

REDACTIONAL ELEMENTS BEHIND THE PETRISOV ZBORNIK OF III BARUCH*

Harry GAYLORD, Groningen

III Baruch, like Paraleipomena Jeremiou and the Apocalypse of Paul, has been very widely read in medieval circles over a very broad geographical area. Little is left over of the Greek tradition of III Baruch. We have only two manuscripts in Greek and they are both derived from a highly reworked version. Therefore the Slavic recensions are important not only if one wishes to examine the various transformations in various Slavic areas, but also for reconstructing the outlines of the original Greek version itself. I have focused in my recent translation and commentary in the new *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* collection upon their usefulness in the reconstruction of the original Greek version.¹ Here I want to concentrate on the internal Slavic developments in the transformations of this work.

III Baruch would appear to have been popular because of its description of a heavenly journey and the various parts of heaven which Baruch visits and its accounts of their contents. The form of a journey beyond earth to heaven and/or hell was very popular in the Middle Ages. The earliest remains of such works come from very ancient times. The earliest known one is in I Enoch which exists today only in Ethiopic, with parts in Greek, Latin, Syriac, and a few fragments in Aramaic among the Dead Sea Scrolls. It must have been written not later than the third century B.C. There are other examples of this genre written by Jews and Christians up into the Middle Ages. Examples include the Apocalypse of Abraham in Slavonic, III Baruch, a portion of the Testament of Abraham, the Ascension of Isaiah, and many others. The

*In memory of Prof. B. Grabar. This article was typeset on a Monotype Lasercomp phototypesetter and printed at Oxford University Computer Service. I particularly wish to thank Catherine Griffin of the OUCS for her expertise and generosity in bringing this complicated text to print.

1. Cf. Gaylord 1983c: 653-79.

Apocalypse of Paul, of course, was even more popular in practically every medieval culture, perhaps because of its concentration on Hell and the punishments meted out there, and we have many manuscripts of it in nearly every medieval language. New works continued to be created in this genre until very late. Moreover, some of the ancient works continued to be transformed and rewritten. A particularly complex example of this is II Enoch whose textual tradition has still not been completely sorted out. Unlike biblical texts and works by known authors, these anonymous texts were loosely handled by their transmitters, who apparently felt quite free to recompose the works by adding and omitting material and by revising the works. This editorial activity is particularly interesting and it should serve as a warning to scholars who attempt to reconstruct an Ur-text of the first or second century on the basis of much later manuscript material. Secondly it shows us what the interests of the revisors and their public were. I will concentrate on the interests of the revisors in this paper.

Stematically there are three families of manuscripts in the Slavonic version of III Baruch, two of which are closely related. Each of these families reflects a version in a particular geographical area over several centuries. All of these manuscripts are ultimately copies of a Church Slavonic version which may be a Cyrillic transliteration of a translation from Greek written in Glagolitic. There is no convincing evidence of more than one translation into Slavonic. What has happened in the textual traditions has been a development within Slavic. Two of the families have as their oldest manuscripts ones from the end of the thirteenth / beginning of the fourteenth century. The third is represented by two late sixteenth manuscripts, but both are copies of a single manuscript which is much more ancient. It is reasonable to assume that all three text types were in existence by the beginning of the fourteenth century.

Family A is represented by three manuscripts. The oldest is from Sinai, dating from the end of the thirteenth century. Part of it is St. Catherine Slav. 34, most of the rest is Leningrad GPB Greč. 70 and two quires are catalogued separately in the Leningrad library.² This is a copy of a Bulgarian manuscript, but whether the copyist was Bulgarian or Russian is not entirely clear. This manuscript also contains a number of Russian saints' lives, and corrections have been entered by a Russian hand. In any case both the other manuscripts of this text type are Russian. One is the fifteenth/sixteenth century manuscript Moscow GBL f. 272, Synodical Collection 363, partially published by

2. Cf. Zagrebin 1979: 61-80 and Gaylord 1983b.

Tichonravov in 1894.³ The third manuscript is a Barsov manuscript dated 1701 and edited by M. Sokolov.⁴ III Baruch in this manuscript has been considerably revised and abbreviated and the text ends at the beginning of chapter twelve.

