Apocryphal and Esoteric Sources in the Development of Christianity and Judaism

The Eastern Mediterranean, the Near East, and Beyond

Edited by

Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Contents

Preface xi
List of Figures and Tables xii
Notes on Contributors xvii

Introduction 1

PART 1
Esoteric Writing and Esoteric Cults in the Biblical Religions

1 The Exoteric Appearances of Jewish Esotericism 29
Ithamar Gruenwald

2 The *Gospel of Peter* between the Synoptics, Second Century, and Late Antique 'Apostolic Memoirs' 43
Tobias Nicklas

3 All Mysteries Revealed? On the Interplay between Hiding and Revealing and the Dangers of Heavenly Journeys according to the *Ascension of Isaiah* 70
Joseph Verheyden

4 Early Christianity and the Pagan Mysteries: Esoteric Knowledge? 88
Jan N. Bremmer

5 The Medieval Dualist *Nachleben* of Early Jewish and Christian Esoteric Traditions: The Role of the Pseudepigrapha 105
Yuri Stoyanov

6 The Esoteric Cardinal: Giorgios Gemistos, Bessarion and Theurgy 124
Ezio Albrile

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

PART 2
Bridging the Account of the Origins and the Messiah's Advent

7 La création d'Adam à Noravanḳ: Théologie et narrativité 143
Jean-Pierre Mahé

8 *Translatio corporis Adæ*: Trajectories of a Parabiblical Tradition 153
Sergey Minov

9 Apostles, Long Dead 'Heretics', and Monks: Noncanonical Traditions on Angels and Protoplasts in Two Late Antique Coptic Apocalypses (7th–8th Century CE) 179
Daniele Tripaldi

10 Face as the Image of God in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha 206
Andrei A. Orlov

11 *On the Perdition of the Higher Intellect and on the Image of Light*: Critical Edition, Translation, and Commentary 217
Maria V. Korogodina and Basil Lourié

12 Bridging the Gaps in the Samaritan Tradition 262
Abraham Tal

13 'On the Mountains of Ararat': Noah's Ark and the Sacred Topography of Armenia 276
Nazénie Garibian

14 The Historian's Craft and Temporal Bridges in Apocrypha and in Early Christian Art: Para-Biblical Sources in the Light of the Work of Marc Bloch 296
Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev

PART 3
Symbols and Figures of the Messianic Expectation

15 Quellen der nichtbiblischen Mose-Überlieferung in der *Kratkaja Chronografičeskaja Paleja* 317
Dieter and Sabine Fahl

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

16 Whether Lamb or Lion: Overlapping Metaphors in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism 340
Abraham Terian

17 Rescuing John the Baptist 351
Albert I. Baumgarten

18 The Esoteric Legacy of the Magi of Bethlehem in the Framework of the Iranian Speculations about Jesus, Zoroaster and His Three Posthumous Sons 368
Antonio Panaino

19 Visual Apocrypha: The Case of Mary and the Magi in Early Christian Rome 383
Felicity Harley

20 Gnostic and Mithraic Themes in *Sefer Zerubbabel* 411
Yishai Kiel

PART 4
Angels, Heavenly Journeys and Visions of Paradise

21 1Enoch 17 in the Geneva Papyrus 187 439
David Hamidović

22 Enochic Texts and Related Traditions in *Slavia Orthodoxa* 452
Florentina Badalanova Geller

23 Visions of Paradise in the Life of St Andrew the Fool and the Legacy of the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Byzantium 521
Emmanouela Grypeou

24 Eternal Chains and the Mountain of Darkness: The Fallen Angels in the Incantation Bowls 533
Yakir Paz

25 Iconography of Angels: Roots and Origins in the Earliest Christian Art 559
Cecilia Proverbio

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

26 The Gardens of Eden: Compositional, Iconographic and Semantic Similarities between the 'Birds Mosaic' of the Armenian Chapel in Jerusalem and the Mosaic of the Synagogue at Maʿon (Nirim) 590
Zaruhi Hakobyan

Postscript: Border-Crossing Texts 610
Hartmut Leppin

Index of Place Names 619
Index of Modern and Early Modern Authors 621
Index of Biblical and Mythological Names 623
Index of Subjects 626
Index of Ancient and Mediæval Sources 629

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

CHAPTER 22

Enochic Texts and Related Traditions in *Slavia Orthodoxa*

Florentina Badalanova Geller

На майка и татко—за Великден,
който така и не можахме да празнуваме заедно тази година

1 Frame of Reference

When examining the transmission history of the Enochic corpus in the Byzantine Commonwealth,[1] and especially its domestication within the realm of *Slavia Orthodoxa*, one conventionally assumes that the discussion will focus exclusively on *2 Enoch*[2] (also known among specialists as *The Slavonic Apoca-*

1 The term Byzantine Commonwealth (= Gr. οἰκουμένη) was coined by D. Obolensky; it is conventionally employed to designate the Eastern Orthodox *Pax Slavia Christiana* as a specific intellectual landscape impacted by Byzantine confessional, cultural and socio-political models; see D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453*, New York, 1971. See also the discussion in H. Birnbaum, 'The Balkan Slavic Component of Medieval Russian Culture', in H. Birnbaum and M.S. Flier (eds), *Medieval Russian Culture*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, 1984, pp. 3–30.

2 Among scholars whose intellectual blueprint is detectable in the current discussion on *2 Enoch* (regardless of whether the author agrees with their interpretations of the studied data or not) are A. Popov, 'Bibliograficheskie Materialy, Sobrannye Andreem Popovym (iv): Iuzhnorusskiĭ Sbornik 1679 goda', *Chteniia v Imperatorskom⁊ Obshchestvě Istorii i Drevnosteĭ Rossiĭskikh pri Moskovskom⁊ Universitetě* vol. 3 (1880), pp. 66–139; M. Sokolov, *'Materialy i Zametki po Starinnoĭ Slavianskoĭ Literature*. Vyp. Tretiĭ (vii/2): *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*. Tekst s latinskim perevodom', *ChIOIDR* vol. 4 (1899); id., 'Feniks v Apokrifakh ob Enokhe i Varukhe', *Novyĭ Sbornik Stateĭ po Slavianovedeniiu, Sostavlennyĭ i Izdannyĭ Uchenikami V.I. Lamanskago pri Uchastii ikh Uchenikov po sluchaiu 50-letiia ego Ucheno-Literaturnoĭ Deiatel'nosti*, Sankt Peterburg, 1905, pp. 395–405; id., 'Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago. Teksty, latinskiĭ perevod i issledovanie (Posmertnyĭ trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniiu M. Speranskiĭ)', *ChIOIDR* vol. 4/235

© FLORENTINA BADALANOVA GELLER, 2021 | DOI:10.1163/9789004445925_024
For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

lypse of Enoch, or *The Book of the Holy Secrets of Enoch the Just*);[3] this is not the case with the present article. In what follows, I shall explore some particular clusters of compositions extant in Old Church Slavonic (i.e. *Florilegia*, *Chrono-*

(1910); Ǐord. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, Sofia, 1925, pp. 165–191; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* [= *Abhandlungen der königlischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, N.F. Bd. 1, № 3], Berlin, 1896; id., *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlishen Literatur*, 44 Band Heft 2, Leipzig, 1922; N. Meshcherskiĭ, 'Sledy pamiatnikov Kumrana v staroslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ literature. (K izucheniiu slavianskikh versiĭ Knigi Enokha)', in L.A. Dmitriev and D.S. Likhachev (eds), *TODRL* vol. 19: *Russkaia Literatura XI–XVII Vekov Sredi Slavianskikh Literatur*, Moscow–Leningrad, 1963, pp. 130–147; id., 'K istorii teksta slavianskoĭ knigi Enokha (Sledy Pamiatnikov Kumrana v Vizantiĭskoĭ i Staroslavianskoĭ Literature)', *VV* vol. 24 (1964), pp. 91–108; id., 'Problemy izucheniia slavianorusskoĭ perevodnoĭ literatury XI–XV vv.', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *TODRL* vol. 20: *Aktual'nye zadachi izucheniia russkoĭ literatury XI–XVII vekov*, Moscow–Leningrad, 1964, pp. 180–231; id., 'K voprosu ob istochnikakh slavianskoi Knigi Enokha', *KSINAA* vol. 86 (1965), pp. 72–78; Ém. Turdeanu, 'Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudobogomiles', *RHR* vol. 138, issue 1 (1950), pp. 22–52, and vol. 138, issue 2 (1950), pp. 176–218; id., 'Notule I. Une curiosité de l'Hénoch slave: les phénix du sixième ciel', *RÉS* vol. 47, issue 1–4 (1968) [= *Communications de la délégation française au VIe Congrès international des slavistes* (Prague, 1968)], pp. 53–54; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch. Texte slave et traduction française*, Paris, 1952; S. Pines, 'Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*', in R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker (eds), *Types of Redemption*: *Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968* [= Numen Book Series: *Studies in the History of Religion* vol. 18], Leiden, 1970, pp. 72–87; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, Oxford, 1976; J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone, 'The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the *Similitudes*', *HTR* vol. 70, issue 1/2 (1977), pp. 51–65; id., 'The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch', *Numen* vol. 26, issue 1 (1979), pp. 89–103; M. Scopello, '*The Apocalypse of Zostrianos* (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*', *VC* vol. 34, issue 4 (1980), pp. 376–385; id. 'The Angels in Ancient Gnosis: Some Cases', in L. Brisson, S. O'Neill and A. Timotin (eds), *Neoplatonic Demons and Angels*: *Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition* vol. 20, Leiden–Boston, 2018, pp. 19–45; F. Andersen, '2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*. A New Translation and Introduction', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1: *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, Garden City, N.Y., 1983, pp. 91–221; M. Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell. An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature*, Philadelphia, 1983; id., *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, New York–Oxford, 1993; id., *An Apocalypse*: *A Brief History*, Chichester, 2010; W. Adler, 'Berossus, Manetho, and *1Enoch* in the World Chronicle of Panodorus', *HTR* vol. 76 (1983), pp. 419–442; id., *Time Immemorial*: *Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* [Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26], Washington, D.C., 1989; id., 'The Survival and "Christianization" of Older Jewish Apocalypses', in J.C. VanderKam and W. Adler (eds), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* [*Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum*, Section III: *Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature* vol. 4], Van Gorcum, 1996, pp. 25–~~1~~29; A. Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*, Leiden–Boston–

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

grapha, Hexameral compilations) that circulated concurrently with *2 Enoch*, thus clarifying the trajectories of its transmission against the background of the scribal culture of the medieval *Orbis Orthodoxus*. Of particular importance for our investigation will be the indigenous taxonomy coined by the

Köln, 2000; J. Collins, 'The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism', in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, Tübingen, 1983, pp. 531–548; id., *The Apocalyptic Imagination*: *An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, Grand Rapids, MI–Cambridge, UK, 1998; id., *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*, Boston–Leiden, 2001; id., *Apocalypse, Prophesy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, Grand Rapids, MI–Cambridge, UK, 2015; Ch. Böttrich, 'Recent Studies in the Slavonic *Book of Enoch*', *JSP* vol. 9 (1991), pp. 35–42; id., *Weltweisheit Menschheitsethik Urkult*: *Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* [Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Reihe 2; Bd. 50], Tübingen, 1992; id., *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch*, Frankfurt et al., 1995; id., *Das slavische Henochbuch* [Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Bd. 5, Apokalypsen, Lfg. 7], Gütersloh, 1996; id., 'Astrologie in der Henochtradition', *ZAW* vol. 109 (1997), pp. 222–245; id., 'The Melchizedek Story of *2* (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*: A Reaction to A. Orlov', *JSJ* vol. 32, issue 4 (2001), pp. 445–470; id., 'Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen im slavischen Henochbuch und in Qumran', in C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger (eds), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* [*BETL* 159], Leuven, 2002, pp. 297–321; id., 'Die vergessene Geburtsgeschichte. Mt 1–2 / Lk 1–2 und die wunderbare Geburt des Melchisedek in slHen 71–72', in H. Lichtenberger and G.S. Oegema (eds), *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext* [JSHRZ-St 1], Gütersloh, 2002, pp. 222–249; id., 'Biblische Figuren im slavischen Henoch-Buch', in H. Lichtenberger und U. Mittmann-Richert (eds), *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* [*Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature; Yearbook 2008*], Berlin–New York, 2009, pp. 303–335; id., *Geschichte Melchisedeks* [JSHRZ.NF 2:1], Gütersloh, 2010; id., '*The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (*2 En*): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 37–67; id., 'The Angel of Tartarus and the Supposed Coptic Fragments of 2 Enoch', *EChr* vol. 4 (2013), 509–521; P. Schäfer, 'In Heaven as It Is in Hell', in R.S. Boustan and A.Y. Reed (eds), *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 233–274; id., *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, Tübingen, 2009.

3 For a survey of variations of the original Old Church Slavonic titles/headings in different Mss., see in Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*, p. 1 (note 2); id., *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha* (Part 1), pp. 111, 133, 145, 155; (Part 2), pp. 1, 10, 32, 33, 47, 69, 72, 76, 84, 92, 94; A. Iatsimirskiĭ, *Bibliograficheskiĭ Obzor Apokrifov v Iuzhnoslavianskoĭ i Russkoĭ Pis'mennosti* (*Spiski Pamiatnikov*: *Apokrify Vetkhozavetnye*), Vyp. 1, Petrograd, 1921, pp. 81–88; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch*, p. 3 (note 1); A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, p. 4 (note 1); F. Andersen, '*2* (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*', p. 102 (notes 1a, 1b); A. de Santos Otero, 'Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)', in A.D. Macho et al. (eds), *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, Tomo 4: *Ciclo de Henoc*, Madrid, 1984, p. 161; Ch. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit Menschheitsethik Urkult*: *Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*, pp. 130–131; G. Macaskill, *The Slavonic Texts of* 2 Enoch, Leiden–Boston, 2013, p. 38 (note 1), p. 39 (note 28).

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

local scribes to identify parabiblical writings penned in the name of Enoch (as listed in the earliest Slavonic renditions of the Byzantine Greek *Indices of Prohibited Books*), as well as some fashionable for the period para-Hexameral compilations containing cosmogonic and anthropogonic, cosmological and cosmographic, chronographic and historiographic accounts. By the time *2 Enoch* caught the attention of the local literati, these types of compositions must have amalgamated into a flexible hyper-narrative, thus creating the scribal culture that welcomed *2 Enoch* in its new homeland.

