

**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 Apostolus. 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<sup>1</sup>. With the exception of the Gospel editions of J. Vajs<sup>2</sup>, 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 Slepčė and Ohrid<sup>3</sup>: 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-

<sup>1</sup> N27 and its earlier editions for the Greek and the impressive series from the *Vetus Latina* Institute in Beuron (Germany) for the Latin text.

<sup>2</sup> Prague, 1934–1936.

<sup>3</sup> Ilinski 1912, Kulbakin 1907.

ability of the transcriptions cannot be checked due to the lack of photographic documentation.

Even more recently the situation has not improved. The recent edition of the Apostolus of Plištovac is based on the same principles as the editions of those of Slepče and Ohrid<sup>4</sup>. Variants from other sources are given in the edition of the Apostle of Strumica<sup>5</sup>, 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<sup>6</sup> and the facsimile edition of the Gennadian Bible<sup>7</sup>: they provide access to the manuscripts themselves and offer the possibility of checking errors 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 lectionary text of the Gospels and Apostolus was the first one to be translated into Old Slavic<sup>8</sup>; 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 lessons 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 complete 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.

<sup>4</sup> Stefanović 1989; some photographs are added as illustrations, not for checking the readings.

<sup>5</sup> Bláhova & Hauptova, 1990.

<sup>6</sup> Microfiche edition Bogdanović, 1986.

<sup>7</sup> Библия 1499 года, Moskva 1992.

<sup>8</sup> 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 Temčín, 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 Kałužniacki's 1896 edition of the *Christinopolitanus*<sup>9</sup>, 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* Apostle (see below for the terminology). Kałužniacki 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<sup>10</sup>.

### 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-*

<sup>9</sup> Kałužniacki 1869; see also Van der Tak, 1992 for an evaluation of this edition.

<sup>10</sup> 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).

*kovye*)texts<sup>11</sup>. 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<sup>12</sup>. 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<sup>13</sup> 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 positioned 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)*<sup>14</sup>. 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

<sup>11</sup> There also exist *Apostolevangeliaria*, 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.

<sup>12</sup> Full description of the the *Typikon* and analysis of it in Čiflyanov, 1976.

<sup>13</sup> Usually called an *incipit*, the plural of which offers a Latin monstrum.

<sup>14</sup> Judging from a photograph in Vzdornov, 1980, nr. 6.

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.П. I. 101 + 101A + Q.I. 1186 + Plovdiv, NBIV 25. The *Apostolus of Slepčë*, 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 Ĺištovac, a full Lectionary used for the text. dating from 1324. The non-
- 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 wee
- R** Cod. Praha NM, Slav IX E 25, Short Lectionary Apostolus from Macedonia (also called *Macedonian* and *Strumica*), dating from the 13Ith 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 и нѣса извѣстиша for сзвѣдѣтельство христово; 1Cor4, 3 вз вамз for кз вамз; 1Cor5, 1 жде а единого оучит for женѣ етерѣ отьца имѣти; 1Cor9, 10 написа; 2Cor2, 4 възстажатз са for възстажѣ са.
- 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

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 *hypotheseis* or *napisania* and are believed to be translations of the Greek *hypotheseis* by Euthalius<sup>15</sup>. 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 *hypotheseis*, pericope marks and liturgical indications. For the text I used the mentioned edition<sup>16</sup>.

**T** Continuous Apostle of Črkolez–Dečani. 13th c.; now preserved in the National Library of Beograd. Consulted in the edition on microfiche by Bogdanović<sup>17</sup>.

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.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. on this matter Van der Tak 1992.

<sup>16</sup> Kovačević 1979. The facsimile edition of the *Matičin Apostolus* (Bogdanović 1981) was not used for the present edition.

<sup>17</sup> Bogdanović 1986.

- F** Cod. St.-Peterburg, RNB, F.I. 407. Continuous Apostle. Dated about 1545. Contains *hypotheseis*, pericope marks and liturgical indications. The text was consulted on a microfilm from the GPB and *de visu*.
- L** Cod. L'viv, LBAN, MB 422. Continuous Apostle. Dated 15th c. Contains *hypotheseis*, pericope marks and liturgical indications. Consulted on microfilm by the Library and *de visu*.
- A** Cod. Amsterdam, private collection of the author. Continuous Apostle, probably dating from the 16th c. (from watermarks). The first 11 chapters of Acts are missing, as well as last 3 from Hebrews. Contains *hypotheseis*, pericope marks and liturgical indications. Consulted *de visu*.
- W** Cod. Moskva, GIM, Sin. 915–1; the so-called Gennadian Bible, dated 1499. Consulted in facsimile edition<sup>18</sup>. The manuscript contains the complete text of Acts and Epistles, as well as liturgical indications, pericope numbers and *hypotheseis*.

#### 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 Tolkovy Apostolus of 1220, from Rostov. No photographs or microfilms could be obtained, so the text was taken from the undiplomatic editions by Voskresenski<sup>19</sup>, 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 Ukraine. 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<sup>20</sup>, but as they contain only parts of Acts, they have not been consulted for this study. The text is not com-

<sup>18</sup> Biblia 1992.

<sup>19</sup> Voskresenski, 1892.

<sup>20</sup> Cod. Kiev, CBAN, O. R. VIII, 3. They contain Acta 9, 28 through 13, 5.

plete: the first 12 chapters from the Acts are missing, as well as parts of the Epistles<sup>21</sup>. In these parts, but also elsewhere, the edition of Kałużniacki 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, *hypotheses* and - often apparently added later - liturgical indications. Readings from the edition by Kałużniacki<sup>22</sup> have been checked with the original and at a later stage with a microfilm obtained from the Museum.

**Tf** 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 *hypotheses* 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. *Hypotheses* 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*<sup>23</sup> (the details of which have been described in Bakker &

<sup>21</sup> 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.-Peter-burg, RNB, Hilf 14; Moskva, GIM, Sin. 7 and 18.

<sup>22</sup> Kałużniacki 1896; cf Van der Tak 1992.

<sup>23</sup> 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<sup>24</sup> 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 (ou, u, ū) or i (i, j, y, i, i̇). 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 *fAsg* -*æ* (æ, œ, ou, u). With this feature it is also possible to equate e.g. the 'Serbian' orthographic *č* with

<sup>24</sup> 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 *ca*, even excepting those places where genuine *ce* (*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 *братиѣ*, and not *братриѣ*. 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 Čiflyanov<sup>25</sup>, 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 address “brethren” is added to the first words of the lectionary text. Consequently, 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

<sup>25</sup> Čiflyanov, 1976, p. 342.

the beginning of Sunday 10, where the continuous text contains МѢНѢ БО ІАКО, 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 ІАКО - 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 ІАКО and БОГЪ.

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<sup>26</sup>.

### 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 ІАКО ТРЪБИ instead of ІАКО ОТРЪБИ.

<sup>26</sup> 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 Homoiarkton:** 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: ΔΙΨΕ ... ΔΟΥΧΟΒΥΝΟ, obviously because the first part of this verse also contained ΤΕΛΟ ΔΟΥΧΟΒΥΝΟ.

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 *же* to the recurring *мы ... вы...* Often *же* is also added automatically to *так*, probably because of the high incidence of *так же*<sup>27</sup> (e.g. 1Cor9, 5: MSS PDLP30; 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 *Δ* (“but”) in the second part of almost each pair of opposites, while OBFW almost at random add *и* or *же*.

The conjunctions *или* (“or”) and *ли* (*interrogation particle*) are often confused, and in a few cases *ли* is added to an already sufficient *или*, 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 *же*, *оубо*, *бо*, *ли* (*passim*).

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

**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).

<sup>27</sup> Implicitly, I show here how we try, as far as possible, to divide words. If a word is proven to exist (the *Slovník* is our touchstone) on its own, we separate it whenever possible.

The same happens with *господа*, to which *нашего* is added in spite of the Greek original<sup>28</sup> (2Cor11, 31, only ODCTh do not add; cf. the apparatus *ad locum*).

The well-known liturgical expression *вѣкъ вѣка* (“world without end”) leads to the addition of *вѣка* (*вѣкоу*) to *вѣкъ* in 2Cor9, 9 in JUM. In the same way, *всѣми* is added to *вами* 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 *къ* to *вамъ* (1Cor4, 17 by RJPT). A similar case forms *отъ* added to *господа* in 2Cor4, 10 by O. More difficult is the addition of *отъ* to *мрътвѣхъ* in 1Cor15, 42 by J; here the addition may have been caused also by a difference in interpretation.

**A Special Case:** As the letter *и* 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 it 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: *вз скръбѣхъ вз бѣдахъ. вз тѣгахъ 5 вз ранахъ. вз тѣмьницахъ. вз не строениихъ. вз трудохъ вз здѣланиихъ. вз пошениихъ 6 вз чищении. вз разумѣ. вз трзпении. вз благодсти. вз души свѣтъ. вз любве не лицемернѣ. 7 вз словесе истиннѣ. вз силѣ божи*, 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 decide 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 *κζτο* was mistaken for *κκκο* by one scribe and consequently found its way

<sup>28</sup> The Greek text of *Apostoliki Diakonia*, however, includes hJmw'n.

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<sup>29</sup>. 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. ПОСЛАВЬНИКЪ for АПОСТОЛЪ, БЛАГОВѢСТОВАНИЕ for ЕВАНГЕЛИЕ, 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<sup>30</sup>.

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.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. Jagić, III, 1920.

<sup>30</sup> 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.

### **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.  $\text{o}\psi/\text{t}\theta$  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



14, 20–25), where C unexpectedly lacks a folium and the text breaks off in the first words of verse 21<sup>31</sup>. Should I have used C as base text, this would have resulted in all other MSS recorded as having “additions”, an obvious absurdity<sup>32</sup>.

### **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 ‘replace’ 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*<sup>33</sup>, 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<sup>34</sup> as the basis for the lexico–grammatical normalisation of the intermediary text.

<sup>31</sup> 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 Kałużniački’s edition, which does not clearly mark the passages filled in from other manuscripts (cf. Penev, 1989, p.282–291; Lavrov, 1966<sup>2</sup>, p33; see also above, note 20).

<sup>32</sup> 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.

<sup>33</sup> *Slovník*, 1958.

<sup>34</sup> Leskien, 1969.

### 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 the manuscripts are “regularized” to the full form<sup>35</sup>.

Words that only appear in their abbreviated form, e.g. брѣтїѣ, брѣтѣа or богъ, божїи, господь, исѹсъ, христосъ and their derived and declined forms pose a separate problem. In these cases, I have based my choice on the major-ity usage<sup>36</sup>.

**Abbreviated forms of исѹсъ:** The question has been raised, whether declined forms of the consistently abbreviated word исѹсъ occur at all in Gospel MSS<sup>37</sup>. In the pericopes scrutinised in the present paper, two instances of the *I* исѹсомь occur. One of the occasions is 1Cor4, 14, where the text reads и ны исѹсомь възкрѣситъ (“and he will raise us through Jesus”). Here, all MSS clearly have a grapheme “м” 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 *I* form of this noun. The second passage is different. Here (Rom 15,30) the text reads господьмь нашимь исѹсъ христомь (“[I beseech thee, brethren,] by our Lord Jesus Christ”). Twelve of the 17 MSS read исѹ(с)м, the other five have исѹхм. 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 исѹсъ 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*) исѹса. This case occurs 14 times, 3 times without following “Christ”. In these last places (2Cor4, 10, 11, 14) all wit-

<sup>35</sup> This way of working practically sets a limit to the amount of text that can be handled in the computer in one time. The 20 pericopes presented here, comprising approximately 3200 words of Slavic text, require already slightly more than 1000 “regularisations”. Collation with some 20 manuscripts and this amount of regularisations becomes excruciatingly slow.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. above, “Length of pericopes”, on the weakness of such an argument.