Sinai and Moscow contain several substantial additions in III Baruch. When the fall of Adam and Eve is introduced at the beginning of chapter five, both mss have an addition about the creation of Adam and Eve, largely based upon information in the biblical book of Genesis. The Moscow and Barsov manuscripts also incorporate a story about how the archangel Satanael lost his -el and became Satan.⁵ This is not in the Sinai manuscript, but the whole section is omitted in that manuscript. Finally at the end of III, Baruch Sinai and Moscow add a rather long prayer for sinners by Baruch.

Family B exists in two Serbian and one Croatian manuscript. The oldest of these is the early fourteenth century Pop Dragol manuscript in the National Library in Belgrad which was also edited by Sokolov.⁶ A second manuscript is the early sixteenth century Šibenički zbornik at the Yugoslavian Academy of Sciences in Zagreb, published by Novaković in 1886.⁷ Because of a homoeoteleuton this manuscript omits an account of the planting of Paradise by the angels (cf. IV.8). The third manuscript in this family is the Glagolitic Petrisov zbornik of 1468.⁸ I shall return to this text type and in particular the Petrisov zbornik.

Family C is found in the southern Slavic area. One manuscript, the late sixteenth century Panagjurski sbornik now in the Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia, has been published by Sokolov.⁹ There are three additional complete copies of this text type: Vienna Slavic 149¹⁰ which is a copy of the same manuscript as the Panagjurski sbornik, the Adžarski sbornik

3. Tichonravov 1894: 48-54. Apparently when this edition was sent to the printers, some of Tichonravov's pages were lost or misplaced and thus not printed. Through the kindness of the Lenin Library, I have been able to edit the complete text from photographs of the manuscript. The break in Tichonravov's edition occurs on the first line of his page 52. Turdeanu 1969: 40 first mentioned the omission.

4. Sokolov 1907: 223-26 and the description in Sokolov 1910: 69-73. I have not been able to identify the present location of this ms.

5. For an edition of this addition, see Gaylord 1982: 303-309.

6. Belgrade NB 651; edited in Sokolov 1907: 204-20.

7. Zagreb KJAZU III.a.20; edited in Novaković 1886: 203-09.

8. Zagreb NSB R4001; edited in Hercigonja 1964: 63-93.

9. Sofia NBKM 433; edited in Sokolov 1907: 220-23.

10. Vienna ÖNB Slav. 149; described in Birkfellner 1975:214-20, but unedited.

also in the Cyril and Methodius National Library which comes from the sixteenth century,¹¹ and an eighteenth century manuscript in the village of Goljamo Belovo in Bulgaria.¹²

Families B and C derive from a common original which I will refer to as BC. That original can be reconstructed by the study of all the manuscripts which we have. Furthermore the originals of B and C can also be reconstructed in the same fashion. By comparing these reconstructions with the other available versions (in this case Slavonic family A and the Greek version) we can draw up a profile of redactional interventions at different times. A similar exercise could be undertaken for family A and the Greek versions as well. Here I restrict the discussion to redactional activities which stand behind the common prototype of families B and C, the prototype of family B, and that of the Petrisov zbornik itself. On the basis of this I conclude with a few general comments about this redactional activity. The basis of this is the Greek version,¹³ my published normalized Slavic text,¹⁴ and a synoptic edition of the Slavonic version,¹⁵ based on photographs of the manuscripts themselves.

Let me summarize the contents of III Baruch so that we can compare the earlier with the later versions. At the opening Baruch, the scribe of Jeremiah, is lamenting the fall of Jerusalem at the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, when an angel announces that God has sent him to show Baruch heavenly secrets unknown to mankind. They pass through the firmament which contains the upper waters between heaven and earth (cf. Gen. 1.6) and arrive at the gates of the first heaven. Here Baruch sees a plain inhabited by strangely-shaped humans. Baruch enquires about the size of this plain and the angel tells him this. The angel promises more secrets, but Baruch asks who these humans are and the angel tells him they are those who made war against God.

They proceed to the second heaven where Baruch sees other strangely-shaped men on a plain. This time Baruch asks directly about the men. The

11. Sofia NBKM 326; described in Conev 1910: 315-20, but unedited.

12. Described in Kožuharov 1971: 263-71.

13. Two editions are available: James 1897 and Picard 1967. The advantage of James is his very valuable introduction and of Picard is the fact that he published the actual readings in their original spelling in the apparatus.

