THE APOSTOLUS CHRISTINOPOLITANUS
AND THE TEXT OF THE OLD SLAVIC APOSTOLUS

The Lessons for Saturday and Sunday
of Weeks 10–20 after Pentecost

Johannes G. van der Tak

This paper offers the critical text of the ‘Lectionary core’ of the Old Slavic Apostol. It is established on the basis of a critical recension of some twenty manuscripts of various dates and origins. The publication aims at several goals, the most important being to clarify the position of the Apostolus Christinopolitanus in the textual tradition of the Slavic Apostolus. The second goal is to show how, by the use of modern technology as well as proven scientific methods from adjacent disciplines, like Classics and Theology, a scientifically sound and yet accessible text of the Slavic Version of the New Testament can be produced. The third is to shift the accent in treatment of manuscripts by Slavists from the ‘monument’ they constitute towards the text they contain. My last goal is to provoke reactions from the scientific communities of Slavists as well as Bible scholars on such an approach to the Slavic Version of the New Testament.

Introduction

Looking at the early versions of the New Testament, one is struck by the fact that no edition of the Slavic Version exists, whereas the Latin and Greek texts are reasonably accessible. With the exception of the Gospel editions of J. Vajs, the only extant type of edition is that of single manuscripts, sometimes illuminated by a number of variants from a limited set of other, more or less randomly chosen, manuscripts. As examples I refer to the editions of the Apostles of Slepč and Ohrid: they offer more or less diplomatic transcriptions of the manuscripts with a short introduction, but without any textual commentary or variants from other manuscripts. Unfortunately, the reli-

1 N27 and its earlier editions for the Greek and the impressive series from the Vetus Latina Institute in Beuron (Germany) for the Latin text.
2 Prague, 1934–1936.
3 Ilinski 1912, Kulbakin 1907.
ability of the transcriptions cannot be checked due to the lack of photograph-
ical documentation.

Even more recently the situation has not improved. The recent edition of
the Apostolus of Itstovac is based on the same principles as the editions of
those of Slepče and Ohrid. Variants from other sources are given in the edi-
tion of the Apostle of Strumica, but the text chosen for a main text seems to
be not the best one available, to say the least, and no attempt whatsoever has
been made to treat the text critically (save, perhaps, the repeated use of the
word sic when an almost impossible reading is found in the Strumica). Better
instruments for the textual critic are the editions of the Apostolus of Crkolez
and the facsimile edition of the Gennadian Bible; they provide ac-cess to the
manuscripts themselves and offer the possibility of checking er-rors by
means of microfiche and photograph.

The present paper offers a first attempt to establish the text of a part of
the Old Slavic Apostolus on the basis of various manuscripts. The reason for
presenting only part of the text is that the number of manuscripts involved is
large and that this is the first attempt in this direction. The pericopes have
been chosen for two reasons: the first is the widely held opinion that the lec-
tionary text of the Gospels and Apostolus was the first one to be translated
into Old Slavic; the second is that most manuscripts are damaged. Damage
and loss are likely to occur more frequently in the first and last quires of a
manuscript, so the chance of finding relatively undamaged portions of text is
greater in its middle. In view of these considerations, I have chosen for trial
the lections for the Saturdays and Sundays of week 10 to 20 after Pentecost.

In a way, this publication must be considered a first step towards a com-
plete critical edition of the Old Slavic Apostolus. The preparation to publish
the remaining pericopes of the short Lectionary text (Saturdays and Sundays
for week 1–10 and 20–Lent) is well under way. The pericopes here presented
serve as a pilot project to provoke reactions from the scientific community.

4 Stefanović 1989; some photographs are added as illustrations, not for check-ing
the readings.
5 Bláhova & Hauptova, 1990.
8 Alekseev 1984; Lunt 1977, p. 441f. The hypothesis, however, still needs
confirmation from textual facts. For the Gospels some doubts on this theory have
been raised by Temelin, 1993.
For this reason, I will be grateful for all comments from colleagues that improve the quality of the text, the apparatus and the comments provided.

I want to stress the fact that the given text is only an indication of my views as to the direction one should take in order to obtain an accessible text that meets modern scientific standards. No attempt whatsoever is made to reconstruct the earliest translation of the text.

In this paper I pay special attention to the position of the Apostolus Christinopolitanus, which is considered both by Slavists and non-Slavists to be one of the most important existing witnesses of the Apostolus. The manuscript figures in the Introduction to the edition of the Greek text by Nestle–Aland from the 26th edition in 1971 onwards, and it is a major source for Apostolus readings in the Prague Slovník.

In Kalužniacki’s 1896 edition of the Christinopolitanus, the missing parts are supplemented from other manuscripts. The editor makes no attempt to reconstruct the text from the sources and so produces a dangerous hybrid that appears to be an edition of the Apostolus, but is just the edition of single manuscripts. The edition was - with all its shortcomings - the earliest one of a continuous Apostile (see below for the terminology). Kalužniacki offers a text with ‘modern’ punctuation, upper–and lowercase characters, chapter– and verse numbering, etc. Therefore and because additions from other manuscripts are not clearly marked in the text, it has come to be regarded as the oldest and most reliable manuscript of the Slavic Apostolus. Because the Christinopolitanus holds such a prominent position, I have thought it worthwhile to compare its text to that of other manuscripts in the light of modern textual criticism.

Manuscripts and Descriptions

This edition is based on manuscripts dating from the XIth to the XVIth c., selected partly because of their celebrity, partly on the basis of their availability in printed form or on microfilm or –fiche. On the basis of the ordering of the text and the accompanying materials, the manuscripts can be divided into the following types: Lectionary, Continuous and Commented (or tol-

---

9 Kalužniacki 1869; see also Van der Tak, 1992 for an evaluation of this edition.
10 In highlighting the Christinopolitanus. I fulfil my promise that this MS should have a prominent place in future research into the text of the Old Slavic Apostolus (Van der Tak 1992, p. 100–103).
The Old Slavic Apostolus texts. As the terminology is borrowed from Bible research rather than from Slavic studies, some explanation is required:

**Lectionaries** are the manuscripts that present the text of the Epistles in the order of the lessons as determined by the Typikon for every day of the liturgical year. Within the Lectionary, the year is divided into the following periods: Easter to Pentecost, Pentecost to the beginning of Lent, and Lent to Easter. Apart from this, most lectionaries contain lessons for the feasts of Saints in the order of the ecclesiastical year, which starts in September. Within the lectionary group there are short lectionaries, with only lessons for the Saturdays and Sundays, and full lectionaries, containing lessons for the other days of the week as well.

**Continuous** texts offer the Acts and Epistles in sequence as complete books. The order of books differs slightly from that used in the Western tradition: Acts, Catholic Epistles, and Pauline Epistles. The continuous texts mostly indicate the beginnings and endings of the daily lessons either in the text itself or in the margins, written in red ink. Usually a numbering of pericopes (začala) and the first words of the lesson are given in marginibus as well.

**Commented** texts form on first sight a subdivision of the Continuous type, presenting the same ordering of the text as the last group and often offering the same liturgical marking of the beginning and ending of lessons as well. In addition, however, these texts offer commentaries on the text of the Epistles (rarely the Acts). These explanations (tolkovanyia) may be po-sitioned either in the margins of the main text, as is the case with the Greek scholia, known from manuscripts of classical (especially Greek) authors, or they are interwoven with the biblical text. The Apostolus Christinopolitanus is an example of the first ordering, the codd. St.-Petersburg F.P.I. 24 and Po-godin 30 (Tf and P30, see infra) have the latter arrangement. To this category also belongs the Tolkovy Apostolus of 1220 (D). This leaves the Christinopolitanus in an isolated position regarding its external features: it is so far the one and only Apostle MS with commentaries written in the margins.

---

11 There also exist Apostolevangelia, i.e. texts that present the Apostolus lesson followed by the Gospel lesson for each corresponding day. Although I did consult several of such MSS, none were used for the present paper.
12 Full description of the the Typikon and analysis of it in Čiflyanov, 1976.
13 Usually called an *incipit*, the plural of which offers a Latin monstrum.
known to us.

In the following, I present a short description of every manuscript I used for the publication and the way in which I have consulted it: by means of edition, microfilm, and/or de visu. Each description is preceded by a Latin capital siglum denoting the manuscript.

**Lectionaries**

**S** Codd. St.-Peterburg, RNB, F.II. I. 101 + 101A + Q.I. 1186 + Plovdiv, NBIV 25. The *Apostolus of Slepče*, a short lectionary, dating from the 11th c. The text is taken from the edition by Ilinski, 1912, which contains a considerable number of individual readings, possibly an indication of revision in this text (cf. Bakker & Van der Tak 1994, p. 44/5).

**O** The Ohrid Apostol, a short lectionary dating from the 11-12th c. For the text the edition by Kulbakin 1907 was used. The large number of singular readings, mostly due to corruption, in this manuscript make it unsuitable for being used as a base text for collation, as argued in Bakker & Van der Tak 1994, p. 37.

**B** Cod. Belgrade, MSPC, 322; the Apostolus of ištovac, a full Lectionary dating from 1324. The non-diplomatic edition by Stefanović 1989 was used for the text.

**Z** Athos, Zographou, 53, full Lectionary, probably dating from the 12th c. As the text contains many lacunae, this manuscript can only be used as a constant witness for the weeks 10–20 part of the lectionary. Consulted on microfilm, kindly provided by the Hilandar Research Centre for Medieval Studies, Columbus, Ohio, USA.

**R** Cod. Praha NM, Slav IX E 25, Short Lectionary Apostolus from Macedonia (also called *Macedonian and Strumica*), dating from the 13th c. The recent edition of this Apostol (Bláhová and Hauptová, 1990) offers ample proof of its corruption by the repeated sic in the apparatus when it differs from the other Apostles used in that edition (in this article the sigla S, O, B, M and C). This seems to be the most corrupt of all manuscripts used for the present edition. The following examples of R’s corruption in the pericopes presented are not included in the apparatus: 1Cor 1, 6 in ðëçøèøû ðòðøèòûíûé ðàñòêîâîé ²àñòêîâîé; 1Cor4, 3 êë ëëëî for êë ëëëî; 1Cor5, 1 ïàðà êøåðíîãî ²àñòêîâîé ê çôàø êòðàùòû; 1Cor9, 10 Ôàïåæà; 2Cor2, 4 ëçòàâøè ñà for ëçòàâøè ñà.

**J** Cod. NBKM 882; 13th c., short Lectionary Apostolus. Readings from microfilm from the library.

**P** Panteleimon Monastery (mount Athos) S 14, dated 1313, short Lectionary. Consulted on photographs from microfilm by PIPS.

**Q** Cod. Sofia, NBKM, 883, dated 14th c. Lectionary text. Text consulted.
The Old Slavic Apostolus

from photocopies from a microfilm, by courtesy of M. Taube, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Continuous Manuscripts

Continuous Apostolus texts contain as a rule lectionary indications, *incipit* quotations and pericope numbers. Also to be found in nearly all continuous texts, with or without commentary, are introductions preceding both the Acts and all the Epistles. These introductions are called *hypotheses* or *napisania* and are believed to be translations of the Greek *hypotheseis* by Euthalius\(^\text{15}\), I have not investigated the distribution, transmission and translation of these introductions, but this promises to be an interesting field of research for Slavists. In a limited number of manuscripts also figures a general introduction to the Pauline Epistles, sometimes accompanied by an outline of the Life of St. Paul.

K
Mount Athos, Karakallou, 239. Continuous Apostle, dating from the 13th c. Initial description by Bakker 1990. Parts of the MS contain explanations within the text. This fact might suggest relations with the Commented type of text. From the apparatus below it appears that this MS indeed shows textual affiliation with D, C, Tf and P30. This Apostle was been consulted on photographs from a microfilm by PIPS.

