

# Slavonic Apocrypha and Slavic Linguistics

ALEXANDER KULIK

Church Slavonic was created and developed as a language of translation from Greek. Studying translated texts with their extant *Vorlage* close at hand, or reconstructing their lost prototypes, is the only way to understand the functioning and the development of Church Slavonic.<sup>1</sup> The consequences of this phenomenon are noticeable also in later stages of the development of Slavic languages, up to the modern period. That is the reason why the study of an important group of translated documents – the Slavonic apocrypha<sup>2</sup> – cannot be done without applying the up-to-date knowledge on the early Jewish and Christian literatures, to which the originals of these works belong, as the tools of Slavic linguistic research. Moreover, before we are even attempting any substantial research, the very primarily understanding of the texts of these compositions cannot be achieved without referring to both these fields of knowledge simultaneously. It might go without saying, if the practice of the research of Slavonic apocrypha had been different. The reasons of this situation are very understandable. Many of the texts under discussion belong to the very beginning of the literary activity of Slavs; some of these texts have been saved in old manuscripts, which preserved valuable evidence in the development of the language. Many of these documents must have been popular, since they have survived in numerous copies from different parts of the realm of *Slavia Orthodoxa*. From the middle of the nineteenth century Slavists began to publish and study these texts as a part of the Slavic legacy, only occasionally referring to their ancient background. At the same time, western (Christian, and then Jewish) students of theology, history of religion, Jewish thought, mysticism, *etc.*, at times were unable to refrain from making conclusions based on the documents, the very content of which in many aspects has remained obscure to them. In best instances, the proper division of labor took place: a Slavist had published the text, restricting himself to textual criticism and primarily interpretation, then the text was translated (usually

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. “The main reason for incomprehensibility [of early Slavonic texts] is, of course, literal translation, and the list of works in which whole passages are completely without meaning in Slavonic is long ...” (Thomson 1978, 117).

<sup>2</sup> Or more accurately “Slavonic Pseudepigrapha,” although this terminology became widely accepted, especially in research written in Russian.

not by Slavists, but by someone who knew Church Slavonic to some extent), and from this point the translated text was becoming accessible to all. This process was not obligatory for all compositions, but when it took place, its disadvantages were clear: to make proper evaluations, whether concerning linguistic phenomena, or textual interpretation, or textual criticism, or other more profound analysis of the contents and structure of the text, the researcher needs to have all relevant data and has to be able to see all alternatives at once.

In this article, using the series of examples, I would demonstrate that even the most rudimentary level of understanding of the text of Slavonic apocrypha cannot be achieved on the basis of Slavic linguistics only, without taking into consideration data from the non-Slavistic disciplines. I will restrict myself to a discussion of a representative list of obscure word usages in one text, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (= *ApAb*),<sup>3</sup> which contains the following *hapax legomena*:<sup>4</sup>

1. *измалъ* ‘chisel’ (1.8)
2. *кокониль* ‘Nile’s grain’ (?) (2.3)
3. *настръзати* ‘destroy’ or *настръзати* ‘carve’ (1.1)
4. *поновения* ‘consecration’ (9.9)
5. *съпоношение* ‘agreement’ (28.5)
6. *съпримиреныи* ‘proportional’ (6.9)

In addition, some well-known words occur in the document with unattested (or very rare) meanings, mainly as a result of calquing.

7. *владыка* as ‘domain’ (30.6)
8. *гласъ* as ‘language’ (15.7)
9. *даръ* as ‘sacrificial offering’ (13.2)
10. *изъглаголаемы* as ‘explicit’ (10.8)

<sup>3</sup> The original text of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is presumed to have been composed in Hebrew not later than the second century CE. It has come down to us in East Slavic copies dating from the fourteenth century onwards. These go back to the South Slavic prototext (translated from Greek), which may date to the tenth or eleventh century. A relatively full text of *ApAb* is found in six manuscripts from the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries, four of which are integrated into the *Palaea Interpretata* (mss ABCK). *Codex Sylvester* (= ms S) is the oldest and the only independent manuscript containing the full text of *ApAb*. Since it is also the most obscure copy, it was declared “extremely faulty,” abundant in “errors major and minor” (RL 686). Other copies are obviously secondary and contain almost no independent evidence (cf. Lunt 1985, 56; RL, 686–87). The detailed description and stratification of the manuscripts is presented by Turdeanu (1972) as well as in the critical editions by Philonenko (Phil, 14–20) and Rubinkiewicz (Rub, 15–27). See also brief but valuable characterizations in (RL, 681–2, 686–8) and (Lunt 1985, 55–6).

<sup>4</sup> For technical reasons the Slavonic texts are cited in standard transliteration used also in both editions of *ApAb* (*e* for ѿ, *o* for ѡ, *y* for ѣ and ѧ, *ю* for ѣ, *я* for ѧ, ѣ, ѧ).

11. *купля* as 'affair, deal' (2.8)
12. *ослаба* as 'willfulness' (29.8)
13. *основати* as 'appoint' (26.1)
14. *потъцати* as 'trouble' (27.12)
15. *притецу* as 'descend' (27.3)
16. *разграбиту* as 'seize, take' (27.3, 4)
17. *срамитися* + *dir.* as 'reverence' (29.5)
18. *свѣтъ* as 'fire' (5.8)
19. *свѣтъ* as 'luminary' (9.3)
20. *с(ъ)вѣтъ* as 'will,' 'reason' (22.2; 23.10; 23.14; 26.5–6; 29.10)
21. *сѣходъ/сѣхода* as 'host,' 'gathering' (27.3; 28.4,5; see also other possibilities)
22. *усѣчи* as 'hew' (1.9)
23. *утерьдиту* as 'sustain with food' (29.18)

All the meanings adduced above are the result of the following discussions:<sup>5</sup>

1. On his way to carve an idol, Terah asks Abraham: *принеси ми сѣчи́ва и* (S om. *al.*) *измала из дома* – “Bring me an ax and <?> from the house” (1.8). CS *сѣчи́во* which reproduced ἐγχειρίδιον (Heb בַּרְחָ) in Exod 20:25 (fourteenth cent.; Srezn, 3.905) means there, as well as in our verse, the tool used to hew stone. This use of בַּרְחָ is not typical for the late Hebrew. Gk πέλεκυς (Heb כַּשִׁיף or רֶגֶל) for *сѣчи́во* (Sin Ps 73:6) would go well with πελεκίζω for *сѣчи* in 1.9 (see comm. *ibid.*). Cf. Ep Jer 15 on the idol holding in his hands both ἐγχειρίδιον and πέλεκυς. The word might have been originally a gloss to the unfamiliar *измала*. The forms *измаала/изымала* are used in Slavonic Num 4:9 for Gk λαβίδας, Heb מַלְכָּאֵל (Lunt 1985, 59), which is not appropriate in this context. Moshe Taube proposes rabbinic Heb לַמְזַנָּה ‘chisel’ (see, e.g., Kelim 13,4). In this case *сѣчи́во* = πέλεκυς might be inserted as a gloss to the transliteration ιζμαλ(ος) (?) in G. This kind of doublet of transliteration and translation occurs in LXX and is very typical for Theodotion (Thackeray 1909, 1.31–2). Lunt reconstructs the form *\*изъмало* derived from לַמְזַנָּה. This form can exist only if one of two conditions is observed: (1) the nouns *сѣчи́ва* and *измала* are acc. neut. sg. forms in an *akanie* dialect, which is not possible in the northern, perhaps Novgorodian, text of S; or (2) *сѣчи́ва* and *измала* are neutr. pl.

Another possibility is that we are dealing here with one more example of a direct object in the gen. used with the verb *приносити*; cf. *принеси прѣста твоего* in *Mar John 20:27* (Vaillant 1948, № 120). Cf. also the same use in *SU 4:2* (*принесе џѣны*; see comm. *ibid.*). Thus, we can also posit the form *\*измалъ* < Gk *\*ιζμαλ(ος)* < Heb לַמְזַנָּה.

<sup>5</sup> Some of the examples below were published in my article, “Reconstruction and Interpretation,” *Апоскрыфа* 13 (2002), 203–26, namely № 2, 3, 18, and part of 20.

2. In 2.3 Abraham goes out to the “main road” in order to sell his father’s idols, “and behold, merchants from Paddan Aram came with camels to go to Egypt to buy *kokonil* [?] from the Nile there” – *и се купци отъ фанданы сурьскыя грядуть съ вельблуды идуще въ егупеть куповатъ оттудѣ кокониль* (AD: *кукониль С вкониль ВКО погониль I*) *от нила* (*оттудѣ... нила* om. SU). Rub suggests that *hapaх legomenon кокониль* is the calque from Gk *κοκκίνα* ‘scarlet clothing’ or *κουκίνοϛ* ‘dour palm; fiber of palm,’ which does not help to explain the origin of all constituent parts of the word. We propose to interpret *кокониль* as a combination of two words which could be either original Greek or their Slavonic transliterations attested in other documents. The Greek *Vorlage* probably contained: \*) ἀγοράζειν κόκκον Νεῖλου (in *scriptio continua* – \*κοκκοννειλου; unattested elsewhere) with the regular Middle Greek itacism reading of the diphthong *ei* (for other cases of incorrect division of words in Slavonic translations, see Thomson 1988, 360). CS *кокъ* reproducing Gk *κόκκος* occurs in the fifteenth cent. East Slavic mss of *De bello judaico* (Meshcherskii, 1958:70). There it means ‘scarlet,’ denoting one of the cloths from which the veil in the Temple was made – Heb יַנִּיט or יַנִּיט תַּלְתִּיל (Exod 25:4 *et pass.*). In our case its later meaning – ‘grain’ – is no less appropriate to the context. The word is known as ‘wheat grain’ (see, e.g., Philumenus, *De Venenatis Animalibus* 3:3 – LSJ, 971) and as ‘barley’ in later sources (Sophocles 1860, 380). Egypt’s grain export is reflected not only in Gen 41ff. but was also a well-known part of the Hellenistic world. The merging of *κόκκον* and *Νεῖλου* into one word and, perhaps, the dittographic writing of *Νεῖλου* might have appeared in the *Vorlage* as well as at the stage of translation. Neither can the following reading be rejected: ἀγοράζειν κόκκον Νεῖλου ἀπὸ Νεῖλου “to buy the Nile’s grain from the Nile.”

