

## THE NEW TESTAMENT LECTIONS IN THE EUCHOLOGIUM SINAITICUM

**Michael Bakker**

*This paper gives a text-critical appraisal of the Apostolos and Gospel lections contained in the Euchologium Sinaiticum on the basis of collations with other Glagolitic and Cyrillic manuscripts. It also tries to shed some light on the history of the Euchologium Sinaiticum and to give recommendations for a critical edition of the Old Slavic New Testament.*

### INTRODUCTION

#### **The Sinai Folia Containing New Testament Lections**

The discovery in 1975 of additional Slavic manuscripts on Mount Sinai was a miraculous event for palaeoslavists. The catalogue published by Tarnanidis in 1988 provided the long-awaited key to the new finds. Fortunately, it provides a great number of photographs and amongst them all the additional folia of the Euchologium Sinaiticum. Naturally, the New Testament lections preserved on these folia have drawn the interest of scholars.<sup>1</sup> In this article it is assumed that Tarnanidis has satisfactorily proven that the folia belong to the Euchologium Sinaiticum.<sup>2</sup>

#### **Collation Method**

I have submitted the New Testament lections in the Euchologium Sinaiticum to the same collation procedure as described in "Collating Greek and Slavic Apostolos Manuscripts" (Bakker & Van der Tak 1994). This collation method consists of four components:

- Entering into the computer of the selected pericopes from all the particip-

---

<sup>1</sup> Bláhová and Alekseev submit them to textual analysis in their reviews. Bláhová concludes that the Gospel lections in the ES are closest to the Assemani Lectionary; Alekseev has quite a different impression: he discerns similarities with the text of the Savva Lectionary. Cf. "Tentative Grouping on the Basis of Shared Readings".

<sup>2</sup> Below (in "Hypotheses Regarding the Euchologium Sinaiticum") I give additional evidence.

ating manuscripts resulting in full, diplomatic and machine-readable transcriptions.

- Automatic collation of the manuscripts.
- Data abstraction from the orthographic and morphological vicissitudes in the manuscripts.
- Construction of a standardised intermediary text which serves as base text for the collations.

This collation method makes it possible to (temporarily) leave the orthographic idiosyncrasies of the copyists aside and to concentrate on the text and its significant variant readings as witnessed by the manuscripts.

### **The Lections and the Manuscripts**

The following Apostolos lections were collated: Acts (Ac) 1.1-5; Romans (Ro) 12.1-3; 1 Corinthians (1Cor) 15.39-45; 2 Corinthians (2Cor) 4.6-15; 6.16-7.1; 9.6-11; Galatians (Ga) 4.4-7; Ephesians (Eph) 4.1-7; 5.8-19; Titus (Tt) 2.11-14, 3.4-7; Hebrews (He) 2.11-18; 12.1-10.

The following Gospel lections were collated: Matthew (Mt) 2.1-12; 3.13-17; 9.9-13; 15.21-28; 20.1-16; 22.2-14; Mark (Mk) 10.32b-45; Luke (Lk) 1.24-38; 6.1-10; 6.31-36; 11.1b-13<sup>1</sup>; 12.32-40; John (Jn) 6.40-44.

The lections from the ES were entered on the basis of the reproductions in Tarnanidis' catalogue and Nahtigal's edition.

Next follow the sigla of the other manuscripts and their respective editions:

- As Assemani Gospel Lectionary: Ivanova-Mavrodinova & Džurova 1981.
- Zo Zographou Gospel: Jagić 1879.
- Ma Marianus Gospel: Jagić 1883.
- Os Ostromir Gospel Lectionary: Ostromirovo Evangelie 1988.
- Sa Savva Gospel Lectionary: Ščepkin 1903.
- Iv Tsar Ivan Alexander Gospel: Živkova 1980.
- Ni Nikola Gospel: Daničić 1864.
- Ko Kochno Gospel Lectionary: Kossev 1986.
- Ms Mstislav Gospel Lectionary: Žukovskaja 1983.
- Y Vajs Gospel: Vajs 1935a, 1935b, 1936a, 1936b.
- SA Slepče Apostolos Lectionary: Ilinskij 1912.
- OA Ohrid Apostolos Lectionary: Kul'bakin 1907.
- RA Strumica Apostolos Lectionary: Bláhová & Hauptová 1990.

---

<sup>1</sup> ES omits verses 5-8.

- BA Šišatovac Apostolos Lectionary: Stefanović 1989.  
 TA Crkolez Apostolos: Bogdanović 1986.  
 CA Christinopol Apostolos: Kałużniacki 1896.  
 KA Karakallou Apostolos: cod. Athos, Karakallou, 294;  
 cf. Bakker 1990.  
 MA Matica Apostolos: Kovačević 1979.

### **Limitations of this paper**

For Bakker & Van der Tak 1994 we used, roughly speaking, as many manuscripts as we could find editions or microfilms of. Since then I have come to the conclusion that it is useful to have a smaller set of ‘constant witnesses’<sup>1</sup> in order to limit the amount of variant readings and to become fully aware of the characteristics of the participating manuscripts.

For both the Gospel and the Apostolos lections the oldest extant manuscripts were used. Since the collated Gospel manuscripts are relatively older than the collated Apostolos manuscripts, the two collations are not on equal footing. In this article the younger, so-called ‘Fourth Recension’ manuscripts remain outside our scope of interest.

## **THE COLLATION METHOD**

### **Diplomatic Transcription of the Manuscripts**

In addition to the Apostolos and Gospel lections in the ES, I entered the same lections from other Old Slavic manuscripts into the computer *in extenso*. The resulting transcription files of the manuscripts form the basis of the collation method. Precisely how diplomatic they should be still remains a matter of debate.<sup>2</sup> Because the modern day transcriber makes the same mistakes as any medieval copyist, the transcription files are repeatedly

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Nestle-Aland 1983 (Introduction p. 10).

<sup>2</sup> It is important for future co-operation and exchange of data that palaeoslavists agree on a set of transcription guidelines. It is now already possible to send transcription-files from one side of the world to the other electronically.

I entered the Glagolitic manuscripts in Cyrillic transcription. If a good screen and print font of Glagolitic for the Apple Macintosh computer becomes available, it will be very easy to change the appearance of a transcription file to Glagolitic, because there is a one-to-one relationship between the Glagolitic and the Cyrillic transcription. Naturally, it is desirable to have Glagolitic on screen, when entering Glagolitic manuscripts, in order to gain experience of the scribal pitfalls of this writing system (e.g. similar letters; cf. “Graphic Similarity”).

checked with the manuscripts. This error checking can largely be performed on the basis of the collations. Since the layout of the manuscripts is preserved, it is relatively easy to compare the transcription-file to the manuscript and to see whether words are missing or have been inadvertently added to a line.

### **Collation of the Manuscripts**

I collated the computerised transcriptions of the manuscripts automatically using the computer program *Collate* (Robinson 1992) as described in Bakker & Van der Tak 1994. *Collate* is a flexible and straightforward program which allows the user to generate collations at any time and under differing circumstances on the basis of the transcription files. While collating, it produces a list of variant readings, i.e. all the differences of the manuscripts with the base text.

### **Orthographic and Morphological Data Abstraction**

In comparison to Greek minuscule manuscripts (which are orthographically much more stable, cf. Bakker & Van der Tak 1994) *Collate* produces huge lists of variants for Slavic manuscripts. Since *Collate* automatically marks a word as a variant even if the difference consists of one jer, the lists contains a myriad of petty spelling variants. This severely obscures the view of a researcher who wants to concentrate on the underlying text rather than the surface of spelling conventions (or lack of them) in Slavic manuscripts. Fortunately, *Collate* offers two powerful means to reduce the number of text-critically less interesting variant readings:

- *Replace*

Before the collation process starts this feature replaces certain characters according to a predetermined list (the transcription files themselves remain inviolate, because the changes are made in copies of these files which are discarded after the collation has been completed). For example, ѿ becomes o and ѡ becomes ѡ. Iotation is removed by the following rules: ѿ → ѿ, ѿ → ѿ, ѿ → ѿ, ѿ → ѿ and the jers are simply removed by replacing them with nothing.

- *Regularisation*

This remarkable feature of *Collate* makes it possible to regularise words from all or certain manuscripts. For example, ѿѡ becomes ѿѡ and ѿѡ becomes ѿѡ. The rule ѿѡ → ѿѡ is only valid for Serb manuscripts and besides has to be restricted to occurrences of the reflexive pronoun. In fact, *Collate* can be instructed to this effect.

It should be stressed that the transcription-files themselves remain intact

and available for further analysis. If, at a later date, I want to study, for example, the morphological characteristics of certain manuscripts, I can make a collation with a less rigorous level of data abstraction or even without any abstraction.<sup>1</sup>

### **Standardised Base Text: Intermediary Text**

*Regularisation* asks for a standard to which to regularise the different realisations of a word. To abstract from the many different writings of ‘Bethlehem’ (e.g. ВИФЛЕЕМ, ВИФЛЕОМ, ВИТЛѢИМ; in the cited words *Replace* has already removed the jers and the yod), I chose the spelling of the Slovník: ВИТЬЛЕЕМЪ (in the text file; after *Replace*: ВИТЛЕЕМ). The forms ТАКѢШЮМОУ, -ШЮМОУ, -ШОМОУ and -ШОУМОУ I regularised to -ШОУЕМОУ (in the text file; after *Replace*: -ШОУЕМОУ). By means of *Regularisation* these and similar variants are prevented from ‘spoiling’ the list of variants. A step that naturally follows from this process of standardisation is the creation of a separate text file made up of standardised forms. Before presenting the merits of such an ‘intermediary’ text I will discuss the problems of using a manuscript as base text for the collation.

It would have been natural to use ES as the base text for the collations. ES, however, has its orthographic/phonetic (во, passim), morphological (ДАЖДИ, passim), lexical (ИЗБИЛОВАТИ vs. ИЗБЫТЪЧСТВОВАТИ, f.19r *bis*) and textual (addition/omission of words, see “Classification of Variants”) idiosyncrasies. Every manuscript to a greater or lesser extent contains singular readings which isolate it from the other manuscripts. Often these readings can be described as secondary or simply mistakes of the copyist. For instance, in Mt 22.10 (f.106v) ES reads СЕВЪРАША ВСА ОБРѢТѢ, while As Zo Ma Os Iv Ko Ni read СЗЕВЪРАША ВЪСА ѠЖЕ ОБРѢТѢ (ОБРѢТОША Os Iv Ni). If ES were the base text, the other manuscripts would be listed as having an addition, although in ES ѠЖЕ has probably been omitted by mistake. Of course, it is possible to use ES as the ‘manuscript de base’<sup>2</sup> and to remove evident cases of corruption from it. However, this approach calls for the creation of a separate file, since we want the transcription file of ES to remain intact.

If this separate file containing a more or less abstracted text is made orthographically and morphologically consistent, one can regularise to the

---

<sup>1</sup> In the apparatus that accompanies some of the editions of Slavic manuscripts data abstraction is performed as well. If orthographically slightly differing variants would each be mentioned separately, the apparatus would turn into a veritable ‘Variantenfriedhof’.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Bédier 1928.

words of this file. And if it is used as a collation base the collation becomes more stable. Experience has taught us that such an intermediary text contributes considerably to the success of the collation process.

It should be noted that the intermediary text is only a tool for researchers interested in the text rather than the individual manuscripts. I give it the name ‘x’ to emphasise the fact that it is not claimed to be a reconstruction of the original. The orthography is based on Cyrillic rather than Glagolitic writing and the morphology largely on Leskien’s grammar. The main requirement is that the orthographic and morphological rules are consistently applied.<sup>1</sup> *Collate* offers the possibility to change the base text; it is therefore always possible to switch back to a manuscript.

Below follows a sample from an ‘output file’ collated by the computer (Mk 10.36). Each word from the ‘data-abstracted’ intermediary text is followed by the manuscript sigla. Every character appears in Cyrillic, even the word ‘OMITTED’.

исоус \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс  
 же \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс  
 рече \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс  
 има \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс  
 что \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс  
 хощета \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс  
 да \_ ЁС Ас Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс / ОМИТТЕДА, Зо  
 створѣ \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Ив Ни Мс / творѣ Са  
 вама \_ ЁС Ас Зо Ма Ос Са Ив Ни Мс

### The Modification of the Intermediary Text

The computer collates and performs data abstraction according to the given instructions. I constructed the intermediary text more or less automatically by applying orthographic and morphological standardisation and removing evident scribal errors. Naturally, the intermediary text and the other transcription files needed to be checked and recollated.

---

<sup>1</sup> The rules themselves can be changed on the basis of the collated manuscripts (on which Leskien is also based). The computer allows us to make global changes in the intermediary text quite easily. The basis for the intermediary text is one of the manuscripts. This need not necessarily be the *codex optimus* (textually speaking). We prefer the manuscript that can be orthographically and morphologically standardised in the easiest and quickest way (an East Slavic manuscript is often a good candidate).

When two or more variants that are not obvious corruptions opposed each other, I had to make a choice. Since at this early stage I am not trying to reconstruct the original, I most often picked the variant that makes the list of variants as small as possible, i.e. the one supported by the majority of manuscripts. However, *manuscripta ponderantur, non numerantur*. A variant supported by one manuscript, or attested in none of the manuscripts, can eventually be ruled to be the original reading. Here the crucial discipline of textual criticism<sup>1</sup> comes into play.

### TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF OLD SLAVIC MANUSCRIPTS

A textual critic wants to account for the variants attested by the manuscripts. How and why were different readings created during the transmission of the text? “There is no textological fact, if it is not explained.”<sup>2</sup> Without analysing and classifying the variants it is impossible to give a text-critical appraisal of the manuscripts. Here follow a number of aspects for consideration:

- Significant or insignificant

I disregarded linguistic phenomena like the replacement of root aorists in Os and Iv as textologically insignificant. Fortunately, this type of information is preserved in the transcription files and can be used when studying the history of individual manuscripts.

- Singular or group

The term ‘singular reading’ is of course relative, because a manuscript, being the sole witness of a variant among the collated manuscripts, can have numerous allies among the manuscripts that are not collated.

- Original or secondary

On the basis of intrinsic considerations—in this case our knowledge of the Old Slavic language—we can safely judge  $\text{и}\Delta\bar{\text{н}}$  to be the original form and  $\text{и}\Delta\text{ош}\bar{\text{а}}$  the innovation. Most scribal errors can also be unmasked as secondary readings, but for the analysis of many variants more internal and external evidence is needed. A beautiful example of an obvious secondary or tertiary reading is given under “Graphic and Linguistic Innovation, Syntactical”.

- Intentional or unintentional

Related to the previous opposition is the question: did a copyist change the

---

<sup>1</sup> Known in the Slavic domain as ‘textology’.

<sup>2</sup> Lixačev 1983: 553.

aorist suffix on purpose or accidentally? Very often this question is difficult to answer. If every occurrence of a root aorist has consistently been changed, a scribe has probably made a conscious revision of the text.<sup>1</sup>

- Corruption or revision

Every intentional or unintentional change of the original text arisen during the course of the text transmission could be called corruption. But if a conscious and sensible revision of the text is made, this altered text could be regarded as a new translation. The revision of the Slavic text on the basis of Greek manuscripts goes much ‘deeper’ than orthographic and linguistic innovation.

- Genetic kinship or independence

If manuscripts share a variant this does not necessarily prove a family relationship, because copyists can commit the same scribal error independently of each other.<sup>2</sup> A special case of this text-critical dilemma is the following opposition:

- Inner-Slavic or Greek-Slavic

Certain variants have parallels in the Greek manuscript tradition. This can point to subsequent external influence on the original Slavic text. However, this need not always be the case: parallel variants may have arisen independently of each other, because the scribal tendencies of corrupting and ‘improving’ texts are universal.

In Lk 11.13 there is limited Greek and versional support<sup>3</sup> for πνεῦμα ἄγαθόν instead of πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Each reading could have given rise to the other. On the basis of external evidence (i.e. the number of manuscripts and their geographical distribution) and the occurrence of ἀγαθὰ in the first part of the verse, πνεῦμα ἄγαθόν is judged to be a secondary reading in *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Metzger 1971). Of the collated Slavic manuscripts ES As Zo Sa Iv Ni have БЛАГЪ; Ma сѣтѣ, Os twice сѣтъи and Ms twice сѣтѣ. It is plausible that the former reading was the original Slavic reading. The readings in Ma Os Ms could then have arisen

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bakker & Van der Tak 1994: 37. On this page, in the section “Orthographic and Morphological Standardisation”, the words “standardise, standardized, standardised and standardisation” occur. This inconsistent spelling was—no doubt unintentionally—introduced by the copyist of our autograph.

<sup>2</sup> Metzger (1968: 173) quotes Pasquali: “coincidence in ‘trivializzazioni’ does not prove relationship between manuscripts”.

<sup>3</sup> According to *The Greek New Testament*<sup>4</sup>: ⲡ<sup>45</sup> L 1211 1384 1387 1770 1773 11780 it<sup>aur</sup> vg syr<sup>hmg</sup> slav<sup>mss</sup> Cyril<sup>1/2</sup>, Augustine. In the third edition the apparatus mentions additional Greek lectionaries.



en under influence of Greek manuscript(s) containing the majority reading. It is, however, also possible that the copyists of Ma Os Ms (or their ancestors) committed a scribal error: changing the less familiar combination of ‘good spirit’ to ‘holy spirit’ or ‘the holy spirit’.<sup>1</sup>

In Lk 1.27 Os reads  $\mu\sigma\sigma\iota\phi\zeta\prime\ \sigma\tau\zeta\ \delta\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\iota\ \sigma\check{\upsilon}\check{\sigma}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\bar{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\upsilon\alpha$ , while ES As Zo Ma Iv Ni Ms read  $\mu\sigma\sigma\iota\phi\zeta\prime\ \sigma\tau\zeta\ \delta\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\alpha$ . This addition of Os has a direct parallel in Greek manuscripts (καὶ πατρίας  $\times$  C L f<sup>1</sup> 700. 1424 a). An alternative explanation to Greek influence could be that  $\mu\iota\ \sigma\check{\upsilon}\check{\sigma}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$  is a gloss intruding into the text, but this seems less likely.

## CLASSIFICATION OF VARIANTS

The following classification of textological phenomena<sup>2</sup> aims to give an impression of the variants that remain after data abstraction has been performed. If a reading is shared by more than one manuscript, it is given in its ‘abstracted’ form, i.e. after *Replace* and *Regularisation* have done their work. If they agree with the intermediary text, however, I cite this text (in its ‘unabstracted’ form). The context is in most cases provided by the intermediary text file.<sup>3</sup>

### Clear-cut Corruption

Sometimes the only explanation for a certain variant is that the copyist blundered. Obvious scribal errors are likely to remain without offspring in a uncontrolled tradition, because, to combat these errors, more than one manuscript is used to check this type of transmission. Nastier ones, of

---

<sup>1</sup> For Os and Ms this seems, however, less likely because both occurrences of the verse (in the Synaxarion and the Menologion) agree. This could point to consistent revision. On the other hand, the Slavic Apostolos manuscripts collated for Bakker & Van der Tak 1994 did not display a high degree of ‘intratextual’ consistency. Besides, two of the collated Greek lectionaries in one of the two occurrences of Acts 17.19 (example 5) added a negation (one manuscript, however, in the Synaxarion, the other in the Menologion): probably an example of how a variant reading can arise by itself.