<sup>37</sup> Temčín, 1994.

nesses have a clearly visible “Δ” 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 other 8 instances, a varying minority (2–6 MSS, amongst which always<sup>38</sup> D, while W misses out just once) has an abbreviation that ends in -Δ, whereas the other MSS have the form ис or и҃.

The last case occurring in the pericopes is the *L* исоу҃съ. 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 examples of the *L*, the word “Jesus” in final position receives the case ending in the abbreviation. This conclusion is only provisional and only more comprehensive 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

<sup>38</sup> I emphasise however that the readings of D could not be checked from the original.

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 reserved for variants, shared by groups or families

of manuscripts<sup>39</sup>.

### **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, yers 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*<sup>40</sup> (Bakker & Van der Tak, 1994). However, as these editions lack a critical apparatus, I have quoted the

<sup>39</sup> 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.

<sup>40</sup> Apostolus, 1987.

variants and the main text from the Nestle–Aland edition<sup>41</sup>, in which the Byzantine text type mostly coincides with the siglum  $\tilde{\text{}}$ .

I have refrained from quoting text and/or the apparatus by Tischendorf<sup>42</sup>, 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)<sup>43</sup>. 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 *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

<sup>41</sup> Nestle–Aland, 1993<sup>27</sup> (= N27 in the apparatus).

<sup>42</sup> Tischendorf, 1859.

<sup>43</sup> The same text is printed in the GNT<sup>4</sup>, but the apparatus is different. Because the *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 pericopes<sup>44</sup>, 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 loan-words, e.g. БЛАГОВѢСТВОВАНИЕ in FA LW (e.g. 1Cor 9, 12 and 15, 1) corresponds to ЕВАНГЕЛИЕ in the other witnesses, АПОСТОЛЫ becomes ПОСЛАДЬНИИ-КЫ (1Cor 4, 9), ПОСЛАДЬНИИ (1Cor 16, 3) corresponds to КЗНИГАМИ, ЯЗЫЧЬ-СКЫИ КЗНАЗЬ in FALW (2 Cor 11, 31) with ѿНАРХЪ of the lectionaries.

Other common features in the field of vocabulary are НАДЕЖДА / ОУПЗВАНИЕ (1Cor 9, 10)<sup>45</sup>, ТЕЛЕСНАА / ПЛЗТСКАА (1Cor 9, 11), ДРОУГЪ ДРОУГА / СЕБЕ (1Cor 16, 20), ОУКАРАЕМИ / ОКЛЕВЕТАЕМИ (1Cor 4, 12), БЛАГОДАРѢ / ХВАЛѢ (1Cor 1, 4), ОУТВЕРДИТЪ ВАСЪ / ИЗВѢСТИТЪ ВЪ (1Cor 1, 8), ПИШЕТЪ / ПИСАНО ІЕСТЪ (1Cor 9, 9 аѿд 14, 21), ВЪКА / МИРА (1Cor 2,8), РАСПАЛИ / ПРО-ПАЛИ (ibid.), БОДЗРСТВОУИТЕ / БЗДИТЕ (1Cor 16, 13), СТРОИТЕЛЪ / ПРИСТАВЪ-НИКЪ (1Cor 4, 1/2), ТОЧИЮ / ТЪКЪМО (2Cor 2, 2), ПОЗНАЕТЕ / РАЗОУМЪЕТЕ (i-bid. 4), НЪЩИИ / ЕТЕРИ (1Cor 4, 18), НЪ / А (2Cor 4, 8), МАКЕЛИГА / РАЗЪМЪ-НИЦА (1Cor 10, 26), ИСПАЗНЕНИЕ / КОНЬЦЪ (1Cor 10, 27 and 28), ДЛЗГОТЪРЪ-ПЪНИЕ / ТЪРЪПЪНИЕ (2Cor 6, 6), БЕЗЧЕСТИЕ / ДОСАЖДЕНИЕ (2Cor 6, 8), БЕСЪ-ІЕТЕ СЪ / ЗЪЛИ СЪ ДЪІЕТЕ (1Cor 14, 23), ИЗОБИЛОВАТИ / ИЗЪЫТЪСТВОВАТИ (2 Cor 9, 8), НЪЖДА / БЪДА (2Cor 9, 7), ПРОСТОТА / ШЕДРОТА (2Cor 9,11), КРО-МЪ / РАЗЪВЪ (2Cor 12, 3), ИЗГЛАГОЛАННЫИ / ИЗДРЕЧЕННЫИ (2Cor 12, 4), БЕЗОУ-МЕНЪ / НЕМЪДЪРЪ (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

<sup>44</sup> Bakker & Van der Tak, 1994, p. 46.

<sup>45</sup> 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<sup>46</sup>, 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 Kažniacki) 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<sup>47</sup>: НАСТАВЬНИКЪ / ПѢСТОУНЪ (1Cor4, 15); ГЛИННѢХЪ / СЪЖДЪЛЪНѢХЪ (2 Cor4, 7); ЖИВАЦЬ / ЖИВОТВОРИЦЬ (1Cor15, 45).

In combination with K, M, or T (*sigla* in brackets), the list of variants in vocabulary is longer: ЗА ВЪ (K) / О ВАСЪ (1Cor1, 4); ОУ ДСР30К (въ TfM) / О (1Cor1, 6); ВЛАДИК (K) / КЪНАСЬ (1Cor2, 8); ПРОПАЛИ (TM) / РАСПАЛИ (1Cor2, 8); ПРОКЛАТЪ (PM) / АНАФЕМА (1Cor16, 22); РАЗВЕЛИЧАТИ СѦ (M) / РАЗ-

<sup>46</sup> I sincerely express my gratitude to the monks of Hilandar Monastery as well as to the Director and staff of the Hilandar Room in the University Library of the Ohio State University for the excellent opportunities to study all relevant materials.

<sup>47</sup> Quotations are in the order DCTfP30 / other MSS; because C plays a role in all these variants, they can be found in the apparatus as well. Again, I give the Slavic words in their 'abstracted' forms.



грудѣти (three times: 1Cor4, 18, 19 and 5, 2); тѣшим (M) / молимз сА (ibid. 4, 13); всплакасте (M) / плакасте (ibid. 5, 2); оуже (M) / се (ibid. 5, 3); вимѣ (M) / о имени (ibid. 5, 4); зовет (T) / призываетз (1Cor10, 26); спостижеми (M) / оставляеми (2Cor4, 9); храм (K) / цркви (2Cor6, 16); мѣсто add. to сын (KM) (ibid. 6, 18).

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 : писано быстз / взписа сА. (1Cor9,10); лишеномз быти / лишити сА (1Cor1, 7); встѣлан бѣдѣ, от истѣлан бѣдѣ / встѣжѣ сА (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, Tf 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 K, this is not surprising at all, because in his description of it, Bakker mentions the occurrence of commentaries within the text of at least the Epistle to Timothy<sup>48</sup>. 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

<sup>48</sup> Bakker, 1990.

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 DTfP30. 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<sup>49</sup>. 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<sup>50</sup> terms it “the earliest and most reliable manuscript of the Apostolus”, together with the Apostolus of Ńištovac and, *mirabile dictu*, the editions of the Gospels by Vajs. Apart from the questionable character of the edition by Ka-łuźniacki, 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.

<sup>49</sup> I refer to 1Cor4, 11; 1Cor3, 6; 2Cor4, 15; 1Cor10, 23; 1Cor10, 28; 2Cor11, 31.

<sup>50</sup> Aland, 1993,<sup>4</sup>, pp. 28/9\*. For a full discussion of the use of the Slavic version in this Introduction, see Bakker, 1995.

**Text****The Lessons for Saturdays and Sundays  
of Week 10–20 after Pentecost****Saturday of Week 10 after Pentecost: Rom. 15 30–33**

(MSS: SORJBVPQDCTfP30KTMFALW)

15 30 БРАТІЕ. МОЛѢЖЕ ВЪ<sup>51</sup> ГОСПОДЬМЪ НАШИМЪ ИСОУСЪ ХРИСТОМЪ<sup>52</sup> ЗА  
 ЛЮБЕЗВЪ ДОУХОВНЫМЪ. ПОСПѢШЬСТВОУИТЕ МИ ВЪ МОЛИТВАХЪ О МЫНѢ КЪ БОГОУ.  
 31 ДА ИЗБАВЛѢ СѦ ОТЪ ПРОТИВАЛѢЩИИХЪ МИ<sup>53</sup> СѦ ВЪ ИЮДѢИ. И ДА СЛОУ-  
 ЖЕБА МИ ѢЖЕ<sup>54</sup> ВЪ ИЕРОУСАЛИМѢ. ПРИНАТА СВАТЫМИ ДА БѢДЕТЪ. 32 ДА РА-  
 ДОСТИНѢ ПРИДѢ КЪ ВАМЪ. ВОЛЕНѢ БОЖИЕНѢ И ПОЧИТѢ СЪ ВАМИ. 33 БОГЪ ЖЕ  
МИРА<sup>55</sup> СЪ ВЪСѢМИ ВАМИ АМИНЪ.

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

(MSS: SORJBVPQDCTfP30KTMFALW)

4 9 БРАТІЕ. <sup>56</sup>БОГЪ МЫ АПОСТОЛЫ ПОСЛАВЬНАНА ѢВИ<sup>57</sup>. ТАКО НАСЪМЪРЪЗЪНИКЪ.  
 ТАКО ПОЗОРУЮ БЫХОМЪ ВСЕМОУ МИРОУ. АНГЕЛОМЪ И ЧЛОВѢКОМЪ. 10 МЫ БОУИ  
 ХРИСТА РАДИ. ВЫ ЖЕ МѢДРИ О ХРИСТѢ. МЫ НЕМОЩНИ. ВЫ ЖЕ КРѢПЪЦИ. ВЫ

<sup>51</sup> БРАТІЕ add DCTfKTMALW (+ мѡта P30) from the full text.

<sup>52</sup> и add. QCP30TfTFW. Cf. above “Abbreviated Forms of исѡсѡз” for a discussion of the declension of the word исѡсѡз.

<sup>53</sup> SBRTM, МЫНѢ AF, ом ОQPCCTfP30KL

<sup>54</sup> SOBQP30TMFALW, еже R, иже CTf, ест add R. RCTf disregard the gender of СЛОУЖЕБА.

<sup>55</sup> SOBRJPQP30TFALW M, мироу CTf. “Alleingang” of CTf. Cf., however, also 1Cor9, 2 and 9, 7 in the lesson for Sunday 11.

<sup>56</sup> МЫНѢ БО ТАКО add DCTfFALW (Gr. dokw' gavr N27, add o{ti Q<sup>2</sup> D<sup>2</sup> ~ vg<sup>cl</sup> sy). 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 БОГЪ. Many marginal *incipit* quotations include these words.

<sup>57</sup> SORJBQP30KTFALW, ѢВИАЗ PCTfM. C and companions use the *pf* (without *aux*), thought to be a non-witness form.

СЛАВЬНИ. МЫ ЖЕ БЕЩЬСТЬНИ. 11 ДО НЫНѢШНЯГО ЧАСА. <sup>58</sup>ДЛЗЧЕМЗ И  
 ЖАЖДЕМЗ И НАЗИ БЫВАЕМЗ<sup>59</sup>. СТРАЖДЕМЗ И СКЫТАЕМЗ СЛ. 12 И ТРОУЖДАЕМЗ  
 СЛ ДѢЛАЮЩЕ СВОИМИ РѢКАМИ. ОКЛЕВЕТАЕМИ БЛАГОСЛОВИМЗ ГОНИМИ  
ОУДРЪЖИМЗ СЛ<sup>60</sup>. 13 ХОУЛИМИ МОЛИМЗ<sup>61</sup> СЛ. ГАКО ОТРЕБИ<sup>62</sup> ВСЕМОУ МИРОУ  
 БЫХОМЗ. ВСѢМЗ ПОПЬ-РАНИЕ ДОСЕЛѢ. 14 НЕ СРАМЛѢА СЛ<sup>63</sup> ВАСЗ ПИШѢ СИИ. НЗ  
 ГАКО ЧАДА СВОА ВЗЗ-ЛЮБИЕНАГА НАКАЗАТѢ<sup>64</sup>. 15 АЩЕ БО ТЪМѢ ПѢСТОУНЪ<sup>65</sup>  
 ИМАТЕ О ХРИСТѢ. НЗ НЕ МЗНОГЫ ОТЫЦА. О ХРИСТѢ БО ИСОУСѢ ЕВАНГЕЛИЕМЪ ДЗЗ  
 ВЪ РОДИХЪ. 16 МОЛѢТѢ ЖЕ ВЫ ПОДОБНЫ МИ БЫВАЙТЕ.