3. The writing begins with the following words: *въ днь настръзающую* (*настръзающую В настержзающую AD настержзающую СК*) *ми богы отца фары* “On the day when I was <?> the gods of my father Terah....” The phrase contains the *hapaх legomenon настръзати/настръзати*. *Lectioes difficiliores* in mss S (*настръзающую*) and B (*настръзающую*) may be considered as closest to the prototext, while AD apparently reflect an East Slavic development of \*-br- > -er-, and CK contain the forms reflecting the secondary *polnoglasię* or the analogous influence of \**stbrzo*, \**stergti*. (cf. Lunt 1985, 58). The root of the *hapaх* cannot be determined exactly; there are at least three different possibilities. In previously conducted research the root was considered to be *stbrg/sterg/storg* ‘guard’; it was argued that the mutation of *g* to \**z* is more usual with front-vowel

roots (Lunt 1985, 58). Actually, the palatalization of the root-final consonant might be conditioned morphologically (see Trubetskoi 1922; Vondrák 1923/24; Otrębski 1948; Shevelov 1964, 339–44). Thus, the root *\*strug-*/*\*strъg-* ‘carve’ becomes also possible. Taking into consideration that CS *сѣрѣзати* (attested also in the form *сѣрѣзати* < *\*stъrzati*; see Mikl, 893), usually rendered Gk ζέω/ξύω (Slov, 4.186; Srezn, 3.562; LSJ, 649), and that Slavonic calques prefixed by *на-*, as a rule, reproduce Greek forms with ἐπι- (see, e.g., Srezn, 2.266–353), *\*насѣрѣзати* might have reproduced Gk. ἐπιζέω or ἐπιξύω. Cf. ἐπιξύω used with εἰκόνας λίθων “stone images” (Procopius Caesariensis, *De Aedificiis* – LSJ, 649). Terah is described as an idol-maker in parallel sources (*Jub* 12, *Tanna debe Eliahu* 2:25, *Gen. Rab.* 38:13), and, moreover, Abraham himself is depicted as making an idol with his father in *Seder Eliahu Rabba* (= *Dibrei Yemei Yerahmiel*) 33.

However, the most probable root seems to be *\*strig-*/*\*strъg(?)*. Here also the phonological conditions for progressive palatalization are observed; cf. the forms of the same root with palatalization after *\*i*: *ностризати* (Vaillant 1966, 2.167), *ностризание* (Srezn, 2.1267). Gk κείρω were known to Slav scribes in its principal meaning, ‘cut hair’ (Srezn, 2.571; Vasmer, 3.778). Thus, CS *\*насѣрѣзати* might render Gk ἐπικείρω ‘destroy’ (LSJ, 637,932; Lampe, 740). Cf. an analogous model: *ностригати* for ἀποκείρω (Srezn, 2.1266). This meaning seems to be the most appropriate for the context: Abraham destroys idols in *ApAb* 1.6; 2.9; 5.6–7; 8.5–6, in Palaia interpolations borrowed from the *Chronicle of George the Monk* in *ApAb* 8 (mss ABCK) and in other midrashic and apocryphal sources: *Gen. Rab.* 38:19; *Tanna debe Eliahu* 2:25; *Jub* 12 (cf. *ApAb* 8.5–6). In this case *насѣрѣзати* may be defined as both a morphological and semantic calque.<sup>6</sup>

4. Having been ordered to fulfill the sacrifice (“Covenant between the Pieces”), Abraham obtains the promise of the historical vision: *и ты покажу ти вѣкы глѣмъ моимъ създаная и утврженая сътвореная и поновеная* – “and there I shall show you the ages: the things built and strengthened, made and renewed by my word” (9.9). Ms S has *създания и утвржения сътворения и поновения*, lit. “creations and consolidations, makings and renovations” (thus, the beginning of the verse must be: “and there I shall show you the ages by my word”). The fourth term CS *поновения* ‘renovations’ may reproduce Gk ἐγκαινία (like *поновления* in *Supr* 239,6; Mikl, 623) and Heb כִּוְּנָה ‘consecration’; cf. LXX and MT in Dan 3:2; Ezra 6:16, 17; Neh 12:27 (in the last two cases the consecration of the Second Temple is meant). In John 10:22 this Greek word (as well as

<sup>6</sup> For the detailed discussion on the *hapaх*, see Kulik, 1997a (in Russian).

its Hebrew counterpart in rabbinic sources) was used to denote the feast of Chanukah established by Judas Maccabaeus at the reconsecration of the Temple after the Maccabean revolt. Thus, the other three terms may also relate to the stages of the history of Israel classified according to the destiny of the Temple: (1) “constructions” – CS *създание* ‘creation’ (Gk κτῆσις), ‘creature’ (Gk πλάσμα) was used to translate Greek words meaning ‘building’ or ‘process of building’: Gk οἰκοδομή – Heb מִבְּנֵה (Ezek 40:2), בִּירָה (1 Chr 29:1), בְּנִי (Aq Sm Ezek 40:5), בֵּית (Th Ezek 11:1) designating the Temple, or Gk οἰκοδόμησις, οἰκοδομία (*cf. създание храмины* “the building of the house” in *Pand. Ant.* eleventh cent., 251). Thus, here the foundation of the Temple of Solomon may be meant; *cf.* the description of the celestial prototype of the Temple in 25.4. (2) “Strengthenings” – *утвержения* (Gk ἀσφάλεια?) – restoration of the offerings or repair of the Temple (*cf., e.g.,* 2 Kgs 12:5–16) by the righteous kings of the First Temple period; *cf.* 27:10: “the time of justice will come with the righteousness of kings ...” (3) “Makings” – *сътворения* Gk ποιήσις (Heb מַעֲשֵׂה) or ἀποτέλεσμα ‘completion,’ ‘accomplishment’ (Slov, 4.351; Mikl, 958) – building of the Second Temple. *Cf.* the four stages of the Jewish history in *ApAb* with the analogous triple structures in *1 Enoch* and *2 Baruch*:

<i>ApAb</i> 9.9	<i>1 Enoch</i>	<i>2 Baruch</i>
1) “constructings”	1) 89.59 First Temple	1) 61 First Temple
2) “strengthenings”	2) --	2) 66 restorations of the offering
3) “makings”	3) 89.72 Second Temple	3) 68 Second Temple
4) “renovations”	4) 90.6–42 Maccabean revolt and “a new house greater than the first one” (90.28–29)	4) --

This interpretation assumes that the history of *ApAb* ended before the last destruction of the Temple. There are no reliable data on the exact date of the document. Common opinion attributes it to the decades following the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans (based on the description of the destruction of the Temple in 27.1–5). Nevertheless, according to the data of this verse as well as of 1.9 (possible reference to Caligula; see comm. to 1.9) and 27.1–7 (see comm. there) and the generally “templocentric” attitude of the document (*cf.* 1.2–3; 25.4; 27.1–5; 29.18), *ApAb* might have been composed, with at least equal probability, in the late Second Temple period.

5. In 28:5 the protagonist is informed about the terms and conditions of the future exile of Israel: *р љѣтъ будеть въ злѣ въ языцѣхъ а часъ въ милость ихъ и споношении (поношении В; а часъ ... споношении от.*

S) – “for one hundred years<sup>7</sup> it [Israel] will be in evil among the heathen <and an hour in their mercy and agreement>.” The verse is obscure. *Harax legomenon* *съпоношение* previously understood, according to evidence of ms B, as *поношение* (Gk ὄνειδος, Heb כְּלִימָה, כְּרַח) ‘reproach’ is rather a calque of Gk σύμβασις ‘agreement,’ ‘coming together’ (LSJ, 1675; Lampe, 1280; cf. CS *съпонести* for Gk συμβαστάζω in Job 28:19 – Srezn, 3:800).

6. In his reflection on the hierarchy of idols, Abraham says:

*что же иоавонѣ бозѣ на друзѣмъ бозѣ (на друзѣмъ бозѣ om. SU) иже стоитъ съ зухемъ яко и чьстьнѣ естъ паче варисаиа бога иже естъ отъ дрѣва дѣланъ и отъ сребра кованъ яко тѣ съпримирение естъ (В спрѣмиренѣ А спрѣмѣрение К om. SU) цѣниванъ (om. SU) отъ чловѣкъ на явленіе видения*

[And] what about Yoavon, god <who is in the power of another god>,<sup>8</sup> who stands beside Zoukh? <Since [even] he is more honored than the god Bar-Eshath who is made of wood, while [Yoavon is] forged of silver. And *being better proportioned* [?], he is sold by men in order to show him> (6.9)

CS *съпримирение* is a *harax legomenon*. In (Mikl, 673) there is *примѣрение* “admetiri” and in (Srezn, 2.1434) is *примѣрятися*. They both are derived from *měr-* and should render Gk συν- + -μετρ-: *συμμετρία*, *συμμετρέω*, etc. (cf. RL). Our text would be clearer if we were to presume that the prototext contained the comparative form \**съпримѣренѣ* (a calque of Gk *συμμετρότερος*) which, due to the well-attested interchange of *u/ѣ*, was understood by later copyists as the noun *съпримирение*.

Alternate interpretations: (1) Gk *σύμμετρος* in Aq Jer 22:14 renders Heb מִדוֹת meaning ‘big’ in בֵּית מִדוֹת “big house.” Thus, H might have מִדוֹת בֵּית מִדוֹת ‘big’; cf. מִדוֹת שֵׁנַי (Num 13:32); (2) The meanings ‘of wreathed work’ or ‘strung together’ (Gk *συνειρόμενος*) are less probable (cf. *πλοκή* in Exod 28:14 and further): assuming a root *mir-*, we could posit that *συνείρω* was taken for συν- + -ειρην- (CS *мировати*, *смирение*).

7. The fifth plague brought upon the nations will be *въ владыкахъ ихъ орениемъ труса и меча гибель* (30.6). It is usually translated: “destruction among their rulers through the ravage of earthquake and sword,” ac-

<sup>7</sup> “Year” here and “hour” below designate relative periods of time used in eschatological descriptions in *ApAb*. Chronological units which occur in the eschatological portion of *ApAb* (28.5; 29.1, 2, 13, 14, 18; 30.2; 31.2; 32.3) are as follows: CS *лѣто* – Gk ἐνιαυτός – Heb שָׁנָה ‘year/cycle’; CS *часъ* – Gk ὥρα – Heb שָׁעָה ‘hour’; CS *годъ/година* – Gk *καίρος* – Heb עֵת/יָמִים ‘period of time’ (used as a synonym for *часъ* ‘hour’ in 29.2, 9); CS *вѣкъ* – Gk αἰών – Heb דּוֹר/עוֹלָם ‘age.’

