

Великотърновски университет „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“

Институт за балканистика при БАН

ТЪРНОВСКА КНИЖОВНА ШКОЛА. Т. 7

Седми международен симпозиум, Велико Търново, 8—10 октомври 1999 г.

AN EXAMPLE OF THE VALUE OF SLAVONIC TRANSLATIONS: THE LOST GREEK HOMILIA IN NATIVITATEM DOMINI NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI BY ATTICUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE

Francis THOMSON (Antwerpen)

The sole surviving fragments of a homily on the Nativity of Our Lord by Atticus, bishop of Constantinople (405/6–425), are two brief passages quoted twice by Cyril of Alexandria (c. 378–444), first in his *De recta fide* addressed to Arcadia (400–444) and Marina (403–449), the younger sisters of Theodosius II (408–450), in 430¹ and then in his *Apologeticus pro duodecim capitibus adversus Orientales episcopos* of 431, in which he defended himself against the charges of Apollinarianism and Arianism levelled at him by Andrew of Samosata († after 444).² The same two passages were quoted during the sixth session of the Council of Ephesus on 22 July 431.³

The second passage is also found in the Syriac translation of a homily on the Nativity ascribed to Atticus of Constantinople, the sole complete text of which is found in a ninth-century MS.⁴ The text of the Syriac version poses a problem: the beginning is in fact made up of *Oratio v, Laudatio in S. Virginem ac Dei genitricem Mariam* by Proclus (before 390–446) without the concluding peroration on the name Emmanuel,⁵ while in the remaining part there are several phrases which are very similar indeed to some in another of Proclus' Marian eulogies, viz. *Oratio i, Laudatio in sanctissimam Dei genitricem Mariam*.⁶ Socrates records that Proclus served as Atticus' amanuensis⁷ and thus it has been concluded that the translation is that of a homily by Atticus but edited by Proclus.⁸ The fact that the homily does not contain the first briefer passage quoted by Cyril of Alexandria is explained away by the assumption that it was lost somewhere in the transmission of the Greek original or the Syriac translation.⁹ In fact, however, the internal evidence of the text reveals quite clearly that it is a conflation of two independent works, the first being Proclus' *Oratio v* without the ending, the second the ending of Atticus' homily edited by Proclus.¹⁰

Incontrovertible proof of the fact that the Syriac text is a conflation is provided by the Slavonic translation of the original form of Atticus' homily: it not only contains both passages quoted by Cyril of Alexandria but also supplies two

passages missing in the Syriac text. If this fact has hitherto been overlooked it is because the Slavonic translation is falsely and for no apparent reason ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa (c. 338–after 394).¹¹ The earliest traced codices of the translation are of the late fourteenth century, two of which have been used in the present edition:

1. *Codex 1045* in the collection of the Bulgarian National Library at Sofia [=S]. The codex is a convolute: ff. 1–189 with watermarks of 1375–1385 contain the fourteenth-century Slavonic translation of the *Ascetica* ascribed to Basil of Caesarea (329/30–379),¹² while ff. 190–298 with watermarks of 1322–1327 contain festal homilies and *vitae*, the sixth of which on ff. 206^r–208^v is Atticus' sermon. Despite the difference in date of the watermarks both parts were copied in the late fourteenth century and the orthography is Bulgarian. A gloss on f. 189^v reveals that in 1840 it was in the monastery of St. John the Baptist at Slepche and it is thus known as the Slepche Florilegium.¹³

2. *Codex 873* in the collection of Mikhail Pogodin (1800–1875) in the Russian National Library at St. Petersburg [=P]. The manuscript with watermarks of 1376–1390 was copied by six scribes in the late fourteenth century, the orthography being Serbian, and contains the *Vita S. Symeonis junioris* by Nicephorus Uranus (ff. 10–11th centuries),¹⁴ some synaxarium *vitae* and a collection of festal homilies, Atticus' sermon being on ff. 58^r–61^r, which were among those copied by the second scribe.¹⁵

In addition to these two early manuscripts three codices, all of the first half of the seventeenth century, in the collection the Athonite monastery of Hilandar have also been used for the edition:

3. *Codex 442* [=A]. This is the December volume of an immense menologium compiled on the basis of up to eight exemplars for each month by Abercius, a monk from Hercegovina, at St. Sabas' Hermitage in Karyes on Athos between 7131 (1622/3) and 7134 (1625/6) for abbot Hilarion of Hilandar (1622–1628). Atticus' homily is on ff. 509^r–514^r of the codex, which was completed in 7133 (1624/5).¹⁶

4. *Codex 489* [=N]. The orthography of this codex is Serbian and a gloss on f. 293^r reveals that it was one of thirty volumes which Nicanor (✠ 1685), confessor of Hilandar and brother of its abbot Symeon (1685–after 1692), left to the scete of the Holy Trinity on Athos in 1685. The codex contains festal homilies and a few *vitae*, Atticus' homily being on ff. 49^r–52^r.¹⁷

5. *Codex 649* [=H]. This is the sole traced codex with the homily the orthography of which is East Slav. This is not, however, evidence that the translation was known in Ruthenia or Muscovy as it was probably copied by an East Slav scribe on Athos. The codex, whose watermarks are of 1620–1622, contains festal homilies and Atticus' sermon is on ff. 281^r–285^v.¹⁸

In addition to the MSS used for the edition the following codices also contain the translation:

6. *Codex 706* in the collection of the convent at Dragomirna in Moldavia. The codex, which has watermarks of 1401–1408 and the orthography of which is Bulgarian, contains a collection of festal homilies and *vitae*, Atticus' homily being on ff. 417^r–421^r.¹⁹

7. *Codex 301* in the collection of the Rumanian Academy of Sciences. The codex, which has watermarks of 1411–1426 and whose orthography is Serbian, contains festal homilies and *vitae*, Atticus' homily being on ff. 387^v–391^v.²⁰

8. *Codex 4/5* in the collection of the monastery at Rila in Bulgaria. This codex was copied by the celebrated scribe Madarius of Rila (fl. 1480–1509) in 1483 and contains festal homilies and *vitae*, Atticus' homily being on ff. 351^r–353^v.²¹

9. *Codex 72* in the History Museum of Croatia at Agram. This codex, whose orthography is Moldavian, was copied by an anonymous scribe in 1538 and contains festal homilies, Atticus' being on ff. 182^v *et seq.*²²

The present edition is based on the Slepche Florilegium, whose orthography has been retained as it provides material for dating the translation. The abbreviations have been expanded between brackets in accordance with the orthography of the scribe, e.g. **выс[тъ]**, not **выс[тъ]**, **ест[ъст]во**, not **ест[ъст]во**, and the few scribal errors have been corrected with the original readings given in the *apparatus criticus*. The few minor variants of the other codices reveal that the textual transmission of the translation remained very stable over the centuries, the scribes copying faithfully the incomprehensible phrases with no attempt being made to emend the text to make sense. The three Hilandar codices of the early seventeenth century merely contain a very slightly stylistically revised text, the revision in H and N being greater than that in A.