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

(MSS: SOZRJBPDCTfP30KTMFALW)

1 3 БРАТИЕ. БЛАГОДАТЬ ВАМЪ И МИРЪ ОТЪ БОГА ОТЫЦА ГОСПОДА НАШЕГО ИСОУСЪ

<sup>58</sup> и add DCTfP30KW {kai; peinw'men... N27}. Sign of revision in these MSS or simply addition of an extra copula to the string?

<sup>59</sup> ORJPDCTfP30KM, НАГОТОВИЕМЪ 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 FALW group. The periphrastic rendering is thought to be primary and has been chosen in the text.

<sup>60</sup> SBRJPDfP30KTMFALW, ДРЖИМ СЛ Q, ТРЪЖИМЪ СТf. C and Tf are not joined by either P30 or K and M and are likely to have individual variants, as is the reading in Q {ajnesovmeqa N27, AD}.

<sup>61</sup> SOBPDQTFALW, МАЛИМЫ R, ОУМЛИМ J, ТЪШИМ DCP30Tf, ТЪШИМ се M. Why did C *cum suis* choose this rare word to render parakalou'men, omitting even the following СЛ?

<sup>62</sup> BQDCTfP30KTMALW, ТРЪБИ SPF, ТРЪБОВАНИЕ RJ, ТРЪБИМИ O. SPF show haplography, which may be the origin of the corruption in O, as well as in RJ; C sides with the majority.

<sup>63</sup> SORJPQDP30TM, om CKTfFALW, же B. The combination of CTfK and FALW 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.

<sup>64</sup> nouqetw' AD, B D F Y ~ latt; nouqetw'n° N27 П11 ААСРрс. The Slavic is uncertain because of confusion of the nasals. *Isg* НАКАЗАТѢ found in SORJBPDCTM TfFW (K illegible). ZLA *pra* -А.ВЫ add OJPR.

<sup>65</sup> SOBPDQTMFALW, ПЕТАКОЛЫ J, НАСТАВЬНИКЪ DCTfP30, НАСТАВЬНИКЪ Z. The group DCTfP30 shares a significant variant with Z (after corruption?). The J variant may be an old reading, echoing the Greek paidagouu.

христа. 4 хвалѣнъ бога моего всегда о васъ<sup>66</sup>. о благодати божии данъи вамъ о христѣ исоусѣ. 5 како всьде обогатисте сѧ о немъ всьмъ словомъ и всьмъ разумомъ. 6 како же тайна божѣ<sup>67</sup> извѣсти сѧ о<sup>68</sup> васъ. 7 како вамъ не лишити сѧ<sup>69</sup> ни єдиногѣ дарованиѣ. чѣмъ гвлениѣ господѧ нашего исоусъ христа. 8 иже извѣститъ вы до конца. не повинны въ днь господѧ<sup>70</sup> нашего исоусъ христа. 9 върны богъ имъже званы<sup>71</sup> бысте. въ обшениє сына єго исоусъ христа господѧ<sup>72</sup> нашего.

### Sunday of Week 11 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 9 2–12

(MSS: SOZRJBPDCTf P30KTMFALW)

9 2 братиє. печать<sup>73</sup> моемоу апостольствоу<sup>74</sup> вы есте о господи. 3 мои отвѣтъ възвѣщающимъ мене естъ се. 4 еда не имамъ власти ѣсти и пити. 5 еда не имамъ власти сестры<sup>75</sup> жены<sup>76</sup> водити. како и прочии апо-

<sup>66</sup> SOZBRJPQRTMFALW, за вы DCTf P30K. C joins the other Commented MSS and K (see Introduction).

<sup>67</sup> SOZBJPQ. (и) сзвѣдѣтельство христово (DCTfP30KTM)FALW, {to; martuvrion tou' cristou' N27, AD}. The Greek would support сзвѣдѣтельство христово of C and the other Commented MSS, but not и; FALW sharing this reading could be a sign of revision, but in KTM revision is not frequent.

<sup>68</sup> SZBRJPQTFALW, оу DCP30K: error probably from the Glagolitic, ѡѡ as in въ TFM, secondary to the reading of DCP30K, thus proving affinity within the Commented group and with KM; O reads вамъ in stead of о васъ.

<sup>69</sup> SOZBJPAW (лишати L), лишитъ сѧ RQF, лишеномъ быти DCTfKTM, лишенымъ быти P30. Again C shares with the Commented MSS and KTM the use of a *pf* tense in contrast with the lectionaries and FALW.

<sup>70</sup> SZBRJPQDP30TMFALW, господи CTfK. This grammatical variant is repeated by C alone in the next verse (note 72).

<sup>71</sup> SZBRJPQDKP30TFALWM, избавлени C, призывани Tf. A curious singular read-ing in C, not supported by other Commented MSS; understandable in Tf.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. note 70.

<sup>73</sup> SOZBRPQDTM, бо add JCP30TfFALW. {gavr N27, om AD}. Revision in some MSS, or simply an addition from the continuous text?

<sup>74</sup> SZBRJPQKTFALW, моего апостольства ODCTfP30M. 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.

<sup>75</sup> SOZRJBPAK, сестрѧ TFALW, сестрою DCTfP30, ѣсти и пити M. The cluster DCTfP30 has an individual variant, not shared by K or M; the latter interchanges

СТОЛИ. И БРАТИГА ГОСПОДЫНАГА. И КИФА. 6 ИЛИ ЕДИНЪ ДЪЗ И ВАРНАВА. НЕ ИМА-  
 ВЪ ВЛАСТИ НЕ ДЪЛАТИ. 7 КЪТО ВОИНЪ БЫВАЕЪТЪ СВОИМИ ОБРОКЪ КОЛИ. КЪТО НАСА-  
 ЖДАЕЪТЪ ВИНОВАДЪ. И ОУЪ<sup>77</sup> ПЛОДА ЕГО НЕ ГАСЪТЪ. ИЛИ<sup>78</sup> КЪТО ПАСЕЪТЪ СТАДО И  
 ОУЪ МАЪКА СТАДОУ<sup>79</sup> НЕ ГАСЪТЪ. 8 ЕДА ПО ЧЛОВЪКОУ СЕ<sup>80</sup> ГЛАГОЛЪТЪ. ИЛИ НЕ ВЪ  
 ЗАКОНЪ СЪХЪ<sup>81</sup> ГЛАГОЛЪТЪ. 9 ВЪ МОИСЕОВЪ БО ЗАКОНЪ ПИСАНО ЕСТЪ. НЕ  
 ОБЪЗТИШИ ВОЛА ВЪРЪХЪЩА. ЕДА О ВОЛЪХЪ РАДИТЪ БОГЪ. 10 ИЛИ НАСЪ РАДИ  
 ГЛАГОЛЪТЪ. НА-СЪ БО РАДИ ВЪПИСА СЪ.<sup>82</sup> ГАКО НА<sup>83</sup> ОУПЪЗВАНИИ<sup>84</sup> ДЪЗЖЪНЪ ЕСТЪ  
 ОУЪИ ОРАТИ. И ВЪРЪХЪИ НА ОУПЪЗВАНИЕ СВОЕ ПЪРИЧАЩАТИ СЪ.<sup>85</sup> 11 АЩЕ МЫ ВАМЪ  
 ДОУХОВНАГА СЪГЪХОМЪ. ВЕЛИКЕ АЩЕ МЫ ВАМЪ ПЪЗТЬСКАГА ПОЖИЕМЪ. 12 АЩЕ ИНИ  
 ВАШЕИ ВЛА-СТИ ПЪРИЧАЩАТЪТЪ СЪ. НЕ ПЪЧЕ ЛИ МЫ. НЪ НЕ СЪТВОРИХОМЪ ПО

verses 4 and 5a and reads ОБЛАСТИ, an old form, already found in the Clozianus, for  
 ВЛАСТИ.

<sup>76</sup> SOZBRJPQDCTfP30K, жѣтѣ Т, жѣтѣ FALW (gunai'ka1 F G a b; ajdelfh;n gu-  
 nai'ka N27, AD). CDP30Tf not having the *sg* excludes revision in this group of MSS,  
 but FALW do show revision.

<sup>77</sup> оуъ all MSS follow the Greek Byzantine text{to;n karpovn N27; ejk tou' karpou'  
 ~ Y and AD}.

<sup>78</sup> или SRJPQTMFALW, om OZBDCTfP30K; {h[ N27 ~ and AD; om Y}. The MSS  
 are neatly divided in groups: DCTfP30 and three lectionaries omit, FALW and oth-er  
 lectionaries keep или. It could also be that a different Greek source (e.g. Y, for once  
 diverging from the Byz. majority) lies at the root of this divergence.

<sup>79</sup> SORJKTFALW, стада ZBQDCTf, om P30M. Decisive evidence for the reading  
 in the text is meagre; the group DCTfP30 is divided and the lectionaries disagree with  
 each other (B vs. S and O); as things are, стада could be just as acceptable a choice.

<sup>80</sup> SOZBJRQTM, сѣ FAW; om DCTfP30. The groups distinguish themselves  
 quite clearly: FAW restore the Greek *pl*, DCTfP30 omit.

<sup>81</sup> OZJDCTfP30KTM, се SPQВ, ли сѣ FALW. The *G* сѣхъ has the support of T  
 and O as well as the DCTfP30 group.

<sup>82</sup> SZBRPQTMFALW, оубо писа Ј, писано быстъ DCTfP30. *C cum suis* is remarkable  
 in its use of the *pf* {Greek: ejgravfh N27}; cf. the Introduction.

<sup>83</sup> SOZBRJPQTM, о DCTfP30FALW. C chooses the same *prep* as below, note 85.

<sup>84</sup> SOZRBJP(DCKTM, надежди TfFALW

<sup>85</sup> SOBQMFAW, приращаетъ сѣ ZJPT, приращитъ сѣ CTf, приращати DP30, о  
 оу-пъзване add DCP30, о надежди add Tf, оуповании add M. The change in word-  
 order reflects a Greek divergence: ejp j ejlpivdi tou` metevcein N27, th`1 ejlpivdoi  
 aujtou` metevcein ejp j ejlpivdi Y ~; AD. The occurrence of 3sg in many Slavic MSS  
 - among them C - has no basis in the Greek and must be an inner-Slavic corruption.

ОБЛАСТИ СЕИ. НЗ ВСЕ ТРЪПИМЪ. ДА НЕ ПРЪКРАЩЕНИТА ЕТЕРА<sup>86</sup> ДАМЪ<sup>87</sup> ЕВАНГЕЛИЮ ХРИСТОВОУ.