<sup>8</sup> Here and elsewhere the portions of text which do not occur in the version of *Codex Sylvester* (ms S) are enclosed in triangular brackets.

ording to the most widespread meaning of CS *владыка* rendering Gk *δεσπότης, ἡγεμών* (Mikl, 66; Srezn, 1.267). In this case the earthquake would have killed selectively – only the “rulers.” The word refers rather to Gk *ἐξουσία* ‘power,’ ‘authority,’ as it did in *Ostr* Matt 8:9 (*подъ владыкою – ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν* “under authority”). We propose the translation based on another meaning of Gk *ἐξουσία* – ‘domain, district’ (cf., e.g., LXX for Dan 3:2, where this Greek word renders Aram *אֲרָמֵיָא*). Thus, “their domains” of the fifth plague is parallel to “their native land” of the previous plague in 30.5 (“the fourth [plague] is famine in their native land”).<sup>9</sup>

8. Having arrived to the heavens Abraham meets a terrifying “crowd of many people” (angels) who were “changing in appearance and likeness, running and being transformed and bowing *and shouting in a language the words of which I did not know* (*и зъвуца гласомъ словесъ егоже не вѣдяхъ*)” (15.7). The italicized section was previously misinterpreted by Bonwetsch “und rufend mit einer Stimme der Worte, welche ich nicht kannte.” The same occurred in Box and Landsman: “crying with a sound of words which I knew not,” in Rubinkiewicz “crying aloud words I did not know” and in “et se prosterant en criant des paroles, que je ne connaissais pas.” Philonenko-Sayar translates it as “et clamaient d’une voix dont je ne connaissais pas les mots” and his translation is the closest to the correct one. Others are syntactically or semantically absurd, although some of them could be confirmed by the existence of the word combination “sound/voice of words” – Gk *φωνῆ ῥημάτων* – Heb *קוֹל מִלֵּי* (Job 33:8; 34:16). However, the only way to reach a perfect reading of the verse is to consider that CS *гласъ* regularly renders Gk *φωνῆ*, meaning not only ‘voice,’ ‘sound’ (Heb *קוֹל*; cf. 16:3; 17:1 and LXX *pass.*) but also ‘language’ (Heb *לשון*; cf. LXX and MT in Is 54:17). On the special language(s) of angels see *TestJob* 48.3, 49.2; 50.1, 2 (“angelic dialect(s)”; 1 Cor 13:1 (“tongues of angels”); cf. also Acts 2:11; 10:46.

9. In 13.2 Abraham says that, having prepared animals for the sacrifice, he *пождахъ дара вечерняго*, lit. “he waited for the evening gift.” Rubinkiewicz translates *даръ вечернии* as “evening gift” (comm. *ibid.*: “or ‘reward’; Gk *dōron, dōrea*”). In fact, Gk *δῶρον* here must mean ‘offering,’ rendering Heb *הנחה* meaning both ‘gift’ and ‘offering’ (HR, 359). Cf. 29.18: *мужи праведны... будутъ живущие утвержаеми жрътвами и*

<sup>9</sup> “Their native land” – *уселенія рода ихъ*. Lit. “the inhabited world of their kin” – Gk *τῆς οἰκουμένης* (or: *γῆς*) *τοῦ γένεος* (or: *τῆς γενέσεως*, or: *πατρίδος*) *αὐτῶν*; Heb *מולדתם ארץ* “their native land”; cf. Gen 31:13; Ruth 2:11; Jer 22:10; Ezek 23:15, etc.

*дарьми правды и истины* “The righteous men ... will live, being sustained by the just and truthful sacrifices and offerings [lit. ‘gifts’].” The word combination must reproduce a Greek calque of biblical Heb  $\text{בָּרַעַ(ה) מִנְחָת}$  “evening offering [lit. ‘gift’].” It was usually rendered by  $\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\nu\eta$  in LXX (in Slavonic versions – *жрътва вечернѣа*). In our text it designates rather the time of day (before sunset, when the evening sacrifice in the Temple was offered) than the offering itself. See this use in Dan 9:21, where Heb  $\text{בָּרַעַ(ה) מִנְחָת}$  “evening offering” is obviously not connected to an actual offering: “While I was still speaking in prayer the man Gabriel ... touched me about the time of evening offering ( $\text{בְּרַעַ(ה) מִנְחָת}$ ); the same usage is attested in Ezra 9:4, 5, etc.

10. In 10.8 the angel guide says to the protagonist: *азъ есмь иаоилъ ... сила посредѣ е[с]мь изъглаголемаго (al. неизъглаголемаго S) слежаща имени въ мнѣ*, which probably means: “I am Yahoel... I am a power in the midst of the Ineffable (?) who put together his names in me.” CS *посредѣемь* SU *посредесмь* C *посредуемь* al. (translated here as “I am ... in the midst of ...”) was usually understood as inst. sg. “through the medium.” Mss SCU, however, witness another reading: *посредѣемь* < *посредѣ есмь* (SU) and *посредесмь* < *посред[ъ] есмь* (C). Cf. *посредство* in our verse (10.3). We reconstruct either Gk  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota \dots \acute{\omicron} \acute{\epsilon}\nu$  ( $\tau\hat{\omega}$ )  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega \dots$ , Heb  $\text{אֲנִי(וְ) בְּקִרְבִּי}$  “I am ... in the midst of ...” (HR, 461–7) or more probably Gk  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota \dots \acute{\omicron} \mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$ . The words in 10.8 and 10.3 might render Gk  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  ‘middle, mediation’ (cf. Mikl, 638: *посрѣдие* –  $\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ). For 10.3 Gk  $\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$  ‘mediator’ is also probable, especially in light of the parallels: *TDan* 6.2:  $\tau\hat{\omega} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega \tau\hat{\omega} \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega \upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota \mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$  “to the angel who intercedes for you, for he is the mediator between God and men,” cf. *TLev* 5.6:  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota \acute{\omicron} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma \acute{\omicron} \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ . For  $\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$  denoting a mediator between God and men see also Job 9:33 (Heb  $\text{מְוַכִּיחַ}$ ); Gal 3:19–20; 1 Tim 2:5; Heb 9:15. On Metatron in this role, see Odeberg 1928, 103–4. Some scholars derived the very name of Metatron from Lat *mediator* (Odeberg 1928, 135). Cf. 10.3, where the protagonist hears “the voice of the Holy One” saying: *иди иаоилъ тѣже* (S *аль тезе* A *явлъ тезе* B *явлъ тѣже* K *доль тезе* D *аоилъзе* I *ангеле* C) *посредѣства* (S *посредуества* A *посредства* B) *неизрекомаго имени моего* (A – my word division, Tikhonravov proposes: *альтезе*; K – my word division, Porfir’ev: *идия влтѣзе*).

CS *тѣзь* (*тѣзь, тезь, тозь*) usually renders Gk  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  + gen. or  $-\nu\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  after another root (cf. Lunt 1985, 59–60). Normally used with dat.; cf. *неустовѣству тѣзь, бгословию тезь, тезь ѿцу* (Srezn, 2.1078). Its Greek counterpart, however, demands gen., as it is in our case –

*посредѣства*. Therefore, Slavonic prototext *иди иаоиль тѣзѣ посредѣства неизрекомаго имени моего* may be retroverted to Gk ἦλθε Ἰαοὴλ ὁ ἐπώνυμος τοῦ μεσίτου τοῦ ἀφάτου νόμου μου – “Go, Yahoel, the namesake of the mediation of my ineffable name.” This interpretation corresponds to the meaning of Heb יהוהאל/יהואל, which is a combination of God’s names. See *b.Sanhedrin* 38b: רבו כשמו שטרון זהו מטטרון “This is Metatron whose name is like that of his Master” (leaning on “I send an angel ... my name is in him” of Exod 23:20–21). Yahoel and Metatron, whose functions are very similar, are explicitly identified in *3 En* 48D.1 (cf. Scholem 1946, 68–70).

Cf. *неизрекомаго имени* “ineffable name” of 10.3 and *неизъглаголемаго S изъглаголемаго al.* ‘ineffable’ in 10.8. The variant of *S неизъглаголемаго* ‘ineffable’ (and not *изъглаголемаго* ‘said,’ ‘uttered’ of other mss) would seem to be more plausible in the light of 10.8. Nevertheless, the reading of most mss may also go back to Heb שם המפורש “Explicit [lit. ‘expressed clearly’] Name’ denoting actually the same *nomen ineffabile* (Tetragrammaton) in its explicit form; cf. the use of this term in *3 En* 22.5, 48B, D.5.

Our interpretation of 10.3 helps to clarify also the meaning of the following segment here: *слежаща (слежаще В) имене (имени КО) въ мнѣ*. The verse as a whole was always understood as “I am Yahoel... a power through the medium of his *ineffable name* dwelling in me.” Sreznevskii also posits the meanings ‘*пребывать, находится*’ *ad loc.* (Srez, 3.731). However, the placing of *слежаща* ‘dwelling’ in the sentence – whether it relates to *имене/имени* ‘name(s)’ or to *сила* ‘power’ – requires justification. We propose to treat here *сълежати* as ‘lay/put together,’ according to its rarer meaning attested in *Io. ex.* 76 (Srezn, 3.731, *s.v.* *сълежатися*), used in the prototext with acc. pl. *имени* (as in mss КО) and not with gen. sg. or nom. pl. *имене*. This interpretation goes well with the meaning of the Heb equivalent of CS *иаоиль* – יהוהאל/יהואל which is a combination of God’s names (see 10.3). Cf. *3 En* 48D.5: “These 70 names (are) a reflection of the Explicit Name... which the Holy One, blessed be He, took from his Explicit Name and put upon the name of Metatron.” Cf. example № 24.