The Bulgarian orthography of S is typical of the fourteenth century: both nasals are found but are muddled, e.g. the accusative feminine singular and plural adjectival endings **-жа** and **-ыж** instead of **-жаж** and **-ыла**, and are never iotacized even in initial position, e.g. **азыци**. The use of semivowels is chaotic: between root and prefix or suffix they are either omitted, e.g. **възвыснть**, **прѣмнраго**, or muddled, e.g. **ннзъврѣже**, **мыслъно**, which also applies to their use in roots, e.g. **злова**, **естъство**. In final position either is used, e.g. **храмъ**, but **вбразъ**, which also applies to the instrumental singular, e.g. **прѣстѣплениемъ** but **прнвнѣниемъ**, and to the third person singular and first person plural of the present tense, e.g. **прославнть** and **прославнмъ**, but **рыдаеть** and **празноуниаъ**, although here there is a marked preference for **ь**. In a few cases **ь** had been replaced by **ѣ**, e.g. **творецъ**, **прѣдвѣцъ** but there is no case of **тъ** being replaced by **о**. A typically Middle Bulgarian feature is the confusion of **ѣ** and **ѣ**, e.g. the nominative singular **землѣ**. There is also one case of the omission of epenthetic **л**, viz. **земедѣлцоу**, and two strange instances of a lack of patalization in the vocative of the word **еретике**, which phonetically reproduces the Greek **αἰρετικέ**.²³

On the whole the language is not early and there are obvious Middle Bulgarian features such as the use of an uninflected relative pronoun to render a Greek article, e.g. **прннесе нже въскѣ носцаго** and **къ нже въскѣхъ врачу**, but

there are also undoubted archaisms in both morphology and syntax. Thus, in addition to contracted adjectival endings, e.g. *нестъзданнаго*, there are occasional uncontracted ones, e.g. *пръвозданнаго*, while uncontracted imperfect tense endings occur four times, once in *вѣдѣаше* and thrice in *нѣкаше*. The early conditional of *вѣти* occurs twice, both times in the same sentence *лице не вѣ... не вѣ*. An early syntactic trait is the use of the *dativus possessivus*, e.g. *вѣсемъ мироу творецѣ*, *creator of the whole world*, and the use of possessive adjectives to render nouns in the genitive, e.g. *сѣнь законнаа*, the *shadow of the law*. There is also one instance of a *genitivus privationis*: *мене ангелъскыхъ штажчи славы*, *He separated me from the glory of the angels*. The question thus arises as to whether these archaisms are the remnants of an Old Bulgarian translation which was revised in the fourteenth century. The lexical evidence would favour a later rather than an earlier dating since there are no obvious archaisms and there is a definite predilection for iterative verbs such as *вѣсѣвати*, *нстѣшавати*, *обѣлговати* and *показовати*.

A comparison of the vocabulary with the contents of the five principal dictionaries of Slavonic²⁴ revealed only five lexemes foreign to their corpus:

1. *гласоголголивѣ*. This occurs in the phrase *гласоголати гласоголголивое хъдожьство възбранн*,²⁵ literally *He forbade my voice-speaking art to speak*, which corresponds to the Syriac *He forbade my music to speak*.²⁶ In the absence of the Greek it is difficult to explain this *hapax legomenon*, although there is a clear association of the word *гласъ* with music since it renders *ἦχος* in the sense of mode in Byzantine music and is even more closely associated with the idea of melody in *стѣхѣра самогласъна*, which renders *στιχηρὸν ἰδιομέλον*, while *λαλεῖν* is used with regard to music in the sense of *to sound*.

2. *двоевѣснѣн*. This is found in the expression *еллининѣ двоевѣснѣн*, literally *twice-possessed pagan*, which corresponds to *a pagan who worships devils* in the Syriac.²⁷ This *hapax legomenon* is perhaps a mistranslation of *δεισιδαίμων*, *superstitious*, misconstrued as **δισδαίμων*.

3. *онеплодствѣти*. This occurs in the phrase *дѣваа... немошь онеплодствѣти*, literally *a virgin... made infirmity infertile*, which corresponds to *a virgin...made infirmity void* in the Syriac.²⁸ The Slavonic is probably a calque of *ἀκαρπώ*.

4. *отболѣти*. The phrase *дѣва отболѣ* corresponds to *a virgin travailed* in Syriac.²⁹ The unprefixated verb *болѣти* often renders *ὠδίνω*, *to have the pains of childbirth*, but the reason for the addition of the prefix remains unclear.

5. *пръвохъдожннкѣ*. The sentence in which this occurs is corrupt but there can be no doubt but that the word is a calque of *ἀρχιτέκτων*.³⁰

The linguistic evidence on balance would date the translation to the thirteenth or fourteenth century rather than indicate that an earlier translation had then been revised, but the question cannot be considered closed until the evidence of the other MSS has been examined.³¹

The translator's approach to his task was literalist to the extent that he followed the Greek even when the result was clearly meaningless. To give an example :

НѦПНЕСАНА НАША НМѢКАШЕ ДІАВОЛѢ
 ПРѢГРѢШЕНІА БЛАГОДАТІЖ ПОМАЗАНА
 ΜΝΟΓΟΣΡΑΣΤΗΝΑΓΟ ΤѢΛΕΣΕ. ΠΡѢΔΑΣ(ΤѢ)
 ДІАВОЛѢ СѢМРѢТН.