As promptly noted by W. Adler in his comments on *2 Enoch*, this 'mysterious work' may be considered 'especially illustrative of the difficulties of establishing meaningful criteria for authorship and origin,' since 'almost nothing certain can be said about its provenance, date or original language.' In fact, '*2 Enoch* exemplifies the difficulties that often arise in identifying an apocalypse's Jewish or Christian provenance on the basis of inconclusive internal evidence.'[4] Despite decades of research, no scholarly consensus regarding the intellectual homeland of the antecedent textual corpus of *2 Enoch* (conventionally designated by Nikita Meshcherskiĭ as *Proto-Enoch 2* [*Протоенох 2*])[5] has been achieved. Its hypothetical locations are sought either in Ancient Mesopotamia, or Palestine, or Hellenistic Alexandria, or Byzantium, or even Medieval Bulgaria, while the chronological framework of the assemblage of its earliest edition stretches from the 3rd–1st centuries BCE to the 9th–10th centuries CE.[6] Besides, there is no certainty as regards the original language of the underlying Ur-text of the *Proto-Enoch 2*, with opinions supporting either the Semitic (e.g. Hebrew, Aramaic), or Indo-European (e.g. Greek) linguistic environment. Nor does a coherent set of ideas concerning its transmission history exist, since there are virtually no traces of scribal traditions outside the Slavonic intellectual landscape.[7] It is safe to surmise, therefore, that the epistemological

4 See W. Adler, 'The Survival and "Christianization" of Older Jewish Apocalypses', pp. 27–28.

5 Cf. N. Meshcherskiĭ, 'Sledy pamiatnikov Kumrana v staroslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ literature', p. 143.

6 This astonishing variety of epistemological templates in the studies on *2 Enoch* is discussed by J. Greenfield and M. Stone, 'The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch', pp. 98–99; F. Andersen, '*2 (Slavonic Apocalypse) of Enoch*', pp. 94–97; A. Pennington, '*2 Enoch*', in H.F. Davis Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, Oxford, 1984, pp. 323–326; M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, pp. 37–44; J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*: *An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, p. 34; id., *Apocalypse, Prophesy, and Pseudepigraphy*, p. 211, and others.

7 It has been announced that fragments of *2 Enoch* (chapters 36–42) were discovered in 1972 in Coptic manuscripts from Qasr Ibrim in Egyptian Nubia. They were studied by J. Hagen,

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

framework of Enochic traditions in the *Orbis Orthodoxus* is still being negotiated between Slavonic specialists representing different, occasionally conflicting, scholarly discourses.[8]

'No Longer 'Slavonic' Only: *2 Enoch* Attested in Coptic from Nubia', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 7–34. Regrettably, no *editio princeps* of these data has been produced as yet; hence it would be somewhat precipitous to include the Coptic material in the list of the text witnesses of *2 Enoch* (although some scholars are inclined to do so). See also the discussion in Ch. Böttrich ('The Angel of Tartarus and the Supposed Coptic Fragments of 2 Enoch', pp. 509–521), with whom the present author is in total agreement.

8 See in this connection the discussion in A. Popov, 'Bibliograficheskie Materialy, Sobrannye Andreem Popovym (iv): Iuzhnorusskiĭ Sbornik 1679 goda', *ChIOIDR* vol. 3 (1880), pp. 66–139; Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*; id., 'Feniks v Apokrifakh ob Enokhe i Varukhe', pp. 395–405; id., *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago*; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch*; id., *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch*; W.R. Morfill and R.H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Translated from the Slavonic by W.R. Morfill and edited, with introduction, notes and indices by R.H. Charles, Oxford, 1896; A.S.D. Maunder, 'The Date and the Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*', *The Observatory* vol. 41 (1918), pp. 309–316; J.K. Fotheringham, 'The Date and Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Enoch*', *JThSt* vol. 20 (1919), p. 252; id., 'The Easter Calendar of the *Slavonic Enoch*', *JThSt* vol. 23 (1922), pp. 49–56; R.H. Charles, 'The Date and Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Enoch*', *JThSt* vol. 22, issue 1 (1921), pp. 161–163; N. Schmidt, 'The Two Recensions of *Slavonic Enoch*', *JAOS* vol. 41 (1921), pp. 307–312; K. Lake, 'The Date of the *Slavonic Enoch*', *HTR* vol. 16, issue 4 (1923), pp. 397–398; A. Rubinstein, 'Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*', *JJS* vol. 13 (1962), pp. 1–21; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, pp. 107–116; N.A. Meshcherskiĭ, 'Sledy pamiatnikov Kumrana v staroslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ literature', pp. 130–147; id., 'K istorii teksta slavianskoĭ knigi Enokha', pp. 91–108; id., 'Problemy izucheniia slaviano-russkoĭ perevodnoĭ literatury XI–XV vv.', pp. 180–231; id., 'K voprosu ob istochnikakh slavianskoi Knigi Enokha', pp. 72–78; F. Repp, 'Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des cod. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek', *WSJ* vol. 10 (1963), pp. 58–68; M. Philonenko, 'La cosmogonie du Livre des secrets d'Hénoch', in Ph. Derchain (ed.), *Religions en Egypte hellénistique et romaine*, Paris, 1969, pp. 109–116; S. Pines, 'Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*', pp. 72–87; F. Andersen, '2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*', pp. 91–100; M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, pp. 37–44, 83–87; P. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, pp. 77–85; J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, pp. 243–247; W. Adler, 'The Survival and "Christianization" of Older Jewish Apocalypses', pp. 25–129; Ph. Alexander, 'From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of Biblical Enoch', in M. Stone and T. Bergen (eds), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, Harrisburg, PA, 1998, pp. 87–122; T. Jovanović, 'Apokrif o Enohu prema Srpskom Prepisu is Narodne Biblioteke u Beču', *Arheografski Prilozi* vol. 25 (2003), pp. 209–223; B. Lourié, 'Metatron i prometaia—vtoraia kniga Enokha na perekrestke problem', in Basil Lourié (ed.), *Scrinium* 2: *Universum Hagiographicum Mémorial R.P. Michel van Esbroeck, s.j.* [1934–2003], Saint Petersburg, 2006, pp. 371–407; id., 'After-

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

As for the research lemmata implemented by the present author, they can be outlined as follows: the text of what we now designate as *2 Enoch* was translated into Old Bulgarian/Old Church Slavonic from a (no longer extant) Greek protograph[9] which, in turn, was a derivative from a (now lost) Aramaic (or less likely Hebrew) *Vorlage*. The translation of the Semitic text into Greek may

life of the *2 Enoch* Calendar: Major Christian Feasts on the Sixth Day', *Henoch* vol. 33, issue 1 (2011), pp. 102–107; id., 'One *hapax legomenon* and the date of *2 Enoch*', *Henoch* vol. 33, issue 1 (2011), pp. 94–96; id., 'Calendrical Elements in *2 Enoch*', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 191–219; id., 'Pochemu 'Slavianskiĭ Enokh' okazalsia v Nubii?', in A.Kh. Ėlert (ed.), *Arkheograficheskie i Istochnikovedcheskie Aspekty v Izuchenii Istorii Rossii. Sbornik Nauchnykh Trudov. Arkheografiia i Istochnikovedenie Sibiri*, Novosibirsk, 2016, pp. 35–42; G. Macaskill, '*2 Enoch*: Manuscripts, Recensions, and Original Language', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 83–101; id., *The Slavonic Texts of* 2 Enoch; L. Navtanovich, '*Ждѣнїе ею и пѣнїю раздаанїю* v slavianskom perevode Knigi Enokha', in O.V. Tvorogov (ed.), *TODRL* vol. 53, Saint Petersburg, 2003, pp. 3–11; id., 'The Provenance of *2 Enoch*: a Philological Perspective. A Response to Christfried Böttrich's Paper "*The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*: Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview", in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 69–82; A. Orlov, 'Celestial Choirmaster: the Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah Tradition' *JSP* vol. 14, issue 1 (2004), pp. 3–29; id., *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* [TSAJ, 107], Tübingen, 2005; id., *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism*: *Studies in Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* [JSJSup 114], Leiden–Boston, 2007; id., *Selected Studies in Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, Leiden–Boston, 2009; id., 'The Sacerdotal Traditions of *2 Enoch* and the Date of the Text', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only*, Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 103–116; id., 'The Watchers of Satanail: the Fallen Angels Traditions in *2 Enoch*', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only*, Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 149–180; L. Schiffman, '*2 Enoch* and Halakhah', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 221–228; D. Stökl Ben Ezra, 'Halakha, Calendars, and the Provenance of *2 Enoch*', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 229–242; C.H.T. Fletcher–Louis, '*2 Enoch* and the New Perspective on Apocalyptic', in A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini (eds), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*: *No Longer Slavonic Only* [Studia Judæoslavica 4], Leiden–Boston, 2012, pp. 127–148; A. Stoĭkova, 'Ot Mesopotamiia do Etropole. Transformatsii na mita za gigantskata kosmicheska ptitsa', *SL* vol. 49–50 (2014), pp. 126–168; E. Syrtsova, 'Apokrificheskaia kontseptsiia tvoreniia v Knige Enokha (II)', *VSK* vol. 2 (2014), pp. 49–61.

9 In contrast to some scholars who argue that the translation was made directly from a Hebrew protograph in Kievan Rus'; see N. Meshcherskiĭ, 'Sledy pamiatnikov Kumrana v staroslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ literature', p. 147; id., 'Problemy izucheniia slaviano-russkoĭ perevodnoĭ literatury XI–XV vv.', p. 191. The present author is in agreement with the argument put forward in H.G. Lunt and M. Taube, 'Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew', *RL* vol. 12 (1988), p. 181.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

well have occurred in Alexandria, and was accomplished most probably by a Hellenised Jew, approximately in the 1st century CE, prior to (or concurrently with) the commencement of the Gnostic movement.[10] Although there is no surviving evidence for the circulation in Byzantium of any manuscripts containing Greek editions of what we now designate as *2 Enoch*, it would be logical to assume that such types of 'maverick' sources did exist. Having remained steadily under the radar of mainstream scribal convention for centuries, they surfaced once again in the new intellectual landscape of *Slavia Orthodoxa*, the homeland of the final phase in the transmission history of *2 Enoch*.

The translation of its Greek protograph into Old Bulgarian/Old Church Slavonic, which was originally produced in Glagolitic script, was accomplished no later than the beginning of the 11th century, most probably in one of the monastic scriptoria in the vicinities of Preslav, the then capital of the First Bulgarian Kingdom. The composition circulated in shorter and longer recensions.[11]

10 As shown by some scholars, there are close textual parallels between *2 Enoch* and *The Apocalypse of Zostrianos* (Nag Hammadi VIII.1); see M. Scopello, '*The Apocalypse of Zostrianos* (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*', pp. 376–385; id., 'The Angels in Ancient Gnosis: Some Cases', p. 39.

11 Various editions of a number of Church Slavonic text witnesses (both to the longer and shorter recensions of *2 Enoch*, as well as their abbreviated redactions), along with segments from the composition, were published by A. Popov, *Obzor Khronografov Russkoĭ Redaktsii*, Vyp. 2, Moscow, 1869, pp. 162–169; id., 'Bibliograficheskie Materialy, Sobrannye Andreem Popovym (iv): Iuzhnorusskiĭ Sbornik 1679 goda', p. 67, pp. 75–83, pp. 89–139; S. Novaković, 'Apokrif o Enohu', *Starine* vol. 17 (1884), pp. 70–81; Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*, pp. 1–80; id., *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 1, pp. 109–161); Ĭord. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, pp. 165–191; St. Ivšić, 'Hrvatski Glagoljski Apokrif o Melhisedekovu Rođenju i Spasenju Za Općega Potopa', *Nastavni Vjesnik* (Zagreb, Matica Hrvatska), Knjiga 15 (1931/1932), pp. 101–108; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*; L. Navtanovich, 'Kniga Enokha', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *Biblioteka Literatury Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 3: *XI–XII veka*, Sankt Peterburg, 2004, pp. 204–241; T. Jovanović, 'Apokrif o Enohu prema Srpskom Prepisu is Narodne Biblioteke u Beču', pp. 224–237; J. Reinhart, 'A Croatian Glagolitic Excerpt of the Slavonic Enoch (*2 Enoch*)', *Fundamenta Europæa* vol. 4 (2007), pp. 31–46; V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 2: *Teksty Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ*, Sankt Peterburg, 2009, pp. 459–493; G. Macaskill, *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, pp. 38–268. (This list is not complete; for a survey of published text witnesses see the Appendix). For English, German, and French translations of the apocryphon (with commentaries), see W. Morfill, R. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch*; id., *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch*; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch. Texte slave et traduction française*; F. Andersen, '2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*. A New Translation and Introduction', pp. 102–221; A. Pennington,

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

The debate as to whether the longer recension represents an expanded edition of the shorter, or that the shorter is an abridged edition of the longer, is far from over; there is still no consensus among scholars as to whether the longer recension represents the pristine version of the earliest Old Church Slavonic translation of *2 Enoch* from Greek (thus preceding the shorter one), or the other way around. The earliest surviving text witnesses are dated to the 14th century.[12]

The main goal of the current discussion is therefore to examine the concept of hermetic knowledge, as interpreted in parabiblical narratives circulating in the Byzantine Commonwealth, and identify the sources facilitating the conversion, transfer and diffusion of certain mythographic templates (the earliest

'*2 Enoch*', pp. 321–362; Ch. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*; F. Badalanova Geller, *Second* (*Slavonic Apocalypse of*) *Enoch*: *Text and Context*, Berlin (Preprint 410), 2010; G. Macaskill, *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, pp. 269–322. (See further the Appendix.)