11. This is an example where Greek and Hebrew retroversions both have appropriate (although different) meanings, and it is difficult to make a final decision which one of them to prefer. In ch. 2 Abraham put his fathers’ idols on his ass; the ass took fright and he ran and threw down the gods (2.2–7). Abraham says: “I have been distressed in my heart, [wondering] *како принесу куплю отцю моему*,” lit. “How would I bring the *purchase* to my father?” The sentence is not perfectly clear: *купля* is known to render Greek words for ‘purchase,’ ‘goods,’ ‘affair,’ ‘deal,’ and ‘trade’ not ful-

ly appropriate to the context. Considering that CS *купля* might have rendered Gk *πράγμα* (cf. Srezn, 1.1371: CS *куплю дѣяти* for Gk *πραγματεύσεσθαι* in *Pand. Ant.* or CS *безъ купля* for Gk *ἀπραγματέυτος*), which regularly reproduced Heb *דבר* in LXX, *принести куплю* might be a reflection either of the Greek idiom *παρέχειν πράγμα τινί* “to cause trouble to s.-o.” (LSJ, 1457) or of the Hebrew idiom *אל דבר אל הבריא* in the meaning “let s.-o. know about the matter” (Exod 18:19, 22, 26; *Lev. Rab.* 32), both going well with the context. Thus, two possible translations are: (1) I have been distressed in my heart, [wondering] how would I cause trouble to my father?” (according to the Greek reconstruction); or (2) I have been distressed in my heart, [wondering] how would I let my father know about the matter?” (according to the Hebrew reconstruction).

12. Chapter 29, where a messianic (or anti-messianic) figure is introduced, is the most enigmatic in the entire writing. CS *ослаба* of 29.8 is a key definition of this messianic figure: “Hear, Abraham, the man whom you saw shamed and struck and again worshiped is the *ослаба* of the heathen for the people who will come from you in the last days.” Previous interpretations of the word were conditioned by the understanding of most of the chapter as a Christian interpolation, and the figure introduced in it as Jesus (although he is “going out from the left side of the heathen,” kissed by Azazel, etc., see below). Cf. BL: “relief” (Gk *ἄνεσις*, Heb *מנוחה*), Phil: “soulagera,” Rub: “déliverance” (Gk *ἄνεσις*, *ἔνδοσις*, *ἄδεια*), RL: “liberation.” Actually, Greek counterparts of CS *ослаба*, *ослабление*, *ослабѣние* may also have negative connotations: ‘willfulness’ – Gk *ἄνεσις* or ‘weakening,’ ‘laxity’ – Gk *ἔκλυσις*, *παράλυσις* (Mikl, 518; Srezn, 2.723–4; SRJa, 11–17, 13.1013). The last one might have rendered Heb *רפיון* and thus could relate to a pseudo-Messiah; cf. *רפיון התורה* “laxity [= neglect] of the Law” (*Lam. Rab.* 1,4) or *רפיון ידים מן התורה* “laxity of hands in upholding the Law” (*Midrash Tanhuma, Beshalah* 25). Cf. also *חולש על גוים* of Is 14:12 similar to *ослаба отъ* (om. КО) *языкъ* here.

We suppose that the eschatological scenario of *ApAb* 29 might have the well known Jewish eschatological duo-messianic structure (in this case: anti-Messiah vs. true Messiah). This assumption helps to remove contradictions in the description of the messianic figure: in 29.4–8 the text speaks of an anti-Messiah (known as Beliar/Belial, Malqi-Resh’a of the pseudepigrapha and Qumran documents, Armilus of Targum Is 11:4 and later Jewish sources, or Antichrist of NT; see, e.g., Milik 1972; Schürer 1973, 2.526, 553–4; 3.336n, 450) “going out from the left side of the heathen” and “worshiped by the heathen with Azazel”:

[29.4] <And I looked> and saw a man going out from the left side of the heathen. Men and women and children, great crowds, went out from the side of the heathen and they worshiped him.

[29.5] <And> while I was still looking, those on the right side went out, and some shamed<sup>10</sup> this man, and some struck him, and some worshiped him.

[29.6] <And> I saw that as they worshiped him, Azazel ran and worshiped, and having kissed his face he turned and stood behind him.

[29.7] And I said, “Eternal Mighty One! Who is this shamed and struck man, worshiped by the heathen with Azazel?”

[29.8] And he answered and said, “Hear, Abraham, the man whom you saw shamed and struck and again worshiped is the *laxity* of the heathen for the people who will come from you in the last days, in this twelfth hour of the age of impiety.

However, in 29.9 and in the first clause of 29.10, the true Messiah “from the seed of Abraham” may be meant:

[29.9] And in the [same] twelfth period of the close of my age I shall set up the man from your seed which you saw.

[29.10] Everyone from my people will [finally] admit him [or: “this”], while the sayings of him [or: “that”] who was as if called by me will be neglected in their minds.<sup>11</sup>

[29.11] And that you saw going out from the left side of the picture and those worshiping him, this [means that] many of the heathen will hope in him.

<sup>10</sup> See example № 17.

<sup>11</sup> The second clause of this verse is very vague and probably corrupt: *изъ* (om. S) *людии моихъ сему вси уподобятся и притъчи яко отъ мене зовома преминующесе въ свѣтехъ своихъ*. The first words *изъ* (om. S) *людии моихъ* “from my people” were usually attached to the previous sentence, while the rest of the verse was translated as follows: “... diesem werden alle nachahmen und hinzugezählt werden wie von mir gerufen, die sich ändernden in ihren Ratschlüssen” (Bonw); “this one all will follow, and such as called by me (will) join, (even) those who change in their counsels” (BL); “Celui-là, tous le suivront. Et ajoute ceux qui auront changé dans leur conseil, parce qu’ils auront été appelés par Moi” (Phil); “All will imitate him ... (you) consider [*притъчи* as imperative from *притъкнути*] him as one called by me ... (they) are changed [*прѣмѣнующесе*] in their counsels” (RL). Our reading is not more than an alternative interpretation, although based on the new understanding of the whole chapter (see comm. to 29.8): the verse speaks of two persons: one is “the man from your [Abraham’s] seed,” the true Messiah of the previous verse, while “he who was as if called by me” is the Pseudo-Messiah of 29.4–8, 11–13. Then, CS *уподобятся* might have rendered Gk *ὁμολογέω* ‘acknowledge, admit, confess’ (confused here with *ὁμοιόω*?) used also with dat. (cf. concerning Jesus in Matt 10:32) or Gk *νομοθετέω* (see Srezn, 3.1240) in *pass.* ‘ordained by law’ (cf. Heb 8:6). Both Gk words rendered Heb *הִדַּבֵּר* in *hiph’il* ‘confess, acknowledge’ (see LXX for Job 40:14(10); Aq Th Ps 99(98):3 and Prov 28:13, etc.). CS *преминующесе* here in previous research was always emended to *прѣмѣнующесе* ‘change(d)’. In the light of the interpretation introduced above the emendation is not necessary: CS *прѣминути(ся)* rendered Gk *παρὰτρέχω* (meaning here ‘neglect’ or ‘deliberately overlook’) or Gk *ὑπερβαίνω* (‘trespass’) are both appropriate to the context (Slov, 3.458; Mikl, 736; Srezn, 2.1666; cf. Lampe, 1027). CS *с(ъ)вѣтъ* reproduces Gk *βουλή*, Heb *הַצֵּל, דַּעַת, דַּעַת, מַחְשַׁבָּה* in 22.2; 23.10; 23.14; and 26.5.

[29.12] <And> those of your seed you saw on the right side, some shaming and striking him, and some worshiping him, many of them will be misled on his account.

[29.13] And he will tempt those of your seed who have worshiped him.

For other doubts concerning Christian interpolations in *ApAb* see Licht 1971 and Hall 1988.

13. Having seen the allegorical depictions of the sins of Israel, Abraham exclaims: *превѣчне крѣпче то почто еси основаль быти тако* – “Eternal, Mighty One! Why did you *ordain* [lit. “establish”] it to be so?” (26.1). CS *еси основаль*, lit. “establish” – Gk *θεμελιόω* – Heb *טָוַן*, lit. ‘found, establish’ (cf., e.g., Slavonic versions of Josh 6:25 and Is 44:28 presented in (Srezn, 2.732). In later books of the Bible this word, however, means also ‘ordain,’ ‘appoint’ – more appropriate to our context (Esth 1:8; Ezra 7:9; 1 Chr 9:22).

14. Having seen the Temple burnt and Israel captured “because of the idol and murder” (27.7; cf. *b.Yoma* 9b; *Ta’anit* 5a-b), the visionary asks: “Eternal Mighty One! Let the evil works of impiety now pass by ...” (*и рѣхъ превѣчне крѣпче да мимоидуть* (SU + *нынѣ al.*) *злбия* (SU *злбная al.*) *въ нечьстьи дѣла А* (om. A)). The response looks enigmatic in Slavonic:

*и рече къ мнѣ наче праведное время срящеть* (SU + *я al.*) *преже преподобимъ* (SU *подобимъ al.*) *цѣсарь и въ правдѣ сужу имъ* (SU *судящимъ al.*) *яже преже създахъ обладати отъ нихъ въ нихъ отъ техъ же изидуть мужи иже потѣцать* (*потѣцати* SU) *я елико* (*внелѣже* SU) *възвѣстихъ тебе и видѣ*

And he said to me, “Rather the time of justice will come first with the righteousness of kings. And I shall adjudge to them with justice those whom I earlier created in order to rule thence over them. And from those [kings] will come men who will trouble them, as I made known to you and you saw” (27.10–12).

Both verses are very obscure. The latter speaks, apparently, of the varying generations of righteous kings and their unrighteous descendants (cf. 9.9). The following data should be taken into account for the different possible interpretations of this verse: (1) CS *наче* (translated here as “rather”) may be, less probably, a part of the previous sentence: *и рече къ мнѣ наче* “and he said to me more.” (2) a form *цѣсарь* may be nom. or acc. sg. as well as gen. pl.: “In [CS *наче* < Gk *παρά*] the time of justice the King [= Messiah (?); cf. 29.8–9] will meet them first with the righteousness” according to the majority of mss or “the King will meet the time of justice first with the righteousness” according to SU. (3) *яже преже създахъ* may mean also “whom I initially created”; cf. comm. to 9.3 and Eph 1:4: “he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.” (4) CS *судити*, Gk *κρίνω* may mean here not only ‘judge’ but also ‘determine,’ ‘adjudge.’ This usage is obvious in 23.12: *почто еси судиль сему области такоу* “why

did you adjudge to this such a power.” (5) The use of *обладати* + *въ* meaning “rule over” may reflect a use of Heb מַשִּׁל/שָׁלַט + -בּ ‘rule over’; cf. 31.2: *властвующая въ нихъ* “ruling over them” and 29.2: *держати въ языцехъ и въ сѣмени твоємъ* “rule over the heathens and over your seed” (for other hebraized uses of CS *въ* in *ApAb* see 12.10, 25.2; (cf. Rubinstein, 1954: 132). (6) *отъ нихъ* may render Gk ἐκ τούτων ‘since then,’ ‘after this,’ or less probably ἀπὸ τούτων ‘through them,’ ‘by means of them’: “... those whom I earlier created in order to rule through them [= kings] over them [= whom I earlier created]...” (7) *въ нихъ* might be either a gloss for *отъ нихъ* or the beginning of the next sentence. (8) The Greek equivalents of CS *срящеть* – ἀπαντάω, ὑπαντάω, συναντάω (Srezn, 3.818) – are used with dat., while CS *преподобьимъ* (Gk ὁσιότης, Heb יושר, תום; see HR) of mss SU may be not only instr. sg. but also dat. pl.: “the time of justice will meet first the righteousness of kings.” Cf. 1 Kgs 9:4, where Gk ὁσιότης and Heb תום relate to David and Solomon.

