Slavonic Apocrypha: New Discoveries, New Perusals

The Cases of the Dispute between Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist and the Story about Beautiful Joseph

Anissava Miltenova

Institute for Literature, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia
amiltenova@gmail.com

Abstract

The mixed-content miscellanies could be defined as a unifying genre of the 'readable' type of unstable makeup and varied content. Manuscripts that reflect the nucleus of characteristic works in expanded or reduced form, providing they feature sufficient textological proof of common origin or typological similarity, could be classified with a certain type. The present study on the Dispute between Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist and on the The Story about beautiful Joseph has two objectives: 1) to introduce several so far unstudied South Slavonic manuscripts that contain mainly apocrypha, and 2) to reveal how the differences between initial translations and secondary editing of Slavonic apocrypha are indicative of the intervention of the Slavic writer.

Keywords

Slavonic apocrypha – mixed-content miscellanies – Slavonic petty clergy – popular Christianity

A considerable number of medieval Slavic literary works have been preserved not merely as independent texts, but specifically as components of liturgical, historical, legal, or edifying miscellanies. It is primarily the systematization and genre characteristics of these miscellanies, and the discovery of the principles underlying their creation and distribution, that medievalists have focused on in the past fifty years. The view of specific types of miscellanies as literary and historical phenomena of specific ages and areas is a particularly important goal of contemporary medieval Slavic studies. As a result of this new development, the study of the “dialogue” between a separate text (article) and

its environment in miscellany manuscripts achieved a central position in medieval Slavic literary studies. The coexistence and interpenetration of texts proved extremely important, particularly for clarifying the history and chronology of separate works that were disseminated as a set for a very long time. The typological characterization of miscellanies also contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the role of manuscript books and their structure within a broader conceptualization of cultural heritage.

The present study on the *Dispute between Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist* and on the *The Story about beautiful Joseph* has two objectives: 1) to introduce several so far unstudied South Slavonic manuscripts that contain mainly apocrypha, and 2) to reveal how the differences between initial translations and secondary redactions of Slavonic apocrypha are indicative of the intervention of the Slavic writer. These interventions reveal important changes resulting from the circulation of the text in a certain environment. The existence of new source material from manuscripts that have not been studied helps shed light on the history of the texts in a novel way.

1. The *Dispute between Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist* (CANT 84; BHG 812f-g) is one of the apocrypha whose history in Byzantine literature has not been studied and there is no text critical edition of the Greek copies. In his book on apocryphal literature, A. de Santos Otero referred to fourteen Croatian (Glagolitic), Bulgarian, Serbian, Ukrainian and Russian copies.¹ To these (as we shall see) we can add several more so that today the Slavonic tradition consists of some twenty copies. Two Greek copies, from the 12th and the 13th century, published by A. Vassiliev more than a hundred years ago, give us some, albeit not comprehensive, idea about the tradition of the text.² They differ in both volume and some details. Consequently, it can be concluded that the text in Greek was distributed in several versions. The chronology of the Greek text cannot be specified definitively. The source used was the Apocalypse of Saint John the Theologian, which originated in the 5th-6th century.³ As A. Vassiliev has noted, the text could possibly have been the product of *Paulician* or *Mani-*

1 A. de Santos Otero. *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen*, Bd. 2, Berlin – New York, 1981, pp. 156-160.

2 A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, I (Mosquae, 1893), pp. v-vii, 4-10. The first copy (α), dating from the 12th century, is from the manuscript of Veneto Sancti Marci 42, class. II, fol. 255-257; the second copy (β), dating from the 13th century, is from the manuscript of Vindobonensi hist. 67, fol. 18-19.

3 Я. Милтенев. “Апокрифният апокалипсис на Йоан Богослов – анализ на междутекстовите отношения” [Y. Miltenov, “Apocryphal Apocalypse of John the Theologian: analysis of inter-textual relations”], *Palaeobulgarica*, xxviii, No. 3 (2004), pp. 89-90.

chean environment in the 7th-8th century.⁴ Nevertheless, the question about the origin and the distribution of the Greek original remains open.

The Slavonic translation of the work attracted the attention of scholars. Even in the 1860s, 17th-18th century Russian copies appeared, published by A.N. Pypin⁵ and N.S. Tikhonravov.⁶ Later S. Novaković for the first time published a Serbian copy from a 16th-century manuscript, kept at the National Library in Belgrade.⁷ A late Serbian copy from the collection of the National Museum in Prague was published by J. Polivka,⁸ and two 16th-17th century copies of Ukrainian origin were published by I. Franko.⁹ The known copies of the *Dispute* include that from the 14th century parchment miscellany No. 137 from the Austrian National library in Vienna, first published by K. Radčenko,¹⁰ and later by Y. Ivanov.¹¹ At that time, this copy, Bulgarian in origin and with archaic orthography, was considered by scholars to approach the initial translation. There is a separate group including several Glagolitic 15th-16th century copies of Croatian origin, the oldest of which are the texts published by V. Štefanić¹² and R. Strohal.¹³ Their relation to the other copies has not been clarified sufficiently. Y. Ivanov included the *Dispute* in the works used by the Bogomils, analyzing those texts in it which do not correspond to their views.¹⁴ E. Turdeanu also discussed the work, but he tended to assume that it is among the texts additionally redacted on Slavonic ground.¹⁵