M
Cod. Novi Sad, MS RR 184, inv. nr. 113437. The Apostolus of Matica Srpska. Continuous text, dating from the 13th c. According to the introduction to the edition by Kovačević, the manuscript stems from Hercegovina and is of Serbian origin. The first part of the Acts is missing. Contains *hypotheses*, pericope marks and liturgical indications. For the text I used the mentioned edition\(^\text{16}\).

T
Continuous Apostle of Črkolez–Dečani. 13th c.; now preserved in the National Library of Beograd. Consulted in the edition on microfiche by Bogdanović\(^\text{17}\).

The next four manuscripts might be part of the so–called Fourth Recension, of which the Gennadian Bible (W) is the chief representative. See below under Grouping the Manuscripts for a review of this division.

---

\(^\text{15}\) Cf. on this matter Van der Tak 1992.

\(^\text{16}\) Kovačević 1979. The facsimile edition of the Matičin Apostolus (Bogdanović 1981) was not used for the present edition.

\(^\text{17}\) Bogdanović 1986.
Commented Manuscripts

The addition of explanations to certain parts or words of the text of a Continuous Apostle moves it into another class: that of the Commented Apostles. These texts show in many cases specific textual peculiarities, as may be seen from the apparatus. The question poses itself, whether we are dealing with a text type to be distinguished from the others (Lectionary, Continuous) or not.

D Cod. Moskva, GIM, Sin. 7. The Tolkovyi Apostolus of 1220, from Rostov. No photographs or microfilms could be obtained, so the text was taken from the undiplomatic editions by Voskresenski\textsuperscript{19}, where this Apostolos is printed as the main text of his so-called First Recension. As no checks with the original could be made, the reliability of the readings in this manuscript is limited.

C Cod L'viv, HM, OR 39. The Apostolus Christinopolitanus from Červonohrad, formerly Christinopol, in Ukaine. The manuscript is dated to the 13th c. Eight folia from this manuscript are preserved in the Library of the Academy of Sciences at Kiev\textsuperscript{20}, but as they contain only parts of Acts, they have not been consulted for this study. The text is not com-

\textsuperscript{18} Biblia 1992.
\textsuperscript{19} Voskresenski, 1892.
\textsuperscript{20} Cod. Kiev, CBAN, O. R. VIII, 3. They contain Acta 9, 28 through 13, 5.
The Old Slavic Apostolus

The Old Slavic Apostolus is not complete: the first 12 chapters from the Acts are missing, as well as parts of the Epistles. In these parts, but also elsewhere, the edition of Kalužniacki is to be used with the utmost caution, because it does not clearly mark these parts as missing from the original manuscript. The manuscript contains marginal commentaries, pericope numbers, hypoteseis and - often apparently added later - liturgical indications. Readings from the edition by Kalužniacki have been checked with the original and at a later stage with a microfilm obtained from the Museum.

TT Cod. St.-Peterburg, RNB, F. P. I 24, Commented Apostolus, dating from the 15-16th c. The explanations are located within the text. The nature of the commentaries has not been subject of this investigation. The text contains hypoteseis for each Epistle; pericope-numbers and liturgical indications are present, but not consistently distributed. Consulted from photographs provided by the library and checked against the original.

P30 Cod. St.-Peterburg, RNB, Pogodin 30, Commented Apostolus, dated end of the 14th c. Text of the same type as Tf: explanations within the continuous text. Hypoteseis are present, liturgical indications and pericope-numbers as well, but not consistently. Consulted on photographs provided by the Library, checked against the original.

Collation Technique

Starting with the manuscripts means reading the manuscripts and collating them. Collations of all twenty pericopes were made by means of the computer program Collate (the details of which have been described in Bakker &

21 The missing parts are: Acts 1, 1–13, 20; 1Cor 7, 28–37; ibid. 14, 21–33; 2Thess 2, 3–15; 1Tim 4, 8–15, ibid. 5, 1–5; ibid. 6, 3–22; 2Tim 1, 10–4, 22; Tit 1, 1–3, 15; Phlm 1–25. The missing parts are supplied from the MSS St.-Peterburg, RNB, Hilf 14; Moskva, GIM, Sin. 7 and 18.


23 Produced by Oxford Computing Services for the Apple Macintosh computer. The heart of the program is a straightforward algorithm that compares the texts of a number of files and produces a list of differences (variant readings). Collate is especially designed to work with transcription-files and contains many useful features that make it a valuable tool for collating Slavic manuscripts (Robinson, 1992). In the meantime an improved version 2 has appeared, but I did not use it for the present paper.
Van der Tak 1994), on the basis of the full text entered into the computer from each manuscript involved in diplomatic format (the transcription–files).

**Data Abstraction**

The program *Collate* makes a collation by comparing all transcription–files to a chosen base–text, which may either be one of the MSS or a self made ‘abstract’. In order to avoid useless variants as a result of orthographic differences, quite a number of vowels and consonants are ignored or equated to one another: this is the beginning of the process of data abstraction, required to make comparisons of textual variants meaningful.

It should be stressed at this point, that the diplomatic recording of the MSS is in no way affected by this data abstraction, because the computer program makes abstracted copies of the transcription–files that are used only for the purpose of collating. These copies are destroyed immediately after the collation of a ‘block’ of the text (in the biblical texts a verse) has been completed.

**Regularisation and Replacement**

The data abstraction is effected by means of processes of replacement and regularisation. The ‘replace’ feature is the most ruthless way of achieving this. One can e.g. replace all iotated vowels by their non–iotated counterparts in all manuscripts in all cases. In the same way it is possible to abstract from the many different ways to write ou (ου, υ, η) or i (ι, ι, ι, ι). In this way the computer is instructed to ignore the orthographic habits of individual scribes.

The ultimate measure to be taken is omission: by replacing the yers and yors by nothing, we eliminate them from the collations so that they do not interfere with the work of the textual critic.

A more refined tool for data abstraction is regularisation. Here one can define equations for only one word in just one manuscript and/or in a group of manuscripts. This is the way in which many abbreviations are tackled, as well as e.g. the numerous ways of marking the $f_{Asg}$ (φι, ις, υς, ς). With this feature it is also possible to equate e.g. the ‘Serbian’ orthographic $ς$ with

---

24 The degree of “diplomaticity” depends on the form in which the MSS have been accessible; microfilms yield more diplomatic features than editions without access to the original.
the reflexive \( \varkappa \), even excepting those places where genuine \( \varepsilon \) (behold or that) is meant, in the manuscripts concerned.

For the researcher it is very important to know that all these replacements (about 40 in the pericopes here presented) and regularisations (about 1000) are recorded in the files that accompany every collation. At any chosen time during the collation–process these files can be consulted and specific replacements or regularisations can be modified or removed.

For the texts presented here I should stress the fact that in the apparatus Slavic words are given in their abstracted forms, i.e. without yers and/or iotation and with simplified vowels. I have chosen this presentation, because it makes no sense, in my opinion, to apply too strict orthographic standards to the rendering of textual variants in manuscripts of widely diverging origin.

**General Principles in the Establishment of the Text**

**The Lectionary Character of the Text**

Because the lectionary text is given, the introductory “Brethren” is restored at the beginning of every pericope. As this word is always written in its abbreviated form, it is not clear from the manuscripts, which form of this word is to be adopted. As there are no signs of a second r, I have chosen \( \breve{\text{brati}e} \), and not \( \breve{\text{bratri}}e \). Decisions like this had to be taken at the beginning of a number of pericopes (see below).

It is commonly believed that the lectionary text of the New Testament was the first to be translated into Slavic (cf. note 8 above). As already noted in Bakker & Van der Tak 1994, no proof for this claim is found. The same still holds true after examining the pericopes here presented: there are no specific peculiarities for the lectionary text as opposed to the continuous variants, apart from the necessities caused by the text type itself (e.g. the addition or omission of “brethren” near the beginning or the end of a lesson).

**The Typikon and its Meaning**

The Typikon governs the day of the year on which a certain passage is to be read. This may either be a day determined by the date of Pentecost and/or Easter (e.g. Saturday of the 13th week after Pentecost) or a fixed day of the calendar (e.g. 3rd of October). It is remarkable that in the Christinopolitanus only pericope–numbers to indicate the beginning of a lection and the desig-
nation “end” are to be found. *Incipit* quotations, however, are missing. Especially the “end” marks often seem to be added to the text in a later stage, in C and in the other Commented texts consulted (Tf, P30) as well. Calendar days (most often feasts in honour of a Saint) are not present in C.

**Length of the Pericopes**

The difficulties encountered in determining the exact length of the lessons in the lectionary text can be exemplified by the pericope for the Saturday of week 12 after Pentecost: for this day, all 17 manuscripts present the text 1 Cor. 1, 26–29. Most Lectionaries stop here and most Continuous MSS indicate an “End of the lesson for Saturday” on this point. The commented MSS indicate only the beginning of this lection, not its end. On the basis of this evidence one could think that the lesson ends at 1, 29 and that in the commented manuscripts the end mark had been omitted erroneously. The lectionary O puts an end–mark at 1, 29, but the text goes on, because it is read also on Great Friday (1, 18–2, 3), at which point in the Menologion there is only a reference in order to save space.

The only recent work on these typikon–related questions, that of Çiflyanov25, states that the lesson for this Saturday contains the text from 1Cor 1, 26 to 2, 5. The latter point is exactly where the Commented MSS have their starting mark for the next lesson. To remain within the limits of this paper I have confined the lesson to its minimal size (1Cor 1, 26–29), as most of the manuscripts that I consulted have it. I am fully aware that in doing so, I am basing myself on the weak argument of the majority. In view of the material at my disposal, however, no other solution was viable. Clearly much work on the Typikon still has to be done, but it is beyond the scope of this paper.

**Additions and Omissions at the Beginning of a Pericope**

As the lectionary text has been extracted from the continuous - at least in the Greek - some adaptations were necessary. Almost everywhere, at least the ad-dress “brethren” is added to the first words of the lectionary text. Consequent-ly, when this word occurs in the first sentence of the continuous text, it vanishes from that place in the lectionary, because a “brethren” already occurred within the ‘memory span’ of the scribe (e.g. in Saturday 10, Rom 15, 30). Sometimes, however, farther reaching changes occur, as e.g. in

---

the beginning of Sunday 10, where the continuous text contains ταξο, words omitted in the Greek and Slavic lectionaries. As can be seen from the apparatus ad locum, the Slavic manuscripts do not show a consistent distribution: the continuous T and P30 do not add these words. In a similar case, at the beginning of the lesson for Sunday of week 15 (2Cor 4, 6), the word ταξο - not present in the lectionaries - is included by some of the continuous MSS, whereas other continuous MSS correctly separate the lection by the insertion (or “addition”, but we must be careful in the usage of this word, cf. note 26) of “brethren” between ταξο and κορη.

As a result of these considerations, omissions and/or additions at the beginning of a lesson do not have the same textual value as in the middle of a running text. The textual critic always has to be on the alert for textual variations that are generated by the text type to which a manuscript belongs and that may be characteristic just for that type without bearing on the text itself. Such variants should be eliminated from the apparatus. In this paper, however, I have not removed them, because I wished to illustrate the wide range of variety one encounters when dealing with this kind of manuscripts.

Variants and their Classification

A survey of the variant readings in the 20 pericopes presented here is useful to determine the limits of conscious intervention into the text.

The first group of accidental variants to be considered add to or omit from the text. 26

Omissions

Haplography: When the eyes of the scribe make a jump, letters, words, and even whole phrases can be omitted by haplography. In 1 Cor 4, 13 (Sunday of the 10th week) the manuscripts SPF read ταξο τρεμα instead of ταξο οτραμα.