12 See also the discussion in N. Schmidt, 'The Two Recensions of *Slavonic Enoch*', pp. 307–312; N. Meshcherskiĭ, 'Sledy pamiatnikov Kumrana v staroslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ literature (K izucheniiu slavianskikh versiĭ Knigi Enokha)', pp. 130–147; id., 'K istorii teksta slavianskoĭ knigi Enokha', pp. 91–108; Ph. Alexander, 'From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of Biblical Enoch', pp. 101–108, pp. 116–117; Ch. Böttrich, 'Recent Studies in the Slavonic *Book of Enoch*', pp. 35–42; id., *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch*; id., 'Astrologie in der Henochtradition', pp. 222–245; id., '*The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (*2 En*): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission (An Overview)', pp. 37–67; A. Orlov, 'Celestial Choirmaster: the Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah Tradition', pp. 3–29; B. Khristova, *Kniga na Enokh*, Sofia, 2008; F. Badalanova Geller, 'Heavenly Writings: Celestial Cosmography in *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*,' *SL* vol. 45–46 (2012), pp. 197–244; id., 'Poetics of Errors', in K. Geus and M. Geller, *Productive Errors*: *Scientific Concepts in Antiquity* [TOPOI—Dahlem Seminar for the History of Ancient Sciences: Max Planck Preprint 430], Berlin, 2012, pp. 207–218; id., 'Geography of Heavens in the Byzantine Commonwealth: the Enochic Chronotope', in K. Geus and M. Thiering (eds), *Common Sense Geography and Mental Modeling* [Max Planck Preprint 426], Berlin, 2012, pp. 74–100; id., 'Recasting the Bible, Recapturing Eden (Parascriptural Cosmologies in the Byzantine Commonwealth)', in E.J.C. Tigchelaar (ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures* [*BETL* 270], Leuven, 2014, pp. 479–482; id., 'Creation Encrypted: Ontology Through Metaphor (*The Books of the Holy Secrets of Enoch the Just*)', in M. Witte and S. Behnke (eds), *The Metaphorical Use of Language in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* [Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2014/2015], Berlin–Boston, 2014–2015, pp. 381–409; id., 'Astronomical Knowledge in *The Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch*: Traces of Ancient Scientific Models', in J. Renn and M. Schemmel (eds), *Culture and Cognition*: *Essays in Honor of Peter Damerow*, Berlin, 2019, pp. 103–119. Several essays gathered in the collective monograph *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch* (published in 2012 under the editorship of A. Orlov and G. Boccaccini), are valuable and pertinent to the study of Enochic traditions in the Slavonic realm of the Byzantine Commonwealth.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV



FIGURE 22.1 Witch milking the Moon; fresco from the church of Archangel Michael, Leshko, South-Western Bulgaria. Painted in 1889. The inscription reads: 'А се магесница щото лаже людето ке свале месецо да го мазе въ место месецо даволо мазе' ('And this is a witch who lies to people, that she takes down the Moon to milk it, but milks [in fact] the Devil').
PHOTO: AUTHOR

attestations of which occur in ancient Enochic literature)[13] through the last *lingua sacra* of Europe, Old Church Slavonic ~~(see Figure 22.1)~~.[14]

13 A synoptic overview of Enochic motifs in early Christian literature is produced by J. VanderKam, '*1Enoch*, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature', in J.C. VanderKam and W. Adler (eds), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*: *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum*, Section III: Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature vol. 4, Van Gorcum, 1996, pp. 33–101. For a comparative analysis of passages from and/or references to writings attributed to Enoch in post-biblical Jewish, Christian and Muslim traditions, see J.C. Reeves and A. Yoshiko Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* vol. 1: *Sources From Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, Oxford, 2018.

14 It is most intriguing that there are some parallel mythologemes (e.g. the idolatrous use of heavenly bodies) that occur both in *3Enoch* 5:7–9, and in vernacular Slavonic witchcraft narratives (e.g. demonological fabulæ of cosmologically-oriented sorceries enabling witches to bring the moon down to earth to serve their will, etc.); these types of parallel mythologemes related to magical aspects in the *3Enoch* tradition on the one hand, and Slavonic (and Greek) folklore and iconography on the other, are analysed in F. Badalanova Geller, 'Mythographies of the Demonic (Notes on Slavonic and Balkan Ethnohermeneutics)', in J.M. Hartley and D.J.B. Show (eds), *Magic, Texts and Travel. Homage to a Scholar,*

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

2 Enochic Traditions in *Slavia Orthodoxa*: Tracing Primary Scribal Evidence

2.1 *The Book(s) of Enoch in Old Church Slavonic Indices of Hermetic/Secret Books: The Case of The Symeonic Florilegium*

The first reference to the Enochic apocryphal corpus in *Slavia Orthodoxa* appears in the *Symeonic Florilegium*,[15] the earliest edition of which was com-

Will Ryan, London, 2021, pp. 118–123, 126–127. Further on the attestations of the 'Bringing Down the Moon' demonologeme in modern Balkan oral traditions and iconography (without any reference to the Enochic traditions, however), see the discussion in L. Mikov, 'Luna/Krava, Lamia/Viatŭr: Metamorfoza i Tŭzhdestvo', *IIMK* vol. 4, issue 1 (1992), pp. 153–159 and O. Chokha, 'Novogrŭtski i bŭlgarski razkazi za mag'osnitsi, koito svaliat mesechinata', *BF* vol. 3 (2017), pp. 287–299; see also Figure 22.1 above.

15 Its earliest extant copy, the *Sviatoslav's Miscellany* (written in Cyrillic), is dated to 1073. The prevailing scholarly opinion holds that it was made in Kiev for Prince Sviatoslav the Second (hence its conventional designation), on the basis of an earlier—now nonextant—Bulgarian protograph. The manuscript containing the original Bulgarian edition was most probably taken as booty by his grandfather, Sviatoslav the First (945–972), during his military campaign against the First Bulgarian Kingdom, resulting in the devastation of the capital Preslav in 969; see K. Kuev, 'Poiava i razprostranenie na Simeonoviia sbornik', in P. Dinekov et al. (eds), *Simeonov Sbornik* (*Po Svetoslavoviia Prepis ot 1073*) vol. 1, Sofia, 1991, p. 35. The optico-photographic analysis of the palimpsest of the *Sviatoslav's Miscellany* conducted by palæographers shows that the name of the Kievan Prince Sviatoslav was written over the scratched name of the Bulgarian Tzar Symeon; see I. Levochkin, *'Izbornik Sviatoslava* i ego slavianskiĭ protograf', *SL* vol. 8 (1980), pp. 46–49; id., *'Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073*—pamiatnik drevnerusskoĭ kul'tury', in L.P. Zhukovskaia (ed.), *Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073* vol. 2: *Nauchnyĭ apparat faksimil'nogo izdaniia*, Moscow, 1983, p. 10. See also the discussion in J. Vrooland and W. Veder, 'O rukopisnoĭ traditsii *Simeonova Sbornika*', *Polata k"nigopis'naia* vol. 35 (2006), p. 70. The codex of the *Sviatoslav's Miscellany* is now part of the Synodal Collection [Синодальное собрание] of the State Historical Museum [Государственный исторический музей] in Moscow, Catalogue № 1043 (f. 80370). Fragments from the Ms. were published for the first time by K. Kalaĭdovich in his monograph *Ioann, Ekzarkh Bolgarskiĭ: Issledovanie, ob'iasniaiushchee istoriiu slovenskogo iazyka i literatury IX i X stoletiĭ*, Moskva, 1824, pp. 102–104, 133–136; a phototype edition of the codex was produced half a century later in Saint Petersburg, with an introduction by Gennadiĭ Karpov; see *Izbornik Velikogo Kniazia Sviatoslava Iaroslavicha 1073 goda*, Peterburg, 1880. In 1883, the first half of the corpus (with Greek parallels and Latin translation) was published in the academic series *ChIOIDR*, кн. 4 [Октябрь-Декабрь 1882], pp. 1–184, under the editorship of the late O. Bodianskiĭ, with an introduction by E. Barsov (ibid., pp. i–xxv), and with commentaries by A. Diuvernua (ibid., pp. 1–32). A century later a facsimile edition of the codex was produced under the editorship of L. Zhukovskaia; see *Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073*, Kn. 1: *Faksimil'noe Izdanie*; Kn. 2: *Nauchnyĭ Apparat Faksimil'nogo Izdaniia*, Moscow, 1983. The present study refers to the Old Church Slavonic edition of the text of the *Symeonic Florilegium* / *Sviatoslav's Miscellany* (1073) prepared under the editorship of P. Dinekov

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

piled[16] during the reign of Tzar Symeon (893–927) by scribes belonging to the Preslav Literary School,[17] on the basis of a Greek (Byzantine) *Vorlage*.[18] The editorial work on this encyclopædic compendium was most probably carried

---

et al., *Simeonov Sbornik*. Taken into consideration is also the second, updated edition by P. Ianeva et al., *Simeonov Sbornik* (*Po Svetoslavoviia Prepis ot 1073*) vol. 3: *Grŭtski Izvori*, Sofia, 2015, pp. 119–1221, in which the Old Church Slavonic text is presented together with the parallel Byzantine Greek sources (see also notes 16, 17 and 18 below). For a concise bibliographic survey of editions of the original Church Slavonic Mss. containing the *Symeonic Florilegium*, along with relevant secondary literature, see O. Tvorogov, 'Izbornik 1073', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *Slovar' Knizhnikov i Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi*, Vyp. 1: XI—pervaia polovina XIV veka, Leningrad, 1987, pp. 194–196; P. Ianeva et al. (eds); see *Simeonov Sbornik* vol. 3: *Grŭtski Izvori*, pp. 102–108, 1223–1239; M. Dimitrova, 'Bulgarian Studies on the Reception of Byzantine Literature in Medieval Bulgaria', in E. Bakalova, M. Dimitrova and M.A. Johnson (eds), *Medieval Bulgarian Art and Letters in a Byzantine Context*, Sofia, 2017, pp. 323–324. See also http://catalog.shm.ru/entity/OBJECT/178472?fund=21&index=11.

16 As pointed out by scholars, the corpus of the *Florilegium* is extant in Greek (Σωτήριος), including the final list of emperors, and the Slavonic version is a translation-by-compilation using extant translations; see the discussion in W. Veder, 'Shest tsitata ot *Lestvitsata*', in V. Panaĭotov et al. (eds), *ТРИАНТАФУЛЛО*: *In Honorem Hristo Trendafilov* [Iubileen sbornik v chest na 60-godishninata na Khristo Trendafilov], Shumen, 2013, pp. 283–294; id., 'Michael Syncellus' *Libellus de recta fide*: Translation and Revision', *RS* 15 (2017), pp. 359–383. For a second translation, see F.J. Thomson, 'A Comparison of the Contents of the Two Translations of the *Symeonic Florilegium* on the Basis of the Greek Original Texts', *KMS* vol. 17 (2007), pp. 721–758. (Courtesy William R. Veder).

17 Further on the *Symeonic Florilegium*, see the discussion in I. Ševčenko, 'Remarks on the Diffusion of Byzantine Scientific and Pseudo-Scientific Literature among the Orthodox Slavs', *SEER* vol. 59, issue 3 (1981), pp. 330–334; H. Lunt, 'On the *Izbornik* of 1073', *HUS* vol. 7 (1983) [= *Okeanos*: *Essays presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*], pp. 359–376; F. Thomson, '*The Symeonic Florilegium*: Problems of Its Origin, Content, Textology and Edition (Together with an English Translation of the *Eulogy* of Tzar Symeon)', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 17, issue 1 (1993), pp. 37–53; id., 'A Contribution to the Textology of the *Symeonic Florilegium* (Together with the 'Editio Princeps' of the Part of Anastasian Question 20 Missing in the Codex of 1073)', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* vol. 28, issues 1–4 (2006) [= *Rus' Writ Large*: *Languages, Histories, Cultures. Essays Presented in Honor of Michael S. Flier on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*], pp. 307–327; I. Duĭchev, 'Kŭm izuchavaneto na Izbornika ot 1973', *SL* vol. 5 (1979), pp. 115–122; P. Dinekov, 'Simeonoviiat (Svetoslavoviiat) *Izbornik* 1073 v razvitieto na bŭlgarskata literatura', *SL* vol. 5 (1979), pp. 3–9; id., 'Kulturno-Istoricheskoto Znachenie na Simeonoviia Sbornik', in P. Dinekov et al. (eds), *Simeonov Sbornik*, pp. 9–17; K. Ivanova, 'Simeonoviiat Sbornik Kato Literaturen Pametnik', in *Simeonov Sbornik* pp. 18–33; K. Kuev, 'Arkheografski belezhki za razprostranenieto na Simeonoviia (Svetoslavoviia) sbornik v starite slavianski literaturi', *SL* vol. 5 (1979), pp. 38–56; id., 'Poiava i razprostranenie na Simeonoviia sbornik', pp. 34–98; N. Rozov, 'Stareĭshiĭ bolgarskiĭ *Izbornik* i ego russkaia rukopisnaia traditsiia', *IANSSSR/SLIA* vol. 28, issue 1 (1969), pp. 75–79; I. Levochkin, 'Izbornik Sviatoslava i ego slavianskiĭ protograf', 46–49; id., 'Izbornik Sviatoslava (Simeona) v russkoĭ dorevoliutsion-

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

out in the royal scriptorium, where medieval Bulgarian literati also translated a cluster of other landmarks of Byzantine Greek intellectual thought and scientific culture (e.g. *The Hexæmeron*,[19] *The Exact Exposition of the Orthodox*

noĭ i sovetskoĭ nauke (1817–1982)', *SL* vol. 16 (1984), pp. 33–40; id., 'Izbornik Sviatoslava i russkie sborniki XV–XVII vekov', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *TODRL* vol. 40, Leningrad, 1985, pp. 373–378; G. Barankova et al., 'Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073 goda. Nekotorye drevnerusskie i iuzhnoslavianskie cherty rukopisi', in N.I. Tolstoĭ (ed.), *Slavianskoe Iazykoznanie*: *X Mezhdunarodnyi S"ezd Slavistov* (*Sofiia 1988*). *Doklady Sovetskoĭ Delegatsii*, Moscow, 1988, pp. 3–17; A. Iurchenko, 'Izbornik 1073 goda: interpretatsiia osnovnykh drevnerusskikh filosofskikh terminov', *VoprIazyk* vol. 2 (1988), pp. 75–90; D. Likhachev, 'Sud'ba rukopisi *Izbornika* 1073 g. v XIV v.', in D.S. Likhachev, A.A. Alekseev and M.A. Salmina (eds), *TODRL* vol. 49, Saint Petersburg, 1996, pp. 297–299; P. Ianeva et al. (eds), *Simeonov Sbornik* vol. 3: *Grŭtski Izvori*, pp. 11–118; J. Vrooland and W. Veder, 'O rukopisnoĭ traditsii *Simeonova Sbornika*', pp. 68–80; A. Angusheva-Tikhanova et al., 'Knizhovnostta po vremeto na Tsar Simeon', in V. Giuzelev, Il. Iliev and K. Nenov (eds), *Bŭlgarskiiat Zlaten Vek. Sbornik V Chest Na Simeon Veliki* (893–927), Plovdiv, 2015, pp. 228–230; S. Temcinas (= Temchin), 'Novyĭ vostochnoslavianskiĭ spisok Izbornika bolgarskogo tsaria Simeona iz Velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo', *Knygotyra* (Vilnius) vol. 65 (2015), pp. 254–268.