- 4 Vassiliev, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, p. VI.
- 5 А. Пыпин, *Ложныя и отреченныя книги русской старины. Памятники старинной русской литературы* [A. Pypin, *False books and renunciation of Russian antiquity. The monuments of ancient Russian literature*], III, St. Petersburg, 1862, pp. 86-88.
- 6 Н. Тихонравов, *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* [N. Tikhonravov, *Monuments renounced Russian literature*], vol. 2, Moscow, 1863, pp. 282-288.
- 7 S. Novaković, "Апокриф о препиранју Исуса Христа са дјаволом," *Starine*, 16 (1884), pp. 86-89.
- 8 G. Polivka, "Описи и изводи из неколико југославенских рукописа у Прагу," *Starine*, 22 (1890), pp. 200-203.
- 9 І. Франко, *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* [I. Franko, *Apocrypha and legends s ukrainskih manuscripts*], vol. II, Lviv, 1898, pp. 196-203.
- 10 К. Радченко, "Заметки о пергаменном сборнике № 139 (137) XIV века Венской Придворной библиотеки" [K. Radchenko, "Notes on the parchment manuscript No. 139 of 14th c. Vienna Cort Library"], *ИОРЯС*, 12, 3 (1907), pp. 196-198.
- 11 Ї. Иванов, *Богомилски книги и легенди* [Y. Ivanov, *Bogomil Books and Legends*], Sofia, 1925, pp. 249-253.
- 12 V. Štefanić, *Glagoljski rukopisi Jugoslavenske Akademije*, vol. 1, Zagreb, 1969, pp. 50-51.
- 13 R. Strohal, *Stare hrvatske apokrifne priče i legende, sбрао из starih hrvatskih glagolskih rukopisa od 14-18 vijeka R.S.*, Bjelovar, 1917, pp. 54-56.
- 14 Иванов, *Богомилски книги и легенди*, pp. 253-257.
- 15 E. Turdeanu, "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudobogomiles," *Revue de l'Histoire des religions*, 138 (1950), pp. 194-199.

The South Slavonic witnesses of the *Dispute* are following:¹⁶

- a. MSS 34, Monastery "St. Catherine", Sinai, parchment, 12th-13th c., Bulgarian protograph; f. 72r-77r: Слово ѡ прѣпрѣвни дни[...]а г(с)дѣмъ ѿшимъ ѿ бл(с)ви ѿче. Inc.: Пришедоу іѡсу на горѣ елевньскѣ. и р(ч)е къ ѿченикомъ своимъ алчимъ зае .ѿ. дни.
- b. MSS 137, Austrian National Library, Vienna, parchment, 14th c., Bulgarian;¹⁷ f. 177r-178v (without end): Сло(в) ѡ прѣпрѣвни диволѣ съ гдѣмъ ѿшимъ ѿ(с)х(с). Inc.: Пришедъ гъ въ горѣ елевньскѣ, заповѣда оученикомъ своимъ алкати .ѿ. дѣни.
- c. MSS 52 from the collection of the Nikojac monastery, near Bijalo Polje, Montenegro, paper, 15th c., Serbian; f. 66r-71r: (The title is illegible.) Inc.: Прїиде їс на гору елевньскоую. и рече къ ѿченикомъ своимъ. алчемъ .ѿ. дни и .ѿ. ноци. азъ бо разоумѣхъ силоу его. тако хощеть въвроужити се на ни.
- d. MSS 433 (Panagurište), Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia, paper, 16th c., Bulgarian;¹⁸ f. 101r-105v: Сло(в) ѡ прѣпрѣвниѣ антих(с)ѣѣ. съ гднемъ наши(м) ис(с)хомъ ѡ(ч). Inc.: Х(с)оу приближишу сѣ. на гороу маслинѣѣ. и р(ч)е къ оученико(м) свои(м). постимъ сѣ. ѿ. днен. и пости сѣ х(с) .ѿ. днен съ оученики своимъ.
- e. MSS 149, Austrian National Library, Vienna, paper, 16th c., Bulgarian; f. 113r-117v: Сло(в) ѡ прѣпрѣвниѣ антих(с)ѣѣ. съ г(д)мъ наши(м) ѿв х(с)мъ. Inc.: Х(с)оу приближишу се на гороу маслиною. и р(ч)е къ оученико(м) сви(м). постим се .ѿ. дни.
- f. MSS 100 (written by Daniel from Etropole), Museum of Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade, paper, year 1628, Bulgarian;¹⁹ f. 84r-87v: Сло(в) ѡ прѣпрѣвни

16 I have used the Repertorium of Old Bulgarian Literature digital database, created with the participation of David Birnbaum for the information from the manuscripts and the comparison of the copies: <<http://repertorium.obdurodon.org/searchTitlesFree.php?target=%D0%99%D0%BE%D1%81%D0%B8%D1%84>>.

17 А. Яцимирский, *Описание южнославянских и русских рукописей заграничных библиотек*, I. Вена, Берлин, Дрезден, Лейпциг, Мюнхен, Прага, Люблина [A. Yatsimirskiy, *Description of South Slavonic and Russian Manuscripts in Foreign Libraries*, 1. Vienna, Berlin, Dresden, Leipzig, Munich, Prague, Ljubljana] (СОПЯС, 98, № 2), St. Petersburg, 1921, pp. 184-187; G. Birkfellner, *Glagolitische und kyrillische Handschriften in Österreich*, Wien, 1975.

18 The copy from Panagurište has also been translated into Modern Bulgarian by Donka Petkanova and has been commented on in: *Стара българска литература*, 1. Апокрифи [Old Bulgarian Literature, 1. Apocrypha], Sofia, 1981, pp. 173-176, 380-381.

19 The miscellany is described in: А. Милтенова, "Сборник със смесено съдържание, дело на етрополския книжовник йеромонах Даниил" [A. Miltenova, "A Miscellany of

