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.\(^1\) 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\(^2\) – 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

\(^1\) 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).

\(^2\) 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*), which contains the following *hapax legomena*:

1. изма̀лъ ‘chisel’ (1.8)
2. коко̀нилъ ‘Nile’s grain’ (?) (2.3)
3. настро̀зати ‘destroy’ or настро̀зати ‘carve’ (1.1)
4. поно̀вения ‘consecration’ (9.9)
5. съпоно̀шение ‘agreement’ (28.5)
6. съпримирены ‘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. влады̀ка as ‘domain’ (30.6)
8. гласъ as ‘language’ (15.7)
9. даръ as ‘sacrificial offering’ (13.2)
10. изъглаголаемы as ‘explicit’ (10.8)

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).

For technical reasons the Slavonic texts are cited in standard transliteration used also in both editions of *ApAb* (e for ę, o for ő, y for ю and ю for я, ў for у, Ѳ for ü).
11. kuplya as 'affair, deal’ (2.8)
12. oslaba as ‘willfulness’ (29.8)
13. основати as ‘appoint’ (26.1)
14. потьщати as ‘trouble’ (27.12)
15. притещи as ‘descend’ (27.3)
16. разграбити as ‘seize, take’ (27.3, 4)
17. срамитися + dir. as ‘reverence’ (29.5)
18. свтъ as ‘fire’ (5.8)
19. свтъ as ‘luminary’ (9.3)
20. съвътъ as ‘will,’ ‘reason’ (22.2; 23.10; 23.14; 26.5–6; 29.10)
21. съходъ / съхода as ‘host,’ ‘gathering’ (27.3; 28.4,5; see also other possibilities)
22. усъ as ‘hew’ (1.9)
23. утвердити as ‘sustain with food’ (29.18)

All the meanings adduced above are the result of the following discussions:

1. On his way to carve an idol, Terah asks Abraham: принеси ми счива и (S om. al.) измала из дома – “Bring me an ax and <?> from the house” (1.8). CS счиво which reproduced ἐγρηγόρευον (Heb בַּרַנ) 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 בַּרַנ is not typical for the late Hebrew. Gk πέλεκυς (Heb לְעֵין or לְמָן) for счиво (Sin Ps 73:6) would go well with πέλεκίς for счива in 1.9 (see comm. ibid.). Cf. Ep Jer 15 on the idol holding in his hands both ἐγρηγόρευον and πέλεκυς. The word might have been originally a gloss to the unfamiliar измала. The forms измаала/измалама are used in Slavonic Num 4:9 for Gk λαβίδας, Heb לְמָן (Lunt 1985, 59), which is not appropriate in this context. Moshe Taube proposes rabbinic Heb לְמָן ‘chisel’ (see, e.g., Kelim 13.4). In this case счиво = πέλεκυς might be inserted as a gloss to the transliteration Τμαλ(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 *измало derived from לֶמֶן. This form can exist only if one of two conditions is observed: (1) the nouns счива 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) счива 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 пръста твоего in Mar John 20:27 (Vaillant 1948, № 120). Cf. also the same use in SU 4:2 (принесε цβής; see comm. ibid.). Thus, we can also posit the form *измайтъ < Gk *ιζμαλ(ος) < Heb לְמָן.

5 Some of the examples below were published in my article, “Reconstruction and Interpretation,” Apocrypha 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 суръскыя градуют съ вельблуды идущи въ египетъ куповать оттудъ коконилъ (AD: куконилъ С вконилъ ВКО погонилъ I) отъ нила (оттудъ... нила om. SU). Rub suggests that hapax legomenon коконилъ is the calque from Gk коккίνα ‘scarlet clothing’ or кουκίνος ‘doum palm; fiber of palm,’ which does not help to explain the origin of all constituent parts of the word. We propose to interpret коконилъ 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 Νεὰλου (in scriptio continua – *κοκκονειλον; 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 κοκκъ 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 יִלֹּם or יֵלֶם תַּלְלָה (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 Νεὰλου into one word and, perhaps, the ditigraphic writing of Νεὰλου might have appeared in the Vorlage as well as at the stage of translation. Neither can the following reading be rejected: ἀγοράζειν κόκκον Νεὰλου ἀπὸ Νεὰλου “to buy the Nile’s grain from the Nile.”

