The Dream of King Jehoash: A Textual Analysis

Keiko Mitani

The University of Tokyo

kmitani@mbi.suisui.ne.jp

Abstract

The term "apocryphal" has been applied to a broad range of medieval Slavonic texts. Many of them were composed in the Judeo-Hellenistic literary tradition and brought into the Slavic lands, forming a particular textual corpus abundant in a variety of contents and narrative styles. However, there is also a group of pieces regarded as Slavonic apocrypha but whose origin is unclear. The Dream of King Jehoash, a very short story written in Old Slavonic, is one of such texts, copies of which were mostly circulated from the 13th to the 18th century in Russia. This paper compares nine copies of the Dream, including the oldest one, analyzes linguistic and structural features of them, and presents the early transmission pattern of copies. Based on a particular expression reminiscent of the one found in The Song of Songs, the author concludes that the Dream was a Slavonic creation.

Keywords

Slavonic apocrypha – The Song of Songs – Biblical translation in Slavonic – King Jehoash

The term "apocryphal" has been applied to a broad range of medieval Slavonic texts. Many of them were composed in the Judeo-Hellenistic literary tradition and brought into the Slavic lands, forming a particular textual corpus abundant in a variety of contents and narrative styles. However, there is also a group of pieces regarded as Slavonic "apocrypha" but whose origin is unclear. *The Dream of King Jehoash* [Сон царя Йоаса in Russian, Сънят на цар Йоас in Bulgarian] (further, the *Dream*), a very short story written in Old Slavonic, is typically seen as one such text, copies of which were mostly circulated from the 13th to the 18th century in Russia.

It has been suggested that the *Dream* was partly, or wholly, translated into Slavonic from Greek, but no equivalent in Greek, or any other language, has been found. As is not unusual with texts without the *Vorlage*, no attempt has been mounted either to look for its protograph or to detect the transmission pattern of the copies. Precise characterization of the *Dream* as a literary piece has not been provided yet, although an established understanding is that it is an apocryphon. Thus, this text indeed needs deeper observation in order to be properly placed in the tradition of medieval Slavonic writings, and this will be the task of this paper.

The paper is structured as follows: firstly, the storyline, manuscripts, and previous study concerning this text are overviewed; secondly, linguistic features of Russian and Bulgarian manuscripts are described for the purpose of looking for the language of protograph; thirdly, the content and textural structure of the story are analyzed, and fourthly, the early transmission pattern of the text is reconstructed in reference to other texts appearing adjacent to the *Dream*. The analysis concludes that the text was composed by way of combining the Slavonic tradition of apocryphal narrative and the style of exegetical writings popular in Byzantine-Orthodox literature.

1 Story, Copies, Previous Study

1.1 Story

A rumor that King Jehoash had a dream reached Amaziah, King of Judah, who then sent Jehoash his message to offer a meeting. Jehoash responded by relaying his dream through his messengers.

The narrative of dream after this introductory statement starts with an unclear yet impressive phrase: *грьзнѣ глѣмыи коупина иже на синан сын поустиахъ есть кедрови ливаньскомоу двѣ женѣ оуиѣ възоръмъ* (“a grape” named “bush” has directed two pretty women to the Lebanon cedar standing on the Sinai mountain). This phrase, which might lead readers to anticipate the beginning of an unknown apocalyptic story, however, is followed by a narrative that runs not in a usual storytelling style but as a succession of fragmental phrases depicting different scenes without cohesive relationship between one another, for example: Two young pretty women, one of whom has a red face and the other – a white face; *Abishag* warms you; Big is the city, but small for me, and scarce are the people; a poor but wise man is in the city; it is him who saves the city besieged by a mighty king.

The narrative of the dream of Jehoash ends with the words addressed to Amaziah to explain all these. Amaziah, then taking the part of decipherer,

gives interpretation to each phrase of the dream: *купина* in the first phrase of the dream, for example, means Jesus; *кедр ливански* represents a righteous belief for new people; of the two women-heralds, the one with a red face is the Old Testament while the other with a white face is a holy, true faith. After the interpretations of Amaziah, phrases referring to the verses of the Psalms appear and the story ends.

1.2 *Copies*

Copies of the *Dream* are dated from the 13th century, disseminated in Russia with one exception of Bulgarian provenance included in the “Ivan Alexander’s Miscellany.” The number of copies are estimated at several tens, but exact enumeration is supposedly difficult; not only because of the incomplete, fragmental copying of the text but also because of its interpolation into totally different texts.¹

The oldest extant copy, marked Q in this paper, is included in the collection Q.p.1.18, RNL (further, Qp18), fols. 1-3v, compiled in the first half of the 13th century in Russia.² The next oldest copy (O) is contained in the Codex F.205 (the O IDR collection), No.171, RSL (abbreviated as O171), dated the second half of the 13th century.³ The other copies consulted, or referred to, in this paper are the following:

- T11 – RSL, the Library Collection of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra, F. 304, I. No. 11 (abbreviated as TSL11), fols. 57-58v, 14th c.

- 1 S. Ivanov, for example, noticed that the *Dream* was interpolated into one of Russian recensions of “the Story about the Twelve Fridays”: С.В. Иванов, “«Сказание о 12 пятницах» и «Сон царя Иоаса»: взаимодействие двух апокрифических текстов,” in: *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология – XV. Материалы чтений, посвященных памяти профессора Иосифа Моисеевича Тронского. 20-22 июня 2011 г.* [S.V. Ivanov, “The Story about the Twelve Fridays» and «King Jehoash»: Interplay between two apocryphal texts,” in *Indoeuropean Linguistics and Classic Philology – XV. Materials of readings, dedicated to the memoiry of professor Iosif Moiseevič Tronskij. Jun 20-22, 2011*], Saint Petersburg, 2011, pp. 212-220; The *Dream* is also inserted into anthologies of texts ascribed to Ioannes Chrysostomos, ex.: «Въ средѣ цвѣтныа нѣн слово истѣковано ѿ еѡѡѡа. Посла нивасъ црь ко амесию црю израильтескому. Толк. Амесию црь рече, грезнь есть хс.» (А.В. Горский, К.И. Невоструев, *Описание рукописей московской синодальной библиотеки, Отдел II, Ч. 3* [Description of Manuscripts in the Moscow Sinodal Library, Division II, Part 3], Moscow. 1857, p. 96.)
- 2 В.Н. Мочульский, “Сон царя Иоаса” [The Dream of King Jehoash], *Русский филологический вестник*, 37 (1897), pp. 97-113; H. Wątróbska, *The izbornik of the XIIIth century: Cod. Leningrad, GRV, Q.p. 1.18: Text in transcription* (Полата књигописњана, 19-20), Nijmegen, 1987.
- 3 А.А. Алексеев, “К истории русской переводческой школы XII в.” [On the Russian Translational School of the 12th Century], *ТОДРЛ*, 41 (1988), pp. 154-196, here p. 155.

