

Anissava Miltenova (Sofia)

## AN UNSTUDIED COMPILATION WITH THE NAME OF ANDREW THE APOSTLE

The non-canonical Acts of Andrew the Apostle are among the earliest and most valuable sources for the history of translated literature in medieval Bulgaria. It is a widely accepted view that the archetypal Greek text of *Acta Andreae* originated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century in Alexandria<sup>1</sup>. There are several works that have reached our time in Coptic, Armenian, Syrian, Arabic, Ethiopic, Latin, Greek and Slavic copies in various versions, often in fragments<sup>2</sup>. It is a well-known fact that Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 263–339) mentions the text in his *Ecclesiastical History* (III, 25) with reference to Origen (ca. 184–254). The Greek, Oriental and Latin traditions have been described in detail<sup>3</sup>, investigated and published to a certain degree<sup>4</sup>. A. de Santos Otero published a list of the copies known in Slavic manuscripts<sup>5</sup>. According to F. Thomson (in his analysis of the archaeographical data of A. de Santos Otero)<sup>6</sup> at least seven or eight different texts that can be attributed to the acts of Apostle Andrew were in circulation in the Slavic tradition: *Acta et marti-*

<sup>1</sup> Jean-Marc Prieur (*The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D.N. FREEDMAN, vol. I, Doubleday 1992, p. 246): *The Manichean Psalter, which contains some allusions to the content of Acts Andr. (A Manichean Psalm-Book, ed. by C.R.C. Allberry etc. [Including Psalms by Syrus, Heraclides and Thomas. A Transcription and Translation of the Coptic Text. With Plates.] Stuttgart 1938, p. 142, 143, 192), establishes the 3<sup>rd</sup> century as the terminus ad quem for the redaction of the apocryphon, but the Acts had to have originated earlier, between 150 and 200, closer to 150 than to 200. The distinctive christology of the text, its silence concerning the historical and biblical Jesus, and its distance from later institutional organization and ecclesiastical rites militate for an early dating. Moreover, its serene tone and unawareness of any polemic against some of its ideas as heterodox, particularly in the area of christology, show that it derived from a period when the christology of the Great Church had not yet taken firm shape. One might repeat here the line of argumentation employed by Junod and Kaestli for locating the Acts of John in the same period. Moreover, Acts John displays several affinities with Acts Andr., such as the literary genre, structure, and theological orientations.*

<sup>2</sup> L. ROIG LANZILLOTTA, *Acta Andreae Apocrypha. A New Perspective on the Nature, Intention and Significance of the Primitive Text. With 12 Plates*, Genève 2007 [http://irs.ub.rug.nl/dbi/4b96033e2328f].

<sup>3</sup> *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, cura et studio M. GEERARD, Brepols-Turnhout 1992, p. 135–146.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the comprehensive publication of J.-M. Prieur: *Acta Andreae*, vol. I–II, ed. J.-M. PRIEUR, Turnhout 1989 [= CC.SA, 5–6]. Full bibliography in: *The Apocryphal Acts of Andrew*, ed. J. N. BREMMER, Leuven 2000, p. 186–189.

<sup>5</sup> A. DE SANTOS OTERO, *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen*, vol. I, Berlin–New York 1978, p. 69–83.

<sup>6</sup> F. THOMSON, *Apocrypha Slavica*, SEER 58.2, 1980, p. 256–268.

*rum Andreae* (BHG 95b); *Acta Andreae et Mathiae in urbe anthropophagum* (BHG 109–110d) in two translations; a compilation of *Acta Andreae* (BHG 94–94c and 95) and *Martirium Andreae* (BHG 97), whose Greek or Slavic origin is impossible to determine; *Vita Andreae* in the Slavonic Prolog (BHG 101b); *Commentarius de Andreae*, the earliest copy of which is from the 13<sup>th</sup> c.; an original Russian writing about the Apostle Andrew, his visit to Russia and the conversion of Russians to Christianity, which was spread in numerous copies between the 15<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>7</sup>. Of all the above works, the paleoslavists' attention is drawn primarily by the acts of Andrew and Mathew in the land of cannibals, a text that has been translated in modern Bulgarian as well<sup>8</sup>.

The text under discussion in this paper is entitled “From the teaching of Apostle Andrew”: (Ѡ) оучениа ст҃го ап(с)ла андреа, инс. Ъшь(д)шоу ст҃моу ап(с)лоу андрею въ сьн'мь съ оученикі си. начеше и(х) въпрашати Ѡ коу(д) юсте и что ю(с)ваше сло(в). It is preserved in a sole copy from the 14–15<sup>th</sup> c., written in Raška orthography, without nasal vowels, and with one jer (ь). Today the manuscript is preserved in the collection of the Rumyantsev Museum (178), No. 10272, in the Russian State Library in Moscow. The material of the manuscript is bombacyne; it has no visible vergeures and pontuseau and is written out in the Serbian semiuncial, typical for the end of 14<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of 15<sup>th</sup> century. Originally it belonged to the collection of A. I. Hludov; however, as evidenced by the number (No. 84) written at the top of the first folio in blue pencil, it had turned up there from the second, so called “Macedonian” collection of A. F. Hilferding. The exceptionally intriguing fate of Hilferding's collection has been studied in detail in the articles of Anatolij A. Turilov<sup>9</sup> and Zhanna Levshina<sup>10</sup>. This collection was formed during A.F. Hilferding's trip to Bosnia, Herzegovina, Macedonia and “old” Serbia in 1857,