*The devil had our transgressions
 written down anointed by the grace of
 a multipassionate body. The devil
 delivered (them? it?) up to death.*

This is one of the passages which has a parallel in Proclus' *Oratio i*:

Διὰ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ πάντες τὴν
 ἁμαρτίαν ἐχειρογραφήσαμεν·
 δούλους ἡμᾶς κατεῖχεν ὁ
 διάβολος· τὰς ὠνάς ἡμῶν
 προέφερε, χάριτι κεχρημένος τῷ
 πολυπαθεῖ ἡμῶν σώματι.³²

*Through Adam we all acknowledged
 sin in writing; the devil held us fast as
 slaves; he presented our deeds of
 purchase, using our body subject to
 many passions as the document.*

It is quite clear that the translator understood *χάριτι κεχρημένος* as *χάριτι κεχρημένος* and rendered it literally even though the result was meaningless. Moreover, since the document is no longer mentioned it is uncertain what is being delivered up to death by the devil. A similar misreading of the Greek which can be resolved by reference to Proclus' *Oratio i* occurs in the sentence:

НѦ ОБРАЩЕШН ВО ПРѢВХОЖДОЖНИКА КАКО
 СЪЗДА ДОМЪ ВЪ ЖИЛИЩЕ.

*For thou shalt not find an architect
 how he made (his) home in a dwelling.*

Οὐχ ὕβρις ἀρχιτέκτονι μεῖναι ἐν
 οἷς ὠκοδόμησεν.³³

*It is not an outrage for an architect to
 abide in what he has built.*

The translator clearly understood *Οὐχ εὐρήσεις ἀρχιτέκονα*. It is, of course, theoretically possible that there were corruptions in the Greek text which he was translating but it is more likely that his knowledge of Greek was not perfect. Thus, for instance, the statement that *БОГАТЫН ВЪ ПОКРЫВАЛѢ РАЖДАЕТСѦ*, *the rich one is born in a covering*, does not convey much to the reader who does not realize that the translator has confused *κατάλυμα*, *an inn*, with *κάλυμμα*, *a veil*, cf. the second passage quoted by Cyril of Alexandria: *ὁ πλοῦσιος ἐν καταλύματι γίνεται*.³⁴

Some of the translator's errors were due to mere carelessness, e.g. *НЖЕ УПѢ ДРѢВѦ ВЪЗРАСТѢШАГО ГРѢХѦ ПАКЫ КР(Ъ)СѢ УПРАЖНѢЕТѢ*, *from the tree of the grown sin the cross again abolishes*, *ВЪЗРАСТѢШАГО ГРѢХѦ* should be in the accusative not the genitive and the meaning is obviously: *the sin grown from the tree the cross again abolishes*. In various places the punctuation in all the MSS reveals that the text was not understood by the scribes copying it.³⁵ The translation teems with calques which by the fourteenth century must have been comprehensible even when literally rendering the metaphorical meanings of the Greek lexemes, e.g. *ВЪПЕРИТН* translates *ἀναπτερόω* and is used in the text not in the literal sense of *to give feathers to* but in the metaphorical sense of *to raise*, a meaning frequently found in both translations and original Slav works.³⁶ These calques

coupled with metaphrastic literalism give an excellent insight into the untraced Greek original – untraced but perhaps not lost since the ascription to Gregory of Nyssa was probably in the Greek codex used for the translation. Gregory did write a homily for the feast of the Nativity³⁷ and a closer examination of all the traced copies whose incipit has not been recorded³⁸ may lead to the discovery of the text.

Григоріа еп[н]скопа Ннсекаго. На рождѣство Г[оспод]а нашего І[нс]у[са] Х[рист]а. Бл[аго]с[ло]ви, ѿ[т]ч[е].

Днес[ь] Х[ристо]с[ъ] вл[а]д[ы]ка чл[о]в[ѣ]колюбное рождѣство въспрїать, в[о]ж[ь]ствнаго² двестоннства сжцство прѣжде вѣ. Єлицн оубв вѣрніи н кѣ Б[ог]оу протажено нмаше мыслѣное шко, н се сжще, такоже нарекоствеса, хрїстїане, прїидѣте, прославнѣт вл[а]д[ы]кж нашего н Б[ог]а прѣмнрнаго въ мнрѣ н мнрскын очнщающа грѣх[ъ]. Днес[ь] вл[а]д[ы]ка Х[ристо]с[ъ] єднноколѣнникъ намѣ выв³, н въплѣщса, роднса шт[ъ] д[ѣ]внцж³ Марїа н чл[о]в[ѣ]колюбнѣ творнт[ъ] ц[а]р[ь]ствїа пжть, да твои помыслѣ възвыснтѣ н жителѣ (206^v)ство ползчнв на н[е]в[е]си, г[ла]голешн съ Павлом[ъ]: Наше во жителѣство на н[е]в[е]сехѣ ес[т]ь. Нж да не пострадаешн еретнчское въ семь, брате, ннже отъцетншн са о в[о]ж[ь]ствнѣмъ хждожствѣ, нж чюднса съмотреїоу, іако сѣло чл[о]в[ѣ]колюбно съхожденїе н іако еже не длѣженъ вѣ създатель. Єїе выс[т]ь създатель тварь. Яще н ц[а]рѣ сы естѣствомъ, равїнмъ зракомъ виднса, нж іакоже прѣдрече⁴ самѣ, недлѣжное прїатѣ, да тебѣ простнтѣ еже длѣжен[ъ] вѣ Х[ристо]с[ъ] прншедѣ. Днес[ь] вл[а]д[ы]ка, нже мнрѣ исплѣнѣжн, паче же нже въсему мнроу творецѣ, н[е]во збо съдѣлавъ штровж д[ѣ]внцж, шт[ъ] нежже въплѣщсаемъ, н жрѣтѣвннкъ іасн съдѣлавъ, ап[о]ст[ол]ы же влѣхвы прнзва шт[ъ] Перснды. Ѻтворѣжѣмоу д[с]шевнаа скровнца, братїе; прїимѣмъ вѣрож несоуменнож егоже прїжть чрѣво д[ѣ]внчєе безъ стжженїа. Н вы же жены, ажє о Х[ри]ст[ѣ] раждающа н скврѣнж штврѣгнжвшжа н бл[а]гос[ло]венїоу прнчѣщѣшжаса с[в]а[т]ыж Марїж, прїимѣте н вы въ чрѣвѣ вѣрож нже днес[ь] шт[ъ] д[ѣ]внчєе рождѣшагоса; нш с[в]а[т]аа Марїа прѣвѣ вѣрож очнщшн храмъ чрѣва, таже въ храмъ прїатѣ ц[а]рѣ вѣккмъ, достонны съдѣавшн ц[а]р[ь]ствїа свож оуды.