26 A dangerous assumption at this stage, because this is precisely what we are looking for and do not yet know. Here, it is considered in reference to the intermediary text, printed as main text. As will become clear from the part of this paper devoted to it (“The nature of the intermediary text”), the intermediary text is used as an independent basis for comparison. Already Colwell (1965, 373) re-marked that by the use of the descriptive categories of addition or omission the student tacitly assumes knowledge which he has not yet attained. I bear these restrictions in mind.
Homoioteleuton and Homoioarkton: When virtually identical phrases, with similar beginning or ending, occur at short distance from each other, the scribe may omit the text in between them. Examples of this phenomenon are 1 Cor 15,44 (Saturday of week 18), where SRJPQFLM omit the last part of the verse: μὲν... πάντας, obviously because the first part of this verse also contained τίποτα πάντας.

Omissions also occur on less easily explicable grounds and may be due to such trivial causes as lack of competence or attention of the scribe.

Additions

Additions are not frequent in the pericopes studied. This is remarkable for a text, allegedly belonging to a contaminated tradition. If it had indeed always been copied from more than one antigraph, additions and even contaminations should be expected in large numbers.

Addition of Particles and Conjunctions: Particles are often added in repetitions or enumerations, such as 1Cor 4, 10, where a number of MSS indiscriminately add ἂν to the recurring ΜΑ... ΜΑ... Often ἂν is also added automatically to τακά, probably because of the high incidence of τακά ἂν27 (e.g. 1Cor9, 5: MSS PDLF30; 1Cor6, 15: MSS RBM; 1Cor4, 18, MSS OZBTM F). A similar case is the repeated opposition in 1Cor15, 39–42 (“another flesh is that of man, another that of beasts...” etc.), where P adds τά ("but") in the second part of almost each pair of opposites, while OBFW almost at random add ἀν or ἂν.

The conjunctions ἢ and ἢ (interrogation particle) are often confused, and in a few cases ἢ is added to an already sufficient ἢ, perhaps to be on the safe side (1Cor9, 7, MSS JPFALW). Some words seem to be added more readily than others, the most frequent being ἂν, φανέρω, ὁ, ἢ (passim).

Sometimes it is misunderstanding of the text that leads to addition, e.g. in 1Cor9, 9, where R and T add ἄν.

Formulaic Additions: Another category of additions is that of formulaic phrases. The words “Jesus Christ” frequently occur together, and when only “Jesus” occurs, scribes tend to add “Christ” automatically, regardless of their exemplar (e.g. 2Cor4, 14, where MSS U and S stand alone in the addition).

27 Implicitly, I show here how we try, as far as possible, to divide words. If a word is proven to exist (the Slovnik is our touchstone) on its own, we separate it whenever possible.
The same happens with ἐγώ, to which ἐγώ is added in spite of the Greek original (2Cor11, 31, only ODCTT do not add; cf. the apparatus ad locum).

The well-known liturgical expression κόσμος κόσμος (“world without end”) leads to the addition of κόσμος (κόσμος) to κόσμος in 2Cor9, 9 in JUM. In the same way, κόσμοι is added to κόσμοι by the scribe of S in 1Cor16, 23, but this could also be due to the influence of the following paragraph.

‘Superfluous’ Prepositions: The waning meaning of cases is perhaps responsible for the addition of κατά τον κόσμον (1Cor4, 17 by RJPT). A similar case forms οτοι added to κόσμοι in 2Cor4, 10 by O. More difficult is the addition of οτοι to ορθοποθά in 1Cor15, 42 by J; here the addition may have been caused also by a difference in interpretation.

A Special Case: As the letter κ can represent not only the conjunction “and”, but also the first or last vowel of another word, it is often as difficult for the researcher as is must have been for the scribes to correctly segment the scriptio continua. Consider e.g. 2Cor6, 4–7, where the repetition leads to the independent addition of “and” in many MSS: εἰς σκέπασμα εἰς κάλεσμα. εἰς τάγματα 5 εἰς πάντας εἰς τυλίγματας εἰς θρόνους εἰς θαλάσσας εἰς θεσσαλίας εἰς αἰγίδας εἰς σέρβιες εἰς θρόνους εἰς τρέποντας εἰς εὐλογε- στικ. εἰς δύσιν στὸν εἰς θάνατον μηδεμίως. 7 εἰς σέρβιες ιστυλών, εἰς σίκλοι κοινών, just as it leads to the independent transposition of several of the elements in the MSS.

Substitution

Confusion of Words: Almost commonplace is the confusion between “we” and “you” and their corollaries “our” and “your” in the pericopes studied. Frankly speaking, I have not found a single passage in which one of these words occurs and where all 17 MSS give the same reading. This made me de-cide to leave out of the apparatus most of these instances, except where differences in interpretation could be inferred. Sometimes arguments from the Greek - where homophony leads to identical, or worse, confusion - had to play a decisive role in the choice for the correct Slavic text (cf. e.g. 2Cor6, 16 and the commentary in the apparatus).

Confusion also occurs because of graphic similarity. Thus in 2Cor12, 6 κατο was mistaken for κατο by one scribe and consequently found its way

28 The Greek text of Apostoliki Diakonia, however, includes ἱμών.
into the MSS DCTfKM.

**Lexical Variation:** The use of synonyms is one of the features of Old Slavic texts that have been studied extensively in the past. Because the reasons for this kind of changes have not yet been discovered, it is almost impossible to draw conclusions from these data. It can however be noticed that some groups of manuscripts have their own vocabulary: e.g. पोज्लोक for अपोस्टोल, ब्लागोव्स्टोविं for एवागे, and the like are features of the manuscripts FALW. More details are given in “Grouping of Manuscripts” below.

**Variation in Punctuation**

It seems as if the scribes of Old Slavic manuscripts placed a punctuation mark at the end of the portion of text they could recollect in one time, before having to look at their antigraph again. In this way the text is divided into so-called *syntagmata*, which clearly do not correspond to any modern way of dividing the text. Some scribes make shorter *syntagmata* than others, and there are many instances of individual scribes placing stops so awkwardly, that one could be inclined to ask whether they really understood what they were writing.

Punctuation in the Old Slavic manuscripts used for this paper mainly consists of full stops. The colon or semicolon is sparsely used and only in manuscripts of relatively recent dating (viz. XVth or XVIth century). Moreover, the exact difference in meaning between the various punctuation marks is unclear. For this reason I have equated all punctuation marks to the full stop in the collations. It is clear, however, that much research still has to be done in this particular field in order to clarify the meaning of the use of various punctuation marks in given periods.

---

30 I have to add immediately that, from the textual critic’s point of view, such scribes are to be preferred, because they are not inclined to change the texts submitted to them for copying.
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The Intermediary Text

The text given as base text is a neutral form of what can be distilled from the various MSS. It does not represent the text of any one MS with all its peculiarities, individual readings, etc. I have chosen this form of presentation because it is the form of text we wish to have in the end: the Slavic Version of the Greek Apostolus, to which all MSS are no more than witnesses. As in editions of Homer’s Odyssey or other texts from Classical Antiquity, we wish to publish not the representation of the text in one MS (witness), but the text as conceived by Homer, or something that comes as close to it as possible.

The collation method chosen for this paper requires a base text. It would have been natural to choose C itself, but C contains - even in the pericopes presented here - many singular readings and orthographic peculiarities (e.g. υψίκε in the endings of the fAsg, etc.) that are not present in most of our manuscripts. So, if C had been chosen, it would nonetheless have been necessary to create a separate file to remove these singularities as well as the abbreviations, in order not to violate the principle of the diplomatic rendering of the MS in the transcription–files. The lack of a folium in the middle of the lection for Saturday of week 17 (see below) also disqualifies C as the basis for the collation.

To stress the hypothetical character of this intermediary text, I have called this file ‘x’, to mark the fact that we are dealing with a non–existing MS.

An Independent Measuring Stick

One of the purposes of this paper is to clarify the position of the Christinopolitanus as a witness to the Apostolus text in comparison to a number of other MSS and to check its reliability. For the reasons stated above, it was necessary to create an independent measuring stick by which are to be judged not only the Apostolus C, but all the other MSS as well. In this way, the value of C can be clearly set off against its fellows.

No Hazard of Omissions

By adopting a non–manuscript–dependent text as the basis for the comparison, I have excluded the risk of omissions in the base text. That this is no imaginary fear, is illustrated by the pericope for Saturday of week 17 (1Cor
J.G. van der Tak

14, 20–25), where C unexpectedly lacks a folium and the text breaks off in the first words of verse 21. Should I have used C as base text, this would have resulted in all other MSS recorded as having “additions”, an obvious absurdity.

Abstraction from Orthographic and Dialectal Peculiarities

The use of a neutral intermediary text for the comparison of the text–witnesses also offers the possibility to abstract from the vicissitudes of orthography and local dialect forms that one encounters in Slavic MSS. As these variants offer no contribution whatsoever to the text itself, they are already temporarily removed from the manuscript–files during the collation process by the ‘replacement’ and ‘regularisation’ features described above.

Because it is in no way certain, which kind of orthography or what dialect has more ‘ancestral rights’ than another, I have thought it wise to adopt in the neutral intermediary text the orthography of an equally neutral authority, the Slovník, the orthography of which abstracts from dialectal variation as well.

Normalisation of the Text

A neutral intermediary text also requires lexico–grammatical normalisation, so that the textual comparison is not disturbed by the variations of individual scribes and MSS. In order to stay outside modern controversies, I have decided to adopt the orthography of the Slovník and the grammar of Leskien as the basis for the lexico–grammatical normalisation of the intermediary text.

---

31 This omission has escaped the attention of some scholars dealing with this passage, e.g. Penev and Lavrov, who mark certain variants as attested by C on the absent page; obviously they are misled by Kužnjački’s edition, which does not clearly mark the passages filled in from other manuscripts (cf. Penev, 1989, p.282–291; Lavrov, 1965, p33; see also above, note 20).
32 An illustration of this absurdity is given in the edition of the Strumicki Apo-stolos (Blagova & Hauptova, 1990, passim); the rather peculiar position of this manuscript leads to an apparatus with many variants that are in fact the correct reading. As a matter of fact, the collation programme which I use does not accept lacunæ in the ‘master’. This fact alone prevents the use of C for a base text.
33 Slovník, 1958.
34 Leskien, 1969.
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Abbreviations

The diplomatic rendering of abbreviations in the transcription–files also yields useless variants in the collations. For this reason, in the base–text all abbreviations have been resolved and the individual variants in in the manuscripts are “regularized” to the full form. Words that only appear in their abbreviated form, e.g. братье, братья or кор, ками, господь, исус, христос and their derived and declined forms pose a separate problem. In these cases, I have based my choice on the major-ity usage.

Abbreviated forms of исус: The question has been raised, whether declined forms of the consistently abbreviated word исус occur at all in Gospel MSS. In the pericopes scrutinised in the present paper, two instances of the Исус occur. One of the occasions is 1Cor4, 14, where the text reads и Исус (“and he will raise us through Jesus”). Here, all MSS clearly have a grapheme “и” as the last character of the various forms of abbreviation, sometimes even preceded by the Slavic equivalent of “with”. There can in my view be no doubt that the Slavic text here shows the И form of this noun. The second passage is different. Here (Rom 15,30) the text reads господь наш Исус Христос (“[I beseech thee, brethren,] by our Lord Jesus Christ”). Twelve of the 17 MSS read Исус, the other five have Исуси. Basing myself on the principle that words with an attested existence of their own should be recognised as separate words (cf. above, on addition of particles and conjunctions), I regard the word исус here as a separate noun, showing no sign of declension. Consequently in the intermediate text the undeclined form appears. A number of scribes also add one or two supralinear signs for abbreviation (“titla”), but in my view no evidence can be drawn from these weakly visible signs for the breaking up of the scriptio continua.