3. The writing begins with the following words: въ днь настройзующю (настърззующю AD настърззующю CK) ми боги отъца фары “On the day when I was <?> the gods of my father Terah....” The phrase contains the hapax legomenon настройзати/настързати. Lec- tiones difficiliores in mss S (настройзующю) and B (настързующю) 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 polnoglasie or the analogous influence of *stbrzo, *stergti. (cf. Lunt 1985, 58). The root of the hapax cannot be determined exactly; there are at least three different possibilities. In previous ly conducted research the root was considered to be stbrz/gestrg/storg ‘guard’; it was argued that the mutation of g to *з 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; Otřebški 1948; Shevelov 1964, 339–44). Thus, the root *strug-/*strъg- ‘carve’ becomes also possible. Taking into consideration that CS стръзати (attested also in the form стръзати < *strъzati; see Mikl, 893), usually rendered Gk ξύω/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), *настръзати might have reproduced Gk. ἐπιξύω or ἐπιζύω. Cf. ἐπιξύω used with εἰκόνες λίθῳ “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 (= Dibre 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: постризати (Vaillant 1966, 2.167), постризание (Srezn, 2.1267). Gk κείρω were known to scribes in its principal meaning, ‘cut hair’ (Srezn, 2.571; Vasmer, 3.778). Thus, CS *настръзати might render Gk ἐπικείρω ‘destroy’ (LSJ, 637,932; Lampe, 740). Cf. an analogous model: постризати 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 настръзати may be defined as both a morphological and semantic calque.6

4. Having been ordered to fulfill the sacrifice (“Covenant between the Pieces”), Abraham obtains the promise of the historical vision: и ту покажу ти въкы глямъ моимъ създаная и утвержена сътворена и поновена — “and there I shall show you the ages: the things built and strengthened, made and renewed by my word” (9.9). Ms S has създаная и утвержена 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 ἐγκατάνεια (like поновления in Supr 239,6; Mikl, 623) and Heb הונכד ‘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

---

6 For the detailed discussion on the hapax, 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 κτήσις), ‘creature’ (Gk πλάσμα) was used to translate Greek words meaning ‘building’ or ‘process of building’: Gk οἰκοδομή – Heb בְּתוּקָתָה (Ezek 40:2), בֵּית (1 Chr 29:1), בְּתֵן (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” – утверждения (Gk ἀποθέλεσμα?) – 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” – створення Gk ποιήσας (Heb רְשׁוּמָה) 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:

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

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 а р е б р е с н о в ст ё в ё т в о я ц е н и ц е в я зыц и въ часы въ милость ихъ и споношении (поношении B; а часъ ... споношении om.)
“for one hundred years” it [Israel] will be in evil among the heathen.<and an hour in their mercy and agreement>.” The verse is obscure. *Hapax legomenon* *sъпоношение* previously understood, according to evidence of ms B, as *poношение* (Gk ὅνειδος, Heb חֵרֶף, כָּלְמָו) ‘reproach’ is rather a calque of Gk σώμβασις ‘agreement,’ ‘coming together’ (LSJ, 1675; Lampe, 1280; cf. CS *съпомещи* for Gk συμβαστάζω in Job 28:19 – Srezn, 3:800).

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

[And] what about Yoavon, god <who is in the power of another god>, 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 Therefore, he is sold by men in order to show him> (6.9)

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

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

---

7 “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 *λεπτο* – Gk ἐναςτός – Heb יָעַשׂ ‘year/cycle’; CS *часъ* – Gk ὥρα – Heb יָעַשׂ ‘hour’; CS *годъ/година* – Gk κατόρος – Heb יָעַשׂ ‘period of time’ (used as a synonym for *часъ* ‘hour’ in 29.2, 9); CS * векъ* – Gk αἰών – Heb יָעַשׂ ‘age.’