Кто⁵ не поклоннса Б[ог]оу Словоу, братїе? Кто не прославнтѣ Б[ог]а, чл[о]в[ѣ]ка нас[ъ] радн вывша⁶? Єе во хошет[ъ] сказанїе Ємнаноулево. Сєго Ємнаноула шткры ѿ[т]ч[е]; възвѣстн же Нсаїа⁷, прѣстомъ прор[о]чствїа⁸ помазаемъ. Сєго поносн д[ѣ]ваа без[ъ] стжженїа; сєго вл[а]говѣстн Гаврїилѣ архангелѣ; сєго зачат[ъ] чрѣво д[ѣ]внчєе кромѣ съвъкоупленїа. Ѻ вєщн паче слова! Ѻ враздо съплетшїаса оубо земедѣлцоу не оскврѣннвшн же са! Ѻ сѣмене оутанвшагоса! Ѻ чюдесе, егоже въспрїатѣ вѣкѣ не вѣдѣаш! Д[ѣ]ваа зачатѣ, д[ѣ]ва⁹ поносн, д[ѣ]ва¹⁰ штволѣ, д[ѣ]ва¹¹ родн, д[ѣ]ва¹² прѣвѣсть! Нн єднно же шт[ъ] нже на землн чюдєсь таково: море раздѣлнса, нж пакы съвъкнпнса; поустынн нсточн маннж, нж пакы своє позна естѣство; Іорданъ възвратнса въспат[ъ], нж позна своє теченїе; сл[ъ]нце ста протнж Гавашноу,

нж пакы въспрїать свое теченїе. Нн єдино же шт[ъ] чюдєсть прѣвыс[тъ] чюдо. Д[ѣ]ваа родн — въ семь тѣчїж выс[тъ] чюдо н прѣвываєт[ъ] чюдо. Д[ѣ]ваа родн д[ѣ]ва¹³ сжщн. ѿ чюдєє! И д[ѣ]ва¹⁴ прѣвысть. ѿ чо[207']дєє таниства великааго Б[ог]а чл[овѣ]ка бывша! И что прноврѣтенїе?

Днес[ъ] свѣтъ д[ъ]невнын въсїаваєтъ н днес[ъ] сл[ъ]нце правєдное роднса н свѣтн мыслѣнїн свѣтовнмь¹⁵ съвъкзуплѣжтса чювєствннмь. Дїаволжє повѣждаєтса н тварь въздвнзаетса. Дїаволъ повѣждаємь штгоннт'са н сѣнь законнаа прѣходнтъ. Колѣвємаа вєщєн сташа, прор[о]чьствїа концъ прїємлат[ъ], шсжждєнїа мєчь прнтжпнс. Чл[овѣ]колюбное слово нстѣщаваєтса, нєнстѣщамъ сын; сєбє во нстѣщн,¹⁶ зракъ равїн въспрїємь. Бесплѣтнын тєбє радн въплѣщаєтса, слово плѣтъ выс[тъ]. Ижє осасанїю нє подпадажн за єжє єстѣствомь нєосазамь, осазамь вываєтъ; вєзначалнын подъ началомь вываєтъ тѣлеснынмь; съврѣшеннын възрастаєтъ; нєпрѣлож'нын прѣспѣваєтъ; богатын въ покрывалѣ раждаєтса;¹⁷ одѣважн н[є]во шєлакы пєлєнамн повнваєтса; ц[а]рь въ паслєхъ повнваєтса; нжє вєз' м[а]тєрє горѣ, вєзъ ш[т]ца вываєтъ на зємн. Пнсма штлжчаетса, д[с]хъ лнхонмєствєзєтъ. Горѣ неразлжчнын, долѣ нєскврѣненъ, н св[ѣ]дѣтел'ствоуєтъ долнєє рождєнїє горнєє неразлжчєнїє. Ємманоуилъ гавѣ показоуєтса. Сєго нзнєсє чрѣво д[ѣ]внчєє вєзъ стжжєнїа н прѣдпочнтаетса пачє н[є]в[є]снааго кржга чрѣво д[ѣ]внчєє, нмѣашє во вѣнлтръ нжє вѣнѣ опнсаннаго; прннєсє нжє вѣсѣк носщага; поносн нжє ржкож сѣдрѣжжщага концѣ въселєннынмь; прннєсє врємѣ, въселєн'скаго сп[а]сєнїа хрѣнло, н д[ѣ]внчѣскымн лжєснмь поносн вєлнкєє таниство, Б[ог]а нз[ъ] нєж въплѣщамє. Єїа жє вышж єнцє, занє тако въсхотѣ сѣдѣтєль Б[ог]ъ, понєжє єнцє чл[овѣ]колюб'ствова, ннчтожє во шт[ъ] вож[ъ]ствннынхъ хотѣнїн нєвъзможнє.

Ягг[е]лѣ прѣндє, нж радн агг[е]ла аггєлѣ нє выс[тъ]. Ярхаггєлѣ прѣндє н нє опєчѣан постыдѣвшѣагосѣ достонн'ствомь. Почто? Занє нє нмѣашє злєва стр[а]стнжѣ млѣвж. Чл[овѣ]кѣ овєзѣчьєстн шєразъ н вываєтъ чл[овѣ]кѣ, нє нмѣж оучнтєл'ство шєраза, єгожє овєзѣвьѣстн дїаволѣ прѣлѣстїж. Позна лн прнходѣщѣаго достонн'ство? Оужасє лн сѣ тани'ства сѣмотрєнїа вѣрож (207') сѣкнопншємаго? Празноуымъ нє празннчнѣ, нж в[о]ж[ъ]ствнѣ. Євъзвєслнмєс. Овєщнѣк прєславнмь прѣмнрнѣаго въ мнрѣ. Напнтанмєс пнщєж д[с]ховнож. Рѣцѣмь сѣ д[а]в[ы]домѣ: Євєн азѣщн,¹⁹ въсплєщатє ржкамн, іакє Г[оспод]ѣ вышнїн, єстрашєнъ, ц[а]рь вєлєн по вѣсєн зємн. Кышнїн вєзначалнын Г[оспод]ѣ іакє сѣдѣтєль, н ц[а]рь іакє самовластннкѣ, вєлєн іакє вєзъ рассжждєнїа, по вѣсєн зємн въплѣтнвынєсѣ Б[ог]ъ н вѣчл[овѣ]чнвынєсѣ.