More frequent is the G (or A) исус. This case occurs 14 times, 3 times without following “Christ”. In these last places (2Cor4, 10, 11, 14) all without...
nesses have a clearly visible “α” ending, just as we discovered with the I case. The remaining 11 cases show three occurrences of an apparently undeclined form of “Jesus” in all MSS (1Cor1, 7; 1Cor16, 22; 2Cor11, 31). In the oth-er 8 instances, a varying minority (2–6 MSS, amongst which always D, while W misses out just once) has an abbreviation that ends in -ά, whereas the other MSS have the form Ἰς or Ἰς.

The last case occurring in the pericopes is the L Ἰςοῦς. Its three occurrences all have a preceding “Christ” and they all show the case ending in the abbreviation (1Cor1,4; 1Cor4,15; 1Cor16, 24).

Summarising, I cannot support the thesis that declined forms of “Jesus” do not occur in the MSS of the Slavic Apostolus. It is possible, that in the formulaic combination “Jesus Christ” the first part was not felt as a separate word by all scribes and they did not feel obliged to express the case ending for the first part of what they considered as a solid unity. I draw attention to the fact, that when the order of the words is inversed, as is the case in all exam-ples of the L, the word “Jesus” in final position receives the case ending in the abbreviation. This conclusion is only provisional and only more com-pre-hensive research into this matter can clarify this interesting question.

Consequently, the intermediate text contains the undeclined form when the G or I case is followed by “Christ” and the declined form when it is not. Another interesting, but once more unresolved, question remains, why in the case of the L, the word order “Jesus Christ” is inversed in all our examples.

No Reconstruction of the Original Translation

After summing up the features of the intermediary text, I must stress the fact that I make no attempt at all to reconstruct the original Slavic translation of the Greek Apostolus text. The intermediary text I present on these pages is just the greatest common denominator of the textual data from the MS witnesses. The use of textual criticism in the way as is common practice in editions of texts from classical antiquity (esp. the preference for primary forms that may have been the source of later corruptions) simply leads to the oldest attainable text on the basis of all MSS, and it is by no means certain, which stage in the development of the text between the original translation and the

38 I emphasise however that the readings of D could not be checked from the original.
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MSS can be reached in this way. That it is not the original translation itself should be clear from the foregoing.

There is another point to clarify about the intermediary text, viz. its flexibility. Even though printed now, the text remains subject to changes, either by the recognition of new data from the manuscripts, or by the reinterpretation of these data by the textual critic. I can be sure that in the time between the completion of this paper and its publication, my views on certain passages will differ from those printed. For a parallel to such a constantly changing text, I refer to the critical edition of the Greek original of the New Testament. Its recent 27th edition offers a text considerably different from the first, owing both to new insights and newly discovered MSS, recent editions of other versions, and the like. The introductions to the various editions bear ample testimony to these developments as well as to the fact that the most recent edition will not be the definitive one. It is in this way that we have to consider the present first attempt to establish a critical text of a part of the Slavic New Testament: I hope that it will soon be superseded by new editions of the same text and more parts of the Apostolus as well as the Gospels, making use of an increasing number of manuscripts. With the use of modern computer–aided techniques for editing and collating as described in this paper, it must be possible to produce the first draft of a scientifically sound critical text of the Slavic Gospels and the Apostolus within a few years.

Intermediary Text for a Group of Manuscripts

Working with and developing an intermediate text, it occurred to me that it would be useful to collate not only individual manuscripts, but groups of manuscripts as well, which show identical variations in vocabulary and even in the use of grammatical constructions. Thus, I have tried to make a "sub–x", e.g. for the manuscripts FALW, or the Commented texts. This has been proven to be a fruitful and efficient procedure, but one has to be careful in the number of deviations from the group one is willing to allow while still keeping the manuscript in the group. Another danger when following this practice is the blurring of individual features in the final apparatus. As this likelihood increases with the number of manuscripts, these individual readings will have to be collected in the introductory descriptions of all witnesses that have contributed to the text. In this way, the space in the critical apparatus can be re–served for variants, shared by groups or families.
of manuscripts\textsuperscript{39}.

**The apparatus criticus**

For the apparatus I have chosen the *positive* type, as opposed to the *negative*, which only indicates which MSS have variants, whereas in the *positive* type for every variant all MSS in which the passage occurs are quoted. (Moreover, I quoted the *sigla* of all manuscripts containing the text in the heading of every pericope).

As a rule, I first give the *sigla* of the MSS that contain the reading of the *underlined* words in the main (intermediate) text. After those follow the variants in the Slavic witnesses, additions, omissions and in a few cases the Greek text, with variants where that seems appropriate. In order to facilitate the reading of the apparatus I present all witnesses in the same order in all places: first come the Lectionaries, then the Commented MSS, followed by the (other) Continuous texts. Within these groups the MSS are mentioned in order of estimated age.

**Abstracted Slavic Forms**

In the apparatus the Slavic words are cited in their ‘abstracted’ forms, as explained above under “Data Abstraction”. This means that prejotated vowels, yrs or yors do not occur and that nasals are used simplified. Abbreviations are written in full, as in the intermediate text. No grammatical or orthographic standardisation was applied when quoting from the MSS themselves.

**Greek**

It is impossible to take a critical view of the text of the Slavic Apostolus without recourse to the Greek. In fact, I have done so when I felt that a Slavic variant could only be explained by reference to the Greek text and/or the underlying variants. As I have made clear elsewhere, the Greek text at the basis of the Slavic translation is the Byzantine type, to be found nowadays in the editions of the *Apostoliki Diakonia*\textsuperscript{40} (Bakker & Van der Tak, 1994). However, as these editions lack a critical apparatus, I have quoted the

\textsuperscript{39} A really critical apparatus is based on selection. In my view it does not make sense to simply enumerate all variants of all consulted manuscripts, thus creating a ‘Variantenfriedhof’. Only the variants that have something to elucidate on the constitution of the main (intermediate) text have to be selected.

\textsuperscript{40} *Apostolus*, 1987.
variants and the main text from the Nestle–Aland edition\textsuperscript{41}, in which the Byzantine text type mostly coincides with the siglum \textsuperscript{\textasciitilde}.

I have refrained from quoting text and/or the apparatus by Tischendorf\textsuperscript{42}, because this edition is not easily accessible. In order to retain the transparency of my work for all possible readers, I kept for this publication to the most common available edition of the Greek New Testament, that of Nestle–Aland (N27)\textsuperscript{43}. As this latter edition shows a predilection for Alexandrine readings and papyri, I will probably give the Greek text according to Tischendorf, where it diverges from N27, in the edition of the complete short Lectionary (i.e. from Sunday of the first week after Pentecost up to the beginning of the Great Lent).

**Singular Readings**

As a general principle, the apparatus gives no singular readings: in most cases they are \textit{lapsus} of individual scribes and have no bearing on the establishment of the main text. Constant mention of the extreme corruption of e.g. manuscript R would blur the view of the whole. This principle is widely adopted in critical editions of classical texts, and I follow it here.

**Grouping the Manuscripts**

The small number of MSS used up to now makes grouping and the subsequent use of an intermediate group text a hazardous business. Yet it will be the only way to deal with the huge number of MSS we will have to collate in the future. As the number of MSS increases, however, I believe that grouping will become easier. By then, simple spot checks of fixed points in vocabulary and the like will be sufficient to rank the MS in question in one of the groups.

In the collations made for this edition, I use a single intermediate text for all MSS. However, in order to demonstrate the utility of a group–oriented approach, I present below the data collected separately for the manuscript groups FALW (at least partly designated by Voskresenski as the “Fourth

\textsuperscript{41} Nestle–Aland, 1993\textsuperscript{27} (= N27 in the apparatus).
\textsuperscript{42} Tischendorf, 1859.
\textsuperscript{43} The same text is printed in the GNT\textsuperscript{4}, but the apparatus is different. Because the \textit{Christinopolitanus} is treated in a remarkable way in the Introduction (cf. be-low), I thought it wise not to quote from this edition.
Recension”), DCTfP30 (the Commented MSS) and the three MSS TKM, which agree now with the Commented MSS (esp. KM), now with the Lectionaries (T), but insufficiently to be included in either group. In the data some striking features can be observed.

The FALW–Group

The coherence of the manuscripts FALW, which we already observed in the pilot project on six Apostolus pericopes44, is firmly corroborated in the pericopes presented here. They seem to form part of the so–called Fourth Recension, which was first distinguished by Voskresenski in his edition of some of the Epistles (Voskresenski 1896, 1904, 1906).

In the pericopes presented here, one of the most striking features is the well-noted fact that ‘pure Slavic’ forms appear to be substituted for loanwords, e.g. благовестование in FA LW (e.g. 1Cor 9, 12 and 15, 1) corresponds to проповедь in the other witnesses, апостолы becomes посланники (1Cor 4, 9), посланники (1Cor 16, 3) corresponds to евангели, языческий язык in FALW (2 Cor 11, 31) with евангели of the lectionaries.

Other common features in the field of vocabulary are надежда / оправданне (1Cor 9, 10)45, телемана / палатема (1Cor 9, 11), дрозда дрозда / сибе (1Cor 16, 20), освобождение / освобождение (1Cor 4, 12), благодарность / благодарение (1Cor 1, 4), оставлена вас / исключена вы (1Cor 1, 8), пишете / пишано искат (1Cor 9, 9 и 14, 21), якда / як (1Cor 2, 8), растут / про-пали (ibid.), координаты / координаты (1Cor 16, 13), строители / приставы-пник (1Cor 4, 1/2), тело / тело (2Cor 2, 2), поэзия / поэзия (ibid. 4), чудо / чудо (1Cor 4, 18), ик / ик (2Cor 4, 8), наступа / наступа (1Cor 10, 26), исполнение / совершенство (1Cor 10, 27 and 28), духовное писание / трапеза (2Cor 6, 6), беседу / беседу (2Cor 6, 8), беседу / беседу (2Cor 14, 23), изучение / изучение (2Cor 9, 8), низжда / низжда (2Cor 9, 7), простота / простота (2Cor 9, 11), крепк / креп (2Cor 12, 3), изглаживаемый / изглаживаемый (2Cor 12, 4), казуш / казуш / казуарах (2Cor 12, 6).

After completing the textual part of this paper, I had the opportunity to review some 40 Apostolus MSS from Hilandar Monastery on Mt. Athos and

44 Bakker & Van der Tak, 1994, p. 46.
45 The variants are given in the order FALW / other MSS; these variants are not always mentioned in the apparatus, because this focuses on C.
various other repositories, dating for the greater part from the XIVth to the XVIth century. They all shared the above mentioned features of the FALW group. In my view, this implies that the so-called Fourth Recension can no longer be seen as a relatively young development in the textual history of the Old Slavic version of the Apostolus nor as the result of a more or less thorough revision or even retranslation on the basis of a Greek original.

As I pointed out, Voskresenski (and Kalužniacki) have been the first to assume a division of the textual history of the Slavic Apostle into four or five recensions, redactions, or even revisions, and it has been repeated many times after them. Already now it seems to me, however, that the presumption of such a sequential division is premature in the light of my textual findings in the pericopes presented here and that, as a consequence, we have to be very cautious with speculations concerning the history of the textual tradition. The division into such recensions seems to me all the more questionable, because on close inspection the Second and Third Recension appear to consist of a very restricted number of representatives.