- АНТИХРИСТОВѢ СЪ ГѢМЪ НАШИ(М) ТѢ ХѢ. ОУЧЕ БЛВИ. Инс.: ХѢ ПРИБЛИЖИШѢ СЕ НА ГОРѢ МАСЛИЧНОЮ. И Р(У)ЧЕ КЪ ОУЧЕНИКѢ(М) СВОИ(М). ПОСТИМ СЕ , М, ДНѢИ. И ПОСТИ СЕ ХѢ .М. ДНѢИ СЪ ОУЧЕНИКѢ СВОИМИ.
- g. MSS 326 (Adžar), Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia, paper, 17th-18th c., Bulgarian; f. 41r-44r: Слово ѡ прѣвѣпраніѣ аньтихристѡво(м) съ гѣмъ наши(м) і(с)у хѣмъ ѡуче блви. Инс.: Х(с)уу приближишѣм (sic!) се на горѢ масличнѡю. и р(у)чѣ кѣ оученико(м) свои(м). пости(м) се хѣс. м. дны съ оученики своими.
- h. MSS 273 (copy of Novaković), National Library, Belgrade, destroyed at the time of World War II, paper, 16th-17th c., Serbian;²⁰ f. 127v-142v: Сказаніѣ слово и прѣвѣпраніѣ диаволь съ господѣмъ нашимъ тѣу христомъ. бл(с)ви ѡуче. Инс.: Вѣзвѣшадъ господѣ на горѢ елѣвнѣскѡю, и рече оученикомъ своимъ. ал'чѣмъ .м. дны и пошти да прѣвѣпримо се съ диаволѡмъ.
- i. MSS IX.H.16 (copy of Polivka), National Museum, Prague, paper, year 1646, Serbian;²¹ f. 227r-231r: Сло(в) ѡ прѣвѣпренію дѣвола съ госп(д)омъ наши(м) іѡмъ хр(с)омъ. оуче бл(с)ви. Инс.: Приша(д)ъшѣ ісусѣ на горѢ елѣв(н)ѣскѡю, и глѣ ѡченикѡ(м) свои(м). алчѣмъ з(д)ѣ дни .м. поне(ж) хоцѣ пр(ѣ)вѣпрати се съ дѣвола(м), занеже вѣорѣжаѣ се на насъ велми.
- j. Traces of South Slavonic archetype are found in a Ruthenian copy in MSS 4713, created by father Theodor from Dubivci village, Institute for Literature – Kiiv, 16th-17th c., identified and published by Ivan Franko²² and another of Russian origin, MSS 229 (Q. XVII. 82), Tolstoy collection, Russian National Library, St. Petersburg, year 1602, identified and published by N. Tikhonravov.²³
- k. Croatian glagolitic tradition studied in details and published by Savomir Sambunjak.²⁴

The oldest copy of the *Dispute* known today is found on f. 72r-78r in a parchment manuscript from the St. Catherine monastery in Sinai, No. 34, 12th-13th century. This has not been published and discussed in research literature. The text has inconsistent orthography, with 19-20 lines a page, two juses, two jers,

Mixed Content – the work of Etropole scholar monk Daniel"], *Старобългарска литература*, 19 (1986), pp. 114-125.

20 Љ. Стојановић, *Каталог Народне библиотеке у Београду* [L. Stojanović, *Catalogue of the National Library in Belgrade*], Belgrad, 1903, pp. 352-354.

21 J. Vašica and J. Vajs. *Soupis staroslovanských rukopisů Národního musea v Praze, Praha*, 1957, pp. 331-344.

22 Франко, *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів*, pp. 196-200.

23 Тихонравов, *Памятники отреченной русской литературы*, pp. 282-285.

24 S. Sambunjak. *Jezik i stil hrvatskih glagoljskih prenja*, Split, 2000.

with Middle Bulgarian protograph. Although the manuscript is present in some reviews of South Slavonic manuscripts at the monastery in Sinai,²⁵ it attracted the attention of specialists only at the end of the 1970s. The credit for this goes to the Russian scholar V.M. Zagrebin,²⁶ who, following paleographic analysis, identified as parts of MS No. 34 from St. Catherine on Sinai several palimpsest excerpts from the State Public Library M.E. Saltykov-Shčedrin in Leningrad Q.п.1.63, Q.п.1.64 and Греч. 70. The three excerpts found their way to the collection of the library thanks to K. Tischendorf who brought them back from his visits to Sinai in 1844, 1853 and 1858-1859. V.M. Zagrebin established that the parchment folios with signatures Q.п.1.63 and Q.п.1.64 completely coincide with miscellany No. 34 in both hand and content, and that folios from 101r to 119v can definitely be said to belong to the assembled manuscript under signature Греч. 70 in Син. 34. Zagrebin's discovery was recently confirmed by A.A. Turilov,²⁷ who associated yet another excerpt with the *Codex Sinaiticus* – No. 18/N from the collection of the newly-discovered manuscripts at the St. Catherine monastery described by I. Tarnanidis. The part associated by Turilov, No. 18/N, features an interesting marginal note on f.1r, which is evidence of cooperation of Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian monks at the monastery: Да ꙗ вѣдомо всакомоу калѣгерѣ приходящѣмю ѿ синаю или ꙗ сръблѣнь или ꙗ вѣгаринѣ или ꙗ рѣсинѣ за сие келіе. наставленіемъ г(с)нимъ всеосвещенѣнаго ꙗп(ис)ко(па) германа кѣ надохъ вѣставиъ да ꙗ работати никомѣ ница.²⁸

According to K. Radčenko and Y. Ivanov, the Vienna copy from the 14th century corresponds to the first Greek version published by A. Vassiliev. Scholars are unanimous that compared to the other Slavonic copies, this one is distinguished with some individual readings, with additions and changes compared to its archetype. It is interesting to note the place where the Antichrist determines his place in the heavenly hierarchy: р(ѣ)е дѣвѣоль. въ истинѣ вѣси. то сѣтъ дѣль мѣѣ. и паѣ дѣгль твоихъ. вѣщи есмѣ. и паѣ тебѣ старѣи, where the Greek text

25 Cf. Н. Розов, "Южнославянские рукописи Синайского монастыря" [N. Rozov, "South Slavic manuscripts Sinai Monastery"] *Филологические науки (Научные доклады высшей школы)*, No. 2 (1961), pp. 129-138.

26 В. Загребин, "О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая" [V. Zagrebin, "On the origin and fate of some Slavic Sinai palimpsests"], in: *Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний (Исследования. Обзоры. Публикации)*, Leningrad, 1979, pp. 61-80.

27 *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в России, странах СНГ и Балтии. XIV век*, вып. 1, Moscow, 2002, Annex 1, № 166, p. 567.