Гдє вѣсовє нннѣ? ѿтѣвѣгошж! Гдє началозловнын дїаволѣ? Єнднмь єго іакє млѣнїж спадша сѣ н[є]в[є]сє. Гдє влѣхєн? Млѣчлѣтъ, нєш пр[о]рочѣскыж нєтнны нсплѣнєнїє, вѣсовєскомоу повѣждєнїюу выс[тъ] вѣход[ъ]. ѿлє чюдєсємь! Єдннє чрѣво д[ѣ]внчєє рождѣство прѣєлавно въспрїать н вѣсѣкѣ дїаволєскаа оустѣ въ млѣчанїє облѣчє. Єдїнож д[ѣ]ва родн н вѣсѣкѣж коупно нємошѣ

онеплодствен. Быс[тъ] по нас[тъ] чл[овѣ]къ коупнороденъ кроликъ грѣха, не мнѣ-
нїемъ, не²⁰ привидѣнїемъ, не по мѣчтанїю въсїа в[о]ж[ъ]ство, нж по истинѣ
въплѣщєса, д[с]шж же оумнѣа прїемлетъ моего швраза, да мон сп[а]сетъ
швразъ и плѣть овесѣмрътнтъ.

Вѣнѣ оубв да стождъ нже истинѣ овлѣгателе! Да никтоже прнстжднтъ,
ннже Іоуден невѣрнын вл[а]г[о]д[а]телю на кр[ъ]стѣ досаждажн; ннже елннннѣ
двоевѣснын, нн хрнстїанннѣ даже до шглаголанїа сего простнратнса, таже о²¹
вл[а]д[ы]цѣ сжднтн н създанїе несъзданнаго овлѣговатн; нн Євномїе, смѣшажн
в[о]жѣство; нн Ірїе раздѣлкѣн нераздѣльное ест[ъ]ст[во]; нн Македонїе штѣцажн
д[с]ха С[в]а[т]аго; нн Фотннѣ нн Маркелъ Галатїнскы; нн Павелъ Самосатскы,
нншїн вѣрѣ нсташателе, проста чл[овѣ]ка бытн н шт[ъ] чл[овѣ]къ штвръженъ,
досаждажше достонн[ст]вѣ д[ѣ]внчьскаго рожденїа, хоулаше Ємманоула,
штмѣктажшеса прор[о]кѣ. Нж праведно ест[ъ] въпроснтн нхъ, шткждс сїе постра-
дашж о плѣтн его. Се н²² Іоудеє пострадашж, н Самарнтѣ, ннже подовнннса,
еретнкѣ! Нж в[о]ж[ъ]ствѣ вѣрзешн? Се н вѣсн пострадашж, въпїахж во гл[а]-
голѣще: Оубв, что намъ н тебѣ, с[ы]не в[о]жїн? Прншель есн прѣжде вѣрїене
мжчнтн нас[тъ]? Не стыдншн лн са, еретнкѣ, тжко пастырѣ сын тебе радн овчл
выс[тъ]? Ійко сл[ъ]нще сын праведное въсїа тжкоже свѣтнланнѣ Іованноу?²³ Ійко²⁴
прїнде възыскатн погывшшаго?²⁵ Ійко прїнде възыскатн драхмѣ погывшжа?
Что ж[ѣ] (208г) ест[ъ] драхма вл[а]д[н]чнѣа? Вѣра, ажѣ ты прѣстждленїемъ
погоубнл есн. Ійко шстави швца незаважждъшжа н прїнде за тѣ прѣлѣщеннаго
н, на ramo въземъ, чл[овѣ]колюб'нѣ понесе? Ійко дверь выс[тъ], да ты
везьтроднѣ вънндешн? Ійко источннкѣ выс[тъ] н к[ъ] тебѣ прїнде тебе радн,
да тебе шт[ъ] грѣховннѣ сквернны штмыеть? Вѣспон оубв красное славноаго
прор[о]ка сложенїе, шт[ъ] въсѣхъ пѣваемѣа пѣсень: Бал[а]г[о]с[л]овенъ градын
въ нма Г[оспод]ѣ, кто сын н паки грады. Невѣдѣща наоучн ма, ш прор[о]че,
кто Б[ог]ъ Г[оспод]ѣ, н явнса намъ? Не везь расмотренїа прор[о]кѣ прїходѣщаго
проповѣда н настождше показоуетъ, Спаса нашего І[ис]ус[а] Х[рист]а прншествїе,
н нже шт[ъ] дрѣва възрастьшаго грѣха паки крѣсть оупражнѣетъ. Нж, виднтѣ
вл[а]д[ы]чнее дльготрѣпнїе!

Б[ог]а невѣмѣстнаго смъртннѣ въмѣстн чл[овѣ]къ н чудо, не нмамъ
како нзрещн съповѣданїе: съннде²⁶ во, тжкоже вѣстѣ, въмѣстнса тжкоже
въсхотѣ. Яше не вн въ ма овлѣкѣса, не вн прѣвозданнаго шт[ъ] шсжденїа
нзбавнлѣ. Шсешн оубв невѣзмож'но бытн нма тжко, како Б[ог]ъ овлѣчєса въ
чл[овѣ]ка? Не обрашешн во прѣвожджннѣа како създа домѣ въ жнлнще.
Ажѣ во създаваж, не оскверннса, сїж носѣ, не оукалѣса.²⁷ Погрѣшнвѣ оубв
Іадамъ ранскѣа слава погоубн. Землѣ сего радн трѣнїе растнтн повелѣса. Не
тѣкмо же смѣ съгрѣшенїемъ злын намъ нзнесе²⁸ трѣдѣ, нж н смъртн
осжднса работатн.