14. Gaylord 1982. The references to chapter and verse here have been adjusted to the traditional Greek chapter and verse division and therefore differ from those in my 1982 article.

15. This synoptic edition is being printed at the Oxford University Computing Service on their Monotype International Lasercomp and will appear shortly in the series Early Slavic Texts, IDC, Zug.

angel tells him that these are those who built the tower (of Babel) to see what heaven is made of. They forced people to build the tower one of whom was a woman about to give birth. They did not release her from work and she had to give birth in the midst of working. God halted their progress and punished them with blindness and confusion of languages.

Next Baruch and the angel travel to the third heaven. Here Baruch sees a serpent, coiled around a mountain, which drinks a cubit from a cosmic sea and eats earth as grass (cf. Gen. 2.14). The angel explains that all the rivers run into this sea and the serpent drinks from it to keep its waters in balance. He also lists the major rivers which run into this sea. Baruch asks about the tree through which Adam and Eve sinned. Here there is a long dialogue between Baruch and the angel about the creation of the original heavenly Paradise, each angel planting a species of tree including Samael or Satanael who planted the vine through which Adam fell. During the flood a piece of the vine was brought by the waters to earth and Noah found it. When he did not know what to do, God sent an angel to tell him to plant it, as it will be changed into a good thing. The angel warns Baruch that wine should be drunk in moderation because drunk in excess it still has its potential for bringing on vices and evils, which are listed (cf. Gen. 8.20-21). Baruch returns to the subject of the serpent and asks about the size of its stomach. The angel compares it to Hades and give gigantic proportions for it.

The angel takes Baruch further and shows him the sun riding on a chariot and accompanied by a bird, the Phoenix, which moderates the heat of the rays of the sun for earthlings. It is a wonderful creature which wings of fire have given birth to. It eats the manna of heaven and excretes cinnamon which is necessary for the coronation of kings. Baruch sees the doors of heaven open in preparation for the sun's daily ride in his chariot. The Phoenix awakens earthly cocks and then calls to the sun: 'Lightgiver, give light to the world.' The cocks repeat his song. After the sun sets Baruch again sees the sun returning weary from his daily journey. Angels take his crown to be cleansed. It is tarnished from its exposure to the sins committed on earth. Baruch is frightened by the splendour but the angel reassures him and tells him to wait.

Next Baruch enquires about the moon. The angel tells him that the moon has the shape of a woman in a chariot carried by angels with the appearances of cows. Formerly she had equal splendour to that of the sun, but she was reduced when all the heavenly beings hid themselves at the time that Satanael enticed Adam and Eve to sin: only the moon stayed and shone. God diminished her because of this.

The angel takes Baruch to the fourth heaven though its entrance is not mentioned. Here he is shown a large lake on a plain where wonderful birds sing God's praise constantly night and day. From this lake come the clouds which bring rain to the earth to produce crops.

The gates to the fifth heaven are closed as Baruch and the angel approach. When Michael comes, three classes of angels approach him:

1. those in charge of the righteous
2. those in charge of the insufficiently righteous
3. those in charge of the sinners.

The last group beg Michael to release them from their charges because of their evilness, the first two groups bring the deeds of righteousness or prayers of their charges and give them to Michael to put in his basket. The basket is not filled by the deeds or prayers, and Michael tells the angels to wait for him as he ascends to an upper heaven. When he returns he brings rewards for the righteous and insufficiently righteous and tells the third group that they must remain with the evil men, but they can bring plagues and disasters on them.

Next Baruch hears the voices of the dead sinners crying: 'Have mercy on us!', and he prays that they may be forgiven. Finally a heavenly voice comes telling his angelic guide to bring Baruch back to earth so he can tell mankind what he has seen - all the mysteries of heaven. Here the book ends.

This summary is based on a reconstruction of the Greek version and the three Slavic mss families and represents the rough lines of what existed in the original translation into Old Church Slavonic. Ms family A has gone through certain transformations as a whole, and further transformations took place before the extant mss were copied. Families B and C have undergone a common transformation (manifested in BC) and then further transformations separately. It is the stages BC and B which I will discuss here.¹⁶

Changes between the original Slavic translation and BC

Second Heaven

III.5 At the mention of making of bricks for the tower, a description of how the bricks were made is added.