The Commented Manuscripts

The traditional ordering of the witnesses according to the way in which they present the NT-text, Lectionary, Continuous or Commented, seems to be reflected by an internal opposition. As the apparatus shows repeatedly, the Commented MSS (viz. the manuscripts DCTfP30) have textual variants that distinguish this group from the other MSS. Below, I give an analysis of the passages, where the Commented MSS have readings of their own, to begin with the lexical variants not shared with the Lectionaries and/or the Continuous:

...
More significant than simple lexical variation is the choice of a periphrastic perfect consisting of a participle with a form of “to be” by the Commented MSS (in the last two examples +M) in contrast with the others: писа́ть / вписать́ (1Cor9,10); ли́шиться / лишившись (1Cor1, 7); вста́ть бъя́ти, о́п иста́ть ли́чный / вста́ть ли́чный (1Cor4, 3). Here the Commented MSS seem to display a syntactical pattern of their own.

Although this grouping needs confirmation from more witnesses of the same type, I think that we have sufficient reason to assume the existence of a specific tradition of the Commented MSS. This might imply the assumption that these texts were copied from each other, but we cannot be sure until more research is done into both the text itself and into the nature and the contents of the commentaries.

The exact boundaries of the Commented group are not yet clear, but it is quite certain that from the MSS used for this paper the MSS D, C, Tt and P30 belong to it. As will be clear from the above listings, they are often joined by the MSS K, T and M. As for К, this is not surprising at all, because in his description of it, Bakker mentions the occurrence of comments within the text of at least the Epistle to Timothy48. So, a firm external link with the Commented MSS exists for this witness. More surprisingly, the Commented MSS are often joined by M and T, manuscripts for which no external link with this type of MSS exists at all. For the moment, nothing more can be said about this. Maybe the collation and critical edition of the next 40 pericopes from the Pentecost lectionary can shed some light on this question.

The Position of the Christinopolitanus

One of the main aims of this publication is to clarify the position of the Apostolus Christinopolitanus in the textual tradition of the Slavic Apostolus text. Two conclusions about this manuscript will be clear after studying the data in the apparatus below. The first conclusion is that the Christinopolitanus is a representative of a (perhaps) important subgroup in the tradition: that

of the Commented MSS. There are virtually no examples of C joining the lectionaries and/or the FALW group, while at the same time being in conflict with the MSS DTIP30. The second conclusion was already noted in the pilot project on the six pericopes: C and its commented companions show many signs of revision, probably based on comparison with a Greek original. Once more, the apparatus below bears ample witness to this. This precludes the consideration of C as representative of an early stage of the text.

As mentioned, the Christinopolitanus has often been treated as the main representative of “the” Slavic Apostolus, e.g. the Introduction to GNT terms it “the earliest and most reliable manuscript of the Apostolus”, together with the Apostolus of Čítovac and, mirabile dictu, the editions of the Gospels by Vajs. Apart from the questionable character of the edition by Kalužniacki, it is quite absurd to put this single representative of a specific text type, which may have undergone revision, on one line with the reconstruction of the Gospel texts by Vajs, for which several manuscripts were used in a laudable effort to establish a critical text according to modern scientific standards.

Conclusions
An interesting feature of the texts presented here is that they contain just over 3,000 (Slavic) words, on which there are some 300 textual variations. Not all of them will be worth mentioning in a critical edition, even though I already omitted the singular readings and variations in word-order. The variations due to the text type are of no importance for the final establishment of the text. If only the variations related to the Christinopolitanus manuscript are counted, the number of variations shrinks to 116 (which almost is almost equal to the number of notes). The largest part of the text is thus exempt from variation. One could therefore ask, whether it really matters to review all—or almost all—2,000 manuscripts of the Slavic Apostolus in order to establish the text of it beyond reasonable doubt. It could well be feasible to establish a text on basis of a representative selection. Possibly, this paper can contribute to make such a selection.

49 I refer to 1Cor4, 11; 1Cor3, 6; 2Cor4, 15; 1Cor10, 23; 1Cor10, 28; 2Cor11, 31.
Text
The Lessons for Saturdays and Sundays
of Week 10–20 after Pentecost

Saturday of Week 10 after Pentecost: Rom. 15 30–33

(MSS: SORJBQDCTP30KTMFALW)
15 30 kратие, молити же вы_51 господь наш иисус христос_52 да любовь духохьвильку, послушествуйте ми ко молитвам о имени кого из.
31 да исказыя са от ти противоположникух ми_53 са к эвдовии и да слободы ми наже_54 ен иерусалимо привате схватници да бежить.
32 да радости прияли кос ваке, козие козие и помим си вали.
33 кого же мирес_55 са весты кали дни.

Sunday of Week 10 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 4 9–16

(MSS: SORJBQDCTP30KTMFALW)
4 9 кратие, кого_56 вы апостоли послъдници табис_57, како магистръгъны.
50 како поздъръгъ бъхъ въ свъдь кифо, агелъкъ и щенъкъ.
10 и мы кохъ христа ради вы же къдъръ о христа, мы неолъграмъ, вы же къгъцъ, вы

51 kратие add DCTKTMALW (+ мол П30) from the full text.
52 и add. QCP30TTFW. Cf. above “Abbreviated Forms of ἱκουσέ” for a discussion of the declension of the word ἱκουσέ.
53 SBRTM, μισ AF, om QQPCTP30KL.
54 SOBRQP30MTMALW, οθ R, οθ CTf, est add R. RCTf disregard the gender of слободы.
55 SOBRJPQP30TFAWL M, θεροс CTf. “Alleingang” of CTf. Cf., however, also 1Cor9, 2 and 9, 7 in the lesson for Sunday 11.
56 θερος οθ add DCTFIALW (Gr. dokw’ gavr N27, add o’ti Q2 D2 - vg2 sy).
57 The addition in the beginning is typical for the Continuous MSS in contrast to the lectionaries, but the distribution does not follow this division exactly. As for the Continuous MSS, it depends on the accurateness of the scribe, whether he excluded these words by means of an initial at кого. Many marginal incipit quotations in-clude these words.
58 SOBRBPQ30KTFALW, κεβαл PCTFМ. C and companions use the pf (without aux), thought to be a non–witness form.
славянъ, мы же благовестники 11 до нынѣшняго часа. _58далечь въ и жаждѣ и нынѣ вышель, страждѣла и сѣялиса св. 12 и труд ждали св. Далѣѣъ о своями рѣками, оклеветающи благословѣнны гонимы оудраждѣнны св. 60. 13 хощаћи молимся св. тако острени 62 вышено вправду владыча, вѣстѣ и попрѣ выстье досчалъ. 14 не срамимся св. 63 васъ гуща син. на тако чада своя вѣд-мѣленна наказатъ. 64. 15 аще бо тыйҁ петокръ 65 илае о христѣ, на не многихъ отца, о христѣ бо исусъ вѣднѣлъ, азъ вы редьхъ. 16 моложъ же вы подобны азъ йвлите.

Saturday of Week 11 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 1 3–8

(MSS: SOZRJBPDCTIP30KTMFALW)

1 З ертии. благоцепать вамъ и миръ отъ его отца господа нашего исусъ

58 и add DCTIP30KW {καὶ; πεινωμένω... N27}. Sign of revision in these MSS or simply addition of an extra copula to the string?
59 ORJPDCITP30KM, ηγερογένως SBQTFALW. Both variants are attested in old as well as in more recent MSS, although the latter variant is dominantly present in Continuous MSS, sharing features of the ALW group. The periphrastic rendering is thought to be primary and has been chosen in the text.
60 SBRJPDP30KTMFALW, дреѣа св. Q, трѣвана CTf. C and Tf are not joined by either P30 or K and are likely to have individual variants, as is the reading in Q (αἰμενομενα N27, AD).
61 SOBPQKTFALW, молымъ R, Pмлымъ J, тѣшая DCp30̣Tf, тѣшилъ се M. Why did C cum suis choose this rare word to render parakalou’men, omitting even the following св.?
62 BQDCTIP30KTMALW, трѣвъ SPF, тѣвѣваджъ RJ, тѣвѣвадъ O. SPF show haplography, which may be the origin of the corruption in O, as well as in RJ; C sides with the majority.
63 SORJPQDP30T, мъ C TIK and ALW is interesting and up to a certain extent paralleled in note 56 above, but is not joined by the Commented MSS D or P30; B offers a simple error.
64 нокетвмъ AD, B D F Y ` Iatt; нокетвмънъ N27 [11 ΑΑΑPpс. The Slavic is uncertain because of confusion of the nasals. 1sg наказажъ found in SOJBPQDCTMT TFW (K illegible). ZLA πρα ` ας add ОИР.
65 SOBPQKTMFALW, πεκακομи J, наставиющи DCTIP30, наставиющи Z. The group DCTIP30 shares a significant variant with Z (after corruption?). The J variant may be an old reading, echoing the Greek paidagogouгнω.
христа. 4 вдячн бога юного всегда о вас, 66 о благогати божии дани
вали о христа исуса. 5 тако всаде обогатисте са о небъ, встайте, словомъ
и словомъ, радоцеловать. 6 тако же тайна божия, 67 идущи са о вас, 68 вас.
7 тако вами не лишить са 69 ни единого же дарованыка чадинео увлажнения
gospoda нашего исуса христа. 8 иже идущии за вас. 70
вам) о божии да:й вам) о христа исуса.
qko vos obogatiste s( o ¢&m| v|s:m| slovom|. i v|sem| razoumom|.
qko je ta¢a bojiq
izv:sti s( o vas). qko
vam) ¢e listi s( ¢i ¢&di¢ogo je darova¢iq. ~a+}em) qvl&¢iq go
spoda ¢a{ego isous) hrista.
ije izv:stit) vy do ko¢|ca. ¢e povi¢|¢y v) gospoda
¢a{ego isous) hrista.
v:r|¢) bog) im|je z)va¢y
byste. v) ob|}e¢i& sy¢a &go isous) hrista
gospoda ¢a{ego.
Sunday of Week 11 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 9 2-12
(MSS: SOZBRJPQDCTP30KTMFALW)
9 2 кратне, печать, 73 мненему апостольство, 74 вы нисте о господи. 3 му
отъ встать встывающих вмнє ниста се. 4 еда не иимале власти части
и пиши. 5 еда не иимале власти сестры, 75 именя, 76 водити, пако и профи апо-