- T122 – RSL, the Library Collection of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra, F. 304, I. No. 122 (TSL122), fols. 152v-155, 15th c.
- T408 – RSL, the Library Collection of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra, F.304, I. No. 408 (TSL408), fols.492-494v, 15th c.
- V – RSL, Volokolamskij collection, F. 113, No. 13 (V113), 16th c.⁴
- R – RGADA F.181 (RO MGAMID), op. 5. part. 2. 478/958 (RGD), fols. 533-533v, 16th c.⁵
- S – RSL, The Synodal Library collection, No. 235, fols. 102r-102v, 18th c.

A Bulgarian copy (1A) is included in Tsar Ivan Alexandăr's Miscellany of 1348 (BA), fols. 207-209v.⁶

1.3 Previous Study

P.A. Lavrovskij (1858)⁷ was probably the first study to shed light on the Qp18, in which a copy of the *Dream* is contained. Although Lavrovskij mostly focused on the linguistic features of the collection, this surely generated scholarly interest in the *Dream* among researchers of subsequent generations, such as A.S. Uvarov (1896),⁸ V.N. Močul'skij (1897),⁹ V.M. Istrin (1898),¹⁰ and A.I. Sobolevskij (1911).¹¹ Močul'skij's contribution of the publication of Q should remain highly estimated today, but his conjecture that the narrative of Jehoash's dream was composed by a Byzantine writer who was inspired by the Church art, whereas the interpretation part was later supplemented by a Slav, was severely criticized by Istrin as baseless. The latter remarked that the source text, which

4 Алексеев, "К истории русской переводческой школы," p. 157.

5 Д.В. Каштанов, "Русь и Фессалоника в XII-XIII веках: люди, идеи, пути" [Rus' and Thessalonica in the 12-13th Centuries: People, thoughts and roads], *Византийский временник*, 65. (2006), pp. 94-106, here p. 96.

6 E. Zashev, *Lavrentij's Miscellany. Tsar Ivan Alexandăr's Miscellany of 1348. Phototype edition*, Sofia, 2015; see also: К. Куев, *Иван Александровият сборник от 1348 г.* [Ivan Alexander's Miscellany in 1348], Sofia, 1981.

7 П.А. Лавровский, "Описание семи рукописей императорской публичной библиотеки" [Description of the Seven Manuscripts in the Imperial Public Library], *Чтения оидр* (1858), No. 4, pp. 3-90; particularly pp. 17-24.

8 А.С. Уваров, "Рисунок символической школы XVII вѣка" [A Drawing of the 17th-century Symbolic School, *Археологические известия и заметки* (1896), No. 4, pp. 93-99.

9 See note 2.

10 В.М. Истрин, "К вопросу о 'сне царя Иоаса': По поводу статьи проф. Мочульского" [On the Question about 'the Dream of King Jehoash': In regard to the prof. Močul'skij's article], *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* (1898, February), pp. 300-308.

11 А.И. Соболевский, "Неизвестный русский паломник" [An Unknown Russian Pilgrim], *ИОРЯС*, 16, 1 (1911), pp. 5-7.

should have been written in Greek, was not composed at one stroke but was gradually compiled over years by many writers. According to Istrin, this can explain the disorganized yet still unique textual structure of the *Dream*.

In recent years, M. Babitskaja (1995)¹² examined the composition of Qp18 and concluded that this collection, as well as other collections of similar contents compiled in Russia, has an antecedent of East Slavonic provenance; however, no mention was made in reference to the *Dream*. In a series of works concerning the Slavonic translation of the biblical book of the Song of Songs, A.A. Alekseev more than once touched upon the *Dream* (Alekseev 1983, 1985, 1988, 2002) and suggested that the Slavonic version might have first been translated in the South Slavic region from a Greek text whereas the interpretation part could have been a creation in Kievan Rus.¹³ D.V. Kashtanov noticed this story in his study of fragmental texts extracted from the exegesis of Psalms appearing after the *Dream* in several copies, and guessed in relation to those fragmental texts that the *Dream* already existed by the end of the 12th century.¹⁴

As for the South Slavonic copy, 1A, K. Kuev (1981) gave a brief description of the *Dream* in his commentary to BA,¹⁵ whereas, in I. Zašev (2015),¹⁶ no particular mention was provided in regard to the *Dream*.

2 Languages

2.1 Russian Copy Q

This section will sketch linguistic features of Q, the oldest Russian copy, and the sole Bulgarian copy 1A. The purpose of doing so is to search for clues to the language of protograph, since the possibility of the South Slavic origin of the *Dream* has been repeatedly suggested, while the copies were mostly circulated in Russia, including the oldest one dating from the 13th century.

12 M. Бабицкая, "Источники Изборника XIII века [Origins of a 13th-century Miscellany] (Cod. St. Petersburg, ГРВ Q.р.1.18)," *Byzantinoslavica*, 56 (1995), pp. 631-635.

13 Алексеев, "К истории русской переводческой школы," р.181; А.А. Алексеев, "Цитаты из Песни песней в славянской письменности"[Citations from Song of Songs in the Slavonic literature], *Старобългарска литература*, 18 (1985), pp. 74-92; idem, "К определению объема литературного наследия Мефодия (Четий перевод Песни песней)" [On the Definition of Range of Methodius's Literary Legacy ('Četij' translation of Song of Songs)], *ТОДРЛ*, 37 (1983), pp. 229-255; idem, *Песнь песней в древней славяно-русской письменности* [Song of Songs in Old Slavonic and Russian Literature], Saint Petersburg, 2002.

14 Каштанов, "Русь и Фессалоника," р. 101.

15 Кув, *Иван Александровият сборник*, pp. 383-385, 389-390.

