

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 Alexandria¹. 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 fragments². 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 detail³, investigated and published to a certain degree⁴. A. de Santos Otero published a list of the copies known in Slavic manuscripts⁵. 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 Manichaeian 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.*

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

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

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

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

⁶ F. THOMSON, *Apocrypha Slavica*, SEER 58.2, 1980, p. 256–268.

rum Andreae (BHG 95b); *Acta Andreae et Mathiae in urbe anthropophagum* (BHG 109–110d) in two translations; a compilation of *Acta Andreae* (BHG 94–94c and 95) and *Martirium Andreae* (BHG 97), whose Greek or Slavic origin is impossible to determine; *Vita Andreae* in the Slavonic Prolog (BHG 101b); *Commentarius de Andreae*, the earliest copy of which is from the 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 centuries⁷. Of all the above works, the paleoslavists' attention is drawn primarily by the acts of Andrew and Mathew in the land of cannibals, a text that has been translated in modern Bulgarian as well⁸.

The text under discussion in this paper is entitled "From the teaching of Apostle Andrew": (Ѣ) оучениа ст҃го ап(с)ла андреа, инс. Ъшь(д)шоу ст҃моу ап(с)лоу андрею въ сынѣмъ съ оученикѣмъ си. начеше и(х) въпрашати ѿ коу(д) юсте и что ю(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 bombacine; 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. Turilov⁹ and Zhanna Levshina¹⁰. This collection was formed during A.F. Hilferding's trip to Bosnia, Herzegovina, Macedonia and "old" Serbia in 1857,

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

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

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

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

when he was the Russian consul in Sarajevo; later he published a description of the trip¹¹. A considerable number of the South Slavic manuscripts were collected by A. F. Hilferding in the Slepče Monastery, the Lesnovo Monastery, in Kratovo, Lešok (Tetovo region), the Treskavec and despot Marko's Monastery as well as in Ohrid, and they probably were sold to A. I. Hludov not later than 1869. The margins of the miscellany contain notes written by A. N. Popov, who worked on the texts; he was also likely to have temporarily kept the book in his collection (today 237 in the Russian State Library). The following inscription has been written out on folio 122v: *ПОМОЗИ БОЖЕ ГОСПОДИНУ ДЕСПОТУ* (God help our master the Despot); the text on folio 133v reads: *ГЮРГУ ДЕСПОТУ* (To Gyurgi the Despot). Probably the ruler in question is Georgi Branković (1427–1456)¹². The manuscript is cited and examined by a number of scholars in accordance with its description in A.I. Hludov's catalogue (No. 105)¹³ (e.g. Santos Otero mentions it with the same number in his review (No. 31); so does F. Thomson in the review cited above). However, the manuscript has not been in Hludov's collection for the last 70 years, since it is considered to have been acquired by the 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)¹⁴; this is followed (folio 2r–14v) by an excerpt from *Siracides* (The Wisdom of Sirach) (the beginning is missing, the text resembles the translation in the *Izbornik of 1076*)¹⁵; next comes the writing about Apostle Andrew, on which is discussed in this paper (14r–18v)¹⁶. 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. Хлудова*, Москва 1872, p. 250–252.

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. МУШИНСКАЯ, Е.А. МИШИНА, В.С. ГОЛЫШЕНКО, ed. А.М. МОЛДОВАН, vol. I–II, Москва 2009².

