

N. VAN WIJK'S EDITION OF THE 'Ανδρῶν ἁγίων βιβλος

Richard POPE, Toronto

Although Mouton's series »Slavistic Printings and Reprintings« is now up in the 290's, volume 1, which was to be Nikolaas van Wijk's edition of the Old Church Slavonic translation of the 'Ανδρῶν ἁγίων βιβλος never appeared. The reasons for this are many and varied and the vicissitudes of the career of the MS are incredible (see: C. H. van Schooneveld, »Foreword«, *The Old Church Slavonic Translation of the 'Ανδρῶν ἁγίων βιβλος in the edition of Nikolaas van Wijk*, Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, I, edit. by Daniel Armstrong, Richard Pope, and C. H. van Schooneveld [The Hague: Mouton, 1974], VII-X). The book is now, however, about to appear.

The MS of the text of the Slavic translation of the 'Ανδρῶν ἁγίων βιβλος was readied for publication by Daniel Armstrong and myself. We worked from the error-ridden proofs of the edition set with a Russian font by Mouton in the mid-fifties. The entire text was corrected first according to a microfilm print-out of van Wijk's very accurate handwritten transcription and then according to microfilms of the actual Vienna and Paris fourteenth-century MSS which were used by van Wijk. Then Mouton, working from our corrected proofs, reset the entire thing in a new Church Slavic font with a number of specially cut ligatures. The new galley proofs for over two-thirds of the text have already been corrected and the book should appear in late 1974. In my two-part »Preface« to the book (pp. 1—24) I examine two main questions: 1) »Did Methodius Translate a Patericon?«; 2) »If Methodius Translated a Patericon, which One was It?«.

In Part I, I go over the bibliography on the subject and discuss the main views for and against a patericon and criticize them:

- I a Patericon — Šafařík, Preobraženskij, Van Wijk, Nikolova and the majority
- II Interpretative Biblical Commentaries — Nikol'skij
- III a Homiliary — Grivec, Nahtigal, Bláhová, Ivanova-Mirčeva.
- IV a Bee — Aitzetmüller
- V other theories

It is difficult to decide between the first three. The fact is that Methodius *could* have translated any one of the three, since all three were definitely desiderata. This is perhaps why Grivec and Gošev have tried to embrace several texts in their theories. The words »oč̣ḅskyę knigy« do not help much since they most likely refer to patristics in the widest sense, including both hagiographic and non-hagiographic writings of the Church Fathers, and thus *could* indicate a variety of things.

It seems that the only way to establish what Methodius translated is to carefully compare all the possible texts with those of certain Methodian provenance, but even this is difficult at the present stage of scholarship:

1) as my colleague William Veder points out in his Warsaw Congress paper entitled »Was ist Methods Väterbuch,« we are not yet in any position to undertake such a comparison, since »Die vollständige Veröffentlichung des sprachlichen Materials der gesicherten Teile des Corpus Methodianum ist eine der ganz dringenden Aufgaben der Slavistik.«

2) many of the texts which are candidates for Methodian translation are unpublished and textologically unstudied. This is particularly true of patericons and Biblical Interpretative texts of the type Nikol'skij had in mind.

In Part 2 of my »Preface«, I review in some detail the arguments for the various patericons:

<i>Rimskij</i>	—	Sobolevskij, Mareš
<i>Sinajskij</i>	—	Leonid, T. A. Ivanova
<i>Skitskij poglavnyj</i>	—	Preobraženskij, Van Wijk
<i>Svodnyj</i>	—	Nikolova

The three most serious candidates are the *Skitskij poglavnyj*, *Rimskij*, and *Sinajskij pateriki*, though the presence of »Pannonomoravianisms« and *similarity* to the Nomocanon are not enough to definitely establish Methodian translation, since all late ninth-century translations would naturally show such features. The most interesting thing is that thanks to Van Wijk, Mareš, and Ivanova, we know that at least three full patericons were translated and available by the beginning of the tenth century at the latest. This in itself is a literary event of great magnitude which for me will in no way be diminished if we fail to prove conclusively that Methodius himself translated one of them.

S a ž e t a k

N. VAN WIJKOVA EDICIJA Ἁνδρῶν ἁγίων βιβλος

N. v. Wijkovu ediciju staroslavenskog prijevoda Ἁνδρῶν ἁγίων βιβλος, koja se nikada nije pojavila, pripremili su Daniel Armstrong, Richard Pope i C. H. van Schooneveld za Moutonovu seriju »Slavistic Printings and Reprintings« t. 290, vol. 1, The Hague, Mouton, 1974. Čitav tekst je provjeren i korigiran prema mikrofilmu sa kojega je prepisivao Van Wijk, kao i prema mikrofilmovima Bečkog i Pariškog rukopisa XIV v. kojima se također služio Van Wijk. U prvom dijelu svoga predgovora Pope proučava dva glavna pitanja: 1) Da li je Metodije preveo paterik?; 2) Ako je Metodije preveo paterik, koji bi to onda bio tip paterika? Drugi dio obuhvaća u izvjesnim detaljima osnovne podatke o različitim tipovima paterika.