<sup>2</sup> Loosely based on Tov 1992 and Colwell 1965.

<sup>3</sup> This text, therefore, receives the role of basis for comparison, although it is only preliminary and operational. Certain variants clearly deserve their prominent place in the intermediary text, but the case for others still has to be argued. Thus a variant labelled as omission could just as well be the original reading (the variant in the base text being an addition); cf. Colwell 1965: 373: “When the classification of readings is based upon these descriptive categories [i.e. omission, addition, transposition and substitution, *MB*], the student has tacitly assumed knowledge which he has not yet attained”.

course, stay on and give rise to the diversity attested in the manuscripts. There are many examples of clear-cut corruption that are difficult to classify under one of the following headings. For example, ES reads  $\text{NAMZ}$  instead of  $\text{BAMZ}$  in Lk 11.9 and in 2Cor 4.12 it is the only manuscript to change ( $\text{CZMPPTZ OYBO}$ )  $\text{BZ NACZ D\text{B}E\text{T}B CA' (\Delta \text{ЖИВОТЗ BZ BAC'})}$  in  $\text{BZ BACZ DECATZ CA}$  (f.17r) thus rendering the opposition senseless. The Glagolitic  $\text{ч}$  and  $\text{ѣ}$  are not very similar, so this does not absolve the copyist of ES. The corruption of  $\text{D\text{B}E\text{T}B}$  into  $\text{DECATZ}$  probably came about under the influence of the following  $\text{CA}$ .

### Minuses

Letters and sometimes whole phrases can be omitted, when the eye of the scribe makes a fatal jump (*saut du même au même*).

#### • Haplography

In Mt 2.4  $\text{CZEPABZ B\text{C}FA \text{APXIEPEA}}$  (As Os Ni Ms) opposes  $\text{CBPA B\text{C}FA \text{APXIEPEA}}$  (ES Sa Iv Ko; Zo Ma do not contain this verse). The latter reading has probably arisen through omission of the second occurrence of  $\text{B(Л)}$ .<sup>1</sup>

#### • Parablepsis (homoioteleuton, homoioarcton)

In Ga 4.7, OA BA TA were corrupted through homoioteleuton: they read  $\text{жe}$  instead  $\text{жe OYжe}$ .

SA and MA omit the last part of 1Cor 15.44 by shifting from the first occurrence of  $\text{TEBO DOYXOBHO}$  to the second ( $\text{BZCTAETZ TEBO DOYXOBHO. A\text{C}E \text{KCTZ TEBO DOY\text{C}H\text{B}HO' \text{KCTZ TEBO DOYXOBHO}$ ). In the following verse OA makes a similar but less obvious scribal error: they jump from  $\text{DOY\text{C}H\text{B}}$   $\text{ЖИВ\text{O}ТВОРИЩ\text{E}}$  to  $\text{DOY\text{C}XZ}$   $\text{ЖИВОТВОРИЩ\text{E}}$ .

#### • Omissions

Scribal inattention can result in omissions. In Mt 3.16 Zo renders the following clause in an anacoluthon by omitting the last word:  $\text{OTBPC\text{A} CA \text{KEMOY NEBCA}}$ .<sup>2</sup> It is, of course, also possible that the scribe left out word(s) from the antigraph(s) of which he could not make sense.

### Pluses

A scribe seems inclined to add rather than to omit.

<sup>1</sup> The opposite explanation—that the latter reading gave rise to the former through ditto-graphy—is less likely, because, on the basis of the Greek evidence, the former is probably the original.

<sup>2</sup> Zo Os I Sa Iv Ni Ms have  $\text{OTBPO\text{C}A}$  vs. ES As  $\text{OTBPC\text{A}}$ .

- Dittography

The opposite of haplography is dittography: writing the same letter(s) or word(s) twice. For example, ES has a singular reading in the beginning of Eph 5.19 (ΓΛΑΓΟΛΙΨΙΣΕ ΣΕΒΕΪ ΒΖ ΠΣΑΛΜΙΧΖ.) by writing ΒΖ for ΣΕΒΕΪ as well. As reads in Mt 2.10 ΒΖΖΔΡΑΔΟΒΑΨΑΔ ΣΑ ΡΑΔΟΨΙΨ ΡΑΔΟΨΙΨ ΒΕΛΙΕΨ ΣΨΛΟ.

ES contains special cases of doubling: the last letters of f. 23r are Ψ ΠΟΨΖ and the beginning of the verso side reads: Ψ ΠΟΨΖΛΛΒΖ. Something similar occurs on f. 16 in Lk 11.4. This type of deliberate dittography occurs, of course, especially in service books. In ES, however, Ψ ΠΟΨΖ on the recto side is not marked as a catchword, so it could also be a simple transcriptional error by the copyist. The doubling of ΡΑΔΟΨΙΨ in As can be the result of a catchword in the antigraph.

- Conflations of readings

When a scribe was not able to choose between competing variants in the manuscripts before him, he could combine them into one reading in the new copy. The resulting conflate reading is a clear indication of a contaminated transmission, in which more than one exemplar was used by the copyist. For instance, in Lk 1.29 ES As Ma Os Ni read ΒΙΔΨΒΖΨΙΨΙ, while Zo Iv read ΣΛΨΨΑΒΨΨΙ. Ms combines these variants into: ΣΛΨΨΑΨ Ι ΒΙΔΨΒΖΨΙΨΙ.

In Mt 20.1 (ΙΖΙΔΕ) ΚΟΥΠΨΝΟ ΟΥΨΡΟ is supported by As Zo Ma Iv Ni. Sa replaces ΚΟΥΠΨΝΟ ΟΥΨΡΟ with ΖΑ ΟΥΨΡΑ; Os Ms<sup>1</sup> with ΚΟΥΠΨΝΟ ΖΑ ΟΥΨΡΑ and ES reads simply ΟΥΨΡΟ.<sup>2</sup> The Greek word ἄμα is probably the culprit for this confusion, because it is an adverb (‘at the same time’, ‘together’) as well as a preposition (in combination with πρῶτ: ‘early in the morning’). Os Ms combine the renderings ΚΟΥΠΨΝΟ ΟΥΨΡΟ (As Zo Ma Iv Ni) and ΖΑ ΟΥΨΡΑ (Sa) into one reading. This could be a conflate reading.

- Additions

Some pluses were caused not so much by the scribe’s inaccuracy, as by the conscious or unconscious tendency to make the text smoother, more explicit and understandable. In most cases the result is accretion of the text.

In Lk 6.1 (ΓΑΔΨΑΧΨ ΙΨΤΙΡΑΨΨΙΨΕ) ΡΨΚΑΜΑ is supported by As Zo Ma Iv; ES

<sup>1</sup> This is Ms’s reading for March 9th; on Wednesday of the 8th week after Pentecost it reads ΔΒΙΕ ΖΑ ΟΥΨΡΑ.

<sup>2</sup> ES—or rather its ancestor(s)— can probably be counted as supporting the former reading, because it is likelier that its variant arose from the former rather than from the latter reading.

Ni read ρῥκαми and Os ρῥκαми своими.<sup>1</sup> Os makes the text more explicit.

In He 12.9 ES and RA add ичз то срамлѣдохомз сѣа. This is an expansion that makes perfect sense and occurs in modern translations as well.<sup>2</sup>

A special case of addition is the result of ‘liturgical reflexes’. The manuscripts were copied and used in an environment where the scribes were imbued with liturgical phrases by daily singing and recitation. For example, the addition of вѣка by ES and вѣкоу by Ma to вѣкы in 2Cor 9.9 (matched by a number of Greek uncials and minuscules) was probably induced by the twofold occurrence of this word in prayers etc.

ES has a tendency to expand the name исоуѣз (īc) to исоуѣз христосз (īc хc) in the Apostolos lections (passim).

### Transpositions

Changes in the order of words occur frequently in the manuscripts. Most of these transpositions, however, are singular readings. In Lk 11.13, for instance, Os’s reading чадомз вашимз дати is opposed by дати чадомз вашимз (ES As Zo Ma Os Sa Iv Ni). A possible source of transpositions is the limited memory span of the scribes.

### Substitution

#### • Graphic similarity

In Lk 12.39 ES reads и еже instead of се же (As Zo Ma Os Sa Iv Ni). This variant can easily be explained by the similarity of ж and з in the Glagolitic alphabet.

ES OA RA replace in 2Cor 4.14 (the abbreviation of) исоуѣсомь with ним. In this case the two words are relatively dissimilar in Glagolitic as well as in Cyrillic, which decreases the chance that this error arose independently.

#### • Phonetic similarity

<sup>1</sup> The dual is probably the original reading on the basis of the manuscripts that support it. Besides external evidence, intrinsic evidence should also be considered. Is the dual common in similar cases, i.e. when the total number is actually more than two?

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Russian Synodal, English RSV, Dutch NBG. The original Old Slavic translation is generally assumed to be quite free, so why not in these cases? One can envisage the possibility that ES as sole manuscript among the collated manuscripts, preserved the original reading. The other manuscripts could then bear the marks of subsequent revision that brought the text slavishly into line with the Greek original.

Finally, there is the possibility that a Greek manuscript adding αὐτῶν is the source of ρῥκαми своими. This is one of the numerous examples showing that textual criticism of versions like the Old Slavic is more difficult than that of the Greek original itself.

In the same verse OA has a singular reading that could be explained as the result of dictation or internal recitation: ѡБРѢТЪЗ ПОСТАВИТЪЗ instead of ПРѢДЪЗ-ПОСТАВИТЪЗ.

- Semantic similarity

A word can also be replaced in the mind of a scribe by a word which is semantically close. For example, SA reads in He 12.9 БОГОУ instead of ОТЬ-ЦОУ, ES in Eph 5.10 БОГОВИ instead of ГОСПОДЕВИ<sup>1</sup> and in Lk 6.8 Ма reads ЧЛВѢКОВИ and Os ЧЛОВѢКОУ instead of МЯЖЕВИ.

- Harmonisation

In the Synoptic Gospels quite a number of parallel passages occur. These can, of course, influence each other.<sup>2</sup>

In Mt 2.4 ES adds и СТАРЦА before the last word in АРХИЕРЕНА и КЗНИЖНИКЫ ЛЮДСКЫЯ (As Os Sa Iv; Ni reads ИЮДЫСКИЕ). A parallel of this variant (without ЛЮДСКЫЯ) is found in Mk 14.53. It is, however, not likely that the addition in ES was made under the influence of exactly this parallel passage. Given the amount of corruption in ES, this example should probably simply be listed under “Additions”.<sup>3</sup>

- Lexical variation

Since this type of variation between manuscripts is the most conspicuous, it has been a classical object of study by palaeoslavists.<sup>4</sup> It is, however, not a reliable tool for diagnostic purposes, since it is difficult to pinpoint the source of a particular change. Does Os read in Lk 6.6 СБОРИЩЕ instead of СЗНЬМИЩЕ, because the latter was unfamiliar to the scribe, or were these words freely interchangeable?

---

<sup>1</sup> In this respect, ES joins the Greek manuscripts D\* F G 81\*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Metzger 1971: xxcii: “Scribes would frequently bring divergent passages into harmony with one another.”

<sup>3</sup> Consider the words of G. Salmon quoted in Metzger 1971: 284: “the tendency of scribes to refuse to allow two words to part company which usually go together (such as eating and drinking, fasting and praying, wives and children), and when one occurs to add the other, with or without authority.” Although the Slovník is not a concordance, the examples it gives under the entries ЛЮДСКЪЗ and СТАРЦЪ suggest that these words frequently occur together.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. V. Jagić in “Zum Altkirchenslavischen Apostolus”. I, II, *Sitzungsber. KAW*, Wien 1919; III, 1920.

In Eph 5.18 KA MA<sup>1</sup> read instead of БЛ҃҃ДЗ (ὁσωτία) the calque НЕСЗПА-СЕНИИЕ: possibly an example of a gloss that intruded into the text. CA reads БЛОУДЗ, but contains in 1Pe 4.4 the calque<sup>2</sup>, while SA BA KA MA read БЛ҃҃ДЗ.

- Orthographic/phonological variation

Here the causes of change are manifold as well. Not only do we have to reckon with the results of shifting phonological systems of the scribes' dialects, but also with the conservative and innovative forces governing the use of not one, but two scripts. The lack of orthographic consistency is the greatest source of variants. A scribe sometimes writes the same word in two different ways on the same folium.<sup>3</sup>

- Morphological variation

This category overlaps with the previous and the following one. Consider, for instance, the interchange in ES of ТЕБЕ/ТЕБѢ and СЕБЕ/СЕБѢ where the other manuscripts agree on either the accusative or the dative (e.g. in Mt 2.6 (їс ТЕБѢ) and Mt 3.14 (отз ТЕБѢ)). The reading оцѣстит себе люди израадны of ES TA in Tt 2.14 is grammatically and theologically unacceptable.

The forms ДАЖДИ (Mt 20.8, Mk 10.37), словеси (genitive; Mt 15.23) and ДЕСЯТИ (locative, Mt 20.6) in ES seem to be cases of morphological innovation.

In many manuscripts verbal endings are changed. The cause of this phenomenon could be unfamiliarity of the scribes with the verbal inflexions. In Ga 4.4 ES reads придет instead of (їгдд) придет (коньчина лѣтоу) and in the next verse ES is joined by MA in reading примет instead of примемъ. In Zo Ni значатъ is replaced by значнет (Lk 1.36). In Tt 2.12 ES changes the

---

<sup>1</sup> Joined by cod. Moskva, GIM, Voskresenskij 30p (f.17v): an 11th century copy of the *Pandects of Antiochus*.

<sup>2</sup> This 'imitatio mechanica vocis græcæ' is listed in the *Slovník*, although it is a *hapax legomenon* in CA and does not occur anywhere else in its base of manuscripts. It is accompanied in 1Pe 4.4 by БЛОУДЗМЪ in the margin. Because the commentary in the margin of CA wraps around the gloss and the writing is similar, the gloss appears to be written by a contemporary corrector or even the copyist himself. Besides, the accompanying commentary contains the word БЛОУЖЕНИЕ and not the calque.

<sup>3</sup> The Slavic manuscripts could in this respect be compared to certain Greek papyri. In his study of corruption in a number of Gospel papyri Colwell (1965: 374) makes the following comment: "Why did the scribes of these papyri create this mass of singular readings? The first reason is their lack of ability to spell."

participle ОТЗВРЗГЗШЕ to ОТЗВРЗЖЕМЗ.

- Syntactical variation

The competition between accusative and genitive (with animate beings) and between (possessive) genitive and dative deserves systematic attention. In certain cases most manuscripts agree on either member of these two oppositions, but in other cases it is difficult to say which form was original. There are several instances where one or more manuscripts have adnominal  $\kappa\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon$  instead of adnominal  $\kappa\epsilon\gamma\omicron$  and vice versa (e.g. in Lk 6.6 and Lk 6.30). In the following phrase (in 2Cor 4.13), however,  $\kappa\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon$  is not interchangeable, because it is the definite article of ПЬСАНОУКЕМОУ: ИМѢЩЕ ЖЕ ТЗЖДЕ ДОУХЗ ВЪРЪ ПО ПЬСАНОУКЕМОУ (κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον). ES TA have the obviously secondary (or even tertiary) ПИСАН(И)Ю ЕГО, OA and RA seem to have been corrupted even further; they read, respectively: СПЪАНИЮ ЕГО and ПИСАНИѢ ЕГО.

In ES there is a strong tendency towards analytical constructions. It reads, for instance, in Lk 11.4 ОСТАВИ ОТЗ НАСЗ ГРѢХЫ НАША instead of ОСТАВИ НАМЗ ГРѢХЫ НАША.

- Stylistic change

In Mk 10.37 ES Sa Iv Ms replace  $\text{и } \kappa\epsilon\delta\iota\text{нз}$  with  $\Delta$  ДРОУГЫ in ДАЖДЬ НАМА' ДА  $\kappa\epsilon\delta\iota\text{нз}$  О ДЕСНѢИѢ ТЕБЕ' И  $\kappa\epsilon\delta\iota\text{нз}$  О ШОУИѢ ТЕБЕ САДЕВѢ. Given their innovative tendencies, their reading is probably secondary. No doubt it is a genuine 'Slavic' means to create an opposition. However, the reading of As Zo Ma Os Ni, which follows the Greek (twice εἶς), seems to be preferable, because the text does not contain a real opposition.

ES opposes the rest in Lk 1.32, where it reads the more 'Slavic' adjective ДѢЗ instead of the genitive (прѣстолз) ДАВИДА.

- Variation in punctuation

The division of the text into clauses can give information about the interpretation of the text and the filiation of the manuscripts. For example, in the verse mentioned "Syntactical Variation" (ИМѢЩЕ ЖЕ ТЗЖДЕ ДОУХЗ ВЪРЪ ПО ПЬСАНОУКЕМОУ. ВЪРОВАХЗ ТЕМЬ ЖЕ И ВЗЗГЛАГОЛАХЗ...) ES OA have a punctuation mark between ДОУХЗ and ВЪРЪ, although these words belong together.

- Erasure/correction

A special case of change is subsequent correction by the scribe himself or

another person. In Mt 2.12 Os reads ВЗВРАТИТИ instead of ВЗВРАТИША. If one examines the picture in the facsimile edition, however, one notices a different colour under the last two letters of this word. It is therefore possible that Os previously had the same reading as the other manuscripts.

It is not surprising that scribes made errors. What is remarkable, however, is that in most collated manuscripts they were subsequently not corrected. A glaring mistake like the dittography in As referred to above could easily have been remedied by erasing one of the occurrences of the word.

### PRELIMINARY APPRAISAL OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

Here follows a superficial textual assessment of the participating manuscripts:

#### The Gospel Lections

- The ES displays a comparatively high level of corruption. Most of the variants can be explained as scribal errors.
- As shares this characteristic with ES, but has its own singular readings.
- Among the collated Gospel manuscripts Zo Ma take the middle ground: they differ relatively less from the intermediary text<sup>1</sup>. They can, however, hardly be grouped together because of the variants they do not share.
- Since Sa contains only 65% of the collated text, it is difficult to draw conclusions. Its singular readings (part of them clearly secondary) seem to banish it to a peripheral position.
- Apart from the linguistic innovation Iv shares with Os and Sa it seems to bear the marks of textual revision.
- Ni and Ko are clear examples of the maxim *recentiores non deteriores*. Despite their linguistic innovation and occasional lapses, these manuscripts compare well with the oldest manuscripts.
- Ms stands even farther apart from the rest than Iv. Its variants seem to be the result of a conscious editorial effort.
- Y is both orthographically and morphologically very stable, and its text differs in only a few cases from the intermediary text.<sup>2</sup> Because it does not contain the nonsensical scribal errors attested in the other manuscripts, it is almost certainly the product of careful revision or recension. Since Y is a

---

<sup>1</sup> Which is itself to a large extent the greatest common denominator of the manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup> In fact, Y formed the basis for the intermediary text of the Gospel lections. After scanning into the computer the lections from Vajs' editions, I made a few changes in the orthography. On the basis of the collations I modified the text in 22 places.



bilingual codex (cf. the Greek-Latin codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis), it could even be a new translation. Its archaic features, however, seem to belie this hypothesis. This unique Slavic monument not only provides glosses from other Slavic codices, its Greek text is also accompanied by an intricate *apparatus criticus*. It is surprising that it has received so little attention among slavists.