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

(MSS: SOZRJPQDCTfP30KTMFALW)

1 26 БРАТИЕ. ВИДИТЕ<sup>88</sup> ЗВАНИЕ ВАШЕ\_<sup>89</sup>. РАКО НЕ МЗНОСИ ЛИ ПРЪМЪДРИ ПО ПАЗТИ. НЕ МЗНОСИ ЛИ СИЛЬНИ. НЕ МЗНОСИ ЛИ БЛАГОРОДНИ. 27 НЗ БОУГА МИРА<sup>90</sup> ИЗЪРА<sup>91</sup> БОГЪ. ДА ПОСАРАМИТЪ ПРЪМЪДРЫНА. И НЕМОЩНАТА ИЗЪРА<sup>92</sup> БОГЪ. ДА ПОСАРАМИТЪ КРЪПКАТА<sup>93</sup>. 28 И БЕЗРОДЪНАТА ВСЕГО МИРА<sup>94</sup> И ОУКОРЕНАТА ИЗЪРА БОГЪ. И НЕ СЪЩАТА. ДА СЪЩАТА ОУПРАЗНИТЪ. 29 РАКО ДА НЕ ПОХВАЛИТЪ СЪ ВЪСТАКА ПАЗТЬ ПРЪДЪЗ БОГОМЪ.\*

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

(MSS: SOPZRQDCTfKTMFALW)

1 БРАТИЕ. СЪКАЗАНЪ ЖЕ ВАМЪ ЕВАНГЕЛИЕ МОЕ. ЕЖЕ БЛАГОВЪСТИХЪ ВАМЪ. ЕЖЕ ПРИНАСТЕ. ВЪ НЕМЪЖЕ И СТОИТЕ. 2 ИМЪЖЕ И СЪПАСАЕТЕ СЪ. КЪИМЪ СЛОВОМЪ БЛАГОВЪСТИХЪ ВАМЪ. АЩЕ СЪДЪРЖИТЕ. РАЗВЪ АЩЕ НЕ ВЪ СОУЧЕ ВЪРОУЧЕТЕ. 3 ПРЪ-

<sup>86</sup> OZBRJQD, етеро ТМ, коѣго FALW, котораго СКТf, которамъ P30, om S, когдa мы F; (благовѣствованию 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.

<sup>87</sup> SZBJPQDP30KTM, даме O, дамы CTfAWR. The C variant does not figure in the extant grammars, despite its frequency in Apostolus MSS.

<sup>88</sup> SORJPQTFALW, блядѣте же DCTfP30K, смотрите оубо M; бо add TFAW, оубо add L. DCTfP30 ally with K in this variant; M, singular in reading, allies with L in the addition; TFAW add бо {gavr N27, ou\h DFG}.

<sup>89</sup> братие add CTfP30KMFALW {ajdelfoiv N27}. The Continuous MSS only seemingly add, because the lectionaries move the address to the beginning of the les-son.

<sup>90</sup> SJPQDCP30TfKTMFALW, всего add PDCTfKM, всемоу миру Z, ли всемоу миру O, миръ R. As всъ миръ is commonly considered to be the original translation for kovsmoi, the addition of всъ should not surprise.

<sup>91</sup> SOZRJPQP30TFALW, изърал DCTfKM. C cum suis prefer the pf; cf. note 92.

<sup>92</sup> SRJQTFALW, изърал DCTfP30K; cf note 91.

<sup>93</sup> SOQJKDP30TMFALW, om R, крѣпкое CTf, a surprising sg in CTf.

<sup>94</sup> PDCTfP30, мира JFALW, всего K, в миръ T, всемоу миру OZ, 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”.

ДАХЪ БО ВАМЪ ИСПРЪВА. ІЕЖЕ И ПРИНАХЪ. ТАКО ХРИСТОСЪ ОУМРЪ ГРѢХЪ РАДИ НАШИХЪ ПО КЪНИГАМЪ. 4 И ТАКО ПОГРЕБЕНЪ БЫСТЪ. И ТАКО ВЪСТА ВЪ ТРЕТЬИ ДЪНЕ ПО КЪНИГАМЪ. 5 И ТАКО ГАВИ СЯ КИФЪ. ПО ТОМЪ ЖЕ ІЕДИНОМУ НА ДЕСАТЕ<sup>95</sup>. 6 ПО ТОМЪ ЖЕ ГАВИ СЯ БОЛЕ ПАТИ СЪТЪ БРАТИИ ІЕДИНОИЪ. ОТЪ НИХЪЖЕ МЪНОЖИШИИ<sup>96</sup> ПРѢБЫВАЮТЪ ДОСЕЛЪ. ІЕРИ<sup>97</sup> ЖЕ ПОЧИША. 7 ПО ТОМЪ ЖЕ ГАВИ СЯ ИГДКОВОУ. ПО ТОМЪ ЖЕ АПОСТОЛОМЪ ВЪСЪМЪ. 8 ПОСЛѢЖДЕ ЖЕ<sup>98</sup> ВЪСЪХЪ. ТАКО ИЗВРАГОУ ГАВИ СЯ И МЪНЪ. 9 АЪЗЪ БО ІЕСМЪ МЪНИИ АПОСТОЛЪ. ІЕЖЕ НѢСМЪ ДОСТОИНЪ НАРИЦАТИ СЯ АПОСТОЛЪ. ЗДАНЕ ГОНИХЪ ЦРКЪЗВЪ БОЖИИЪ. 10 БЛАГОДАТИИЪ ЖЕ БОЖИИИЪ ІЕСМЪ. ІЕЖЕ ІЕСМЪ. И БЛАГОДАТЬ ІЕГО ТАЖЕ ВЪ МЪНЪ НЕ ТЪЩА БЫСТЪ. НЪ ЛИШЕ ВЪСЪХЪ ТРОУДИХЪ СЯ. НЕ АЪЗЪ ЖЕ НЪ БЛАГОДАТЬ БОЖИИЪ. ТАЖЕ СЪ МЪНОИЪ. 11 АЩЕ ОУБО АЪЗЪ АЩЕ ЛИ<sup>99</sup> ОНИ. ТАКО ПРОПОВѢДАЕМЪ. И ТАКО ВЪРОВАСТЕ.

#### Saturday of Week 13 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 2 6–9

(MSS: SOZRBPQDCTfP30KTMFALW)

2 6 БРАТИЕ. ПРѢМЪДРОСТЬ ЖЕ ГЛАГОЛИЕМЪ ВЪ СВЪРШЕННИХЪ. ПРѢМЪДРОСТЬ ЖЕ НЕ ВЪКА СЕГО. НИ КЪНАСЪ ВЪКА СЕГО ПРѢСТАИШИИХЪ. 7 НЪ ГЛАГОЛИЕМЪ БОЖИИЪ ПРѢМЪДРОСТЬ. ВЪ ТАИНЪ СВЪРШЕННИИЪ. ІЪЖЕ ПРОВАРЕЧЕ БОГЪ. ПРѢЖДЕ ВЪКЪ ВЪ СЛАВѢ НАШѢ. 8 ІЕЖЕ НИКЪТО ЖЕ ОТЪ КЪНАСЪ<sup>100</sup> МИРА<sup>101</sup> СЕГО НЕ РАЪОУМЪ.

<sup>95</sup> SOPQDP30WKTM, ОБЪМА НА ДЕСАТЕ СТfFAL. Here, the number of the Apostles seems to be under discussion, like in some of the other versions {Greek: e{ndeka D\* F G latt sy<sup>hmg</sup>, dwvdeka N27, AD}.

<sup>96</sup> SOBRPKDCTfP30TMFALW, МНОЖИ ЖЕ С. Slip of the pen or the ear?

<sup>97</sup> KRT, ДРОУЗИ SOPDCTfP30M, НЪЩИИ FALW. The older form seems to be represented by a minority. The FALW group clearly has its own vocabulary. ДРОУСИИ would be the choice of the majority.

<sup>98</sup> SOZBKWLW, ПОСЛЕ ЖЕ DCTfF, ПОСЛѢД ЖЕ RP30TA, ПОСЛѢДИ ЖЕ QM, ПО ТОМЪ ЖЕ... ИЗВРАГОУ P. The sequence –жде же brings about some confusion: P is clearly corrupt, others have a word of later coinage.

<sup>99</sup> SOBRPQKDP30TMFALW, om CTf. The unity of the Commented MSS is broken here by an almost singular reading in C and Tf.

<sup>100</sup> SOTfFALW, ВЛАДИК DCP30K, ЧЛОВѢКЪ M, ОТЪ КЪНАСЪ om B, ОТ... СЕГО om RQ. A lexical variant in a group of MSS.

<sup>101</sup> SOBRPKDP30TM, ВЪКА СТfFALW. 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.



АЩЕ БО БЫША РАЗУМѢЛИ. НЕ БЫША ГОСПОДА СЛАВѢ РАСПАЛИ<sup>102</sup>. 9 НЗ ТАКО ЖЕ  
 ІЕСТЗ ПИСАНО. ИХЗЖЕ ОКО НЕ ВИДѢ. И ОУХО НЕ СЛЫША. И НА СРЗДЫЦЕ ЧЛОВѢКОУ НЕ  
 ВЗЗИДОША. ІАЖЕ<sup>103</sup> БОГЗ ОУГОВОДА ЛЮБАЩИИМЗ ІЕГО.

### Sunday of Week 13 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 16 13–24

(MSS: SOZRBPDCTfP30KTMFALW)

16 13 БРАТИЕ. БЗДИТЕ И СТОИТЕ ВЗ ВѢРѢ МѢЖДИТЕ СЯ ОУТВРЖДАТЕ СЯ. 14  
 ВСТА ВАМЗ ЛЮБВИНѢ ДА БЫВАИТЪ. 15 МОЛИТЪ ЖЕ ВЫ БРАТИЕ. ВЪСТЕ ДОМЗ  
 СТЕФАНИНОВЗ И ФОРЗТОУНАТОВЗ. ТАКО ІЕСТЗ НАЧАТЪКЪ ДХАИНА. И ВЗ СЛОУЖЕНИЕ  
СВАТЫИМЗ<sup>104</sup> ОУЧИНИША СЕБЕ. 16 ДА И ВЫ ПОВИНОУИТЕ СЯ ТАКОВИИМЗ. И ВСТА-  
 КОМОУ ПОСПѢВАИЩОУІЕМОУ И ТРОУЖДАИЩОУІЕМОУ СЯ. 17 РАДОУИТЪ ЖЕ СЯ О  
 ПРИШЕСТВИИ СТЕФАНИНОВѢ И ФОРЗТОУНАТОВѢ. И ДХАИКОВѢ. ТАКО ВАШЕ ЛИШЕНИЕ  
 СИИ ИСПЛЗНИША. 18 ПОКОИША БО МОИ ДОУХЪЗ И ВАШЪ. ЗНАИТЕ ОУБО ТАКОВИНА. 19  
 ЦѢЛОУИТЪЗ ВЫ ЦРЪКЪВИ АСИИКИИ. ЦѢЛОУИТЪЗ ВЫ О ГОСПОДИ МЗНОГО. АКЪЛЪЛА  
 И ПРИСКЪЛЪЛА. СЪ ДОМАШЪНѢИТЪ<sup>105</sup> ЦРЪКЪВИИТЪ. 20 ЦѢЛОУИТЪЗ ВЫ БРАТИНА ВСТА.  
 ЦѢЛОУИТЕ СЕБЕ ЛЮБЪЗДАНИЕМЪ СВАТОМЪ<sup>106</sup>. 21 ЦѢЛОВАНІЕ МОИИТЪ РЪКОИТЪ ПАВЪ-  
 ЛЕИТЪ. 22 ИЖЕ НЕ ЛЮБИТЪ ГОСПОДА ІСОУСЪЗ ХРИСТА. ДА БѢДЕТЪ АНДѢЕМА<sup>107</sup>.  
 МАРНАФЪ. 23 БЛАГОДАТЬ ГОСПОДА НАШЕГО ІСОУСЪЗ ХРИСТА СЪ ВАМИ. 24 ЛЮБИ

<sup>102</sup> SOBRPQKFALW, пропали DCTf P30TM. The Commented MSS (this time united and joined by T and M) have a different prefix.

<sup>103</sup> SOZPTDP30FALW, ако же R, јеже B, ихже СТfKM, егоже Q. СТfKM possibly have retained the G from the preceding relative.

<sup>104</sup> SKRDTf, свАТЫИМИ ОВРQCP30TMFALW. The corruption seems to be deeply rooted in the Slavic MSS, this time including C.