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)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*)¹⁸; excerpts from *The story about Barlaam and Josaphat* (92r–108r); short *Life of St Sava of Serbia* (108r–120v)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. Ivanova²⁰ by providing information on the manuscript regarding its number in the Rummyantsev Museum. The author describes the content as a combination of *sermons that have been extracted from the Menaion and the Triodion panegyric and, possibly, from a Reading Menaion of the Old Redaction ("staroizvoden cheti-minej"), with a mixed-up calendar sequence*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: *самохотниѣ* 'free will' (Codex Supr., *Izbornik 1073*, Gregory of Nazianzus 11th c.: *самохотниѣ*, *самохотниѣ*; *Izbornik 1076*: *самохотью*); *самовластьцѣ* 'absolute' (Codex Supr.); *таинникѣ* 'keeper of the secrets' – *шела(д)ающаа земляныими. таинника не(с)нымъ* (Gregory Naz. 11th c.; Codex Supr. *таиньникѣ*; *Izbornik 1073* *таинѣьныи*); *простына* 'absolution' – *простиноу грѣхѣвъ* (Codex Supr. *простыниѣ*); *отѣмьстѣникѣ* 'revenger' (hapax; Codex Supr. *отѣмьстивѣ*); *несытѣ* 'greedy' (Codex Supr., *Prophetologion*, etc.); *благына* 'goodness' (Codex Supr.); *благостыниа* 'benevolence' (*Psalterium Sin.*, *Euchologium Sin.*, Codex Supr., *Prophetologion*, etc.); *стоудѣство* '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. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 1–52.

¹⁸ *Изборник 1076 года*, p. 164–203.

¹⁹ Д. БОГДАНОВИЋ, *Кратко житије светог Саве*, ЗМСКЈ 24.1, 1976, p. 5–32.

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

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 82.

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

There is no trace of rhetoric in the style: the story is a simple narrative. The introduction, which refutes Herod’s role and disguises his origin, undoubtedly bears a resemblance to the initial part of *Acta Andreae*. I had at my disposal a Georgian text translated into Russian²², the comparison with whose introduction showed a close concurrence, even regarding the rendering of names. As noted by researchers of the Greek text, a homily in the synagogue of the town of Amasea is depicted here, whereas the Georgian text relates of the town of Sinop (the capital of the Pontic rulers in Paphlagonia). In our copy no name of a town is mentioned, while the synagogue is referred to as “сѣньмѣ”. The interrogation-response form of the introduction reveals a bias towards polemic; it is obvious that Apostle Andrew is speaking to Jews.

²² *Житіе 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 стрѣпѣвъ богатѣства толики(х) бѣгынѣхъ); a reluctance to glorify God because of pride (дѣаволь же възвеличавъ се на творѣца и не хоте славити юго съ инѣми). It is emphasized twice that it is the elder's own will to turn into an evil force (самохотию оберати се на зло, яко самовластѣцѣ). The allegation that initially there was darkness is renounced (и да никтоже глѣеть яко испрьва тма бѣше. бѣ бо свѣтъ ю(с) и вса свѣтлаа створи).

2) Man was created in the place of the fallen angelic rank, and was endowed with high virtue (бѣгын же бѣ и творѣцъ всѣмъ. видѣвъ юго ѿпадаша и соущи(х) иже по(д) нимъ. и створи члѣка въ образъ свои. въ него мѣсто. по(д)бна самовластѣца свѣтла възоромъ. бѣгаа яснословѣца. шела(д)ающаа земляныи. таинника не(с)нымъ. тлѣниа кромѣ и смирѣти). 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 человеки, праведныхъ члѣкъ созываетъ и мѣсто самаго сатаны сотвори гдѣ плотна чловека превозданнаго йдама²³. As witnessed by Euthymius Zigabenus, the same motif (possibly of a Gnostic origin), alluded to in the Book of Enoch²⁴, has found its place in the Bogomil teaching, although slightly modified²⁵.

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: дѣаволь же вѣ(д)ше, яко бѣше члѣкоу родити родъ неистлѣиныхъ. и яко аще пръвѣаго не прѣльститъ, вѣторѣи не тлѣнѣхъ 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, р. 297.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, р. 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 (роди се снъ по(д)бнъ адамѹ и правѣ(д)нъ. тѣхъ бо мѹдрость изъверѣтъ); this merit coincides with the comment on Seth in one of the versions of the *Palaea Historica*²⁶ as well as with the questions and answers, where the creation of the writing is credited to him²⁷.