### The Apostolos Lections

The collated Apostolos manuscripts are considerably younger than the collated Gospel manuscripts. They display much more orthographic and linguistic diversity; their level of corruption seems to be higher as well. In some places it is difficult to pick from among the variants a reading that makes sense and is grammatically sound.

- ES has a considerable number of singular readings.
- SA occupies a relatively isolated position among its counterparts on account of its great number of unique variants.
- OA is also severely corrupted; its variants tend to be nonsensical.
- RA scores highest on the corruption scale. It differs sharply from the other manuscripts with respect to its manifold omissions.<sup>1</sup>
- BA is not very conspicuous: apart from an occasional lapse it keeps the middle road.
- This is even more the case for TA.
- In Bakker & Van der Tak 1994 we indicated that CA bears the marks of revision and subsequent influence from Greek manuscripts. For example, in 2Cor 4.14 only this carefully executed manuscript omits *cz* and thus brings itself—maybe accidentally—into line with the Greek Byzantine text type.<sup>2</sup>
- KA is a comparably stable manuscript.
- MA contains a mixture of nonsensical readings and conscious changes.

### TENTATIVE GROUPING ON THE BASIS OF SHARED READINGS

When data abstraction is applied, the list of variants shrinks dramatically. And if one disregards readings attested in only one of the collated manu-

---

<sup>1</sup> A plausible explanation would be that the scribe was copying from one already severely corrupted manuscript and that he preferred omitting words to writing nonsense.

<sup>2</sup> Represented by  $\aleph$  in the fourth edition of *The Greek New Testament*, it has  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$  instead of  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ . Regrettably, CA was chosen to represent (together with BA) the Slavic Apostolos in this edition (cf. Bakker 1994).

scripts, a surprisingly stable text emerges. On the basis of variants shared by the Gospel manuscripts no clear pattern of groups can be discerned. Against the background of changing coalitions ES and As seem to team up slightly more than the rest.

It is of course premature to form groups or families, especially on the basis of such limited and raw material. However, one distinct group of Apostolos manuscripts started to surface during the analysis of the lists of variants: CA KA MA. These manuscripts (and only they) add МѢСТО in 2Cor 6.18 and И СВАТѢ in Ro 12.1; in 2Cor 6.16 they read ВЫ (БО) ХРАМЪ ЕСТЬ instead of МЫ ЦРЬКЗВИ ИСМЪ. KA and MA share the calque НЕСЪПАСЕНИЕ (CA reads this word in another verse; cf. “Lexical variation”). Typologically they are also related: all three contain continuous (full) Apostolos texts. CA is with its commentary even a special type of non-lectionary Apostolos (ТОЛКОВЫЙ). The commentary in the text of 1 Timothy in KA suggests that an ancestor of this manuscript was a continuous Apostolos with commentary. It must be said, however, that CA KA MA do not always agree.

It is remarkable that TA, which is also a continuous Apostolos, has more in common with ES and OA. It sides in certain important places with these manuscripts and not with the other continuous Apostolos manuscripts. ES OA RA TA share (in various stages of corruption) the first reading mentioned under “Syntactical variation”. Assuming the occurrence of this rare scribal blunder is not a coincidence, it could point to genetic kinship.<sup>1</sup>

## **HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE EUCHOLOGIUM SINAITICUM**

In this section I allow myself to speculate about the textual history of the New Testament lections in the additional folia of the ES and the history of the ES as a whole.

### **At Least One Ancestor?**

Collation with other Slavic manuscripts and critical analysis of the variants has revealed a comparatively high level of corruption in the additional ES folia. Besides, there are specific marks of linguistic change. The main body of the ES as published by Nahtigal shares these characteristics to a large extent.<sup>2</sup> This serves as extra proof that the additional folia do indeed belong to the ES. Moreover, these shared characteristics make it probable that the

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Athos Zografou 53 and Cod. Sofia NBKM 882 share this reading as well.

<sup>2</sup> I.e. nonsensical readings, interchange of ВЫ/МЫ, specific forms like ДАЖДИ, tendency towards analytical constructions et cetera.

texts contained in ES were copied as a whole at least once.

### **Closed Tradition?**

The ES could then be the sole surviving copy of a unique constellation of texts that probably did not receive widespread dissemination. It is, therefore, possible that the copyist of the ES had no similar manuscript at hand with which to compare its antigraph. Regarding the readings for the days of the week Tarnanidis remarks that “the order preserved in this Slavonic Euchologion bears no resemblance to that found in other Greek and Slavonic Euchologia”<sup>1</sup> Although the New Testament lections in the ES are all part of the short Gospel and Apostolos lectionaries, only a well-read scribe would immediately locate the counterparts of the weekday readings in the Synaxarion of a lectionary.<sup>2</sup> The ES could, therefore, be the product of an uncontaminated (closed) rather than a contaminated transmission. This hypothesis would explain the high level of singular readings and the absence of symptoms of contamination (e.g. conflate readings).<sup>3</sup>

If the ES was not subject to contamination, the texts preserved in it have

---

<sup>1</sup> Tarnanidis 1988: 79.

<sup>2</sup> Two Apostolos lections carry the wrong ascription (2Cor 4.6-15: Hebrews and Tt 2.11-14, 3.4-7: Timothy). This phenomenon (which occurs in lectionaries as well) encumbers comparison especially with continuous New Testament manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> This applies to at least some of the other collated manuscripts as well. It is often assumed (cf. Alekseev 1986: 8) that the Old Slavic New Testament was copied by scribes using two or more antigraphs. However, has the validity of this model been satisfactorily proven? Maybe the tradition of the (oldest) Slavic New Testament manuscripts should not be compared to the careful copying of Greek uncials, but rather to the sometimes ‘wild’ and uncontaminated tradition of the Greek New Testament papyri. I quote three observations from Colwell’s study (1965: 382, 386, 388):

“ $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  gives the impression of a scribe who writes without any intention of exactly reproducing his source. He writes with great freedom—harmonizing, smoothing out, substituting almost whimsically. Here again, there is no evidence whatever of a second party control—less than three singular readings per hundred are corrected—nor in fact of external controls of any kind.”

“Wildness in copying is the outstanding characteristic of  $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ . This makes it very difficult to decide whether particular readings are due to editorializing on the part of the scribe or rather due to his general laxity and inefficiency.”

“The corruption of the text in  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  sheds light on the process of corruption in an uncontrolled tradition. In that tradition a particular kind of freedom exists. It occurs where Greek sophistication is in short supply—in the backwoods where few knew Greek—and results in the making of an independent translation. In these areas appeal to a ‘standard’ text was impossible, for the very idea did not exist.”

their own isolated tradition. The ES would then be the exit of a tunnel originating at the moment when its protograph was compiled. In addition, the nonsensical and ungrammatical readings attested in the New Testament lections of the ES do not point to revision. This would mean that, during their journey through the tunnel, they were covered with a layer of corruption, but apart from that remained basically unadulterated.<sup>1</sup>

### **Where were the New Testament lections taken from?**

The ES reads in the place of the Apostolos lection for the sick (f. 22r):<sup>2</sup> ИСПОВЕДАЙТЕ СЕБѢ ГРѢХЫ. ИЩИ НА ПАМЯТ' ПРѢДА ИЛИНА. Instead of repeating a lection, lectionaries often save parchment or paper by referring to another occasion where it has been given.<sup>3</sup> This reference was, therefore, probably copied from an Apostolos lectionary.<sup>4</sup> The length of the lections conforms to the usual length in Apostolos and Gospel lectionaries. Besides, textually they seem closer to the lectionaries than to the continuous manuscripts collated. Thus, it seems likely that they were taken from lectionary manuscripts. These could have been short lectionaries, because none of the pericopes in the ES belongs to the extra lessons (for weekdays after Pentecost) given by the long lectionaries.<sup>5</sup> Since the ES has a number of readings in common with certain Apostolos lectionaries,<sup>6</sup> it is possible that the compiler of ES' protograph used an Apostolos lectionary genealogically linked to these manuscripts. Moreover, since these readings appear to be secondary, corruption must have had the opportunity to wreak havoc in the text of this 'family'. The protograph of the ES was, therefore, probably not compiled during the very beginning of Slavic letters.

### **Who Compiled the Protograph of the ES?**

---

<sup>1</sup> In this case it is not so important what age is assigned to the ES itself. The Nikola Gospel is even much younger than the ES, but still it contains (also under a layer of corruption and innovation) an ancient text.

<sup>2</sup> Tarnanidis (1988: 83) concludes that one or two folia are missing, because the readings mentioned on f. 22r are not appropriate for sickness, but according to Čifljanov (1976: 345) James 5.10-16 was in the 9th century the Apostolos reading for the Anointing of the Sick. The pericope of the Canaanitess (Mt 15.21-28) speaks about healing as well.

<sup>3</sup> On f.10r of the main body of the ES (in the Service of БРАТРОТВОРЕНИЕ) the text refers in a similar fashion to the Gospel lesson of the seventh Sunday after Easter.

<sup>4</sup> In which the lessons for the various occasions follow the readings of the Menologion.

<sup>5</sup> The Apostolos lessons designated for the weekdays are all read on Saturdays and Sundays after Pentecost and before the start of Great Lent.

<sup>6</sup> And the continuous Apostolos TA; cf. "Tentative grouping on the basis of shared readings".

This contradicts the hypotheses of Tarnanidis (1988: 79), who speculates that the selection of Apostolos and Gospel lections is an *ad hoc* compilation by Cyril and Methodius for their missionary work in Moravia.<sup>1</sup> The contradiction is further strengthened by the fact that the themes of the lessons are neither exceptionally ‘missionary’, nor are they connected with the days on which they are read.<sup>2</sup>

In fact, I suspect that the learned Byzantine missionaries would not be happy to be credited with the design of such an extraordinary manuscript. Its user has to look up the feast of Prophet Elijah in an Apostolos lectionary, if he wants to celebrate a service for the sick.<sup>3</sup> The lections for the feast could, of course, have been listed in the gathering that followed the present gathering according to Tarnanidis’ reckoning (1988: 74). That would mean that after a selection of only four feasts from the Menologion (Christmas, Theophany, Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, Annunciation) and at least one from the Synaxarion (Easter) a lesser feast from the Menologion would have followed.

In any case, the compiler seems not to have worked according to a clear design. Maybe the ES is what remains of a collection of Old Slavic writings, in which the compiler simply lumped together Old Slavic (liturgical) texts available to him.

### **What is the Value of the ES as a Witness of the Old Slavic New Testament?**

Even if the speculations offered above are proven to be wrong, the fact remains that—under layers of corruption and innovation—an ancient text appears to rest in the New Testament lections in the ES. When one disregards similar layers in the other collated manuscripts, the differences between a number of them and ES become rather small. Anyone interested in restoring the original translation of the Old Slavic New Testament should definitely take into account the ES lections. In fact, when ES, As, Zo, Ma, Ni and Ko agree, there is a strong case for their reading being the earliest

---

<sup>1</sup> According to him the selection has no parallel in Greek nor Slavic Euchologia.

<sup>2</sup> Although phrases like “I will be their God, and they shall be my people” (2Cor 6.16), “I came not to call the righteous, but sinners” (Mt 9.13) and the teaching about prayer in Lk 11.1b-4 & 9-13 are appropriate for converts.

<sup>3</sup> The New Testament lections that are usually given at the end of an Euchologia are meant to relieve the celebrant from carrying an Apostolos and an Gospel lectionary with him.

attainable.<sup>1</sup> It is possible, however, that this is not the original Cyrillo(-Methodian) translation, which could have been modified subsequently. In that case, we can only cross this barrier by conjecture.<sup>2</sup>

The ES contains the oldest witnesses for the Apostolos text. If the Gospel lections in the ES are of an ancient text type, it seems plausible that, analogically, the Apostolos lections are ancient as well. In this case, the ES becomes the most important witness for the Apostolos text, not only because the Apostolos manuscripts are much younger, but also because they appear to be either revised or considerably corrupted.

I have one last speculation to offer. The collated manuscripts contain a considerable number of scribal errors.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, most of them were subsequently not corrected and contain few traces of contamination like conflate readings. In addition, occurrences of the same verses do not appear to have been brought in line with each other.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the collated manuscripts do not seem to be witnesses of a highly critical tradition.<sup>5</sup> This means that

---

<sup>1</sup> One could draw a comparison with the Greek: As Zo Ma are like uncials as the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus or papyri as  $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ , Ni and Ko could be compared to versions like the Syriac and Coptic (translated from ancient Greek exemplars), and ES has something in common with the independent tradition of the New Testament quotations in the Greek Church Fathers. The apparent revision in Os and Ms could be compared to the modification process that produced the Byzantine text type.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly, we cannot look past the barrier posed by the Greek NT papyri. Their readings indicate that the first centuries were an especially volatile time for the Greek text. Most changes in the text seem to have taken place during this time.

<sup>3</sup> One would like to have an objective method of measuring corruption. A ‘corruption index’ for each manuscript (scribe) would make it easier to compare manuscripts and traditions.

<sup>4</sup> In Bakker & Van der Tak 1994 we scrutinised ‘intratextual counterparts’, i.e. repeated occurrences of the same pericope in a single lectionary manuscript. Instead of agreement we found great divergence between intratextual counterparts in Slavic Apostolos lectionaries. The Greek Gospel lectionaries offer a different picture (Colwell 1969: 93): “Thus we see that [Greek Gospel, *MB*] lectionaries agree with one another in lections taken from the Synaxarion and in lections from the Menologion.”

<sup>5</sup> This is, of course, not surprising for a freshly established literary tradition. The Greek original was transmitted in a much more developed literary and scholarly environment. One should, therefore, rather use versions like the Armenian and the Gothic as typological evidence. On the other hand, the Slavic version could be treated as a sub-system of the Byzantine literary system, for which the ultimate authority remained the Greek original. Cf. Bakker 1994: “It should not be forgotten that for a long time the Slavia Orthodoxa was to a greater or lesser extent part of the Byzantine Commonwealth (unlike most of the churches associated with the other early versions). Therefore, changes in the Typikon also

the original translations must have been corrupted at quite an early stage.<sup>1</sup> At some point, the need for revision must have arisen. One would especially expect repairs to the text in carefully executed manuscripts like Os. Peripheral manuscripts like Ni and Ko, on the other hand, seem to have escaped revision. Together with the oldest manuscripts (produced to a certain extent in a closed fashion), they are the first manuscripts one should turn to in preparing a critical edition of the Old Slavic New Testament.

## **TOWARDS A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE OLD SLAVIC NEW TESTAMENT**

This undertaking readily presents itself when the attention is shifted from the specific form of the text in the individual manuscripts to the text itself. Vajs took this important step in his reconstructions of the Old Slavic Gospels. He dared to make choices among the variants attested in the manuscripts and standardise the orthography: a normal procedure for editions in any language. Of course, this pioneering undertaking is not perfect,<sup>2</sup> but this was also the case for the first edition of the Greek New Testament. Erasmus' work contained many errors and was only the first of many editions. Consider the words in the Introduction to the 27th edition of Nestle-Aland: "It should be understood that this text is a working text: it is not to be considered as definitive, but as a stimulus to further efforts toward defining and verifying the text of the New Testament."<sup>3</sup>

In "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program" Colwell describes the five steps needed to prepare a critical edition.<sup>4</sup> In his description of the first step he writes: "The readings of individual manuscripts are the objective data

---

found their way to Slavonic manuscripts. Moreover, the Slavonic text of the New Testament was probably subsequently compared to Greek manuscripts on several occasions. This continuous influence of the Greek considerably encumbers the reconstruction of the translations of Cyril and Methodius."

<sup>1</sup> RA seems to be the culmination of this process. When the lector in church was reading aloud from this manuscript, the believers must surely have wondered sometimes at the meaning of his words. One would have to be desperate to use this manuscript as exemplar for further copying.

<sup>2</sup> On pp. 416-421 of Metzger 1977, a balanced assessment of Vajs' work is given.

<sup>3</sup> Nestle-Aland 1993: 45\*. The text of the 27th edition is identical to the text of the 26th edition; only the apparatus has been modified.

<sup>4</sup> (Colwell 1969: 148-171): 1. Begin with readings, 2. Characterize individual scribes and manuscripts, 3. Group the manuscripts, 4. Construct a historical framework, 5. Final judgement on readings.

with which the critic must deal. He should be familiar with a very large number of these, including readings that never find their way into an apparatus criticus.” Nowadays, the computer offers the possibility to store the objective data par excellence: the manuscripts themselves. Once the diplomatic transcriptions have been entered (and rigorously checked), they can be made available to colleagues electronically on CD-ROM or through a computer network. The computer can perform the collations in a flawless and efficient manner. Subjectivity enters the stage when one selects a set of manuscripts and starts applying data abstraction. Reversibility, however, is guaranteed: one can always go back to the manuscripts and separate fact from fiction.<sup>1</sup>

The work on the critical edition will give an impulse to textual criticism of the Old Slavic New Testament. Not only will ‘global’ issues like the orthography of the base text and the weight of individual manuscripts have to be discussed, but also the external and internal evidence for or against a specific variant must be the subject of debate.<sup>2</sup> Hypotheses like the ones listed in “Tentative Grouping on the Basis of Shared Readings” and “Hypotheses Regarding the Euchologium Sinaiticum” can be tested in a heuristic manner.<sup>3</sup>

It seems wise to produce first ‘operational editions’ of the short Gospel and Apostolos lectionaries. Lunt repeatedly urged a lection per lection analysis of the Slavic New Testament. The (modified) text of Vajs can serve as intermediary text for the Gospels. The apparatus will be extracted from the computer collations and commentary on specific variants provided. In order to progress quickly it is better to keep—for the time being—the sets of manuscripts small.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lunt 1986: 121: “The large number of lections obviously makes an enormously time-consuming task of collation. And it is not easy to present conclusions in a perspicuous way. Nonetheless, I am encouraged by my preliminary results, and urge my colleagues to undertake the same sort of investigation. It offers at least a chance to find an alternative to the present state of affairs—a series of contradictory opinions which are unfortunately based chiefly on unclear assumptions.”

<sup>2</sup> It is important that these are explicitly formulated to enhance transparency and accountability.

<sup>3</sup> Danti 1977 [translated by W.R. Veder]: “An edition can be called critical not because it restitutes an established, canonical, definitive etc. text, but because it makes use of relevant criteria, to be considered valid, until replaced by new and better hypotheses or the discovery of new facts.”



An edition of the New Testament lections in the Euchologium Sinaiticum is given in the appendix to this paper.

