Anissava Miltenova (Sofia)

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

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

---

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


\(^3\) *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, cura et studio M. Geerard, Brepols-Turnhout 1992, p. 135–146.


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

The text under discussion in this paper is entitled “From the teaching of Apostle Andrew”: Ṿо оучениꙗ стꙗго ап(с)ла андреа, inc. Вьш(д)шоу стꙗмоу ап(с)лоу андрею вь сьнⸯмь сь оученїкї си. начеше и(х) вьпрашати ѿ коу(д) ѥсте и что ѥ(с) ваше сло(в). It is preserved in a sole copy from the 14–15th c., written in Raška orthography, without nasal vowels, and with one jer (ь). Today the manuscript is preserved in the collection of the Rumyantsev Museum (178), No. 10272, in the Russian State Library in Moscow. The material of the manuscript is bomabayne; it has no visible vergeures and pontuseau and is written out in the Serbian semiuncial, typical for the end of 14th and the beginning of 15th century. Originally it belonged to the collection of A. I. Hludov; however, as evidenced by the number (No. 84) written at the top of the first folio in blue pencil, it had turned up there from the second, so called “Macedonian” collection of A. F. Hilferding. The exceptionally intriguing fate of Hilferding’s collection has been studied in detail in the articles of Anatoliy A. Turilov and Zhanna Levshina. This collection was formed during A.F. Hilferding’s trip to Bosnia, Herzegovina, Macedonia and “old” Serbia in 1857,


10 Ж. Левшина, Путешествие А. Ф. Гильфердинга 1868 года и славянские рукописи его «македонской» колекции (истои и перспективы изучения), Арх 34, 2012, p. 77–107. I wish to express my gratitude to Zhanna Levshina for providing me with data concerning the Hilferding collection as well as the text of her article prior to publishing it.
when he was the Russian consul in Sarajevo; later he published a description of
the trip. A considerable number of the South Slavic manuscripts were collected
by A. F. Hilferding in the Slepče Monastery, the Lesnovo Monastery, in Kratovo,
Lešok (Tetovo region), the Treskavec and despot Marko’s Monastery as well as in
Ohrid, and they probably were sold to A. I. Hludov not later than 1869. The mar-
gins of the miscellany contain notes written by A. N. Popov, who worked on the
texts; he was also likely to have temporarily kept the book in his collection (today
237 in the Russian State Library). The following inscription has been written out
on folio 122v: Помози боже господину деспоту (God help our master the Despot);
the text on folio 133v reads: Гюрьгу деспоту (To Gyurgi the Despot). Probably
the ruler in question is Georgi Branković (1427–1456). The manuscript is cited
and examined by a number of scholars in accordance with its description in A. I.
Hludov’s catalogue (No. 105) (e.g. Santos Otero mentions it with the same num-
ber in his review (No. 31); so does F. Thomson in the review cited above). However,
the manuscript has not been in Hludov’s collection for the last 70 years, since it is
considered to have been acquired by the Rumyantsev Museum prior to 1947.