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”²⁸ or rewriting / recreating the Holy Scripture; these works are also categorized recently as “parabiblical literature”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/ ѿ оучениа сѣго ап(с)ла андреа

Бѣшь(д)шоу сѣмоу ап(с)лоу андрею въ снѣмъ съ оученіи си. начеше и(х)

²⁶ Collection of Josifo-Volokolamsk monastery, № 551, 16th c.

²⁷ Lovech miscellany, 16th c.: да кому нан прѣжде посла бѣ граманижство. ѿ(вѣтъ). ситѹ снѹ адамѹ.

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

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

въпрашати ѿ коу(д) юсте и что ю(с) ваше сло(в). ѿвѣщавъ андреи р(ч)е к ни(м). ї(с)а галилеискааго юсмы оученици. а слово оубо слышасте ѿ нѣмъ юже изыде ѿ нѣр(с)лама. изыдоше же иродиади. и рѣше їс(с)а оубо слышахомъ. нъ ирода глѣмъ истїи ю(с) х̃(с)ъ. иже оуркана низложивъ и шелѣче се въ юрсоньскыи вѣнцъ. и иже побѣди многыи въставишь. ѿвѣщавъ же а(н)дреи р(ч)е. послоушайте мене. ирѡ(д)ъ иноплѣменикъ бѣше снѣ антипатра раба юре(ѡ)ва асколонита. ирѡдъ же /14v/ тѣхъ бѣше гоубитель чедооубитель мѣжъ льстивъ. и не бѣше жидовинъ ни ѿ плѣмене юдина. шни же паки рѣша іако пр(о)рци рѣше. іако іѡанъ снѣ за(х)ринъ ѿ колѣне юдина ю(с). Р(ч)е же андреи моужи и бра(т)ю послоушайте мене. азъ іѡановъ оученикъ юсмы прѣвы. азъ бо ѿ іѡ(н)а прѣж(д)е оучихъ се съ инѣми, проповѣдавѣшоу іѡану крѣщенїе въ покаянїе. видѣвъ же ї(с)а гредоуща къ нѣмоу, и прѣстомъ показа се агньцъ бѣ въ земли и грѣхы всего всего (!) мира. и р(ч)е їсоу азъ трѣбоую ѿ тебе крѣщен[.] быти а тыи гре(д)ши къ мнѣ. и свѣ(д)тельствова іѡ(а)нъ ѿ нѣмъ. іако видѣ(х) д[.] сходящъ и прѣбывающъ на нѣмъ. азъ не вѣ(д)хъ. нъ пославітїи мѣ кр(с)тити тѣхъ мнѣ р(ч)е. на нъ же ви(д)ши дхъ бжїи сходящъ съ нѣсе и прѣбывающъ на нѣмъ, тѣхъ ю(с) снѣ бѣ живааго. Гї оубо слышавъ азъ андреа ѿ іѡан оставѣвъ іѡа(н) послѣдова(х) ї(с)соу. г̃. [.]и паче чю(д)са многаа створи їсѣ прѣ(д) /15r/ нами. по прѣж(д)е пи(с)нѣмоу ѿ пр(о)ркѣхъ ѿ нѣмъ. архїереи же нестрѣпѣвъше величаемъи имъ. прѣдаше юго пилатоу игемоноу юдеискому и распеше и. и положеноу юмоу бывшоу въ гробѣ новѣ. и въ третїи днѣ прѣж(д)е ютра въскрѣсе. и яви се намъ въ днѣхъ. м̃.ти(х) въ галилеи. и заповѣда намъ проповѣдати покаянїе въ простиню грѣхомъ въ имѣ юго въ всѣ(х) юзицѣ(х). И ѿпоустивъ народы стѣи андреи. въниде шелеши съ оученики своими. бѣ же оученикъ юго съ нимъ. н̃.