## CONCLUSIONS

I collated the New Testament lections in the Euchologium Sinaiticum with Slavic Apostolos and Gospel manuscripts. The use of an intermediary text and the application of data abstraction enabled me to concentrate on (text-critically) significant variants. Apart from a relatively high number of singular readings ES seems to basically agree with the oldest Gospel manuscripts. Most of the variants of ES can be classified as linguistic innovations and scribal errors. In this paper I made only passing mention of the Greek Vorlage. Most of the variant readings can, in fact, be explained without resorting to the Greek.

The features shared by the various parts of the ES make it probable that the compilation was previously copied as a whole at least once. The nature of the variants and the lack of signs of revision or contamination could well be the result of a ‘closed’ and rather corrupt transmission.

The collation method used for this paper will be the central process for producing a critical edition of the Old Slavic New Testament. The diplomatic transcriptions of the manuscripts form the solid fundament for this undertaking.

## APPENDIX: AN EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT LECTIONS IN THE EUCHOLOGIUM SINAITICUM

The main purpose of this operational edition is to enable the reader to make a text-critical appraisal of the ES lections. Banning singular and (likely) secondary readings to the apparatus highlights the corruption of the ES text and its level of variation. Codicological, palaeographic and orthographic characteristics of the manuscript, excluded from this publication, can be considered on the photographs provided by Tarnanidis 1988.

### The Text of this Edition

The text is the intermediary text used (and modified) during the collation process. It is operational and subject to changes on the basis of growing external (additional Slavic witnesses, Greek Vorlage) and internal evidence (translation technique, linguistic evidence: for instance, the textual committee may decide to expand all occurrences of the stem  $\text{БРАТ-}$  to  $\text{БРАТР-}$ ). At this

stage, the text is merely an aide for reading the apparatus, i.e. considering the variants.

### **The Apparatus Criticus of this Edition**

The apparatus contains all the (significant) readings of ES that differ from the intermediary text. These are accompanied by the evidence from the other witnesses. When ES agrees with the intermediary text the apparatus provides variant readings only in a few instances.

The apparatus is in principle positive, i.e. all variants and all witnesses are mentioned. However, when a variant has only very limited support (e.g. ES and one or two witnesses), the apparatus turns negative.

The first reading (in a positive critical unit) is the reading of the text and it is not repeated. All other readings are given in their abstracted form, except when supported by only one witness; then they are cited in their actual spelling.

The comments in the apparatus concentrate in the first place on the readings of ES, but, inevitably, conceptions regarding the original Old Slavic translation of the New Testament are presented (e.g. in Mk 10.45). The criticism regarding the group symbol ‘slav’ in the fourth edition of *The Greek New Testament* should also be considered as contributing towards the study of the Old Slavic New Testament in general.

### **Lectionary Set-up**

For each lesson the occasion mentioned in ES is indicated. However, this Typikon-related information is not provided for the other witnesses. So far, only one of the occurrences of a lesson in a lectionary has been collated (the most complete evidence from the most obvious place in the Menologion or (short) Synaxarion). The order of the lessons has been changed to that of a modern continuous text. The term Slavic lectionaries refers to ES as well (it being a special form of lectionary).

### **Caveats and Disclaimers**

Caveat 1: The apparatus contains only the variant readings from ES that remain after data abstraction, thus no orthographic variants.

Caveat 2: A variant is given in its abstracted form (i.e. without jers etc.); only when it is supported by one witness, is the actual spelling provided.

Caveat 3: The apparatus does not contain all the (significant) variants attested in the other witnesses. One should therefore be aware not to draw conclusions *ex silentio*.

Caveat 4: The same applies to the passages where ES is damaged. In case

of doubt consult the photographs of ES.

Caveat 5: The apparatus is partly positive, partly negative.

Caveat 6: At this stage Greek evidence is only occasionally provided. Moreover, it is taken from only two editions.

Disclaimer 1: I used mostly printed apographs of the witnesses. All the transcription errors not made by their editors are my own.

Disclaimer 2: The text of this edition does not pretend to be a reconstruction of the original translation.

## Mt 2. 1-12

ES: ff. 23r, 23v; lesson for Nativity

Other Witnesses: As Os Sa Iv Ni Ko Ms

2<sup>1</sup> исоуоу рождыоу са· вѣ вѣтлѣнемѣ иудѣистѣнемѣ<sup>1</sup> вѣ дни ирода цѣсарѣа· се влзсви отъ вѣстокъ· придѣ вѣ иероусалимъ 2 глаголюще· кѣде естъ рожди са цѣсарь иудѣискъ· видѣхомъ бо свѣздѣ ѿ него на вѣстоцѣ· и придомъ поклонитъ са ѿмоу· 3 оуслышавъ<sup>2</sup> же иродъ цѣсарь сзimate са· и вѣсь иероусалимъ сз ни-мъ· 4 и сзбравъ<sup>3</sup> вѣса архiereнѣ и кзнижники —<sup>4</sup> людьскыѣ· вѣпрашаше ѿ кѣде христосъ раждаетъ са· 5 они же рѣша ѿмоу· вѣ вѣтлѣнемѣ иудѣистѣнемѣ· тако бо пѣсано естъ пророкомъ· 6 и ты вѣтлѣнемѣ землѣ иудова· ничимъ же мѣнши еси вѣ владыкаѣхъ иудоваѣхъ· ис тебе<sup>5</sup> бо изидетъ вождь<sup>6</sup>· иже оупасетъ люди моѣ израила· 7 тогда иродъ таи призвавъ влзхы<sup>7</sup> испита отъ нихъ вѣрма гавлыша са свѣзды· 8 —<sup>8</sup> и пославъ ѿ вѣ вѣтлѣнемъ рече·

<sup>1</sup> As Sa Iv Ni Ko Ms | иудѣистѣи ES Os. The change of gender may have occurred under influence of the Greek (in which ‘Bethlehem’ is feminine). However, the unanimous support for мѣнши in v.6 seems to prove the primacy of the feminine gender.

<sup>2</sup> Os Sa Ni Ko Ms | слышав ES As Iv. The preceding ѿмоу can have given rise to the variant through haplography, although it is equally possible that dittography produced the first reading.

<sup>3</sup> As Os Ni Ms { συναγαγών } | сбра ES Sa Iv Ko. The conjunction и is introduced by Sa Ko before вѣпрашаше to connect the two finite verb forms. ES’ sentence remains awkward and is definitely secondary.

<sup>4</sup> add · и старца ES, a not unusual doublet.

<sup>5</sup> тебѣ ES. This confusion of cases—or rather е and ѣ—occurs elsewhere in ES as well.

<sup>6</sup> ES As Iv Ms | владыка Os Sa Ni Ko. The second reading probably arose under influence of the preceding владыкаѣхъ in the same verse.

<sup>7</sup> призва влзхы· ꙗ ES, the conjunction makes the sentence grammatical.

<sup>8</sup> add ꙗ посъ ES, probably a catchword (written last on the recto side of the folio) yet not specially marked as such.

ШЬДЗШЕ ИСПЫТАИТЕ ИЗВѢСТЬНО О ОТРОЧАТЕ' КГДА ЖЕ ОБРАЩЕТЕ \_<sup>1</sup>. ВЗЗВѢСТИТЕ МИ' ДА И ДЗЗ ШЬДЗ ПОКЛО-НИѢ СА КЕМОУ' 9 ОНИ ЖЕ ПОСЛОУШАВЗШЕ ЦѢСАРѢ ИДѢ' И СЕ СВѢЗДА ИѢЖЕ ВИДѢША НА ВЗСТОЦѢ' ИДѢШЕ ПРѢДЗ НИМИ<sup>2</sup>. ДОИДЕ ЖЕ ПРИШЬДЗШИ СТА ВРЗХОУ' ИДЕ ЖЕ БѢ ОТ-РОЧА' 10 ВИДѢВЗШЕ ЖЕ СВѢЗДАѢ' ВЗЗДРАДОВАША СА РАДОСТИѢ ВЕЛИКЕѢ СѢЛО' 11 И ВЗШЬДЗШЕ ВЗ ХРАМИНѢ' ВИДѢША ОТРОЧА' СЗ МАРИКЕѢ МАТЕРЫѢ КЕГО' И ПАДЗШЕ ПО-КЛОНИША СА КЕМОУ' И ОТВРЪЗЗШЕ СЗКРОВИЩА СВОГА' ПРИНЕСА КЕМОУ' ДАРЫ' ЗЛАТО И ЛИ-ВАНЗ И ЗМУРНѢ' 12 И ОТЗВѢТЗ ПРИИМЗШЕ ВЗ СЗНѢ' НЕ ВЗЗВРАТИША СА КЗ ИРОДОУ' НЗ ИНѢМЪ ПѢТЪМЪ ОТИДѢ ВЗ СТРАНѢ СВОИѢ'

### Mt 3.13-17

ES: f. 24v: lesson for Theophany

Other witnesses: As Zo Os Sa Iv Ni Ms

3·13 ВЗ ОНО ВРѢМА' ПРИДЕ ИСОУСЗ ОТЗ ГАЛИЛЕѢ НА ИОРДАНЗ' КЗ ИОАНОУ' КРЪСТИТЗ СА ОТЗ НЕГО' 14 ИОАНЗ ЖЕ ВЗЗБРАНГАДШЕ КЕМОУ' ГЛАГОЛА' ДЗЗ ТРѢБОУѢ ОТЗ ТЕБЕ<sup>3</sup> КРЪ-СТИТИ СА' А ТЫ ЛИ<sup>4</sup> ГРАДЕШИ КЗ МЪНѢ' 15 ОТЗВѢЩАВЗ ЖЕ ИСОУСЗ РЕЧЕ КЗ КЕМОУ' ОСТАНИ МЫНѢ' ТАКО БО ПОДОБНО КЕСТЗ НАМЗ ИСПЛНИТИ ВЪСТАКѢ<sup>5</sup> ПРАВЪДАѢ' ТОГДА ОСТАВИ И' 16 КРЪЩЕ ЖЕ СА ИСОУСЗ' ВЗЗИДЕ АБИКЕ ОТЗ ВОДЫ' И СЕ ОТВРѢСА<sup>6</sup> СА КЕМОУ' НЕБЕСА' И ВИДѢ ДОУХЗ БОЖИИ' СЗХОДАЩЕ ѢАКО ГОЛѢБЪ' И ГРАДѢЩЕ НА МЪ' 17 И СЕ ГЛАСЗ СЗ НЕБЕСЕ ГЛАГОЛА' СЪ КЕСТЗ СЫНЗ МОИ ВЗЗЛЮБЛЕНЫИ' О НЕМЪЖЕ БЛАГОВОЛИХЗ'<sup>7</sup>

### Mt 9 9-13

ES: f. 17v: lesson for Friday

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Sa Iv Ni Ko Ms

9·9 ВЗ ОНО ВРѢМА' ПРѢХОДА ИСОУСЗ ОТЗТѢДОУ' ВИДѢ ЧЛОВѢКА' НА МЫТЬНИЦИ СѢ-ДАЩА ИМЕНЕМЪ МАТЗѢѢ' И ГЛАГОЛА КЕМОУ' ПО МЪНѢ ГРАДИ' И ВЗСТАВЗ ПО НЕМЪ ИДЕ' 10 И БЫСТЗ КЕМОУ' ВЗЗЛЕЖАЩОУ' ВЗ ДОМОУ' \_<sup>8</sup> И СЕ МЗНОСИ

<sup>1</sup> As Os Sa Ko Ms | add ε ES Iv Ni. Probably a case of scribal expansion. If, however, the original translation was quite free, ES could have retained the original reading.

<sup>2</sup> НИМИ ES. This singular clashes with the preceding ВИДѢША.

<sup>3</sup> ТЕБѢ ES.

<sup>4</sup> As Zo Ni | ЛИ ТЫ ES Sa Ms | ТЫ Os Iv.

<sup>5</sup> Zo Os Sa Iv Nik | ВСѢ ES As Ms.

<sup>6</sup> ES As | ОТВРЪЗОША Zo Os Sa Iv Ni Ms.

<sup>7</sup> As Zo Os Sa Ms | БЛАГОИЗВОЛИХ ES Iv Ni.

<sup>8</sup> add εго ES, which makes the text more explicit.

грѣшници и мы-таре<sup>1</sup> пришьдзше възлеждхѣ сз исоусомз' и сз оученикы него' 11 и видѣвше фарисѣи глаголадохѣ оученикомз него' по чьто сз митары и грѣшники оучитель вашъ гасъ' 12 исоусъ же слышавъ рече имз' не трѣбуѣтъ здравии врача' нз бо-лащеи' 13 шьдзше же наоучите сѧ' чьто естъ' милостыни хошѣ' а не жрьтѣ' не придз бо правѣдникъ призватъ' нз грѣшникъ на покагание'

### **Mt 15.21-28**

ES: ff. 22r, 22v; lesson for the sick (cf. p. 176; ftn. 3)

Other witnesses: Zo Ma Os Sa Iv Ni Ko Ms

15:21 в з оно врѣма' взиде<sup>2</sup> исоусъ в странѣ турскѣ и сидонскѣ' 22 и се же-на хананѣиска' отъ прѣдѣлъ тѣхъ ишьдзши' въззпи глаголащи' помилюи ма господи' сыноу<sup>3</sup> давидовъ' дщи моѧ злѣ бѣсьноуѣтъ сѧ' 23 онъ же не отвѣща еи словесе<sup>4</sup> и пристѣплше оученици него' молдахѣ и глаголаще' отпусти ѿ' како възпиѣтъ в слѣдъ насъ' 24 онъ же отвѣщавъ рече' нѣсмь посладанъ' тѣкмо кз овцамъ погыбшиимъ домоу израилева' 25 она же пришьдзши поклони сѧ<sup>5</sup> немоу глаголащи' господи' помози ми' 26 онъ же отвѣщавъ рече' нѣстъ добро отати хлѣба чадомъ<sup>6</sup> и поврѣши \_<sup>7</sup> псомъ' 27 она же рече' еи' господи' ибо и пси ѣдатъ отъ кроупиць' падаѣщихъ сз трапезы господии своихъ' 28 тогда отвѣщавъ исоусъ рече еи' о жено велиа естъ вѣра твоѧ' бѣди тебѣ како же хо-щеши' и ицѣлѣ дщи ѧѧ в з тз часъ'

### **Mt 20.1-16**

ES: ff. 25v, 26r, 26v; lesson for Forty Martyrs of Sebaste

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Sa(1-10) Iv Ni Ms

20:1 рече господь притчѣ снѣ' подобно естъ цѣсарствине небесскою

<sup>1</sup> Ma Os Sa Iv Ko Ms | мытари ES As | мытаріе Ni | мыздѣицы Zo.

<sup>2</sup> ES Sa | изиде Os Ms Ko | отиде Zo Ma Iv Ni. The reading of the lectionaries ES Sa may well be secondary.

<sup>3</sup> Zo Ma Os Sa Ms | сыне ES Iv Ni Ko.

<sup>4</sup> словеси ES. Our knowledge of the Old Slavic language labels this variant as linguistic innovation.

<sup>5</sup> Zo Os Sa Ni Ko Ms | om сѧ ES Ma Iv.

<sup>6</sup> отъ чадъ ES, more analytical and precise.

<sup>7</sup> add и ES Os. Dittography and/or the tendency to make the text more explicit could have produced this reading.

чЛОВѢ-КОУ ДОМОВИТОУ ИЖЕ ИЗИДЕ КОУПНО ОУТРО<sup>1</sup>. НАНАТЪ ДѢЛАТЕЛЬ ВЪ  
 ВИНОГРАДЪ СВОИ. 2 СЗВѢЩАВЪ ЖЕ СЪ ДѢЛАТЕЛИ ПО ПѢНАСОУ НА ДЬНЬ ПОСЛА  
 Я ВЪ ВИНОГРАДЪ СВОИ. 3 И ИШЪДЪ ВЪ ТРЕТИИѢ ГОДИИѢ ВИДѢ ИНЫ НА  
 ТРЪЖИЩИ СТОЯЩА ПРАЗДЬНЫ. 4 И ТѢМЪ рече<sup>2</sup>. ИДѢТЕ И ВЫ ВЪ ВИНОГРАДЪ  
 МОИ И КЕЖЕ БѢДЕТЪ ПРАВЪДА ДАМЪ ВАМЪ. 5 ОНИ ЖЕ ИДѢ ПАКЪ ЖЕ<sup>3</sup> ИШЪДЪ  
 ВЪ ШЕСТИѢ И ВЪ ДЕВАТИѢ ГОДИИѢ СЪТВОРИ ТАКОЖДЕ. 6 ВЪ ЕДИИѢИѢ ЖЕ  
 НА десате<sup>4</sup> ГОДИИѢ ИШЪДЪ ОБРѢТЕ ДРОУГЫЯ СТОЯЩА праздьяны<sup>5</sup> И ГЛАГОЛА  
 ИМЪ ЧТО сѣде стоите<sup>6</sup> ВЪСЬ ДЬНЬ ПРАЗДЬНИ. 7 И ГЛАГОЛАША КЕМОУ ТАКО  
 НИКТО ЖЕ НАСЪ НЕ НАНАТЪ. —<sup>7</sup> ГЛАГОЛА ИМЪ ИДѢТЕ И ВЫ ВЪ ВИНОГРАДЪ МОИ  
 И КЕЖЕ БѢДЕТЪ ПРАВЪДА ПРИИМЕТЕ. 8 ВЕЧЕРОУ ЖЕ БЫВЪШОУ ГЛАГОЛА  
 ГОСПОДИНЪ ВИНОГРАДА КЪ ПРИСТАВНИКОУ СВОЕМОУ ПРИЗОВИ ДѢЛАТЕЛЯ И  
даждь<sup>8</sup> ИМЪ МЪДѢ НАЧЫНЪ ОТЪ ПОСЛѢДЬНИИХЪ ДО ПРЪВЫИХЪ. 9 ПРИШЪДЪШЕ  
 ЖЕ ИЖЕ ВЪ ЕДИИѢ НА ДЕСАТЕ ГОДИИѢ ПРИНЕСА ПО ПѢНАСОУ. 10 И  
 ПРИШЪДЪШЕ ПРЪВИИ МЪНѢАХЪ СЯ ТАКО ВАЩЕ ПРИИМѢТЪ<sup>9</sup>. И<sup>10</sup> ПРИНЕСА И ТИ ПО  
 ПѢНАСОУ. 11 ПРИИМЪШЕ ЖЕ РЪПЪТААХЪ НА ГОСПОДИНА 12 ГЛАГО-ЛѢЩЕ  
КАКО<sup>11</sup> СИИ ПОСЛѢДЬНИИ<sup>12</sup> ЕДИИЪ ЧАСЪ СЪТВОРИША И РАВЪНЫ Я НАМЪ  
СЪТВО-РИЛЪ<sup>13</sup> КЕСИ ПОНЕСЪШИИМЪ ТАГОТЪ ДЬНЕ И ВАРЪ. 13 ОНЪ ЖЕ ОТЪВѢЩАВЪ

<sup>1</sup> As Zo Iv Ni | оутро ES Ma | за оутра Sa | коупно за оутра Os Ms | бие за оутра Ms (in Synaxarion). The difficulty of the first reading may have led to коупно being left out in ES Ma (cf. “Conflations of readings”).