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

---

11 А.Ф. Гильфердинг, Поездка по Герцеговине, Боснии и Старой Сербии. Босния в начале 1858 г.,
Санкт-Петербург 1859 [= ЗИРГО, 13].
12 A Serbian despot (1427–56), vassal of the Turks and the Hungarians. In 1439 he fled to Hungary.
He took part in an anti-Ottoman coalition (1443–44); regained (1444) his possession, paid tax to the
Turks, but in 1454 lost part of his land.
13 А.Н. Попов, Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А. И. Хлу-
14 The byzantine work is composed immediately after the Second Council of Lyon (1274) and its
ideological content is against the Lyon union and the policy of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos
(1259–1282), see: А. Попов, Историко-литературный обзор древнерусских полемических
сочинений против латинян (XI–XV в.), Москва 1875, p. 238–286. This fragment (may be the
earliest copy in South Slavic tradition) is worthy of separate analysis.
15 Изборник 1076 года, coll. М.С. Мушкинская, Е.А. Мишина, В.С. Голышенко, ed. А.М. Мол-
16 A transcription of the text is published by M. N. Speranskiy posthumously: М. Н. Сперанский,
Библиографические материалы А. Н. Попова. Учение ап. Андрея, ЧИОИДР 1889, 3, p. 53–62.
The publication does not include an analysis of the eventual sources of the work; a transcription
of the Martyrdom of Saints Apostles Peter and Paul of the same manuscript is also published there.
evation of the Holy Cross (anonymous, missing folia between 46 and 47) (46v–48r); The Life of St Eustace Placidus (48r–57v); Martyrdom of Saint Apostles Peter and Paul (57v–66v)\(^\text{17}\); The Life of Prophet Elijah (66v–70r) (abridged text at the end of which the part of the encomium by St Clement of Ohrid is added) Enkomion on the Dormition of the Theotokos by St Clement of Ohrid (70r–71r); The Life of St Pope Sylvester (fragment) (71r–72v); The Life of St. Euphrosynus the Cook (fragment) (73r–73v); The Life of St George (fragment of the old redaction) (74v); excerpts from the sermon (anonymous) (75r–83r); excerpts from the Paterikon (83r–84r), excerpts from The Erotapokriseis by Anastasios of Sinai (84r–88r); Instruction of Father to his Son (88r–92r, folia appear to be missing between 90v and 91r; identical to the copy in the Izbornik of 1076)\(^\text{18}\); excerpts from The story about Barlaam and Josaphat (92r–108r); short Life of St Sava of Serbia (108r–120v)\(^\text{19}\); Synaxarion Life of St Simeon Serbian (121r–122v); A Miracle of St. Nicholas of Myra, about his saving the lives of three men (123r–129r); The Life of St. Demetrius of Thessaloniki (129v–135r, 74r–74v, copy of the old redaction; the text is uncompleted, without an ending). The content of the hagiographies and the homilies has been specified by K. Ivanova\(^\text{20}\) by providing information on the manuscript regarding its number in the Rumyantsev Museum. The author describes the content as a combination of sermons that have been extracted from the Menaion and the Triodion panegyric and, possibly, from a Reading Menaion of the Old Redaction (“staroizvoden cheti-minej”), with a mixed-up calendar sequence\(^\text{21}\).

The prevailing number of texts retain archaic linguistic features from the time of First Bulgarian Kingdom. I will quote only a few examples from the vocabulary of the text: салохutivo ‘free will’ (Codex Supr., Izbornik 1073, Gregory of Nazianzus 11\(^{\text{th}}\) c.: салохотих, салохотих; Izbornik 1076: салохотку); саловластець ‘absolute’ (Codex Supr.); танинник ‘keeper of the secrets’ – воля(д)мымъ земляниций. танинника не(с)нымъ (Gregory Naz. 11\(^{\text{th}}\) c.: Codex Supr. таньник; Izbornik 1073 танкънин); простяня ‘absolution’ – простиня грѣховъ (Codex Supr. простыня); отъкълъствикъ ‘revenger’ (hapax; Codex Supr. отъкълъствикъ); неськъ ‘greedy’ (Codex Supr., Prophetologion, etc.); благънин ‘goodness’ (Codex Supr.); благостъння ‘benevolence’ (Psalterium Sin., Euchologium Sin., Codex Supr., Prophetologion, etc.); стондество ‘shame’ (Codex Supr., Life of Alexander the Great), etc. Usage of dual form, along with the use of nominative in the place of accusative case, are quite common.

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

---

\(^{17}\) Published by: М.Н. Спера́нски́й, op. cit., p. 1–52.

\(^{18}\) Изборник 1076 года, p. 164–203.

\(^{19}\) Д. Богданови́ч, Кратко житие светог Саве, ЗМСКJ 24.1, 1976, p. 5–32.

\(^{20}\) Кл. Иванова, Bibliotheca Hagiographica Balcano-Slavia, София 2008, p. 82–83. The author refers the chronology of the manuscript to the last decades of 14\(^{\text{th}}\) c., defining the font as ustav.