16 Zashv, *Lavrentiy's Miscellany*, pp. 11-64.

The reason for our selecting Q as an object of examination among Russian copies is not only because Q is the oldest extant text but also because it looks most reliable in reference to textual quality. Let us compare, for example, O (the second oldest copy) with Q. O lacks the first part of the story, and the following is the beginning of the extant part:

O) ...Ѹ(Ї)ТЬНАА А КЕЖЕ ВЪЗВѢСТИТА ГОРАМЪ И ХЪЛМОМЪ ДА СА Ѡ(Т)ВИТАЮТЬ ...

... it (the belief) is honorable (?), and the two announce to mountains and hills that they themselves “otvitajut”¹⁷

This is most likely a part of Amaziah’s interpretation of the dream, and the corresponding phrase in Q reads:

... ѸТАЯ ѸТЬНАА А ИЖЕ ВЪЗВѢСТИТА ГОРАМЪ И ХЪЛМОМЪ ДА СА ѠВИВАЮТЬ

... it (the belief) is pure and honorable, and they two announce to mountains and hills that they themselves “otvivajut”

The obvious closeness of these two indicates that they are copied from a common source; however, the form of the relative pronoun in O, *кеже*, obviously disagrees with the verb form *възвѣститѣ*, which is in the 3rd person dual present form. Moreover, the verb *Ѡ(Т)ВИТАЮТ СА* (‘dwell themselves’?) in O looks to be an error in comparison with Q’s *ѠВИВАЮТЬ СА* (‘disclose themselves’) and the similar forms appearing in the corresponding position of other texts (Т11: *ѠВИВАЮТЬ*, Т408: *ѠБИВАЮТ*, Т122: *ѠВИВАЮТЬ*).

Defects and errors are found in different degrees in other younger manuscripts, too. Т11, which is as complete a text as Q, for example, also shows errors in copying, as illustrated below:

(Q) ОБАВИ ЖЕ СА О ТОМЪ АМЕСИИ ЦРЮ ИЮДИНОУ И ПОСЛА АМЕСИИ

(Т11) ОБАВИ ЖЕ СА СОНОТЪ АМИСИЮ СЪНУ ИЮДИНУ ИСАМЕСИИ

Here, *о томъ* in Q is changed in Т11 to *соноут*, which is evidently an error, and *амесии црю иудиноу* in Q is miscopied to *амисию сну иудину* (to Amaziah, Son of Judah”).

17 *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI-XIII вв.* [Repertory Catalogue of Slavonic-Russian Old Manuscripts from the 11th-13th centuries, kept in USSR], Moscow, 1984, p. 312.

These defects and errors in other copies give us good grounds to estimate Q as a copy that is closer than others to the Russian protograph and to take it as an objective of observation. Further, this manuscript will be used for the citation, too.

The language features that Lavrovskij remarked on in his observation of Qp18¹⁸ naturally hold true to Q. The jers in strong positions are retained in certain degree, whereas weak jers are mostly omitted: *сѣмѣ* ('dream,' nom.sg.), but *сна* (gen.sg.); *мнѣ* (dat.1sg, against the proper OR form *мѣнѣ*); *слы* (<сѣль 'herald,' acc.pl.). Thus, the way in which jers are used in Q matches the general tendency of treatment of jers in the writing tradition of Kievan Rus.¹⁹ Pleophonic forms are found as in *под главу*,²⁰ *истекающею молоку*,²¹ and *бръви висоцѣ акы чърнилъмъ заволоученѣ*,²² but their occurrence is not consistent; rather, it is accompanied with the South Slavonic alternatives: *главу* *оубавеноу*, *оубавеная* *иеть глава*. As for *градъ*, the pleophonic form *городъ* is not attested. Inter-consonantal diphthongs, originating from the Proto-Slavic *TьRT and *TьRT, are consistently written as <ъ+liquids>, which were usual in Old Russian: *хълмомъ* (<*hьlmъ, OCS:хълмъ);²³ *първое* (<*pьrvъ, OCS:прьвъ).²⁴ The big jus is not used, the etymological *q being represented by *оу* or *ю*: *роукоу* (<рѣка, acc.sg.); *стѣкающе* (<[и]стѣци, active participle present, n.nom.sg). The small jus is often replaced with *я* or *а*: *рѣша* (<рѣци, aor.3.pl.). It can be noted also that the preposition repetition, a feature typically observed in medieval Russian writings, is attested: *къ Иоасу къ снѣу ахъазову*.²⁵

Along with these Russian features, Q shows archaic features as well, such as the correct use of dual forms: *речено же иеть има, възвѣститѣ* (<възвѣстити); *сѣсома надонѣ* (<сѣсъ, instr.du.), and the dative absolute structure: *истѣкающею молоку по изовилоу*.²⁶

On the basis of these observations, we can state that Q was definitely written in Russia, but several features, such as the use of South Slavonic forms

18 Лавровский, "Описание семи рукописей," p. 18.

19 В.И. Бorkовский, П.С. Кузнецов, *Историческая грамматика русского языка* [*Historical Grammar of Russian Language*], Moscow, 2006, pp. 99–100.

20 Тп, Т408: под главу.

21 Тп: истѣкающе млеко; Т408: истикающе млеко.

22 Тп: чърнилъмъ заволоученѣ, Т408: чърнило(м) заволоучени.

23 Т122, Т408: хълмомъ, ІА: хълмѣмъ.

24 Тп, Т408: первое, ІА: пръвъе.

25 Тп: ко іоаси снѣу ахъазову ко црю изѣаву; ІА: къ іоасу снѣу ахъазову црю ісрѣмову

26 For the use of dative absolutive in OR, see Borkovskij, Кузнецов, *Историческая грамматика русского языка*, pp. 445–446.

without pleophony, along with the grammatical archaism, may hint at the South Slavic origin from which the Russian copy was composed.

2.2 IA

Let us turn our attention to IA.