66 SOZBRJPQRTMFALW, 2а вы DCTF P30K. C joins the other Commented MSS
and K (see Introduction).
67 SOZBJPO, (я) свидетельство христово (DCTIP30KTM)FALW, {то; martuvrion tou' cristou' N27, AD}. The Greek would support
свидетельство христово of C and the other Commented MSS, but not ... revision is not frequent.
68 SZBRJPQTFALW, ω DCP30K; error probably from the Glagolitic, ω as in в.
TIM, secondary to the reading of DCP30K, thus proving affinity within the Com-
mented group and with KM; O reads вами in stead of о вас.
69 SOZBRJPQAW (лицевит I), лишить са RQF, лишняяя бьш DCTKTM, лишняяя,
быш P30. Again C shares with the Commented MSS and KTM the use of a pf
tense in contrast with the lectionaries and FALW.
70 SOZBRJPQDP30TMFALW, господи CTIK. This grammatical variant is repeated
by C alone in the next verse (note 72).
71 SOZBRJPQDKP30TFALWM, издавали C, придавали Tf. A curious singular
reading in C, not supported by other Commented MSS; understandable in Tf.
72 Cf. note 70.
73 SOZBRPQDTM, εо add JCP30TIFALW. {гавр N27, от AD}. Revision in some
MSS, or simply an addition from the continuous text?
74 SZBRJPQKTFALW, καµονо апостолства ODCTIP30M. If the use of the D
is primary to that of the G, this place is to be counted as a proof for corruption in O, C,
the other Commented MSS and M, would in that case have a secondary reading. But
then, the G and D case could simply have been interchangeable, as in note 76 below.
75 SOZRJBPQK, сестра TFALW, сестрее DCTIP30, части и пиши М. The cluster
DCTIP30 has an individual variant, not shared by K or М; the latter interchanges
verses 4 and 5a and reads ελαστι, an old form, already found in the Clozianus, for ελαστι.
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colni. и братия гостеприимна, и киша, 6 или идя се и варчива. не има-
къ власни не дахли. 7 като който бъхнете своиим оброка коли, като нас-
ждахте винограда и от 77 плодъ юго не даст, имах 78 като пъстета стадо и
отъ искъ стадовъ 79 не даст. 8 еда по човековъ съ 80 глаголъ, или не е въ
дево; съ 81 глаголъ. 9 езъ понесъ въ десно, писано ниста, не охрань
воля връщаща. еда о вълчъ радитъ богъ. 10 или насъ ради
глаголъ, на-съ ко ради баптисти съ 82 какъ на 83 огъванніе 84 дахнетъ ниста
ыми останъ и връща на огъванніе свое прибавий съ 85 11 ище вълхи
досягнъла стихомъ. велики ище вълхи платъха поживолъ. 12 ище ими
ваши влас-сти прибавий съ, не паучъ ли имъ, не въ сътворенъ по
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ждахте винограда и отъ 77 плодъ юго не даст, имах 78 като пъстета стадо и
отъ искъ стадовъ 79 не даст. 8 еда по човековъ съ 80 глаголъ, или не е въ
дево; съ 81 глаголъ. 9 езъ понесъ въ десно, писано ниста, не охрань
воля връщаща. еда о вълчъ радитъ богъ. 10 или насъ ради
глаголъ, на-съ ко ради баптисти съ 82 какъ на 83 огъванніе 84 дахнетъ ниста
ими останъ и връща на огъванніе свое прибавий съ 85 11 ище вълхи
досягнъла стихомъ. велики ище вълхи платъха поживолъ. 12 ище ими
ваши влас-сти прибавий съ, не паучъ ли имъ, не въ сътворенъ по
oblasti seí. na ye trazimis, da na prakrštenina etero. Damara evangeliio hristovoj.

Saturday of Week 12 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 1 26–29

(MSS: SOZRJPQDCTP30KTMFALW)
1 26 krateje, vratite88 zavijanje vaše—89, iako ne kazovje li pravljadro po platni, ne kazovje li snedmi, ne kazovje li blagodarni. 27 na koju vaša80 izbra eda.91 kogž da posravit pravljadro, i nekomu izbra 92 kogž. Da posravit kritika.93 28 i blagodarni vaše vaša94 i oseorni izbra kogž i ne slažu. Da slažu oseornitiz. 29 iako da na posravit sa svaka plati preda kogžom.*

Sunday of Week 12 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 15 1–11

(MSS: SOPZRQDCTP30KTMFALW)
1 krateje, sajdelaj že vaše evangeliio žene, neke blagostojih vaše, neke privaste, ka nevlije i stojite. 2 neži i sagasidete sa. kaževa, slovom, blagostojih vaše, ose kijdeni, razjed aši ne ka ševe vedkhet. 3 pr-

86 OZBRJQD, etero TM, kogž P30, om S, kogž F; (blagostojainno in F and in ALW like many other lexical variants common for this group; cf. Introduction). C does not have the oldest form of pronoun.
87 ŠZBJQD30KTML, daže O, daže CTIAWR. The C variant does not figure in the extant grammars, despite its frequency in Apostolus MSS.
88 SOJRJPQFAW, krateje je DCTP30K, smotrite vašo M; se add TFAW, anato add L. DCTP30 ally with K in this variant; M, singular in reading, allies with L in the addition; TFAW add so (gavr N27, ou'n DFG).
89 krateje add CTP30KFWL (ajdelio N27). The Continuous MSS only seemingly add, because the lectionaries move the address to the beginning of the les-son.
90 SRQDCP30KCTMFALW, vašo ad DCTIKM, vašelju Štvo ŠT, om Štvo Štvo. O, štvo R. As važi štvo is commonly considered to be the original trans-lation for kovan, the addition of štvo should not surprise.
91 SOZRJPQSTPFAW, izbra DCTIKM. C cum suis prefer the pf. cf. note 92.
92 SRQVTFAW, izbra DCTIP30K; cf note 91.
93 SOQJKDP30MTMFALW, om R, kriješ CTI, a surprising sg in CTI.
94 PDCTIP30, štvo JFALW, kogž K, k kišak T, vašelju Štvo ŠT, om M. A rather unclear picture, cf. above.

Because of a problem related to the Typikon I break off the lesson at this point; cf. above "Length of the Pericopes".
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Доха бо вашь исправа, неже и приях, иох Христоса очири в греха ради наша по князьям, 4 и нако проповеда бысть, и нако вста в третий день по князьям. 5 и нако певи са киф, по той же единоиму на десять, 6 по той же певи са более пати сете братии единоим, отъ накое слово—щасливы — прибежавши досять степи, 7 по той же певи са нак- ковоч, по той же апостоловъ въсячъ. 8 послѣдамъ же въ 98 въсячъ, иох извра- гошу певи са и киф. 9 азъ бо нось, мании апостолъ, ико нось, достоинъ наприяти са апостолъ, да не гоня рука апостолъ божий. 10 ведательнъ же бо- жиямъ нось. 11 азъ бо нось, и благода тъ бо ико нось, и благода тъ бо ико нось, и благода тъ бо, ико нюсь, и благода тъ бо, ико нось, и благода тъ бо, ико нось, и благода тъ бо, ико нось. 11 азъ бо нось. 12 азъ бо мъ гов. 13 азъ бо гов. 14 азъ бо мъ гов. 15 азъ бо мъ гов. 16 азъ бо мъ гов. 17 азъ бо мъ гов. 18 азъ бо мъ гов. 19 азъ бо мъ гов. 20 азъ бо мъ гов. 21 азъ бо мъ гов. 22 азъ бо мъ гов. 23 азъ бо мъ гов. 24 азъ бо мъ гов. 25 азъ бо мъ гов. 26 азъ бо мъ гов. 27 азъ бо мъ гов. 28 азъ бо мъ гов. 29 азъ бо мъ гов. 30 азъ бо мъ гов. 31 азъ бо мъ гов. 32 азъ бо мъ гов. 33 азъ бо мъ гов. 34 азъ бо мъ гов. 35 азъ бо мъ гов. 36 азъ бо мъ гов. 37 азъ бо мъ гов. 38 азъ бо мъ гов. 39 азъ бо мъ гов. 40 азъ бо мъ гов. 41 азъ бо мъ гов. 42 азъ бо мъ гов. 43 азъ бо мъ гов. 44 азъ бо мъ гов. 45 азъ бо мъ гов. 46 азъ бо мъ гов. 47 азъ бо мъ гов. 48 азъ бо мъ гов. 49 азъ бо мъ гов. 50 азъ бо мъ гов. 51 азъ бо мъ гов. 52 азъ бо мъ гов. 53 азъ бо мъ гов. 54 азъ бо мъ гов. 55 азъ бо мъ гов. 56 азъ бо мъ гов. 57 азъ бо мъ гов. 58 азъ бо мъ гов. 59 азъ бо мъ гов. 60 азъ бо мъ гов. 61 азъ бо мъ гов. 62 азъ бо мъ гов. 63 азъ бо мъ гов. 64 азъ бо мъ гов. 65 азъ бо мъ гов. 66 азъ бо мъ гов. 67 азъ бо мъ гов. 68 азъ бо мъ гов. 69 азъ бо мъ гов. 70 азъ бо мъ гов. 71 азъ бо мъ гов. 72 азъ бо мъ гов. 73 азъ бо мъ гов. 74 азъ бо мъ гов. 75 азъ бо мъ гов. 76 азъ бо мъ гов. 77 азъ бо мъ гов. 78 азъ бо мъ гов. 79 азъ бо мъ гов. 80 азъ бо мъ гов. 81 азъ бо мъ гов. 82 азъ бо мъ гов. 83 азъ бо мъ гов. 84 азъ бо мъ гов. 85 азъ бо мъ гов. 86 азъ бо мъ гов. 87 азъ бо мъ гов. 88 азъ бо мъ гов. 89 азъ бо мъ гов. 90 азъ бо мъ гов. 91 азъ бо мъ гов. 92 азъ бо мъ гов. 93 азъ бо мъ гов. 94 азъ бо мъ гов. 95 азъ бо мъ гов. 96 азъ бо мъ гов. 97 азъ бо мъ гов. 98 азъ бо мъ гов. 99 азъ бо мъ гов. 100 азъ бо мъ гов. 101 азъ бо мъ гов.

Saturday of Week 13 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 2.6–9

(MSS: SOZRBQDP30KTMFALW)

2 6 кратие, прывкладрость же глаголева въ свяшеничь, прывкладрость же въ веа сего, нак квамъ веа сего престалычень. 7 нак глаголева божие прывкладрость, въ тамь свяшеничь, въже прендре бого, прыде веа въ славъ нашъ. 8 накаке нимско же отъ квамъ. 100 вѣра101 сего же разумщ.

95 SOPQDP30WKT, об:ма на десять. CTMFAL. Here, the number of the Apostles seems to be under discussion, like in some of the other versions (Greek: ендеа D* F G latt sy hmg, двдека N27, AD).
96 SOBPKDCTP30TMFALW, множамъ же C. Slip of the pen or the ear?
97 KRT, ср:ви SOPDCTP30M, иззви FALW. The older form seems to be represented by a minority. The FALW group clearly has its own vocabulary. др:ви would be the choice of the majority.
98 SOZBKWLW, послѣ же ДСТФ, послѣдя же Р30ТА, послѣдя же QM, по той же... извра:о P. The sequence —же же brings about some confusion: P is clearly cor-rupt, others have a word of later coinage.
99 SOBRPQDP30TMFALW, об: том. The unity of the Commented MSS is broken here by an almost singular reading in C and Tf.
100 SOTTFALW, владикъ DCP30K, човикъ М, отъ квамъ om B, отъ... сего om RQ. A lexical variant in a group of MSS.
101 SOBPKD30TM, веа CTIFALW. Lexical variant, but not along the same division line as in note 100. Common to both variants is the disintegration of the Commented MSS group.
Sunday of Week 13 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 16 13–24

(MSS: SOZRBPGDCCTIP30KTMFALW)

16 13 krateite, kajdite in stojite de vepred. lizondite sa. otrjavajdite sa. 14 vse glav navodite da vjeklit. 15 molite je vse krateje. veste doma steфанове и фркточево, kajo je 102 jezeg napotke 4hjva je kaj slujenje o epnjjla. 104 oznjja sebe. 16 da je jeje lizondite sa. takovajdite, in vsegljaj se postavljanjefalvo in trojedanjanjefalvo, sa. 17 radeje je sa o prijastvii steфанове и фркточево, и акоже, kajo jeje lizondi se ne zalo. 18 pokoja sa je mej doma je kajdite. 19 цлаудите je цркве донсков, цлаудите je vse. оддад и прикунал, sa domašnjefalvo, 105 црквен. 20 цлаудите je vse. цлаудите sebe lizljepalno, скатова. 106 21 цлауне je 4dome 4node vjekom. je 22 je jeje lizondite sa. иосаф христа. da kajdite аналоjla. 107, marahela. 23 благоje vse. иосаф христа sa vami. 24 lizby.