На оутрина събра се множество народа. и изышъ(д) андреи р(ч)е лю(д)мъ миръ вамъ бра(т)ю. шни же рѣше и с тобою (!). и наче глѣти имъ кротѣцѣ. бѣ юдинъ ю(с) безъ начала и пр(и)носи блгъ. и творцъ всѣхъ и твари нѣсьнимъ и землянимъ. и прѣиспо(д)нимъ. тѣхъ юдинъ. ї. чинѡвъ аггльскы(х) створишь. свѣтѣ сыи и свѣтлаа створи. ѡгнь сїи и ѡг[н] нѣпалецаа створишь. юдинъ же ѿ ї. чинѡвъ старѣи чинѡу своемоу. не стрѣпѣвъ богатѣства толики(х) блгынъ. /15v/ самохотїю шбрати се на зло, іако самѡвластьцъ. да въ свѣта мѣсто, вы(с) тѣмъ. и въ блгынѣ вонѣ въсь сираднъ. и въ ч(с)то ты мѣсто неч(с)тъ и непо(д)бнъ. и да никтоже глѣтъ іако испрѣва тѣма бѣше. бѣ бо свѣтъ ю(с) и вѣса свѣтлаа створи. дїаволь же възвеличавѣсе на творѣца и не хѡте славити юго съ инѣми. самохотїю мѣгнѡувъ лишень вы(с) свѣта. и за многаа добра іаже моу бѣхѡу дана, многымъ повийнъ вы(с) и прѣльстникъ. лѣжъ ненавистникъ доброу. блгынъ же гѣ и творцъ всѣмъ. видѣвъ юго ѡпадшаа и соущїи(х) иже по(д) нимъ. и створи члѣка въ шбразъ свои. въ нѣго мѣсто. по(д)бна самѡвластьца свѣтла възоромъ. блгаа ясновѡвѣца. шела(д)ающаа землянымъи. таниника не(с)нымъ. тлѣннаа кромѣ и смьрти.

Лоукавыи же дїаволь. видѣвъ члѣка тако почтѣна шбразомъ бжїимъ. и въ нѣго мѣсто поставленъ възрѣвовавъ и тыщаше се съврѣши ю(г) ѿ тоѣ чьсти. блгынъ же гѣ видѣвъ кова/16r/рство лоукавааго дїавола. и члѣка самѡвластьца и проста. да(с) юмоу по(д)поръ и помѡщъ, дрѣво пады. и рекъ юмоу сеюмоу юдиномоу тѣчию не прикосни се и не имаши оумрѣти. и не възноси се и не имаши ѿлоучень