<sup>2</sup> рече ИМЪ ES, which makes the text smoother.

<sup>3</sup> om ES {om M}, perhaps under the influence of Greek manuscripts, but more probably by simple oversight of the scribe.

<sup>4</sup> δεσσι ES.

<sup>5</sup> Zo Ma Os Sa Ni {οργους M} | om ES As Iv Ms {om X D L33 al}. The addition or omission could have been made independently following v. 3.

<sup>6</sup> ES Zo Os Iv Ms | стоите сде As Ma Sa Ni.

<sup>7</sup> Zo MA Sa Iv Ni Ms | add И ES As Os, which explicitly connects the two speech acts.

<sup>8</sup> дажди ES, which occurs in the main body of the Euchologium Sinaiticum as well.

<sup>9</sup> ES Zo Iv Ni | ваще прияти As Ma Os Ms.

<sup>10</sup> om ES.

<sup>11</sup> ES Zo Ma Os Iv Ni | како As Ms | {om Greek (editions used)}.

<sup>12</sup> As Zo Iv Ni Ms | сиа послѣдьяны ES Ma Os. Cf. the following variant.

<sup>13</sup> сзтвориша и равны я намъ сзтворилъ As Zo |

створиша и равны нам а створил Iv Ni |

створша и равны нам а створил Ma Ms |

сзтворыша равны намъ сзтворилъ а ES |

сзтворивзша равны намъ сзтворилъ я Os.

The rather awkward participle construction is alleviated in ES through the omission of the conjunction.

рече \_\_<sup>1</sup> единомуу ихъ. друуже не обиждѣ тебе. не по пѣнасоу ли сзвѣщахъ сз тобою. 14 взъыми свое и иди<sup>2</sup>. хошѣ же \_\_<sup>3</sup> семоу послѣднююемоу дати тако и тебѣ. 15 или нѣстз ми лѣть сзтворити еже хошѣ вз своихъ ми. аше<sup>4</sup> око твоѣ лѣкаво ѣстз. такѣ<sup>5</sup> азъ благъ есмь. 16 тако бѣдѣтъ послѣднии прѣви. и прѣвии послѣ-днии. мзноси бо сѣтъ ззвани. мало же избранныхъ.

### Mt 22.2-14

ES: ff. 106r, 106v; lesson for Monday

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Iv Ni Ko Ms

22:2 рече господь притчѣ ситѣ. оуподоби са цѣсарьствие небесьскоѣ<sup>6</sup> чловѣ-коу цѣсарю. иже сзтвори бракз сыноу своему. 3 и посзла рабы своя. приззвати ззванья иа бракз. и не хотѣахѣ прити. 4 пакы посзла ины рабы глагола. рѣцѣте ззваньямз. се обѣдз мои оуготовахъ. и<sup>7</sup> юнци мои и<sup>8</sup> оупитѣнаѣ исколена. и всѣа готова. придѣте на бракз. 5 они же нерождыше отидѣ. овз на село свое. овз же на коупитѣ свои. 6 а прочии имзше<sup>9</sup> рабы его досадиша имз и избвиша ѣ. 7 и слышавз цѣсарь тз. разгнѣва са и посзлавз<sup>10</sup> воѣ своѣа погуби оубица ты. и градз ихъ зажже. 8 тогда глагола рабомз своимз. бракз оубо готовз ѣстз<sup>11</sup>. а ззвани не бѣша достоини. 9 идѣте оубо на исходища пѣтии<sup>12</sup>. и ѣлико

<sup>1</sup> add к ES As.

<sup>2</sup> om ES.

<sup>3</sup> add и ES Iv.

<sup>4</sup> This word does not render the ἦ of the Greek editions used. The conjunction εἰ suggested by the Slavic translation probably arose through itacism. All Slavic witnesses support this corruption (in the Greek tradition). Cf. the English rendering: “Or is your eye evil, because I am good?”.

<sup>5</sup> Zo Ma Os Ni | нз ES As Iv Ms. The second reading probably arose as an effort to alleviate the difficult text (cf. the preceding variant).

<sup>6</sup> ES Zo Ma | небесное As Os Iv Ni Ko Ms. According to the Slovník the suffix of the first reading occurs most often in the oldest MSS.

<sup>7</sup> ES Zo Iv Ni Ko | om As Ma Os Ms.

<sup>8</sup> om ES.

<sup>9</sup> Zo Ma Os Ms | емше ES As Iv Ni Ko.

<sup>10</sup> ES Zo Os Iv Ni | посла As Ma Ko Ms.

<sup>11</sup> бракз оубо готовз ѣстз Zo Ma Iv Ko Ms |

брак оубован ест ES Os |

бракъ оубо оубованъ ѣсть Ni |

браци оубо оубовани сѣтъ As |.

As Ni seem to conflate the first two readings.

<sup>12</sup> пѣти ES.

АЩЕ ОБРАЩЕТЕ' ПРИЗОВЪТЕ НА БРАКЪЗ<sup>1</sup>. 10 И ИШЪДЪШЕ РАБИ ТИ НА ПЪТИ' СЪБЪРАША ВСА' НАЖЕ<sup>2</sup> ОБРЪТЪТЪ. ЗЪЛЫ<sup>3</sup> ЖЕ И ДОБРЫ' И<sup>4</sup> ИСПЛЪНИ СЯ БРАКЪЗ<sup>5</sup> ВЪЗЛЕЖАЩИИХЪ. 11 ВЪШЪ-ДЪ ЖЕ ЦЪСАРЬ \_<sup>6</sup> ВИДЪТЪ ВЪЗЛЕЖАЩИИХЪ. ВИДЪ ТОУ ЧЪЛОВЪКА НЕ ОБЪЧЕНА ВЪ ОДЪНА-НИЕ БРАЧЬНОЕ. 12 И ГЛАГОЛА КЕМОУ' ДРОУЖЕ КАКО ВЪНИДЕ СЪМО' НЕ ИМЪ ОДЪНИГА БРАЧЬНА<sup>7</sup>. ОНЪ ЖЕ ОУМЪЛЧА. 13 ТОГДА РЕЧЕ ЦЪСАРЬ \_<sup>8</sup> СЛОУГАМЪ: СЪВАЗАВЪШЕ КЕМОУ'<sup>9</sup> РЪЦЪ И \_<sup>10</sup> НОСЪ' ВЪЗЪМЪТЕ И' И ВЪРЪСЪТЕ И ВЪ ТЪМЪ КРОМЪШЬНИТЪТЪ. ТОУ БЪДЕТЪ ПЛАЧЪ И СКРЪЖЪТЪ ЗЪБОМЪ. 14 МЪНОСИ БО СЪТЪ ЗЪВАНИ<sup>11</sup>. МАЛО ЖЕ ИЗБЪРАНИИХЪ'

### Мк 10.32b-45

ES: ff.13v, 14r, 14v (first folio severely damaged); lesson for Tuesday

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Sa Iv Ni Ko(39-45) Ms

10·32 ВЪ ОНО ВРЕМЯ' ПОИМЪ ИСОУСЪ ПАКЪ ОБА НА ДЕСАТЕ' НАЧАТЪ ИМЪ ГЛАГОЛАТИ' КЕЖЕ ХОТЪША БЫТИ КЕМОУ' 33 ТАКО СЕ ВЪСХОДИМЪ ВЪ ИЕРОУСАЛИМЪ И СЫНЪ ЧЪЛОВЪЧЬ-СКЫИ ПРЪДАНЪ БЪДЕТЪ АРХИЕРОМЪ И КЪНИЖЬНИКОМЪ' И ОСЪДАТЪ И НА СЪМРЪТЬ И ПРЪДАДАТЪ И ЯЗЫКОМЪ. 34 И ПОРЪГАИТЪ СЯ КЕМОУ' И ОУТЕПЪТЪ И' И ОПЛОУТЪТЪ И И ОУБИИТЪ И' И ТРЕТИИ ДЪНЬ ВЪСКРЪСНЕТЪ. 35 И ПРЪДЪ НИМЪ ИДЕТЕ<sup>12</sup> ИАКОВЪ И ИОНЪ' СЫНА ЗЕВЕДЕВОВА ГЛАГОЛИТЪША КЕМОУ' ОУЧИТЕЛЮ' ХОЩЕВЪ' ДА КЕГОЖЕ АЩЕ ПРОСИВЪ \_<sup>13</sup>. СЪТВОРИШИ НАМА. 36 ИСОУСЪ ЖЕ РЕЧЕ ИМА' ЧЪТО ХОЩЕТА' ДА СЪТВОРИТЪ ВАМА. 37 ОНА ЖЕ

<sup>1</sup> ES Ma Os Ni Ko Ms | бракъз As Zo Iv.

<sup>2</sup> om ES, resulting in two unconnected clauses.

<sup>3</sup> Iv | зълъа ES As Zo Ma Os Ni Ko Ms.

<sup>4</sup> om ES Ni, which erroneously connects the preceding nouns to the following verb.

<sup>5</sup> исплъни сѧ бракъз Zo Iv Ni |

испъниша бракъ ES Ma Ko Ms |

напъзниша бракъ Os |

испъзниша сѧ браци As, again a conflation of the other readings (cf. v.8).

<sup>6</sup> add т ES As, which prevents confusion between the ruler in the parable and the King of heaven.

<sup>7</sup> Zo Ma Os | брачнадо ES As Iv Ni (Ko Ms).

<sup>8</sup> add тз As.

<sup>9</sup> и по ES, which cannot be explained by graphic similarity in Glagolitic.

<sup>10</sup> add по ES.

<sup>11</sup> As Zo Ma Iv Ni Ko | званни ES Os Ms.

<sup>12</sup> ES As Ma Sa | идосте Zo | идеста Iv | идета Ni | идоста Ms | Os retranslates this word and the preceding two into призидѧсте кемоу (προσπερεύονται αὐτῷ).

<sup>13</sup> ES Zo Ma Ni | add ти As | add оу тебе Os Iv Ms.



рѣсте ꙗмоуꝫ даждь<sup>1</sup> нама да ꙗдинъ о деснѣхъ тебе и ꙗдинъ<sup>2</sup> о шочѣхъ<sup>3</sup> тебе садѣвъ въ славъ твоѣи. 38 исоуѣсъ же рече имаꝫ не вѣста саꝫ чесо просащаꝫ можеѣа ли пити чашѣхъ ꙗже азъ пиѣхъ ли крѣщениемъꝫ имъже азъ крѣщѣхъ саꝫ крѣ-стити саꝫ. 39 она же рѣсте ꙗмоуꝫ можеѣвъ исоуѣсъ же рече имаꝫ чашѣхъ оубоꝫ ꙗже азъ пиѣхъ испиѣѣа и крѣщениемъꝫ имъже азъ крѣщѣхъ саꝫ крѣстити саꝫ. 40 а ꙗже съ-сти о деснѣхъ мене<sup>4</sup> и о шочѣхъ<sup>5</sup> нѣстъ мьнѣ<sup>6</sup> датиꝫ нъ имъже ѣстъ оугото-вано<sup>7</sup>. 41 и слышавъше десатьꝫ начаса негодоватиꝫ о иаковѣ и иоанѣ<sup>8</sup>. 42 исоуѣсъ же призвавъ ѣа глагола имъꝫ вѣстеꝫ ꙗко мьнашии саꝫ власти ѣзъкыꝫ оустонаѣхъ имъꝫ и велици<sup>9</sup> ихъ обладаѣхъхъ имиꝫ. 43 не такожде ѣстъ<sup>10</sup> въ васъꝫ нъ иже аще хошеѣхъ ваши<sup>11</sup> быти<sup>12</sup> въ васъꝫ да бѣдеѣхъ вамъ<sup>13</sup> слоугаꝫ. 44 и<sup>14</sup> иже аще<sup>15</sup> хошеѣхъ быти въ васъꝫ старѣиꝫ да бѣдеѣхъ въѣмъꝫ рабъꝫ. 45 ибо сынъ чьловѣчьскыи не придеꝫ да послужаѣхъ ꙗмоуꝫ нъ да<sup>16</sup> послужитъꝫ и дати<sup>17</sup> доушѣхъ своѣхъ изба-влѣние за многы<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> дажди ES.

<sup>2</sup> As Zo Ma Os Ni | а дрочы ES Sa Iv Ms. The sense does not require a strong opposition (the Greek has twice εἶς). The second reading may therefore be secondary.

<sup>3</sup> ES As Ma Iv Ni | лѣвѣхъ Zo Os Sa Ms.

<sup>4</sup> As Ma Os Sa Iv Ni Ms | мене Ko | om ES Zo.

<sup>5</sup> add мене ES, transposed from the previous variant.

<sup>6</sup> As Zo Ma Os Sa Ni Ko | мене ES | мое Iv Ms. ES has problems keeping apart ѣ and е in pronouns.

<sup>7</sup> ES Zo Ma Sa | оуготовано ест As Os Iv Ni Ko Ms, which could be original either way.

<sup>8</sup> add о ES, which prefers to repeat prepositions; cf. Mt 22.13.

<sup>9</sup> Os Sa Ko | велици ES As Zo Ma Iv Ni Ms.

<sup>10</sup> ES As Zo Os Sa Ni Ko {ἔστιν B D slav} | бѣди Ma Ms | бѣдеѣхъ Iv {ἔσται Byz Lect}. Most of the Slavic witnesses do not reflect the Byzantine variant, but the reading of the old uncials.

<sup>11</sup> ващѣи ES As.

<sup>12</sup> om ES, which greatly reduces the intelligibility of the text.

<sup>13</sup> Zo Ma Os Iv Ni Ko | въѣмъ ES As Sa Ms. Maybe the second reading arose under influence of въѣмъꝫ in the following verse.

<sup>14</sup> Ma Os Sa Iv Ni Ms | а ES As Ko | om Zo. The second reading seems to be the result of a tendency to reinforce contrasts (cf. Mk 10.37).

<sup>15</sup> om ES Ko.

<sup>16</sup> ES As Os Ni Ms | om Zo Ma Sa Iv Ko.

<sup>17</sup> дасть Ms. Although the support for this variant is very slim, it seems preferable because it is stylistically more in keeping with the preceding да послужаѣхъ and (да) послужитъ. The infinitive attested by almost all the Slavic witnesses could have arisen under influence of the Greek δοῦναι.

<sup>18</sup> за избавлѣние многомъ ES. The transposition of the preposition makes the text easier.

**Lk 1.24-38**

ES: ff. 27v, 28r; lesson for Annunciation

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Sa(32-38) Iv Ni Ms

1:24 ВЪ ОНО ВРѢМА· ЗАЧАТЪ ЕЛИСАВЕѢ ЖЕНА ЗАХАРИИНА<sup>1</sup>· И ТАКАШЕ СѦ МѢСАЦЪ ПЯТЬ ГЛАГОЛѢШИ· 25 ТАКО ТАКО СЪТВОРИ МНѢ ГОСПОДЬ ВЪ ДЪНИ· ВЪ НАЖЕ ПРИЗЪРЪ· ОТЪА-ТИ ПОНОШЕНИЕ МОЕ ВЪ ЧЛОВѢЦѢХЪ· 26 ВЪ ШЕСТЬИ ЖЕ МѢСАЦЪ· ПОСЛАНЫ БЫСТЪ АНГЕ-ЛЪ ГАВРИИЛЪ ОТЪ БОГА· ВЪ ГРАДЪ ГАЛИЛѢИСКЪ· КЕМОУЖЕ ИМА НАЗАРЕТЪ<sup>2</sup>· 27 КЪ ДѢВѢ ОБРѢЧЕНѢ<sup>3</sup> МѢЖОУ<sup>4</sup>· КЕМОУЖЕ ИМА ИОСИФЪ· ОТЪ ДОМОУ ДАВИДОВА· И ИМА ДѢВѢ МАРИТА· 28 И ВЪШЕДЪ КЪ НЕИ АНГЕЛЪ Рече· РАДОУИ СѦ БЛАГОДѢТНАГА· ГОСПОДЬ СЪ ТОБОИ· БЛАГОСЛОВАЕНА ТЫ ВЪ ЖЕНАХЪ· 29 ОНА ЖЕ ВИДѢВШИ<sup>5</sup> СЪМАТЕ СѦ О СЛОВЕСИ ЕГО· И ПОМЫШЛЯДШЕ ВЪ СЕБѢ<sup>6</sup>· КАКОВО СЕ БѢДЕТЪ ЦѢЛОВАНИЕ· 30 И Рече КЕИ АНГЕЛЪ<sup>7</sup>· НЕ БОИ СѦ МАРИТЕ· ОБРѢТЕ БО БЛАГОДѢТЬ ОТЪ БОГА· 31 И СЕ ЗАЧНЕШИ ВЪ ЧРѢВѢ И РОДИШИ СЫНЪ<sup>8</sup>· И НАРЕЧЕШИ ИМА КЕМОУ ИСОУСЪ· 32 СѢ БѢДЕТЪ ВЕЛИИ· И СЫНЪ ВЪШЕ-ННАЕГО НАРЕЧЕТЪ СѦ· И ДАСТЪ КЕМОУ ГОСПОДЬ БОГЪ ПРѢСТОЛЪ ДАВИДА<sup>9</sup> ОТЪЦА ЕГО· 33 И ВЪЦѢСАРИТЪ СѦ ВЪ ДОМОУ ИАКОВЛИ ВЪ ВЪКЪ<sup>10</sup>· И ЦѢСАРЬСТВИЮ ЕГО НЕ БѢДЕТЪ КОНЬ-ЦА· 34 Рече ЖЕ МАРИТА КЪ АНГЕЛОУ· КАКО БѢДЕТЪ СЕ 11· ИДЕ МѢЖА НЕ ЗНАИ· 35 И ОТЪВѢЩАВЪ АНГЕЛЪ Рече КЕИ· ДОУХЪ СВАТЫИ НАИДЕТЪ НА ТА· И СИЛА ВЪШЕННАЕГО ОСѢ-НИТЪ ТА· ТѢМЪ ЖЕ И<sup>12</sup>· КЕЖЕ РОДИТЪ СѦ СВАТО· НАРЕЧЕТЪ СѦ СЫНЪ БОЖИИ· 36 И СЕ ЕЛИСА-ВЕѢ ѢЖИКА ТВОГА· И ТА ЗАЧАТЪ СЫНА<sup>13</sup> ВЪ СТАРОСТЬ СВОИ· И СѢ

<sup>1</sup> ES As Os Iv Ms | ego Zo Ma Ni. The continuous gospel Iv has adopted a typical lectionary reading.

<sup>2</sup> om ES. The codex Bezae omits this clause as well: surely a coincidence.

<sup>3</sup> As Zo Ma Os | обрѣченѣи ES Iv Ni Ms.

<sup>4</sup> ES As Ni | мѣжеви Zo Ma Os Iv Ms.

<sup>5</sup> ES As Ma Os Ni {ἰδοῦσα A 28} | слышавши Zo Iv {ἀκούσασα A1194 vg<sup>cl</sup>} | слышѣ. и видѣвши Ms.