Finally, CS *потъщати* regularly rendered Gk σπουδάζω (as trans. normally means ‘care for’), which in LXX reproduces Heb בָּהַל (also as trans. in *hiph’il*) ‘trouble.’ See Slavonic Job 23:16 (Srezn, 2.1304): *вседержитель же потщаль мя* (Gk ἐσπούδασέ με, Heb הַבְּהִילָנִי); cf. also LXX and MT in Job 22:10 (Gk ἐσπούδασέ σε Heb יַבְהִילֶךָ). The whole verse in Hebrew would look like this:

ויאמר אלי עוד עת הצדק יבוא תחילה עם מלכי הצדק:  
ונתתי להם בצדקה את [העם] אשר יצרתִי מראשונה למשול מאז בהם:  
ומהם יצאו [גם] האישים אשר יבהלום כאשר הודעתִך וראית.

15–16. Two calques may occur in the description of the Temple destruction in 27.3:

*се видѣхъ притекашая к нимъ съходы (SU въходы al.) чѣтыри и црковь зажегоша огньмъ и суцая в ней стая разграбиша* – And behold, I saw four angels [or: “hosts”] descending to them [to the people on the right side of the visionary picture]. And they burned the temple with fire, and they *took* the holy things that were in it.

If we accept the suggestion of that the *hapax legomenon* *съхода* means ‘angel’ or ‘host of angels’ (see example 21; according to the motif of four angels burning the Temple attested in 2 Bar 6.4–5; *Pesiqta Rabbati* 26,131; *etc.*), we have to assume that CS *притеци* here must mean rather ‘descend’ than ‘come,’ rendering Gk κατατρέχω, meaning not only ‘come’ but also ‘descend’ (see counterparts in *Greg. Naz.*, eleventh cent. 5 – Srezn, 2.479) and CS *разграбуми* here and in 27:4 as well as *расхытити* (27.1, 5) means here not ‘plunder,’ but like its regular Greek counterpart (δι)αρπάζω (Slov, 3.565; Srezn, 3.32), rather ‘seize,’ ‘snatch,’ ‘carry away’ (LSJ, 245–6, 410). In later sources Gk (δι)αρπάζω may even mean simply ‘take’ “without idea of violence and injustice”

(Lampe 1961, 1.228–9). The latter meanings of the verb would be more appropriate to the context presumed by the preceding comments, positing that the subjects of action in the verse are “angels” and not “heathens.” This interpretation also corresponds to the accounts of 2 *Bar* 6.7; 4 *Bar* 3; 2 *Macc* 2:4–8, *etc.*, in which holy accessories of the destroyed Temple were carried away by angels. Thus, the verse as a whole would appear thus:

καὶ εἶδον τέσσαρα συναγωγὰς [or: τέσσαρας πρέσβεις] κατατρέχοντας πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐνέπρσαν τὸν ναὸν ἐν πυρὶ καὶ ἤρπασαν τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ ὄντα ἄγρια	וַאֲרָא אֶת אַרְבַּעַה הַמַּחֲנוֹת [אג]: הַמְלֵאכִים] יוֹרְדִים עֲלֵיהֶם וַיְבַעֲרוּ אֶת הַמִּקְדָּשׁ וְאֶת הַקֹּדְשִׁים אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ חֹטְפוּ
--	--

with the following counterparts:

CS <i>сѣходѣ</i> <sup>12</sup>	Gk πρέσβυς	Heb מלאך
or	or	
CS <i>сѣхода</i>	Gk συναγωγῆ	Heb מחנה or קהל
CS <i>пртещи</i>	Gk κατατρέχω	Heb ירד or נחת
CS <i>разграбити</i>	Gk (δι)αρπάζω	Heb חטף or תפס

17. In example 12, discussing supposedly Christian interpolation in ch. 29, the CS *срамяхуся* (SA *срамляху* BDIKO) occurs in the following context:

<And I looked> and saw a man going out from the left side of the heathen. Men and women and children, great crowds, went out from the side of the heathen and they worshiped him. <And> while I was still looking, those on the right side went out, and some *shamed* this man, and some struck him, and some worshiped him.

The oldest manuscripts have a reflexive form of the verb, which probably reproduced either Gk ἐντρέπομαι (Srezn 3.476, 478) meaning ‘be ashamed’ as well as ‘turn toward,’ ‘reverence’ (*cf.* Mark 12:6; LXX Lev 26:41 rendering Heb כנע here ‘humble oneself’) or less probably Gk αἰσχύνομαι ‘be ashamed, dishonored’ (Srezn, 3.476, 478).

18. Having experienced the weakness of helplessly damaged idols (ch. 1–2), Abraham performs a final test, this time intentional, of one of them:

And it came to pass, after I had put the splinters on the fire, in order to cook food for my father, that I went out to ask about the food and I put [the idol] Bar-Eshath [“fiery”]<sup>13</sup> near the hearth of fire, saying to him menacingly, “Bar-Eshath, make sure that the fire does not go out before I come back. If the fire does go out, blow on it to make it flare up.” [And] I went out, having kindled my fire. When I came back again I found Bar-Eshath fallen backwards, his feet enveloped in fire and terribly burned. Laughing greatly to myself, I said, “Bar-Eshath, you certainly are able to kindle fire and cook food!” (5.6–9).

<sup>12</sup> See example № 21.

<sup>13</sup> See comm. to 5.5.

The problem is a passage translated here as “I went out, having made my fire” (*узидо<sup>x</sup>* (AKO + *u al.*) *створихъ свѣ<sup>m</sup> σου*). BL translate *створихъ свѣтъ* as “accomplished my purpose” and comment: “lit. ‘did my counsel’: a Hebrew phrase, *העשה עצה* ‘execute a plan’ (Isa 30:1).” This interpretation was accepted by all the later translators and commentators. Actually, this Hebrew idiom is attested only twice, in Isa 30:1 and Ps 13:3, where it means rather “plan” than “execute a plan.” The following interpretation seems to be more appropriate. Mss AKO omits a conjunction *u* between the two verbs. The absence of *u* makes it syntactically possible to reconstruct a form *\*створихъ* in place of *створихъ<sup>x</sup>* where the superscript *в* was altered by scribal error to *x* (*cf.* the alternation of *прѣмыслихъ* and *прѣмысливъ* in 5.1). Thus, the translation should be: “I went out, having made my fire,” considering that CS *свѣтъ* renders here Gk *φῶς* meaning not only ‘light’ but also ‘fire’ (see, *e.g.*, in Mark 14:54 and Luke 22:56; for *φῶς ποιεῖν* as ‘kindle fire’; see, *e.g.*, Xenophon, *Historia graeca* 6, 2; LSJ, 1916).

19. In the beginning of the revelation God characterizes himself this way:

*азъ есмь прежде вѣка и крѣпокъ бгъ иже первѣе створихъ свѣта вѣка* (S *иже прежде створихъ первѣе свѣта вѣка* ABC *иже прежде первѣе створихъ свѣта вѣка* D) – I am the primordial and mighty God, who initially [?] created the two luminaries [?] of the world [?] (9.3)

For CS *прежде вѣка* Rubinkiewicz (Rub) proposes the quite rare Gk *προαιώνιος* (rendered usually by *прѣвѣчьи* (Slov, 3.414; Srezn, 2.1626), that occurs also in our document in 13.8, 10), and Heb *אלהי קדם* or *קדמון*. CS pl. *прежде вѣкъ* ‘before the ages/worlds’ is well attested for rendering Gk *πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων* (1 Cor 2:7, SDRJa 11–14, 2.293). Sg. *прежде вѣка* here might have rendered Gk *ἔως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (Heb *עולם עולם*), usually reproduced by CS *до вѣка* (Srezn, 1.485). This wide-spread Hebrew/Greek biblical idiom meaning “for eternity” relates to the future rather than to a preceding eternal existence. Thus, the verse as a whole may be a transposition paraphrase of Ps 136:7:

... to him who created the great luminaries, I am forever... who initially created the for his mercy is forever (Ps 135:7) two luminaries of the world (*ApAb* 9.3)

We translate CS *свѣта* as “two luminaries.” If CS *свѣта* is interpreted as gen. sg. of ‘light,’ Gk *φωτός* and *первѣе* (*прѣвѣе*) as ‘before,’ Gk *πρὸ* (Slov, 3.401; Mikl, 715), the verse might be translated like this: “who (previously) created before the light of the world” (RL). CS *свѣта вѣка*, thus, would go back to Heb *אור עולם*, lit. ‘light of the world/eternity’ = ‘eternal light.’ *Cf.* Isa 60:19, 20: “the Lord will be your eternal light [*φῶς αἰῶνος, אור עולם*],” and John 8:12: “I am the light of the world [*τὸ φῶς*”

τοῦ κόσμου].” In our case, however, this definition seems to be less plausible, for in both cited sources it is an epithet of God himself. This problem may be solved by the following assumption. The form of CS *вѣка* is identical with that of the previous word *свѣта*, and the semantic fields of both intersect (in the meaning ‘world’). Thus, *вѣка* might be a gloss for *свѣта*, inserted by a Slav scribe in order to indicate that *свѣтъ* here means not ‘light’ (Gk φῶς, Heb אור) but ‘world’ (Gk κόσμος/αἰών, Heb עולם; see Slov, 4.35; Srezn, 3.297). For this scribe the passage would mean: “who created before the world/eternity,” while the prototext would read: *иже первѣе stworixъ свѣта* which may be understood also as “who created before the light [was existing]” (or even “before man” considering that the gen. of Gk φῶς ‘light’ and φῶς ‘man’ are identical – φωτός).