<sup>105</sup> SORQPKDP30M, ИМЗ add CTfFA, их add LW, ею add BT {aujtw'n AD}. Most lectionaries omit; их seems to be the result of revision, but so may seem the other additions. All 'groups' are divided on this point.

<sup>106</sup> SBPRTfK, свАТЫИМИ ZOQDCP30TMFALW. Here C, along with most Slavic manuscripts, erroneously combines an *sg* noun (ЛЮБЪЗДАНИЕМЪ) with a *pl* adjective. The underlying opposition is, of course, between *indef* СВАТОМЪ and *def* СВАТЫИМЪ, corrupted to -и.

<sup>107</sup> SOZBRQKTFALW, проклАТЪ PDCTfP30M. 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).

МОГА СЪ ВЪСЪМИ ВАМИ О ХРИСТЪ ИСОУСЪ АМИНЬ.

**Saturday of Week 14 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 4 1–5**

(MSS: SOZRJBPDCTfP30KTMFALW)

4 1 БРАТИЕ. ТАКО НЫ ДА МЫНИТЪ ЧЛОВЪКЪ. ТАКО СЛОУГЫ ХРИСТОВЫ И ПРИСТАВНИКЫ ТАИНАМЪ БОЖИГАМЪ. 2 А ЕГОЖЕ ПРОЧЕНО ИЩЕТЕ ВЪ ПРИСТАВНИЦЕХЪ. ДА ВЪРЪНЪ КЪТО ОБРАЩЕТЪ СЯ. 3 МЫНЪ ЖЕ НЕ ВЪ ВЕЛИКО КЕСТЪ. ДА ОТЪ ВАСЪ ВЪСТАЖЪ СЯ<sup>108</sup> ИЛИ ОТЪ ДЪНЕ ЧЛОВЪКЪ. НЪ НИ СЕБЕ ВЪСТАСАИТЪ. 4 НИЧЪСО ЖЕ БО СЕБЕ СЪВЪДЪ. НЪ НЕ О СЕМЬ ОПРАВДАИТЪ СЯ. ВЪСТАСАИИ ЖЕ МА ГОСПОДЬ КЕСТЪ. 5 ТЪМЪ ЖЕ НЕ ПРЪЖДЕ ВРЪМЕНЕ НИЧЪСО ЖЕ НЕ СЪДИТЕ. ДОНЪДЕЖЕ ПРИДЕТЪ ГОСПОДЬ. ИЖЕ ПРОСВЪТИТЪ ТАИНАТА ТЪМЫ И ГОВИТЪ СЪВЪТЫ СРЪДЪЧНЫНА. И ТЪГДА ПОХВАЛА БЪДЕТЪ КОМОУЖДО ОТЪ БОГА.

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

(MSS: SOZBPIQDCTfP30KTMFALW)

1 21 БРАТИЕ. ИЗВЪЩАИИ ЖЕ НАСЪ СЪ ВАМИ ВЪ ХРИСТА. И ПОМАЗАВШИ НАСЪ БОГЪ. 22 И ЗНАМЕНАВШИ НАСЪ. И ДАВЪ ОБРЪЧЕНИЕ ДОУХА ВЪ СРЪДЦА НАША. 23 АЪЖЕ ЖЕ СЪВЪДЪТЕЛА БОГА НАРИЦАИТЪ НА МОИЪ ДОУШЪ. ТАКО ШАДА ВАСЪ ПАКЫ НЕ ПРИДОХЪ<sup>109</sup> ВЪ КОРИНЪ. 24 НЕ ТАКО ОУСТОИМЪ ВАШЕИ ВЪРЪ. НЪ ТАКО ПОСПЪШНИЦИ КЕСМЪ РАДОСТИ ВАШЕИ. ВЪРОИТЪ БО СТОИТЕ. 2 1 СЪДИХЪ ЖЕ СЕБЪ СЕ. НЕ ПАКЫ СКРЪБИИТЪ КЪ ВАМЪ ПРИТИ. 2 АЩЕ БО АЪЖЕ СКРЪБЪ ТВОРИТЪ ВАМЪ. КЪТО КЕСТЪ ВЕСЕЛАИ МА. ТЪКЪМО ПРИЕМЛАИ СКРЪБЪ ОТЪ МЕНЕ. 3 ИБО ПЪСАХЪ ВАМЪ СЕ ИСТОЮ. ДА НЕ ПРИШЪДЪ СКРЪБЪ НА СКРЪБЪ ПРИИМЪ. О НИХЪЖЕ ПОДОБАЕТЪ МИ РАДОВАТИ СЯ. НАДЪВАНЪ СЯ НА ВСЯ ВЫ. ТАКО МОГА РАДОСТЬ ВЪСЪМЪ ВАМЪ КЕСТЪ.

<sup>108</sup> SOBRIQKTFALW, ВАМИ ВСТАЖАН БЪДЪ СР30М, ВАМИ ИСТАЖАН БЪДЪ DTf, ВАМИ ИСПИТАН БЪДЪ И ДНЕ Р, СТАЖЪ СЯ F, ИСТАЖЪ СЯ AW, ТЪЖДЪ СЯ 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).

<sup>109</sup> придохъ ZPDCTfP30KMFALW, придъ SOBQRT, приити J {h\lqon N27}. The confusion stems from the root–*aor* придъ (reflected in SOBQRT), which could lead to either variant –охъ or –ѡ.

4 отъ печали бо многы и тѣгы сръдѣца<sup>110</sup> пьсахъ вамъ многами слъзми. не да оскръ-бите сѧ. нъ да любезъ разумѣете. ꙗже имамъ излиха къ вамъ<sup>111</sup>.

**Saturday of Week 15 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 4 17–21 5 1–5**

(MSS: SOZRJBPDCTfP30KTMFALW)

4 17 братие. сего ради послахъ вамъ Тимофеа. иже ми ѡстѣ<sup>112</sup> члдо възлюбленое. и вѣрно о господи. иже вамъ вспоманетъ. ꙗкѣти моя. ꙗже о христѣ тако же и всьде възвѣстакоеи цркзвѣ оучѣ. 18 тако не градѣшюу ми къ вамъ. разгръдѣша<sup>113</sup> етери<sup>114</sup>. 19 придѣ же скоро къ вамъ. аще господь възхошетъ. и разумѣтъ не слово разгръдѣвшихъ<sup>115</sup> нъ силѣ. 20 не въз словесе бо цѣсарствине божие нъ въз силѣ. 21 чьто хошете палицѣѣ ли при-дѣ на вы. или любезнѣѣ. доухомъ же кротости. 5 1 отзнѣдѣ<sup>116</sup> слышитъ сѧ въз васъ любодѣганиѣ. и тако любодѣганиѣ. тако бо же ни въз ѡзвѣстѣхъ имѣнуетъ сѧ<sup>117</sup>. тако женѣ етерѣ отьца имѣти<sup>118</sup>. 2 и вы

<sup>110</sup> SOBJPQFALW, сръдѣцоу DCTfP30KT, срѣчние M. 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*.

<sup>111</sup> SOBJPQDP30KTMFALW, въз васъ CTf. The variant of C and Tf is not joined by D and P30.

<sup>112</sup> SOZBRJPQDP30TFALW, ѡстѣ ми CTfK {ejsti tevknon mou AD, ejstiv mou tevk-non N27}. Could CTfK have been revised from a non-Byzantine text?

<sup>113</sup> SOZBJQKTFALW, om R, развѣличаша сѧ DCTfP30M. Lexical variant in the Commented MSS and M; cf. notes 115 and 119.

<sup>114</sup> SOBJPQDP30KT, нѣции CTfFALW, инии M. Lexical variant in CTf, shared this time by the FALW, but the Commented MSS diverge.

<sup>115</sup> SOZBRJPQKFALW, развѣличавшихъ сѧ DCTfP30M. The same lexical variant as in notes 113 and 119.

<sup>116</sup> SOZBQRDP30KTFALW, вьсма ли CTf.

<sup>117</sup> DCTfP30TMFALW, нарицають сѧ ORP, мѣнить сѧ SBQ, дѣть сѧ J, om K {ojnomavzetai Y ~, sy, vg, AD; om N27}. Almost all Slavic MSS follow the Byzantine majority and Y. K stands isolated, the other variants are inner Slavic.

<sup>118</sup> SOJPAWK, нѣкого женоу очю имѣюща DCTfP30M, женѣ нѣкоему очю имѣти FL. Apparently a difficult passage to translate from the Greek {gunai~kav tina tou' patro; i e[cein}.

РАЗГРЗДЪВЪЗ-ШЕ<sup>119</sup> есте. а не паче ПЛАКАСТЕ<sup>120</sup> сѧ. да изъметъ сѧ отъ срѣды  
вашеѧ. сѧ-дѣлавыи дѣло се. 3 азъ же оубо\_<sup>121</sup> кромѣ сыи тѣломъ. тоу же  
сыи доухомъ. се<sup>122</sup> сѣдихъ нао сыи. сѧдѣлаващаго сице. 4 о имени<sup>123</sup>  
господа нашего исочъсз христа. сѧбъравашемъ сѧ вамъ. и моемоу доухоу сѧ  
силоу господѧ нашего исочъсз христа. 5 прѣдати таковаго сотонѣ. въ  
измъждание пазти. да доухъ сѧспасетъ сѧ. въ днь господѧ нашего исочъсз  
христа.

### Sunday of Week 15 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 4 6–15

(MSS: USOZRJBPDCTfKTMFALW)

4 б братиѣ. \_<sup>124</sup> богъ рекъи ис<sup>125</sup> тьмы свѣтоу възсияти. иже възсия въ срѣ-  
дцѣхъ нашихъ. къ просвѣщенію разума славы божиѧ. о лицѣ исочъсз хри-  
стовѣ. 7 имамъ же сѧкровище се. въ скѣдзльнѣхъ<sup>126</sup> сѧсѣдѣхъ. да прѣспѣ-  
ние силы бѣдетъ божиѣ.<sup>127</sup> а не отъ насъ. 8 о всѣмъ скрѣщае. а не сѧтѣ-  
жающе сиѧ<sup>128</sup> не чаеми. нъ не отъчаеми. 9 гоними нъ не оставляеми<sup>129</sup>.

<sup>119</sup> SOBRJKTFALW, разгрдѣли Р, развеличали сѧ DCTfP30M. The same lexical variant as in notes 113 and 115.

<sup>120</sup> SOBRGJKTFALW, всплакасте DCTfP30M, плачете Р. The Commented MSS and M distinguish themselves again.

<sup>121</sup> ако add DCTfP30MFLW {wJ1 add DFGY~, AD}. Here the Greek original becomes clear for the MSS that add ако: it has to be one of the Byzantine minuscles or Y. K does not go with the Commented MSS in the three cases mentioned above.

<sup>122</sup> OВJPQKTFALW, оуже DCTfP30M. {h[dh N27, AD} Lexical variant in the Commented MSS, perhaps after revision.

<sup>123</sup> SOZBRJPQKTFALW, в имя DCTfP30M; cf. preceding note. As this is the fifth example in this pericope of DCTfP30 with M sharing a unique variant, there is a strong case for grouping these MSS together.

<sup>124</sup> ако add CTfTALW, om USOBZRJPQDMF (o{ti 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.

<sup>125</sup> USOZBJQDMKTFALW, отъ CTf, ис тьмы om RP. Lexical variant in CTf, but not shared by D.

<sup>126</sup> USOZBJPQKTMFALW, глинихъ DCTf; a lexical variant for DCTf.

<sup>127</sup> божиѣ SKTfLW, божиѧ USOZQD, божиѧ ВTMPFA, om RJ. The Slavic has difficulties with the connection of the Greek tou' qeou', but no characteristic group is to be discerned.

<sup>128</sup> om DCK.