\(^{21}\) Ibidem, p. 82.
sion to the redemption and salvation (заповѣда намь проповѣдати покаяніе въ простиню грѣхѡмь). It starts with an introduction about the place and the circumstances under which Saint Andrew states forth his “teaching”; i.e. with stating the grounds for the main compositional part of the text that follows. Andrew and the other disciples answer the questions of the people in front of the “meeting”; by answering the question who they are and what their word is, Andrew denies their assertion that Herod is the true Christ, depicting him as a murderer of children, a deceiver who originates from another tribe and does not belong to the Jews, therefore being their ill-wisher. Andrew declares himself to be the first disciple of John the Baptist, gives an eyewitness account of the baptism of Christ, and confirms that he and the other Disciples of Christ have been sent to preach penance and absolution of sin among all peoples. The main sermon of the Apostle Andrew before the people starts the next day. In it, he traces the events since Creation. The removal of the tenth angelic rank, and its elder, who became the forefather of evil of its own will, is an important issue (самохотию, ꗗко самовластьць). In the text, he is referred to as “the devil”; the name “Satan” or “Satanail” is missing. Man was created in place of the fallen rank of angels in the image and likeness of God and endowed by God with power over all things, over earthly riches and heavenly mysteries, and with immortality. The next part is devoted to the seduction of the first people by the guileful devil, the birth of Cain and his transgressions. Cain’s sins are not only listed in the text, but also characterized by examples. Further, the story relates the Old Testament events from the kin of Abel to the flood and the survival of the family of Noah. The anonymous compiler focuses on the worship of pagan idols and Abraham’s rejection of pagan customs, the extension of Abraham’s offspring, the escape of Joseph to Egypt and the Exodus of the Jews to the Promised Land with Moses; Joshua, Samuel, David and the prophet Daniel are mentioned. The final part tells of the birth and deeds of Jesus until his death on the cross and the resurrection – for the salvation of men and the destruction of the devil. The text ends with an eschatological perspective of the Second Coming and the Last Judgment.

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

22 Житие св. апостола Андрея первозванного, ХЧ 8, 1869, р. 151–180.
The narrative of the Old Testament story has many parallels with the *Palaea Historica*. Here are some of them:

1) There are similar reasons and the manner of the revolt of the tenth angelic rank, and its elder – out of envy of the perfect and wealthy deeds of God (не стрягъвь богатства толики(х) бѣгыны); a reluctance to glorify God because of pride (дїаволь же вѣзвеличавⸯсе на творⸯца и не хоте славити ѥго съ инѣки). It is emphasized twice that it is the elder’s own will to turn into an evil force (самохотию сѫбрать се на зло, иако самовластьца). The allegation that initially there was darkness is renounced (и да никто гѣаетъ иако испрѣбъ тӀма вѣше. ѵъ ко свѣтъ ѵе(с) и ѵъ свѣтла сѣтвори).

2) Man was created in the place of the fallen angelic rank, and was endowed with high virtue (блгыи же ѵъ и творць всѣкъ. видѣвъ ѥго ѿпадшаа и соущїи(х) иже по(д) нимъ. и створи чѣка въ образъ съмого. въ нѥго мѣсто. по(д)бна самовластьца свѣтла възоромъ. блгыи иако съмлѣнни. таинніка нѣ(с) нѣлъ. тѣкина прѢкъ и сѫбрѣти). Besides being in the *Palaea Historica*, this motif has found a place in one of the versions of the Legend of the Tiberian Sea as well: вместо отпадшихъ ликъ наполняетъ гдѣ человѣки. правѣдыъ чѣкъ созываетъ и мѣсто самаго сатаны сотвори гдѣ плотна человѣка первозданнаго Адама. As witnessed by Euthymius Zigabenus, the same motif (possibly of a Gnostic origin), alluded to in the Book of Enoch, has found its place in the Bogomil teaching, although slightly modified.

3) The motif of the devil tempting Adam and Eve, and the birth of Cain, are also similar to the *Palaea* story, despite being much shorter; man was created innocent and immortal, but tempted into evil ways by the devil, whose aim was to tempt the very first of the humans so that the next generations would also turn mortal: дїаволь же вѣ(д)ше. гѣе. аще прѣльстить вѣторїи нетлѣнⸯнь боудеть.

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

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

---

23 Й. Иванов, Богомилски книги и легенди, София 1925, p. 297.
24 Ibidem, p. 172, 189.
25 The Bogomils say that the fallen angels, on hearing that Satanail had promised the Father to replace them by human beings in Heaven, started copulating with human daughters, in the hope of returning to Heaven. Of this mixing the giants were born, see: PG, vol. 130, col. 1305.
6) Seth laid the foundations of wisdom (ῥοίμος ἐς τὸν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀλαμβάνοντος ἡμᾶς τὴν καθορισμένην ἀλήθειαν); this merit coincides with the comment on Seth in one of the versions of the Palaea Historica\(^\text{26}\) as well as with the questions and answers, where the creation of the writing is credited to him\(^\text{27}\).