Here, medieval Bulgarian innovative features are conspicuous, such as the use of juses in etymologically unrelated positions:²⁷ **А** for the etymological ***q** in **ИМАЦИ** (<ИМѢЦИ, Q: ИМУЦИ), **ЛѢВѢА** **РѢКИѢ** (acc.sg.);²⁸ **Ѣ** used in place of **Ѧ** or **А**: **ѢЗЫКЪ** (<***ę**зыкъ, meaning ‘people’);²⁹ **УМНОЖИШѢ СѦ** (aor.3.pl. <умножити сѦ).³⁰ At the same time, old features are retained, for instance, **СЫН** (<сѣтъ [быти]), in spite of the medieval Bulgarian tendency from the 12th century to replace **Ы** with **Ѣ** in the ending of the masculine nominative singular of the active participle present.³¹

Amongst other features outside phonological ones we may notice:

- the dative absolute phrase, which correctly occurs in Q, is changed into **СТАЧУѢЩИѢ МЛѢКО**. This could be read as a scribe’s reinterpretation of the dative absolute in the source text into the usual participial phrase with the nominative singular feminine form of the active participle of the verb **СТАЧУТИ** (‘shed’) followed by **МЛѢКО** as the direct object,³² meaning ‘shedding milk’; otherwise it could be a simple error in copying.
- one of the two women appearing in Jehoash’s dream is depicted in Russian copies as “has a red face with black eyes” (Q: **УЧИНІ СМАГЛѢ**), but, in IA, the adjective **СМѢГЛА** modifies the second woman who should be “white,” resulting in a formation of the contaminated phrase **ДРУГАА ЖЕ СМѢГЛА БѢЛО ЛИЦЕ**: “another black(?) woman (has) a white face.”

Another deviance which looks to be a result of a scribe’s miscopy is **АМИНОДАВА ЖЕ ДЪЦИ ДАВИДАМИЛА**, whereas, in Q, the corresponding phrase is **ДЪЦИ ДАВИДАМЛА**: “David’s(?) daughter.”

27 К. Мирчев, *Историческа граматика на Български език* [*Historical Grammar of Bulgarian Language*], Sofia, 1963, pp. 102, 104-105.

28 Q: **ЛѢВУЮ РОУКУ**.

29 Тп: **ЯЗЫКЪ**.

30 Тп: **УМНОЖИШАСѦ**.

31 Мирчев, *Историческа граматика*, p. 214.

32 The use of the verb **СТАЧУТИ** as a transitive can be found in: **ЕСТИ А ВЪ ЗЕМѦ БЛАГѢ. ИСТАЧѢЩИѢА МЛѢКО И МЕДЪ**: J. Kurz, et al. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského* (*Словарь старославянского языка. Репринтное издание*) [Dictionary of Old Church Slavonic (Reprinted edition)], Saint Petersburg, 2006, vol. 1, p. 814.

Difference in lexical selection is scarcely observed between IA and Q, with one clear divergence: *прѣльстити* in IA and *сѣблазнити* in Q:

IA: ДѢВОЛЪ ХОТА ЛЮДИ ПРѢЛЬСТИТИ И ВЗВѢСТИ ВЪ МѢКѢ ВЪНУШѢ

Q: ТО ЕСТЬ ДИАВОЛЪ ХОТА ЛЮДИ СѢБЛАЗНИТИ И ВЗВѢСТИ ВЪ МОУКОУ ВЪНУШЮ

This difference, however, does not provide us with any key to define the place or time of origin of these copies, as both verbs were used in Old Slavonic; i.e., in medieval Bulgarian as well as Russian writings.

Thus, our sketch of the linguistic features of Q as well as IA revealed that both Q and IA show orthographic features of medieval Russian and Bulgarian writings, respectively. To define the language of protograph of the *Dream* from comparison of these two copies is therefore hardly a promising endeavor. Nevertheless, some lexical features may indicate the South Slavic origin of the *Dream*, such as *дѣсница* 'a right hand' and the use of *книга* to mean 'a book (of the Bible)': *оучение стых книгъ*.³³ It has been suggested in previous studies, as in Alekseev (1985), that the part of Jehoash's dream may have first appeared in the South Slavic region, but the interpretation part could be a later addition in Kievan Rus. However, the linguistic features of Q look to contradict such a hypothesis, as pleophonic forms (*голова*, *заволоучѣнѣ*) mostly appear in the dream part, while, in the interpretation part, the South Slavonic forms without pleophony are dominant. If the dream part were of South Slavic composition and the interpretation were a Russian addition, the appearance of pleophonic forms would be opposite. The possibility, as has been suggested by Močul'skij (1868) and Istrin (1898), that the *Dream* was composed gradually, firstly the dream part and later the interpretation part, cannot be denied; however, it is hardly conceivable that the first appearance of the *Dream* was in Kievan Rus and that the text was then introduced to the South Slavic region where the interpretation part was added before being brought back into Russia. The simplest way to understand the formation process of the *Dream* would be that the text as a whole was first composed in a South Slavic region, most likely Bulgaria, and then brought into Russia, where it underwent rewriting in compliance with scribes' habits of Kievan Rus. The reason why the pleophonic forms are more favored in the dream part than in the interpretation part should be examined separately, which is outside the scope of this paper.

33 Алексеев, "К истории русской переводческой школы," p. 181.

3 Composition and Content of the Text

The *Dream* is composed of the introductory segment, the main narrative as a core part, and a short coda. The main narrative is two-partite: the narrative of Jehoash's dream, and interpretations given by Amaziah.

It has been already noted in the previous study that the *Dream* was a compilation of biblical books and drew particularly on The Song of Songs, The Kings, and the book of Ecclesiastes. Indeed, as we will see below, the author(s) of this short piece must have made the best use of these books; however, the strategy that the author(s) selected for referring to them is not simplex but ranges from plain quotation, though partial modification, to free adaptation. In addition, not only the biblical books but also the exegeses of the biblical books were used for composing this piece.

3.1 Introductory Segment

After the opening clauses of "in the time of the Prophet Isaiah, Jehoash, King of Israel, dreamed, and the rumor somehow reached King Amaziah of Judah," the phrases telling of the reaction of Amaziah follow. Having heard about the vision that Jehoash experienced, Amaziah sent heralds to Jehoash:

И ПОСЛА АМЕСИНА СЛЫ КЪ НАСОУ. КЪ СНОУ АХАЗОВОУ. ЦРЮ ИЗЛѢВОУ ГЛА ПРИДИ КЪ МНѢ
ДА СА ВИДИЕЪ ПОСЛА ЖЕ ИНАСЪ ЦРЬ ИЗЛѢЪ КЪ АМЕСИИ ЦРЮ ИЮДИНОУ. ГЛА СИЦЕ.