In any case, the difficulty of the above readings is the absence of an object for the transitive verb *створixъ* ‘create.’ The scribe of ms K tried to solve the problem by interpolating here “heaven and earth,” which were created before the light and world. The only reasonable candidate for the role of a verbal object in the text at hand may be *свѣта*, understood as acc. dual. ‘two lights/luminaries.’ The word for ‘light’ denotes sometimes also ‘luminary’ in Slavonic (*свѣтъ*, Slov, 4.35; Srezn, 3.296), as well as in Greek (φῶς, and not only in Jewish Hellenistic sources; see, e.g., τὰ φῶτα, meaning ‘sun and moon’ in Ptolemaeus, *Tetrabiblos* 37,38) and Heb (אורים in Ps 136:7). Thus, God is defined here by the creation of luminaries, for they were Abraham’s last candidates for gods, considered by him to be the most powerful elements of the world (see 7.8–10; cf. 7.12). Taking further into account that CS *первѣе* (*прѣвѣе*) was widely used as an adv. (‘initially, primarily’) rendering Gk πρῶτον/πρῶτος (see Slov, Srezn, and Mikl, *ibid.*), Heb בראשונה (ב), בתחילה (Judg 20:32; Dan 8:1; Aq Th Is 65:7; Jer 16:18, etc.) or Gk πρότερον (Slov, 3.401; Srezn, 2.1768; Mikl, 715), Heb לפנים (Lev 18:27; Deut 2:12; Josh 1:14; Jer 34(41):5; Neh 13:5), בראשונה (1 Kgs 13:6; Jer 33(40):11), מראשית (Isa 46:10), קדם (Jer 30(33):20), we obtain the linguistically plausible and intertextually confirmed interpretation based on the oldest ms: “who initially created the two luminaries of the world” (*иже первѣе stworixъ свѣта вѣка* S). For the related phrase “who created the luminaries” (*створixъ свѣта*), see Ps 136(135):7: “to him who created great luminaries” – τῷ ποιήσαντα φῶτα μεγάλα – לעשה אורים גדלים (cf. previous commentary); for “the luminaries of the world” (*свѣта вѣка*) see 3 *En* 10 (Schäfer 1981, № 13, V48a/12): מאורות שבעולם “the luminaries that are in the world”; *Gen. Rab.* 12,5: מאורות ארץ “the luminaries of the earth.” Thus, this passage in Hebrew might look like this: מראשית (מ)אורות עולם אשר.

20. In some cases CS *c(ъ)вѣтъ* comes for Gk *boulh/*, with the variety of meanings: ‘will,’ ‘reason,’ ‘mind,’ ‘design’:

20a. In heaven Abraham was shown allegoric images belonging to the main points of human history; in 23.5–8 he saw

a man very great in height and terrible in width, incomparable in size, entwined with a woman who was also equal to the man in aspect and size. And they were standing under a tree of Eden, and the fruit of the tree were like the appearance of a bunch of grapes of vine. And behind the tree was standing, as it were, a serpent in form, but with hands and feet like a man, and with wings on its shoulders: six on the right side and six on the left. And he was holding in his hands the grapes of the tree and feeding the two whom I saw entwined with each other.

Abraham asks Yahoel for explanation, and he gives his answer: *се есть свѣтъ члвчъ (слнце В) се есть адамъ и се есть помышление ихъ на земли си есть евъга* (23.10). The verse was misinterpreted before: key definitions *свѣтъ члвчъ* and *помышление ихъ на земли* were translated previously as “the human world” and “their desire upon the earth” (BL), “penchant [Gk διαβούλιον – Heb יצר] des hommes” and “leur convoitise sur terre” (Phil), “la lumière, le soleil [according to ms B]” and “l’objet de leur desire sur la terre” (Rub), “the world of men” and “their thought on earth” (RL). Actually, CS *c(ъ)вѣтъ* here as well as in 22.2; 23.14; 26.5; 29.10 most probably renders Gk βουλή (Slov, 4.243–4; Mikl, 916; Srezn, 3.681), Heb עצה, דעת, מחשבה (HR, 227–8), while CS *помышление* means here rather ‘desire’ than ‘thought.’ This word rendered either Gk ἐπιθυμία (cf. *Supr* 296,1 and Slavonic versions of Matt 5:28; Lam 1:7 – Heb מַחַמַּד; Dan 9:23 – Heb מַחַמַּד) or διάνοια (Heb יצר, in Gen 8:21: *помышление члчско* – ἡ διάνοια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου – יצר לב האדם “the desire of the man’s heart”; see (Srezn, 2.1171). The most common equivalents for Gk ἐπιθυμία in MT are Heb תַּאוּה, קַשְׁח, רִצּוֹן (HR, 521), while Gk διάνοια renders Heb יצר (1 Chr 29:18). Thus, *ApAb* might refer here to an allegorical conception very similar to the idea of Philo of Alexandria, according to which Adam and Eve symbolize correspondingly ‘reason’ (νοῦς) and ‘passion’ (αἵσθησις); see Philo, *Leg. All.* II,10,14; *Quis Her.* 11. The dichotomy of ‘reason’ (λογισμός) and ‘passion’ (πάθος) is found also in 4 Macc 2.

20b. In 23.14 Abraham wonders: “Eternal Mighty One! Why did you will to do so that evil is desired in the heart of man?” and then explains his question by the very obscure (in Slavonic) argument:

зане гнѣваешися на изволеное тебѣ (твое AC) въ свѣтѣ твоємъ (нѣ свѣтъ ствоємъ S) дѣлающему неполезное – Since you are angry at what was willed by you, who does a bad thing<sup>14</sup> according to your design<sup>15</sup> (23.14)

Unusual dat. *дѣлающему* after *гнѣвѣтисѣ* may be a syntactic calque: both Gk *χολόω* and *ὀργίζω* ‘be angry’ are used with object in dat. CS combination *въ свѣтѣ твоємъ* must go back to Heb *תלצוב* or *תלצוב* (on CS *с(ъ)вѣтъ* understood as Gk *βουλή*, Heb *רצו* or *לצו*; cf. 22.2; 23.10; 26.5–6; 29.10). Another possibility is that *нѣ свѣтъ ствоємъ* (S) and *въ свѣтѣ твоємъ* (*al.*) reflect a fore-text (*нѣ*) *въ свѣтѣ своємъ* “(but) according to its own reason”: “you are angry at what was willed by you, (but) [which is] doing a bad thing according to its own reason/will.”

20c. Our reading of previous example goes well with the idea of 26.5:

*яко свѣтъ оца твоего въ немъ (+ бысть D) якоже твои свѣтъ в тебѣ тако и моя воля свѣтъ въ мнѣ (+ есть SU) готовъ бываеъ въ дни приходящая прежде и (от. DCU) тѣхъ не увеси ни будущиъ в ня* (26.5).

The most obscure passages here are: *моя воля свѣтъ въ мнѣ* (cf. 22.2: *се есть воля моя к сущему во свѣтѣ*; both phrases can hardly be explained on the level of a Semitic original) and *готовъ бываеъ*. CS *с(ъ)вѣтъ* – Gk *βουλή* we translate here as ‘will,’ although ‘reason,’ ‘counsel’ might be also appropriate. In early Christian Gk *βουλή* was often used as ‘(free) will,’ ‘(evil) impulse,’ ‘will (of God)’ (Lampe, 302). CS *воля* must render Gk *θέλημα* (Esth 1:8) or *θέλησις* (cf. Heb *רצו* in Prov 8:35; 2 Chr 15:15 or *רצו* in Ezek 18:23); see (Srezn, 1.298; SDRJa 11–14, 1.472–4). The combination of both (*воля* – *θέλημα* and *свѣтъ* – *βουλή*) is attested in the very similar context of Eph 1:11: ... προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ “... predestined according to the purpose of him who does all things according to *the will desired by him*.” The idea of our verse becomes fully clear, when the following *готовъ бываеъ* (previously invariably interpreted as ‘is ready’) is retroverted. It is, obviously, a calque of Gk *ἔτοιμόν ἐστιν* ‘inevitable,’ ‘sure to come’ (on *ἔτοιμος* + *εἶμι* or *γίγνομαι* see LSJ, 704; Dvoretiskij, 1.680). The Slav translator was apparently misled by the use of this idiom in NT, where *ἔτοιμόν εἶμι* means only ‘be ready’; cf. Greek and Slavonic versions of Luke 22:33 (*Zogr, Mar, Nik*); Matt 24:44 (*Zogr, Mar, As, Ostr*) and 2 Cor 12:14 (*Slepz, Šiš*). The translation of the whole verse will look like this: “As the will of your father is in him, as your will is in you, so also the will desired by me is in-

<sup>14</sup> Lit. “useless thing.” CS *неполезное* rendering Gk *ἄχρηστος, ἀχρεῖος*, lit. ‘useless,’ may mean also ‘bad, evil.’ Its Gk counterparts reproduce Heb *רצו-רצו* ‘undesirable’ (Hos 8:8) and *בס* ‘base’ (2 Sam 6:22).

<sup>15</sup> See example № 20b.

evitable in coming days which you will not know in advance, nor the things which are in them.” Hence, we are dealing here with the rabbinic conception of free will combined with the inevitability of God’s will (pre-determination).

The idea is most clearly expressed in *Abot* 3:5: צפוי והרשות והתונה הכול “Everything is predestined, but freedom is given.” The same idea is probably reflected also in *Ps. Sol.* 9.4: “Our works are in the choosing and power of our souls, to do right and wrong in the works of our hands, and you in your righteousness oversee human beings.”

*Cf.* also:

And he [God] said to me, “*This is my will for existence in design* [CS *се есть воля моя к сущему во свѣтѣ*], and it was pleasing to me [CS *и годѣ бысть лицу моему* – Heb לפני ליבי]. And then, afterward, I gave them a command by my word and they came into being. And whatever I had determined to be had already been previously depicted and stood before me in this, as you have seen, before they were created” (22.2); Everyone from my people will [finally] admit him, while the sayings of him who was as if called by me will be neglected *in their minds* [שב סבתם לבם סוויחם] (29.10; see example № 12).