28 I quote the text according to I. Tarnanidis, *The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, Thessaloniki, 1988, p. 147.

has been revised: ἀλλὰ πλείων σου ὑπάρνω καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων σου γέγονα.²⁹ Y. Ivanov pointed out that in this case the Bogomil view about the seniority of Antichrist and Jesus has been supported on Bulgarian soil.³⁰ In the copy from Sinai this place reads as: и ρ(ϣ)ѣ днѣволъ дѣгль тѣохъзъ сѣтрашнѣи есмь, in other words, the introduced heretical element is missing. In the Nikoljac copy and (d), (e), (f), (g): и паге тебе силнен есмь, and in Croatian tradition: и паки вѣиш сѣдр' есмь.³¹ In a number of cases the copy from Sinai (which also has incorrect readings, omissions and mistakes) conveys the archaic condition of the Slavonic translation's protograph. We should also note the place (in the missing part of the Vienna copy), where the dualistic view of the Devil's equality with God: и ρ(ϣ)ѣ днѣволъ. аще са не корѣ (!) с' тобож. не бж(д) тъкмѣнь вишнѣмоу. The ancient lexeme тъкмѣнь (replaced with тъчѣнь in the later copies) is found in the translation of the *Fountain of Knowledge* of St. John Damascene by John the Exarch and in the 16 homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus with the interpretations of Nicetas Metropolitan of Herakleia.³² In other copies the reading is: аще не поборѣ се с' тобою не боу(д) тъчѣнь вишнѣмоу, and in Croatian tradition: ако не борѣ се с' тобою не боу(д) подобанъ вишнѣмоу (but also: ако се не борѣ с' тобою не имамъ противити се вишнѣмоу).³³

A full comparison between the copies of the *Dispute* from Sinai, Vienna and Nikoljac is impossible as the end of the text in the Vienna copy has not been preserved (one folio in the manuscript is missing). There are **two newly-discovered copies** of the work which allow additional comparisons and conclusions.

1) A copy in the miscellany No. 760 of the National Library of Serbia, Belgrade (new acquisition in 2004) from the first decade of the 16th c., paper, 150x100 mm, 351 folia, written in semiuncial one hand. Orthography is without juses, inconsistent two jers, absence of typical Serbian features. Contents are the next: Revelation of Pseudo-Methodios of Patara; Homily for Christmas; Revelation of Baruch; Dispute between our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist; Story about the handsome Joseph; Life of Sts. Kerykos and Julitta; Martirium of St George; Life of Sts. Sergios and Bacchos; The descent of the Theotokos into Hell; Questions of St. John the Theologian to Abraham; Sermon about the vanity of life by St John Chrysostom; Sermon on the Epistle to Thessalonians by John Chrysostom; Life of St Euphrosyne; Miracles of St Nicolas of

29 Vassiliev, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, p. 5.

30 Иванов, *Богомилски книги и легенди*, p. 256.

31 Sambunjak, *Jezik i stil hrvatskih glagoljskih prenja*, p. 228.

32 F. Miklosich, *Lexikon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Vindobonae, 1862-1865, p. 1017.

33 Sambunjak, *Jezik i stil hrvatskih glagoljskih prenja*, p. 229, 231, 233.

Myra; Life of St Alexis of Rome; A father's exhortation to his son from the Izbornik; Commentary on the Holy Liturgy; Sermon of St. Makarios of Rome; Martirium of St. Hypatios, etc.³⁴ The text of the *Dispute* is on the folia 61r-68v: Слов(о) ѡ прѣпрѣвнѣи дѣвола съ гѣмъ нашимъ і(с)у хѣмъ. ѡ(ѣ). Пришь(д)шоу їсоу на гороу еленинскоу. и р(ѣ)ѣ ѣченико(м)ъ своимъ. ал'ѣмъ ї. дѣны и ї. ноци. да прѣприм се съ дѣволомъ. разѣмѣх' бо силоу єго. іако хоцѣтъ въврѣжити се на ни.

2) A copy in the manuscript No. 2a in the Archive of Baltazar Bogišić in Cavtat, Croatia³⁵ from the end of 16th – first decade of 17th c., paper, 105 x 145 mm, 187 folia, without beginning. The binding of the MS is from the same period. The manuscript was restored later, there are many folia overlaid with paper; elsewhere text was written later in another hand. Irregular semiuncial, three or four hands; it is composite manuscript with two main parts: prayer book and miscellany; it is visible that the prayer book was added later. Contents are the next: Revelation of the Theotokos about the seven deadly sins (short redaction); Miracles of St. Nicholas of Myra. Miracle about Demetrios; Series of stories about the Holy Tree, attributed to Gregory the Theologian (first version); Questions and answers: Razumnik (without beginning); Mira-

34 I am very grateful to National Library of Serbia for possibility to work *de visu* with the manuscript in August 2016. The short sum up of the contents in the publication of Milanka Ubiparip: М. Убипарип, "Зборник са кратким житијем краља Милутина" ["A Miscellany with the Short Version of the Vita of King Milutin"], *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор*, 71/1-4 (2006), pp. 53-72.