<sup>6</sup> ES Zo Ma Iv Ms {ἐν ἑαυτῇ D pc} | om As Os Ni. (Vajs did not adopt the first reading which is supported by the 'Western' codex Bezae.)

<sup>7</sup> Zo Ma Iv Ni Ms | ангел к неи ES As.

<sup>8</sup> As Zo Ma Os | сына ES Iv Ni Ms.

<sup>9</sup> дѣз ES (cf. "Stylistic change").

<sup>10</sup> вѣк ES Sa.

<sup>11</sup> add мнѣ ES Sa.

<sup>12</sup> As Zo Os Sa Ms | om ES Ma Iv Ni.

<sup>13</sup> ES As Ma Iv Ni Ms | сын Os Sa | om Zo. Cf. Lk 1.31; ES is consistent in its use of the genitive.

мѣсѧць шестѣи кѣстѣи кѣи· нарицаемѣи неплодѣви<sup>1</sup>. 37 ꙗко не изнеможѣтъ  
отъ бога въстѧкъ глаголъ. 38 рече же мѧрита· —<sup>2</sup> се раба господьнѧ· бѣди  
мнѣ по глаголю твоѣмоу· и отидѣ отъ нѣѧ ангѣлъ·

### Lk 6.1-10

ES: ff. 15r, 15v; lesson for Wednesday

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Iv Ni Ms

б·1 въ оно врѣмѧ· хождаше исоусъ сквозѣ сѣѧниѧ· въ сѣботѣ<sup>3</sup> и  
въстрѣзѧхъ<sup>4</sup> оученици ѧго класы· и гдѣхъ истирающе рѣкѧма<sup>5</sup>. 2  
ѣтери<sup>6</sup> же отъ фарисѣи рѣша имъ· чѣто творите· ѧгоже не достоитъ  
творити въ сѣботѣ· 3 и отвѣщавъ —<sup>7</sup> исоусъ рече къ нимъ<sup>8</sup>· ни ли сего  
кѣте чѣли· кѣже сѣтвори давидъ· кѣгда възвѣжа —<sup>9</sup> самъ и<sup>10</sup> иже съ нимъ  
бѣхъ· 4 како взидѣ въ домъ божии· и хлѣбы<sup>11</sup> прѣдъ-ложениѧ приимъ<sup>12</sup>  
гѧстѣ· и дастъ и сѣшимъ съ нимъ· ихъже не достоѧше гѧсти· тѣкмо  
иереомъ кѣдинѣмъ· 5 и глаголаше имъ· ꙗко господь кѣстѣи сынъ чловѣ -  
чѣскыи сѣботѣ· 6 быстъ же и<sup>13</sup> въ дрогѧтѣ сѣботѣ· взнѣти кѣмоу въ  
сѣньмище и оучити· и бѣ чловѣкъ тоу<sup>14</sup> и рѣка деснѧѧ кѣмоу бѣ<sup>15</sup> соухѧ·  
7 и назирахъ и кзникъници и фарисѣи<sup>16</sup>· аще въ сѣботѣ ицѣлитъ и· да  
обращѧтъ рѣчь на нѣ· 8 онъ же вѣдѣше помышленѧи ихъ· и рече  
мѧжеви<sup>17</sup> имѧщюу кѣмоу соухъ рѣкъ· встанѧ и стѧни посрѣдѣ· онъ же

<sup>1</sup> неплодѣѣ ES.

<sup>2</sup> add и ES.

<sup>3</sup> Zo Ma Os Iv Ni | сѣбот ES As | сѣботы Ms.

<sup>4</sup> въстрѣзѧхъ ES.

<sup>5</sup> As Zo Ma Iv Ms | рѣкѧми ES Os Ni (add своими Os).

<sup>6</sup> ES As Zo Ni | ѣдини Ma | нѣци Os Iv Ms.

<sup>7</sup> add же ES.

<sup>8</sup> имъ ES | om As. Generally ES adds prepositions rather than omitting them. Its reading could therefore be primary.

<sup>9</sup> add сѧ ES Ma Ms.

<sup>10</sup> om ES.

<sup>11</sup> хлѣб ES Ni.

<sup>12</sup> As Os Iv Ni Ms | приѧ и Ma | om ES Zo.

<sup>13</sup> ES Ma Os Iv Ms | om As Zo Ni.

<sup>14</sup> тоу чѣз ES.

<sup>15</sup> деснѧѧ кѣмоу бѣ ES Zo Ma Ms | деснѧ еѧ бѣ Zo | емоу бѣ деснѧѧ As | емоу деснѧѧ бѣ Os Iv | емоу деснѧѧ бы Ni.

<sup>16</sup> ES Ma Os | om As Zo Iv Ni Ms. This omission is not mentioned in Vajs' apparatus.

<sup>17</sup> ES As Zo Iv Ms | моужоу Ni | члѣоу Os | члѣѧкови Ma.

ВЗСТА<sup>1</sup>. 9 рече же<sup>2</sup> исоу҃сз кз нимз' взпрошѣ вы' аще достоитз въ сѣботѣ<sup>3</sup> добро сзтворити ли ззло сзтворити<sup>4</sup>. доушѣ сзпасти ли погочити' 10 и възбрѣвз на вса рече немоу' простьри рѣкѣ твоѣ' онз же про-стьрѣтз' и оутврѣди са рѣка него<sup>5</sup> \_<sup>6</sup> тако и друугаѣ'

### Lk 6 31-36

ES: ff. 19v, 20r (part of v. 35 and the whole of v. 36 illegible; lesson for Sunday)

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Sa Iv Ni Ko Ms (v. 36 lost in Sa Ko)

6:31 рече господь \_<sup>7</sup>. тако же хощете' да творатз вамз чловѣци' и вы творите имз такожде' 32 и аще любите любашаѣ вы' каѣ вамз хвала естз' ибо и грѣшьници любашаѣ ихз<sup>8</sup> любатз' 33 и аще благотворите благотворашиимз вамз' каѣ вамз хвала естз' ибо и грѣшьници тожде творатз' 34 и аще въ заимз даѣте' отз нихже чаѣте възпринати' каѣ вамз хвала естз' ибо и грѣшьници грѣшьникомз въ заимз даѣтз' да възпринимѣтз раввно' 35 обаче любите врагы ваша' и добро-творите' и въ заимз даѣте' ничесо же не чаѣще' и бѣдетз мьзда ваша многа' и бѣдете сынове вышньнего' тако тз блгз естз на невззблагодѣтныѣ и ззлыѣ' 36 бѣдѣте оубо милосрѣди' тако же и отьць вашь милосрѣдз естз'

### Lk 11.1b-13

ES: ff. 16r, 16v; lesson for Thursday; ES omits vv. 5-8!

Other witnesses: As(5-13, Saturday before масопоустз) Zo Ma Os(5 June) Sa(5-13, Saturday before масопоустз) Iv Ni Ms(12 December)

11:1 въ оно врѣмѣ' придѣ кз исоу҃соу оученици него и рѣша немоу<sup>9</sup>. господи' на-оучи ны молити са' тако же иоанз наоучи оученикы своя' 2 рече же имз' негда молити са глаголите' отьче нашь' иже еси на небесьхз'

<sup>1</sup> ES Zo Ma Ni Ms | встѣв ста As Os | възстѣвз и ста Iv.

<sup>2</sup> om ES.

<sup>3</sup> Zo Ma Os Iv Ni | сѣботѣ ES Ms | сѣботз As. Cf. v.1.

<sup>4</sup> As Zo Os Iv Ms | творити ES Ma Ni.

<sup>5</sup> ES Zo Ma Iv Ms | емоу As Os Ni.

<sup>6</sup> add сдрава ES As.

<sup>7</sup> add своимз оученикомз ES, which transforms this incipit into another standard lectionary beginning.

<sup>8</sup> om ES As Ko. If the original reading was ѡ, the preceding ending could have swallowed up this letter.

<sup>9</sup> ES Os Ms | к немоу Zo Ma Iv Ni.

ДА СВАТИТЪ СА ИМА ТВОЕ: ДА ПРИДЕТЪ ЦЕСАРСТВО<sup>1</sup> ТВОЕ ДА БЪДЕТЪ ВОЛА ТВОА ТАКО НА НЕБЕСЕ<sup>2</sup> И НА ЗЕМЛИ: 3 ХЛѢБЪ НАШЪ НАСѢЩНЫ<sup>3</sup> ДАИ<sup>4</sup> НАМЪ НА ВСАКЪ ДЕНЬ: 4 И ОСТАВИ НАМЪ<sup>5</sup> ГРѢХЪ<sup>6</sup> НАША: ИБО И САМИ ОСТАВЛЯЕМЪ ВСАКОМУ ДАЛЖНИКОУ НАШЕМОУ: —<sup>7</sup> И НЕ ВЗВЕДИ НАСЪ ВЪ ИСКОУШЕНИЕ: НЪ ИЗБАВИ НЫ ОТЪ НЕПРИАЪЗНИ: 5 И РЕЧЕ КЪ НИМЪ: КЪТО ОТЪ ВАСЪ ИМАТЪ ДРОУГЪ: И ИДЕТЪ КЪ НЕМОУ ПОЛОУНОЩИ И РЕЧЕТЪ НЕМОУ: ДРОУЖЕ: ДАЖДЪ МИ ВЪ ЗИМЪ ТРИ ХЛѢБЪ: 6 ИДЕ ДРОУГЪ МИ ПРИДЕ СЪ ПЪТИ КЪ МЫНЪ: И НЕ ИМАМЪ: КЕЖЕ ПОЛОЖЪ<sup>8</sup> ПРѢДЪ НИМЪ: 7 И ТЪ ИЗПЪТРЪЖДОУ ОТЪВѢЩАВЪ РЕЧЕТЪ: НЕ ТВОРИ МИ ТРОУ-ДА: ЮЖЕ ДВЪРИ ЗАТВОРЕНЪ СЪТЪ: И ДѢТИ МОА СЪ ИЗНОЖЪ НА ЛОЖИ СЪТЪ: НЕ МОЖЪ ВЪСТАТИ ДАТИ ТЕБЪ: 8 ГЛАГОЛЪ ЖЕ ВАМЪ: АЩЕ НЕ ДАСТЪ НЕМОУ ВЪСТАВЪ: ЗАНЕ КЕСТЪ ДРОУГЪ НЕМОУ: НЪ ЗА БЕЗОЧЕСТВО ЕГО: ВЪСТАВЪ ДАСТЪ НЕМОУ: КАКИО ТРѢБОУЕТЪ: 9 И ДЪЗ ГЛАГОЛЪ ВАМЪ<sup>9</sup>: ПРОСИТЕ И ДАСТЪ СА ВАМЪ<sup>10</sup>: ИЩЕТЕ И ОБРАЩЕТЕ ТАЗЦЕТЕ И ОТЪВРЪЗЕТЪ<sup>11</sup> СА ВАМЪ: 10 ВСАКЪ БО ПРОСАИ ПРИЕМЛЕТЪ<sup>12</sup>: И ИЩАИ ОБРѢТАЕТЪ: И ТАЗКЪЩОУ НЕМОУ ОТЪВРЪЗЕТЪ СА: 11 КОТОРАГО ЖЕ ОТЪ<sup>13</sup> ВАСЪ ОТЬЦА ВЪСПРОСИТЪ СЫНЪ СВОИ ХЛѢБА: ЕДА КАМЕНЪ ПОДАСТЪ НЕМОУ: ЛИ РЫБЪ: ЕДА ВЪ РЫБЪ МѢСТО ЗМИЖЪ ПОДА-СТЪ НЕМОУ: 12 ЛИ<sup>14</sup> АЩЕ ПРОСИТЪ АИЦА: ЕДА ПОДАСТЪ НЕМОУ СКОРЪПИЖЪ: 13 АЩЕ ОУБО ВЪ ЗЪЛИ СЪЩЕ: ОУМЪНЕТЕ ДАГАНИТА БЛАГА ДАГАТИ ЧАДОМЪ ВАШИМЪ: КОЛЬМИ ПАЧЕ ОТЬЦЪ ВАШЪ СЪ НЕБЕСЕ<sup>15</sup> ДАСТЪ ДОУХЪ БЛАГЪ<sup>16</sup>: ПРОСАЩИИМЪ ОУ НЕГО:

<sup>1</sup> Zo Ma Os Iv | цесарство ES Ni Ms.

<sup>2</sup> Zo MA | небеси Os Sa Iv Ms | небесѣх ES Ni. The plural can have arisen under influence of the preceding plural in the same verse.

<sup>3</sup> Ma Os Iv Ms | днѣсны ES Sa | надънебзны Zo | иносушѣны Ni.

<sup>4</sup> Zo Ma Ni | дажд Os Sa Iv Ms | дажди ES.

<sup>5</sup> отъ насъ ES. Even the words of the Lord's prayer are subject to the analytical tendencies of ES. One would expect the frequent recitation of this prayer to guarantee the stability of its text.

<sup>6</sup> дагы OS Iv. The text of Os in this verse differs sharply from the rest of the witnesses.

<sup>7</sup> и не ES, an unmarked catchword at the end of the recto side of the folio (cf. Mt 2.8).

<sup>8</sup> As Sa Iv Ni | чесо положити Zo Ma Os Ms.

<sup>9</sup> ES Zo Ma Ms | вам глаголъ As Os Sa Iv Ni.

<sup>10</sup> намъ ES.

<sup>11</sup> отврззѣтъ ES.

<sup>12</sup> приметъ ES.

<sup>13</sup> om ES Sa Ms. Uncharacteristically, ES omits a preposition instead of adding one.

<sup>14</sup> ли ES.

<sup>15</sup> ES Zo Ma Os Iv Ms | съ небъ Sa | nebesny As Sa (in Synaxarion) Ni. The adjective has a parallel in a number of Greek manuscripts.

<sup>16</sup> ES As Zo Sa Iv | дагы Ni | сват Ma Ms | сваты Os.

**Lk 12.32-40**

ES: ff. 18v, 19r (part of the first folio lost); lesson for Saturday

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Sa Iv Ni Ko Ms

12·32 рече господь· не бои са· малое стадо· тако благоизволи отьць вашь дати вамъ цѣсарьствие<sup>1</sup>. 33 продадите имѣнїа ваша<sup>2</sup>· и дадите милостынѣ· сзтво-рите себѣ взлагалища<sup>3</sup>· не ветзшатища· сзкровище не оскѣдѣемо на небесѣхъ· иде же тать не приближаѣтъ са ни тьла тьлитъ· 34 иде же бо ѣстъ сзкровище ваше· тоу и срьдце ваше бѣдетъ· 35 бѣдѣ чрѣсла ваша прѣпоасана· и свѣтильници горѣще· 36 и вы подобни чьловѣкомъ чаѣшемъ господа своего· когда вззвратитъ са отъ бракъ· да пришѣдшоу и тлзкноувшоу абїе отвръжѣтъ ѣмоу· 37 блажени раби ти· ꙗже господь пришѣдъ обратѣтъ бздѣща· аминъ глаголютъ вамъ· тако прѣпоашетъ са· и посадитъ ꙗ· и минѣвъ послоужитъ имъ· 38 любо вз<sup>4</sup> вз-торѣтъ любо вз третїиѣ стражѣ придѣтъ· и обратѣтъ тако· блажени сѣтъ раби ти· 39 се же<sup>5</sup> вѣдите· тако аще би вѣдѣлъ господинъ храминъ· вз кыи часъ тать при-дѣтъ· бздѣлъ оубо би· и не би далъ подзкопати домоу своего· 40 и вы бѣдѣте готови· тако вз ѣже часъ не мѣните· сынъ чьловѣчьскыи придѣтъ·

**Jn 6.40-44**

ES: f. 21v; lesson for the dead

Other witnesses: As Zo Ma Os Iv Ni Ms (Os and Ms start their lection (for Thursday of the third week after Easter) with v. 39)

6·40 рече господь кз пришѣдшимъ кз немому иудеомъ· се ѣстъ вола отьца моего· да всѣакъ видаи сына и вѣрочѣи въ нѣ· иматъ животъ вѣчьныи· и възкрѣшѣ и азъ въ послѣднии дѣнь· 41 рзпзтадохѣ же иудѣи о немъ· тако рече· азъ не смь хлѣбъ сзшѣдыи<sup>6</sup> сз небесе· 42 и глаголадохѣ· не съ ли ѣстъ исоусъ сынъ иосифовъ· ѣмоуже мы знаемъ отьца и матерь· како оубо съ глаголетъ· тако сз небесе<sup>7</sup> сзни-дъ· 43 отвѣща исоусъ и рече

---

<sup>1</sup> As Zo Ma Os Sa Iv | цѣсарство ES Ni Ko Ms.

<sup>2</sup> ES As Os Iv Ni Ko | имѣнїе ваше Zo Ma Sa Ms.

<sup>3</sup> As Ma Os Sa Iv Ko | влагалище ES Zo Ni | имѣнїа Ms.

<sup>4</sup> во ES.

<sup>5</sup> и же ES. This variant probably arose through graphic similarity of the Glagolitic **ѣ** and **ѣ**.

<sup>6</sup> сшѣдыи ES As.

<sup>7</sup> неси ES.

ИМЗ' НЕ РЗПЗЩИТЕ МЕЖДУ СОБОУ. 44 НИКЗТО ЖЕ НЕ<sup>1</sup> МОЖЕТЗ ПРИТИ ИЗ МЫНЪ' АЩЕ НЕ ОТЬЦЬ ПОСЛАВЫИ МА ПРИВЛЪЧЕТЗ ЕГО' И ДЗЗ ВЗСКРЪ-ШЪ И ВЗ ПОСЛЪДЪНИИ ДЪНЬ'

### Ac 1.1

ES: f.28v; (incomplete) lesson for Easter

Other witnesses: RA BA TA

1:1 ПРЗВОЕ СЛОВО СЗТВОРИХЗ О ВЪСЪХЗ О ФЕОФИЛЕ' РАЖЕ НАЧАТЗ ИСОУСЗ ТВОРИТИ ЖЕ И ОУЧИТИ' 2 ДО НЕГОЖЕ ДЪНЕ ЗАПОВЪДАВЗ АПОСТОЛОМЗ ДОУХОМЪ СВАТЫИМЪ' РАЖЕ ИЗ-БЗРА<sup>2</sup> ВЪЗНЕСЕ СЪ' 3 ПРЪДЪ НИМИ ЖЕ И СТА ЖИВЪ' ПО МЪЧЕНИИ СВОЕМЪ' ВЗ МЗНОСЪХЗ ЗНАМЕНИИХЗ' ДЪНЬМИ ЧЕТЫРЗМИ ДЕСАТЫ' РАВНАА СЪ ИМЗ И ГЛАГОЛА' РАЖЕ О ЦЪСАРЪ-СТВИИ<sup>3</sup> БОЖИИ' 4 И СЗ НИМИ РАДЫ ПРЪЩАДАШЕ ИМЗ' ОТЗ ИЕРОУСАЛИМА НЕ ЛЪЧИТИ СЪ' НЗ ЖЪДАТИ ОБЪТОВАНИА ОТЬЧА' ЕЖЕ СЛЫШАСТЕ ОУ МЕНЕ' 5 РАКО ИОАНЗ КРЗСТИ ВОДОУ' ВЫ ЖЕ КРЗСТИСТЕ СЪ ДОУХОМЪ СВАТЫИМЪ' НЕ ПО МЗНОСЪХЗ ЖЕ ДЪНЕХЗ СИХЗ'

### Rom 12.1-3

ES: f.15v, 16r; lesson for Thursday

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA CA KA MA

12:1 БРАТИЕ' МОЛЪ    <sup>4</sup> ВЫ ШЕДРОТАМИ БОЖИГАМИ' ПРЪДЗСТАВИТИ<sup>5</sup> ТЪЛЕСА ВАША' ЖРЪ-ТВЪ ЖИВЪ    <sup>6</sup> ОУГОЖДЕНЪ БОГОВИ' СЛОВЕСЬНОЕ<sup>7</sup> СЛОУЖЕНИЕ ВАШЕ' 2 И НЕ СЗОБРАЗУ-ИЩЕ СЪ ВЪКОУ СЕМОУ' НЗ ПРЪОБРАЗУЧИТЕ СЪ ВЗ ОБНОВЛЕНИЕ МЫСЛИ ВАШЕИ' ИСКУША-ИЩЕ ЧЪТО КЕСТЗ ВОЛГА БОЖИГА' БЛАГАА И ОУГОЖДЕНАА' И СЗВРЗШЕНАА' 3 ГЛАГОЛЪ БО БЛАГОДЪТИИЪ ДАВШЕНЪ<sup>8</sup> МИ СЪ' ВЪСТАКОМУ СЪЩОУЕМОУ ВЗ ВАСЗ' НЕ ПРЪМЪДРАТИ СЪ' ПАЧЕ ЕЖЕ ПОДОБАЕТЗ

<sup>1</sup> om ES.