102 SOZRBQKTFALW, препало DCTIP30TM. The Commented MSS (this time united and joined by T and M) have a different prefix.
103 SOZPTRP30FALW, kajje B, nake B, ijeje CTIPKM, egke Q, CTIPKM possibly have retained the G from the preceding relative.
104 SKRT, скатова OBQCP30TMFALW. The corruption seems to be deeply rooted in the Slavic MSS, this time including C.
105 SORQKDP30M, якje add CTIF, икje add LW, оо add BT {аuijw'н AD}. Most lectionaries omit; икje seems to be the result of revision, but so may seem the other additions. All ‘groups’ are divided on this point.
106 SBRPTIK, скатова ZOQDCP30TMFALW. Here C, along with most Slavic manuscripts, erroneously combines an sg noun (лобзацем) with a pl adjective. The underlying opposition is, of course, between indef скатове and def скатова, corrupted to —ha.
107 SOZBRQKTFALW, препало DCTIP30M. The Commented MSS set themselves apart, joined by M and this time also by P. The Greek word is untranslated in most lectionaries and FALW: this observation contradicts the thesis that older MSS simply transliterate difficult Greek words and that ‘pure Slavic’ forms stem from a more recent date (cf. also the note 171).
Saturday of Week 14 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 4 1–5

(MSS: SOZRJBPQDCTP30KTMFALW)

4 1 bratije, tako da uznite člancůž, jako služby Hristova i pristavající táníček Boljševka. 2 A někde pročně někde v pristavajících. Da výrok kato opračet sa. 3 Někde je ne v klenk o hreha. Da odž vass kastal-jek sa 108 ili odž vass člancůž, na jí sebe kastalalj. 4 Někde je v sám sebe clevadk, na jí sej opravadik sa. Kastalaljí jí va hreha o hreha. 5 Tož jí ne předk je vratlené někde je ne sčítajte. Donkdeje přidét gaspod- ssa, přik všetekí táníček, a hratí sačky řehočenéka, a týda pohrdala blídu končíkado odž boga.

Sunday of Week 14 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 1 21–24 1–4

(MSS: SOZBPJOQDCP30KTMFALW)

1 21 bratije, izpečciojí jí nací sa vamí v hrista, i pomazávají jí hreha. 22 i srovnávají nací i dace opračenice ducha v srovná nací. 23 dají jí srovnávající Bog a napěln na jí ducha, jího žalda vass paki ne přidoke 109 v jí koříneč. 24 v jí ne jako oustavojí vami všere, na jího poštániky jí někdy radosti vami, ktoroh ko stote. 2 jí slácuse jí sevt sá, ne jího srovení jí vamí priti. 2 ašo ko džas scral. tvořej vamí, kato hreha všechna jí. tajne ho přiměnili crí da, ote mene. 3 jího všechna vamí se istoč, da ne přivlcdá scral na scral. přiměly, o někde poštániky jí radovatí sa. nadžívají sa na vass v jího jího radosti všechna vamí hreha.

108 SOBRJQKTFALW, vamí kastalám bledá. CP30M, vamí istažan bledá DTF, vamí istažan bledá i dne P, stážak sa F, istažak sa AW, tajdík sa L. The text of the lectionaries is preferred to the various stages of corruption in P, R and FALW; the vocabulary of DCP30Tf is remarkably constant in its peculiarity: again a pf tense is chosen (cf. note 67).

109 přidoke ZPDCTPJ30KMFALW, přidok SOBQRT, priti J {hilipon N27}. The confusion stems from the root–aor přid (reflected in SOBQRT), which could lead to either variant –a a or –j.
Saturday of Week 15 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 4 17-21 5 1-5

(MSS: SOZJRBPQDCTfP30KT MFSALW)

4 17 братие, сего ради послахъ божь тяжебе, иже мнь вести112 чадо кь-глаголеное, и вѣрно о господи, иже божь кесопломаеть. Плакь моя, тако о христѣ тако же и въсладь ея взыскано пречисте учекъ. 18 ико не градущий113 или кь боже, разглаждыша114 стерпи114. 19 прило же скоро кь боже, аще господь касахуетъ и разучимся не слово разглаждышныхъ115 на силах. 20 не кь слобосе бо царствіе вожіне изь кь силах. 21 что хощете глаголитъ ли при-дѣ на вы, или люобимъ доволь, же кротости. 5 1 отмѣна.116 слышитъ са ея вась люободѣданіе, и тако люободѣданіе, како бо же икь кь маєшьца именовашета са117. како же ико стерпи отца имяти118. 2 и вы

110 SOBJPQFALW, глаголощ DCTfP30KT, глаголи М. The adnominal D should be a mark of older mss, yet here it is in the Commented mss, including their fol-lowers KT. This is in conflict with note 74, where the Commented mss have the G.

111 SOBJPQD30KT MFSALW, ея вась CTf. The variant of C and T is not joined by D and P30.

112 SOZRJPQD30TFALW, вести и МCTfK {ejsi про тов нон AD. ejstiv mou teyv-non N27}. Could TIK have been revised from a non-Byzantine text?

113 SOZJBQFTFALW, om R, развецишъ о DCTfP30M. Lexical variant in the Commented mss and M; cf. notes 115 and 119.

114 SOBQPQD30KT, нон MCTfALW, и М. Lexical variant in CTf, shared this time by the FALW, but the Commented mss diverge.

115 SOBZRJPQKFWL, развецишыхъ са DCTfP30M. The same lexical vari-ant as in notes 113 and 119.

116 SOBZRDP30KT FALW, влазлъ CTf.

117 DCTfP30MT FALW, нон MCTfRDKFWL, са ORP, развециш ща DCTfP30M. Almost all Slavic mss follow the Byzantine majority and Y. K stands isolated, the other variants are inner Slavic.

118 SOJPAWK, никого жены оно имящца DCTfP30M, жена николеб уна имяти FL. Apparently a difficult passage to translate from the Greek {gynai–kav tina tou' patro; i ecein}. 
Sunday of Week 15 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 4 6–15

(MSS: USOZRJBPQDCTIKTMFALW)
4 6 кративе. 

119 SOBRJKTFALW, разгрдлив Р, разгрдли са DCTIP30M. The same lexical variant as in notes 113 and 115.
120 SOBRGJKTFALW, разпалечо DCTIP30M, плаше P. The Commented MSS and M distinguish themselves again.
121 яко add DCTIP30MFLW (wji add DFGY*, AD). Here the Greek original becomes clear for the MSS that add яко: it has to be one of the Byzantine minuscules or Y, K does not go with the Commented MSS in the three cases mentioned above.
122 OBJQKTFALW, срхе DCTIP30M. (h)dh N27, AD} Lexical variant in the Commented MSS, perhaps after revision.
123 SOZBRIJPQKTFALW, и ила DCTIP30M; cf. preceding note. As this is the fifth example in this pericope of DCTIP30 with M sharing a unique variant, there is a strong case for grouping these MSS together.
124 яко add CTTALW, om USOBZRJPQDMF (οτι N27). At first sight a lectionary vs. continuous beginning, but as a result of inaccurate separation of the les-son in some Continuous MSS, the word is included there; cf. the Introduction.
125 USOZRJQDMKTALW, срх CTT, и илы om RP. Lexical variant in CTT, but not shared by D.
126 USOZRJPQKTFALW, гамили DCTF; a lexical variant for DCTF.
127 кение CTTALW, кени USOZQD, кеник BTMPFA, om RJ. The Slavic has difficulties with the connection of the Greek той. Кеou', but no characteristic group is to be discerned.
128 om DCK.
Saturday of Week 16 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 10 23-28

(MSS: SOZRJPQDCTFP30MTFALW)

10 23 brother, you and your brothers; you were not like this.
10 24 You were not like this.

129 USOZBRJQTFLAW, supported by CTfKM, and by PD. Again the Commented MSS are set apart by a lexical variant, P and D depending from CTfKM.

130 USOZBRJTDTP30MTFLAW, confirms C. A singular variant in C, not even shared by D, Tf and M.

131 ἡμῶν add US. A case of Formulaic Addition; cf. the Introduction.

132 USOZBRJQDKMD, supported by CTfAW, opposed by FL. In this case the minority reading of CTfAW is a more Slavic translation of the Greek (πλεονάσσεις N27, AD); an error secondary to this reading is found in FL. A majority of Slavic MSS has a misleading text. CTfAW could have been revised on basis of the Greek, but D does not share this revision.

133 SOZBJQDP30MTFLAW: as CS. CTf are not joined by D and P30.

134 ἡμεῖς DCTFP30, and SOZBJQTFALW. The old reading is present in DCTfP30 and M: the Greek sg verb after a subject in npl is retained, like in the first sentence of this pericope. (παρενόησεν N27); σέτα is an innovation, influenced by the next pl.

135 οὖν P30, οὖν DCTfFL. οὖν P30, οὖν DCTf, οὖν P30, οὖν DCTf, οὖν P30, οὖν DCTf, οὖν P (οἴκοδομεῖ N27, AD). A bewildering variation of half (οὖν) and totally erroneous (οὖν, οὖν, οὖν, οὖν) readings; to decide between the variants οὖν (9) and οὖν (8) is difficult. The indecision is between sg and pl after a subject in npl, and the sg in C TIFLP - the last MSS after corruption - is thought to be the oldest form here, too, as in the preceding note.
The Old Slavic Apostolus

Sunday of Week 16 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 6 1–10

(MSS: SOZBJQPRDCTKTMFALW)

6 1 кратно, постшествующе же молитвах, не въ тае благодать божию
2 глаголет бо къ врагам приваты послюющих тебе, и въ дань, сказанши похожды, и се въ нынѣ нѣчто благоприятно. 141. се нынѣ дань сказанши. 3 нынѣ, нѣчто же дающе прымкани, да не порочь бо глаголет сказанши, и въ съ всѣ, сказанши се, паче боин сказанши. 4 къ о всѣ, сказанши се, паче боин сказанши. 5 къ о всѣ, сказанши се, паче боин сказанши. 6 къ о всѣ, сказанши се, паче боин сказанши. 7 къ о всѣ, сказанши се, паче боин сказанши.

136 SOZBJQCKP30TTFALW, не add DCTfT. A hypercorrect addition.
137 SOZBJQDCTP30T, не add CK, исполненъ TIFALW. A rare case of divergence between C and T, the latter joining the FALW vocabulary.
138 SOIQKMFALW, не add P, не add DCTP30T. The DCTP30 group stands apart with T (and P).
139 OZBJQCTIKM, не add SP30TTFALW, не add CTfT. Like above, the CTfT combination adopts the later rule of double negation, yet is not joined by D and P30.
140 om DC, unique among the Slavic witnesses in the omission. N27 omits this phrase too, but HeY- and AD have it. This may be a sign of revision in D and C, but not based on the Greek Byzantine text. Other Versions (part of sy and latt) omit it.
141 CTfTFAW, прочло SBQDKLTM, не... сказаны om OR, прочло... нѣчто om JP. The evidence is here rather meagre, because of the many omissions – caused by homoioaretic- in the witnesses. The reading of SBQTKML does not not seem primary to the one chosen here, but because of the exact correspondence of cλάγο with euj– one might choose the short form, it being seemingly unrevised (euj–provsekti N27, AD, devkti F G). It is interesting that the text types are divided over the variants, neither FALW, nor DCTf, nor the lectionaries showing a com-mon variant.
142 OZPBRDCTIKTM, ДОФГТЕРПЪ СЪFALW.
оружением, правдою, деснини и щурицами. 8 славою и досаждениемъ, 
хваленіемъ и глаголеніемъ, како листви и истинами. 9 тако не знаны і 
показаны, тако оправданы, и се живи искы, тако показаны и не 
оукрашаны. 10 тако оправданы ясно же радующе са, тако нищим 
многиже же богатства, тако ничию же иначе, а висе садрежать.