Написана наша наѣкаше дѣволъ прѣгрѣшеніа,²⁹ вл[а]г[о]д[а]тіѣ помазана многостр[а]стнаго тѣлесе. Прѣдас[тъ] дѣволъ съмрътн, съмрътже адоу, адже пріемъ, осѣдн лютеѣ іаже о нас[тъ] подълежатн вѣднѣ. Вндѣв' оубв проор[о]къ нн шткждоу же стр[а]стн оубрачножшнса, възъснааетъ глас[тъ] къ нже вѣсѣхъ врачю н рече: Преклонь н[е]в[е]са н сънннн. Сѣдн на Херувимѣ³⁰ гавнса. Въздвннн снаж твож н пріндн въ еже сп[а]стн нас[тъ]. Плачет[тъ] оубв дѣволъ, съмрътн раздршнѣ бывшн, н рыдаетъ мжнтель себе, гл[агол]: Не к тому ц[а]рствуж. Въсхыщенн вышж шт[тъ] мене³¹ нже прѣвѣе шт[тъ] мене нжднѣ поравощеннн. Архаггел'ское мн вонн'ство штемъ, іако не вонн'стввна шт[тъ] н[е]в[е]сн нзъврѣже ма. (208^v) Паки, въ ненже ц[а]рствовах[тъ] плѣтн, съ неж³² покрывса съмжцаж ма штгоннтъ долѣнше. Язъ женскжл просвѣтанх[тъ] добротж, шко къ сѣтн въпернхъ, съ же съшедъ цѣломждріе нзыавн. Язъ тмнванъ н кнвалъ къ веселіоу възъкнцатн наоучнхъ, съ же съшедъ гл[агол]атн гласогл[агол]нвоє³³ хждожество възврнн. Язъ конерыстаніа іако тоужде зрѣніе наоучнх[тъ], съ же съшед[тъ] ап[о]с[то]лскн показа пжтъ. Люта мн шт[тъ] вѣсждоу н волѣзньна. Погоубнх[тъ] іадовнтыж свож слны. Боговорнаго Павла шттрѣже н хрїстоносна оучнтелѣ показа. Язъ съмрътн прѣдавецъ вывѣ, Іоудеж оубв боговорца показухъ. Мене³⁴ агг[е]л'скыж штажн славы н словомъ развонннка оправдавъ, ранскаго оуставн вытн храннтелѣ. Блажннцж шт[тъ] мене съкршамж оуцѣломждрн н, д[ѣ]вѣстѣвнымъ тж помазавъ масломъ, ц[а]рствіа н[е]в[е]снаго жнтелннцж дарова. Елѣхвы мож шт[тъ] Перснды къ своємж познанію прнведе. Ер[ъ]стоу прнгвозднтнса плѣтоносномоу Б[ог]оу Словоу сътворнхъ, оумерша того мнѣхъ н свож крѣпость показухъ. Съмрътже того вндѣвшн, нзнеможе слоуж. Скакажт³⁵ прочее мон мрътѣвцн сего вндѣвше н попрннжл възспрїемше³⁶ оукрѣплѣшеса снаж іако врагwm[ъ] ш[т]ца³⁷ ма³⁸ нарнчат[тъ]. Трїд[ъ]нвнвоє³⁹ възскр[ъ]сеніе показа н нже шт[тъ] мене поравощеныж нскзпн показнїемъ. Свѣзаннн прочее н въ Тартаръ възврѣженнн въсн възкзпѣ на ма гласwm[ъ] възспѣважтъ: Г[оспод]ь въц[а]рнса да радзетса землѣ. Томоу слава въ вѣкы вѣкwm[ъ]. Ямнн[ъ].

ABBREVIATIONS

- BHG Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca, 3 vols., and Novum auctarium, ed. F. Halkin. (= Subsidia hagiographica, 8a, i-iii and 65), Bruxelles, 1957–1984.
- CPG Clavis Patrum Graecorum, 5 vols. and Supplementum, by M. Geerard. Turnhout, 1974–1998.
- PG Patrologiae cursus completus... Series graeca et orientalis..., 167 vols. in 171, ed. J. Migne. Paris, 1857–1866.
- PL Patrologiae cursus completus... Series prima..., 221 vols., ed. J. Migne. Paris, 1844–1865.

- Alvarez Campos, Corpus: S. Alvarez Campos, Corpus Marianum patristicum [...], 4 vols. in 5, Burgos, 1970–1985.
- Аванесов, Словарь: Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.), изд. Р. Аванесов, Москва, 1988– (in progress, 6 vols. to date).
- Бархударов, Словарь: Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв., изд. С. Бархударов и др., Москва, 1975– (in progress, 25 vols. to date).
- Baur, Initia: C. Baur, Initia Patrum Graecorum, 2 vols. (= Studi e testi, 180–181), Rome, 1955.
- Bidez, Sozomenus: J. Bidez, Sozomenus. Kirchengeschichte, ed. G. Hansen (= Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 50), Berlin, 1960.
- Богдановић, Инвентар: Д. Богдановић, Инвентар ћирилских рукописа у Југославији (XI–XVII века) (=Зборник за историју, језик и књижевност српског народа, I Одељење, 31), Београд, 1982.
- Богдановић, Каталог: Д. Богдановић. Каталог ћирилских рукописа манастира Хилендара, one volume and Палеографски албум, Београд, 1978.
- Brière, Homélie: M. Brière, Une homélie inédite d'Atticus, patriarche de Constantinople, in *Revue de l'Orient Chretien*, 30 (1933–34), pp. 160–180.
- Caro, Homilética: R. Caro, La Homilética Mariana Griega en el Siglo V, 2 vols. (= Marian Library Studies, New Series, 3–4), Dayton, 1971–1972.
- De Aldama: Repertorium: J. De Aldama, Repertorium pseudochrysostomicum (= Documents, études et répertoires de l'Institut de Recherches et d'Histoire des Textes, 10), Paris, 1965.
- Fedwick, Bibliotheca: P. Fedwick, Bibliotheca Basiliana universalis. A Study of the Manuscript Tradition of the Works of Basil of Caesarea, 3 vols. in 4 (= Corpus Christianorum, no no.), Turnhout, 1993–1997.
- Hansen, Sokrates: G. Hansen, Sokrates. Kirchengeschichte (= Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge, 1), Berlin, 1995.
- Юфу, Колекција: З. Юфу, За десеттомната колекција Студион (Из архива на румњнскиа изследвач Џон Юфу) in *Studia Balcanica*, 2 (1970), pp. 299–342.
- Иванова, Ръкописи: К. Иванова, Български, сръбски и молдовлахийски кирилски ръкописи в сбирката на М. П. Погодин. София, 1981.
- Христова, Ръкописи: Б. Христова, Д. Караджова и А. Икономова. Български ръкописи от XI до XVIII век, запазени в България. Своден каталог, т. I. (all published), София, 1982.
- Кодов, Сборник: Х. Кодов. Слепченски сборник. Среднобългарски паметник от края на XIV век. В: Известия на Народната библиотека „Кирил и Методий“, 7/13 (1967), с. 33–110.
- Kurz, Lexicon: Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae, ed. J. Kurz et al., 4 vols., Prague, 1966–1997.