<sup>2</sup> ИЗБРАВЗ ES. The amount of evidence at this point is very meagre. It is conceivable that the finite form was changed under influence of the following prefix and the fact that the following verb is also a finite form.

<sup>3</sup> ЦРСТВЪ ES.

<sup>4</sup> add оубо BA TA CA KA MA. BA does not join the other lectionaries in omitting this connective.

<sup>5</sup> пръдзставите ES | пръдзстависте RA.

<sup>6</sup> add и ES BA | add сватъ CA KA MA.

<sup>7</sup> словесно ES OA.

<sup>8</sup> BA CA | давшѣ ES TA | давшѣ SA KA | давшѣ OA | давшаа RA.

мѣдрствовати' нѣ оумѣждрати са вѣ цѣломѣдрии комоуждо' тако богъ  
нѣстѣ раздѣлилз мѣрѣ вѣрѣ'

### 1Cor 15.39-45

ES: f.21r, 21v (severely damaged); lesson for the dead

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA CA KA MA

15:39 братиѣ' нѣ вѣстакѣ плзть таже плзть' нѣ инѣ оубо чьловѣкомз' инѣ  
же ско-томз' инѣ же плзть пзтицамз' инѣ же рыбаз' 40 и тѣлеса  
небеснаѣ<sup>1</sup> и тѣлеса земнаѣ' нѣ инѣ оубо небеснымз слава' инѣ же  
земнымз' 41 инѣ слава слзнь-цоу' инѣ слава мѣсацоу' инѣ слава  
свѣздамз' свѣзда бо свѣзды<sup>2</sup> разлѣчаѣтѣ са вѣ славѣ' 42 тако и  
взскрѣшеніе мрзтвнымз' сѣѣтѣ са вѣ истѣлѣннѣ' вѣстѣтѣ вѣ безистѣлѣннѣ'  
43 сѣѣтѣ са вѣ нечѣсти' вѣстѣтѣ вѣ славѣ' сѣѣтѣ са вѣ не-мощи'  
вѣстѣтѣ вѣ силѣ' 44 сѣѣтѣ са \_\_\_<sup>3</sup> тѣло доушевно' вѣстѣтѣ тѣло  
доухо-вно' аще нѣстѣ тѣло доушевно' нѣстѣ тѣло доуховно' 45 тако и  
пишетѣ' быстѣ прѣвви чьловѣкз адамз вѣ доушѣ живѣ' послѣдннн адамз  
вѣ доухѣ живо-творннѣ'

### 2Cor 4.6-15

ES: f. 16v, 17r, 17v; lesson for Friday

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA CA KA MA

4:6 братиѣ' богъ рекъи ис тѣмы свѣтоу вѣснѣти' иже вѣснѣ вѣ срздыцихъ  
наши-хъ<sup>4</sup> кз просвѣщенію разоума славы божиѣ' о лицн исочсз хрнстовѣ'  
7 имамз же скрочище се' вѣ скѣдзльнѣхъ сзсѣдѣхъ' да прѣспѣннѣ силѣ  
бѣдетѣ божиѣ<sup>5</sup> а не отз насз' 8 о всемѣ скрзбашѣ' а не сзтѣжѣтѣ си  
нечѣннн' нѣ не отзчѣннн' 9 гонннн<sup>6</sup> нѣ не оставлѣннн' ннззлагѣннн нѣ  
не погыбѣтѣ' 10 вѣсгдѣ мрзтво-стѣ господа исочса<sup>7</sup> вѣ тѣлѣ носѣтѣ'

<sup>1</sup> небеснаѣ ES CA KA.

<sup>2</sup> add от ES SA RA. This variant will be elaborated upon in the critical edition.

<sup>3</sup> add в ES RA TA. It is understandable that a scribe under influence of the preceding analogous phrases with preposition added вѣ. This is a clear example of corruption by scribal inertia.

<sup>4</sup> ваших ES RA.

<sup>5</sup> SA KA | бѣдет божи SA OA | бѣдет божиѣ BA MA | бѣжи бѣдет ES | бѣжи бѣдет TA.

<sup>6</sup> гоннн ES.

<sup>7</sup> ис хѣ ES; quite a common expansion in ES.





ГЛАГОЛѢТЪ ГОСПОДЬ· И НЕЧИСТЪ НЕ ПРИКАСАТЕ СѦ· И ДЪЗ ПРИИМѢ ВЪ· 18 И БѢДѢ ВѢМЪ ВЪ ОТЬЦЬ· И ВЪ БѢДЕТЕ МЪНѢ ВЪ СЫНЫ <sup>1</sup> И ДЪШЕРИ· ГЛАГОЛѢТЪ ГОСПОДЬ ВСЕДРЪЖИТЕЛЬ· 7·1 СИ ЖЕ ИМѢЩЕ ОБѢТОВА·НИГА· ВЪЗЪЛЮБЛЕННИИ· ОЦѢСТИМЪ СѦ ОТЪ ВСѦКОМЪ СКВРЪЗНЫ· ПЛЪТЬСКИМЪ<sup>2</sup> И ДОУХОВЬ·НЫМЪ· ТВОРАЩЕ СВАТЫНѢ ВЪ СТРАСѢ БОЖИИ·

## 2Cor 9.6-11

ES: f.19r, 19v; lesson for Sunday

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA CA KA MA

9·6 БРАТИЕ· СЪМЪ <sup>3</sup> ШАДѦИ· ШАДѦИ ПОЖЪНѢТЪ· И СЪМЪ О БЛАГОСЛОВЛЕННИИХЪ· О БЛАГОСЛОВЛЕННИИХЪ<sup>4</sup> И ПОЖЪНѢТЪ· 7 КЪЖДО ТАКО ЖЕ ИЗВОЛЕНІЕ ИМАТЪ СРЪДЦЕМЪ· НИ ОТЪ СКРЪБИ НИ ОТЪ БѢДЫ· ТИХА БО ДАТЕЛА ЛЮБИТЪ БОГЪ· 8 СИЛЪНЪ ЖЕ БОГЪ· 5 ВСѦ·КѢ БЛАГОДѢТЬ ИЗЪБИТЪЧЕСТВОВАТИ<sup>6</sup> ВЪ ВАСЪ· ДА О ВСЕМЪ ВСЕГДА· ВСѦКЪ ДОВОЛЪ ИМѢЩЕ· ИЗЪБИТЪЧЕСТВОУЕТЕ· ВЪ<sup>7</sup> ВСѦКО ДѢЛО БЛАГО· 9 ТАКО ЖЕ НЕТЪ ПИСАНО· РАСТОЧИ И ДАСТЪ ОУБОГИМЪ· ПРАВЪДА ЕГО ПРѢБЫВАЕТЪ ВЪ ВѢСЫ <sup>8</sup>· 10 ДѦИ ЖЕ СЪМА СЪМЪ·ЩОУЕМОУ· И ХЛѢБЪ ВЪ СЪНѢДЪ ДА ПОДАСТЪ· И ОУМНОЖИТЪ СЪМА ВАШЕ· И ДА ВЪЗДРАСТИТЪ ЖИТА ПРАВЪДѢ ВАШЕИ· 11 О ВСЕМЪ БОГАТАЩЕ СѦ· ВЪ ВСѦКѢ ШЕДРОТѢ· ІАЖЕ<sup>9</sup> СЪДѢВАЕТЪ НАМИ ХВАЛѢ БОГОВИ·

## Ga 4.4-7

ES: f.22v; lesson for Christmas

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA CA KA MA

<sup>1</sup> add МѢСТО СА КА МА.

<sup>2</sup> ПЛЪТЬНЫМЪ ES.

<sup>3</sup> add и ES OA.

<sup>4</sup> о БЛѢВЕНЬХЪ— о БЛѢВЕНЬ ES. The Slavic rendering (not mentioned in the Slovník) of the Greek idiomatic expression ἐπ' εὐλογίας (bountifully) is the obvious cause of much confusion in the Slavic manuscripts, which do not have any reading in common.

<sup>5</sup> БОГ В ES RA.

<sup>6</sup> ИЗЪБИЛОВАТИ ES SA | ИЗЪБИЛОВА RA.

<sup>7</sup> ИЗЪБИТОЧЕСТВОУЮЩИ ОА | ИЗЪБИЛОУЕТЕ ВО ES | ИЗЪБИЛОУЕТЪ· ВЪ RA. In three cases (2Cor 4.15, 2 Cor 9.8 bis) RA ES share the same lexical variant.

<sup>8</sup> add ВѢСА ES | add ВѢСОУ MA. This expansion has an equivalent in Greek manuscripts, but could, of course, have arisen independently.

<sup>9</sup> ТАКО ЖЕ ES OA MA. This combination of words occurs very often, so a scribe could easily have expanded the relative by mistake to the more familiar conjunction.

4·4 БРАТИЕ· КѢГДА ПРИДЕ<sup>1</sup> КОНЬЧИНА ЛѢТОУ· ПОСЛА БОГЪ СЫНА СВОЕГО  
 ЕДИНОЧАДА·КѢГО· РАЖДАЮЩА СЯ ОТЪ ЖЕНЫ· БЫВАЮЩА ПОДЪ ЗАКОНОМЪ· 5 ДА  
 ПОДЪЗАКОНЫНА ИС·КОУПИТЪ· ДА ВЪСЫНЕНІЕ ПРИИМЕМЪ<sup>2</sup>· 6 ІАКО ЖЕ ІЕСТЕ  
 СЫНОВЕ· ПОСЛА БОГЪ ДОУХЪ СЫНА СВОЕГО ВЪ СРЪДЦА ВАША<sup>3</sup>· ВЪЗПИНА<sup>4</sup> АВВА  
 ОТЬЦЬ· 7 ТѢМЪ ЖЕ ОУЖЕ НѢСИ РАБЪ НЪ СЫНЪ· АЩЕ ЛИ СЫНЪ И НАСЛѢДЬНИКЪ  
 БОЖИИ ИСОУСЪ ХРИСТОМЪ<sup>5</sup>·

### Eph 4.1-7

ES: f.105v, 106r; lesson for Monday

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA TA CA KA MA

4·1 БРАТИЕ· МОЛИТѢ ВЫ· АЗЪ ПЪЗЬНИКЪ<sup>6</sup> О ГОСПОДИ· ДОСТОИНО ХОДИТИ ЗЪВАНИЮ·  
 ВЪ НЕ·ЖЕ<sup>7</sup> ЗЪВАНИ БЫТЕ· 2 СЪ ВЪСАКОТѢ СЪМЪРЕНОТѢ<sup>8</sup> МЪДРОСТИТѢ· И  
 КРОТОСТИТѢ· СЪ ТРЪ·ПЪНИЕМЪ· ОТЪРАЖДАЮЩЕ ДРОУГЪ ДРОУГОУ ЛЮБВИТѢ· 3  
 ТЪЩАЩЕ СЯ БЛЮСТИ· ЕДИ·НЕНІЕ ДОУХА· ВЪ СЪПЪЗЪ<sup>9</sup> МИРА· 4 ЕДИНО ТѢЛО· И  
 ЕДИНЪ ДОУХЪ· ІАКО ЖЕ И ЗЪВАНИ БЫТЕ· ВЪ ЕДИНОМЪ ОУПЪЗВАНИИ<sup>10</sup>· ЗЪВАНИА  
 ВАШЕГО· 5 ЕДИНЪ ГОСПОДЬ· ЕДИНА ВЪРА· \_\_<sup>11</sup> ЕДИНО КРЪЩЕНІЕ· 6 ЕДИНЪ  
 БОГЪ<sup>12</sup> И ОТЪЦЬ ВЪСЪМЪ· ІЖЕ НАДЪ ВЪСЪМИ· И О<sup>13</sup> ВЪСЪХЪ· И ВЪ<sup>14</sup> ВЪСЪХЪ \_\_<sup>15</sup>·  
 7 ЕДИНОМОУ КОМОУЖДО НАСЪ<sup>16</sup>· ДАСТЪ СЯ· БЛАГОДѢТЬ· ПО МЪРЪ ДАРОВАНИА

<sup>1</sup> придетъ ES.

<sup>2</sup> принимает ES MA. This reading can be caused by graphic similarity of Glagolitic ѿ and ѿ.

<sup>3</sup> ES SA OA TA KA MA {ὁμῶν Ψ Byz Lect<sup>pt</sup> 3R} | НАША RA BA CA {ὁμῶν X A Lect<sup>pt</sup> slav}. The siglum ‘slav’ should rather be listed as supporting the first variant.

<sup>4</sup> SA OA RA TA | ВЪПИНА ES BA CA KA | ВЪЗЫВАЕИ MA.

<sup>5</sup> SA RA TA MA | ХЬМЪ BA | ХЪВЪ CA | И ХЪВЪ KA | ДОУХОМ ES OA. The last variant can hard-ly be explained by attributing it to graphic similarity.

<sup>6</sup> пѣжник ES SA TA.

<sup>7</sup> немъже ES. This could be a *lectio facillior*.

<sup>8</sup> сѣмѣренѣтѣ ES. Cf. Rom 12.3.

<sup>9</sup> ТА | сѣпѣзъ ES | сѣпѣзъ SA OA BA CA KA MA | сѣпаза RA.

<sup>10</sup> ЕДИНО ОУПЪЗВАНИЕ ES | ЕДИНОЮ НАДЕЖАЮЮ MA. ES changes the locatives to accusatives, while it changes the accusative to a locative with the same verb in v.1.

<sup>11</sup> add и ES. Not an unexpected addition.

<sup>12</sup> господ ES MA. This variant, semantically similar, could have arisen under influence of the same word in the previous verse.

<sup>13</sup> отъ ES.

<sup>14</sup> во ES.

<sup>15</sup> ES OA RA TA {X A B C P} | add НАС BA CA KA (subsequently added) MA {ἡμῖν D F G Byz Lect slav} | add ВАС SA. It is more likely that this word was added under influence of Byzantine manuscripts than that it was accidentally omitted.

<sup>16</sup> ВАС ES RA.

ХРИСТОВА<sup>1</sup>.

### Eph 5.8-19

ES: f. 18r (damaged); lesson for Saturday

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA CA KA MA

5·8 БРАТИНЕ' ГАКО ЧАДА СВѢТОУ ХОДИТЕ' 9 ПЛОДЪ БО ДОУХОВНЫИ ВЪ ВСАКОИ БЛАГО-СТЫНИ' И ПРАВДАЪ И ИСТИНѢ' 10 ИСКОУШАЮЩЕ ЧТО ЕСТЬ ГОДЪ ГОСПОДЕВИ<sup>2</sup>. 11 И НЕ ПРИЧАЩАЙТЕ СЯ КЪ ДѢЛОМЪ НЕПЛОДНЫИМЪ ТѢМЪ' ПАЧЕ ЖЕ ОБЛИЧАЙТЕ' 12 БЫВАЮЩАГА ТАИ' О НИХЪЖЕ' СРАМЪ ЕСТЬ ГЛАГОЛАТИ' 13 ВСА ЖЕ ОБЛИЧАЕМА ОТЪ СВѢТА ГЛАГОЛАЮЩЕ СЯ' 14 ВСАКО ЖЕ ГЛАВЛЕНИЕ СВѢТЪ ЕСТЬ' ТѢМЪ ЖЕ ГЛАГОЛАЮЩЕ ВЪСТАНИ СЪ-ПАИ' И ВЪСКРѢСНИ ОТЪ МРТВЫИХЪ' И ОСВѢТИТЪ ТА ХРИСТОСЪ<sup>3</sup>. 15 БЛЮДЕТЕ ОУБО ОПА-СНО КАКО ХОДИТЕ' НЕ ГАКО НЕМАЮЩИ' НЪ ГАКО ПРѢМАЮЩИ' 16 ИСКОУПОУЮЩЕ ВРЕМЯ' ГАКО ДЪНЕ ЗЪЛИ СЪТЪ' 17 СЕГО РАДИ НЕ БЫВАЙТЕ БЕЗОУМНИ' НЪ РАЗОУМѢВАЮЩЕ ЧТО ЕСТЬ ВОЛГА ГОСПОДЬНА<sup>4</sup>. 18 И НЕ ОУПИВАЙТЕ СЯ ВИНОМЪ' ВЪ НИЕМЪЖЕ ЕСТЬ БЛѢДЪ' НЪ ПАЧЕ <sup>5</sup> ИСПЛЪНАЙТЕ СЯ ДОУХОМЪ' 19 ГЛАГОЛАЮЩЕ <sup>6</sup> СЕБѢ' ВЪ ПСАДЪМЪХЪ' И ПѢНИИХЪ' И ПѢСНЬХЪ ДОУХОВНАХЪ<sup>7</sup>. ПОЮЩЕ И ПРѢПОЮЩЕ' ВЪ СЪЗДАНИИХЪ ВАШИИХЪ ГОСПОДЕВИ'

### Tt 2.11-14, 3.4-7

ES: f.24r, 24v; lesson for Theophany

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA KA

2·11 ЧАДО ТИТЕ<sup>8</sup>. ПРОСВѢТИ СЯ БЛАГОДѢТЬ БОЖИГА СПАСИТЕЛНА<sup>9</sup> ВСѢМЪ ЧЛОВѢ-КОМЪ' 12 НАКАЗАЮЩЕ НЫ' ДА ОТВРЪЗЖЕ<sup>10</sup> СЯ НЕЧЪСТИ<sup>11</sup> И

<sup>1</sup> МЪ ДАРОВАНЮ ES | МЕРЪ ДАРОВАНИЮ ХЪОУ СА | ВЪРЪ ХЪВЪ МА. While the variants in CA MA make sense, ES does not.