35 Baltazar Bogišić (1834-1908) is a Croatian scholar, a specialist in law, ethnography, and art, collector of manuscripts and folklore, and generally an encyclopedist. He was born in Cavtat near Dubrovnik. A graduate of the University of Vienna, he became a PhD (1862) and acquired a PhD in law (1866) at the same higher educational establishment. Later, he was elected *Doctor honoris causa* at the newly established Russian University in Odessa. He was a legal adviser of the Interim Russian Government after the Russian-Turkish war of Liberation in Bulgaria. Minister of Justice of Montenegro. Academician of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and a honorary member of the Bulgarian Literary Society (today Bulgarian Academy of Sciences). Worked in close cooperation with Konstantin Jireček and other European scientists. Bogišić collected manuscripts from provincial centres in Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, and Dalmatia. The archives in Cavtat contain a rich collection of proverbs and sayings, numismatics, medals, pictures and correspondence, among others. The manuscripts are total 153: in Latin, Italian, Greek and Slavonic (Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian are 23). The oldest manuscript dates from the 14th century and the latest – from the end of the 18th century. The collection also contains over 500 old printed books, in some of which there are additional manuscript folia. I enjoyed the full cooperation of the Croatian Academy of Sciences, which gave me permission to work with the archives of Bogišić *de visu*. I am grateful to the Head of the archives, Ms Stane Đivanović, who welcomed me and provided me her full cooperation.

cles of St. Nicholas of Myra. Miracle about Agrippa's son; Series of stories about the Holy Tree by priest Jeremiah; Story about Prov's brotherhood with Jesus Christ; Story about the origin of the Paulicians; Story about how St. Basil liberated a man from the devil (miracle about Eladius and Corasia); Dispute between our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist; Miracles of St. George, etc.³⁶ The text of the *Dispute* is on the folia 35r-38v: (without title and beginning) ...w горѣ тѣбѣ дѣаволѣ и аггѣлѣмъ твои(мъ). и свѣтильникѣ(м) твои(м) пришьа ѿ(с) на зѣм-лоу иже те по(г)убить.

Comparison between the two oldest copies from Sinai and Vienna with other copies, as well as with the newly-discovered Belgrade MS 760 – shows that there were probably **two separate translations** originating from different Greek versions. First of all, witnesses (d), (e), (f), (g) come from one and the same archetype, and the correspondence in content between (d), (e), (f) is obvious.³⁷ On the basis of the initial comparative analysis it can be said that the copy from Sinai (a) lies at the basis of the archetype of (d), (e), (f), (g), while the copy from Vienna (b) is distinguished by its individual features. Group formed of (d), (e), (f), (g), consist entirely of Bulgarian manuscripts, is of special interest as it features additional changes in comparison with the copy from Sinai and the other copies as well. The beginning of the text in this group is very indicative. It is precisely in this group that we find the additional assertion of Antichrist that man is his creation and belongs to him: и р(у) ѿ. право вѣси дѣаволѣ іако ѿ женѣ роди х се. да скончует се слово еже р(у) бл(д)ка. сззда(х) по своему образѣ. и не хоцѣ его ѿпдстити. и р(у)е дѣаволь. глѣши о члвцѣ его же азъ сззда(х). та(ж) аще ти сзгрьши(т), тог(д)а волю мою скончуетъ и чѣсть. и славу оставитъ то что сзтвориши емѣ. The new redaction is characteristic of the hypothetical archetype of the Panagyurishte miscellany No. 433, the Vienna miscellany No. 149 and the miscellany of Daniel No. 100, which are exceedingly similar in content and textological features. There is no doubt that there is a connection with the Adžar miscellany No. 326, which was compiled on the basis of several sources, one of which is close to the archetype of the above-mentioned three manuscripts.

New copies in the miscellany No.760 of the National Library of Serbia and in the manuscript No. 2a in the Archive of Baltazar Bogišić are intermediary of the presupposed archetype of witnesses (d), (e), (f), (g) and of Sinai copy (a),

36 No analytical description of the manuscript. Short catalog: V. Mošin, "Izvještaj o radu na urednju Bogišićeva archiva v Cavtatu," *Ljetopis Jugoslavenske akademije*, 59 (1954), pp. 20-26.

37 Cf. Милтенова, "Сборник със смесено съдържание."

and near to Nikojac copy (c).³⁸ Witnesses (h) and (i) are closer to the version in the manuscript from the Nikojac monastery (c) too. A new edition of the manuscript Sinai 34 will shed light on all tradition of the text and the relationship between witnesses in the context of Slavia Orthodoxa.³⁹

II. *The Story about Joseph* (Genesis 37-50) is widespread in medieval Slavonic literatures in a number of translations which vary according to their function and genre: 1) *Homily about fasting, and Joseph, and the priest, and the prophet David* by John Chrysostom (СВѢТАГО ІОАННА ЗЛАТОУСТАГО СЛОВО О ДАКАНИИ І ѿ ѿсифѣ и о погѣ и о давзидѣ); 2) *Sermon about the handsome Joseph by Ephrem the Syrian* (Въ понедѣльникъ страстныа недѣли слово о прекраснѣмъ ѿсифѣ како продаша его братѣа зависти ради); 3) *Sermon on Joseph's strength* (Слово ѿ крѣпосты ѿсифовѣ, ѿко рабѣ чистѣи живын, можеть вл(д)къ ч(с)тнѣи быти); 4) *Story about the handsome Joseph* (Слово прѣкраснаго ѿсифа како продаше его братѣа коупцемъ); 5) *Story about Joseph and Aseneth* (Житіе и исповѣданіе асенеды дщере пентефрѣини и како поестъ ю ѿсифѣ прѣкрасни въ женоу себѣ); 6) *Story about the handsome Joseph* in the version in the miscellanies known as *damaskini* (Житіе и жизнь праведнаго и прекраснаго ѿсифа); 7) excerpts from various parts of the story of Joseph, included separately in the manuscripts, the most distinctive being those with the interpretation of pharaoh's dream. Sometimes the differences between the biblical stories and the quoted works are minimal, but in other cases they are considerable. A.I. Yatsimirskiy⁴⁰ first tracked down and listed an abundant number of copies (with short archeographic data) of the above-mentioned groups of works, noting that the Sermon about the handsome Joseph by Ephrem the Syrian is most widespread. The stories about the handsome Joseph and about Joseph and Aseneth he identified as apocrypha, i.e. uncanonical versions of the biblical story in the Old Testament.

38 A. Miltenova, "Unstudied Manuscript with Apocrypha in the Collection of Baltazar Bogišić", in *У знак сећања Димитрија Богдановића*, 2018 (in print).