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

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

Appendix

\[14r/ \text{Бъшь(} \text{)шоу стьлмь ап(} \text{)ла андреу вь сьнъмь сь оученики си. начеше и(х)}\]

\(^{26}\) Collection of Josiño-Volokolamsk monastary, № 551, 16th c.

\(^{27}\) Lovech miscellany, 16th c.: дъ комъ ми преїде посла ей граманикество. ῞εικῆς. ей ей адаламоун.


въпрашати въ коу(д) ѣсте и что ѣс(с) ваше слово и въ немъ иже изыде въ иер(с)лы. изидоше же иродиꙗди. и рѣше ѣс(с)а оубо слышахомь. нь иродь иѥр(с)лы. изидоше же иродиꙗди. и рѣше ѣс(с)а оубо слышасте въ нѥмь иже изыде вѿ иѥр(с)лы. изидоше же иродиꙗди. и рѣше ѣс(с)а оубо слышахомь. нь иродь гласа ире(ѡ)ва асколонита. ирѡдь же /14v/ ть вѣкъ гоустъ чедоуучитель лыжъ лостьвъ. и не вѣкъ жидоуученъ ни въ плѣмене ѣудина. вѣни же таалъ рѣша ико пр(о)риц рѣше. ико изанъ сѣй з(а)(х)ринъ въ колѣне ѣудина ѣс(с). Р(ч)е же андреи моужи и братъѥ послушаите мene. азь ѣѡановъ оученикъ ѣсмь прьвы. аз бо ѣѡ(н)а прѣ(д)ь оучихъ се съ инѣми, проповѣдавъ ѣванову крѣнію въ показанію. видѣкъ же ѣ(с)са гредоуща къ нечу, и проктоль показа се агнѣцъ бѣ въ землѣ и грѣхы всего мира. и р(ч)е ѣс(с)оу азь трѣбоу ѣ тебе крѣн[...] быти а тьнь пр(д)شي въ линѣ. и свѢ(д) тельствова ѣй(д)ничъ въ нечу. ико вѣ(д)къ(х) Д[...] хощѣ и прѣквълошу на нечъ. азь не вѣ(д)хь. нь пославїи мѣ кр(с)тити ть мѣ р(ч). на нѣ не явили дѣв вѣкъ вѣдѣ сѣй дѣпи съ нѣсѣ и прѣквилошу на нечъ, ть ѣс(с) сѣй бѣ живааго. Гѣ ѣско слышавъ азь андреи вѣ въ чедоуучителю ѣванову крѣнію въ показанію. видѣкъ же ѣ(с)са гредоуща къ нечу, и проктоль показа се агнѣцъ бѣ въ землѣ и грѣхы всего мира. и р(ч)е ѣс(с)оу азь трѣбоу ѣ тебе крѣн[...] быти а тьнь пр(д)شي въ линѣ. и свѢ(д) тельствова ѣй(д)ничъ въ нечъ. ико вѣ(д)къ(х) Д[...] хощѣ и прѣквълошу на нечъ. азь не вѣ(д)хь. нь пославїи мѣ кр(с)тити ть мѣ р(ч). на нѣ не явили дѣв вѣкъ вѣдѣ сѣй дѣпи съ нѣсѣ и прѣквилошу на нечъ, ть ѣс(с) сѣй бѣ живааго. Гѣ ѣско слышавъ азь андреи вѣ въ чедоуучителю ѣванову крѣнію въ показанію. видѣкъ же ѣ(с)са гредоуща къ нечу, и проктоль показа се агнѣцъ бѣ въ землѣ и грѣхы всего мира.