8 Here and elsewhere the portions of text which do not occur in the version of *Codex Sylvester* (ms S) are enclosed in triangular brackets.
According to the most widespread meaning of CS владыка rendering Gk δεσπότης, ἥγεμων (Mikl, 66; Srezn, 1.267). In this case the earthquake would have killed selectively – only the “rulers.” The word refers rather to Gk έξουσία ‘power,’ ‘authority,’ as it did in Ostr Matt 8.9 (πάντα έξουσία – ύπο έξουσίαν “under authority”). We propose the translation based on another meaning of Gk έξουσία – ‘domain, district’ (cf., e.g., LXX for Dan 3:2, where this Greek word renders Aram נַעַרְיָה). 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”).

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 зъвуци гласовь словесъ егоже не въдъвяхъ)” (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 ρημάτων – Heb וְלֹא מִלְכָּי (Job 33:8; 34:16). However, the only way to reach a perfect reading of the verse is to consider that CS глас regularly renders Gk φωνῆ, meaning not only ‘voice,’ ‘sound’ (Heb הֵדוֹן; 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 пошедъ даръ вечеринаго, lit. “he waited for the evening gift.” Rubinkiewicz translates даръ вечерини as “evening gift” (comm. ibid.: “or ‘reward’; Gk δόρον, δόρεα”). In fact, Gk δόρον here must mean ‘offering,’ rendering Heb מָלָא meaning both ‘gift’ and ‘offering’ (HR, 359). Cf. 29.18: мужи праведны… будуть живущие утверждаемъ жертвами и

9 “Their native land” – уселения рода ихъ. Lit. “the inhabited world of their kin” – Gk τῆς οἰκουμένης (or: γῆς) τοῦ γένεσις (or: τῆς γενέσεως, or: πατρίδος) αὐτῶν; Heb הבית ארץ מולדת meaning both ‘gift’ and ‘offering’ (HR, 359). Cf. 29.18: мужи праведны... будуть живущие утверждаемъ жертвами и
даръми 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 בָּלַע(ו) תְרוּמָה “evening offering [lit. ‘gift’].” It was usually rendered by θυσία έσπερινή in LXX (in Slavonic versions – жертва вечернка). 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 בָּלַע(ו) תְרוּמָה “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 (תְרוּמָה התער), 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 посредъ е[с]ь изълаголемаго (al. неизълаголемаго S) слежаща имене 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 посредемь SU посредемъ C посредемъ 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: посредъемъ < посредъ есмь (SU) and посредъемъ < посред[ъ] есмь (C). Cf. посредство in our verse (10.3). We reconstruct either Gk έγῶ εἰμὶ … ὁ ἐν (τῷ) μέσῳ …, Heb בְּלַע(ו) תְרוּמָה “I am … in the midst of …” (HR, 461–7) or more probably Gk έγῶ εἰμὶ … ὁ μεσίτης. The words in 10.8 and 10.3 might render Gk μέσος, μεσότης ‘middle, mediation’ (cf. Mikl, 638: посредние – μεσότης). For 10.3 Gk μεσίτης ‘mediator’ is also probable, especially in light of the parallels: TDan 6.2: τῷ ἄγγελῳ τῷ παρατομένῳ ὑμᾶς ὁ οὕτως ἔστι μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων “to the angel who intercedes for you, for he is the mediator between God and men,” cf. TLev 5:6: έγῶ εἰμὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ παρατομένος. For μεσίτης denoting a mediator between God and men see also Job 9:33 (Heb הוהי); 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: ιδία αιώνι τοῦ(Σ ἀλλ τετα Α αίων τετα Β αἰων τετα Κ αἰων τετα Δ αἰων Ε) σοφὸς (S посредства A посредства B) неизълаголемаго имени моего (A – my word division, Tikhonravov proposes: αἴσθητε; K – my word division, Porfir’ev: ιδία γαίτ). CS тъе (тъе, тезъ, тозъ) usually renders Gk έπόθυμος + gen. or -νμος after another root (cf. Lunt 1985, 59–60). Normally used with dat.; cf. неистовъ тъе, богословъ тезъ, тезъ ἄνυ (Srezn, 2.1078). Its Greek counterpart, however, demands gen., as it is in our case –
Therefore, Slavonic prototext иди иаоиъ тьъ посредством неизрекомаго имени моего may be retroverted to Gk Ἡλθενος ᾿Ιαοῆλ ὁ ἐπώνυμος τοῦ μεσίτου τοῦ ἄφρτου νόμου μου – “Go, Yahoel, the namesake of the mediation of my ineffable name.” This interpretation corresponds to the meaning of Heb יאוהל/יהוָה אל, which is a combination of God’s names. See b.Sanhedrin 38b: “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 съние ‘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 הפסור 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 (слежаше В) имени (имени КО) въ мн. However, the placing of слежаща ‘dwelling’ in the sentence – whether it relates to 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 KO) and not with gen. sg. or nom. pl. имени. This interpretation goes well with the meaning of the Heb equivalent of CS иаоиъ – יאוהל/יהוָה אל 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 отцу 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 дъхъти for Gk πραγματεύεσθαι in Pand. Ant. or CS бръ купля for Gk ἄπραγμάτευτος), which regularly reproduced Heb בָּרָא in LXX, принеси 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 יִנָּה בָּרָא 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 ἰνέσις, Heb יִנָּה, Phil: “soulagera,” Rub: “déliberation” (Gk ἰνεσις, ἐνδοσις, ἔνδεια), RL: “liberation.” Actually, Greek counterparts of CS ослаба, ослабление, ослабъние may also have negative connotations: ‘willfulness’ – Gk ἰνεσις or ‘weakening,’ ‘laxity’ – Gk ἐκλύσις, παράλυσις (Mikl, 518; Srezn, 2.723–4; SRJa, 11–17, 13.1013). The last one might have rendered Heb ישיעיהו and thus could relate to a pseudo-Messiah; cf. רפוי שלחהו “laxity [= neglect] of the Law” (Lam. Rab. 1.4) or רפוי שלחו מíliaו “laxity of hands in upholding the Law” (Midrash Tanhuma, Beshallah 25). Cf. also דומלת על יד of Is 14:12 similar to ослаба отъ (om. KO) 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, Arminus 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”:
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.