<sup>7</sup> More important publications of Slavic translations and revisions: Н.С. ТИХОНРАВОВ, *Памятники отреченной русской литературы*, vol. II. Москва 1863, p. 5–10; St. НОВАКОВИЋ, *Apokrifij jednoga srpskog ćirilovskog zbornika XIV vieka*, Star 8, 1876, p. 55–69; И.Я. ПОРФИРЬЕВ, *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям Соловецкой библиотеки*, СОРЯС 17.1, 1877, p. 87–89; В.Г. ВАСИЛЬЕВСКИЙ, *Хождение апостола Андрея в стране мирмидонян*, ЖМНП, 1877, vol. 189, pars 2, p. 41–82, 157–185; М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *Апокрифи ческие Деяния ап. Андрея в славяно-русских списках*, ТМАО 15.2, 1894, p. 35–75; С.В. ПЕТРОВСКИЙ, *Апокрифические сказания об апостольской проповеди по черноморскому побережью*, ЗООИД 21, 1898, p. 1–184; П.А. ЛАВРОВ, *Апокрифические тексты*, СОРЯС, 67, 1899, series XIV, p. 40–51; К. ИСТОМИН, *Из славянорусских рукописей об апостоле Андрее*, Санкт-Петербург 1904, p. 11–14; Н.В. ПОНЫРКО, А.М. ПАНЧЕНКО, *Апокрифи о Андрее Первозванном*, [in:] *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси*, I. XI–первая половина XIV в., Ленинград 1987, p. 49–54.

<sup>8</sup> *Стара българска литература. I. Апокрифи*, ed. Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, София 1981, p. 185–195, 382–383 (*Acta Andreae et Mathiae in urbe anthropophagum*).

<sup>9</sup> А.А. ТУРИЛОВ, *К истории второй (македонской) рукописной коллекции А. Ф. Гильфердинга*, [in:] *Славянский альманах 2002*, Москва 2003, p. 130–143 [= А.А. ТУРИЛОВ, *От Кирилла Философа до Константина Костенецкого и Василия Софийнина*, Москва 2011, p. 413–428].

<sup>10</sup> Ж. ЛЕВШИНА, *Путешествие А. Ф. Гильфердинга 1868 года и славянские рукописи его «македонской» коллекции (итоги и перспективы изучения)*, АрП 34, 2012, p. 77–107. I wish to express my gratitude to Zhanna Levshina for providing me with data concerning the Hilferding collection as well as the text of her article prior to publishing it.

when he was the Russian consul in Sarajevo; later he published a description of the trip<sup>11</sup>. A considerable number of the South Slavic manuscripts were collected by A. F. Hilferding in the Slepče Monastery, the Lesnovo Monastery, in Kratovo, Lešok (Tetovo region), the Treskavec and despot Marko's Monastery as well as in Ohrid, and they probably were sold to A. I. Hludov not later than 1869. The margins of the miscellany contain notes written by A. N. Popov, who worked on the texts; he was also likely to have temporarily kept the book in his collection (today 237 in the Russian State Library). The following inscription has been written out on folio 122v: *ПОМОЗИ БОЖЕ ГОСПОДИНУ ДЕСПОТУ* (God help our master the Despot); the text on folio 133v reads: *ГЮРГУ ДЕСПОТУ* (To Gyurgi the Despot). Probably the ruler in question is Georgi Branković (1427–1456)<sup>12</sup>. The manuscript is cited and examined by a number of scholars in accordance with its description in A.I. Hludov's catalogue (No. 105)<sup>13</sup> (e.g. Santos Otero mentions it with the same number in his review (No. 31); so does F. Thomson in the review cited above). However, the manuscript has not been in Hludov's collection for the last 70 years, since it is considered to have been acquired by the Rummyantsev Museum prior to 1947.

What is the content of the manuscript? It is a miscellany with mixed content, comprising didactic texts, lives of saints (mostly martyrs), sermons and stories. In the beginning, a fragment has been preserved from *The Dispute between Panagiot the Philosopher and Azimit* (1r–1v)<sup>14</sup>; this is followed (folio 2r–14v) by an excerpt from *Siracides* (The Wisdom of Sirach) (the beginning is missing, the text resembles the translation in the *Izbornik of 1076*)<sup>15</sup>; next comes the writing about Apostle Andrew, on which is discussed in this paper (14r–18v)<sup>16</sup>. The texts that come after are as follows: *The Epistle of Basil the Great to Gregory the Theologian* (18v–25r); *The Life of St Protomartyr Stephen* (25r–32r); *Homily on the Transfiguration* by John Chrysostom (32r–36r); *Homily on Palm Sunday* by John Chrysostom (36v–42r); *Homily on Mid-Pentecost* by John Chrysostom (42r–46v); *Homily on the El-*

<sup>11</sup> А.Ф. ГИЛЬФЕРДИНГ, *Поездка по Герцеговине, Боснии и Старой Сербии. Босния в начале 1858 г.*, Санкт-Петербург 1859 [= ЗИРГО, 13].