БЫТИ ѿ МЕНЕ, СЕ БО Ю(С) СЪМРЬТЬ. ДІАВОЛЬ ЖЕ Б'Ѣ(Д)ШЕ, ТАКО Б'ѢШЕ ЧЛ'КОУ РОДИТИ РОДЬ НЕИСТА'БНЬ. И ТАКО АЩЕ ПРЬВАДОГО НЕ ПР'ѢЛЪСТИТЬ, ВЪТОРІИ НЕТА'БН'НЬ БОУДЕТЬ. ПОТЪЩА СЕ ПР'ѢЖ(Д)Е ДАЖЕ НЕ РОДИТЬ, ВЕЛИЧАНИЕМЪ УСЛОУШАТИ СЕ СТОРО'ШАГО И БА. И ПР'ѢЛЪСТІИ ЖЕНОУ И ЖЕНА МОУЖА. И ІАДША ѿ ДР'ѢВА, ЛИШИСТА СЕ БЛ'ГОСТИНЬМЪ МНОГЫ(Х) БА И АГ'ГЛ'ЬСКИ(Х) БЕС'ѢДЬ. И ВЕНАЖИВША СЕ ПОЗНАСТА СВОЕГО СТОУДЬСТВА И СЪМРЬТЬ. И РОДИСТА СІНЬ УСЛОУШАНИА КАИНА, ЮЖЕ ПОКАЗА ДІАВОЛЮ ЛОУКАВІЮ ЖИТИЮ. Б'Ѣ БО КАИНЬ. НЕБЛ'ТНЬ. ЛОУКАВЬ. ЛЪЖИВЬ. НЕПРАВ'ДИВЬ. НЕСЫТЬ. НЕНАВИДЕН ЧЛКА. И ОУБІИ ОУБО АВЕЛА БРА(Т) СВОЕГО ПРАВЕ(Д)НА СОУЩА И БЕЗЛОВИВА. И ВЪЗЕТЬ З. МЫСТІИ ИМ'ЖЕ. З. ЗЛОБЬ СТОРО'И. ПРЬВ. ЮГ(Д)А НАЧЕТИЮ ПРИНЕСЕ БОУ. НАЧЕ/16V/ТИЮ ПР'ѢЖ(Д)Е САМЪ ДОБР'ѢШЕ ІЗ'ѢДАШЕ И ТАКО БОУ ПРИНОШАШЕ. СЕ ПРЬВОЮ ЗЛО СТОРО'И. ВТОРОЮ ЖЕ ТАКО РЪВНОСТИЮ ВЪЗРЕВ'НОВА АВЕЛОУ БРА(Т)ОУ СВОЕМОУ. ЗА ПРИНОШЕНИА БОУ БОЛШАА. ТРЕТИЮ ЖЕ ЛОУКАВЬСТВО, ТАКО БОУ И РОДИТЕЛ'ЮМА ЛОУКАВ'НОВАА. Д. НЕНАВИСТЬ НЕНАВИДЕ НЕВ БРА(Т). ОУЧАШЕ СЕ КАКО И БІИ (!) ОУБИЛ. Е. УСЛОУШАНИЕ БА И РОДИТЕЛ'Ь. З. ПР'ѢЛЪСТЬ. ПР'ѢЛЪСТИ БО СВОЕГО БРА(Т). РЕКЪ ПОИДЕВЕ НА ПОЛЮ. БРАТОУ АВЕЛЕ, ДА СЕ ПОГЛОУМИВА СЕ'ѢРЕПО. З. СЪЛГА. ПО ОУБИЕНИИ БО Р(Ч)Е БЪ К НЬМОУ, КАИНЕ Г'ДЕ Ю(С) БРАТЬ ТВОИ АВЕЛ. ІАКЫ НЕ В'ѢДЫ ВСЕВ'ѢД'ЦЬ. НЪ РАЗОУМЬ ДАШАШЕ ЮМОУ ПОКАНИА. ОНЖЕ НЕ ТЪЧІЮ МЛ(С)РДОВАВЪ О РАЗЛЪЧЕНИ БРАТНІИ. НЪ НЕСТЫДЕ СЕ Р(Ч)Е ОКАНЬНИ. ЮДА СТРАЖЬ ЮСМЪ АЗЪ БРАТОУ МОЕМОУ. ПРАВДИВ'ЖЕ БЪ ЗА. З. МЫСТІИ. З. ЗЛОБЬ ДА(С) ЮМОУ. А. ЮЖЕ ѿ БА ТОУ(Ж)ДЬ БЫ(С). ІЗЫДЕ БО КАИНЬ ѿ ЛИЦА БЖІА. Б. НА ПРОКЛЕТІЕ ЗЕМЛЮ ВЪСЕЛ'ЮНЬ БЫ(С), ТАКО ВСКВР'НИ Ю КР'ВІЮ БРАТНІЮ. Г. /17Г/Д'ѢЛО БЕСПОКОА. Д'ѢЛА ИБО ЗЕМЛЮ Р(Ч)Е. Д. НЕПЛОДЬСТВО ЗЕМЛИ. РАБОТА ИБО ЗЕМЛІА Р(Ч)Е И НЕ ІМАТ' ТИ ДАТИ СИЛЫ СВОЕЮ. Е. СТЕНАТИ БЕС ПР'ѢМЛ'ЧАНИА. З. ТРЕПЕТАТИ, СТЕНІЮ БО Р(Ч)Е И ТРЕПЕЩЕ ДА ІАСИ (!) ЗЕМЛЮ. ТРЕПЕЩЕ БО НИ ІАСТИ НИ ПИТИ, ЗАІЮ НЕ МОЖААШЕ СВОИМА РОУКАМА ПРИНОСИТИ КЪ ОУСТОМЪ СВОИМЪ. З. ПРЕДЛЪЖЕНИЕ ЖИЗНИ, ОН' БО ХОТ'ѢШЕ И ОУБИЕНИЕМЪ ІЗБЫТИ ЗЛА. МОУЧЕШИМ БО СЕ СЪМРЬТЬ ДАЮТЬ ВЪСКОР'Ѣ ПРОСТІНЮ.