III.6 A note is added that Syriac was the language of mankind until the building of the tower.

¹⁶ For a detailed commentary on the relationship between Pop Dragol and Petrisov zbornik versions, see Hercigonja 1964.

Third Heaven

The structure of both the Greek and Slavonic family A in chapters IV and V is as follows:

1. Description of the serpent in this heaven (IV.1-7)
2. Account of the vine from the time of Adam to Noah, followed by warning about dangers of the vine (IV.8-17)
3. Discussion of the size of the stomach of the serpent (V.1-3).

This pattern, A - B - A, is repeated often in III Baruch. In BC section 3 is rewritten and immediately follows section 1.

The throne of God has created the Phoenix, not wings of fire as in the Greek and Slavonic family A (VI.8).

A major disturbance has taken place in the text here so that VIII.1-3,6 immediately follows VI.13 and VI.15-16 and VII.2 are omitted. However there is no evidence that VII.3-6 ever existed in Slavonic.

The moon is punished because she giggled, not because she did not hide, when Adam sinned (IX.7).

Fourth Heaven

In chapter X all versions differ fundamentally from each other so that a clear reconstruction of the original version of this chapter cannot be established. What is striking in BC is that the primary emphasis is upon this heaven as the source of rain. There is no mention of the heavenly birds who sing God's praise.

Fifth Heaven

Chapters XI through XVI have been fundamentally revised in BC. The Greek and family A agree that mankind is divided into three categories. A series of changes have been introduced here to revise that into two categories: the good and the wicked. This has been done by omitting XII.7-8, XIII.5, XIV-XV.

What appears to be a citation of a refrain in the Apocalypse of Paul chapters IV - V has been introduced in XVI.1 of this revision. The refrain is 'until they repent. If they do not repent and return, I myself will judge them'.

Changes between BC and Family B

The most notable revision of this family as a whole is the omission of VI.11. We can establish the fact that this occurred after the revision which is common to families B and C because this verse is contained in varying versions in the Greek, ms T, family C, and in a much abbreviated form in ms L.

Petrisov zbornik

The first chapter is omitted.

VI.4 is omitted, perhaps by homoeoteleuthon.

In VI.8 the throne and crown give birth to the Phoenix.

What remained of chapters XII and XIII in family B is omitted in the Petrisov zbornik and XI.9 is drastically revised. Chapters XIV and XV were already omitted in stage BC.

There are a number of small revisions which often occur in the Petrisov zbornik, e.g. Baruch is changed to righteous Baruch, the angel is changed to the angel Panuel, and East to east of the sun. Several shifts in numeric values have occurred suggesting that this Glagolitic ms has behind it a copy in Cyrillic.

When one looks at the various stages of revision, one is struck by the amount of substantial revision in stage BC. This activity took place prior to the date of any manuscript which we possess. Here we have clear evidence of a conscious editor who is reshaping III Baruch for his own purposes.

Here follow the texts of the Belgrade ms in Cyrillic and the Petrisov zbornik in Glagolitic. The punctuation of Petrisov zbornik has been modernized, but that of the Belgrade has been left as it appears in the ms. Misplaced passages are printed upright where they appear in the ms, and with inclined letters where they would have been expected to be.

ЧЪТЕНІЕ СЪТГО БАРОХА.

1 ИГЛА посланъ вы^с к немуу англъ
паноуиль. оу стоу гороу сиwnю. на
рѣцѣ ИГЛА плака се. ѡ плѣнени
короуслѣмьцѣмь. ги блгосви.

1 И ИГЛА плѣни навъходьносоръ црѣ
керслѣмь. и в^огати вавилонь. се азъ
варохъ. плакахъ се немальчно. и глахъ ги
2 что ти праведнь бы навъходьносоръ
црѣ. и почто не пощедѣ гр^аа своего
керслама. идѣже градъ твои славыны.
что се тако створи ги.

3 и се плачющюу ми се. и се англъ г^ань
прѣдъста и рече ми. оумльчи моужю ѡ
жалости свое. тако во побаше керсламоу
принете. нь тако глетъ ти гъ
вседръжителъ.

4 и посла ме прѣдъ лицемъ твоимъ да
ти скажю все тинны бжине.

5 зане и слъзы твои гласъ твои въниде
въ оуши вседръжителевѣ ба.