<sup>12</sup> A Serbian despot (1427–56), vassal of the Turks and the Hungarians. In 1439 he fled to Hungary. He took part in an anti-Ottoman coalition (1443–44); regained (1444) his possession, paid tax to the Turks, but in 1454 lost part of his land.

<sup>13</sup> А.Н. ПОПОВ, *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А. И. Хлудова*, Москва 1872, p. 250–252.

<sup>14</sup> The byzantine work is composed immediately after the Second Council of Lyon (1274) and its ideological content is against the Lyon union and the policy of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259–1282), see: А. ПОПОВ, *Историко-литературный обзор древнерусских полемических сочинений против латинян (XI–XV в.)*, Москва 1875, p. 238–286. This fragment (may be the earliest copy in South Slavic tradition) is worthy of separate analysis.

<sup>15</sup> *Изборник 1076 года*, coll. М.С. МУШИНСКАЯ, Е.А. МИШИНА, В.С. ГОЛЫШЕНКО, ed. А.М. МОЛДОВАН, vol. I–II, Москва 2009<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> A transcription of the text is published by M. N. Speranskiy posthumously: М. Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *Библиографические материалы А. Н. Попова. Учение ап. Андрея*, ЧИОИДР 1889, 3, p. 53–62. The publication does not include an analysis of the eventual sources of the work; a transcription of the Martyrdom of Saints Apostles Peter and Paul of the same manuscript is also published there.

evation of the Holy Cross (anonymous, missing folia between 46 and 47) (46v–48r); *The Life of St Eustace Placidus* (48r–57v); *Martyrdom of Saint Apostles Peter and Paul* (57v–66v)<sup>17</sup>; *The Life of Prophet Elijah* (66v–70r) (abridged text at the end of which the part of the encomium by St Clement of Ohrid is added) *Enkomion on the Dormition of the Theotokos* by St Clement of Ohrid (70r–71r); *The Life of St Pope Sylvester* (fragment) (71r–72v); *The Life of St. Euphrosynus the Cook* (fragment) (73r–73v); *The Life of St George* (fragment of the old redaction) (74v); excerpts from the sermon (anonymous) (75r–83r); excerpts from the *Paterikon* (83r–84r), excerpts from *The Erotapokriseis* by Anastasios of Sinai (84r–88r); *Instruction of Father to his Son* (88r–92r, folia appear to be missing between 90v and 91r; identical to the copy in the *Izbornik of 1076*)<sup>18</sup>; excerpts from *The story about Barlaam and Josaphat* (92r–108r); short *Life of St Sava of Serbia* (108r–120v)<sup>19</sup>; *Synaxarion Life of St Simeon Serbian* (121r–122v); *A Miracle of St. Nicholas of Myra*, about his saving the lives of three men (123r–129r); *The Life of St. Demetrius of Thessaloniki* (129v–135r, 74r–74v, copy of the old redaction; the text is uncompleted, without an ending). The content of the hagiographies and the homilies has been specified by K. Ivanova<sup>20</sup> by providing information on the manuscript regarding its number in the Rummyantsev Museum. The author describes the content as a combination of *sermons that have been extracted from the Menaion and the Triodion panegyric and, possibly, from a Reading Menaion of the Old Redaction (“staroizvoden cheti-minej”), with a mixed-up calendar sequence*<sup>21</sup>.

The prevailing number of texts retain archaic linguistic features from the time of First Bulgarian Kingdom. I will quote only a few examples from the vocabulary of the text: *самохотниѡ* ‘free will’ (Codex Supr., *Izbornik 1073*, Gregory of Nazianzus 11<sup>th</sup> c.: *самохотниѡ, самохотниѡ*; *Izbornik 1076*: *самохотью*); *самовластьць* ‘absolute’ (Codex Supr.); *таинникъ* ‘keeper of the secrets’ – *шбл(д)ающаа земльнымии. таинника не(с)нымь* (Gregory Naz. 11<sup>th</sup> c.; Codex Supr. *таивьникъ*; *Izbornik 1073* *таивъьныи*); *простына* ‘absolution’ – *простию грьховъ* (Codex Supr. *простыниѡ*); *отъльствьникъ* ‘revenger’ (*напах*; Codex Supr. *отъльствивъ*); *несытъ* ‘greedy’ (Codex Supr., *Prophetologion*, etc.); *благына* ‘goodness’ (Codex Supr.); *благостына* ‘benevolence’ (*Psalterium Sin.*, *Euchologium Sin.*, Codex Supr., *Prophetologion*, etc.); *стыдство* ‘shame’ (Codex Supr., *Life of Alexander the Great*), etc. Usage of dual form, along with the use of nominative in the place of accusative case, are quite common.