18 See the discussion in M. Bibikov, *Vizantiĭskiĭ Prototip Drevneĭsheĭ Slavianskoĭ Knigi*: *Izbornik Svyatoslava 1073 g*, Moscow, 1996; P. Ianeva, 'Notions of fate, happiness and unhappiness in Byzantine and Old Bulgarian Cultural Environment (based on material from Tzar Symeon's *Florilegium* and its corresponding Greek anthologies)', in V. Giuzelev and A. Miltenova (eds), *Srednovekovna Khristianska Evropa: Iztok i Zapad*, Sofia, 2002, pp. 586–593; P. Ianeva, S. Ivanov and M. Slavova, *Spasitelna Kniga: Grŭtskiiat Original na Simeonoviia Sbornik*: *Kniga, Proizkhozhdashta i Sŭstavena ot Razlichni Rechi i Dushepolezni Razkazi, Narechena Spasitelna* [Transl. from Greek, with Introduction and Commentaries by Petia Ianeva and Sergeĭ Ivanov; ed. by Mirena Slavova], Sofia, 2008; P. Ianeva and S. Ivanov, 'Dubliranite pasazhi v *Izbornika* ot 1073', *Godishnik na Sofiĭskiia Universitet "Sv. Kliment Okhridksi"* (*Tsentŭr za Slaviano-Vizantiĭski prouchvaniia "Ivan Duĭchev"*) vol. 96/15 (2009), pp. 173–180; F. Thomson, 'A Comparison of the Contents of the Two Translations of the Symeonic Florilegium on the Basis of the Greek Original Texts', *KMS* vol. 17 (2007), pp. 721–758; id., 'The Symeonic Florilegium: An Analysis of Its Relation to the Greek Textological Tradition and Its Association with Tsar Symeon, Together with an Excursus on the Old Believers and the Codex of 1073', *KMS* vol. 18 (2009), pp. 248–308. The recent collective monograph by P. Ianeva et al. (eds), *Simeonov Sbornik* vol. 3: *Grŭtski Izvori*, offers concise textological analysis of the Greek Byzantine counterparts of the *Symeonic Florilegium* (i.e. *Coislinianus græcus* 120, *Coislinianus græcus* 258, *Vaticanus grækus* 423, *Ambrosianus græcus* 489, olim L 88 sup, along with *Athous Lauræ G* 115).

19 Assembled by John the Exarch, one of the most prominent scholars of the Preslav Literary School, the compilation offers the earliest Old Bulgarian/Old Church Slavonic edition of translated fragments from the *Homiliæ in Hexæmeron* of Basil of Cæsarea (ca. 329–379) and *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ* of Severian of Gabala (ca. 380–ca. 408/425). The authorship of the selected excerpts from Severian's *Homilies*, however, is ascribed to John Chrysostom. As pointed out by scholars, the Greek protograph used by John the Exarch must have followed the contemporary Byzantine scribal tradition of pseudepigraphic

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Faith of John Damascene,[20] several collections of excerpts from the *Homilies* of John Chrysostom (*Chryssorrhoas*),[21] along with *The Chronography of*

attribution of the authorship of Severian's *Homilies* to John Chrysostom; see V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 2: *Teksty Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ*, p. 94. Included in the content of John the Exarch's *Hexæmeron* are also selected excerpts from the Byzantine redaction of Aristotle's *History of Animals*, along with some other compositions. For text editions of John the Exarch's *Hexæmeron*, see R. Aitzetmüller, *Das Hexæmeron des Exarchen Johannes. Editiones monumentorum slavicorum veteris dialecti*. Bd. 1–6, Graz, 1958–1975. For other editions of the Old Church Slavonic text (with translation into modern Russian and commentary apparatus), see G. Barankova and V. Mil'kov, *Shestodnev Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo*, Sankt Petersburg, 2001; V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 1: *Teksty Geotsentricheskoĭ Traditsii*, Sankt Peterburg, 2008, pp. 125–209; vol. 2: *Teksty Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ*, pp. 120–157. See also the discussion in Ts. Cholova, *Estestvenonauchnite znaniia v Srednovekovna Bŭlgariia*, Sofia, 1988, pp. 16–22, 35–36; V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 1: *Teksty Geotsentricheskoĭ Traditsii*, pp. 21–24, 110–124; vol. 2: *Teksty Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ*, pp. 9–10, 87–91, 117–119; L. Sels and S. Van Pee, 'Scholia from Severian of Gabala's *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ* in the 14th-century Slavonic *Hexæmeron* Collection', in A. Angusheva, M. Dimitrova et al. (eds), *Vis et Sapientia: Studia in honorem Anisavæ Miltenova*, Sofia, 2016, pp. 89–110; Kh. Trendafilov, *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona* (*Chetiri Instalatsii*), Shumen, 2017, pp. 231, 445–446. For a concise bibliographical survey of publications on John the Exarch's *Hexæmeron*, see G. Prokhorov, 'Shestodnevy', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *Slovar' Knizhnikov i Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi*, Vyp. 1: *XI—Pervaia Polovina XIV Veka*, Leningrad, 1987, pp. 481–483; V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 2: *Teksty Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ*, pp. 91–94; M. Dimitrova, 'Bulgarian Studies on the Reception of Byzantine Literature in Medieval Bulgaria', pp. 319–321. See also the discussion below (§ 2.4).

20 The Slavonic designation of John of Damascus's Ἔκθησις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως (= *De Fide Orthodoxa*) is rendered either as *Богословие* [*Theology*], or *Небеса* [*Heavens*]. The translation into Old Bulgarian/Old Church Slavonic was made by John the Exarch. For editions of the text, see L. Sadnik, *Des Hl. Johannes von Damaskus* Ἔκθησις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως *in der Übersetzung des Exarchen Johannes* vol. 1: *Monumenta Linguæ Slavicæ Dialecti Veteris* 5, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967; vol. 2: *Monumenta Linguæ Slavicæ Dialecti Veteris* 14; vol. 3: *Monumenta Linguæ Slavicæ Dialecti Veteris* 16; vol. 4: *Monumenta Linguæ Slavicæ Dialecti Veteris* 17, Freiburg, 1981–1984. Fragments from the Old Bulgarian/Old Church Slavonic corpus (with translation into modern Russian and commentaries) are published by V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 1: *Teksty Geotsentricheskoĭ Traditsii*, pp. 51–109. See also the discussion in F. Thomson, 'John the Exarch's theological education and proficiency in Greek as revealed by his abridged translation of John of Damascus's *De Fide Orthodoxa*', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 15, issue 1 (1991), pp. 35–58; Kh. Trendafilov, '*Nebesa* Ioanna Ekzarkha kak porozhdaiushchaia model' (obzor spiskov i struktura teksta)', in T. Totev (ed.), *Под*

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

John Malalas,[22] *The Chronography of George Hamartolos*,[23] *The Chronography of George Synkellos* (containing abridged edited fragments from *The Chroni-*

Godini Veliki Preslav vol. 2, Shumen, 1995, pp. 60–90; id., 'Perevody *Bogosloviia* Ioanna Damaskina v russkoĭ i slavianskoĭ filologii', in A.A. Alekseev et al. (eds), *TODRL* vol. 50, Sankt Peterburg, 1996, pp. 658–667; id., *'Bogoslovie* Ioanna Damaskina v perevode Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo (*Nebesa*) i original'nye proizvedeniia drevnerusskoĭ literatury XI–XVI vv.', *PrKnSh* vol. 3, Shumen, 1998, pp. 85–118; id., 'Ioann Ekzarkh i stanovlenie slavianskogo teologicheskogo monologizma', in A. Angusheva and A. Miltenova (eds), *Medievistika i Kulturna Antropologiia. Sbornik v chest na 40-godishnata tvorcheska deĭsnost na Prof. Donka Petkanova*, Sofia, 1998, pp. 154–161; id., 'Predislovie Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo k perevodu *Bogosloviia* (*Nebesa*) Ioanna Damaskina v drevnerusskoĭ rukopisnoĭ traditsii', in V.M. Zagrebin (ed.), *Rus' i Iuzhnye Slaviane. Sbornik Stateĭ k 100-letiiu so Dnia Rozhdeniia V.A. Moshina* (1894–1994), Sankt Peterburg, 1998, pp. 305–313; id., *Ioann Ekzarkh Bŭlgarski*, Sofia, 2001; id., *'Nebesa* Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo v drevnerusskoĭ rukopisnoĭ traditsii', in *Glubini Knizhnie* vol. 2, Shumen, 2004, pp. 9–73; id., *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona*, p. 242; V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 1: *Teksty Geotsentricheskoĭ Traditsii*, pp. 43–50; T. Ilieva, *Terminologichnata Leksika v Ioan–Ekzarkhoviia Prevod na "De Fide Orthodoxa"* Sofia, 2013.

21 See F. Thomson, 'The Nature of the Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implications for Russian Culture', *Slavia Gandensia* vol. 5 (1978), pp. 109–110; Kh. Trendafilov, *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona*, pp. 227–228; M. Dimitrova, 'Bulgarian Studies on the Reception of Byzantine Literature in Medieval Bulgaria', pp. 327–328.

22 Cf. V.M. Istrin, 'Pervaia Kniga Khroniki Ioanna Malaly', *Zapiski Imperatorskoĭ Akademii Nauk*, Seriia 8: *Istoriko-Filologicheskoe Otdelenie* vol. 1: 3 (1897), pp. 1–29; M. Chernysheva (ed.), *Khronika Ioanna Malaly v slavianskom perevode*. Reprintnoe izdanie V.M. Istrina. Podgotovka izdaniia, vstupitel'naia stat'ia i prilozheniia M.I. Chernyshevoĭ, Moscow, 1994. Malalas's corpus is the earliest extant representative of the Byzantine chronographic genre. Scholars suggest that the author makes use of some earlier sources (e.g. the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius of Cæsarea, the *Chronological Epitome* of Eustathius of Epiphania, etc.). Apart from the 'classic' annals from Creation until the reign of Justinian I (482–565), this historical synopsis contains an idiosyncratic mythographic account devoted to the Hellenistic pantheon (with an elaborate list of deities functioning as heroes-demiurges). Woven into the fabric of the *Chronography* is also a picturesque tale describing the events of the Trojan War (thus further transmitting Homeric tradition). It has been suggested that this particular portion of Malalas's corpus most probably recycles a number of sources, the purported authorship of which may be attributed either to one of the legendary contemporaries of Idomeneus (one of Helen's suitors), Dictys of Crete (*Dictys Cretensis Ephemeris belli Trojani*), or to the no less mysterious Dares Phrygius (*Daretis Phrygii de excidio Trojæ historia*), or to some other writers working in the Mediterranean world in Late Antiquity. In any case, Malalas's rendition of the history of the Trojan War became one of the 'bestsellers' among the elite circles of medieval Bulgaria, and in particular in Symeon's court; see Ĭ. Moskova, '*Troianskiiat Tsikŭl* v traktovkata na Ĭoan Malala', *PrKnSh* vol. 9 (2006), pp. 257–269. Furthermore, according to the domesticated editions of Malalas's tale of the Trojan War, the ethnicity of 'the Bulgarians' is identical to that of 'the Myrmidons', the warriors of Achilles; see ibid., pp. 267–268. Further on *The Chronogra-*

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

cle of Julius Africanus),[24] together with works like *The Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes*,[25] etc.). This remarkable undertaking was certainly con-

---

phy of John Malalas in *Slavia Orthodoxa*, see O. Tvorogov, 'Antichnye mify v drevnerusskoĭ literature XI–XIV vekov', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *TODRL* vol. 33 (1977), pp. 6–20; D. Bulanin, *Antichnye Traditsii v Drevnerusskoĭ Literature XI–XVI vv.* [Slavistische Beiträge, Band 278], München, 1991, pp. 30–34, 41–44, 53; Ĭord. Moskova, 'Mitologichni motivi v Khronikata na Ĭoan Malala za proizkhoda na tsarskata institutsiia i na vladetelskite insignia', *PrKnSh* vol. 12 (2012), pp. 210–221; id., 'Geroite ot antichnata mitologiia spored Khronikata na Ĭoan Malala', in Tz. Ianakieva et al. (eds), *Quadrivium: In Honorem Veselin Panaĭotov*, Shumen, 2016, pp. 237–257; id., 'Simvolikata na khipodruma v Svetovnata Khronika na Ĭoan Malala', *PrKnSh* vol. 18 (2018), pp. 211–216; D. Peev, 'Portretni opisaniia i lichnostni kharakteristiki v Khronikata na Ĭoan Malala', *PrKnSh* vol. 9 (2006), pp. 270–293. For a brief survey of primary and secondary sources, see O. Tvorogov, 'Khronika Ioanna Malaly', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *Slovar' Knizhnikov i Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi*, Vyp. 1: XI—pervaia polovina XIV veka, Leningrad, 1987, pp. 471–474.

23 *The Chronography of George Hamartolos* was translated in Bulgaria during the reign of Tsar Symeon by unnamed scribe(s)/scholar(s) of the Preslav literary school; see the discussion in R. Stankov, 'Drevnebolgarskiĭ perevod Khroniki Georgiia Amartola v drevnerusskoĭ pis'mennoĭ traditsii', *SL* vol. 39–40 (2008), pp. 45–103; id., 'Drevnebolgarskiĭ perevod Khroniki Georgiia Amartola i Khronograf po Velikomu Izlozheniiu', *PrKnSh* vol. 12 (2012), pp. 191–209; id.,'Iz nabliudeniĭ nad leksikoĭ drevnebolgarskogo perevoda Khroniki Georgiia Amartola', in V. Panaĭotov et al. (eds), *TRIANTAFYLLO: In Honorem Hristo Trendafilov*, Shumen, 2013, pp. 327–332; V. Zheliazkova, 'Edin paralel mezhdu Kniga Izkhod, Simeonoviia Sbornik i Khronikata na Georgi Amartol', *PrKnSh* vol. 10 (2008), pp. 266–280; Kh. Trendafilov, *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona*, p. 229; D. Bulanin, *Antichnye Traditsii v Drevnerusskoĭ Literature XI–XVI vv*., pp. 37, 43–44; M. Dimitrova, 'Bulgarian Studies on the Reception of Byzantine Literature in Medieval Bulgaria', pp. 361 (note 235). Among the first to publish Russian redactions of *The Chronography of George Hamartolos* was V.M. Istrin, *Knigy Vremennyia i obraznyia Georgiia Mnikha*: *Khronika Georgiia Amartola v drevnem slaviano-russkom perevode* (Tekst, izsledovanie i slovar'), Tom 1, Petrograd, 1920; see also the edition provided by T. Anisimova, *Khronika Georgiia Amartola v drevnerusskikh spiskakh XIV–XV vv.*, Москва, 2009.