НИЗЛАГАЕМИ НЗ НЕ ПОГЫБАЮЩЕ. 10 ВСЕГДА МРЗТВОСТЬ ГОСПОДА ИСОУСА ВЗ ТЪЛЪ НОСАЩЕ. ДА И ЖИВОТЪ ИСОУСОВЪ ВЗ ТЪЛЪ НАШЕМЪ ГВИТЪ СЛ. 11 ПРИСНО БО МЫ ЖИВИ. ВЗ СМРЗТЬ ПРЪДАЕМЪ СЛ ИСОУСА РАДИ. ДА И ЖИВОТЪ ИСОУСОВЪ ГВИТЪ СЛ. ВЗ МРЗТВЪНЪИ<sup>130</sup> ПЛЪТИ НАШЕИ. 12 ТЕМЪ ЖЕ СМРЗТЬ ВЗ НАСЪ ДЪИЕТЪ СЛ. А ЖИВОТЪ ВЗ ВАСЪ. 13 ИМАЩЕ ЖЕ ТЪЖДЕ ДОУХЪ ВЪРЪ. ПО ПЪСАНОУЧЕМОУ. ВЪРОВАХЪ ТЕМЪ ЖЕ И ВЪЗГЛАГОЛАХЪ. И МЫ ВЪРОУЧЕМЪ ТЕМЪ ЖЕ И ГЛАГОЛЕМЪ. 14 ВЪДАЩЕ ГАКО ВЪСКРЪШИИ ГОСПОДА ИСОУСА<sup>131</sup>. И МЫ ИСОУСОМЪ ВЪСКРЪСИТЪ. И ПРЪДЪПОСТАВИТЪ СЪ ВАМИ. 15 ВСЪА БО ВАСЪ РАДИ ДА БЛАГОДАТЬ ОУМНОЖИТЪ<sup>132</sup> СЛ МНОЖИШИМИ ПОХВАЛАМЪ ИЗЪБЫТЪЧЪСТВОМЪ ВЪ СЛАВЪ БОЖИИ.

#### Saturday of Week 16 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 10 23–28

(MSS: SOZRJBQDCTfP30MTFALW)

10 23 БРАТИЕ. ВСЪА МИ ЛЪТЬ КЪСТЪ. НЗ НЕ ВСЪА НА<sup>133</sup> ПОЛЬСЪ. ВСЪА МИ ЛЪТЬ КЪСТЪ<sup>134</sup>. НЗ НЕ ВСЪА НАЗИДАЕТЪ<sup>135</sup>. 24 НИКЪТО ЖЕ СВОЕГО СИИ ДА ИЩЕТЪ. НЗ ДРОУЖИНАЕМО КЪЖДО. 25 ВСЕ ПРОДАЕМОЕ ВЪ РАЗЪМЪНИЦЪ ГАДИТЕ. НИЧЪТО ЖЕ

<sup>129</sup> USOZBJRQTFALW, спостижеми СТfKM, постижеми PD. Again the Commented MSS are set apart by a lexical variant, P and D depending from СТfKM.

<sup>130</sup> USOZBRJTDtMFALW, смрътнъи С. A singular variant in C, not even shared by D, Tf and M.

<sup>131</sup> христа add US. A case of Formulaic Addition; cf. the Introduction.

<sup>132</sup> UOZBRJQTKMD, оумноживши СТfAW, оумножившим FL. In this case the minority reading of СТfAW is a more Slavic translation of the Greek {ple-onavsasa N27, AD}; an error secondary to this reading is found in FL. A majority of Slavic MSS has a misleading text. СТfAW could have been revised on basis of the Greek, but D does not share this revision.

<sup>133</sup> SOZBJQDP30TMFALW, вЪ СТf. CTf are not joined by D and P30.

<sup>134</sup> кѣстѣ DCTfP30M, сѣтѣ SOZBJQTFALW. The old reading is present in DCTf P30 and M: the Greek *sg* verb after a subject in *npl* is retained, like in the first sentence of this pericope. {pavnta e[xestin N27]; сѣтѣ is an innovation, influenced by the next *pl*.

<sup>135</sup> назидает FL, назидаѣт SBJQAW, назидаю M, сзидаѣт OT, сзидают D, сзидает CTf, сзидаю P30, сзиждаѣт K, сграждает P {oijkodomei' N27, AD}. A bewildering variation of half (назидаѣт) and totally erroneous (назидаю, сзидаѣт, сграждает) readings; to decide between the variants назида- (9) and сзида- (8) is difficult. The indecision is between *sg* and *pl* after a subject in *npl*, and the *sg* in C TfFLP - the last MS after corruption - is thought to be the oldest form here, too, as in the preceding note.

<sup>136</sup> ВЗСТАСАДИЩЕ ЗА СЗВЪСТЬ. 26 ГОСПОДЬНА БО КЕСТЗ ЗЕМЛА И КОНЬЦЫ<sup>137</sup> КЕНА. 27 АЩЕ ЛИ КЗТО ПРИЗЫВАЕТЗ<sup>138</sup> ВЫ ОТЗ НЕВЪРЬНЫИХЗ. И ХОЩЕТЕ ХОДИТИ. ВСЕ ПРЪДЗСТАВЛЕНОКЕ ВАМЗ ГАДИТЕ. НИЧЕСО<sup>139</sup> ЖЕ ВЗСТАСАДИЩЕ СА ЗА СЗВЪ-СТЬ. 28 АЩЕ ЛИ КЗТО ВАМЗ РЕЧЕТЗ. СЕ ИДОЛОЖРЗТВЬНО КЕСТЗ. НЕ ГАДИТЕ. ЗА ОНО-ГО ПОВЪДАВЗШАИЕГО И СЗВЪСТЬ. ГОСПОДЬНА БО КЕСТЗ ЗЕМЛА И КОНЬЦИ КЕНА<sup>140</sup>.

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

(MSS: SOZJBQPRDCTfKTMFALW)

6 1 БРАТИЕ. ПОСПЪШЬСТВОУИЩЕ ЖЕ МОЛИМЗ. НЕ ВЗ ТЗЩЕ БЛАГОДАТЬ БОЖИИЪ ПРИЯТИ ВАМЗ. 2 ГЛАГОЛИЕТЗ БО ВЗ ВРЕМА ПРИЯТНО ПОСЛОУШАХЗ ТЕБЕ. И ВЗ ДЕНЬ СЗПАСЕНИЯ ПОМОГОХЗ ТИ. СЕ НЫНЪ ВРЕМА БЛАГОПРИЯТНО<sup>141</sup>. СЕ НЫНЪ ДЕНЬ СЗПАСЕНИЯ. 3 НИ КЪДИНОГО НИ О ЧЕМЪ ЖЕ ДАИЩЕ ПРЪТЫКАНИЯ. ДА НЕ ПОРОЧЬНО БЪДЕТЗ СЛОУЖЕНИЕ. 4 НЗ О ВСЕМЪ СЗСТАВЛАИЩЕ СА. ТАКО БОЖИИ СЛОУГЫ. ВЗ ТРЪПЪНИИ МЗНОСЪ. ВЗ СРЗВЪХЗ ВЗ БЪДАХЗ. ВЗ ТЪГАХЗ 5 ВЗ РАНАХЗ. ВЗ ТЪМНИЦАХЗ. ВЗ НЕ СТРОЕНИЯИХЗ. ВЗ ТРОУДЪХЗ ВЗ ЗАБЗДЪЕНИЯИХЗ. ВЗ ПОШЕНИЯИХЗ 6 ВЗ ЧИШЕНИЯИ. ВЗ РАЗОУМЪ. ВЗ ТРЪПЪНИИ<sup>142</sup>. ВЗ БЛАГОСТИ. ВЗ ДОУШИ СВЪТЪ. ВЗ ЛЮБЗВЕ НЕ ЛИЦЕМЪРНЪ. 7 ВЗ СЛОВЕСЕ ИСТИНЪНЪ. ВЗ СИЛЪ БОЖИИ.

<sup>136</sup> SOZBJPQCKP30TfFALWM, не add DCTfT. A hypercorrect addition.

<sup>137</sup> SOZBJPQDP30TM, конц СК, испазнение TfFALW. A rare case of divergence between C and Tf, the latter joining the FALW vocabulary.

<sup>138</sup> SOBJQKMFALW, завет P, зовет DCP30TfT. The DCTfP30 group stands apart with T (and P).

<sup>139</sup> OВJPQCTfKM, ничто SP30TFALW, не add CTf. Like above, the CTf combination adopts the later rule of double negation, yet is not joined by D and P30.

<sup>140</sup> om DC, unique among the Slavic witnesses in the omission. N27 omits this phrase too, but HcY~ 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.

<sup>141</sup> CTfFAW, приятно SBQDKLTM, се... спасения om OR, время... нынъ om JP. The evidence is here rather meagre, because of the many omissions – caused by homoioarcton– in the witnesses. The reading of SBQTDKML does not seem primary to the one chosen here, but because of the exact correspondence of БЛАГО– with euj– one might choose the short form, it being seemingly unrevised {euj-provsdeko1 N27, AD, devkto1 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.

<sup>142</sup> OZPBRDCTfKTM, долготерпѣнии SQFALW.

орѣжиенѣмъ правды. десными и шоуиими. 8 славоитѣ и досаждениенѣмъ. хвалиениенѣмъ и гаждениенѣмъ. тако льстци и истиньнии. 9 тако не знаеми а познаваеми. тако оумираѣще. и се живи есмз. тако показанеми и не оумрзшванеми. 10 тако скрзеаше присно же радоуѣще сѧ. тако нишии мзногы же богаташе. тако ничесо же имѣше. а все сдрзжѣше.

### Saturday of Week 17 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 14 20–25

(MSS: OZRJBVPQDTfP30KTMFALW)<sup>143</sup>

14 20 братиѣ. не дѣти бываите оумы<sup>144</sup>. нз ззлобоитѣ младенествоуите. оумы же свршени бѣдѣте. 21 вз законѣ естз писано<sup>145</sup>. тако иноязычннкы и оустынами инѣми вззглаголитѣ людьмз симз. и тако не послушаѣтз мене глаголетз господь. 22 тѣмъ же языци вз знамение сѣтз не вѣрныимз нз невѣроуѣщиимз. а пророчество<sup>146</sup> не вѣрныимз нз вѣроуѣщиимз. 23 аще бо црзкы всѧ сзидетз сѧ вз коупѣ. и вси глаголитз языци. взидетз же етерз не разоумивыи или не вѣрнз. не рекѣтз ли тако ззли сѧ дѣете<sup>147</sup>. 24 аще ли<sup>148</sup> вси пророчествоуѣтз. взидетз же етерз<sup>149</sup> не вѣрнз или не разоумивз. обличаетз сѧ вьсѣми. и взстасаетз сѧ отз вьсѣхз. 25 и таинага сздыца его гавѣ бываѣтз. и<sup>150</sup> тако падз нишь<sup>151</sup> поклонитз сѧ богоу повѣданѧ. тако вз истинѣ богз вз васз естз.

<sup>143</sup> Because C lacks a folium, its text breaks off after оуст in verse 21. For the sake of completeness I give the full text of the pericope with the relevant variants.

<sup>144</sup> BVPDP30TfKMFALW, оумомъ OQRT, оумомы C. The reading of C is rather corrupt, possibly a result of conflation; cf. N27: tai'1 fresivn. But two lines further down in the same pericope the reading is correct. Perhaps OQRT's оумомъ should be preferred in the text.

<sup>145</sup> OZRBJPQDCTfP30KTM, пишѣт FALW. The Continuous MSS use a different word.

<sup>146</sup> OBALW, пророчствие ZDTfP30KTM, om PF(USC).

<sup>147</sup> OZBJPQDTfP30KTM, бѣсоуете FALW.

<sup>148</sup> OZBJPQMFALW, же Т, же add FAL, om DTfP30K.

<sup>149</sup> OZBRQT, един J, кто DP30TfKMFALW.

<sup>150</sup> ZBJDTfP30KMFALW, тако PQ, om OT, сице add DTfP30K, сице add M, тако add FALW.

<sup>151</sup> OZBRQDTfP30KTM, нице J, на лица FALW.