The examined text is a comprehensive, yet rather brief account of the human history from the Creation to the resurrection of Christ, from the transgres-

<sup>17</sup> Published by: М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 1–52.

<sup>18</sup> *Изборник 1076 года*, p. 164–203.

<sup>19</sup> Д. БОГДАНОВИЪ, *Кратко житије светог Саве*, ЗМСКJ 24.1, 1976, p. 5–32.

<sup>20</sup> Кл. ИВАНОВА, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Balcano-Slavica*, София 2008, p. 82–83. The author refers the chronology of the manuscript to the last decades of 14<sup>th</sup> c., defining the font as *ustav*.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 82.

sion to the redemption and salvation (заповѣда намъ проповѣдати покаяніе въ прѣстѣннѣ грѣхѣмъ). It starts with an introduction about the place and the circumstances under which Saint Andrew states forth his “teaching”, i.e. with stating the grounds for the main compositional part of the text that follows. Andrew and the other disciples answer the questions of the people in front of the “meeting”; by answering the question who they are and what their word is, Andrew denies their assertion that Herod is the true Christ, depicting him as a murderer of children, a deceiver who originates from another tribe and does not belong to the Jews, therefore being their ill-wisher. Andrew declares himself to be the first disciple of John the Baptist, gives an eyewitness account of the baptism of Christ, and confirms that he and the other Disciples of Christ have been sent to preach penance and absolution of sin among all peoples. The main sermon of the Apostle Andrew before the people starts the next day. In it, he traces the events since Creation. The removal of the tenth angelic rank, and its elder, who became the forefather of evil of its own will, is an important issue (самохотню, тако самовластѣць). In the text, he is referred to as “the devil”; the name “Satan” or “Satanail” is missing. Man was created in place of the fallen rank of angels in the image and likeness of God and endowed by God with power over all things, over earthly riches and heavenly mysteries, and with immortality. The next part is devoted to the seduction of the first people by the guileful devil, the birth of Cain and his transgressions. Cain’s sins are not only listed in the text, but also characterized by examples. Further, the story relates the Old Testament events from the kin of Abel to the flood and the survival of the family of Noah. The anonymous compiler focuses on the worship of pagan idols and Abraham’s rejection of pagan customs, the extension of Abraham’s offspring, the escape of Joseph to Egypt and the Exodus of the Jews to the Promised Land with Moses; Joshua, Samuel, David and the prophet Daniel are mentioned. The final part tells of the birth and deeds of Jesus until his death on the cross and the resurrection – for the salvation of men and the destruction of the devil. The text ends with an eschatological perspective of the Second Coming and the Last Judgment.

There is no trace of rhetoric in the style: the story is a simple narrative. The introduction, which refutes Herod’s role and disguises his origin, undoubtedly bears a resemblance to the initial part of *Acta Andreae*. I had at my disposal a Georgian text translated into Russian<sup>22</sup>, the comparison with whose introduction showed a close concurrence, even regarding the rendering of names. As noted by researchers of the Greek text, a homily in the synagogue of the town of Amasea is depicted here, whereas the Georgian text relates of the town of Sinop (the capital of the Pontic rulers in Paphlagonia). In our copy no name of a town is mentioned, while the synagogue is referred to as “сѣньмѣ”. The interrogation-response form of the introduction reveals a bias towards polemic; it is obvious that Apostle Andrew is speaking to Jews.

<sup>22</sup> *Житіе св. апостола Андрея первозваннаго*, ХЧ 8, 1869, p. 151–180.

The narrative of the Old Testament story has many parallels with the *Palaea Historica*. Here are some of them:

1) There are similar reasons and the manner of the revolt of the tenth angelic rank, and its elder – out of envy of the perfect and wealthy deeds of God (НЕ СТЪПЪКЪВЪ БОГАТЪСТВА ТОЛИКЪ(Х) БЛЪГЪНЪНЪ); a reluctance to glorify God because of pride (ДІАВОЛЬ ЖЕ ВЪЗВЕЛИЧАВЪ СЕ НА ТВОРЦА И НЕ ХОТЕ СЛАВИТИ ЮГО СЪ ИНЪМИ). It is emphasized twice that it is the elder's own will to turn into an evil force (САМОХОТИЮ ВЪРАТИ СЕ НА ЗЛО, ЯКО САМОВАСТЪЦЪ). The allegation that initially there was darkness is renounced (И ДА НИКТОЖЕ ГЛЪЖЕТЪ ЯКО ИСПРЪВА ТЪМА ВЪШЕ. БЪ ВО СВЪТЪИ Ю(С) И ВЪСА СВЪТЛАТА СТВОРИ).