21. In the historical part of his vision Abraham observes the destruction of the Temple (27.3; see the text in examples № 15 and 16). The most problematic word in this verse is an enigmatic *сходы* translated here as “hosts” (*cf.* *въсходъ* (*входъ* A) in 25.4, *сходы* (*исходы* A) in 28.4 and *сходъ* (*входъ* АСКО) in 28.5). The combination *сходы четыри* may be interpreted as masc. as well as fem. acc. pl. There is an almost identical verse in Slavonic *LadJac*, where the majority reading contains the form *сходы* (and not *въсходы*): *пусто сътворитъ место се сходи д-ми* “this place will be desolated by the four <?>” (*LadJac* 5.7). *LadJac* 5.9 has *въсходы* like in *ApAb* 25.4: *храмъ имени бога твоего ... запустѣетъ въсходы д*: “a Temple in the name of your God ... will be devastated by four <?>.” Miklosich (Mikl) and Sreznevskii (Srez) define *сходы* of *ApAb* as fem. (Miklosich apparently identifies it with *схода* ‘scout’ from the 16th century *Vita Alexandri*). Bonwetsch (Bonw) proposes “durch vier Eingänge” based on his reading *въсходы* of later mss as instr., which contradicts the form of the numeral (*четыри*). Vox (BL) follow Bonwetsch in translation (“through four entrances”), but note that *сходы* may mean ‘descents,’ ‘generations’ (hypothetical Heb תצאות). Lunt (RL, 702) proposes to emend *сходы* to *исходы* ‘exits’ or *въсходы* ‘ascents,’ and *четыри* also to instr. – *четырьми*.

Rubinkiewicz (1987) reconstructs for *схода* Gk κατάσκοτος (as in *Vita Alexandri*, Mikl, 964) – Heb מלאך ‘angel,’ relying upon the only precedent in Josh 6:24(25), where κατάσκοτος ‘scout’ of LXX corresponds to מלאך ‘messenger,’ ‘angel’ of MT. Rubinkiewicz (1987) relies on the midrashic story of four angels burning the First Temple (*Pesiqta Rab-*

*bati* 26,131; 2 *Bar* 6.4–5; for other sources see Ginzberg 1909–1938, 6.392–4). Four angels represent four kingdoms in *Lev. Rab.* 29:2 and parallels; and the four kingdoms carry out or mark God’s punishment of Israel in Abraham’s vision according to Targum Neophyti *ad Gen* 15:12 (cf. *Mekhilta de R. Ishmael, Yitro* (Bahodesh 9)). In support of Rub we can bring CS *сходьникъ*, which reproduces Gk κατάσκοτος in Slavonic NT (*Christ, Slepč, Šiš* Heb 11:31; and as a gloss to *πρῆλογαταῖ* in *Vita Alexandri, ibid.*) as well as ἄγγελος itself, both in East and South Slavic versions of the Epistle of James, relating to the same story of Josh 6 (*Christ, Šiš* Jac 2:25; see Slov, 3.362; Mikl, 965).

It should be taken into consideration, however, that the translation of LXX in Josh 6:24(25) is contextual, and ‘messenger’ there is, at the same time, ‘scout’ according to the plot. We suppose that CS *сходъ* or *сходъ* must be rather a calque of Gk συν- or κατα- + a verb with the meaning ‘go.’ Gk (συγ)κατάβασις ‘descent,’ or esp. σύνοδος or συναγωγή ‘gathering’ may be also appropriate to the context (here as well as in 25.4; see comm. *ibid.*). Gk συναγωγή regularly translated by CS *сънѣмъ* may mean ‘gathering/host [of angels]’; see (Srezn, 2.780) *ангелъ сънѣмъ* (*Irtolog.* 1250), *сънѣмъ свящѣнъ* (*Supr* 72). Cf. Heb קהל קדשים (Ps 89:6) or רבבות קודש (Deut 33:2). Therefore, here “hosts [of angels]” might also be meant. In LXX Gk συναγωγή regularly renders Heb קהל(ה), עדה, מון (only in Dan), and less frequently חספה/חסף (Exod 32:22, 21), מחנה (Num 5:2 – according to *Cod. Alex.*, while *Cod. Vat.* has Gk παρεμβολή, a regular equivalent of Heb מחנה), סוד (Jer 6:11), חיל (Ezek 37:9) The phrases מחנות שכינה “[angelic] camps of Shekhina” and particularly ארבע מחנות שכינה “four camps of Shekhina” are found in 3 *En* 18.4; 37.1. Cf. “four Presences” (1 *En* 40.8–10), “four ranks” in heaven (2 *En* 18.9(a), “four rows” of angels (3 *En* 18.4), and “four companies of ministering angels” (*Masekhet Hekhalot* 6, Jellinek 1853–1878, 2.43).

CS *сходъ/сходъ* may also be a calque of one of the following Greek words: πρέσβυς, πρεσβεύς, πρεσβευτής, πρεσβεία meaning ‘messenger,’ ‘embassy’: Gk πρεσβεία was rendered by CS *схождение* in *Greg. Naz.* eleventh cent. 86 (Srezn, 3.862). In LXX Gk πρέσβυς reproduces Heb מלאך ‘messenger,’ ‘angel’ (Num 21:20(21); 22:25; Deut 2:26).

## 22. The verse 1.9 is very obscure:

*и усѣче другога марумафу отъ другога камени безъ главы и главу отъвергъшиюся отъ марумафа и прочее марумафы (и прочее марумафы : от. А) скруши – lit.: [Trying to improve the damage injured to his idol Mar-Umath] he [Terah] carved another Mar-Umath, out of another stone, without a head, and [placed on him] the head that had been thrown down from Mar-Umath, and smashed the rest of Mar-Umath.*

Bonwetsch solves almost all of the problems of its interpretation by translating *ycѣчи* as “bildete” and proposing to insert *положи на нь* after *отъ марумафа* (Bonw). According to this reading only the torso of the idol was damaged (see *Translation*). This interpretation conforms to the contents of 3.6, 8: “his [Mar-Umath’s] head fell off of him. And he [Terah] put it on another stone of another god, which he had made without a head.... How then can my father’s god Mar-Umath, having the head of one stone and being made of another stone, save a man, or hear a man’s prayer and reward him?”<sup>16</sup> The shortcoming of Bonwetsch’s reading, nevertheless, is that *ycѣчи*, unlike *cѣчи*, does not occur elsewhere in CS documents with the meaning ‘cut, carve.’ It was widely used to denote ‘cut off’ – ἐκκόπτω, and more specifically: ‘behead’ – ἀποκεφαλίζω (according to Srezn and Mikl it was mostly used in the latter meaning). The only way to stay with the interpretation of Bonwetsch is to assume that the Slav translator has taken *peleka/w* ‘hew,’ ‘shape with an ax’ (Heb לִסַּב, 3 Kgdms 6:1 = 1 Kgs 5:32) for the more familiar *peleki/zw* ‘behead,’ which is found in the NT; cf. Rev 20:4 (the forms of historical tenses of these verbs look almost identical).

23. After the ten plagues will have been brought “upon all earthly creation,” only the righteous men from the seed of Abraham will be left “kept by Me by number, hastening in the glory of My name to the place prepared beforehand for them” (29.15–17). They will live “being *affirmed* by the sacrifices and the offerings of justice and truth in the age of justice” (*утверждаеми жертвами и дарьми правды и (ом. S) истины*) (29.18). CS *утвьрьдиту* most probably renders its regular Gk equivalent *στηρίζω*, reflecting here Heb טַעַם ‘sustain with food’ (Judg 19:5, 8; Ps 104(105):15; *etc.*), while “the gifts of justice” – unattested Heb צדקת (??) “offerings of justice” – resembles קָדָשׁ “sacrifices of justice” (in LXX always in sg.: θυσία δικαιοσύνης; see Deut 33:19; Pss 4:6(5); 51:21(19)). CS *дарь* renders Gk δῶρον, Heb מִנְחָה “offering” also in 13.3 (see comm. *ibid.*). This means that “the righteous men” will feed on the sacrifices like priests. This interpretation goes well with other manifestations of the special importance of the Temple and sacrifices for the author of *ApAb* (cf. 1.2–3; 9.9; 25.4; 27.1–7).

<sup>16</sup> If we try to avoid the interpolation of *положи на нь*, still treating *ycечи* as ‘cut, carve,’ we must assume that Terah made some kind of headless idol or that the CS proto-text had \**без главизны* – ἄνευ κιδάρεως; cf. EpJer 9 about crowns (στεφάνοι) for idols. But these speculations contradict the evidence of 3.6.

## Abbreviations

The books of the Hebrew Bible and New Testament, Qumran documents, the Rabbinic writings, apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and Jewish Hellenistic writings are abbreviated according to the standard and well-known conventions. This applies equally to most of the (Old) Church Slavonic documents. MT, LXX, Aq, Sm, Th, NT are used to indicate, respectively, the Masoretic text, Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the New Testament. *GB* and *OB* designate, correspondingly, the Gennadii Bible of 1499 and the Ostrog Bible of 1581. All abbreviations are used without articles. For other abbreviations see *References*.

A	<i>ApAb</i> , hypothetical Aramaic original
<i>al.</i>	<i>alii</i> , others [mss].
Aram	Aramaic
CS	Church Slavonic
G	<i>ApAb</i> , Greek <i>Vorlage</i>
Gk	Greek
H	<i>ApAb</i> , hypothetical Hebrew original
Heb	Hebrew
Lat	Latin
ms(s)	manuscript(s)
OCS	Old Church Slavonic
om.	omits
S	<i>ApAb</i> , Church Slavonic prototext
Slav	Slavic

## References

### *Manuscripts*<sup>17</sup>

- A Volokolamskaia tolkovaia paleia. Moscow: RGB, Mosk. Dukhovnaia Akademiia, 172/549, XV b., 85–100; ed. Tikhonravov, 54–78; descr. Iazimirskii (1921:100).
- B Sinodal'naia tolkovaia paleia. Moscow, GIN, 869, Sin. 211, XVI v., 76–90; ed. Rubinkiewicz, 227–55; descr. *Opisaniia* (1973, 33).
- C Tolkovaia paleia iz sobr. Moskovskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii. Moscow: RGB, 173.III, № 136, XVI v.), 18–43.
- D Istoricheskaia paleia iz sobr. Tikhonravova. Moscow: RGB, 299, № 704, XVI v., 145–75.
- H Moscow: RGB, 242, № 100, XVI b., 145–75.
- I Tolkovaia paleia iz sobr. Rumiantseva. Moscow: RGB, 256, № 361, XVI v., 94–114.
- K Solovetskaia paleia. SPb: RNB, Kaz. Dukh. Akad., 431, XVI–XVII vv., 79–92; ed. Porfir'ev, 111–30.
- O Tolkovaia paleia iz sobr. Viazemskogo. SPb: RNB, 190, XVII v., 257–305.
- S Sil'vestrovskii sbornik. Moscow: ZGADA, Sin. Tip. 53, XIV v., 164–83; ed. Sreznevskii (1861–1863), 648–65; Tikhonravov, 32–53; Novitskii, 1891.
- U Tolkovaia illiustrirovannaia paleia iz sobr. Uvarova. Moscow: GIM, sobr. Uvarova 85, XVI v., 299–313; descr. Leonid (Kavelin), 1894:3.9; Stroev, 1848: № 286.