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.

I saw that as they worshiped him, Azazel ran and worshiped, and having kissed his face he turned and stood behind him.

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

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:

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

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.

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.

The second clause of this verse is very vague and probably corrupt: изъ (om. S) людии моихъ сему вси уподобятся и притъчи яко оть мене зовома преминующее въ свѧтыхъ 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: “… diesen werden alle nachahmen und hinzugezält werden wie von mir gerufen, die sich ändernden in ihren Ratschlägen” (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 [прємкінющиеся] 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 ὄμολογεω ‘acknowledge, admit, confess’ (confused here with ὀμολογεω?) used also with dat. (cf. concerning Jesus in Matt 10:32) or Gk νομοθετεω (see Srezn, 3.1240) in pass. ‘ordained by law’ (cf. Heb 8:6). Both Gk words rendered Heb הדה in hiph’il ‘confess, acknowledge’ (see LXX for Job 40:14(10); Aq Th Ps 99(98):3 and Prov 28:13, etc.). CS прємкінющиеся here in previous research was always emended to прємкінющиеся ‘change(d).’ In the light of the interpretation introduced above the emendation is not necessary: CS прємкінющиесся rendered Gk παρατρέχω (meaning here ‘neglect’ or ‘deliberately overlook’) or Gk ύπερβατηνά (“trespass”) are both appropriate to the context (Slov, 3.458; Mikl, 736; Srezn, 2.1666; cf. Lampe, 1027). CS съзѣмъ reproduces Gk βουλη, Heb moreš, דעת, דעת 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.