2) Man was created in the place of the fallen angelic rank, and was endowed with high virtue (БЛЪГИИ ЖЕ ГЪ И ТВОРЦЪ ВСЪМЪ. ВИДЪВЪ ЮГО ѠПАДШАА И СОУЩІИ(Х) ИЖЕ ПО(Д) НИМЪ. И СТВОРИ ЧЛКА ВЪ ШЕРАЗЪ СВОИ. ВЪ НИЕГО МЪКСТО. ПО(Д)ВНА САМОВАСТЪЦА СВЪТЛА ВЪЗРОМЪ. БЛЪГАА ІАСНОСЛОВЦА. ШЕЛА(Д)АЮЩАА ЗЕМЪНЪНИИ. ТАИННИКА НЕ(С) НЫМЪ. ТЛЪНИИ КРОМЪ И СЪМЪРТИ). Besides being in the *Palaea Historica*, this motif has found a place in one of the versions of the Legend of the Tiberian Sea as well: ВМЕСТО ОТПАДШИХЪ ЛИКЪ НАПОЛНЯЕТЪ ГДЪ ЧЕЛОВЪКИ, ПРАВЕДНЫХЪ ЧЛКЪ СОЗЫВАЕТЪ И МЯСТО САМАГО САТАНЫ СОТВОРИ ГДЪ ПЛОТНА ЧЛОВЪКА ПЕРВОЗДАННАГО ІДАМА<sup>23</sup>. As witnessed by Euthymius Zigabenus, the same motif (possibly of a Gnostic origin), alluded to in the Book of Enoch<sup>24</sup>, has found its place in the Bogomil teaching, although slightly modified<sup>25</sup>.

3) The motif of the devil tempting Adam and Eve, and the birth of Cain, are also similar to the *Palaea* story, despite being much shorter; man was created innocent and immortal, but tempted into evil ways by the devil, whose aim was to tempt the very first of the humans so that the next generations would also turn mortal: ДІАВОЛЬ ЖЕ ВЪ(Д)ШЕ, ЯКО ВЪШЕ ЧЛКОУ РОДИТИ РОДЪ НЕИСТЛЪНИИ. И ЯКО АЦЕ ПРЪВААГО НЕ ПРЪБЪСТИТЬ, ВЪТОРІИ НЕТЛЪНИИ БОУДЕТЬ.

4) Abel's murder and the seven sins of Cain also parallel the *Palaea Historica*. However, in contrast to the *Palaea* (as already mentioned), each sin is represented here with a much more detailed characteristic and in two parallel sequences: clarification (interpretation) of each sin and the indication of the respective punishment received for it by Cain. This most detailed part of the examined text bears a certain similarity to some interrogation-response works; however, they are not characterized by such exhaustiveness.

5) The narrative about Abel's offspring is a continuation of the theme about the evil acts of the devil, among which the destructive role of wars is pointed out (the same might be referred to the Bogomils' view of life as well).

<sup>23</sup> Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги и легенди*, София 1925, р. 297.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, р. 172, 189.

<sup>25</sup> *The Bogomils say that the fallen angels, on hearing that Satanil had promised the Father to replace them by human beings in Heaven, started copulating with human daughters, in the hope of returning to Heaven. Of this mixing the giants were born*, see: PG, vol. 130, col. 1305.

6) Seth laid the foundations of wisdom (РОДИ СЕ СЊНЬ ПО(Д)ВНЬ АДАМОУ И ПРАВЕ(Д)НЬ. ТЬЬ БО МОУДРОСТЬ ИЗЪВЕРЬТЬ); this merit coincides with the comment on Seth in one of the versions of the *Palaea Historica*<sup>26</sup> as well as with the questions and answers, where the creation of the writing is credited to him<sup>27</sup>.

7) The remaining events from the Old Testament are selected with a similar tendency so as to end the work with the birth of Christ, His Crucifixion and Resurrection.

As evidenced by this brief review, **no** extreme dualistic notions are to be found in the text. Its structure is a combination of narrative and sermon, without any special emphasis on the latter. The “teaching” of the Apostle Andrew is focused on the evil acts of Cain, which doom humanity to a bond with the devil and must therefore be eradicated, as well as on absolution and salvation. The text has undoubtedly been created as a compilation, in which parts of *Acta Andreae* have been used, and aiming at a framework to contrast good and evil by means of the biblical legend. Until now, a source of Greek analogue of this sole copy has not been found. The text is surrounded by works of a paraenetic nature, such as The Wisdom of Sirach and The Epistle of Basil the Great to Gregory the Theologian. The overall content of the miscellany aims at perfecting the faith by means of moralizing models (we may include in their number the multitude of saints’ lives as well). Our conclusion raises the issue of whether or not the examined text can be defined as an apocryphal story. I would refer its composition to the so called type “retelling the Bible”<sup>28</sup> or rewriting / recreating the Holy Scripture; these works are also categorized recently as “parabiblical literature”<sup>29</sup>. The patterns of these texts are rooted in the Holy Scripture and mostly in the Gospels’ text, which contains stable patterns based on plain analogies, meant to illustrate certain didactic maxims. By incorporating elements of the “marginal” texts into ones of higher authority and didactic value, the former are rendered equal to the latter with regard not only to their reception, but their importance as well. Thus the differences between canonical and non-canonical may entirely disappear.