24 See Kh. Trendafilov, 'Nabliudeniia vŭrkhu Slavianskiia Prevod na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 14, issue 4 (1990), pp. 100–110; id., *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona*, p. 228; A. Totomanova, *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel*: *Izdanie i Komentar*, Sofia, 2008; id., 'A Lost Byzantine Chronicle in Slavic Translation', *SC* vol. 1 (2011), pp. 191–204; id., '*The Chronicle of Julius Africanus* in Slavic Translation', Scripta & e-Scripta vol. 19–11 (2012), pp. 237–246; id., 'Nazvaniiata na bibleĭskite knigi v slavianski ekstserpt ot Khronikata na Iulii Afrikan', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 38, issue 1 (2014), pp. 45–53. See also the discussion below (§ 2.3). Because of significant divergences between the original Greek edition of *The Chronography of George Synkellos* [Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας] and its heavily redrafted Slavonic version, we prefer to designate the latter compilation as *The Slavonic Derivative of the Chronicle of George Synkellos*.

25 Translated in the Preslav Literary Centre most probably in the 10th century; see Kh. Trendafilov, *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona*, pp. 227–228. For a survey of extant Slavonic Mss. and critical text-edition of one of the witnesses, with commentaries, see V.V. Mil'kov and S.M. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 2: *Teksty*

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

sidered by the ambitious Bulgarian ruler to be of highest priority and utmost importance for his reputation as an erudite sovereign of a mighty kingdom, the intellectual standing of which was to challenge that of glorious Byzantium. Indeed, at that time the *Florilegia* were rather fashionable among the men of letters of the 'upper-crust' *Orbis Orthodoxus*. Since Symeon himself had spent his formative years in the famous School of Magnaura, which was conventionally attended by the prosperous youth of the imperial nobility, it was no doubt his ultimate ambition to acquire for his library all the mandatory items of contemporary literature which his Byzantine counterparts had in their possession. It was a matter of prestige; and, of course, prestige has always been the precious commodity bolstering the reputation of statesmen. The library of the Bulgarian Tzar Symeon—praised as a 'new Ptolemy' in the solemn *Eulogy*[26] included in the *Florilegium* (which, needless to say, was commissioned by him)—was supposed to attest not only to his erudition, but also to his impeccable image as a key player in the socio-political games shaping the *mappa mundi* of contemporary *Pax Christiana*.[27] Although he was regarded by his Greek contemporaries as an endless source of trouble,—an adversary as dangerous as he was unpredictable,—Symeon was first and foremost a sophisticated, learned offspring of Byzantium, whose intellectual pedigree stemmed straight from the heart of elitist Constantinople.[28] In fact, his tutor was none other than the most prolific theologian of his time, the eminent Patriarch Photios (ca. 810–ca. 893),

---

Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ, pp. 22–86. See also the general discussion in W. Wolska-Conus, *La topographie chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustes: théologie et sciences au VIe siècle* vol. 3, Bibliothèque Byzantine, Paris, 1962.

26 Cf. F. Thomson, '*The Symeonic Florilegium*: Problems of Its Origin, Content, Textology and Edition (Together with an English Translation of the *Eulogy* of Tzar Symeon)', pp. 37–53.

27 The royal library of Symeon was most probably a repository of different types of Mss. written in either Old Bulgarian/Old Church Slavonic, or in Greek. The books gathered in the Greek collection must have been imported, of course, from Byzantium. As for the items in Slavonic—they were either translations from Greek, or compilations made on the basis of domesticated editions of such translations, or original Slavonic compositions written by intellectuals belonging to the local Preslav Literary School. On the hypothetical reconstruction of the list of titles that the royal library of Symeon may have contained, see Kh. Trendafilov, *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona*, pp. 418–420, 430–447.

28 See in this connection the recent discussion in P. Angelov, 'Obrazŭt na Tsar Simeon vŭv vizantiĭskata knizhnina', in V. Giuzelev, Il. Iliev and K. Nenov (eds), *Bŭlgarskiiat Zlaten Vek. Sbornik V Chest Na Simeon Veliki* [893–927], Plovdiv, 2015, pp. 331–346; A. Angusheva-Tikhanova et al., 'Knizhovnostta po vremeto na Tsar Simeon', pp. 213–276; Kh. Trendafilov, *Mladostta na Tsar Simeon*, Sofia, 2010; id., *Tsar i Vek*: *Vremeto na Simeona*; M. Kaĭmakamova, 'Svetovnata istoriia v propagandnata politika na Tsar Simeon Veliki i razvitieto na bŭlgarskata khronografiia', in V. Giuzelev, Il. Iliev and K. Nenov (eds), *Bŭlgarskiiat Zlaten Vek. Sbornik V Chest Na Simeon Veliki* [893–927], Plovdiv, 2015, pp. 301–330.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

whose authority profoundly influenced not only the Bulgarian Tzar, but also the production of the Preslav Literary School. Furthermore, the current research shows that some works featuring in the content of the *Symeonic Florilegium* were analogous to those included in Photios's *Bibliotheca* (*Myriobiblon*).[29]

To sum up, the *Symeonic Florilegium* was meant to be part of the royal celebrated library in Preslav reflecting the Byzantine imperial model; it was designed as an anthology containing diverse articles dealing with various spheres of knowledge. An emblematic representative of its genre, it was assembled as an exegetical compendium of erotapocritical[30] and gnomological, homiletic and apophthegmatic texts discussing matters related to Christian theology and ethics, doctrinal education, grammar and rhetoric,[31] philosophy[32] and science (including astronomy[33] and calendrical data,[34] mineralogy[35] and

29 See P. Ianeva, '*Bibliotekata* na Patriarkh Fotiĭ i *Simeonoviia Sbornik*', in E. Gergova (ed.), *Medievistichni Rakursi: Topos i enigma v kulturata na pravoslavnite slaviani*, Sofia, 1993, pp. 28–32; Kh. Trendafilov, *Mladostta na Tsar Simeon*, pp. 23–32; A. Totomanova, 'A Lost Byzantine Chronicle in Slavic Translation', pp. 202–203.

30 E.g. Pseudo–Anastasian's *Quæstiones et responsiones*; see K. Ivanova, 'Simeonoviiat Sbornik Kato Literaturen Pametnik', pp. 19–21, 23–24, 27; F. Thomson, 'A Contribution to the Textology of the *Symeonic Florilegium* Together with the 'Editio Princeps' of the Part of Anastasian Question 20 Missing in the Codex of 1073', pp. 307–327.

31 E.g. George Choiroboskos's treatise *On Poetic Figures* (*Περὶ τρόπων*). In the *Symeonic Florilegium*, the title is rendered as *Гєорьгиꙗ Хоуровьска о образѣхъ*. The text is copied on fols 237–240 of *Sviatoslav's Miscellany*; see P. Ianeva et al. (eds), *Simeonov Sbornik* vol. 3: *Grŭtski Izvori*, pp. 1100–1113. Among the first to prepare an edition of the original Old Church Slavonic text of Choiroboskos's treatise (on the basis of *Sviatoslav's Miscellany*) was the Bulgarian scholar B. St. Angelov, who published it together with the original Greek text (*Γεωργίου Χοιροβοσκοῦ περὶ τρόπων*) in his study 'Georgi Khirovosk: *Za poeticheskite figuri*'; see ibid., *Iz starata bŭlgarska, ruska i srŭbska literatura*, Kn. 2, Sofia, 1967, pp. 89–105. See also the discussion in E. Velkovska, 'Traktatŭt na Georgi Khirovosk *Za tropite*, negoviiat slavianski prevod i vizantiĭskata ritoricheska traditsiia', *SL* vol. 19 (1986), pp. 75–83; K. Ivanova, 'Simeonoviiat Sbornik Kato Literaturen Pametnik', pp. 27–28. For the translation of the text into modern Russian (with commentaries), see K. Maksimovich, '*O Tropakh ili Ob Oborotakh Rechi*: Traktat Georgiia Khirovoska v *Izbornike* Sviatoslava 1073. (Perevod i kommentariĭ)', in *Istoriko-Kul'turnyĭ Aspekt Leksikologicheskogo Opisaniia Russkogo Iazyka* vol. 1, Moscow, 1991, pp. 112–119.

32 On philosophical terminology attested in the *Symeonic Florilegium*, see A. Iurchenko, 'Izbornik 1073 goda: interpretatsiia osnovnykh drevnerusskikh filosofskikh terminov', pp. 75–90.

33 See W. Ryan, *The Bathhouse at Midnight. An Historical Survey of Magic and Divination in Russia*, Phoenix Mill–Thrupp–Stroud, 1999, p. 376, pp. 384–385; Iv. Dobrev, 'Redŭt na Zodiakalnite Znatsi v *Izbornika* ot 1073', *SL* vol. 5 (1979), pp. 101–106; El. Musakova, 'Redŭt na zodiakalnite znatsi v Simeonoviia sbornik (Svetoslavov prepis ot 1073): opit za rekonstruktsiia', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 16, issue 2 (1992), pp. 123–132.

34 See W. Ryan, *The Bathhouse at Midnight*, p. 381.

35 E.g. the treatise *On the Twelve Stones* (*Περὶ τῶν δώδεκα λίθων, De duodecim gemmis*) of

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

medicine,[36] dietary prescriptions and proscriptions,[37] etc.), along with dogmatic patristic writings.[38]

It is in one of the concluding chapters of the *Symeonic Florilegium* where the earliest reference to the Enochic traditions in *Slavia Orthodoxa* is found, in the fragment entitled 'These [books] are [considered] hermetic / secret / esoteric'[39] [ієлнкоже ськровьнъынхъ],[40] the authorship of which is attributed to Isidore (of Pelusium?) (d. ca. 450). In fact, *Enoch* is listed at the very top of the *Index*, coming in second position after the *Vita Adæ*:

> ієлнкоже ськровьнъынхъ · адамъ ·в̄· ієнохъ ·г̄· малехъ ·д̄· патрьарсн ·ē· молнтва носнфова ·s̄· ієлдад ·ẕ̄· ѕавѣтъ мооуснnъ ·н̄· въсходъ мооусннn

Epiphanius of Salamis; on the reception history of this text in *Slavia Orthodoxa*, see I. Trifonova, 'Za dvanadesette kamŭka (*De duodecim gemmis*) na Epfaniĭ Kipŭrski v sŭstava na iuzhnoslavianskata tŭlkovna redaktsiia na Apokalipsisa', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 42, issue 4 (2018), pp. 73–90.

36 See also the discussion in I.A. Gerasimova, V.V. Mil'kov and R.A. Simonov, *Sokrovennye Znaniia Drevneĭ Rusi*, Moscow, 2015, pp. 166–167.

37 On the explication of temporal characteristics of dietology (in relation to months) in the *Symeonic Florilegium*, see Ts. Cholova, *Estestvenonauchnite znaniia v Srednovekovna Bŭlgariia*, pp. 288–290; W. Ryan, *The Bathhouse at Midnight*, p. 381; I.A. Gerasimova, V.V. Mil'kov and R.A. Simonov, *Sokrovennye Znaniia Drevneĭ Rusi*, pp. 356–364.

38 Included in the *Symeonic Florilegium* are fragments from works of Justin Martyr, Irenæus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil of Cæsarea (Basil the Great), Gregory of Nazianzus (Gregory the Theologian), John Chrysostom, etc.; see K. Ivanova, 'Simeonoviiat Sbornik Kato Literaturen Pametnik', p. 21.

39 Var. 'Those of [books] which are [considered] hidden / apocryphal'; in Western scholarship designated as *The Index of Prohibited / Proscribed Books* [Lat. *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*] (see also the discussion below). For a general survey of various redactions (and Mss. copies) of these types of *Indices* in *Slavia Orthodoxa*, see A. Iatsimirskiĭ, *Bibliograficheskiĭ Obzor Apokrifov v Iuzhnoslavianskoĭ i Russkoĭ Pis'mennosti*, pp. 1–75; B. Angelov, 'Spisŭkŭt na zabranenite knigi v starobŭlgarskata literatura', *IIBL* vol. 1 (1952), pp. 107–159; B. Semenovker, 'Grecheskie spiski istinnykh i lozhnykh knig i ikh retseptsii na Rusi', in D.S. Likhachev (ed.), *TODRL* vol. 40, Leningrad, 1985, pp. 206–228; I. Gritsevskaia, *Indeksy Istinnykh Knig*, Saint Petersburg, 2003; id., 'Indeksy istinnykh i lozhnykh knig v Volokolamskom monastyre', in N.V. Ponyrko (ed.), *TODRL* vol. 58, Saint Petersburg, 2008, pp. 494–504; I. Gritsevskaya, 'Some Problems of Textology of *Indexes of Prohibited Books*', in L. DiTommaso and Ch. Böttrich (eds), *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity*, Tübingen, 2011, pp. 201–223; I.A. Gerasimova, V.V. Mil'kov and R.A. Simonov, *Sokrovennye Znaniia Drevneĭ Rusi*, pp. 253–257. See also F. Thomson, 'The Nature of the Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implications for Russian Culture', p. 123 (note 21).

40 *The Index of Hermetic/Secret/Esoteric Books* is copied on Fol. 254 of the *1073 Sviatoslav's Miscellany* codex from the Synodal Collection of the State Historical Museum in Moscow (Catalogue № 1043, f. 8037); see also note 15 above.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

·ѳ̄· ѱалмосн соломонн ·і̄· нлннно обавленніє ·іа· нсаннно вндѣннiє ·ів· софонннно обавленніє ·іг· ꙁахарннно ıавленніє ·дı̄· нıковла повѣсть ·іе̄· петрово обавленніє ·ı̄s̄· обьходн н оученıа апласка ·н̄і· варнавле посъланніє ·іѳ̄· дѣıаннiє паулe ·к̄· паулово обавленніє ·к̄а· оученніє клнментово ·к̄в· нгнатово оученніє ·к̄г· полоукарпово оученніє ·к̄д· еуаггелніє отъ варнавъı ·к̄е· еуаггелніє отъ матѳеа.[41]

These [books] are [considered] hermetic/secret:[42] [first,] *Adam* ⟨*Adam*ъ⟩;[43] second, [*The Book*(*s*) *of*] *Enoch* ⟨*Ienokh*ъ⟩; third, *Malech* ⟨*Malekh*ъ (*Lamech*?)⟩;[44] fourth, [*The Testaments of the Twelve*] *Patriarchs*

41 Cf. Dinekov et al. (eds), *Simeonov Sbornik* vol. 1, p. 701; see also P. Ianeva et al. (eds), *Simeonov Sbornik* vol. 3: *Grŭtski Izvori*, pp. 1166–1167.