**Sunday of Week 17 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 6 16–18 7 1**

(MSS: UOZRJBTPQDCTfKMFALW)

6 16<sup>Б</sup> БРАТИЕ. МЫ БО ЦРКЗВИ<sup>152</sup> ЈЕСМЗ<sup>153</sup> БОГА ЖИВА. ГАКО ЖЕ РЕЧЕ БОГЗ. ГАКО ВЗСЕЛѢ СѦ ВЗ НА И ПОИДѢ<sup>154</sup>. И БѢДѢ ИМЗ ВЗ БОГЗ. И ТИ БѢДѢТЗ МЫНѢ ВЗ ЛЮДИЕ. 17 ТѢМЪ ЖЕ ИЗИДѢТЕ ОТЗ СРѢДЫ ИХЗ. И ОТЗЛѢЧИТЕ СѦ ГЛАГОЛЕТЗ ГОСПОДЬ. И НЕ ЧИСТѢ НЕ ПРИКАСАТЕ СѦ. И ДЗЗ ПРИИМѢ ВЪ. 18 И БѢДѢ ВАМЗ ВЗ ОТЬЦА. И ВЫ БѢДЕТЕ МЫНѢ ВЗ СЫНЫ<sup>155</sup> И ДЗЩЕРИ. ГЛАГОЛЕТЗ ГОСПОДЬ ВСЕДРЖИТЕЛЬ. 7 1 СИ ЖЕ ИМѢШЕ ОБѢТОВАНИѦ. ВЗЗЛЮБЛЕННИИ. ОЦѢСТИМЗ СѦ ОТЗ ВЪСЯКОЮѦ СКВРЗНЫ ПЛАЗТЬСКОЮѦ И ДОУХОВНОЮѦ. ТВОРАЩЕ СВАТЫНИѢ ВЗ СТРАСѢ БОЖИИ.

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

(MSS: SOZRJBTPQDCTfP30KTMFALW)

15 39 БРАТИЕ. НЕ ВЪСАКА ПЛАЗТЬ ТАЖЕ ПЛАЗТЬ. НЗ ИНА ОУБО ЧЛОВѢКОМЗ. ИНА ЖЕ ПЛАЗТЬ СКОТОМЗ. ИНА ЖЕ ПЗТИЦАМЗ. ИНА ЖЕ РЫБАМЗ. 40 И ТѢЛЕСА НЕБЕСЬСКАѦ. И ТѢЛЕСА ЗЕМЬНАѦ. НЗ ИНА ОУБО НЕБЕСЬНЫИМЗ СЛАВА. ИНА ЖЕ ЗЕМЬНЫИМЗ. 41 И-НА

<sup>152</sup> UOZBJPQTFALW, цркв R, храм DCTfMK. The lexical variant stresses the link between DCTf and K, M. Judging by Metzger's commentary (see note 153), the majority of Slavic MSS joined in the "pedantic correction" and only DCTfKM have the 'correct' singular; cf. the similar 'correctness' of these MSS in note 134).

<sup>153</sup> МЫ... ЈЕСМЗ UOZBRJT, ВЪ... ЕСТЕ PQDCTfKMFALW; есте om QF. The MSS are consistent, the omission in QF is noteworthy and without Greek parallel. {hJmei'1 ga;r nao;1 qeou' ejsmen N27 on basis of B D\* L P 6. 33. 81. (104). 326. 365. 1175. 1881. 2464 pc co; uJmei'1 ... ejste Y ~ lat sy vg AD Tert; hJmei'1... naoi;... ejsmen Å \*0243. 1739 pc CI}. Cf. Metzger, 1971, p. 580: "The reading hJmei'1... ejsmen, strongly supported by both Alexandrian and Western witnesses (...), is to be preferred to uJmei'1... ejste (...), since the latter reading was very naturally suggested by the recollection of 1 Cor 3.16 as well as by the context (verses 14 and 17), while there was no reason for putting hJmei'1... ejsmen in its stead. The plural naoiv (Å\* 0243. 1739 Clement Augustine) is a pedantic correction." It looks as if the lectionaries UOZBT, joined by the elsewhere often corrupt R (and to a lesser extent J), were translated from the group of 'correct' Greek MSS, and that C *cum suis*, amongst which here FALW, had the Byzantine (with Y and others) for an exemplar.

<sup>154</sup> UOZRJBQDKTM, похожѢ CTfFALW, om P. D does not join CTf and the FALW manuscripts.

<sup>155</sup> UOZBRJQTMFALW, сын DCTfK, мѢСТО add DCTfKM. The interdependence of DCTf and KM is illustrated again in this gloss.



СЛАВА СЛЗНЬЦЮҮ. ИНА СЛАВА МБСАЦЮҮ. ИНА СЛАВА СВБЗДАМЗ. СВБЗДА БО<sup>156</sup>  
 СВБЗДЫ РАЗЛАҢЧАЕТЗ СА ВЗ СЛАВЪ. 42 ТАКО И ВЗСКРЪШЕНИЕ МРЗТВЫХЗ СБІЕТЗ  
 СА ВЗ ИСТЪЛБНИЕ<sup>157</sup>. ВЗСТАІЕТЗ ВЗ БЕЗИСТЪЛБНИЕ. 43 СБІЕТЗ СА ВЗ НЕ ЧЪСТИ.  
 ВЗСТАІЕТЗ ВЗ СЛАВѢ. СБІЕТЗ СА ВЗ НЕМОЩИ. ВЗСТАІЕТЗ ВЗ СИЛѢ. 44 СБІЕТЗ СА  
 ТЪЛО ДОУШЕВЬНО<sup>158</sup>. ВЗСТАІЕТЗ ТЪЛО ДОУХОВЬНО. ДЩЕ<sup>159</sup> ІЕСТЗ ТЪЛО  
 ДОУШЕВЬНО. ІЕСТЗ<sup>160</sup> ТЪЛО ДОУХОВЬНО. 45 ТАКО И ПИШЕТЗ. БЫСТЗ ПРЗВЫИ  
 ЧЛОВѢКЗ АДАМЗ ВЗ ДОУШѢ ЖИВѢ. ПОСЛѢДЫНИИ АДАМЗ ВЗ ДОУХЗ  
 ЖИВОТВОРАЩЬ<sup>161</sup>.

### Sunday of Week 18 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 9 6–11

(MSS: USOZRJPQDCTfTMFALW)

9 6 БРАТИЕ. СЪИИ ШАДА. ШАДА И ПОЖЫІЕТЗ. И СЪИИ О БЛАГОСЛОВІЕННЫХЗ. О  
 БЛАГОСЛОВІЕННЫХЗ И ПОЖЫІЕТЗ. 7 КЗЖЬДО ТАКО ЖЕ ИЗВОЛІЕНІЕ ИМАТЗ СРЗДЪ-  
 ЦЕМЬ. НЕ ОТЗ СКРЗБИ НИ ОТЗ БЪДЫ. ТИХА БО ДАТЕЛА АЮБИТЗ БОГЗ. 8 СИЛЫЗ ЖЕ  
 БОГЗ ВЪСАКАѢ БЛАГОДАТЬ ИЗБЫТЗЧЪСТВОВАТИ<sup>162</sup> ВЗ ВАСЗ. ДА О ВЪСЕМЬ ВЪСЕГДА

<sup>156</sup> SZBRJPQDP30TfKTMFALW, по ОС, от add S. Corruption through a slip of the pen in O and C; S has an addition that might come from a gloss.

<sup>157</sup> SOZJPKTMFALW, ислѣнии BDCTf, тлѣние и R, и в ислѣнии Q, стлѣнии P30, ислѣнии Tf. Again correlation (on basis of the Greek *D fqora' N27*) of BDCP30 and Tf.

<sup>158</sup> OBQDP30KMFALW, доушно SCTf, дшевное RJPT. CTf shares the corruption with S; the *def* desinence is remarkable in RJPT.

<sup>159</sup> OZBKТ, и CTf, om DP30AW, дше... доуховно om SRJPQFLM through homoioteleuton.

<sup>160</sup> OBDP30K, и іестз CTfAW, іестз 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 и, which can happen easily.

<sup>161</sup> SOZQTMFALW, животвориши R, животворен J, животен P, живаши DCP30Tf, живоуш B, K unreadable. The variation is bewildering, only the Commented MSS show unity.

<sup>162</sup> OBDCTfTM, избыловати USZJPQRFALW. C, joined by D and Tf, shares the lexical variant of some lectionaries and T.

всѣмъ доволъ имѣше. избытъчествуете<sup>163</sup>. въ всѣмъ дѣло благо. 9 како же кѣтъ писано. расточи и дастъ оубогымъ. правѣда негю прѣбываѣтъ въ вѣкы<sup>164</sup>. 10 дажи же съма сътѣшююемоу. и хлѣбъ въ снѣдѣ да подастъ. и оумножитъ съма ваше. и да въздраситъ жита правѣдѣ вашей. 11 о всемъ богаташе са. въ всѣмъ щедротѣ. гаже сздѣваѣтъ хвалѣ нами богоу.

### Saturday of Week 19 after Pentecost: 1 Cor 15 58 16 1–3

(MSS: SOZRJBQDCTfP30KTMFALW)

15 58 братиѣ. тврзди<sup>165</sup> бываите не постѣпни. избытъчествуѣше въ дѣлѣ господни всѣгда. вѣдѣше како оусилиѣ ваше. нѣстъ тѣше о господи. 16 1 а о сзложени<sup>166</sup> еже къ свѣтымъ<sup>167</sup>. како же рашинихъ цркзвн галатийскыя<sup>168</sup>. тако и вы сзтворите. 2 по единой съботѣ. кзждо васъ да полагаѣтъ<sup>169</sup> схранѣнѣ. еже аще поспѣшитъ са. да не негда придѣтъ тзгда сзложениѣ бѣдѣтъ. 3 негда же придѣтъ нѣже аще искоусите кзнигами.

<sup>163</sup> SBDCTfTMLW, избытъчествуѣше OQP, изобилоуѣте UZA, изобилоуѣт JRF. 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).

<sup>164</sup> UZSBPQDfTMLFALW, вѣк OC, вѣки R, вк вка J, вѣка addU, вѣкоу add M. Here the well-known expression вѣкз вѣка or вѣкы вѣковз plays a disturbing role in the minds of the scribes.

<sup>165</sup> SOZRJPQCT, тѣмъ же братиѣ мол възлюбленнаѣ add DTfP30MFALW, in accordance with the continuous Greek text {w{ste, ajdelfoiv mou ajgaphtoiv, in N27, om AD}. C and T are the only Continuous MSS not sharing this addition, super-fluous in the Lectionary text by the initial “brethren”.

<sup>166</sup> SBQCTfP30KMFA, слоужении ZPRT, слоужение JQMLW. The correct translation of *logiva* is the *lectio difficilior* represented in SBQCTfP30KMFA. The variant слоужении 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: послоужения, слоужения or even сѣрани (P) all other witnesses.

<sup>167</sup> SZRDP30KM, свѣтымъ OJBPQCTfTALW, свѣти F. The majority contains a grammatical error.

<sup>168</sup> SOZBRQKT, цркзвмз галатийскимъ PDCTfP30MFALW. The lectionaries, joined by K and T, are thought to reflect the original translation, while DCTf P30 and FALW with M and P may have been revised according to the Greek: *tai' i ejk-klhsivaii AD, N27*.

<sup>169</sup> са add R, оу сеѣ add DCP30TfM, о сеѣ да (полагѣт) BKF(A)LW {AD: *paraē jautw' / tiqevtw*}. Only SOZJPQT do not render *par jējautw' /*, like the text presented here.

СИѦ ПОСЛАИѦ ДОНЕСТИ БЛАГОДАТЬ ВАШѦ ВЪ ИЕРОУСАЛИМЪ.