ІАВЕЛОУ ЖЕ ОУБИЕНОУ БЫВШОУ. РОДИ СЕ СІНЬ ПО(Д)БНЬ АДАМОУ И ПРАВЕ(Д)НЬ. ТЪХ БО МОУДРОСТЬ ІЗЪВЕР'ѢТЬ. И ТЪХ РОДИ ЮНОСА ПО(Д)БНА СЕБ'Ѣ. ДОБРЫХ БО РА(Д) Д'ѢЛЪМЪ ЮГО БА НАРИЦАХОУ И. СЕГО СІНОВЕ ВИД'ѢВШЕ ДЪЩЕРЫ КАИНОВЫ КРАСНЫ ПОИМАШЕ Ю СЕБ'Ѣ ЖЕНЫ. ПРОКАЖЕНА БО РОДА ДЪЩЕРЫ, КРАСНА БЫВАЮТЬ ЛИЦА ИМЪ. ТИИ ЖЕ НАОУЧИВШЕ Ю ѿЧИ ЗЛОБ'Ѣ. ГРАВИТИ ОУБИВАТИ. ГРАДЫ СЪЗИДОВАТИ. ПРЬВОЮ БО КАИНЬ ВЪЗГРАДИ И БРАНЫ СТОРО'И ЮДИНОГО РА(Д) ЖЕНЫ. ЮЖЕ И НАМЪ ВОУЕВАТИ ЮДИНОГО РА(Д) МОУЖА. И ПОТОМЪ ОУМНОЖЬ/17V/ШИМ' СЕ ЧЛ'КОМЪ. И НЕ МОЖЕ СТР'П'ѢТИ ЗЕМЛІА ЗАЫИ(Х) Д'ѢЛЪМЪ ЧЛ'ЧЬСКИ(Х). И ВИД'ѢВЪ БЪ БЕЗАКОНІЮ ЛЮ(Д)СКОЮ НАВЕ(Д) ПОТОПЬ. И БО(Д)Ю ОУЧ(С)ТИ ЗЕМЛЮ ѿ ГР'ѢХЬ. ЮДИНОГО ЖЕ ПРАВЕ(Д)НА ЧЛКА НОА СЪ. Г. МНІИ СІНІИ И СЪ ЖЕНАМИ ІХЪ СЪХРАНИВЪ КОВ'ЧЕГОМЪ. И СЪ НИМЪ ОУТВАРИ ЖИВОТНІЮ.