На оутриꙗ сѣбра сѣ множество народа. и изъшъ андреи р(ч)е людмь мирь вамь бра(т)ѥ. ѣни же рѣше и съ тобою (!). и наче гл҃ати имь кротⸯцѣ. бѣ ѣдинь и(с) без начела и пр(и)носи бл҃гъ. и творць всѣ и твари нб҃сьнимь и земльнымь. и прѣиспо(д)нимь. ть ѣдинь. и чиновь аг҃гльскы(х) створивь. свѣтъ сыи и свѣтлаа створи. ѣдинь же щ і҃. чиновь старѣи чиноу своѥмоу. не стрьпѣвь богатьства толикы(х) бл҃гыньь. самохотию ѡбрати се на зло, ѣко самовластьць. да въ свѣта мѣсто, бы(с) тьмь. и въ бл҃гыѥ вонѥ вьсь смрадь. и въ ч(с)то ты мѣсто неч(с)ть и непо(д)бнь. и да никтоже гл҃ѥть ѣко испрьва тⸯма бѣше. бѣ бо свѣть ѣ(с) и вⸯса свѣтлаꙗ створи. дїаволь же взвеличавⸯсе на творⸯца и не хоте славити ѣго съ инѣми. самохотию мьгⸯноувь лишень бы(с) свѣта. и за многаꙗ добра ѣже моу бѣхоу дань многымь повинъ бы(с) и прѣльстникь. льжь ненавистникь доброу. блг҃ыи же г҃ь и творць всѣмь. видѣвь ѣго ѿпадшаа и соущїи(х) иже по(д) нимь. и створи чл҃ка въ ѡбразь свои. въ нѥго мѣсто. по(д)бна самовластьца свѣтла вьзоромь. бл҃гаа ѣснословⸯца. ѡбла(д)ающаа земльныими. таиниика нб(с)нымь. тлѣниꙗ кромѣ и съмрьти. Лоукавыи же дїаволь. видѣвь чл҃ка тако почⸯтена ѡбразомь бж҃їимь. и въ нѥго мѣсто поставлѥна вьзревновавь и тьщаше се сьврѣщи ѣ(г) ѿ тоѥ чьсти. бл҃гы же видѣкъ краоу/16v/ рѣтечко лоукаваго дїавола. и ѡча самовластьца и проста. да(с) ѣлооу по(д)ор и полооу, дрѢ(к) иады. и рѣкъ ѣлооу ѣлооу ѣдинолоу тѣчно не прикосни сѣ и не имаши оуарѣти. и не вѣзноси сѣ и не имаши Ѳлоуучень.
быти ў мене, се бо ю(с) съмрьть. дѣвоволь же въ(д)ше, иако въ(д)ше чйкоу роeditи роdъ нинесткѣнъ. и иако аще пръкалъго не пръкалъестить, вкотори нятикъь боудеть. потышъ се пръж(д)е даже не роeditи, вкличинелъ съслоушати се створ’шаго и Б. и пръкълъс’тъ юменъ ё юденъ моюжка. и иада ў дркъда, лишиста се билостинъ мног(х) ё Б и дѣгѣлъсъ(х) всебѣдъ. и вкенинеша се познѣсти сего ствоудства и съмрьть. и редиства сей съслоушанна канина, иже показа дѣволовъ сълуковны житие. въ бо канинъ, неблѣтъ. сълоуанъ. лыживъ. непраад(д)ь. несъть. нинакидъ чйка. и съйкъ оуко абылъ кра(т) сего праад(д) наоула и възлобивъ. и възъ ё. лыстій њлъж. въ. злобъ створъй. првкъ. њп(д) начътише принесе боу. ными/16в/гне пръж(д)ъ сълъ дово роуркшени и тако боу приношише. се прькъоо зло створъ. второо же иако рустькъе ввзрѣнъювъ абылъ кра(т)уо сълоуанло. бо принощения боу болшалъ. третие же сълуковкъство, иако боу и родителяслъла сълоув(н)окълъ. д. нинакистъ нинакидъ нув кра(т). оущашъ се како и къ(х) оуку. ќ. съслоушане ёла и родительъ. 2. пръкълъс’тъ. пръкълъс’тъ бо сего кра(т). рокъ пооиъле на поле. пратоу абылъ, да се поглоуанъа њкрепо. њ. сълыг. по оущениъ бо р(ч)ъ ё В къ нлоуло. канинъ ѐдъ съ(с) кратъ твоо абылъ. тако не въ(д)ды всєкъдъ. нь разоульнъ дааие илоу оупаканилъ. мъже не тъчно мъл(с)дрокавъ ў раздѣлънаи врѣдиъ. нь нестъдъ се р(ч)ъ њкъанъны. ќъда стражъ иесъпъ лъзъ пратоу лъоуло. пранъкъже ё Въ. ќ. лыстій. въ. злобъ да(с) єлоу. д. къже ў Въ тоо(ж)ъ, дъ вы(с). нълъъ ко канинъ ў лицъ кййна. њ. на пролектъе зълъе въсѣлѣнъ вы(с). ќко њскъаръ ко юкрѣнъ краадъное. й. 17г/дѣло въспокого. дѣлъ ико зълъе р(ч)ъ. д. нѣплодъство зълъе. раоко ико зълъла р(ч)ъ и не имаатъ татъ датъ сила свооєе. ќ. стѣнъатъ кесъ прѣклъккъаніа. ќ. трѣпътъъъъъъ стинъ ко р(ч)ъ и трѣпѣщи да асы (!) зълъе. трѣпѣщи бо не съти не нититъ, въне не ложаашъ свооила роукама приноситъ къ оустель скиномъ. ќ. предъложенъ жъфіиъ, њпъ бо ѳѣкъщѣ и оущениѣлъ вкѣшли залъ. моучшчіи бо съ сълъркъ даетъ въскорпъ простьтнъо.