<sup>2</sup> ГДОУ КА | Г^НЪ RA | ГЪОВИ ES.

<sup>3</sup> БЪ ES.

<sup>4</sup> БЖИ ES.

<sup>5</sup> add и ES.

<sup>6</sup> add в ES RA.

<sup>7</sup> SA | ДОУХОВНЫХЪ ES RA TA CA KA MA.

<sup>8</sup> BA | ТИМОФЕЮ ES SA OA RA. The mistake must have been introduced either independently (a more familiar name/incipit) or by a common ancestor. RA has the same erroneous incipit on f. 81a (BA has again the correct reference).

<sup>9</sup> BA TA | СПАСИТЕЛНА SA OA KA | СПАСЕНИЕ ES RA. Greek scribes had similar problems with this (less familiar) word.

<sup>10</sup> ОТВРЪЖЕМЪ ES.

<sup>11</sup> НЕЧЪСТИА ES OA RA.

ПЛЗТЬСКИХЪ<sup>1</sup> ПОХО-ТИИ<sup>2</sup> ЦѢЛОМѢДРЬНО И ПРАВЪДНО И<sup>3</sup> БЛАГОВѢРНО ПОЖИВЕМЪ  
 ВЪ НЫНѢШЬНИИМЪ ВѢЦѢХЪ. 13 ЧАЮЩЕ БЛАЖЕНАГО ОУПЪЗВАНИА И ПРОСВѢЩЕНИА  
 СЛАВЫ ВЕЛИКАГО БОГА И СЪПАСА НАШЕГО ИСОУСЪ ХРИСТА. 14 ИЖЕ ДАСТЪ СЕБЕ  
 ЗА НЫ ДА ИЗБАВИТЪ НЫ ОТЪ ВЪСАКОГО<sup>4</sup> БЕЗАКОННА. И ОЦѢСТИТЪ СЕБѢ<sup>5</sup> ЛЮДИ  
 ИЗРАДЬНЫ РЪВНИТЕЛА ДОБРЫИМЪ ДѢЛОМЪ. 3·4 ЕГДА ЖЕ БЛАГОСТЬ И  
 ЧЛОВѢКОЛЮБИЕ ПРОСВѢТИ СА СЪПАСИТЕЛА \_<sup>6</sup> НАШЕГО БОГА. 5 НЕ ОТЪ ДѢЛЪ  
 ПРАВЪДЬНЫХЪ РАЖЕ<sup>7</sup> СЪТВОРИХОМЪ НЫ НЪ ПО СВОЕИ ЕГО МИЛОСТИ СЪПАСЕ НЫ<sup>8</sup>  
 БАНЕИ ПАСЫБЫТИИКОИИ И ОБНОВАНИЕМЪ ДОУХА СВАТА. 6 ИЖЕ ИЗЛИГА НА<sup>9</sup> НЫ  
 ОБИЛЬНО ИСОУСЪ ХРИСТОМЪ СЪПАСИТЕЛЕМЪ НАШИМЪ. 7 ДА ОПРАВДАВШЕ СА  
 БЛАГОДѢ-ТИИ ЕГО НАСЛѢДЬНИЦИ БѢДЕМЪ ПО ОУПЪЗВАНИЮ ЖИЗНИ ВѢЧЬНЫА.

## He 2.11-18

ES: f. 27r, 27v; lesson for Annunciation

Other witnesses: SA OA RA BA CA MA

2:11 БРАТИЕ СВАТАИ<sup>10</sup> \_<sup>11</sup> И СВАЩАЕМИИ ОТЪ ЕДИНОГО ВСИ КѢЖЕ РАДИ  
 ВИНЫ НЕ СТЫДИТЕ СА БРАТИИ НАРИЦАТИ И<sup>12</sup>. 12 ГЛАГОЛѢ ВЪЗВѢЩѢ ИМА  
 ТВОЕ БРАТИИ<sup>13</sup> МО-ИИ ПОСРѢДѢ ЦРКВЕ ВЪСПОИ ТА. 13 И ПАКЫ АЗЪ БѢДѢ  
 НАДѢА СА НА НЫ И ПАКЫ СЕ АЗЪ И ДѢТИ РАЖЕ МИ ЕСТЪ ДАЛЪ БОГЪ. 14  
 ПОНЕ ЖЕ ОУБО ДѢТИ \_<sup>14</sup> ОБЪЩИША СА ПЛЗТИ И КРЪВИ И ТЪ ИСКРЬ ПРИЧАСТИ  
 СА ТѢХЪ ДА СЪМЪРЪТИИ РАЗДРОУШИТЪ ИМАЩАГО ДРЪЖАВѢ СЪМЪРЪТИ СИРѢЧЬ  
 ДИАВОЛА. 15 И ИЗБАВИТЪ СИА КЕЛИКО СТРАХЪ СЪМЪРЪТИ ВЪСѢМЪ ЖИВОТОМЪ

<sup>1</sup> ПЛЗТЪНЫХЪ ES. Cf. 2Cor 7.1

<sup>2</sup> CONJECTURE (Leskien) | похотѣи ES OA RA BA | похоти SA TA KA.

<sup>3</sup> om ES SA. The omission can have been caused by homoioteleuton.

<sup>4</sup> ВЪСЕГО ES.

<sup>5</sup> СЕБЕ ES TA. An accusative is theologically unacceptable.

<sup>6</sup> add · и ES.

<sup>7</sup> еже ES; cf. the previous себе: another case of interchange between ѣ and е.

<sup>8</sup> СПАСЕНИ ES TA | СПСЕНИЕ RA. The last reading could be tertiary.

<sup>9</sup> ЗА ES. This preposition in combination with this verb (and blood) was probably more familiar.

<sup>10</sup> BA TA CA | СВАТИ(И) ES OA RA MA. The second reading is more familiar.

<sup>11</sup> add БО BA TA CA MA. The lectionary BA also contains the 'continuous' reading.

<sup>12</sup> БРАТРИ И НАРИЦАТИ ES. In this point the readings of the manuscripts are difficult to ascertain with respect to word division and the cases (due to confusion of nasals).

<sup>13</sup> BA CA | БРАТРИ ES | БРАТИ SA OA RA TA MA.

<sup>14</sup> add оу ES. Is this a prefix to the following verb?

ПОВИНЬНИ БѢДѸѢ<sup>1</sup> РАБОТѢ 16 НЕ ОТЪ АНГЕЛЪ БО<sup>2</sup> КЪТО ПРИЕМ-АЕЪТЪ: НЪ ОТЪ СЪМЕНЕ<sup>3</sup> АВРААМЛА ПРИЕМАЕЪТЪ<sup>4</sup>. 17 ПДОУ ДЛЪЖЪНЪ БѢ ПО ВСЕМОУ БРАТИИ ОУПОДОБАТИ СЯ: ДА МИЛОСТИВЪ БѢДЕТЪ И ВѢРЪНЪ СВАТИТЕЛЬ РАЖЕ<sup>5</sup> КЪ БОГОУ: ОЦѢСТИТИ ГРѢХЪ ЛЮДЪМЪ. 18 ИМЪЖЕ БО<sup>6</sup> ПОСТРАДА СЯМЪ ИСКОУШЕНЪ: МОЖЕТЪ НАПАСТЬВОВАНЫМЪ<sup>7</sup> ПОМОЩИ:

### He 12.1-10

ES: f.25r, 25v; lesson for Forty Martyrs of Sebaste

Other witnesses: SA OA BA CA MA

12:1 БРАТИЕ: ТОЛИКЪ ИМѢЩЕ ОБЛЕЖАЩЬ НЫ<sup>8</sup> ОБЛАКЪ СЪВѢДѢТЕЛЬ: ГРЪДОСТЬ ОТЪЛОЖЬ-ШЕ ВСЯКѢ: И ОУДОБЬ ОБРѢТЕНЪИ ГРѢХЪ: ТРЪПѢНИЕМЪ ТЕЧЕНЪ<sup>9</sup> ПРѢДЪЛЕЖАЩИИ НА-МЪ ПОДВИГЪ. 2 ВЪЗРИАЩЕ НА ПОКОНЬНИКА ВѢРѢ: И СЪВЪШТЕЛА ИСОУСА: ИЖЕ ЗА ПРѢДЪЛЕЖАЩИѢМЪ ЕГО РАДОСТЬ: РАСПАТИЕ ПОСТРАДА: О СТОУДѢ ЖЕ НЕРОЖДѢ: О ДЕСНѢМЪ ЖЕ ПРѢСТОЛА БОЖИА СЪДЕ: 3 ПОМЫСЛИТЕ БО ПОСТРАДАВШАЕГО<sup>10</sup> ТАКОВОЕ: ОТЪ ГРѢШНИКЪ ВЪ СЕБѢ<sup>11</sup> ПРѢКОСЛОВИА: ДА НЕ ДѢЛАЕТЕ ДОУШАМИ \_<sup>12</sup> СВОИМИ: ОСЛА-БЛАГѢЩЕ СЯ: 4 НЕ

<sup>1</sup> БѢХОМ? ES. Although the last letter is not legible, it is clear that ES has again a different desinence.

<sup>2</sup> ОУБО ES BA | БО ОУБО ТА.

<sup>3</sup> СЪМЕНИ ES.

<sup>4</sup> om ES SA. Homoioteleuton.

<sup>5</sup> RA BA TA CA | ЕЖЕ SA OA MA | РАКО ЖЕ ES. Cf. 2Cor 9.11.

<sup>6</sup> om ES, possibly due to phonetic similarity to the following prefix.

<sup>7</sup> МОЖЕТЪ ИСКОУШЕНЪ БЫВЪ НАПАСТЬНЫМЪ ES. The scribe did not only try to simplify the construction through transposition, but also by adding БЫВЪ to ИСКОУШЕНЪ (πειρασθείς). Since this is not a case of corruption but rather a more understandable rendering, it could be the original translation.

<sup>8</sup> ОБЛЕЖАЩИИ ES | ОБЛЕЖАЩИИ ТА. Since no semi-vowel follows the щ in TA, the two words seem to have been considered as one word. It could be the intermediate step of corruption that resulted in ES' variant.

<sup>9</sup> ТЕЧЕНИЕМЪ ES. The corruption was probably caused by the preceding word through homoioteleuton.

<sup>10</sup> СТРАДАВША · ES. The prefix was probably lost under influence of the connective БО. The addition of the punctuation mark indicates that the copyist probably did not understand how the sentence should be read.

<sup>11</sup> НА НЕГО CA. CA alone follows the Greek Byzantine text; cf. Bakker & Van der Tak 1994: 45.

<sup>12</sup> add РАКАМИ ES. The appearance of this addition cannot be explained as a mechanical error. However, the combination of this word with the preceding verb is very common in edificatory texts.

оу до крзвѣ<sup>1</sup> противѣ стасте кз грѣхоу противаше са<sup>5</sup> и забы-сте оутышениѣ<sup>2</sup> ѣже вѣмз<sup>2</sup> ꙗко сыномз глаголетз<sup>2</sup> сыноу мои не прѣнемагдаи по-казаниѣмъ господнѣмъ<sup>2</sup> ни ослѣбѣи<sup>3</sup> отз нѣго обличаѣмз<sup>2</sup> б<sup>2</sup> ѣгоже любитз го-сподь показателз<sup>2</sup> бинетз же всѣакого сына ѣгоже приѣмлетз<sup>2</sup> 7 аще<sup>4</sup> показаниѣ трѣпите<sup>2</sup> ꙗко сыномз вѣмз обрѣтаѣтз са богз<sup>2</sup> который бо<sup>5</sup> ѣстз сынз ѣгоже не кажетз отць<sup>2</sup> 8 аще ли бес показаниѣа ѣсте<sup>2</sup> ѣмоуже причастьници быша<sup>2</sup> вси оубо любодѣичици а не сынове ѣсте<sup>2</sup> 9 обаче \_<sup>6</sup> пазти нашеи отьца имѣахомз казателѣа<sup>2</sup> и срамлѣадохомз са \_<sup>7</sup> не паче ли сѣло да повинѣмз<sup>8</sup> са<sup>2</sup> отьцоу доу-хомз<sup>2</sup> и живи бѣдемз<sup>2</sup> 10 они бо вѣ<sup>9</sup> мало дѣнии ꙗко годѣ имз бѣ<sup>10</sup> показадхѣ<sup>2</sup> а съ на польсѣ причастити са свѣтъни ѣго<sup>2</sup>

## REFERENCES

ALEKSEEV, A.A.

1986 "Опыт текстологического анализа славянского евангелия". *Palaeobulgarica* X, 3: 8-19

1988 [Review of Tarnanidis 1988] *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 37: 190-197.

BAKKER, M.

1990 "Discovered on Mount Athos: the Karakalski Apostol". *Palaeobulgarica*, XIV, 4: 61-67.

1994 "The Old Slavonic Version in UBS4" in *Novum Testamentum* [in print].

BAKKER, M. & J. G. VAN DER TAK.

<sup>1</sup> ES OA BA | крви ТА СА МА.

<sup>2</sup> вѣсѣмз ES.

<sup>3</sup> ослѣбѣи ES.

<sup>4</sup> вѣ СА. Cf. Bakker & Van der Tak 1994: 45.

<sup>5</sup> BA TA CA MA | оубо ES | om SA OA.

<sup>6</sup> add по ES OA. This addition does not alter the sense and probably makes the text easier to understand. OA has the same addition in its lesson for September 25th. It is possible that this variant was the original reading which was subsequently brought into line with the Greek text.

<sup>7</sup> add их ES RA. This addition makes the text more explicit.

<sup>8</sup> повинѣхомз ES.

<sup>9</sup> om ES.

<sup>10</sup> бѣхѣ ES. The copyist was probably already looking at the next word or he did not understand the sentence.

- 1994 "Collating Greek and Slavic Apostolos Manuscripts". *Palaeobulgarica* XVIII, 2: 32-49.
- BÉDIER, C.J.  
1928 "La tradition manuscrite du 'Lai de l' Ombre'. Réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes." *Romania* 54: 161-196, 321-356.
- BLÁHOVÁ, E.  
1989 [Review of Tarnanidis 1988], *Byzantinoslavica*, Tome L Fasc. 1: 64-68.
- BLÁHOVÁ, E & HAUPTOVÁ, Z  
1990 *Струмички (Македонски) Апостол*. Скопје.
- BOGDANOVIĆ, D.; B. VELČEVA; A. NAUMOV  
1986 *L'Apostolos bulgare du XIII-e siècle: manuscrit Decani-Crkolez*. Sofia.
- ČIFLJANOV, B. D.  
1976 *Богослужбеният чин, преведен от св. братя Кирил и Методий в началото на тяхната моравска мисия*. София.
- COLWELL, E.C.  
1965 "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text" in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*. Edited by J. Ph. Hyatt. Nashville/ New York.
- 1969 *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden.
- DANIČIĆ, Đ.  
1864 *Nikoljsko Jevandjelje*. U Biogradu.
- DANTI A.  
1977 "O znaczeniu tekstu krytycznego" in *Slavia* 46: 395-398.
- THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT*  
1983<sup>3</sup> edited by K. Aland, M. Black, C. M. Martini, B.M. Metzger and A. Wikgren.  
United Bible Societies. Stuttgart.
- THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT*  
1993<sup>4</sup> edited by B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, B.M. Metzger.  
United Bible Societies. Stuttgart.
- ILINSKIJ, G.A.  
1912 *Слепченский Апостоль*. Москва.
- IVANOVA-MAVRODINOVA, V. & A. DŽUROVA.  
1981 *Асеманиевото евангелие. Старобългарски глаголически паметник от X век. (2) Факсимилно издание*. София.
- JAGIĆ, V  
1879 *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus, characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum notis prolegomenis appendicibus auctum*. Berolini (Repr. Graz 1954).
- 1883 *Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae Codex Marianus glagoliticus characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum*. Berolini (Repr. Graz 1960).
- KALUŽNIACKI, A.  
1896 *Actus epistulaeque Apostolorum Palaeoslovenice ad fidem codicis christinopolitani edidit A. Kalužniacki*. Vindobonae.
- KOSSEV, N.V.  
1986 *Евангелие Кохно, Болгарский памятник XIII в.* София.
- KOVAČEVIĆ, R.  
1979 *The Apostolos of Matica Srpska (13th century)*. Belgrade.



- KUL'BAKIN, S.  
1907 *Охридская рукопись апостола конца XII века*. София. (=Български старини, кн. 3).
- LESKIEN, A.  
1969<sup>9</sup> *Handbuch der Altbulgarischen Sprache*. Heidelberg.
- LIXAČEV, D.S.  
1983<sup>2</sup> *Текстология на материале русской литературы X-XVII веков*. Ленинград.
- LUNT, H.G.  
1986 "On Old Church Slavonic Gospel Texts" in *Byzantino-Bulgarica VIII*: 112-121.
- METZGER, B.M.  
1968<sup>2</sup> *The Text of the New Testament, Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. Oxford.
- 1971 *A Textual Commentary on The Greek New Testament*. A companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament. Stuttgart.
- 1977 *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford.
- NAHTIGAL, R.  
1941 *Euchologium Sinaiticum: Starocerkvenoslovenski glagolski spomenik*. Ljubljana.
- NESTLE, E. - ALAND K.  
1983<sup>26</sup> *Novum Testamentum Graece, post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle communitate ediderunt Kurt Aland et alii*. Stuttgart.
- 1993<sup>27</sup> *Novum Testamentum Graece, post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle communitate ediderunt Kurt Aland et alii*. Stuttgart.
- OSTROMIROVO EVANGELIE  
1988 *Остромирово Евангелие. Апракос 1056-1057 годов - старейший памятник славянской письменности и искусства книги Древней Руси*. Ленинград / Москва. (Facsimile).
- ROBINSON, P.M.W.  
1992 *Collate: Interactive Collation of Large Textual Traditions, Version 1.1*. (Computer Program distributed by Oxford University Computing Service). Oxford.
- ŠČEPKIN, V  
1903 *Саввина Книга*. Спб. (Repr. Graz 1959).
- SLOVNÍK  
1958 *Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského*. Praha.
- STEFANOVIĆ, D.E.  
1989 *Apostolus Šišatovacensis anni 1324*. Wien.
- TARNANIDIS, I. C.  
1988 *The Slavonic Manuscripts discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*. Thessaloniki.
- TOV, E.  
1992 *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, Assen/Maastricht.
- VAJS, J.  
1935a *Evangelium sv. Marka. Text rekonstruovaný*. V Praze.  
1935b *Evangelium sv. Matouše. Text rekonstruovaný*. V Praze.  
1936a *Evangelium sv. Jana. Text rekonstruovaný*. V Praze.  
1936b *Evangelium sv. Lukáše. Text rekonstruovaný*. V Praze.

ŽIVKOVA, L.

1980 *Четвероевангелието на цар Иван Александър*. София. (Facsimile).

ŽUKOVSKAJA, L.P

1983 *Апракос Мстислава Великого*. Москва.