- Lampros, Catalogue: S. Lampros, Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1895–1900.
- Lebon, Discours: J. Lebon, Discours d'Atticus de Constantinople "Sur la Sainte Mère de Dieu", in *Le Muséon*, 46 (1933), pp. 167–202.
- Leroy, Homilétique: F. Leroy, L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople. Tradition manuscrite, inédits, études connexes (= *Studi e testi*, 247), Rome, 1967.
- Mansi, Conciliorum: J. Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio [...], 31 vols., Florence-Venice, 1759–1798.
- Matejic, Catalog: P. Matejic, and H. Thomas, Catalog. Manuscripts on Microform of the Hilandar Research Library. (The Ohio State University), 1 vol. in 2 (= *Resources in Medieval Slavic Studies* 1, i-ii), Columbus, 1992.
- Miklosich, Lexicon: F. von Miklosich, Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum emendatum auctum, Vienna, 1865.
- Мошин, Рукописи: В. Мошин. Ћирилски рукописи у Повијесном музеју Хрватске. Копитарева збирка словенских рукописа и Цојсов ћирилски одломак у Љубљани, one volume and Палеографски албум (= *Опис јужнословенских ћирилских рукописа*, 1), Београд, 1971.
- Quasten, Patrology: J. Quasten, Patrology, 3 vols., Utrecht, 1950–1960.
- Райков, Панегирикът: Б. Райков, Панегирикът на Мардарий Рилски от 1483 г., в: *Старобългарска литература*, 18 (1985), с. 143–149.
- Richardson, Hieronymus: E. Richardson, Hieronymus, Liber de viris inlustribus. Gennadius, Liber de viris inlustribus (= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 14, iA), Leipzig, 1896.
- Sauget, Interprétation: J. Sauget, Pour une interprétation de la structure de l'homiliaire syriaque: MS British Library Add. 12165, in *Ecclesia orans*, 3 (1986), pp. 121–146.
- Schwartz, Acta: E. Schwartz, Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, 4 parts in 13 volumes in 24 issues, Strassburg-Berlin, 1914–1940.
- Синдик, Писар: М. Синдик. Хиландарски писар Аверкијев, в *Проучавање средњовековних јужнословенских рукописа. Зборник радова за III Међународне Хиландарске конференције одржане од 28. до 30. марта 1989*, изд. П. Ивић, Београд, 1995, с. 337–393.
- Спространов, Опис: Е. Спространов, Опис на ръкописите в библиотеката при Рилския манастир, София, 1902.
- Срезневский, Материалы: И. Срезневский, Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам (3 vols. and supplement), СПб. 1893–1912.
- Стоянов, Опис: М. Стоянов и Х. Кодов: Опис на славянските ръкописи в Софийската народна библиотека, т. 3, София, 1964.

- Thomson, Works: F. Thomson, *The Works by or Ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa in the Hilandar Manuscript Collection Together with a Few Remarks on the Slav Reception of Christianity*, to appear in: *The Proceedings of the Fourth International Hilandar Conference (August 1998)*. (In the press).
- Турилов, Рукописи: А. Турилов и Л. Мошкова, *Славянские рукописи Афонских обителей*, изд. А. Е. Тахиаос, Фессалоники, 1999.
- Турилов, Список: А. Турилов, *Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописных книг IX в., хранящихся в СССР (Для Сводного каталога рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР)*, Москва, 1986.
- Васильев Л.: Л. Васильев, М. Гроздановић и Б. Јовановић, *Ново датирање српских рукописа у библиотеци Румунске академије наука*, в: *Археографски прилози*, 2 (1980), с. 41–69.
- Wright, Catalogue: W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the Year 1838*, 3 vols., London, 1870–1872.
- Яцимирский, Рукописи: А. Яцимирский, *Славянские и русские рукописи румынских библиотек*, в: *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской академии наук*, 79 (1905), с. 1–XL, 1–965, 1–XXI.

БЕЛЕЖКИ

*The author wishes to thank the University of Antwerp (RUCA) for an annual grant towards his research expenses.

¹ Ed. Schwartz. *Acta*, I, i, 5, pp. 62–118, see p. 66; PG 76, coll. 1201–1336, see col. 1213.

² Ed. Schwartz. *Acta*, I, i, 7, pp. 33–65, see p. 45; PG 76, coll. 316–385, see col. 341.

³ See the record of the session ed. Schwartz. *Acta*, I, i, 7, pp. 84–117, see p. 94; cf.

Mansi, *Conciliorum*, IV, coll. 1193–1196. The same two passages are also found in Armenian and Syriac florilegia; for the details and an edition see **Lebon**. *Discours*, pp. 196–198.

⁴ British Library, Additional 14514, ff. 80v–84v; on the MS see **Wright**. *Catalogue*, I, pp. 244–246, see p. 245. Additional 12165 of 1015, ff. 9r–10v, contains a mutilated text without beginning or ending; on the codex see *ibid.*, II, pp. 842–851, see 842, and **Sauget**. *Interpretation*, pp. 121–146, see p. 126. The homily (CPG 5650) has been edited twice: **Brière**. *Homélie*, pp. 166–177, with a French translation, *ibid.*, pp. 177–181, and **Lebon**. *Discours*, pp. 176–186, with a Latin translation, *ibid.*, pp. 186–190; on the homily see **Caro**. *Homilética*, I, pp. 59–75, and **Leroy**. *Homilétique*, pp. 84–86.

⁵ BHG 1134; CPG 5804; ed. PG 65, coll. 716–721, and reprinted from there in **Alvarez Campos**. *Corpus*, IV, 1, pp. 89–95. The homily is also found falsely attributed to John Chrysostom (**De Aldama**, *Repertorium*, no. 407) and as such has been edited under his *spuria* in PG 59, coll. 707–710. On the homily see **Caro**. *Homilética*, I, pp. 110–114, and **Leroy**, *Homilétique*, pp. 82–84, 148. The Syriac translation breaks off just before the quotation of Matthew 1:23 (*And they shall call his name Emmanuel*), viz. PG 65, coll. 716–721 corresponds to **Lebon**, *Discours*, pp. 176–180, and **Brière**. *Homélie*, pp. 166–171.

⁶ BHG 1134; CPG 5800 and 8630; ed. **Schwarz**. *Acta*, I, i, 1, 103–107, and reprinted from there in **Alvarez Campos**. *Corpus*, IV, 1, pp. 80–89; PG 65, coll. 680–692. Some of the phrases in question are quoted by **Lebon** in footnotes to his Latin translation. On the homily see **Caro**, *Homilética*, I, pp. 79–94, and **Leroy**. *Homilétique*, pp. 44–61, 140–146.

⁷ *Historia ecclesiastica*, vii, 41, ed. Hansen. Sokrates, p. 390; PG 67, col. 829: ὑπογραφεὺς αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων.

⁸ Thus, for instance, Lebon. Discours, p. 174, and Quasten. Patrology, III, p. 523.

⁹ Thus Lebon. Discours, pp. 172–173.