39 A. Miltenova, "За Синайския препис на "Прение на Исус Христос с дявола" и неговия контекст" ["About Sinai copy of the *Dispute between Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist*"], in "Слова и золота възъ..." Сборник статей памяти Вячеслава Михайловича Загребина (1942-2004). Ж.Л. Левшина ред. ["A ligature of word and gold..." Collected Articles Dedicated to the Memory of Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich Zagrebina (1942-2004), ed. Zh. L. Levshina], St. Petersburg, 2016 (electronic edition available at the Russian National Library site <<http://primo.nl.ru>>).

40 А. Яцимирский, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности*, вып. 1. *Апокрифы ветхозаветные* [A. Yatsimirskiy, *A Bibliographic Review of Apocrypha*], vol. 1, Petrograd, 1921, pp. 118-141.

In spite of the abundance of source material, only a small portion of the texts have been researched and published. The most comprehensive linguistic and textological analysis has been made of the *Sermon on Joseph's strength*, a copy of which is included in miscellany No. 48 at Berlin State Library, early 14th century⁴¹ and in manuscripts of similar content. Scholars have convincingly associated its origin with the Preslav Literary School. The *Homily about fasting, and Joseph, and the priest, and the prophet David* by John Chrysostom, a considerable portion of which is about Joseph, is included as an early Old Bulgarian translation in the 10th-century *Codex Suprasliensis* (ff. 177v-184v, in the part of the manuscript kept at the National Library of Poland, Warsaw).⁴²

A.I. Yatsimirskiy points out that the sermon by Ephrem the Syrian⁴³ is usually included in Paraenesis at position 103 (sometimes 104 or 105) and is part of the main content of this miscellany.⁴⁴ The monastery charters recommend the reading of this work in the first days of Maundy Week. Another date of the church calendar associated with this sermon is the Sunday before Christmas (the Sunday of Forefathers). K. Ivanova has registered two versions of the homily for this feast in Slavonic translation: 1) СЛО(В)Ъ СЪДАГО ЕФРЕМА О ПРЪКРАСИВЪ(М) ИОСИФЪ, which is included in a 14th century menologion for December-August No. III.c.22, Archives of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Art, Zagreb, and in the selective menologia No. 195 from the collection of A. Khludov, 14th century, State Historical Museum, Moscow, and No. 59, 17th century, National Library of Serbia, Belgrade; 2) СЛО(В) ПРЪКРАСНАГО ИОСИФА, which is included in another group of miscellanies: No. 135, 14th century, from the collection of A. Khludov, State Historical Museum, Moscow; No. 95, 14th century, from the collection of Dečani monastery; No. 12.3.9, 14th century, from the Library of the

41 М. Йовчева, Л. Тасева, "Езикови особености на Слово за силата на Йосиф" [M. Yovčeva and L. Taseva, "Language features of Sermon for the strength of Joseph"], *Palaeobulgarica*, 18, 4 (1994), pp. 64-74; X. Миклас, Л. Тасева, М. Йовчева, *Берлински сборник* [H. Miklas, L. Taseva, M. Yovčeva, *Berlini sk sbornik*], Sofia, 2006, pp. 338-354, 416-417.

42 BHGa 2199; CPG 4676. PG 62: 759-764: *De jejunio, de Davide et de presbyteris, de Josepho et de Novato*. Περί νηστείας, καὶ εἰς τὸν Δαυὶδ, καὶ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ εἰς τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ κατὰ Ναυάτου. Καθολικὸν... *De jejunio, de Davide* [Sp.].

43 BHGa 2200-2200e, BHGn 2200f-g CPG 3938, *Sermo in pulcherrimum Ioseph*. Ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσαάκ. Assemani, G.2, 21-41c. D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou, "L'Ephrem Slave et sa tradition manuscrite," in: *Geschichte der Ost- und Westkirche in ihren wechselseitigen Beziehungen: Acta congressus historiae Slavicae Salisburgensis in memoriam ss. Cyrilli et Methodii anno 1963 celebrati*, Wiesbaden, 1967, pp. 87-97.

44 Яцимирский, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов*, p. 121.

Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg.⁴⁵ Considering the large number of copies collected by A.I. Yatsimirskiy (167!) and the information from other sources, the work of Ephrem the Syrian (Sermon about the handsome Joseph by Ephrem the Syrian) is the most popular and most frequently copied text dedicated to Old Testament Joseph not only because the sermon is a model in the parenetic genre, but also because of his obvious authority. For these reasons, the compilers of miscellanies frequently replaced other anonymous and works of unclear origin precisely with it, as we shall see further. The *Story about Joseph and Aseneth* (CAVT 105; Joseph et Aseneth / Confessio et Oratio Asenath) systematically attracted the attention of scholars with resulting abundant literature.⁴⁶ It remains outside the scope of the present paper.

The least studied is the *Story about the Handsome Joseph*,⁴⁷ known from ten copies in the following manuscripts:

1. No. 115 (828) (miscellany of Father Pribil), 1409, National Library of Serbia, Belgrade (burned during World War II); Serbian origin; f. 20v-31v: *Слво ѡ прѣрасне(м) Іѡсифѣ*. Beginning: *Бѣше Іаковъ имаше снѡвъ. Ёі. Іѡсифъ сѧ Вениамыномѣ бѣста мѣнша ѿ все брѣтїе*. Described by S. Matic.⁴⁸
2. No. 241, c. 1451, collection of A. Khudov, State Historical Museum, Moscow; without juses, inconsistently used two-jers orthography, typical Serbian language features are absent; f. 46r-51r: *Сл(в) прѣкраснаго Іѡсифа како продаше ѧго брѣтїа коупце(м) бл(с)ви ѡ(ч)*. Beginning: *Бѣше Іаковъ имаше снѡвъ Ёі. Іѡсифъ и Вениаминъ. бѣста мѣнша ѿ всѣх(ч) брѣтїе*. The manuscript was described by A. Popov and A.I. Yatsimirskiy.⁴⁹

45 K. Ivanova, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Balcano-Slavica*, Sofia, 2008, pp. 376-377.

46 M. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (Studia postbiblica, 13), Leiden, 1968; Ch. Burchard, *Joseph und Aseneth kirchenslavisch* [= *Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth*], Leiden – New York – Köln, 1996; A.-M. Denis, J.-C. Haelewyck, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique: pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 1, Brepols 2000, pp. 191-330; R. Nir, *Joseph and Aseneth. A Christian Book* (Hebrew Bible Monographs, 40), Sheffield, 2012.