This is obviously a direct quotation from the Bible; compare this part with 2 Kings 14:8-9:

И ТОГДА ПОСЛА АМЕСІА ПОСЛЫ КОІАКУ СІУ ІОУЕВУ ЦРЮ І ИЛВУ ГЛА. ПРІДИ ДА СА ВИДІІ В
ЛИЦЕ. И ПОСЛА ІОА ЦРЬ ІИЛѢ КЪ АМЕСІЮ ЦРЮ ІОУДИНУ ГЛА.³⁴

Then Amaziah sent messengers to Jehoash, the son of Jehoahaz son of Jehu, king of Israel, saying, "Come, let us look one another in the face." And Jehoash the king of Israel sent to Amaziah king of Judah, saying, ...³⁵

Once readers understand that it is a quotation from 2 Kings, the relationship between this introductory part and the successive, seemingly unclear, sentences can be easily found: ГРЪЗНЪ ГЛѢМЫН КОУПИНА ИЖЕ НА СИНАЙ СЫІ. ПОУСТИЛЪ ЕСТЬ КЕДРОВИ ЛИВАНЬСКОМУ ДВѢ ЖЕНѢ ОУНѢ ..., as the corresponding part of 2 Kings

34 The Ostrog Bible.

35 Quoted from the King James Version.

continues as follows: *тернъ иже в ливанѣ посла къ кедрови сущему в ливанѣ гл҃а ...* (“The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying ...”)

What is peculiar in this introductory segment is that, in contrast to the usual way of beginning a story, according to which a narrator provides readers with initial background information on the development of the narrative or the theme of story, the opening phrases of this story function only to introduce the names of two biblical persons: Jehoash and Amaziah. Neither of these two persons plays a crucial role in the development of story, nor does the relationship of the two kings narrated in the Book of Kings have any relevance to the content of the *Dream*. Still, this peculiarity can be explained if we estimate that introducing the biblical persons at the onset of the story had significance in relating this story to OT and placing it in the tradition of medieval Orthodox-Christian writings formulated around the biblical, as well as other books related to them.

3.2 *The Main Narrative*

The dream part is made up of phrases associated with the biblical texts in various ways. While the beginning phrase of the dream “*грѣзнь гл҃емыи коупина иже на синани сын. поуѣтилъ ѣстъ кедрови ливаньскомоу*” is a direct quotation of 2 Kings 14:9, “*тернъ иже в ливанѣ посла къ кедрови сущему в ливанѣ,*” the successive sentences depicting two women can be characterized as a free adaptation of the Song of Songs. A phrase starting with “*ѣдина роумано лице имущи,*” for example, is probably associated with the phrase in Song 1:4-5: “*ѹрна ѣсмъ и добра ... азъ ѣсмъ ѡгрѣшена, ѡко прѣзрѣ мѧ сн҃це.*” (“I am black, but comely [...] I am black, because the sun hath looked upon me.”). Relatedness to Song is more clearly seen in the phrases of “*роуманаѧ тѧ лѣвоюю роукою подъложитъ ти подъ голову а бѣлаѧ десницею охопитъ тѧ,*” as Song 2:6 reads: “*Шоуница его подъ главою ми и десница его обыметъ мѧ.*”³⁶ (“His left hand is under my head, and his right hand doth embrace me.”)

A curious phrase is *ависага же да сзг҃рѣтъ тѧ*: the appearance of the name *Ависага*, which should mean *Abishag*, a young woman narrated in the Book of Kings,³⁷ looks sudden here, as the narrative obviously drew on the Song. However, “Shunamite,” the epithet for Abishag, has been identified in various cultural traditions with “Shulamite,” mentioned in Song 6:13[7:1].³⁸ Indeed, in the

36 The Ostrog Bible.

37 1 Kings 1:1-3.

38 LXX: ἡ Σουλαμίτις, but in other Greek versions, “Soulamite” (ἡ Σουναμίτισι) appears: *Septuaginta, id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. A. Rahlfs, Stuttgart,

oldest Slavonic translation of the Song, RNL F.I. 461, the said part reads as “Соуламитѣнии,”³⁹ but the identification of “Shulamite” and “Shunamite” was surely known in the early literature of *Slavia Orthodoxa*, the proof of which is found, for example, in the Slavonic translation of *Pandects*, dated from the 12-13th century: in RSL F.304.12. we read, Рече въ пѣсньхъ соломонъ шестъдесатьдесатъ есть цесарицъ и [...] да поицють цесарю дѣвица дѣвоиѣ. и обрѣтоша суманитѣнию да съгрѣтъ.⁴⁰ Thus, it is quite possible that the author of the *Dream* was acquainted with such identification of “Shulamite” and “Shunamite,” and this association was reflected to the occurrence of the name Ависага in the narrative of this work.

We should note another interesting phrase: “аминодава же дъци давидамаа. имоуши нозѣ въ сапозѣхъ.” The literary interpretation of “аминодава же дъци давидамаа” would be ‘Aminodava, the daughter of Davidam(?)’, but the name *Aminodava* is not known in biblical books. Although a nearly identical expression in the OT, “the daughter of Aminadab,” might connect the said phrase to Esther,⁴¹ we prefer to offer a different interpretation in reference to another expression akin to the phrase in question, found in the old Slavonic translation of Song 7:2: Ыто оукрашиша са стѣпаниа твоа въ сапозѣхъ дъци Амѣнадамова.⁴² The closeness of the expressions of аминодава же дъци and дъци Амѣнадамова suggests that the latter was utilized as a model for the former.

After the sentences depicting the two women, we encounter again a plain quotation from the biblical book: “градъ же ти есть паты великъ нъ мнѣ малъ. мало же въ немъ и мужии и приде црь великъ. и новистоупи и твѣрдыю. и бѣ въ градѣ томъ мужъ ниць нъ мудръ и тъ мужъ сѣе(тъ) градъ.” Compare this part with the Book of Ecclesiastes, 9:14-15: “исно же мудрость видѣхъ подѣлцемъ и великъ есть комнѣ грѣ малъ и мужии в немъ мало. прїидетъ нана црь великъ икорътъ облаже, и сздѣлаетъ о немъ оградъы велѣа. и обрѣтеже в немъ мужа ница и мудра, и сѣи сѣетъ грѣ мудростию своею.” (“There was a little city, and few men within it; and there came

1935, p. 266; G. Barniero, *Song of Songs. A Close Reading*, Leiden – Boston, 2011, p. 364; Also in Syrian and Arabic traditions “Abishag the Shunammite” is understood as the same woman as “Shulamite,” which results in “Abishag the Shulamite”: I. Kalimi, “The Rise of Solomon in the Ancient Israelite Historiography,” in: *The figure of Solomon in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Tradition: King, sage and architect*, ed. J. Verheyden, Leiden, 2013, p. 10.