6 нь рѣци ми да ни приложиши ни
оуложиши. и скажю ти тиннымъ многы.
ихъже не видѣ члвкъ ни^{ко} лиже.

7 и рѣхъ азъ варохъ къ англоу. живъ гъ
въ. аще покажеш ми и слышю. не
трѣвоую ни приложю. словесе єдиноу.
аще ли не оуложи ти приложю.
приложить мнѣ гъ соудъ.

II 1 и възеть ме англъ силы. и несе ме
идѣже вѣ оутверж^аене невсе.

1 Яръшшшэ Шкъзъ Жъррѣ лѣ
рзлкъмъ мѣ жпоя эѣ рѣ рзлѣъ ѣ рѣ
ѡмѣмъ.

1 Впъѡѡз лѣ зпѡѡѡѡѡѡѡ рлѣѡ.

дрехъль. видѣхъ же и птицю сию
гредоущю с нимь. и вѣше дрехъла и
въпросихъ азъ англа что ксть птица
сни дрехла сице. и рече ми англъ дрехла
ксть ѡ знонѣ. и вара слоуньчнаго.

14 и слышахъ ю зовоущюу свѣтодавче
пошли свѣтъ твои мироу. егѡ же
възываетъ свѣтодавче пошли свѣтъ
твои мироу. и авиѣ пѣтель възгласить.

VII 1 и паки рѣхъ къ англѣ. ги скажи
ми много ли почиваетъ слоунце. и рече
ми англъ толико почиваетъ ѡнеже
пѣтель възгласить. и донелѣже свѣтъ
вываетъ. и паки пондетъ.

VIII 1 и зно- сеть англѣ вѣнцѣ
слоунчаны до прѣстола бжигѣ и видѣхъ
слоунце гредоуще и вѣше тако члвкъ.
оунылъ и дрехъль.

2 видѣхъ же и птицю сию гредоущю с
нимь. и вѣше дрехъла

3 и въпросихъ азъ англа что ксть птица
сни дрехла сице.

4 и паки же рече ми англъ слыши
вароше. ещѣ ты скажю ѡ прѣхожѣenni
слоунчнѣмь. егѡ во мимоходить
днѣ. и прѣходить слоунце ѱ. англъ
възмоутъ вѣнцѣ слоунчаны. и
оузносетъ до прѣстола бжигѣ.
вскврѣняетъ во се ѡ землѣ. и ѡ грѣхъ
земльныхъ.

лѣтѣхъ. И пыхъмъ ѡдѣрчѣ ѡбзѣнхъ
лѣтѣхъ рзѣмѣдѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ и
жрѣдѣмъ. И пыхъмъ рѣдѣхъ
ѡбзѣнхъ ѡ рѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ и
жрѣдѣмъ. И жрѣдѣмъ крѣдѣмъ жрѣ
дѣ рѣдѣхъ мѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ и
жрѣдѣмъ? И бжѣ мѣ крѣдѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ
дѣ рѣдѣхъ рѣмъ бжѣмъ ѡдѣрчѣжѣмъ.

14 И ѡдѣхъмъ рѣ бжѣнхъ
ѡдѣдѣмъ ѡдѣдѣ рѣмъ ѡдѣдѣ
мѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ рѣмъ ѡдѣдѣ
мѣмъ мѣмъ и жрѣдѣмъ рѣмъ
ѡдѣдѣмъ.

1 И рѣмъ бжѣмъ ѡмъ ѡдѣдѣмъ
ѡбзѣдѣмъ ѡдѣрчѣ рѣмъмѣмъ? И бжѣ мѣ
крѣдѣмъ ѡдѣдѣмъ лѣмъ бжѣмъ и рѣмъ
ѡдѣдѣмъ.

1 **III** бжѣмъ лѣмъ ѡдѣрчѣ ѡдѣрчѣ
жрѣ рѣмъмѣмъмѣмъмѣмъ. И пыхъмъ
ѡдѣрчѣ ѡбзѣнхъ лѣтѣхъ жрѣ
рзѣмѣдѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ и жрѣдѣмъ.

2 И пыхъмъ рѣдѣхъ ѡбзѣнхъ ѡ
рѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ и жрѣдѣмъ.