Ачелу же оущениоу овкшоо. роди се ѐй по(д)ъдъяъдъ адамоу и прав(д)ъпъ. тъбо моудрость изъщерѣѣ. и тъбо роодъ ниноса по(д)ъдъна съ(с). дѣврибъ бо ра(д)ъ дѣльъ югъ бо нарицаноу и. сего сбонѣ вѣдѣкшѣ дѣкѣры ковѣнъоу краностъонъ се съкъ жены. прокажена бо ро дѣкѣры, красна бывалиъ лицъ нъмъ. титъ нлооучкіе иѣ чнъ зълъкъ. пратитъ оукиатъ. грады сѣкѣдъоватъ. прйкъоо бо канинъ вѣгрѣди и краны сттори юединого ра(д)ъ жены. къже и ныль вооекатъ юединого ра(д)ъ моюжка. и потомъ оущенъ/17в/шулъъ єтъ чйкъло. и нъ мооже стрѣкътъ зълъла зйкъъ(х) дѣкъ вѣтъскѣ(х). и вѣдѣкъ ѐ бъ везаконіе лю(д)скѣе наве(д)ъ потоълъ. и вс(д)ъко учи(с)тъ зълъе ў прѣкъъъъ. юединого же прав(д)ъ на чйка нопъ ё. д. и ўлъъ сѣкъль и съ жѣлъи ихъ сѣхъранкъ ковѣчѣлъ. и съ ныль оутърки животныѣ.

І въачъ оукинооъынылъ є чйкъло, іпръкъоо злъкъдѣло дѣковъ[ло]къ не прѣкъста коонѣ на роѣдъ чѣкъскъ. и наоучи і(х) куюниролъ сългузнитъ. и въ њкѣдъ ёа створеноуъ ковѣчѣскъ. показаны нсъ тъки роукъоу съкѣдъ наже же вѣтъсоъ. якрадъ же юединъ оуѣкъъ куюниреслунитъ. и пооукубоу іхотѣнююлъ створенъ ёбоу и зълъи. и вѣкъ б(с)ки скѣ скѣ ёгъо. и ёѣнъ вѣстъокъ оукиніе вѣтъсо(с)тѣнитъ пр(д)ърѣкъ. и њнаго оущитъ прѣсилъ вѣтъсуоуинъу сънышѣніюъ и гладъоу вѣкъшоу привѣдъ скѣ скѣ въ ўтъпѣчъ прѣкпітъпъ. і пооула іхотѣпѣчъ праад(д)ъкоу скѣ скѣ створѣнисъ раѣкъ. б(с)кѣйъ ѐбъ послъ њѣльсткъу лю(д)ъмъ скинъ мооіыъ. нсъ ќекъръ чо(д)ъсъ
Abstract. The paper presents an unstudied text with the name of the Apostle Andrew in the miscellany of 15th c., now Muz.10272, Rashka orthography. The text (with traces of archaic archetype) is a unique copy of the compilation. The history of the manuscript is very interesting, because it belonged to the A. Hilferding collection in the past. The aim of the author is to propose a preliminary analysis of the text, its origin and chronology, as well as its context in the Slavic tradition.
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