42 Var. 'esoteric'/'treasured'/'hidden'/'apocryphal'; see the discussion below.

43 Unclear; it either refers to *The Life of Adam and Eve* (which in Greek tradition is conventionally designated as *The Apocalypse of Moses*), or to another apocryphal composition, such as *The Book About the Daughters of Adam*: *Leptogenesis* (i.e. *The Book of Jubilees*), *The Book Which is Called the Penitence of Adam, The Apocalypse of Adam*, etc. (as listed in the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum*, for instance); see W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1: *Gospels and Related Writings* [Revised edition ed. by Wilhelm Schneemelcher; English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson], Cambridge, 1990, p. 39. See further M.D. Johnson, 'Life of Adam and Eve', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2: *Expansions of the 'Old Testament' and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo–Hellenistic Works*, Garden City, N.Y., 1985, pp. 249–295; G.A. Anderson and M. Stone (eds), *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (Second Revised Edition) [Society of Biblical Literature. Early Judaism and Its Literature, № 17], Atlanta, Ga., 1994; G.A. Anderson, M. Stone and J. Tromp (eds), *Literature on Adam and Eve*, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 2000; B. Murdoch, *The Apocryphal Adam and Eve in Medieval Europe: Vernacular Translations and Adaptations of the Vita Adæ et Evæ*, Oxford Press, 2009. For Slavonic redactions of *The Life of Adam and Eve*, see N.S. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury* vol. 1, Sankt Petersburg, 1863, pp. 1–18, 298–304; Ĭ. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, pp. 207–227. See also the discussion in F. Badalanova Geller, '*The Sea of Tiberias*: Between Apocryphal Literature and Oral Tradition', in L. DiTommaso and Ch. Böttrich (eds), *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition*: *Continuity and Diversity*, Tübingen, 2011, p. 14 (note 9).

44 In some redactions of the *Index* the name *Malekh* is replaced (due to metathesis) by that of *Lamekh*. On the other hand, it can be suggested that the term *Malekh* is a hypochoriston referring to the apocryphal *Legend about Melchisedek*, the purported authorship of which is attributed to Saint Athanasius of Alexandria [*О том же Мелхиседеке сказание святого Афанасия Александрийского*]; see N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury* vol. 1, Sankt Petersburg, 1863, pp. 26–31; I. Porfir'ev, 'Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoĭ Biblioteki', *SbORIS* vol. 17, issue 1 (1877), pp. 53–55, 131–135, 222–225, 256–259; Iv. Franko, *Apokrifi i Legendi z Ukraïnskikh Rukopisiv* (*Codex Apocryphus e manuscriptis ukraino-russicis collectus*

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

⟨*Patriarsi*⟩;[45] fifth, *Joseph's Prayer* ⟨*Molitva Iosifova*⟩;[46] sixth, *Eldad* [*and Modad*] ⟨*Ieldad*⟩;[47] seventh, *The Testament of Moses* ⟨*Zavětъ Mousinъ*⟩;[48] eighth, *The Assumption of Moses*[49] ⟨*Vъskhodъ Mousiin*⟩;[50] ninth, *The Psalms* [*and Odes*] *of Solomon* ⟨*Psalmosi Solomoni*⟩;[51] tenth, *The Revelation of Elijah*[52] ⟨*Iliino Obavleniie*⟩;[53] eleventh, *Isaiah's Vision*[54] ⟨*Isaino*

opera Dr. Joannis Franko) vol. 1, L'viv, 1896, pp. 92–101. Its position immediately after *Enoch* (in the *Symeonic Florilegium*'s version of the *Index*) supports this identification. In other redactions of the *Index*, both Byzantine and Slavonic, the term *Malekh* is systematically replaced by *Lamekh*; see A. Iatsimirskiĭ, *Bibliograficheskiĭ Obzor Apokrifov v Iuzhnoslavianskoĭ i Russkoĭ Pis'mennosti*, pp. 2–3.

45 Cf. H.C. Kee, 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, pp. 775–828; M. de Jonge, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 505–600. For the Slavonic redactions of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, see N.S. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury* vol. 1, pp. 96–232. See also the discussion in Ém. Turdeanu, 'Les Testaments Des Douze Patriarches en Slave', *JSJ* vol. 1, issue 2 (1970), pp. 148–186; F.J. Thomson, 'The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament', in J. Krašovec (ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible* [= *JSOTSS* 289], Ljubljana–Sheffield, 1998, p. 870 (note 1259); M. Dimitrova, 'Bulgarian Studies on the Reception of Byzantine Literature in Medieval Bulgaria', pp. 356 (note 208).

46 Cf. J.Z. Smith, 'Prayer of Joseph', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, pp. 699–714; see also G.T. Zervos, 'History of Joseph', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, pp. 467–475.

47 Cf. E.G. Martin, 'Eldad and Moldad', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, pp. 463–465.

48 Followed here is the same pattern of cataloguing the apocryphal writings, as the one presented in the Byzantine *Index of the Sixty Books* (or *Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books*) and the *Stichometry of Nicephorus*, where the compositions *The Testament of Moses* and *The Assumption of Moses* are listed as separate items; consult further J. Priest, 'Testaments of Moses', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, pp. 919–934. See also the discussion below.

49 Lit. *The Ascension of Moses*.

50 Cf. J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses*: *A Critical Edition With Commentary*, Leiden, 1997.

51 See R.B. Wright, 'Psalms of Solomon', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, pp. 639–670; see also J.H. Charlesworth, 'Odes of Solomon', in id. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, pp. 725–771. According to the *Stichometry of Nicephorus*, the composition *Psalms and Odes of Solomon* (described as containing 2100 lines) is included in the catalogue of the *antilegomena* (i.e. disputed/heretical writings) of the Old Testament (together with *Maccabees, The Wisdom of Solomon*, etc.).

52 Var.: *The Apocalypse of Elijah*.

53 See O.S. Wintermute, 'Apocalypse of Elijah', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, pp. 721–753; K.H. Kuhn, '*The Apocalypse of Elijah*', in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 753–773.

54 Var. *The Ascension of Isaiah*.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Viděniie⟩;[55] twelfth, *The Revelation of Sofonia*[56] ⟨*Sofoniino Obavlenie*⟩;[57] thirteenth, *The Revelation of Zechariah*[58] ⟨*Zakhariino Iavleniie*⟩; fourteenth, *The Protogospel of Jacob*[59] ⟨*Iakovle Pověstь*⟩;[60] fifteenth, *The Revelation of Peter*[61] ⟨*Petrovo Obavlenie*⟩;[62] sixteenth [and seventeenth], *The*

55 Cf. R.H. Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah: Translated from the Ethiopic Version, Which, Together with the New Greek Fragment, the Latin Versions and the Latin Translation of the Slavonic, is here Published in Full*, London, 1900; Ĭ. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, pp. 131–164; R.H. Charles and J.M.T. Barton, '*The Ascension of Isaiah* (The translation of R.H. Charles revised by J.M.T. Barton)', in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 775–812; M.A. Knibb, 'Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, pp. 143–176; C.D.G. Müller, 'The Ascension of Isaiah', in Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 2: *Writings Relating to the Apostles*; *Apocalypses and Related Subjects*; English translation edited by E. McL. Wilson], Cambridge, 1992, pp. 603–620; A. Giambelluca Kossova et al., *Ascensio Isaiæ: Textus* [*CCSA* 7], Turnhout, 1995; V. Mil'kov, *Drevnerusskie apokryfy* [Pamiatniki Drevnerusskoĭ mysli: issledovaniia i Teksty, Vyp. 1], Sankt Peterburg, 1999, pp. 499–527; V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 2: *Teksty Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ*, pp. 552–582. See also the discussion in R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* [Novum Testamentum Supplements, 93], Leiden–Boston–Köln, 1998, pp. 363–390. For studies dedicated exclusively to Slavonic tradition, see A.V. Rystenko, *K literaturnoĭ istorii apokrifa "Voskhozhdenie Isai"*, Odessa, 1912. See also the discussion in A. Vaillant, 'Un apocryphe pseudobogomile: *La vision d'Isaïe*', *RÉS* T. 42, fasc. 1–4, 1963, pp. 109–121; A. Giambelluca Kossova, 'Nabliudeniia vŭrkhu starobŭlgarskata traditsiia na *Videnie Isaĭevo*: Sŭotvetstviia i razlichiia s tekstovata traditsiia na *Vŭzneseniie Isaievo*', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 7, issue 2 (1983), pp. 66–79; id., 'Edin prenebregnat rŭkopis na *Videnie Isaĭevo*: Iatsimirski prepis 19', *Palæobulgarica* vol. 12, issue 4 (1988), pp. 13–25.

56 That is, *The Apocalypse of Sophonias* (i.e. *The Apocalypse of Zephaniah*).

57 Sophonias is the Greek name for Zephaniah; see also O.S. Wintermute, 'Apocalypse of Zephaniah', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, pp. 497–515; K.H. Kuhn, '*The Apocalypse of Zephaniah and An Anonymous Apocalypse*', in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 915–925.

58 That is, *The Apocalypse of Zechariah*.

59 That is, *Protevangelium of James*.

60 Cf. O. Cullmann, 'Infancy Gospels', in Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1: *Gospels and Related Writings*, pp. 421–439. For the Slavonic tradition, see B. Khristova, *Protoevangelieto na Iakov v starata bŭlgarska knizhnina*, Sofia, 1992. See also the discussion in M. Dimitrova, 'Bulgarian Studies on the Reception of Byzantine Literature in Medieval Bulgaria', pp. 356 (note 209).

61 That is, *The Apocalypse of Peter*.

62 Cf. C.D.G. Müller, 'The Apocalypse of Peter', in Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 2: *Writings Relating to the Apostles*; *Apocalypses and Related Subjects*, pp. 620–638. See also the essays gathered in the collective monograph *The Apocalypse of Peter*, Leuven, 2003, published under the editorship of J.N. Bremmer and I. Czachesz. On a hypothetical interplay between concepts of hellscape attested in *1Enoch* and *The Apoc-*

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Tours [*of the Apostles*] *and Teachings of the Apostles* ⟨*Obkhody i Ucheniia Apostolska*⟩; eighteenth, *The Epistle of Barnabas* ⟨*Varnavle Posylaniie*⟩;[63] nineteenth, *The Deeds of Paul* ⟨*Děianiie Paule*⟩; twentieth, *Paul's Revelation*[64] ⟨*Paulovo Obavleniie*⟩;[65] twenty-first, *Clement's Teaching* ⟨*Ucheniie Klimentovo*⟩; twenty-second, *Ignatius's Teaching* ⟨*Ignatovo Ucheniie*⟩; twenty-third, *Polycarp's Teaching* ⟨*Polukarpovo Ucheniie*⟩; twenty-fourth, *The Gospel According to Barnabas* ⟨*Evangelie otъ Varnava*⟩;[66] twenty-fifth, *The Gospel According to Matthias* ⟨*Evangelie otъ Matfea*⟩.[67]

---

alypse of Peter, see the discussion in J.N. Bremmer, 'Descents to the Underworld from Gilgamesh to Christian Late Antiquity', *Studia Religiologica* vol. 50, issue 4 (2017), pp. 302–305.

63 In the *Stichometry of Nicephorus* the composition entitled *The Epistle of Barnabas* (containing 1360 lines) is classified as a 'disputed' work (together with *The Revelation of John*, *The Revelation of Peter* and *The Gospel of the Hebrews*); see Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1: *Gospels and Related Writings*, p. 41.

64 That is, *The Apocalypse of Paul*.

65 Various Slavonic redactions of this apocryphal composition were edited and published (starting from the second half of the 19th century onwards) by a number of scholars; the list provided below is far from exhaustive. Among the most frequently quoted ones are the following: Al.N. Pypin, *Lozhnyia i otrechennyia knigi russkoĭ stariny*: *Pamiatniki starinnoĭ russkoĭ literatury, Izdavaemye Grafom Grigoriem Kushelevym-Bezborodko*, Vyp. 3, Sankt Petersburg, 1862, pp. 129–133; N.S. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury* vol. 2, Moscow, 1863, pp. 40–58; V. Mil'kov, *Drevnerusskie apokryfy*, pp. 528–582; L. Jiroušková, *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apokryphe im lateinischen Mittelalter unter Einschluß der alttschechischen und deutschsprachigen Textzeugen* [Mittellateinische Studien und Texte, 34], Leiden, 2006; N.H. Trunte, *Reiseführer durch das Jenseits: die Apokalypse des Paulus in der Slavia Orthodoxa* [Slavistische Beiträge 490], München–Berlin–Washington, D.C., 2013. See also the discussion in É. Turdeanu, 'La 'Vision de Saint Paul' dans la tradition littéraire des Slaves orthodoxes', *WSL* 1 (1956), pp. 401–430; J. Stradomski, 'Neskol'ko zamechaniĭ o neobychnoĭ slavianskoĭ redaktsii *Videniia Apostola Pavla* iz rukopisnykh sobraniĭ v Pol'she', *SC* vol. 4 (2014), pp. 193–207. For a general overview of scholarly discourses on *the Apocalypse of Paul*, see Th. Silverstein and A. Hilhorst (eds), *Apocalypse of Paul. A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions*, Geneva, 1997; J.N. Bremmer and I. Czachesz (eds), *The Visio Pauli and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul* [Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha, 9], Leuven, 2007. On Enoch's 'grand cosmic tours' and the 'hellscape' template employed in *The Apocalypse of Paul*, see the discussion in J.N. Bremmer, 'Descents to the Underworld from Gilgamesh to Christian Late Antiquity', pp. 305–306.

66 In the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum*, it is listed as an apocryphal work; see Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1, p. 38.