3 И жрѣдѣмъ крѣдѣмъ жрѣ дѣ
рѣдѣхъ мѣмъ ѡбзѣдѣмъ и жрѣдѣмъ?

4 И бжѣ мѣ крѣдѣмъ ѡдѣдѣмъ ѡдѣдѣ
мѣмъ мѣмъ ѡдѣдѣмъ и рѣмъжрѣ
ѡдѣрчѣмъ жрѣмъ мѣмъжрѣмъ мѣмъ
и бжѣмъ ѡдѣрчѣмъ ѡбзѣнхъ рѣ
бжѣмъмѣмъ И бжѣ крѣдѣмъ и ѡдѣдѣмъ
ѡдѣрчѣмъ ѡдѣрчѣмъ и рѣдѣмъ жрѣ лѣмъ

X 1 и па^{кы} по^етъ ме ан^гль си^лы.
 2 и по^каза ми го^рецо^ую р^ѣко^у з^ѣло. и
 в^ѣ на не^и ѳе^зеро го^лѣ^мо з^ѣло.
 4 и о^упро^сихъ азъ ан^гла. ч^то и^есть
 ѳе^зеро се го^лѣ^мо з^ѣло.
 5 и р^че ми ан^гль
 6 се и^есть ѳе^зеро. ѿ^но^уд^ѣже в^ызе^млю^т
 в^ла^ди^ци во^до^у. и в^дѣ^жа^ютъ по з^ем^ли

8 и р^ѣхъ азъ ва^ро^хъ къ ан^гло^у то ка^ко
 г^лю^т ч^ло^вѣ^ки та^ко в^ла^ди^ци с^хо^де^ть о^у
 мо^ре. и в^ызе^млю^т во^до^у мо^рь^ско^ую. и
 в^дѣ^жа^ютъ по з^ем^ли
 9 и р^че ми ан^гль. л^ьст^ит^ь се ро^дѣ
 ч^лв^чски не в^ѣдо^уще ни^че^со^же. вс^а во
 мо^рь^ска^я во^да сла^на и^есть. да а^ще би
 в^дѣ^жало мо^ре^мь не би пло^ди рас^ли по
 з^ем^ли.

XI 1 И по^етъ ме ан^гль сла^вы. и
 по^ста^ви ме. на .е. не^бси.
 2 и по^каза ми в^рт^а пр^ѣв^лика. и в^ѣх^оу
 пи^сана на в^рт^ѣхъ т^ѣхъ и^ме^на ч^лв^ча. и
 рече ми ан^гль и^мѣ^же и^есть в^ьни^ти
 с^ѣм^о. т^ѣхъ и^ме^на на^пи^сана со^утъ з^ѣл^ѣ.
 и р^ѣхъ азъ ва^ро^хъ къ ан^гло^у. не
 ѿ^вр^ьзо^утъ ли се в^рт^а си^ла. да в^ьни^де^вѣ
 в^ь н^ѣ. и рече ми ан^гль. не ѿ^вр^ьзо^утъ се
 до^нѣ^дѣ^же при^де^ть ми^ха^ль ц^рт^ни^а
 в^жни^а. и по^жа^и и о^уз^ри^ши сла^{во}
 в^жни^ю.

м^лк^ни^а по^бе^жд^ѣхъ о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а о^д
 з^лы^а ѳи^ло^со^фи^а р^зъ е^ст^ь по^сл^ѣд^ни^а ѳи^ло^с
 по^сл^ѣд^ни^а е^ст^ь о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а и ѳи^ло^со^ф
 ѳи^ло^со^фы з^ло^бо^дѣ^лы^а и о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а.

1 И по^сл^ѣд^ни^а м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 2 и по^сл^ѣд^ни^а м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^фы в^ыс^лы^ш
 е^ст^ь р^зъ р^зъ з^ѣл^ѣ.
 4 И по^сл^ѣд^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а?
 5 И в^ѣд^ѣ м^лк^н
 6 з^ѣл^ѣ и ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 з^ло^бо^дѣ^лы^а о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 и ѳи^ло^со^фы р^зъ ѳи^ло^со^фы.

8 И в^ѣд^ѣ ѳи^ло^со^фы и^нѣ^же ѳи^ло^со^ф
 ѳи^ло^со^фы з^ло^бо^дѣ^лы^а и о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а з^ѣл^ѣ м^лк^ни^а и ѳи^ло^со^фы
 ѳи^ло^со^фы.