13. Having seen the allegorical depictions of the sins of Israel, Abraham exclaims: превъвчие кръчче то почти еси основаль быти тако – “Eternal, Mighty One! Why did you ordain [lit. “establish”] it to be so?” (26.1). CS еси основалъ, lit. “establish” – Gk θεμελίωσαι – Heb בֹּנֶה, 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 ръхъ превъвчие кръчче да мимоидутъ (SU + нынѣ al.) злобия (SU злобная al.) въ нечстьи дѣла А (om. A)). The response looks enigmatic in Slavonic:

и рече къ мнѣ паче праведное време срящеть (SU + я al.) прежде преподобнымъ (SU подобнымъ al.) царь и въ правдѣ суджу имъ (SU судящимъ al.) яже прежде създахъ обладати отъ нихъ въ нихъ отъ техъ же изидутъ мужи изъ потщать (потщати SU) я елико (внѣлѣже SU) въжовѣстѣ тебе и судъ

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 паче (translated here as “rather”) may be, less probably, a part of the previous sentence: и рече къ мнѣ паче “and he said to me more.” (2) a form царь may be nom. or acc. sg. as well as gen. pl.: “In [CS паче < 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 прежде 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: почему еси судить сему области такои “why
did you adjudge to this such a power.” (5) The use of ἐδικασάτιν + εις meaning “rule over” may reflect a use of Heb משל + -ב ‘rule over’; cf. 31.2: властвующая εις νησί ruling over them’ and 29.2: держати εις язычес твоемь “rule over the heathens and over your seed” (for other hebraized uses of CS εις in ApAb see 12.10, 25.2; (cf. Rubinstein, 1954: 132). (6) εις νησί may render Gk ἐκ τοῦτων ‘since then,’ ‘after this,’ or less probably ἀπὸ τοῦτων ‘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) εις νησί might be either a gloss for εις νησί or the beginning of the next sentence. (8) The Greek equivalents of CS σрядеть –απαντάω, ὑπαντάω, συναντάω (Srezn, 3.818) – are used with dat., while CS прпподобьимъ (Gk ὁσιότης, Heb י鿫; 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 י鿫 relate to David and Solomon.

Finally, CS попъщати regularly rendered Gk σπουδάζω (as trans. normally means ‘care for’), which in LXX reproduces Heb בהלל (also as trans. in high’il) ‘trouble.’ See Slavonic Job 23:16 (Srezn, 2.1304): вседержитель же попыщалъ ми (Gk ἐσπουδάσε με, Heb בהיהון; cf. also LXX and MT in Job 22:10 (Gk ἐσπουδάσε σε Heb בהלל). The whole verse in Hebrew would look like this:

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

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 σрядода 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; Pesiqtā Rabbati 26,131; etc.), we have to assume that CS прпшецъ 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 разграўдывы here and in 27:4 as well as расхытити (27.1, 5) means here not ‘plunder,’ but like its regular Greek counterpart (δι)αρράξω (Slov, 3.565; Srezn, 3.32), rather ‘seize,’ ‘snatch,’ ‘carry away’ (LSJ, 245–6, 410). In later sources Gk (δι)αρράξω 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 συναγωγάς [or: τέσσαρας πρέσβεις] κατατρέχοντας πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ ἐνέπροσαν τὸν ναόν ἐν πυρὶ καὶ ἤρπασαν τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ ὀντὰ ἁγία

with the following counterparts:

| CS εὐλογεῖ | Gk πρέσβες | Heb מלאך
| --- | --- | ---
| or | or | קהל מתחנה
| CS εὐλογεῖ | Gk συναγωγή | Heb נח ביד או(ep)
| CS πρεσβεῖος | Gk κατατρέχω | Heb תפס או(ep)
| CS ῥαζράωντι | Gk (δι)αρπάζω | Heb חטף או(ep)

17. In example 12, discussing supposedly Christian interpolation in ch. 29, the CS срамлюся (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 כענ here ‘humble oneself’) or less probably Gk σιχάρνομαι ‘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”] 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).

---

12 See example № 21.
13 See comm. to 5.5.
Alexander Kulik

The problem is a passage translated here as “I went out, having made my fire” (изидоχ (AKO + u al.) створиχ свътм сюво). BL translate створихъ свътъ as “accomplished my purpose” and comment: “lit. ‘did my counsel’: a Hebrew phrase, ישות לו租房 ‘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 omit a conjunction и between the two verbs. The absence of и makes it syntactically possible to reconstruct a form *створихъ in place of створихъ where the superscript в was altered by scribal error to х (cf. the alternation of пръмъсмълъ and пръмъсмълъ in 5.1). Thus, the translation should be: “I went out, having made my fire,” considering that CS свътъ renders here Gk φως meaning not only ‘light’ but also ‘fire’ (see, e.g., in Mark 14:54 and Luke 22:56; for φως ποιείν 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:

αζъ есьмь прежде въка и кръпокъ боль иже прежде створихъ свътъ въка (S иже прежде створихъ въка ABC иже прежде въка D) – I am the primordial and mighty God, who initially [?] created the two luminaries [?] of the world [?] (9.3)

For CS прежде въка Rubinkiewicz (Rub) proposes the quite rare Gk προστόνος (rendered usually by пръставъчные) (Slov, 3.414; Srezn, 2.1626), that occurs also in our document in 13.8, 10, and Heb דוד קדוש or עליון. CS pl. прежде въка ‘before the ages/worlds’ is well attested for rendering Gk πρό τόν αιώνα (1 Cor 2:7, SDRJa 11–14, 2.293). Sg. прежде въка here might have rendered Gk ἐξως εἰς τόν αἰωνα (Heb דוד יתי), usually reproduced by CS до въка (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 свътъ as “two luminaries.” If CS свътъ is interpreted as gen. sg. of ‘light,’ Gk φωτός and переве (пръреве) as ‘before,’ Gk πρό (Slov, 3.401; Mikl, 715), the verse might be translated like this: “who (previously) created before the light of the world” (RL). CS свътъ въка, thus, would go back to Heb דוד אврем, lit. ‘light of the world/eternity’ = ‘eternal light.’ Cf. Isa 60:19, 20: “the Lord will be your eternal light [φως αἰώνον, דוד אврем],” and John 8:12: “I am the light of the world [τό φως
“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 вка is identical with that of the previous word втма, and the semantic fields of both intersect (in the meaning ‘world’). Thus, вка might be a gloss for втма, inserted by a Slav scribe in order to indicate that втма here means not ‘light’ (Gk φως, Heb רַא) but ‘world’ (Gk κόσμος/αἰών, Heb עָלָם; 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 перве створихъ свтма which may be understood also as “who created before the light [was existing]” (or even “before man” considering that the gen. of Gk φως ‘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 створихъ ‘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 свтма, understood as acc. dual. ‘two lights/luminaries.’ The word for ‘light’ denotes sometimes also ‘luminary’ in Slavonic (втма, Slov, 4.35; Srezn, 3.296), as well as in Greek (φως, and not only in Jewish Hellenistic sources; see, e.g., τὰ φῶτα, meaning ‘sun and moon’ in Ptolemaeus, Tetrabiblos 37,38) and Heb (הברא Consort 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 перве (первѣ) was widely used as an adv. (‘initially, primarily’) rendering Gk πρῶτον/πρῶτος (see Slov, Srezn, and Mikl, ibid.), Heb בראשית (בראשית), and Nebi il (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 לבים (Lev 18:27; Deut 2:12; Josh 1:14; Jer 34(41):5; Neh 13:5), and Heb רשא (1 Kgs 13:6; Jer 33(40):11), we obtain the linguistically plausible and intertextually confirmed interpretation based on the oldest ms: “who initially created the two luminaries of the world” (иже первѣ створихъ свтма втка S). For the related phrase “who created the luminaries” (створихъ свтма), see Ps 136(135):7: “to him who created great luminaries” – τῷ ποιησαντα φῶτα μεγάλα – לחש אורות צדיקים (cf. previous commentary); for “the luminaries of the world” (свтма втка) see 3 En 10 (Schäfer 1981, № 13, V48a/12): מראות שבתולא מראה ארץ “the luminaries that are in the world”; Gen. Rab. 12,5: מראות ארץ “the luminaries of the earth.” Thus, this passage in Hebrew might look like this: מראותי (נ)אורות עולם.
20. In some cases CS _Fromq 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: _свътъ члвъкъ и сь помышление ихъ на земли си есть евгъ (23.10). The verse was misinterpreted before: key definitions _свътъ члвъкъ and _помышление ихъ на земли were translated previously as “the human world” and “their desire upon the earth” (BL), “penchant [Gk διαβουλιον – Heb רעים] des hommes” and “leur convoitise sur terre” (Phil), “la lumiere, 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 _свътъ члвъкъ here as well as in 22.2; 23.14; 26.5; 29.10 most probably renders Gk διαβουλιον (Slov, 4.243–4; Mikl, 916; Srezn, 3.681), Heb מנהנה, עָלָה, דִּיָּמְעָר (HR, 227–8), while CS _помышление means here rather ‘desire’ than ‘thought.’ This word rendered either Gk ἐπιθυμησι (cf. Supr 296,1 and Slavonic versions of Matt 5:28; Lam 1:7 – Heb הוא מלח; Dan 9:23 – Heb הדרד or דיאנוזף (Heb יר, in Gen 8:21: _помышление члчскъ – ṭ διανοια του ἀνθρωπου – יר בל הראתא “the desire of the man’s heart”; see (Srezn, 2.1171). The most common equivalents for Gk ἐπιθυμησι in MT are Heb רצת, ישע (HR, 521), while Gk διανοια renders Heb רבע (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’ (ווע) and ‘passion’ (איסף); 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:
Since you are angry at what was willed by you, who does a bad thing\(^{\text{14}}\) according to your design\(^{\text{14}}\) (23.14).