67 On the heterodox *Gospel According to Matthias* (or *Traditions of Matthias*), composed most probably in Alexandria before the beginning of the 3rd century, see Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1, pp. 382–386.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

It should be pointed out that the scheme of the hermetic / secret / esoteric / apocryphal writings, as attested in the *Symeonic Florilegium*, is almost identical with that presented in the 7th century Byzantine *Index of the Sixty Books* (or *Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books*), and more precisely, to its addendum, the rubric devoted to the writings 'outside the sixty.' Thus, having listed the thirty-four Old Testament and twenty-six New Testament sanctified books (in accordance with the view held at that time in the Greek Byzantine Church, that the canonical biblical corpus consists of sixty books), its compiler proceeds to the rubric of the writings 'outside the sixty,' and attaches the section devoted to 'the apocryphal' writings. Included in this category are: 1. *Adam*; 2. *Enoch*; 3. *Lamech*; 4. *The Patriarchs*; 5. *The Prayer of Joseph*; 6. *Eldad and Modad*; 7. *The Testament of Moses*; 8. *The Assumption of Moses*; 9. *The Psalms of Solomon*; 10. *The Revelation of Elias*; 11. *The Vision of Isaiah*; 12. *The Revelation of Zephaniah*; 13. *The Revelation of Zechariah*; 14. *The Revelation of Ezra*; 15. *The History of James* (i.e. *The Protogospel of James*); 16. *The Revelation of Peter*; 17. *The Circuits and Teachings of the Apostles*; 18. *The Epistle of Barnabas*; 19. *The Acts of Paul*; 20. *The Revelation of Paul*; 21. *The Teaching of Clement*; 22. *The Teaching of Ignatius*; 23. *The Teaching of Polycarp*; 24. *The Gospel According to Barnabas*; 25. *The Gospel According to Matthias*.[68]

A similar list is attested in the *Stichometry of Nicephorus* (9th century), in which the Old Testament apocryphal writings are presented (with further information concerning the exact number of the lines contained in each composition) in the following order: 1. *Enoch* (4800 lines); 2. [*The Testaments of the Twelve*] *Patriarchs* (5100 lines); 3. *The Prayer of Joseph* (300 lines); 4. *The Testament of Moses* (1100 lines); 5. *The Assumption of Moses* (1400 lines); 6. *Abraham* (300 lines); 7. *Eldad and Modad* (400 lines); 8. [*Book of the*] *Prophet Elias* (316 lines); 9. [*Book of the*] *Prophet Zephaniah* (600 lines); 10. [*Book of*] *Zacharias, the Father of John* (500 lines); 11. *Pseudepigraphica of Baruch, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel*.[69]

In the same source (i.e. *Stichometry of Nicephorus*), the Apocrypha of the New Testament are presented as follows: 1. *The Circuit of Paul, or The Acts of Paul* (3600 lines); 2. *The Circuit of Peter* (2750 lines); 3. *The Circuit of John* (2500 lines); 4. *The Circuit of Thomas* (1600 lines); 5. *The Gospel of Thomas* (1300 lines); 6. *The Teaching* [*Didache*] *of the Apostles* (200 lines); 7. *The Thirty-Two* [*Books*] *of Clement* (2600 lines); 8. [*Writings*] *of Ignatius* [*of Antioch*], *Polycarp* [*of Smyrna*], *and of the Shepherd of Hermas*.[70]

68 See Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1, pp. 42–43.

69 Cf. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1, p. 41.

70 Cf. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* vol. 1, p. 42.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

However, the standard English designation *Index of Prohibited / Proscribed Books* (conventionally used to render Gr. *Κατάλογος Απαγορευμένων Βιβλίων* and / or Lat. *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*), does not adequately convey the Old Church Slavonic taxonomy (that is, ꙗ҆лнкоже ськровьнꙑнхъ), as found in the *Symeonic Florilegium*. The semantic web of the adjective съкръвенъ/ськровьнъ, also rendered as скровенныи/сокровенныи, or ськрьвень/ськрьвеньнь (= Gr. κρυπτός, κρύφιος, ἀπόκρυφος, ἀποκεκρυμμένος, etc.),[71] which is in fact a past passive participle form of the verb ськрꙑвати/скрꙑвати/сокрꙑвати, ськрꙑтн/скрꙑтн/сокрꙑтн (= Gr. κρύπτειν),[72] covers a set of synonyms (e.g. 'cryptic'/'hermetic'/'apocryphal'/'secret'/'esoteric,' etc.), the lexicographic definitions of which appear to have been originally free of negative axiological connotations (such as 'prohibited'/'proscribed'/'banned').[73] Furthermore the survey of related linguistic data shows that the compound Old Church Slavonic adjective сокровеннотайнꙑй[74] (ськръвенъ/ськровьнъ + тайнꙑй/таннъ) is used as an epithet applied to the (Holy) Trinity [Тр҃ца] to convey the meaning of κρυφιομυστικός (the closest English equivalent 'sacrosanctly-mystic,' or 'sacramentally-mystic'). To the same semantic cluster belongs the noun тайна,[75] denoting both 'secret' (τὸ κρυπτον, as in Matth 6:4; τὸ κρυφαῖον, as in Matth 6:18; τὸ ἀπόκρυφον, as in Ps 9:30) and 'mystery' (τὰ μυστήρια, as in Lk 8:10; Rev 10:7; 1 Cor. 13:2; or μυστήριον, as in the *Corpus Areopagiticum slavicum*).[76] Most importantly, the adjective сокровеннотайнꙑй may also denote the mysterious dimensions of the Eucharist.[77]

As pointed out by A.I. Iatsimirskiĭ, only in the later redactions of the *Index* do the compilers/copyists emphasise, with reference to the writings of Saint Athanasius of Alexandria (ca. 296/298–373), that the 'hermetic' / 'esoteric'/ 'secret' books (or scriptures) listed in it are actually 'heretical' [еретнѵеска],

71 Consult G. Bogatova et al., *Slovar' Russkogo Iazyka XI–XVII vv.*, Vyp. 25, Moscow, 2000, pp. 24–28; A. Bonchev, *Rechnik na Tsŭrkovnoslavanskiia Ezik* vol. 2, Sofia, 2012, p. 161, p. 182; S. Fahl, J. Harney and D. Fahl, *Das Corpus des Dionysios Areiopagites in der slavischen Übersetzung von Starec Isaija (14. Jahrhundert)* [Monumenta linguæ slavicæ dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes, t. LIV], Bd. 4.2: *Indices*, Weilburg–Freiburg i. Br., 2012, pp. 1375–1378.

72 Cf. G. Bogatova et al., *Slovar' Russkogo Iazyka XI–XVII vv.*, Vyp. 25, pp. 30–33.

73 Consult S. Fahl, J. Harney and D. Fahl, *Das Corpus des Dionysios Areiopagites in der slavischen Übersetzung von Starec Isaija (14. Jahrhundert)*, Bd. 4.3: *Indices*, p. 1737.

74 Consult A. Bonchev, *Rechnik na Tsŭrkovnoslavanskiia Ezik* vol. 2, p. 182.

75 See the survey of related linguistic data in V. Krysko et al. (eds), *Slovar' Russkogo Iazyka XI–XVII vv.*, Vyp. 29, Moscow, 2011, pp. 176–196.

76 Consult S. Fahl, J. Harney and D. Fahl, *Das Corpus des Dionysios Areiopagites in der slavischen Übersetzung von Starec Isaija (14. Jahrhundert)*, Bd. 4:2, p. 1434.

77 Consult A. Bonchev, *Rechnik na Tsŭrkovnoslavanskiia Ezik* vol. 2, p. 182.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

and hence prohibited.[78] This is clearly not the case, however, with the semantic coverage of the adjective съкровьнъ (= κρυπτός, κρύφιος, ἀπόκρυφος, ἀποκεκρυμμένος, etc.), as employed in the designation of the *Index* in the *Symeonic Florilegium*. In the latter case, the adjective съкровьнъ may designate the concept of 'hermetic' (var. 'secret' / 'concealed' / 'mystic' / 'esoteric' / 'treasured' / 'hidden' / 'apocryphal'), but by no means that of 'proscribed' (var. 'forbidden'/ 'banned').[79]

On the other hand, the reference to a composition entitled *Enoch* (as attested in the *Index* in the *Symeonic Florilegium*) does not either support or refute the conjecture that the actual apocryphon—be it *First* or *Second Enoch*—was in circulation in *Slavia Orthodoxa* at the time when the *Florilegium* was compiled, since the Slavonic scribes may have simply reproduced the original template of the *Index*, as encountered by them in the Greek *Vorlage*.[80] The occurrence of the designation *Enoch* in the *Index* in the *Symeonic Florilegium* proves indisputably only the assumption that, among men of letters working in the royal scriptorium of the First Bulgarian Kingdom, there was awareness of the existence of apocryphal book(s), the authorship of which was attributed to Enoch.

Missing from the *Index* in the *Symeonic Florilegium*, however, are some apocryphal works emblematic for *Slavia Orthodoxa* (and indeed for the Byzantine Commonwealth), such as *The Apocalypse of Abraham*,[81] *The Testament of Abra-*

78 Among the most frequently attested versions of the Church Slavonic designations of the *Index* are the following: *Concerning the So-Called Cryptic/Esoteric Heretical Books* [*О глаголемыхъ скровныхъ книгахъ еретическа*], or *A Discourse / Tale Concerning the So-Called Cryptic/Esoteric/ Secret Books, Which are Heretical Writings* [*О глаголемыхъ съкровенныхъ/тайныхъ книгахъ сказаніе/повѣданіе, іако еретическа суть спнсанія*], etc.; see A. Iatsimirskiĭ, *Bibliograficheskiĭ Obzor Apokrifov v Iuzhnoslavianskoĭ i Russkoĭ Pis'mennosti*, pp. 3–4.

79 Significant in this connection is the fact that, some apocryphal compositions (such as *The Protogospel of James*), which were never considered as 'prohibited' in *Slavia Orthodoxa* (since they were part of Church services), were also enumerated in the Symeonic *Index*.

80 Cf. Ĭ. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, p. 166.

81 Cf. N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, pp. 32–78; see further the discussion in G.N. Bonwetsch, *Die Apocalypse Abrahams*: *Das Testament des vierzig Märtyrer* [Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, Bd. 1. Hft 1], Leipzig, 1897; A. Rubinstein, 'Hebraisms in the Slavonic *Apocalypse of Abraham*', *JJS* vol. 4, issue 3 (1953), pp. 108–115; id., 'Hebraisms in the Slavonic *Apocalypse of Abraham*', *JJS* vol. 5, issue 3 (1954), pp. 132–135; É. Turdeanu, 'L'Apocalypse D'Abraham En Slave', *JSJ* vol. 3, issue 2 (1972), pp. 153–180; B. Philonenko-Sayar and M. Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham* [Semitica vol. 31], Paris, 1981; R. Rubinkiewicz, 'Les Semitismes dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham', *Folia Orientalia* T. 21 (1980), pp. 141–148; id., '*Apocalypse of Abraham* (First to second century AD). A new translation and introduction by R. Rubinkiewicz', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.),

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

ham,[82] *The Ladder of Jacob*,[83] *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (*3 Baruch*),[84] *The Apocalypse of the Virgin Mary*, etc.[85] These omissions suggest that the version presented by the Slavonic scribe reproduced an earlier Greek scheme, similar to—yet not identical with—that attested in the seventh-century Byzantine *Index of the Sixty Books* (or *Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books*) and the ninth-century *Stichometry of Nicephorus*.

2.2 *The Book(s) of Enoch and Their Scribal Escort in Slavia Orthodoxa: The Usual Suspects*

It should be noted that some of the ascent apocalypses, which were omitted from the *Index* in the *Symeonic Florilegium* (e.g. *3 Baruch*), appear to have been habitually copied in various miscellanies alongside *2 Enoch*, thus becoming part of its literary convoy;[86] attested in them are also some common cosmo-

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha vol. 1, pp. 681–688; R. Rubinkiewicz and H.G. Lunt, '*The Apocalypse of Abraham* (transl. by R. Rubinkiewicz; revised and notes added by H.G. Lunt)', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, pp. 689–705; R. Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire* [Źródła i monografie, 129], Lublin, 1987; A. Pennington, '*The Apocalypse of Abraham*', in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 363–391; H.G. Lunt, 'On the language of the *Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham*', *SH* vol. 7 (1985), pp. 55–62; J.C. Poirier, 'The ouranology of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*', *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* vol. 35, issue 4 (2004), pp. 391–408; A. Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*: *Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* [Society of Biblical literature. Text-Critical Studies vol. 3], Leiden, 2005; A. Orlov, 'Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*', in id. *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* [Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha vol. 23], Leiden, 2009, pp. 21–40; id., *Heavenly Priesthood in the Apocalypse of Abraham*, Cambridge, 2013; B. Uspenskiĭ, 'Filologicheskie nabliudeniia nad tekstom *Otkroveniia Avraama*', *VoprIazyk* vol. 5 (2015), pp. 49–86.

82 Cf. N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, pp. 79–90. Consult also N. Turner, '*The Testament of Abraham*', in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 393–421.

83 Cf. A. Pypin, *Lozhnyia i otrechennyia knigi russkoĭ stariny*, pp. 27–32; N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, pp. 91–95; A. Pennington, '*The Ladder of Jacob*', in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 453–463; J. Kugel, 'The Ladder of Jacob', *HTR* vol. 88 (1995), pp. 209–227; Ch. Böttrich, 'A New Approach to the Apocryphal Ladder of Jacob', *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* vol. 28 (2019), pp. 171–181. (The amount of scholarly contributions on this topic is significant, and the survey provided here is by no means exhaustive).

84 See the discussion in A. Kulik, *3 Baruch: Greek Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*, Berlin, 2010.

85 Consult also J. Baun, *Tales from Another Byzantium. Celestial Journey and Local Community in the Medieval Greek Apocrypha*, Cambridge, 2007.

86 See Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 2) pp. 70–71.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

logical motifs (e.g. the heavenly gates through which the two great luminaries, the Sun and the Moon, enter and exit, the celestial escort accompanying them, etc.).[87]

Of particular importance for the current discussion is the apocryphal cycle of compositions relating to the Patriarch Abraham,[88] in the narrative clusters of which cosmological and angelological concepts (similar to those attested in *2 Enoch*) are profoundly and intensely woven.[89] One such case is *The Testament of Abraham*, in which special reference is made to the 'forefather Enoch' as 'the scribe of righteousness'[90] [Slav. кънигъчна праведнъıа; книгчїй правднв].[91] Maintained in this text is that Enoch, together with Abel, encounters the souls of the newly departed in the Beyond, and writes into the 'scriptures of retention' [Slav. пнсанніа памıатнаıа; съпнсанл памлтн] their earthly deeds, whilst the primordial Adam directs them to the respective celestial gates (depending on their conducts—left for sinners, or right for the righteous).

The picture gets even more interesting, should we consider the fact that some Slavonic versions of the sub-plot about the judgement of the souls in the Beyond contain motifs that are not attested in any of the extant Greek witnesses to *The Testament of Abraham*.[92] One such apocryphal tale (entitled *A Discourse About the Death and Life of Abraham* [*Слово ѡ смрти н ѡ жнт Аврамове*]), copied in the 16th century Tikveshki Miscellany, was discovered and published by the Bulgarian scholar N. Nachov.[93] According to this version of the text, when God opened 'the eyes of the heart' (cf. Eph 1.18) of Abraham [ѿврьꙁеⷮть аврамоу срдеѵннн ѡѵн] and the Archangel Michael [Арх҃гль Мнханль] took him to the Fourth Heaven [на ѵетврьтомь н҃бѣ], the Patriarch noticed first the primordial Adam [пръвоꙁ^анн Адамь] and then—the elderly Enoch [Енохь] who, together with the youth Abel [Авель], was monitoring the judgement of the souls. He was also the one recording the sins of recently departed

87 Cf. Sokolov, 'Feniks v Apokrifakh ob Enokhe i Varukhe', pp. 395–405; A. Stoïkova, 'Ot Mesopotamiia do Etropole. Transformatsii na mita za gigantskata kosmicheska ptitsa', pp. 126–168.