## Appendix

/14г/ ѿ оучениа сѣго ап(с)ла андреа

Бъшь(д)шоу сѣомоу ап(с)лоу андрею въ сън’мь съ оученикїи си. начеше и(х)

<sup>26</sup> Collection of Josifo-Volokolamsk monastery, № 551, 16<sup>th</sup> c.

<sup>27</sup> Lovech miscellany, 16<sup>th</sup> c.: да кому нан прѣжде посла бѣ граманижство. ѿ(в)еть. ситѹ снѹ а(д)амову.

<sup>28</sup> F. ALEXANDER, *Retelling the Old Testament*, [in:] *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D.A. CARSON and H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, Cambridge 1988, p. 116–118.

<sup>29</sup> G.J. BROOKE, *Hypertextuality and the “Parabiblical” Dead Sea Scrolls*, [in:] *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature*, ed. P. ALEXANDER, A. LANGE and R. PILLINGER, Leiden–Boston 2010, p. 43–64.

въпрашати ѿ коу(д) юсте и что ю(с) ваше сло(в). Ѡвещавъ андреи р(ч)е к ни(м). ї(с)са галилеискаго юсмы оученици. а слово оубо слышасте ѡ немь юже изыде ѿ иер(с)лма. изыдоше же иродиади. и рѣше їс(с)а оубо слышахомь. нь ирода глѣмь истїи ю(с) х̄(с)ь. иже оуркана низложивъ и шелѣче се въ юрсоньскыи вѣнцѣ. и иже повѣди многыи въставивъ. Ѡвещавъ же а(н)дреи р(ч)е. послѡушаите мене. ирод(д)ь иноплѣменикъ бѣше снѣ антипатра раба юре(ѡ)ва асколонита. иродъ же /14v/ тьъ бѣше гоубитель чедоубитель мьжь льстивъ. и не бѣше жидовинъ ни ѿ плѣмене юдина. вни же паку рѣша тако пр(о)рци рѣше. тако иванъ снѣ за(х)ринъ ѿ колѣне юдина ю(с). Р(ч)е же андреи моужки и бра(т)ю послѡушаите мене. азъ ївановъ оученикъ юсмы прѣвы. азъ бо ѿ їѡ(н)а прѣж(д)е оучихъ се съ инѣми, проповѣдавшоу їваноу крѣщенїе въ покаянїе. видѣвъ же ї(с)са гредѡуща къ немоу, и прѣстомъ показа се агньць ба въ землю и грѣхы всего всего (!) мира. и р(ч)е їсоу азъ трѣбоую ѿ тебе крѣщен[.] быти а тыи гре(д)ши къ мнѣ. и свѣ(д)тельствова їѡ(а)нъ ѡ немь. тако видѣ(х) д[.] сходящъ и прѣбывающъ на немь. азъ не вѣ(д)ахъ. нь пославїи мѣ кр(с)тити тьъ мнѣ р(ч)е. на нь же ви(д)ши дх̄ъ бжїи сходящъ съ нбсе и прѣбывающъ на немь, тьъ ю(с) снѣ бѣ живаго. Гї оубо слышавъ азъ андреа ѿ їѡан оставль їѡ(а)н послѣдова(х) ї(с)соу. г̄. [.]и паче чю(д)са многаа створи їсѣ прѣ(д) /15r/ нами. по прѣж(д)е пи(с)енмоу ѿ пр(о)ркь ѡ немь. архїереи же нестрѣвше величаемьимъ. прѣдаше юго пилатоу игемоу юдеискому и распеше и. и положеноу юмоу бывшоу въ гробѣ новѣ. и въ третїи днѣ прѣж(д)е ютра въскрсе. и ави се намъ въ днѣхъ. м̄.ти(х) въ галилеи. и заповѣда намъ проповѣдати покаянїе въ простиню грѣхомъ въ имѣ юго въ вѣ(х) юзицѣ(х). И ѿпоустивъ народы стѣи андреи. вьниде шелеци съ оученики своими. бѣ же оученикъ юго съ нимъ. н̄.

На оутрина събра се множество народа. и изышъ(д) андреи р(ч)е лю(д)мь миръ вамъ бра(т)ю. вни же рѣше и с тобою (!). и наче глати имъ кротѣцѣ. бѣ юдинъ ю(с) без начла и пр(и)носи блгъ. и творць всѣ и твари нбсннимъ и земльннимъ. и прѣиспо(д)нимъ. тьъ юдинъ. ї. чинѡвъ аггльскы(х) створивъ. свѣт̄ сын и свѣтлаа створи. огнь сїи и ѡг[н] нѣпалецаа створивъ. юдинъ же ѿ ї. чинѡвъ старѣки чиноу своемоу. не стрѣпѣвъ богатства толики(х) блгыннъ. /15v/ самохотню шбрати се на зло, тако самовластьць. да въ свѣта мѣсто, вы(с) тьмнъ. и въ блгынѣ вонѣ вьсь смраднъ. и въ ч(с)то ты мѣсто неч(с)ть и непо(д)внъ. и да никтоже глѣеть тако испрѣва тма бѣше. бѣ бо свѣтъ ю(с) и вса свѣтлаа створи. дїаволь же възвеличавсе на творѣца и не хоте славити юго съ инѣми. самохотню мьрноувъ лишень вы(с) свѣта. и за многаа добра также моу бѣхоу дана, многымъ повийнъ вы(с) и прѣльстникъ. лъжь ненавистникъ доброу. блгын же г̄ь и творць всѣмь. видѣвъ юго ѿпадшаа и соущїи(х) иже по(д) нимъ. и створи члѣка въ шбразъ свои. въ него мѣсто. по(д)вна самовластьца свѣтла възоромь. блгаа ясновѡвца. шела(д)ающаа земльнными. таниника не(с)нымъ. тлѣннаа кромѣ и смьрти.