9 И в^ѣд^ѣ м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 ѳи^ло^со^фы и р^зъ о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а м^лк^ни^а о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а з^ѣл^ѣ
 з^ло^бо^дѣ^лы^а м^лк^ни^а р^зъ е^ст^ь о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а.

1 И по^сл^ѣд^ни^а м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 по^сл^ѣд^ни^а м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^фы р^зъ е^ст^ь.

2 и по^сл^ѣд^ни^а м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 з^ло^бо^дѣ^лы^а и о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 р^зъ о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а. И в^ѣд^ѣ м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а з^ѣл^ѣ м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 по^сл^ѣд^ни^а о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а? И в^ѣд^ѣ м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 р^зъ о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а р^зъ о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а
 м^лк^ни^а о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а з^ѣл^ѣ м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^ф
 в^ѣд^ѣ м^лк^ни^а ѳи^ло^со^фы о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а и
 о^до^бр^ѣн^ны^а ѳи^ло^со^ф

XVII 1 и р^че ми англ^ь оузри виж^а.
покоше праведных^ь и славоу и радость
и веселие и виж^а поконца нечестивых^ь.
слъзы и въз^аыхание и чръвь
неоусыпающ^ь.

2 и зовоуши до невсе грѣшни. помлоуи
ны соудни

3 и рехъ азъ вароухъ къ англоу кто си
сѣть. ги мон.

4 и р^че ми англ^ь си соутъ грѣшници.

5 и рѣхъ азъ вароухъ къ англоу повели ми
ги мон да и азъ плачю се с нимь.

6 и рече ми англ^ь плачи се и ты ѡ нихъ.
не ми гъ въ послушанеть гл^а твоего.
и помлоуиеть ѡ.

7 приде же гл^а с невсе гле снесѣте
вароуха на лице всеи земле да скажеть
сноль члвчским. яже видѣ и слыша и
все тайны прѣдасть ѡмоу

8 боу же наш емоу слава и ч^ть и
покланание ѡцоу и сноу и ст^омоу дхоу
нинѣ и присно и вѣка вѣкема. аминь.

1 8 ра^во^ухъ ва^ро^ухъ къ ан^гл^оу кт^о си
сѣ^ть. ги мо^н.
2 и зо^во^уш^и до не^вс^е гр^ѣш^ни. по^мл^оу^и
ны со^уд^ни

2 и зо^во^уш^и до не^вс^е гр^ѣш^ни. по^мл^оу^и
ны со^уд^ни

3 и ре^хъ азъ ва^ро^ухъ къ ан^гл^оу кт^о си
сѣ^ть. ги мо^н.
4 и рѣ^хъ азъ ва^ро^ухъ къ ан^гл^оу по^ве^ли ми
ги мо^н да и азъ пл^ач^ю се с ни^мь.

7 8 ра^во^ухъ ва^ро^ухъ къ ан^гл^оу кт^о си
сѣ^ть. ги мо^н.
8 бо^у же на^ш ем^оу сл^ав^а и чѣ^ть и
по^кл^ан^ан^ие ѡц^оу и сн^оу и ст^ом^оу дх^оу
ни^нѣ и пр^ис^но и вѣ^ка вѣ^ке^ма. ам^ин^ь.