**Sunday of Week 19 after Pentecost: 2 Cor 11 31–32 12 1–9**

(MSS: SOZRJBPDCTfKTMFALW)

11 31 БРАТИЕ. БОГЪ И ОТЪЦЪ ГОСПОДА НАШЕГО<sup>170</sup> ИСОУСЪ ХРИСТА ВЪСТЪ. СЫИ БЛАГОСЛОВИЕНЪ ВЪ ВЪКЫ. ТАКО НЕ АЗЖѦ 32 ВЪ ДАМАСЦѦ ЕФНАРХЪ<sup>171</sup> АРЕФЫ ЦЕ-САРГА. СТРЕЖАШЕ ГРАДЪ ДАМАСКИНСКЪ. ЯТИ МА ХОТѦ. 33 И ОКЪЗЫЦЕМЪ ВЪ КОШЫНИЦИ ПО СТѢНѢ СЪВЪШЕНЪ БЫХЪ. И ИЗЪБГОХЪ ОТЪ РѦКОУ КЕГО. 12 1 АЩЕ И ПОХВАЛИТИ СѦ ПОДОБАЕТЪ. НЕ ПОЛЬСА БО. ПРИДѦ ЖЕ ВЪ ВИДѢНИѦ И ЯВЛЕНИѦ ГОСПОДЪНА. 2 ВЪМЪ ЧЛОВѢКА О ХРИСТѢ. ПРѢЖДЕ ЧЕТЫРЕ НА ДЕСАТЕ ЛѢТЪ. АЩЕ ЛИ ВЪ ТѢЛѢ НЕ ВѢДѢ. АЩЕ ЛИ РАДЪВѢ<sup>172</sup> ТѢЛА НЕ ВѢДѢ БОГЪ ВЪСТЪ. ВЪСЪХЫЩЕНА БЫВЪША ТАКОВАНЕГО. ДО ТРЕТИНАГО НЕБЕСЕ. 3 И ВѢДѢ ТАКОВАНЕГО ЧЛОВѢКА. АЩЕ ЛИ ВЪ ТѢЛѢ. АЩЕ ЛИ РАДЪВѢ<sup>173</sup> ТѢЛА НЕ ВѢДѢ БОГЪ ВЪСТЪ. 4 ТАКО ВЪСЪХЫЩЕНЪ БЫТЪ НА РАИ. И СЛЫША НЕ ИЗДРЕЧЕНЪНЫ ГЛАГОЛЫ. ИХЪЖЕ НЕ ЛѢТЬ КЕСТЪ ЧЛОВѢКОУ ГЛАГОЛАТИ. 5 О ТАКОВѢМЪ ПОХВАЛИѦ СѦ. А О СЕБѢ НЕ ПОХВАЛИѦ СѦ. ТЪКЪЗМО О НЕМОЩЬХЪ МОИХЪ. 6 АЩЕ БО ВЪСЪХОЩѦ ПОХВАЛИТИ СѦ. НЕ БѢДѦ НЕ МѢДЪРЪ. ИСТИНѦ БО РЕКѦ. ШАЖДѦ ЖЕ СѦ. ЕДА КЪТО<sup>174</sup> НА МА ВЪЗЪНЕПЫЩОУЕТЪ<sup>175</sup>. ПАЧЕ КЕЖЕ ВИДИТЪ МА. ИЛИ СЛЫШИТЪ ЧТО ОТЪ МЕНЕ. 7 И ЗА ПРѢМЪЗНОГАТА ЯВЛЕНИѦ ДА НЕ

<sup>170</sup> SZBRJPQTMFALW, om ODCTf A sign of revision in these MSS: the Greek AD has hJmw~n, N27 omits.

<sup>171</sup> SOZRJBQT, ЯЗЫЧЬСКИИ КЪЗНАСЪ FALW, старѣшина града DCTfKM {AD and N27: ejqnavrch1}. The theory of Horálek 1959 on derivation is confirmed here: older MSS simply transcribe the Greek word, Slavic translations are later: FALW give a mechanical calque, DCTfKM have a more sophisticated translation.

<sup>172</sup> SOZBJPQKTM, кроме DCTfFALW. This time C *cum suis* join FALW.

<sup>173</sup> SOZBJPQDKTM, кроме CTfFALW; cf. preceding note, but D does not join the other Commented MSS.

<sup>174</sup> SZBJRQPTFALW, како ODCTfKM. Simple writing error leading to corruption, but already present in O. This contradicts revision from the Greek for C *cum suis* {ti N27, AD}.

<sup>175</sup> SOBQDKTMFALW, нещочет JR, възрѣт CTf, помыслитъ P. The Greek is quite difficult {logivshtai}, but CTf have an awkward rendering, which is a hapax in all OCS, according to the *Slovník*, which did not use Tf as a source. In combination 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.

ПРЪВЪЗЪНОШЪ СѦ. ДАСТЪ МИ СѦ ПОСТРЪКАТЕЛЬ ПЛЪТИ. АГГЕЛЪЗ СОТОНИНЪ. ДА МИ ПАКОСТИ ДЪИЕТЪ. ДА НЕ ПРЪВЪЗЪНОШЪ СѦ. 8 О СЕМЬ ТРИ КРАТЫ ГОСПОДОУ МОЛИХЪЗ СѦ. ДА ОТЪСТЪПИТЪ ОТЪ МЕНЕ. 9 И РЕЧЕ МИ ДОВЪЛЪИЕТЪ ТИ БЛАГОДАТЬ МОѦ. СИЛА БО МОѦ ВЪ НЕМОЩИ СЪВЪРЪШАИЕТЪ СѦ. СЛАСТЪНЪЕ ОУБѦ ПАЧЕ ПОХВАЛИТЪ СѦ ВЪ НЕМОЩИ МОИИ. ДА ВЪСЕЛИТЪ СѦ ВЪ МАѦ СИЛА ХРИСТОВА.

### Abbreviations

For the MSS sigla cf. "The Manuscripts and their Description"

<i>A</i>	accusative case
AD	Apostolos; cf. Bibliography ad <i>Apostolos</i>
<i>aor</i>	aorist tense
<i>D</i>	dative case
<i>def</i>	definite form
<i>G</i>	genitive case
GNT	The Greek New Testament; cf. Bibliography ad <i>Aland</i>
<i>I</i>	instrumental case
<i>indef</i>	indefinite form
N27	Novum Testamentum Graece, Stuttgart 1993 <sup>27</sup> .
<i>pf</i>	perfect tense
PIPS	Patriarchal Institute of Patristic Studies, Thessalonike.
<i>pl</i>	plural
<i>pra</i>	present active participle
<i>prep</i>	preposition
<i>sg</i>	singular

### Bibliography

- Aland, B. and K. *et al* (= GNT)  
 1983 *The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart 1983<sup>3</sup>; 1993<sup>4</sup>.  
 Alekseev, A. A., = А.А. Алексеев  
 1984 'О греческой основе славянских библейских переводов'. *Palaeobulgarica* 8(1984):3–22.  
 1986 'Опыт текстологического анализа славянского евангелия', *Palaeobulgarica* 10(1986):8–19.  
 Apostol = Апостоль  
 1991 Апостоль, Дѣянїй и Посланїй святыхъ Апостоль, Jordanville, 1991 (repr.).  
 Apostolos = jАповстолоi, pravxeii kai; ejpistolai; tw'n aJgivwn jАpostovlwn, 1987 jАqh'nai, 1987<sup>2</sup>.  
 Bakker, M.

- 1990 'Discovered on Mount Athos: the Karakalski Apostol', *Palaeobulgarica*, 14(1990):4 sqq.
- 1995 'The Slavonic version in UBS<sup>4</sup>', *Novum Testamentum*, 37(1995):1:92–94. Bakker, M. & Van der Tak, J. G.
- 1994 'Collating Greek and Slavic Apostolos Manuscripts', *Palaeobulgarica*, 18 (1994):32–49.
- Biblia = Библия
- 1992 Библия 1499 года и Библия в синодальном переводе, 8, Москва Bláhová & Hauptová
- 1990 Струмички (Македонски) Апостол, Скопје Bogdanović, D.; B. Velčeva; A. Naumov
- 1986 *L'Apostolos bulgare du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: manuscrit Dečani–Crkolez*, Sofia Čiflyanov, B. D. = Б. Д. Чифлянов
- 1976 Богослужбният чин, преведен от св. братя Кирил и Методий в началото на тяхната моравска мисия, София 1976.
- Colwell, E. C.
- 1969 *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden.
- Horálek, K.
- 1959 'La traduction vieux-slave de l'Évangile', *Byzantinoslavica*, 20(1959): 267–284.
- Jagić, V.
- 1919 *Zum altkirchenslavischen Apostolus*, 1-2, Wien; 3 Wien 1920
- Ilinski, G.A., = Г. А. Илинский
- 1912 Слепченский Апостоль, Москва 1912.
- Kałużniacki, A.
- 1896 *Actus epistulaeque Apostolorum Palaoslovenice ad fidem codicis christi-nopolitani edidit A. Kałużniacki*, Vindobonae 1896.
- Karavidopoulos, J.
- 1988 'L'Édition patriarcale du nouveau Testament (1904). Problèmes de texte et de traduction dans le monde Orthodoxe', *Kleronomia*, 20(1988):195–204.
- Kovačević, R.
- 1979 *The Apostolos of Matica Srpska (13th century)*, Belgrade
- Kul'bakin, S. = С. Кульбакин
- 1907 Охридский Апостоль, Москва 1907.
- Lavrov, P. A. = П. А. Лавров
- 1966 Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности, The Hague, 1966 (repr.).
- Leskien, A.
- 1969 *Handbuch der Altbulgarischen Sprache*, Heidelberg.
- Lunt, H. G.
- 1977 'Limitations of Old Church Slavonic in Representing Greek' in Bruce M. Metzger (ed.), *The Early Versions of the New Testament* Oxford 1977:431 – 442

- Metzger, B.M.  
1975 *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*, London–New York.
- Miklosich, F. von  
1862 *Lexicon palæoslovenico–graeco–latinum emendatum auctum*, Vindobonae (repr. Aalen 1963).
- Nestle, E. and Aland, B. *et al.* (=N27)  
1993 *Novum Testamentum Graece, post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle communiter ediderunt Kurt Aland et al.*, Stuttgart 1993<sup>27</sup>.
- Penev, P., = П. Пенев  
1989 'Към историята на кирило–методиевия старобългарски превод на апостола', Кирилло-методиевски студии, 6 (1989):246–326.
- Robinson, P. M. W.  
1992 *Collate: Interactive Collation of large textual traditions, Version 1*. Computer Program distributed by the Oxford University Centre for Humanities Computing, Oxford.
- Slovník  
1958 *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, Praha.
- Stefanović, D.E  
1989 *Apostolus Sistovacensis anni 1324* Wien.
- Tamanidis, I. C.  
1988 *The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, Thessaloniki, 1988.
- Temčín, S. Yu. = С. Ю. Темчин,  
1993 'Было ли краткоапракосное Евангелие первой славянской книгой, переведенной с греческого', Исследования по славянскому историческому языкознанию, Москва, 1993:13–29.
- 1994 Несклоняемые формы имени иисус в церковнославянских списках евангелия XI–XIV вв., *Valoda*, Daugavpils 1994:57–62.
- Tischendorf, C.  
1859 *Novum Testamentum Graece ad antiquos testes denuo recensuit, apparatus criticum omni studio perfectum apposuit commentationem isagogicam praetexit A.F.C Tischendorf*, Lipsiae.
- Van der Tak, J. G.  
1992 'Der Apostolus Christinopolitanus in neuerer Sicht', *Die Slawischen Sprachen*, 30(1992):95–105, 163–165.
- Voskresenski, G.= Г. Воскресенский  
1892 Послания святого апостола Павла по основнымъ спискамъ четырехъ редакцій рукописнаго славянскаго апостольскаго текста съ различными изъ пятидесяти одной рукописи апостола XII–XVI вв. Сергиев Посад 1892, 1906, 1908.
- Vzdornov, G. I. = Г.И. Вздорнов  
1980 Искусство книги в древней Руси, Москва.