39 Алексеев, “К определению объема литературного наследия Мефодия,” p. 253

40 See *The Pandects of Antiochus. Slavic Text in Transcription*. Полата књигописная, ed. J. Popvski, Amsterdam, 1989, p. 4.

41 Esther 2:15: (In the Ostrog Bible) и внигда доступи жребинъ есдириныхъ дщери аминодави; in LXX: Εσθὴρ τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἀμινάδαβ.

42 Алексеев, *Песнь Песней*, p. 29.

a great king against it, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it. Now there was in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city.”)

After the abovementioned quotation from Ecclesiastes, the dream part ends and the interpretation of the dream starts. In this part, the phrases in the previous part are repeated, and each is provided with an interpretation; for example: “И рѣ дмесиѡа цѣрь иудинъ грѣшнъ есть хѣъ. а кедръ правѡа въбра новыѣхъ людий а посланѣи дѣѣ женѣ роуманаѡа есть законъ ветхыи.”

It is obvious that the author employed the writing style of exegetical texts; particularly the biblical exegeses. Let us take for the sake of illustration a passage from a Slavonic translation of the exegesis on Song, originally composed by Philo of Carpasia (†410): “Шюица его подъ главою ми и десница его обоуиметъ мѡ. тѣ. Шюицю мѣнить настоѡащии въкъ десницю же блѡѣтъныи присносоуци животь ...”.⁴³ A word “толкъ,” shown in this example, or the letter т, were often used by scribes of this genre of text to mark the phrases of interpretation, and, indeed, the scribe of Q employed this convention as well; ex.: “... главою оувазеноу Т. оувазенаѡа есть глава бжтво; or А Ависага. Т. Ависага есть заповѣдь сѣла....”

Not only the style but also the content of the biblical exegeses was adopted. The phrase in the dream, “There was a little city, and few men within it...,” which is in fact a quotation from the Ecclesiastes, is interpreted as “the city is a church, a poor wise man is Christ.” This was in fact a quotation from the Byzantine exegetical writing on Ecclesiastes.⁴⁴

After the interpretation there appear the last phrases: “прѣкъ бо рече. правѣдникъ ѡако фюникъ процвѣтетъ и ѡако кедръ иже въ ливанѣ оумножитъсѡ. хѣъ процвѣте ѡако фюникъ сѣи оумножишасѡ ѡако кедрѡи бѡу же нашѣ.” This passage, which does not correspond to the content of Jehoash’s dream and thus looks to be added as a coda, is again a modification of the Bible; this time Psalms 91:13: Праведникъ ѡако фюникъ процвѣтетъ, ѡако кедръ иже въ ливанѣ оумножитъсѡ.⁴⁵

3.3 Summary of This Section

Our observation in this section enables us to state the following.

The first part of the *Dream* can be characterized indeed as apocryphal because of the appearance of biblical persons with starting phrases of ambiguous yet apocalyptic implication, although the two biblical figures, Jehoash of Israel and Amaziah of Judah, do not play any role in the story other than as ‘a

43 Алексеев, *Песнь Песней*, p. 76.

44 Алексеев, “К истории русской переводческой школы,” p. 186.

45 The Ostroth Bible.

dreamer' and an interpreter, and there are no apocryphal stories related to these two Kings.

Moreover, the textual structure made up of the dream accompanied by its interpretation is in accordance with other apocryphal stories disseminated in medieval Slavonic literature, such as the South Slavonic version of *the Story about Sibyl* and *the Story of the Twelve Dreams of Shaxinsha*. These features have probably led researchers of the previous study to place this text in the Slavonic apocryphal tradition. At the same time, the utilization of the style and contents of biblical exegeses makes this text appear closer to exegetical texts.

In sum, the *Dream* can be characterized as a unique composition created through the conjunction of apocryphal settings and the style of exegetical writings.

4 Textual Environment

Investigating the environment in which particular text occurs is important not only for characterizing the function of that text in broader intertextual relationships with other texts, but also for tracing its transmission pattern. This section focuses on this question.

The following table shows the textual environments of the *Dream*; i.e., texts appearing adjacent to the *Dream* in the miscellany and collections that fall under the scope of our examination.

BA	Qp18	TSL11 "Golden Chain"	TSL408 "Stihirar"	TSL122	O171
Questions and responses Уто ради попусти бъ		On the Holy Friday and the Passion of Jesus	Wisdom of Sirah (Questions and responses)	Words from various books (containing 'Solomon's chalice')	On the Gospel and the Resurrection (fragments)
<i>the Dream</i>	<i>the Dream</i>	<i>the Dream</i>	<i>the Dream</i>	<i>the Dream</i>	<i>the Dream</i>
Solomon's chalice Въ сѣби Софѣи	Solomon's chalice Въ сѣи Софѣи	Words on the Resurrection of Jesus Слово ескрѣни гни;	Solomon's Chalice Въ сѣ Софѣи есть к'ѣлиа;	Words of Gregory the Theologian,	Remarks on the Psalms 28.5, 36.35, 71.16
Exegesis of the Gospel Тълкование еульско	From the Gospel отъ евангѣлиа	From John Chrysostom			

This table clearly shows that the *Dream* was circulated together with, or attached to, the biblical exegeses and other didactic, and explanatory, texts. In this environment of occurrence, we notice two patterns of adjacency that look to be important for detecting the transmission pattern of the *Dream*. One of them concerns the occurrence of textual unit consisting of exegetical remarks on three verses of the Psalters, and the other is the appearance of a short story broadly known as “the Story of Solomon’s Chalice.”

The first pattern was noticed by Kashtanov (2006), according to which short explanatory remarks on three verses of Psalms 28:5, 36:35, and 71:16 (“the three remarks on Lebanon”) appear immediately after O, V, and R, in O₁₇₁, V₁₁₃, and RGD, respectively.⁴⁶ The occurrence of the same textual unit in the adjacent position would strongly suggest that O, V, and R were on one and the same line of textual transmission.