47 No identical prototype in Greek tradition; CAVT 108 Historia Joseph (fragmenta Graeca); CAVT 109 Historia Joseph (syriace); CAVT 110 Legenda Joseph (fragmentum copticum); CAVT 111 Historia apocrypha de Joseph (sahidice); CAVT 112 Historia Joseph et fratrum eius (sahidice); CAVT 115 Historia Joseph (arabice), etc.: Denis, Haelewyck, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique*, pp. 343-348 (and bibliography).

48 С. Матић, *Опис рукописа Народне библиотеке* [S. Matic, *Description of the Manuscripts in National Library*], Belgrad, 1952, pp. 135-140, № 196.

49 А. Попов, *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А.И. Худова* [A. Popov, *Description of the Manuscripts and Old Printed Books in*

3. No. 677 (Tikveš Miscellany), end-15th century, St. Cyril and St. Methodius National Library, Sofia; no-juses, one-jer orthography, of West Bulgarian origin; f. 40r-46v: Сло(в) прѣкраснаго Ивсиѣа. ѿче. Beginning: Иаковъ бѣше въ земли Халденсѣи. имаше .ѣи. сновъ свои(х). старей въсе(х) бѣше Юда. нан младен бѣше Ив(с)ифъ и Венеами(н). End: тог(д)а Вениами(н) надѣ се и вси глахоу въпомени се Венѣам(н)е... (без край). The manuscript was described by B. Tsonev⁵⁰ and was published by N. Načov.⁵¹
4. No. IV.a.24, 1520, Archives of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb. Written in Dubrovnik; Serbian orthography with traces of Štokavian dialect. Described and studied by a number of scholars.⁵² M. Rešetar, who is the author of the most comprehensive study of the miscellany, has proved that it consists of five different parts, written by three scribes and a fourth, who has added the red inscriptions, some figures and other elements. In respect to the content, he assumed that the anti-graph of the manuscript was not earlier than the end of the 15th century. Утене приекраснаго ивзефа сина иакова. According to M.Rešetar,⁵³ the text is identical with that in the Tikveš Miscellany.
5. No. 760, the first decade of the 16th c. National Library of Serbia, Belgrade (new acquisitions in 2004, 150x100 mm, 351 folia. Orthography without juses, inconsistent two jers, absence of typical Serbian features.
6. No. 1161, 16th c., Church Historical and Archival Museum; no-juses, two-jers inconsistent orthography with Modern Bulgarian features; f. 70r-81r: Слово ѿ краснѣ(м) Ивсиѣѣ ѿ(ч)е блви. Beginning: Иаковъ бѣше въ земли хал(д)енсѣи имаше .ѣи. сновъ свои(х). старей въсе(х) бѣше юуда и нан мнши бѣста ивсихъ (sic!) и вениаминъ. No end. The miscellany was introduced in research circulation by S. Kožuharov.⁵⁴

A.I. Khludov Collection], Moscow, 1872, pp. 486-488 (the description is incomplete and the manuscript 241 was dated in the 17th century).

50. Б. Конев, *Опис на славянските ръкописи в Софийската народна библиотека* [B. Conev, *Description of Manuscripts in the National Library in Sofia*], vol. 2, Sofia, 1923, p. 208.
51. Н. Начов, "Тиквешки ръкопис" [N. Načov, "The Manuscript from Tikvesh"], *Сборник за народни умотворения наука и книжнина*, VIII (1892), pp. 389-418; XIX (1893), pp. 85-160; X (1894), pp. 69-193.
52. V. Jagić, "Prilozi k historji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga," *Arhiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku*, IX (1868), pp. 65-151; M. Rešetar, "Libro od mnozijek razloga," *Zbornik za istorji jezika i književnosti srpskoga naroda* (1926); idem, *Dubrovački zbornik od god. 1520*, Belgrad, 1933; V. Mošin, *Ćirilski rukopisi Jugoslavenske Akademije*, vol. 1, Zagreb, 1955, pp. 71-73.
53. Rešetar, *Dubrovački zbornik od god. 1520*, pp. 37-52. I do not have access to this copy.
54. С. Кожухаров, "Неизвестен препис на Солунската легенда" [S. Kozuharov, "Unknown

7. No. III.a.43 (Pakrac, Slavonia, Croatia), 16th-17th c., Archives of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb; of Serbian origin; f. 244-252: Сло(в) прѣкрасна(р) ѿсиѣа како прода(ш)е его братѣа. Beginning: Бѣше ѿаковъ имаше бѣ. сновъ. ѿсиѣѣ съ венѣаминѣ(м) бѣ(с)та мнѣша ѿ в(с)е(х) снѣовъ и братѣе. The manuscript has been described several times.⁵⁵
8. No. IX.H.16 (Š 19), 1646, National Museum, Prague; Resava orthography, of Serbian origin; f. 170v-179r: Сло(в) ѡ прѣкраснѣмъ ѿсиѣѣ. Beginning: Иаковъ бѣ(ш) въ зѣ(м)лѣи халѣдеи(с)ци. ѿ има(ш)е бѣ. сновъ свои(х). End: Донѣ(д)ѣже моиси погѣби и(х) амалика мѣчителя на горѣ(ѣ) про(с)тѣртине(м) рѣкъ свои(х) крѣ(с)та ѡбразно. бѣ наше(м)ѣ. сла(в) въ вѣкы. ѿ амин. The manuscript has been described several times by G.A. Voskresenskij, M.N. Speranskij, A.I. Yatsimirskij, J. Vašica and J. Vajs,⁵⁶ and J. Polivka⁵⁷ published a number of texts. The manuscript is associated with the school at Rača monastery.⁵⁸
9. No. 738 (Prizren), 17th century, National Library of Serbia, Belgrade (burned during World War II); no jus, two-jeer inconsistent orthography, of Serbian origin; f. 72r-89v: Слово ѡ прѣкраснаго ѿсиѣа како прѣдаше его братѣа его. Живѣ же ѿсиѣѣ .зѣ. лѣтъ въ дому ѿца своего ѿакова. The manuscript is described by L. Stojanović.⁵⁹