¹⁰ See Caro. Homilética, I, pp. 62–65, 70–71.

¹¹ In 1981 Иванова. Ръкописи, p. 363, noted that the incipit of the Slavonic version coincided with the incipit of the first passage quoted by Cyril as listed in Baur. Initia, II, p. 407, and wondered whether it might contain the same text but did not investigate the question further. The first positive identification was made by Thomson. Works, preprint pp. 7–8.

¹² See Fedwick. Bibliotheca, III, pp. 277–278.

¹³ Христова. Ръкописи, I, no. 116; for a description of the codex see Стоянов. Опис, III, pp. 291–295, with an edition of the 1840 gloss, *ibid.*, p. 295; for a detailed analysis of the language see Кодов. Сборник, pp. 33–110. I must thank Professor Boryana Khristova, Director of the Library, for making a microfilm of the text available and Dr Maria Spasova of the University of Veliko Tărnovo for making a copy of the text from the manuscript itself.

¹⁴ BHG 1690. The translation has not been published.

¹⁵ Турилов. Spisok, app. no. 40; for a description of the codex see Иванова. Ръкописи, pp. 358–374. I must thank Dr. Klimentina Ivanova of the University of Sofia for sending me a photocopy of the text.

¹⁶ Турилов. Ръкописи, no. 432; for brief descriptions of the codex see Богдановић, Каталог, pp. 169–170; Matejic. Catalog, I, p. 539, and Синдик. Писар, p. 390. The entire menologium is in eight Hilandar codices, six of which, viz. *codices 439–444*, were copied by Abercius and two, viz. *codices 445–446* with the months of May to August, by an anonymous scribe. I must thank Professor Predrag Matejic, Curator of the Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies of the Ohio State University, for making photocopies of the text of the homily in all three Hilandar MSS available to me.

¹⁷ Турилов. Ръкописи, no. 974; for brief descriptions of the codex see Matejic. Catalog, II, p. 574, and Богдановић, Каталог, pp. 186–187, with a facsimile of the gloss on f. 293^r, *ibid.*, Албум, no. 198.

¹⁸ Турилов. Ръкописи, no. 882; for brief descriptions of the codex see Богдановић, Албум, pp. 186–187, and Matejic. Catalog, II, p. 664.

¹⁹ For a description of the codex see Юфу. Колекция, pp. 317–323.

²⁰ For a description of the codex see Яцмирский. Рукописи, pp. 458–464; for the watermarks see Василјев. Датирание, pp. 56–57. It is a convolute and the final folia, viz. ff. 455–479, have a watermark of 1486.

²¹ Христова. Ръкописи, I, no. 132; for descriptions of the codex see Спространов. Опис, pp. 84–94, and Райков. Панегирикът, pp. 143–149.

²² Богдановић. Инвентар, no. 520; for a description of the codex see Мошин, Рукописи, pp. 88–95, who, *ibid.*, p. 90, claims that the homily ends on f. 192r, but the explicit given is not that of the homily, which is not long enough to require that number of folia, given the size of the handwriting of the scribe of this MS, see the facsimiles of ff. 46^r and 75^v, *ibid.*, Албум, nos. 16–17. The most obvious explanation is that the ending of Atticus' homily and the beginning of the next entry have been lost and that this has not been noticed.

²³ Dr. Maria Spasova has suggested that by the fourteenth century vocatives in -че, e.g. оучениче, had begun to have the force of diminutives and hence were unsuitable for negative concepts such as heretic. If so, this would mitigate against her hypothesis of an early dating of the translation, see below note 31.

²⁴ Viz. **Аванесов. Словарь; Бархударов. Словарь; Kurz. Lexicon; Miklosich. Lexicon**, and **Срезневский. Материалы**.

²⁵ In S there is a superscript *м* over *w* to give the variant **гласѡм[ъ] глаголанвое**, which might be the original reading but preference has been given to the majority reading.

²⁶ **Lebon. Discours**, p. 185.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

²⁸ *Ibidem*.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

³⁰ On the sentence see below.

³¹ In a letter of 13 April 1999 Dr. Spasova informed me that there was sufficient evidence to justify the hypothesis (предположения) that the extant text is a revision of an Old Bulgarian translation and appended a brief study of the language. I must here express my gratitude to her, although I remain unconvinced of the hypothesis. In this context it should be pointed out that **Кодов. Сборник 108**, was convinced that the Slepche Florilegium was either the translator's autograph or the first copy made of it.

³² **Schwartz. Acta**, I, i, 1 p. 105; cf. the variants in PG 65, col. 685.

³³ *Ibid.*, I, i, 1, p. 104; cf. the variant in PG 65, col. 684.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, I, i, 7, p. 45; PG 76, col. 341.

³⁵ Whether this punctuation goes back to the translator is unknown. These remarks should not be construed in the sense that the entire text is incomprehensible, only that it contains some very obscure passages. The work of the mediaeval translator may not be denigrated from the point of view of modern demands.

³⁶ **Аванесов. Словарь**, II, p. 204; **Срезневский. Материалы**, I, col. 395.

³⁷ CPG 3194; BHG 1915.

³⁸ E.g. in the catalogue of Athonite MSS the incipits are not given, see **Lampros, Catalogue**, i, coll. 46, 179, 239, 243.

¹ АНН add н

² АНН add во

³ А д[ѣ]вы

⁴ НН прѣжде рече

⁵ Р то

⁶ РА вываго

⁷ S Нсіа

⁸ S прор[о]чьстїа

⁹ НН д[ѣ]ваа

¹⁰ See 9

¹¹ See 9

¹² See 9

¹³ See 9

¹⁴ N д[ѣ]ваа

¹⁵ Р свѣтомь

¹⁶ НН add н

¹⁷ S раждаестѡ

¹⁸ S обвѣчьсть

¹⁹ S ѡцн

²⁰ НН нн

²¹ HN omit

²² P omits

²³ N Іѡаннь

²⁴ Omitted as far as 25 in P, then added as a marginal gloss with an indication of where it had been omitted.

²⁵ See 24

²⁶ N въндѣ

²⁷ A възгнѣшасѣ

²⁸ P възнесѣ

²⁹ HN съгрѣшенїа

³⁰ HN Хероувнѣхъ

³¹ N же

³² P adds же

³³ S гласом[ъ] гл[агол]ное

³⁴ HN add же

³⁵ S сказашт'

³⁶ A възпрїемже

³⁷ See 38

³⁸ HN ме ѡ[т]ца

³⁹ HN трнд[ъ]невно