Unusual dat. дѣлается after гнѣваться may be a syntactic calque: both Gk χόλω and ὀργίζω ‘be angry’ are used with object in dat. CS combination въ свѣтѣ твоемъ must go back to Heb יְהַשֵׁע or יֵלֵעַר (on CS с(т)вътъ understood as Gk βουλή, Heb ה新浪财经 or הַלּוֹ; cf. 22.2; 23.10; 26.5–6; 29.10). Another possibility is that въ свѣтѣ твоемъ (S) and въ свѣтѣ своевмъ “(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:

\[\text{яко свѣтѣ оца твоего въ немъ (} + \text{ бысть D) якоже твои свѣтѣ въ тобо (} + \text{ есть SU) готовъ бываетъ въ дни приходящая прежне и (om. DCU) т} \text{къ не увеси ни будущихъ въ ни (26.5).}\]

The most obscure passages here are: моея воля свѣтѣ въ мьнѣ (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 бываетъ. CS с(т)вътъ – 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 יָשָׁר in Prov 8:35; 2 Chr 15:15 or יָשָׁר in Ezek 18:23); see (Srezn, 1.298; SDRJa 11–14, 1.472–4). The combination of both (воля – θέλημα and свѣтѣ – βουλή) is attested in the very similar context of Eph 1:11: … προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν τού τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν βουλῆν τοῦ θεόν σου τοῦ θεόλαμπος 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 бываетъ (previously invariably interpreted as ‘is ready’) is retroverted. It is, obviously, a calque of Gk ἐτοιμὸν ἐστὶν ‘inevitable,’ ‘sure to come’ (on ἑτοιμός + εἰμί or γίνομαι see LSJ, 704; Dvoretzkij, 1.680). The Slav translator was apparently misled by the use of this idiom in NT, where ἑτοιμὸν εἰμί 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-

---

\(^{\text{14}}\) Lit. “useless thing.” CS неполезное rendering Gk ἀξιός, ἀξείς, lit. ‘useless,’ may mean also ‘bad, evil.’ Its Gk counterparts reproduce Heb רְשִׁ vv ‘undesirable’ (Hos 8:8) and בָּשָׁר ‘base’ (2 Sam 6:22).

\(^{\text{15}}\) 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 (predetermination).

The idea is most clearly expressed in Abot 3:5: “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 свят ми], and it was pleasing to me [CS и годъ бысть лицо моему – Heb לפל רוח]. 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 [в свят их поиме] (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 in an enigmatic съходы translated here as “hosts” (cf. въсходъ (входъ A) in 25.4, сходъ (сходы A) in 28.4 and съходъ (входъ ACKO) in 28.5). The combination съходы четырь 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 сходъ (and not въходъ): 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 … запустъетъ въсходы д: “a Temple in the name of your God … will be desolated by four <?>.” Miklosich (Mikl) and Sreznvskii (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 Eingange” based on his reading въходы of later mss as instr., which contradicts the form of the numeral (четыри). Box (BL) follow Bonwetsch in translation (“through four entrances”), but note that сходы may mean ‘descents,’ ‘generations’ (hypothetical Heb זנב תב). Lunt (RL, 702) proposes to emend сходъ to исходъ ‘exits’ or въсходы ‘ascents,’ and четыри also to instr. – четырыми.

