Textes vieux-slaves. Première partie: Textes et glossaire*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. Institut d'Études slaves, 1968.

Vlasova 2016 — Vlasova E. A. About the construction *jako* recitativum in Russian chronicles 11th–16th centuries. *Russkii iazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii*. 2016, 32 (2): 143–174. (In Russian)

Деккер Симеон

Бернский университет,
Швейцария, 3012, Берн, Хохшулштрассе, 3012
simeon.dekker@issl.unibe.ch

Признаки «диатрибы» в произведениях Иосифа Волоцкого*

В статье исследуются признаки «кинико-стоической диатрибы» (диалогического способа изложения дискурса, встречающегося в полемико-дидактических трудах) в сочинениях Иосифа Волоцкого. Диатрибические тексты выделяются не столько как определенный жанр, сколько как форма организации дискурса, которая может включать в себя ряд жанров. Данная тема рассматривается преимущественно на основании главного полемического трактата Иосифа Волоцкого против так называемых жидовствующих, известного под названием «Просветитель». В статье описаны основные черты феномена диатрибы. Обсуждается как ее греческое происхождение, так и ее переход в область церковнославянского языка и дальнейшее развитие в православных славянских произведениях начиная с X в. При этом также уделяется внимание биографии Иосифа Волоцкого и историческому контексту «Просветителя». Демонстрируются основные признаки диатрибы в «Просветителе»; их употребление сравнивается как с переводными славянскими текстами, так и с греческими оригиналами последних. Автор доказывает, что признаки диатрибы в «Просветителе» представлены в ослабленной форме. Таким образом, они могут восприниматься лишь как «остаток» диатрибического способа изложения дискурса. В то же время некоторые из этих признаков явно играют прагматическую роль и служат цели субъективации дискурса. При обсуждении последнего вопроса используется терминология, разработанная Фр. Реканати и Г. Кларком. Иосиф усвоил наиболее характерные диатрибические формы, но не их прагматическую и дискурсивную функциональность. Термин «подражание» не означает, что Иосиф использовал определенную греческую модель для своих сочинений. Скорее, хорошо разбираясь в святоотеческих писаниях, он усвоил диатрибические стратегии. Это указывает на то, что в православно-славянском царстве получили распространение такие формулы, но не их дискурсивные функции.

Ключевые слова: диатриба, Иосиф Волоцкий, историческая прагматика, парентетические глаголы, субъективация дискурса.

Erratum

Романова Т. В., Хоменко А. Ю. Функционирование элементов семантического поля *социальная значимость* в русском и английском языках по данным словарных и корпусных источников. *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Язык и литература*. 2020, 17 (1): 49–73. https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu09.2020.104

В статье ошибочно указан номер гранта РФФИ. Правильный номер гранта РФФИ «Аспиранты», поддержавшего указанную работу, — 19-312-90022.

Romanova T. V., Khomenko A. Yu. The functioning of the elements of the semantic field *social significance* in the Russian and English languages according to vocabulary and corpus sources. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Language and Literature*. 2020, 17 (1): 49–73. https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu09.2020.104 (In Russian)

In this article number of the project of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research has to be read 19-312-90022.