In this relation, we notice that Qp18 contains an exegesis of Psalters, and the phrases referring to the verses 28:5 and 36:35 in it are almost identical with those found in O₁₇₁. Compare 28:5. in these two collections:⁴⁷

	Qp18	O ₁₇₁
28:5	И скроушитьъ гдѣ кедрѣ ливаньскыѣ. Т. бѣсы ꙗко гзрды ꙗко присно радоующа сѧ ливануѣ. ливанъ бо гора жъртвѣ нарицають сѧ. съкроуши же сѧ хѣбо пришѣствие. оупражнь идольско ненстовыѣ.	скушитъ г(оспод)ъ кедрѣ ливаньскыѣ. т(ол)къ. бѣсы ꙗко гзрды. присно радоующа ливануѣ. ливанъ бо гора нарицается. жерзтва идольская. съкроуши же ꙗ х(ристо)во съшествие. и упразни идольское ненствоуство.

This correspondence might seem to indicate that “the three remarks on Lebanon” in O were formed as an extraction from the exegesis of Psaltir included in Qp18. At the same time, however, divergence between these two collections is found in the explanation of 71:16:⁴⁸

Qp18: Т. възнесе бо сѧ пауче дольскыхъ жъртвѣ жъртва ꙗже на кртѣ. ливанъ бо
сказаетъ сѧ жилище идольско.

46 Kashtanov, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 96.

47 Qp18: Wątróbska, *The izbornik*, p. 72; O₁₇₁: Kashtanov, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 96.

48 Qp18: Wątróbska, *The izbornik*, p. 96; O₁₇₁: Kashtanov, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 96.

О171: Т(ол)кѣ. възнесе бо ся г(оспод)ъ на кр(е)сть, и вера кр(е)стьянская възнесеся. паче идолскыхъ жертвъ. ливанъ бо складается. жертва идольская и жилище бѣсовское.

As the text in O171 is not a reduced but an extended version compared to the one in Qp18, we may opt to consider the possibility that “the remarks” on Lebanon in O171 were not directly formed from the exegesis of Psalter contained in Qp18 but were transmitted from another, intermediate, source between these two collections. Still, the close connection between Op18 and O171 is indisputable.

Another notable pattern in reference to the textual environment of the *Dream* is the neighboring appearance of “the Story of Solomon’s Chalice.” The adjacency of “Solomon’s Chalice” to the *Dream* is found in BA, Qp18, and TSL408. In TSL11 the Chalice story appears, too; not after but before the *Dream*, being inserted among various short pieces.⁴⁹ In RGD, which, like O171, contains the remarks on “Lebanon” after the *Dream*, the last sentence of “Solomon’s Chalice” appears after the remarks on Lebanon: “and found (that) from the twelfth year of Solomon’s reign to the reign of Christ there (are) nine hundred and nine years.”⁵⁰

“The Story of Solomon’s Chalice” is a short text, well known in Slavic philology due to its inclusion as the chapter XIII of *Vita Constantini* (VC).⁵¹ Regarding the story appearing as chapter XIII of VC, much discussion has been done, mainly about whether the Chalice episode was an original part of the VC or a later interpolation.⁵²

The Chalice story had been considered a Slavonic creation, probably written by Constantine-Cyril himself, until the discovery by Shevchenko (1967) of a Greek fragment that corresponds to the Slavonic version of the Chalice. After

49 “Словеса избранна от многих книг различных строк” [Words, selected from various books of different writers].

50 Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника.”

51 *Vita Constantini-Cyrrilli* (Житие Константина).

52 I. Ševčenko, “The Greek Source of the Inscription on Solomon’s Chalice in the *Vita Constantini*,” in: *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday 11 October 1966*, vol. III, The Hague, 1967, pp. 1806-1817; R. Picchio, “Chapter 13 of *Vita Constantini*: Its Text and Contextual Function,” *Slavica Hierosolymitana*, 7 (1985), pp. 133-152; M. Taube, “Solomon’s Chalice, the Latin Scriptures and the Bogomils,” *Slovo*, 37 (1987), pp. 161-169; M. Capaldo, “Respect of the Textus Traditus or Venture into Conjecture? On a recent interpretation of the *Vita Constantini* 13,” *Палата књигописная*, 25-26 (1994), pp. 4-92; P. Balcárek, “Some Remarks on Solomon’s Chalice in *Vita Constantini*,” *Palaeobulgarica*, 35.1 (2011), pp. 34-51.

this discovery, it became an established understanding that the Slavonic version is a modification of the Greek antecedent. Outside VC, two recensions of the Chalice story are known. One is shorter, containing an interpretation added after the basic text of the Chalice, and the other is longer, showing a further textual transformation such that each verse of the basic text is accompanied by an interpretation and embedded into an exegetic writing of anti-judaistic vein, traditionally referred to as the “Words of the Holy Prophets”.⁵³ The copies transmitted with the *Dream* belong to the shorter version (abbreviated here as SolChalT).

As Picchio (1985) notes, SolChalT was transmitted, occurring in various miscellanies of exegetic character, with the total number of copies amounting to around 30.⁵⁴ It is notable that the four earliest copies of SolChalT, composed from the 13th to 15th centuries, were included in Qp18, BA, TSL408, and TSL122, emerging in a position neighboring, or close to, the *Dream*. Of them, those included in Qp18, BA, and TSL408, namely, the copies placed immediately after the *Dream*, are most likely derived from the same antigraph; this can be confirmed by comparing the starting part of these copies of SolChalT:

BA	Qp18	TSL408
Въ сѣѣи софѣи естъ келѣа соломонѣ. ѿ камене драгаго дѣлана. нанеи же написани сѣтъ стиси триє. єврейскы и самарѣнскы писмены.	Въ сѣѣи софѣи естъ келѣа соломона. отъ каменыа драгога дѣлана. на неже соутъ написани стиси трыє. єврейскы и самарѣнскы писмены.	Въ сѣ Софѣи естъ кѣлѣа соломона ѿ каменѣа драгаго дѣлана. на неи же сѣ написаны стиси триє. єврейски самарѣнски писмены.

The closeness of these three\ copies is well illustrated by the word келѣа, which commonly appears in them, in contrast to VC, where the word found in the equivalent place is потирѣ.⁵⁵ On the basis of this evidence of adjacency, we can state that Q, 1A, and T408 formed one line of transmission.