Rubinkiewicz (1987) reconstructs for схода Gk κατάσκοτος (as in Vita Alexandri, Mikl, 964) – Heb נביא ‘angel,’ relying upon the only precedent in Josh 6:24(25), where κατάσκοτος ‘scout’ of LXX corresponds to נביא ‘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. Mekhila de R. Ishmael, Yitro (Bahodesh 9)). In support of Rub we can bring CS сходьникъ, which reproduces Gk κατάσκοπος in Slavonic NT (Christ, Slepč, Šiš Heb 11:31; and as a gloss to πρόσογματι in Vita Alexandri, ibid.) as well as ἔγγελος 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 съходъ or съхода must be rather a calque of Gk σύν- 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 съньмъ may mean ‘gathering/host [of angels]’; see (Srezn, 2.780) аγέλες съньмы (Irmolog. 1250), съньмъ сънятъ (Supr 72). Cf. Heb קהל קדישים (Ps 89:6) or רְבָּכְתֵו קַרְיָה (Deut 33:2). Therefore, here “hosts [of angels]” might also be meant. In LXX Gk συναγωγή regularly renders Heb (הנה, קלואל, קרואלב) (only in Dan), and less frequently אסף/אסף (Exod 32:22, 21), מֹאָט (Num 5:2 – according to Cod. Alex., while Cod. Vat. has Gk παρεμβολή, a regular equivalent of Heb מִפָּתָח, מָדוּר (Jer 6:11), מְדֹר (Ezek 37:9) The phrases [angelic] camps of Shekhina and particularly ארבע מְתָחַות וְלָכָנִים “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 съхода/съходъ may also be a calque of one of the following Greek words: πρέσβεια, πρεσβεύει, πρεσβευτής, πρεσβεία meaning ‘messenger,’ ‘embassy’: Gk πρεσβεία was rendered by CS съходжение in Greg. Naz. eleventh cent. 86 (Srezn, 3.862). In LXX Gk πρέσβευς reproduces Heb מלאך ‘messenger,’ ‘angel’ (Num 21:20(21); 22:25; Deut 2:26).

22. The verse 1.9 is very obscure:

и усъде другого марумана от другого камени безъ главы и главу отвергъшею отъ марумафа и прочее марумафы (тр. A) скрушъ – лит.: [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 усѣчи as “bildete” and proposing to insert положи на нь after отъ марумэфа (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?” ¹⁶ The shortcoming of Bonwetsch’s reading, nevertheless, is that усѣчи, unlike сѣщи, 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 пелека/ѡ ‘hew,’ ‘shape with an ax’ (Heb לסר, 3 Kgdm 6:1 = 1 Kgs 5:32) for the more familiar пелеки/ѡ ‘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). The will live “being affirmed by the sacrifices and the offerings of justice and truth in the age of justice” (утвержаеми жертвами и даръми правды и (ом. С) истины) (29.18). CS утвердити most probably renders its regular Gk equivalent στηριζω, reflecting here Heb דות ‘sustain with food’ (Judg 19:5; 8; Ps 104(105):15; etc.), while “the gifts of justice” – unattested Heb באתת הדר ודרות (“offerings of justice” – resembles באתת הדר ודרות “offerings of justice” (in LXX always in sg.: θυσία δικαιουσύνης; see Deut 33:19; Pss 4:6(5); 51:21(19)). CS даръ renders Gk δώρον, Heb אכתחן “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).

¹⁶ If we try to avoid the interpolation of положи на нь, still treating усѣчи as ‘cut, carve,’ we must assume that Terah made some kind of headless idol or that the CS prototext had ἀνευ κιδάρεως; cf. EpJer 9 about crowns (στεφάνοι) for idols. But these speculations contradict the evidence of 3.6.
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