WORKS CITED

- Birkfellner, G., 1975 *Glagolitische und kyrillische Handschriften in Österreich*, Schriften der Balkankommission der Österr. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Linguistische Abteilung 23, Wien.
- Bonwetsch, N., 1896 Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch, *Nachrichten von der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologisch-historische Klasse, pp. 91-102.
- Conev, B., 1910 *Опис на рѣкописитѣ и старопечатнитѣ книги на Народната Библиотека въ София*, Vol. I, София.
- Gaylord, H. E., 1982 How Satanael Lost his 'el', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, XXXIII, 303-309.
- 1983 Славянскій текст Третьей книги Варуха, *полата кѣнигописнага*, VII, Nijmegen, 49-57.
- 1983a 3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, Doubleday, Garden City, Vol I, 653-79.
- 1983b *The Slavonic Version of III Baruch*, diss., Hebrew University.
- Hage, W., 1974 *Die griechische Baruch-Apocalypse*, JSHRZ V. I, G. Mohn, Gütersloh.
- Hercigonja, E., 1964 Viđenje Varuhovo u Petrisovu zborniku iz 1468. godine, *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*, VII, Novi Sad, 63-93.
- Ivanov, J., 1925 Богомилски книги и легенди, Българската академия на науките, София [French tr. *Livres et Légende bogomiles*, tr. M. Ribeyrol, Maisonneuve, Paris, 1976].
- James, M. R., 1897 *Apocrypha Anecdota II*, TS V. I, Cambridge [repr. Kraus, Nendeln, 1967].
- Kožucharov, S., 1971 Неизвестен сборник със смесено съдържание, *Известия на Институт за български език*, XX 263-71.
- Morfill, W. R., 1897 The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Slavonic, in M. R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota II*, TS V I, Cambridge, 91-102.
- Mošin, V., 1955 *Ćirilski rukopisi Jugoslavenske akademije, I. dio. Opis rukopisa*, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb.
- Novaković, S., 1886 Otkrivenje Varuhovo, *Starine JA*, XVIII, Zagreb, 203-9.
- Picard, J.-C., 1967 *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, PsVTG II, E. J. Brill, Leiden.

- Sokolov, M., 1907 Апокрифическое Откровение Варуха, *Древности (Труды слав. комиссии Московского археолог. общества)*, IV. I, Москва, 201-58.
- 1910 Славянская книга Ёноха Праведнаго, *Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе VII*, ЧИОДР, 235, i-v, 109-182, 1-167.
- Srećković, P. S., 1890 Сборник попа Драгоља, *Споменик V*, SANU, Beograd.
- Štefanić, Vj., 1960 *Glagoljski rukopisi otoka Krka*, Zagreb, 355-97.
- Stojanović, Lj., 1903 *Каталог Народне библиотеке у Београду. IV. Рукписи и старе штампане књиге*, Београд.
- Tichonravov, N. S., 1894 Апокрифическія сказанія, *СБОР Я С*, LVIII.4, Санктпетербург.
- Turdeanu, E., 1969 L'Apocalypse de Baruch en slave, *Revue des Études slaves*, XLVIII, 23-48 [repr. Turdeanu 1981, 364-91]
- 1981 *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament*, StVTPs V, E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- Zagrebin, B. M., 1979 О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая, *Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний Отдела рукописей и редких книг ГПБ (Исследования, обзоры, публикации)*. *Сборник научных трудов*, Ленинград, 61-80.

Summary

III Baruch is included in two fifteenth century Greek manuscripts and nine Slavic manuscripts, dating from the late thirteenth until the eighteenth centuries. The text types reflected in the Slavic manuscripts can be divided into three textual families — A, B, and C. The version of the Petrisov zbornik belongs to family B. In this article the author focusses upon the redactional activities in the common prototype of ms families B and C, the prototype of ms family B, and the Petrisov zbornik text itself. The most profound redactional work appears to have been carried out at the earliest stages of transmission, not later than the thirteenth century. The text of the most reliable ms of family B (Belgrade NB 651) is printed in Cyrillic with the text of the Glagolitic Petrisov zbornik in parallel columns.

Sažetak

REDAKTORSKI ELEMENTI U TEKSTU III. BARUHA IZ PETRISOVA ZBORNIKA

III Baruh je uključen u dva grčka rukopisa 15. stoljeća i u devet slavenskih rukopisa, koji datiraju od kasnoga 13. do 18. stoljeća. Slavenske se verzije rukopisa mogu podijeliti na tri tekstualne grupe A, B i C.

Verzija Petrisova zbornika pripada grupi B. U ovome članku autor obraća pažnju na redaktorske promjene u zajedničkome prototipu grupâ B i C, u prototipu grupe B i u samom tekstu Petrisova zbornika. Najznačajnije su redakcijske promjene, čini se, bile izvršene u ranim stadijima predaje, ne kasnije od 13. stoljeća. Tekst najpouzdanijega rukopisa grupe B (Beograd NB 651) štampan je ćirilicom s tekstom glagoljskoga Petrisova zbornika u paralelnim stupcima.

Izvorni znanstveni članak

Primljeno: 15. srpnja 1986.

Autor: *Harry Gaylor*

*Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid,
Groningen*