<sup>17</sup> Later fragmentary and obviously secondary versions are not included.

*Research Works*

References to the editions, translations, and commentaries to the *Apocalypse of Abraham* give the verse under discussion without noting the page.

- BL = Box, George H., and Landsman, Joseph I. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. London: SPCK, 1918.
- Bonw = Bonwetsch, Gottlieb Nathanael. *Die Apocalypse Abrahams*. Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche. Band 1, Heft 1. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1897.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Dean-Otting, Mary. “The Apocalypse of Abraham.” *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Frankfurt/Bern/New York: P. Lang, 1984. 248–61.
- Dvoretzkii, Iosif Khananovich. *Drevnegrechesko-russkii slovar’* Moscow: Gos. isd. inostrannykh i natsional’nykh slovarei, 1958.
- Franko, Ivan. “Krekhivs’ka Paleia.” *Idem. Pam’atki ukrains’ko-rus’koi movi I literaturi*. t. 1. L’viv: T-vo im. T. Shchevchenka, 1896.
- Frey, Jean Baptiste. “Abraham (Apocalypse d’).” *Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Supplément. V.1. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1928–1966.
- Ginzberg, Louis. “Abraham, Apocalypse of.” *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York/London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901–1906. 1.91–2.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1909–1938.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. [New York:] Pantheon Books, 1953–1968.
- Hall, Robert H. “The Christian Interpolation in the Apocalypse of Abraham.” *JBL* 107 (1988). 107–12.
- HR = Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books Graz, 1998.
- Jastrow, Markus. *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. London/New York: Luzac & Co./G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1903.
- Iazimirskii, Aleksandr Ivanovich. *Bibliograficheskii obzor apokrifov v iuzhnoslavianskoi i russkoi pis’mennosti (Spiski pamiatnikov)*, vyp. 1: *Apokrify vetkhozavetnye*. Petrograd: Otdelenie russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Rossiiskoi akademii nauk, 1921.
- Jellinek, Adolf. *Bet Ha-Midrash*. Leipzig: C.W. Vollrath, 1853–1878.
- Kulik 1997a = Kulik, Aleksandr. “Ob odnom tserkovnoslavianskom gapakse.” *Palaeoslavica* 5 (1997). 339–45.
- Kulik 1997b = Kulik, Aleksandr. “K datirovke Otkroveniia Avraama.” *In Memoriam: Pamiati Ia.S. Lur’e*. St. Petersburg, 1997. 189–95.
- Kulik 2002 = Kulik, Aleksandr. “Otkrovenie Avraama.” *Vestnik Evreiskogo Universiteta* 5 (2002). 231–54.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Leonid, arkhimandrit (Kavelin, Lev Aleksandrovich). *Sistematicheskoe opisanie slaviano-rossiiskikh rukopisei sobraniia grafa A.S. Uvarova*. Moscow: Tip. A.I. Mamontova, 1894.
- Licht, Jacob. “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. vol. 2. Jerusalem: Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1971–1978. 125–7.
- Lunt, Horace G. “On the Language of the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham.” *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 7 (1985). 55–62.

- LSJ = Liddell, Henry G., Scott, Robert, and Jones, Henry S. *A Greek-English Lexicon (with a Revised Supplement)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Mikl = Miklosich, Franz, Ritter von. *Lexicon Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum*. Wien: G. Braumüller, 1862–1865.
- Milik, Josef T. “Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-rešha dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens.” *JJS* 23 (1972). 95–144.
- Molnár, Nándor. *The Calques of Greek Origin in the Most Ancient Old Slavic Gospel Texts*. Slavistische Vorschungen 17. Budapest: Akademiai Kiad, 1985.
- Novitskii, P.P. (ed.). *Otkrovenie Avraama (= Obshchestvo liubitelei drevnei pis'mennosti t. 99, № 2)*. St. Petersburg: Tip. A.F. Markova, 1891. (facsimile edition)
- Odeberg, Hugo. *3 Enoch: or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- Olofsson, Staffan. *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- Opisaniia* = Protaseva, Tat'iana Nikolaevna. *Opisaniia rukopisei Sinodal'nogo sobraniia, ne voshedshikh v opisanie A.V. Gorskogo i K.I. Nevostrueva*. Part 2. Moscow, 1973.
- Otrębski, Jan Szczepan. “Pochodzenie tzw. Boudouinowskiej palatalizacji w językach słowiańskich.” *Slavia Occidentalis* 19 (1948). 23–62.
- Pennington = Pennington, A. “The Apocalypse of Abraham.” *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. ed. H.F.D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985. 363–92.
- Phil = Philonenko-Sayar, Belkis, and Philonenko, Marc. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham (= Semitica 31)*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1981.
- Philonenko, Marc. “L'Anquipède alectorocéphale et le dieu Iaô.” *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* (1979). 297–304.
- Porfir'ev, Ivan Iakovlevich. “Otkrovenie Avraama.” Idem, *Apokrificheskie skazaniia o vetkhozavetnykh litsakh i sobytiiakh*. (= *Sobranie otdeleniia russkogo iazyka I slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk* 17.1). St. Petersburg: Tip Imp. Akademii nauk, 1877, 111–30.
- Pypin, Aleksandr Nikolaevich. *Lozhnye i otrechennye knigi slavianskoi i russkoi stariny (= Pamiatniki starinnoi russkoi literatury, izdavaemye grafon Grigoriem Kushelevym-Bezborodko*. t. 3. St. Petersburg: Tip. P.A. Kulesha, 1860–1862.
- Riessler, Paul. “Apocalypse Abrahams.” *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel*. Augsburg: B. Filser, 1928. 13–39.
- RL = “The Apocalypse of Abraham.” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. ed. Charlesworth, vol. 2, 689–705.
- Rub = Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*. Lublin: Société des lettres et des sciences de l'Université catholique de Lublin, 1987.
- Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. “Apokalipsa Abraham.” *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 27 (1974). 230–7.
- Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. “La vision de l'histoire dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham.” *ANRW* 2.19.1. (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1979). 137–51.
- Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. “Les Semitismes dans L'Apocalypse d'Abraham.” *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1980). 141–8.
- Rubinstein, Arie. “Hebraisms in the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham.” *JJS* 4 (1953). 108–15.
- Rubinstein, Arie. “Hebraisms in the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham.” *JJS* 5 (1954). 132–5.
- Rubinstein, Arie. “A Problematic Passage in the Apocalypse of Abraham.” *JJS* 8 (1957). 45–50.
- Schäfer, Peter, et al. *Synopse zur Heikhalot-Literatur*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.

- Schumann, Kurt. *Die griechischen Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altbulgarischen*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1958.
- Schürer, Emil [revised by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar]. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973.
- SDRJa11–14 = Avanesov, Ruben Ivanovich, et al. *Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka* (XI–XIV vv.). Moscow: Russkii iazyk, 1988.
- Shevelov, George Yuri. *A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1964.
- Slov = Kurz, Josef, et al. *Slovník Jazyka Staroslovenskeho*. Praha: Nakl. Českosl. akademie, 1958.
- Sophocles = Sophocles, Evangelinus Apostolides. *A Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek*, Cambridge, MA: Welch, Bigelow & Co, 1860.
- Srezn = Sreznevskii, Ismail Ivanovich. *Materialy dlia slovaria drevnerusskogo iazyka po pis'mennym pamiatnikam*. St. Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1893–1903.
- Sreznevskii, Ismail Ivanovich, *Skazaniia o sviatykh Borise i Glebe. Sil'vestrovskii spisok XIV veka*. St. Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1860.
- Sreznevskii, Ismail Ivanovich, “Knigy Otkrovenii Avrame.” *Izvestiia Imperatorskoi akademii nauk po otdeleniiu russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti*. t. 10, St. Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1861–1863. 648–65.
- SRJa11–17 = *Slovar' russkogo iazyka XI–XVII vv.* Moscow: Nauka, 1975.
- Stroev, Pavel Mikhailovich. *Rukopisi slavianskiiia i rossiiskiiia prinadlezhashchiia... I.N. Tsarskomu*. Moscow: Tip. Got'e, 1848.
- Thackeray, Henry St. J. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: University Press, 1909.
- Thomson F.J., “The Nature of the Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implications to Russian Culture.” *Slavica Gandensia* 5 (1978), 107–39.
- Tikhionravov, Nikolai Savvich. “Otkrovenii Avraama.” *Pamiatniki otrechennoi russkoi literatury*. St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1863. 1.32–78.
- Troubetzkoy, N. “Essai sur la chronologie de certains faits phonétiques du slave commun.” *RÉS* 2 (1922). 217–34.
- Turdeanu, Émil. “L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en slave.” *JSJ* 3 (1972), 153–80. Reprinted in *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament*. SVTP 5. Leiden: Brill, 1981. 173–200.
- Vaillant, André. *Manuel du vieux slave*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1948.
- Vaillant, André. *Le Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952.
- Vaillant, André. *Grammaire Comparée des Langues Slaves*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1966.
- Vasmer = Fasmer, Maks (s dop. O.N. Trubacheva, pod red. B.A. Larina). *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka*. Moscow: Progress, 1986–1987.
- Vondrák, Václav. “O pozdějších palatalisacích v praslavanštině.” *Slavia* 2 (1923–1924), 17–25.
- Vostokov, Aleksandr Khristoforovich. *Opisaniia russkikh i slovenskikh rukopisei Rumiantsevskago muzeuma*. St. Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akademii nauk, 1842.
- Weitzman, Steven. “The Song of Abraham.” *HUCA* 65 (1994). 21–33.