Лоукавыи же дїаволь. видѣвъ члѣка тако почтена шбразомъ бжїимъ. и въ него мѣсто поставлена възреновавъ и тыцаше се съврѣши ю(г) ѿ тоѣ чьсти. блгын же г̄ь видѣвъ кова/лбг/рство лоукаваго дїавола. и члѣка самовластьца и проста. да(с) юмоу по(д)порь и помощь, дрѣво пады. и рекъ юмоу семоу юдиномоу тьчию не прикосни се и не имаши оумрѣти. и не възноси се и не имаши ѿлоучень



БЫТИ ѿ мене, се бо ю(с) сьмрьть. дїаволь же в'ѣ(д)ше, тако в'ѣше ч'лкоу родити родъ неистл'бннъ. и тако аще прьвааго не пр'ѣльститъ, вьторїи нестл'бннъ боудеть. потыща се пр'ѣж(д)е даже не родитъ, величаниємъ вслоушати се створ'шаго и ба. и пр'ѣльстїи женоу и жена моужа. и гадша ѿ др'ѣва, лишиста се бл'гостиньъ многы(х) ба и аг'льскы(х) бес'ѣдъ. и веваживша се познаста своєюго стоудьства и сьмрьть. и роднста снъ вслоушаниа каина, юже показа дїаволю лоукавюе житиє. в'ѣ во каинъ. неб'лтънъ. лоукавъ. лъживъ. неправ'дивъ. несытъ. ненавиден ч'лка. и оубїи оубо авела бра(т) своєюго правє(д)на соуща и безловива. и възетъ з. мьстїи им'же. з. злобьъ створїи. прьвв. юг(д)а начетнїе принесе боу. начє/16v/тнїе пр'ѣж(д)е самъ добр'ѣшиє из'ѣдаше и тако боу приношаше. се прьвою зло створи. второю же тако рьвностию възрєв'нова авелоу бра(т)оу своєюмоу. за приношениа боу болшаа. третнїе же лоукавьство, тако боу и родителїема лоукав'новаа. д. ненависть ненавиде иев бра(т). оучаше се како н' бїи (!) оубиль. е. вслоушаниє ба и родителъ. з. пр'ѣльсть. пр'ѣльсти во своєюго бра(т). рекъ пондеве на поле. братоу авеле, да се поглоумива с'ѣрепо. з. сьлга. по оубнїенїи во р(ч)е бъ к нїємоу, каинє г'дє ю(с) братъ твои авель. пакы не в'ѣды всев'ѣд'ць. нъ разоумъ дагаше юмоу покаиниа. внже не тьчню мл(с)рдовавъ ѡ разл'чени братнїи. нъ нестыде се р(ч)е шканьныи. юда стражъ юсмь азъ братоу моєюмоу. правдив'же бъ за .з. мьстїи .з. злобьъ да(с) юмоу. д. юже ѿ ба тоу(ж)дъ бы(с). изыде во каинъ ѿ лица бжїа. б. на проклетнїе землю всьелєнъ бы(с), тако wskврьни ю крвьию братнїю. г. /17r/д'ѣло беспокота. д'ѣла иво землю р(ч)е. д. неплодъство земли. работа иво земля р(ч)е и не имат' ти дати силы своєю. е. стєнати бес пр'ѣмльчаниа. з. трепетати, стєнє во р(ч)е и трепеще да гаси (!) землю. трепеще во ни гаси ни пити, занє не можааше своима роукама приносить къ оустомъ своимъ. з. предльженнє жизни, вн' бо хот'ѣше и оубнїениємъ избыти зла. моучещим бо се сьмрьть дають вьскор'ѣ простыню.

Явелоу же оубнїеноу бывшоу. роди се снъ по(д)бнь адалмоу и правє(д)нъ. тьъ во моудрость изьвєр'ѣтъ. и тьъ роди юноса по(д)бна сєв'ѣ. добрых во ра(д) д'ѣльъ юго ба нарицахоу и. сєго снѡве вид'ѣвшє дьщєры каинovy красны поимаше ю сєв'ѣ жены. прокажена во рода дьщєры, красна бывають лица имъ. тии же наоучивше ю ѿчи злоб'ѣ. гравити оубивати. грады сьзидовати. прьвою во каинъ възгради и браны створи єдиногo ра(д) жены. юже и намъ воєвати єдиногo ра(д) моужа. и потомъ оумножь/17v/шим' се ч'лкомъ. и не може стрьп'ѣти земля зьын(х) д'ѣльъ ч'лчскы(х). и вид'ѣвъ бъ безаконнє лю(д)скою навє(д) потопъ. и во(д)ю шч(с)ти землю ѿ гр'ѣхъ. єдиногo же правє(д)на ч'лка ноа сь .г. ми снъми и сь женами ихъ сьхранивъ ковчєгомъ. и сь нимъ оутвари животныє.