Saturday of Week 17 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 14 20–25
(MSS: OZRJBPQDTP30KTMFALW)\(^{143}\)
14 20 брати, не дей вивыдите охры\(^{144}\), на здравыми младеничючите, 
охры же саяренину кладите. 21 въ здравье иста писано\(^{145}\), како иннодачици 
ки и остылицы инныи въцглаголь людымъ слове, и тако не послушаны 
мени глаголетъ господь. 22 тымъ же идыци въ знамене стакъ не върны 
ны на непрозрачины. А пророчество\(^{146}\) не непрвьны на вкрыпи 
ны. 23 аще бо цркви высъ санеитъ са въ коучъ и виси глаголытъ идыци, 
санеитъ же стопъ не радоучивы или не врыда, не рекъ ли тако ели 
a двете\(^{147}\). 24 аще ли въ 
ти пророчествоцъ санеитъ же 
стопъ не врыда или не радоучивы, елиму ита выссны и вставае 
tы отъ взы 
ча, 25 и тымъ же орфей ието въцглаголь, и 
тако гадъ нынъ\(^{150}\) покло 
нитъ са богу похвала, тако бо истинъ богъ въ васъ иста.

143 Because C lacks a folium, its text breaks off after оют в verse 21. For the sake of 
completeness I give the full text of the pericope with the relevant vari 
ant.

144 BJPDP30TKMFAW, охры. OQRT, охры. C. The reading of C is rather 
corrupt, possibly a result of conflation; cf. N27: таи' ти февинь. But two lines fur 
ther down in the same pericope the reading is correct. Perhaps OQRT's 
охры should be 
preferred in the text.

145 OZRJBPQDCTP30KTM, пишет FAWL. The Continuous mss use a different 
word

146 OBALW, преречствие ZDTIP30KTM, om PF(USC).

147 OZBPQDTP30KTM, пишеть FAWL.

148 OZBPQMFALW, же Т, же add FA, om DTIP30K.

149 OZBPQ, джынн, жо DP30T/KMFALW.

150 ZBDTP30KMFALW, тако PQ, оне add DTIP30K, оне add M, тако 
add FAWL.

151 OZBPQDTP30KTM, пишеть J, и лики FAWL.
Sunday of Week 17 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 6 16–18 7 1

(MSS: UOZJTBQDCTKMFALW)

6 16 братие, въ ко го живе. како же рече Богъ, како Христос самъ къ нимъ и помазъ. И брати вѣръ къ Богъ, и ти братятъ вмѣстъ къ людии. 17 тѣмъ, же изидае отъ огъ сѣдъ ихъ и отчалите са глаголетъ Господь, и не честь не прикалае са, и Господь глаголе, вѣръ Авге и брати вѣръ къ отцы, и ти братятъ вмѣстъ къ сень.

Saturday of Week 18 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 15 39–45

(MSS: SOZJRBQDCTP30KTMFALW)

15 39 братие, не высака плаше та же плаше, нѣ ина оуко чловѣкъ, ина же плаше стотомъ, ина же птицидя, ина же рѣбѣкъ, 40 и тѣлска небеская, и тѣлска земная, нѣ ина оуко небесныхъ слава, нѣ и земныхъ. 41 и-н-
Sundays of Week 18 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 9:6–11

(MSS: USOZRJPQDCITTMFALW)

9:6 бра́ти. се́ви, ша́да, ша́да и по́жни́тъ, и се́ви о бла́гослове́ння́хъ, о бла́гослове́ння́хъ и по́жни́тъ. 7 къ какъ же и́збраніе и́маетъ слада́я, не отъ чрезъ ни отъ глъды ти́хъ во датьма лю́дямъ бо́га. 8 си́мы же бо́га ви́сне́мъ бла́годать и́дентиче́ствова́ти би́стъ да о бы́семъ ви́сне́дъ.

156 SZBRJPQDP30TITKTMFALW, no OC, от add S. Corruption through a slip of the pen in O and C; S has an addition that might come from a gloss.

157 SOZJPQDCITTMFALW, и́сташъ ВДСТ, та́въ и Р, и въ и́сташъ Q, ста́въ Р30, и́сташъ TF. Again correlation (on basis of the Greek D òqora' / N27) of BDCP30 and TF.

158 OBQDP30KTMFALW, досча́ SCTF, дино́въ RIPT. CTf shares the corruption with S; the def desinence is remarkable in RIPT.

159 OZBK, и TF, om DPO30AW, ие... дончъ ом SRJPQFLM through homoioteleuton.

160 OBQDP30K, и итъ CTFAW, итъ и ZT {e[stin kaiv N27, kai; e[stin AD}. In view of the many mss that omit this sentence (cf. preceding note), the lectionary text has been chosen. C and TF show revision along the line of the Byzantine text, but the unity of the Commented mss is broken, D and P30 omitting it, which can happen easily.

161 SOZQTMFALW, жи́вотвори́ Р, жи́воторе́н J, жи́вото́н P, жи́воти DCP30Tf, жи́воти B, K unreadable. The variation is bewildering, only the Commented mss show unity.

162 OBDCITTM, иди́вотва́ USZJPQRFALW. C, joined by D and Tf, shares the lexical variant of some lectionaries and T.
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Saturday of Week 19 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 15 58 16 1–3

(MSS: SOZRJBQPQCTfP30KMFA)

15 58 братие. 166 пра̀ды вы́жаете не постъпно́, извъ̀тствовую́ще въ̀ до̀лго́ господъ̀ бо́же въ̀ всѝгда къ̀дяще пье́дло́ въ́ще. нѣ́сть́ та́ще о го̀сподъ̀. 16 1 а о солодже́ние 166 нѣ́же къ́ евангелъ̀. 167 та́ко же ра́сширо̀ща изъ̀чения галатийски́я 168, тако и вы́ снетъ́рите. 2 по иеди́ки ски́до къ̀дяде ва̀съ да полагаете 169 схра̀нѣ́ше. нѣ́же дѣ́ще поста̀гнитъ въ́ да не къ̀дя пра̀дь тѣ̀ гда солдже́ние къ̀дяда. 3 къ̀дяда же пра̀дь тѣ́же дѣ́ше иско̀гъ́йте евангеля.

163 SBDCfTfLMW, извъ̀тствову́юща OQP, изъ̀вло́ютъ UZA, и́зъ̀вло́ютъ IRF. Apart from individual corruption in the flexion, the lexical distribution is about the same as in the foregoing note (excepti S and the split of FA and LW).

164 UZSBPQDTfTMFA, въ́к ОС, въ́к R, въ́к J, въ́к adU, въ́к add M. Here the well-known expression въ́к въ́к or въ́к въ́къ́ plays a disturbing role in the minds of the scribes.

165 SOZJBQPCT, ть́жъ́е бра̀тие къ́дя въ́зде́лилъ́ше add DTfP30MFA, in accordance with the continuous Greek text {въ́к, удлелі́овъ́ мову́ адже́патвовъ́, in N27, om AD). C and T are the only Continuous MSS not sharing this addition, superfluous in the Lectionary text by the initial “brethren”.

166 SBQCTfP30KMFA, сла́вени ZPRT, слъ́вени JQMLW. The correct translation of logiva is the lectio difficilior represented in SBQCTfP30KMFA. The variant слъ́вени is interesting, but clearly a secondary reading with the possible character of a ‘Leitfehler’. Remarkably, in the next verse nearly the same error occurs only in J: сла́вени, слъ́вени or even славени (P) all other witnesses.

167 SZRDP30KM, сла́вени OJBQPCTfMLW, сла́вени F. The majority contains a grammatical error.

168 SOZBRQKT, изъ̀чения галатийски́я PDCTfP30MFA. The lectionaries, joined by K and T, are thought to reflect the original translation, while DCTfP30 and FAŁW with M and P may have been revised according to the Greek: та́и ей̣к̣л̣исиа́в AN, N27.

169 ca add R, съ́ въ́к add DCP30TIM, съ́ въ́к да (посла́тъ) BKF(A)LW {AD: пать̣ еи́аутв̣ / ти̣еи̣аутв̣}. Only SOZJPQQT do not render par jẹаụтẉ, like the text presented here.
сны послыш стороны благодарить ваши княжеския.

Sunday of Week 19 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 11 31–32 12 1–9
(MSS: SOZRBPQDCITKTMFALW)

11 31 кратие, когд и отцы, господь нашъ, исшед хреста весте, сын благословененъ еъ вехъ, ико не лжас 32 къ десятие сеовехъ, арены церковъ, страдаше градъ данилынскѧй. итъ ли хоча 33 и оказывая еъ кошный по стынг слышанныхъ вашихъ и испытыхъ отъ вѣру его. 12 1 аще и похвалили са подобаетъ, не посылъ бо, приидя же еъ видѣння и явлений господнихъ. 2 вѣь, человекъ о христѣ, прежде четыре на десате летъ, аще ли къ тѣлѣ не ведлъ. аще ли рать. 172 тѣлъ не ведлъ къ тѣлѣ, всѣдоща вышѣй таковаго. до третьего небеса. 3 и ведлъ таковаго человѣка, аще ли къ тѣлѣ еже ли рать. 173 тѣлъ не ведлъ къ тѣлѣ, всѣдоща таковыхъ къ рани, и словѣ не испрежены глаголы, исходе не лѣть къ тѣлѣ человѣкоу глаголати, 5 о таковѣй, похвалили са, а о съѣвъ не похвалилъ са, такоже о немощныхъ моли. 6 аще бо всѣдоща похвалили са, не вѣлъ не царѣ, истинъ бо рѣкъ, шадѣ же са, еди до. 174 на ли. 175 паче же вѣдѣть ли, или сказанѣ что отъ мона. 7 и за премъвѣрдъ явлений да не

170 SzBRJQTMFALW, om ODCTf A sign of revision in these MSS: the Greek AD has ἡμῶν·ον. N27 omits.
171 SOZRBPQ, удѣлъ на еймѣ. FAWL, сдѣлавшій градъ DCTfKM (AD and N27: ектнаврех). The theory of Horálek 1959 on derivation is confirmed here: older MSS simply transcribe the Greek word, Slavic translations are later: FAWL give a mechanical calque, DCTfKM have a more sophisticated translation.
172 SOZBPQKTM, кромѣ DCITFALW. This time C cum suis join FAWL.
173 SOZBPQKTM, кромѣ CTFALW; cf. preceding note, but D does not join the other Commented MSS.
174 SzBRQPTFALW, кадѣ ODCTfKM. Simple writing error leading to corrup-tion, but already present in O. This contradicts revision from the Greek for C cum suis (11) N27, AD).
175 SOBDKTMFALW, нѣмѣюет JR, ἐκδιαὶ CTf, полъникт P. The Greek is quite difficult (λογισθαὶ), but CTf have an awkward rendering, which is a hapax in all OCS, according to the Slovnik, which did not use TF as a source. In combi-nation with the preceding note, it could be said that CTf are corrupt here. It should be noted that D - also a commented text - does not share this alleged corruption. But then, the reliability of the readings in D is doubtful; cf. the Introduction.
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Abbreviations
For the MSS sigla cf. “The Manuscripts and their Description”

A accusative case  
AD Apostolos; cf. Bibliography ad Apostolos  
aor aorist tense  
D dative case  
def definite form  
G genitive case  
GNT The Greek New Testament; cf. Bibliography ad Aland  
I instrumental case  
 indef indefinite form  
N27 Novum Testamentum Graece, Stuttgart 199327.  
 pf perfect tense  
PIPS Patriarchal Institute of Patristic Studies, Thessalonike.  
pl plural  
 pre present active participle  
 prep preposition  
 sg singular  
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