Thus, from what has been observed, it is possible to restructure an early transmission pattern of the *Dream*, as below:

53 Capaldo, “Respect of the Textus Traditus,” pp. 9-10.

54 Picchio, “Chapter 13 of *Vita Constantini*,” p. 140.

55 Естъ же въ свѣтъѣ Софѣи потирѣ ѿтъ драгаго каменѣа Соломона дѣла. See П.А. Лавров, *Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности* [Materials on the History of Emergence of the oldest Slavonic Literature], Leningrad, 1930.

« Early transmission pattern of the *Dream* »

Suppose that x is the protograph of the Slavonic version of the *Dream*; it should have been included in a collection in which SolChalT was also included, and there a transmission pattern of the *Dream* followed by SolChalT was formed. The formation of this pattern is not surprising, given a perceptible parallelism between the *Dream* and SolChalT: both contain apocryphal elements; the story is made up with a message that should be deciphered (a dream, and the verses never read) and its interpretation. This transmission pattern, most likely formed by the end of the 12th century, was further succeeded by Qp18, BL, TSL408. The adjacency of T122 and SolChalT in TSL122 also allows us to place T122 on the same transmission line as Q, IA, and T408. However, TSL122 differs from these three not only in the order of the *Dream* and SolChalT but also by the textual deviation of SolChalT, as the SolChalT in TSL122 starts: *св. Софни есть комора Соломана сына Давида от камени другого (sic.) сделана*, contrary to Qp18 and other two copies, which include *келия*; not *комора*. Therefore, it can be assumed that a rewriting, or a modification, in transmission took place somewhere between the original pattern and the TSL122.

In the course of transmission of the *Dream*, at the same time, a particular set of remarks on Lebanon was extracted from the exegesis of Psalms to form a textual unit and inserted after the *Dream*. This happened probably when O, or its antigraph, was composed, and the pattern thus made was reflected to V113 and, later, RGD. That R was on the transmission line of Q – IA – R is indicated by the fact that the remarks on “Lebanon” appearing after the *Dream* in RGD are followed by the last phrase of the SolChalT, which is mostly identical to the equivalent part of the SolChalT in Qp18:

(RGD) Числа отъ второго на десять лѣта (С)оломона ц(ес)а)рства до Х(рист)а
лѣтъ 900 и 9⁵⁶

(Qp18) А числа ѿ второго на десѣте цѣрѣства Соломона. до Х҃а лѣтъ десѣть сѣтъ.
и. ѿ. лѣтъ⁵⁷

In the later transmission, however, the connectedness of the *Dream* and Sol-ChalT was lost, and the *Dream* was mostly included in exegetical and didactic writings.

5 Conclusion – The Authorship

As was observed in 3.2, a phrase in the narrative of Jehoash's dream depicting a woman, АМИНОДАВА ЖЕ ДЪЦИ ДАВИДАМЛА. ИМОУШИ НОЗѢ ВЪ СѦПОЗѢХ, is certainly a modification of Song 7:2., and we read an equivalent expression in the Old Slavonic translation of Song.

However, the name appearing in the corresponding part in the Greek version, such as in LXX, is not “Aminadav” or “Aminodav” but “Nadab”: διαβήματα σου ἐν υποδήμασιν θύγατερ ναδαβ (your footsteps in sandals, O daughter of Nadab). In fact, ναδαβ is a literary copy, or a transliteration from Hebrew נַדִּיב (*nadib*),⁵⁸ and, therefore, in Latin translation (the Vulgate) this part reads *fida principis*.

Here, questions arise: where did the expression “ДЪЦИ АМИНАДАМОВА” in the old Slavonic translation of Song come from? Also, how could the phrase “АМИНОДАВА ЖЕ ДЪЦИ ДАВИДАМЛА” in the *Dream* be so close to the Slavonic version of Song? Possible answers may be either that (1) the Slavonic translation of Song was based on a Greek version in which ἀμιναδαβ appeared instead of ναδαβ,⁵⁹ while the *Dream* was also composed by relying on a Greek version in which the word ἀμιναδαβ appeared, and, as a result, it turned out that the two expressions in question in the Slavonic versions of Song and the *Dream* conform, or (2) АМИНАДАВА in the *Dream* was directly composed on the basis of the Slavonic translation of the Song, in which the original ναδαβ or possibly ἀμιναδαβ in Greek was translated into АМИНАДАВ.

56 Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 96.

57 Wątróbska, *The izbornik*, p. 4.

58 A. Pietersma, B.G. Wright, *A new English translation of the Septuagint: And the other Greek translations traditionally included under that title*, New York, 2007, p. 659.

59 *Septuaginta*, ed. Rahlfs, p. 268; Алексеев, *Песнь песней*, p. 212.

Although there is no proof to support either option, we may opt to consider that the second option was what actually happened on account of its simplicity and higher probability than the first option. If so, an assumption would arise that the whole story of the *Dream* was not a translation but a creation by a Slav; most likely by one who was working in the South Slavic writing tradition. Judging from the varied utilization of biblical books, such as the Song, Ecclesiastes, and Kings, and of exegetical texts related to them, the composer of the *Dream* was most likely a scribe, or a compiler, of such religious and didactical books and pieces. Inspired by these texts, he composed this small piece taking advantage of his own experience and knowledge.

The *Dream* has been regarded as apocryphal, but, as our observation revealed, this piece is not in fact an apocryphon but a composition created by way of combining an apocryphal narrative and the exegetical style that was quite popular in Byzantine-Orthodox literature. The connectedness of the *Dream* with the SolChalT in their early transmission may be explained by the similarity of their textual characteristics. Because of this structural resemblance, these two stories were probably perceived as being very close by scribes and compilers of medieval Slavonic texts.

Needless to say, there might have been a Greek text that could serve as a source of the *Dream*, as was the case with the Story of Solomon's Chalice. Brought into the Slavic world, the original text could have been transformed so as to become a Slavonic version of the *Dream*.

In any case, this short piece serves us with good material to observe the process of the early development and perception of the biblical and exegetical writings in *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

Abbreviations

RGADA	Russian State archive of old documents [Российский государственный архив древних актов]
RNL	Russian National Library (Petersburg)
RSL	Russian State Library (Moscow)