И пакы оумножьшим' се ч'лкомъ. испрьва злод'ѣи дїаво[ло]въ не пр'ѣста воює на родъ ч'лчскыи. и наоучи и(х) коумиромъ слоужити. и въ м'ѣсто ба створив'шаго всачьскага, поклонати се твари роукоу своєю паче же в'ѣсомъ. явраам' же єдинъ оуб'ѣжа коумиролужениа. и послужки боу истнїнномуу творцоу нбоу и земли. и т'ѣмъ бл(с)ви с'ѣме юго. и ѿ нєго вьстави оучителє б'г'гоч(с)тивыє пр(о)ркы. и юнаго оучителя иосифа ц'ѣлооумноу слышлєнїю и гладоу бывшоу привєдъ с'ѣме своє въ югуп'тъ пр'ѣпитанє. и поємъ югуп'т'ѣне правє(д)ноє с'ѣме створише рабы. бл(с)вивъ бъ посла ѿ мьстника лю(д)мъ своимъ моисєа. иже створи чю(д)са

[...] и зна/18г/менига велика въ югуптѣ. и раз(д)ѣль морє прове(д)ю а югуптѣне потопи. и прѣбыше въ поустини .л̄. лѣ(т) нисоусомь навинновомь вънидоше въ землю вѣѣтован(н)ноу. и по нѣмь соуднѣ до самоуила и до дѣда црѣа, юмоу же клет'се ѿ плода чрѣсльь юго дати цр(с)тво не(с)ноѣ не прѣм'ѣн'ноѣ. и по дѣдѣ пр(о)кы в'се иже пр(о)рчьствоваше ѿ прих(о)дѣ х(с)вѣ. и сконьчав'шим' се пр(о)чьствомь данилюемь.

Посла бѣ сѣа своѣго въ мирь, и всели се въ штроковицоу ч(с)тоую ѿ сѣмене дѣдва имоушїи хранителя стар'ца. и роди снѣ бжїи въ вѣѣоленѣмѣ нюденсѣмь. нѣо же звѣз(д)оу проповѣда рож(д)ениѣ юмоу, и призваа влхвы пер'скыѣ. и аггли вславише. пастыриѣ слышав'ше блг(о)вѣстише мироу радость. а дїаволоу погыбѣль. .л̄. лѣтъь бывъ съ снѣ бжїи. поусти прѣ(д) собомь їѡа(н) сѣа за(х)рина, проповѣдати крщениѣ въ покаяниѣ мироу. и самь кр(с)тив' се ѿ їѡ(н)а. И по тре(х) лѣ(т)хъ по крщени, оучецоу юмоу въ црѣви лю(д). и шели/18v/чаѣ архинєрєшмь безакон'наа и(х) повелѣниа. вѣдаше .л̄. сребрьникь подроу(г) своєюму, и въ ноши прѣдаше юго пилатоу игемоноу нюденскомоу. и распн'ше по своєюму повелѣнию. и томоу х(о)тецоу положише въ гробь. и страже поставлше стрѣщи гробь, и печатив'ше юго. въ ноцъ же третню шевитающоу днїи вьскр'се. штавивъ гроб'на въ свѣ(д)тельство вьскр'сению своєюму. и жены ѿ на(с) шь(д)ше оувѣ(д)ше ѿ аггла вьскр'сению юго намь повѣдаше. и намь потомь гави се. и с нами ясть и пить .л̄. днїи. и заповѣдавъ намь проповѣдати юго сѣа бжїиа соуща. и видецимь намь юго. въ .л̄. ча(с) днѣ вьне(с)се на нѣо и сѣде ѿ десноую шца своѣго. мы же шжидаемь юго на кон'ць вѣкь прїити соудити живимь и мрѣт'вымь. юмоу же сла(в) съ шцѣмь и сѣмь дх̄омь. н̄на.

**Abstract.** The paper presents an unstudied text with the name of the Apostle Andrew in the miscellany of 15<sup>th</sup> c., now Muz.10272, Rashka orthography. The text (with traces of archaic archetype) is a unique copy of the compilation. The history of the manuscript is very interesting, because it belonged to the A. Hilferding collection in the past. The aim of the author is to propose a preliminary analysis of the text, its origin and chronology, as well as its context in the Slavic tradition.

**Keywords:** Apocryphal acts of the apostles, Old-Church-Slavonic literary tradition, text edition.

**Анисава Милтенова**

Институт за литература

Българска академия на науките  
бул. Шипченски проход 52, бл. 17

1113 София, България

anmilten@bas.bg