И ПАКЫ ОУМНОЖЬШИМ' СЕ ЧЛ'КОМЪ. ІСПРЬВА ЗЛОД'ѢИ ДІАВО[ЛО]ВЪ НЕ ПР'ѢСТА ВОЮЮ НА РОДЬ ЧЛ'ЧЬСКИИ. И НАОУЧИ И(Х) КОУМИРОМЪ СЛОУЖИТИ. И ВЪ М'ѢСТО БА СТОРО'И'ШАГО ВСАЧЬСКАІА, ПОКЛАНАТИ СЕ ТВАРИ РОУКОУ СВОЕЮ ПАЧЕ ЖЕ Б'ѢСОМЪ. ІВРААМ' ЖЕ ЮДИНЬ ОУБ'ѢЖА КОУМИРОСЛОУЖЕНИА. И ПОСЛОУЖИ БОУ ІСТИННОМУ ТВОРОУ НБОУ И ЗЕМЛИ. И Т'ѢМЪ БЛ(С)ВИ С'ѢМЕ ЮГО. И ѿ НЬГО ВЪСТАВИ ОУЧИТЕЛ'Ю БГ'ГОЧ(С)ТИВЫЮ ПРО(О)РКИ. И ЮНАГО ОУЧИТЕЛ'А ІОСИФА Ц'ѢЛОУМНОУ СМЫШЛ'ЕНІЮ И ГЛАДОУ БЫВ'ШОУ ПРИВЕДЪ С'ѢМЕ СВОЕ ВЪ ІЕГ'УП'ТЬ ПР'ѢПІТАЮ. И ПОЕМЪ ІЕГ'УП'Т'ѢНЕ ПРАВЕ(Д)НОЕ С'ѢМЕ СТОРО'ИШЕ РАБЫ. БЛ(С)ВИВЪ БЪ ПОСЛА ѿМЫСТНИКА ЛЮ(Д)МЪ СВОИМЪ МОИСЕА. ІЖЕ СТОРО'И ЧЮ(Д)СА

[...] и зна/18г/мениа велика въ югуптѣ. и раз(д)ѣль море прове(д)ю а югуптѣне потопи. и прѣвыше въ поустини .м̃. лѣ(т) нисоусомъ навинномъ вънидоше въ землю ѡбѣтован(н)оу. и по нѣмъ соуднѣ до самоуила и до дѣда црѣа, юмоу же клет'се ѡ плода чрѣсль юго дати цр(с)тво не(с)ноѣ не прѣмѣн'ноѣ. и по дѣдѣ пр(о)кы в'се иже пр(о)рчьствоваше ѡ приходѣ х(с)вѣ. и сконьчав'шим' се пр(о)чьствомъ данилѣмъ.

Посла бѣ сѣа своего въ мирь, и всели се въ ѡтроковицоу ч(с)тоую ѡ сѣмене дѣдва нмоушїи хранителя стар'ца. и роди снѣ бжїи въ вѣоленїѣ нюдѣнсѣмъ. нбо же звѣз(д)оу проповѣда рож(д)ениѣ юмоу, и призваа влхвы пер'скыѣ. и агли вславише. пастыриѣ слышав'ше блгговѣстише мироу радость. а дїаволоу погыбѣль. .л̃. лѣтъ бывъ съ снѣ бжїи. поустѣ прѣ(д) собоми їѡа(н) сѣа за(х)рина, проповѣдати крїєниѣ въ покапаниѣ мироу. и самъ кр(с)тив' се ѡ їѡ(н)а. И по тре(х) лѣ(т)хъ по крїєни, оучещоу юмоу въ црѣви лю(д). и ѡбли/18v/чае архїєрѣмъ безакон'наа и(х) повелѣниа. въдаше .л̃. сребрьникъ подроу(г) своемуу, и въ ноши прѣдаше юго пилатоу игемоноу нюдѣнскомоу. и распн'ше по своемуу повелѣнию. и тмоу хощемоу положише въ гробъ. и страже поставаше стрѣщи гробъ, и печатив'ше юго. въ ноцѣ же третїю ѡсвитающоу днїи въскр'се. ѡставивъ гроб'на въ свѣ(д)тельство въскрєсению своемуу. и жены ѡ на(с) шь(д)ше оувѣ(д)ше ѡ аггла въскрєсению юго намъ повѣдаше. и намъ потоми гави се. и с нами ясть и питъ .м̃. днїи. и заповѣдавъ намъ проповѣдати юго сѣа бжїиа соуща. и видецимъ намъ юго. въ .л̃. ча(с) днѣ въне(с)се на нбо и сѣде ѡ десноую ѡца своего. мы же жжїдаемъ юго на кон'цѣ вѣкк прїити соудити живимъ и мрѣт'вымъ. юмоу же сла(в) съ ѡцѣмъ и сѣмъ дхѣмъ. ннїа.

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.

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

Анисава Милтенова

Институт за литература

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

1113 София, България

anmiltlen@bas.bg