A.I. Yatsimirskij⁶⁰ added two copies of the work which remain unidentified: a). In festal menologion No. 13.7.2. (Syrku 45) from the collection of P. Syrku, Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, mid-16th century, Resava orthography, ff. 157-159. The book contains services and synaxarion vi-

Copy of Thessaloniki Legend"], *Известия на Института за български език*, XVI, 5 (1966), pp. 491-494.

- 55 Н. Ружичић, "Стари српски рукописи у књијници Југословенске академије у Загребу" [N. Ruzhichić, "Old Serbian Manuscripts in the Archive of Yugoslavian Academy in Zagreb"], *Споменик СКА*, 38 (1900), p. 142; Mošin, *Ćirilski rukopisi Jugoslavenske Akademije*, pp. 79-83.
- 56 Яцимирский, *Описание южнославянских и русских рукописей*, pp. 814-828; I. Франко, "Codex apokryphus e manuscriptis ukraino-russicis collectus," in: idem, *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів*, vol. II; J. Vašica and J. Vajs, *Soupis staroslovanských rukopisů Národního musea v Praze*, Praha, 1957, pp. 331-344.
- 57 J. Polivka, "Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslovenskih rukopisa u Pragu," *Starine*, XXI (1889), pp. 184-225; XXII (1890), pp. 195-221.
- 58 А. Милтенова, "Въпросо-ответните съчинения в ръкописите на Рачанските книжовници" [A. Miltenova, "Questions and Resposes Literature in the Manuscripts of Rača Writers"], in: *Црквене студије*, vol. 3 (Ниш, 2006), pp. 275-287.
- 59 Стојановић, *Каталог Народне библиотеке у Београду*, pp. 306-309.
- 60 Яцимирский, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов*, p. 119.

tae for the major church feasts; from f. 147r onwards there is a synaxarion about Prince Lazar and the Christians who were killed with him in the Battle of Kosovo. In the catalogue of the collection, B. Hristova included it among the manuscripts of Serbian origin;⁶¹ b). In a miscellany of mixed content from the Bolshakov collection (Russian State Library, Moscow),⁶² 17th century, with Ukrainian linguistic peculiarities, ff. 142v-154: Животъ святаго Іосифа патріарха. Яковъ патріарх маіуи дванадцать синовъ на(и)молодшихъ двоухъ. In terms of its peculiarities, this copy is an exception from all the rest.

The copies listed above are all of Bulgarian and Serbian origin. They are incorporated in miscellanies of mixed content, most of which are close in terms of content and textological features. They can be grouped as follows:

- I. Miscellany of Father Pribil, year 1409; miscellany from Belgrade, beginning of the 16th c.; miscellany from Pakrac, mid-16th century; miscellany from Prizren, 17th century.
- II. Miscellany from the A. Khludov collection, mid-15th century and Belgrade miscellany (new acquisition) No. 760.
- III. Tikveš miscellany of the end of the 15th century; miscellany from Church Historical and Archival Museum, the 16th century; miscellany from Dubrovnik, year 1520; miscellany from Rača, year 1646.⁶³

The versions differ in respect to the volume of text, which is larger in the first group, containing more detailed descriptions of the events and in respect to linguistic peculiarities. The language of the first group has preserved older features, and the content somewhat approaches that of the Sermon by Ephrem the Syrian.

The textological and structural peculiarities of miscellanies with mixed content provide grounds for their grouping into several principal types according to their characteristic features, and the types of miscellanies with mixed content identified here are based on our detailed study of the 15th-17th-century manuscript tradition. As we have already seen, this systematization is based on

61 Б. Христова, "Ръкописната сбирка на П.А. Сирку в Ленинград" [B. Hristova, "P.A. Syrku Collection of Manuscripts in Leningrad"], *Известия на НБКМ*, XVIII (24) (1983), p. 273, № 7. I do not have access to the apocryphal text.

62 Г. Георгиевский, *Рукописи Т.Ф. Большакова, хранящиеся в Императорском Московском и Румянцевском музеи* [G. Georgievskiy, *T.F. Bolshakov Collection of Manuscripts in Imperial Moscow and Rumyantsev Museum*], Petrograd, 1915, VIII, p. 20.

63 The text from the last family is published: A. Miltenova, "Text and Context: Story about the Handsome Joseph in the Miscellanies with Mixed Content", *Scripta & e-Scripta*, 14-15 (2015), 231-250.

two sets of features: the structure of the manuscripts and the textological properties of certain works that constitute part of their textual core or nucleus, that is, a relatively stable combination of texts that characterizes each type. The editorial changes in these texts characterize not only the overall makeup of the individual miscellany, but also the type under which it can be categorized. In other words, the relationships among manuscripts of the same type operate in terms of both makeup (the consecutive order of the constituent articles) and the textological features (translations, versions).

To conclude: the examples of transmission of *Dispute between Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Antichrist* and on the *The Story about beautiful Joseph* show that the initial translations of apocryphal works underwent changes in the Slav environment in the Balkans. Elements of oral lore were introduced, on the one hand dualistic legends and on the other – the resistance against heresies. The reader imposes a vision and idea on the already translated text. The works discussed here show that the environment in which apocrypha were distributed was not uniform in terms of ideology, but was similar in style and method of redaction typical of petty clergy. At the same time, the researcher must be very careful when defining these types of texts as belonging to so-called “Popular Christianity.”