88 See F. Badalanova and A. Miltenova, 'Apokrifniiat tsikŭl za Avraam vŭv folklora i srednovekovnite balkanski literaturi', in R. Popov and S. Grebenarova (eds), *Etnografski problemi na narodnata kultura* vol. 4, Sofia, 1996, pp. 204–208, 228–236, 250.

89 See the discussion in Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 2), pp. 128–136.

90 On the designation of Enoch as 'the scribe of righteousness' (or 'scribe of truth'), see G. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (*Chapters 1–36; 81–108*), Minneapolis, 2001, pp. 65–67, pp. 72–77.

91 Cf. Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 2), pp. 130.

92 Cf. Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 2), pp. 130–131.

93 Cf. N. Nachov, 'Tikveshki rŭkopis', *Sbornik za Narodni Umotvorenia* vol. 8 (1892), pp. 411–413.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

people [распнсѳеть всакомѳ ѵл҃кѳ грѣхы], while Abel was escorting the souls to the gates through which they were supposed to enter [проваждаеть дш҃ѳ коюѧжᴬе вь своюѧ сн], according to their status. At this point follows an enigmatic statement on behalf of the Archangel Michael, the meaning of which is hard to comprehend:

> того радн р҃ѵ̂е т҃ть. да не ѡзꙁываеть се енохова црк҃овь н крᶜ̂ть на ꙁемлн.
>
> This is why God pronounced that the *Church of Enoch* and the [Holy] Cross may not be implored on Earth.[94]

A somewhat different wording of this statement is found in the 15th century Slavonic Ms. № 109 from the Library of the Monastery of St Paul on Mount Athos, containing yet another version of *The Testament of Abraham*; the text is entitled *Concerning the Death of Abraham, How the Archangel Michael Came to Abraham; Father, Bless Us* [*О смр҃тн Аврамовѣ како прнїде Арх҃гль Мнханл къ Аврааму Бл҃с҃вн Ох҃е*]. When Abraham asks the Archangel Michael, who is the man handling the issues of the sins of men in the Beyond [кто ює нже съдрьжет грѣхъы ѵл҃ѵе], he answers:

> То ес Ієнох с теломь соудниѧ ѵл҃ком. Томоу бо р҃ѵ̂е т҃ть: Да не оꙁовет се Енохова цр҃ькъвь на ꙁемлн, н ннкто же не прнꙁоветь нме его.[95]
>
> This is Enoch [who was taken] bodily [to the Beyond] to be the Judge of mankind. This is why God pronounced that the *Church of Enoch* is not to be invoked on earth, and nobody may call his name.[96]

Notwithstanding the vagueness of the texts quoted above, one thing is indisputable: in the theological thesaurus of *Slavia Orthodoxa* there appears to have circulated a special term denoting 'the Church of Enoch.' Before conducting the necessary survey of empirical data, however, it is not possible to state with certainty what was the nature of the phenomenon designated by this enigmatic expression.[97]

---

94 Author's translation.

95 See F. Badalanova and A. Miltenova, 'Apokrifniiat tsikŭl za Avraam vŭv folklora i srednovekovnite balkanski literaturi', p. 236.

96 Author's translation.

97 This detail will be discussed elsewhere.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

As for the ascent apocalypses mentioned in the *Index* in the *Symeonic Florilegium* together with *Enoch* (e.g. *Isaiah's Vision*, *The Apocalypse of Paul*, etc.), scholars have already pointed out that the narratives of heavenly journeys and tours of otherworldly realms presented in them systematically parallel some celestial descriptions found in *2 Enoch*.[98] It will be safe to say that this remains one of the unexplored dimensions of apocalyptic intertextuality in *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

The same can be said about the traces of Enochic traditions in the extant Slavonic recensions of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[99] Arguably translated in the same period when the *Florilegium* was compiled, these types of texts were subsequently integrated into the corpus of the *Interpretative Palæa*. Of particular importance for our discussion is the celebrated fragment from *The Testament of Reuben, About Ideas* 5: 1–7,[100] in which the first-born son of Jacob forewarns his offspring about the danger of women's charms, including the traps of their cosmetic wiles. Our analysis is based on one of the Russian redactions of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (copied in 1477), published by N. Tikhonravov in his *Monuments of Proscribed Russian Literature*. The Slavonic title of the chapter in question is given as *The Testament of Ruvim Concerning Prudence* [Ꙁавѣтъ Рувнмовъ ѡ бл҃оумнн]. Although the text does not mention explicitly 'the writings of Enoch' as its source, its discourse as a counter-narrative to the *Book of Watchers* is clear. Furthermore, it is in this particular chapter where the translation into Church Slavonic of the Greek term denoting the Fallen Angels occurs. In contrast to *2 Enoch*, where the form *Gregoroi* [Γρήγοροι, Ἐγρήγοροι] is transliterated (see below § 3), in *The Testament of Ruvim* it is translated. The lexeme used for this purpose is бодрыıа / бодры, which is the plural masculine form of the Old Church Slavonic adjective бъдръ/бъдрый (lit. 'the Wakeful [one]'). Below follows the fragment concerned:

> лоукавы соут женъı ѵада моа. ıако не нмѣюще властн нн снлъı на моужех лстат крашенемь како ıа к собѣ прнваднт. егже снлою не могоут прнноуднт. того лестью прнноужаютъ. нбо ѡ тех мн реѵ аг҃лъ б҃їн наоуѵн ма. ıако женъı sѣло распалаютсѧ на блоуд. паѵе м8жа н

98 See Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 2), pp. 123–127; W. Morfill and R. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, p. xix.

99 W. Morfill and R. Charles were among the first to analyse Enochic quotations occuring in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (see Morfill, Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, pp. xxiii–xxiv), but this detail escaped their attention.

100 Cf. M. de Jonge, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', pp. 519–520 (Chapter 5).

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

в срдцн ражжнзаютъ на моужа. н крашенемь прелщают нх. первое мъслью н взорѡм ıадъ всѣвают. н потом дѣломь плѣнıают. не бо может жена мѫжа прнноуднтн. бѣганте оубо блоуженїıа чад моıа. н заповѣданте женамь вашнмь н дщерем да не красат главъ свонхъ н лнць на прелесть оумѫ. ıако всака жена красащнсе ѡ том в мѫкоу вѣчною соблюдетса. так бо провабнша бодръıа прежде потопа. ѡнн бо съ прнлежаннемь здащıе на на бъıша. в помъıслех дроугъ дрг. н заıаша в помнсле дѣло н прѣобразоваховса въ мѫжа. н в соблажненїн моужь свонх ıавлıаховса нмь. ѡнн же помъıслающе на оумѣ образъı нх. ражахоу гнгантн. ıавъласоу бо нмь бодръı до нб҃сн досазающе. храннреса оубо чада ѿ блоуженїа.[101]

For women are cunning, my children: as they have no power or strength [to stand up] to men, they seduce them by adornments [var. use of cosmetics, or jewellery], so that they may come to them; and a man whom a woman cannot subdue by strength, she subdues by a stratagem. For the angel of God told me about them and taught me that women are prone to fornication [var. promiscuity] much more than a man; and their hearts blaze [with desire] for men. In the way they adorn themselves, they first lead men's minds astray, and by a look they instil the poison, and then in the act itself they take them captive; for a woman cannot coerce a man [by force]. So shun fornication, my children, and command your wives and daughters not to adorn their heads [var. dye their hair][102] and [not to put cosmetics on] their faces to seduce the mind; for every woman who adorns herself [by hair dye and cosmetics] has been reserved for eternal punishment. This is how the 'Wakeful ones' were [conducting themselves] initially, before the Flood. As a result of seeing them [women] continually, they lusted after each other in their thoughts, and they conceived the act in their minds, and [the 'Wakeful ones'] changed themselves into the shape of [human] men and appeared to the women when they were having intercourse with their husbands. And the women, lusting in their minds after the phantom images [var. creatures], gave birth to giants, for the 'Wakeful ones' seemed to them tall enough to touch the sky.[103]

101 Cf. N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, pp. 149–150.

102 With henna?

103 Author's translation; taken into consideration is also the translation of the same paragraph by M. de Jonge, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', pp. 519–520.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Based on the redrafted framework of Genesis 6:1–4, *The Testament of Ruvim Concerning Prudence* 5: 1–7 unfolds as a cosmogonic narrative, with its storyline implementing the ancient magical trope of the *incubus*, the evil spirit who adopts a male form in order to have sexual encounter with female human victims in their sleep, with the aim being to reproduce demonic progeny. This nocturnal set-up explains how 'the Wakeful ones' happened to impregnate the beautiful daughters of men, who then gave birth to a race of giants of mixed human and demonic lineage. But, equally important, *The Testament of Ruvim* conveys in a rather subtle manner the sub-plot of the illicit origins of cosmetics, as formulated in *The Book of Watchers*. Charged with fierce condemnation of the wicked lusty women, whose use of adornments is branded as embodiment of evil, the story provides the necessary grounds for opening an ideological war on the sinful ethos of seductive female conduct. The impact of this discourse is also palpably visualised in religious art. The motif of eternal condemnation of sinful wives and daughters who dare put cosmetics on their faces is depicted in a number of churches and monasteries in the Balkans.

One of the most popular iconographic schemes interpreting the idea of diabolical origin of cosmetics involves the portrayal of a young woman putting on make-up, with the Devil holding a mirror in front of her face; and if the onlookers hesitate how to interpret the scene, the inscriptions accompanying the frescoes duly informs them that: 'should a woman dare putting make-up on her face, it would be the Devil who would hold the mirror for her.' (See Figures 22.2 and 22.3.)

There exist even more drastic types of frescoes interpreting the thorny matter of cosmetics; depicted on them are women holding containers with colouring matter which they are smearing on their faces; painted above the containers, however, are devils who defecate in them. In this—rather extreme, but unequivocal matter—the cosmetics are defined as demonic excrements (see Figures 22.4 and 22.5). As a rule, these types of scenes are situated either in the open gallery, or in the women's section of the church. Judging from the abundance of sites sheltering these images—whose painters were most probably influenced by the home-grown exegesis of polemical treatises and didactic tractates[104] thematically akin to (albeit not directly stemming from) *The Testa-*

104 One such case is the 18th century compilation entitled *Homily on Womenfolk and Maidens* [*Поучение към жените и момите*], composed by the Bulgarian monk Joseph the Bearded [Йосиф Брадати], one of the translators of the celebrated *Thesauros* (Θησαυρός) of the Greek ecclesiastic Damaskinos Stouditis (Δαμασκηνός ὁ Στουδίτης); see D. Dimitrova-Marinova, 'Pouchenieto kŭm zhenite i momite v rŭkopisnata traditsiia ot vtorata polov-

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV



FIGURE 22.2 The Devil holding a mirror in front of a maiden putting on make-up; fresco from church of Archangel Michael (Leshko), painted in 1889. The inscription reads: 'Който се белатъ и царват дяволо имъ даржи огледалото' ('Those who put on [their faces] white and red [colouring matter] have the Devil holding the mirror before them').
PHOTO: AUTHOR

ment of Ruvim—one may estimate the level of the indirect impact of *The Book of Watchers* upon visual propaganda in *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

Indicative in this connection is the very thesaurus of the Slavonic recensions of *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[105] The stock phrase 'the Books of Enoch' has multiple attestations in them.[106] However, apart from the repeti-

ina na 18 vek', *SL* 33–34 (2005), pp. 380–393; V. Dimitrov, 'Khramŭt 'Sveti Georgi' pri selo Igumenets', *PI* 43: 3 (2010), pp. 42–49; A. Angusheva-Tikhanova and M. Dimitrova, 'Samokov i borbata na Tsŭrkvata sreshtu baeneto i gadaeneto', *Godishnik na Asotsiatsiia "Ongŭl"* 12 (2013): *Etnologiia na Obshtuvaneto*, p. 129.

105 Cf. N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, pp. 96–232.

106 Thus in Chapter 5: 5–6 of *The Testament of Simeon* [Завѣт Семѡнѡв], the following statement is made: 'I have come to know from the account of the books of Enoch that your sons, together with you, will be corrupted by fornication' [вндѣхъ оубо въ сказаньн книгъ ієноховъ ıако снве вашн с вамн въ бьлуженьн нстлѣють] (see N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, p. 100; I. Porfir'ev, 'Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoĭ Biblioteki', p. 161). Similar quotations can be found in *The Testament of Levi* [Завѣт Левгнн]: 'as it stands

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

tive references to Enoch the Just, who is portrayed as the ultimate antediluvian authority, *The Testaments* discuss notions that are parallel to cosmogonic concepts attested exclusively in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* (e.g. the idea of 'seven traits,' or 'seven spirits' which were given to man at Creation).[107] This, in turn, indicates that the earliest Slavonic editions of these two apocryphal compositions (e.g. *2 Enoch* and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) can be traced back to a common intellectual landscape—that of the First Bulgarian Kingdom.[108] These types of cosmogonic parallels bring forth once again the

written in the book(s) of the righteous Enoch' [бо рєүє въ книгахъ ієноха праведнаго]; 'I understand from the writing(s)/testimony of Enoch' [раꙁоумехъ ѿ пнсменн Еноховa]; 'I understand from the book(s) of Enoch' [оуведахъ в книгахъ Еноховахъ]; see N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, pp. 110–111, as well as I. Porfir'ev, 'Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoĭ Biblioteki', p. 169. Related phraseology is attested in *The Testament of Judah* [Ꙁавѣт Нюдннъ]: 'And I have come to know from the books of the righteous Enoch about the evils you will commit in the last days' [оувндѣхъ оубо рєᵛ в книгахъ ієноховахъ ієлнко ꙁла створнте в послѣдниаıа днн; var. оувндѣхъ бо рєүє въ книгахъ Еноховахъ елнко ꙁло сотворнте в послѣдниаıа днн]; see N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, p. 115 and I. Porfir'ev, 'Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoĭ Biblioteki', p. 172. Parallel excerpts feature in *The Testament of Dan* [Ꙁавѣт Данов]: 'I have understood from the books of the righteous Enoch' [раꙁумѣхъ бо во книгахъ ієноха праведнаго; var. раꙁоумехъ бо во книгахъ Еноха Праведнаго]; see N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, p. 126 and I. Porfir'ev, 'Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoĭ Biblioteki', p. 181. Somewhat redrafted statements containing alleged Enochic discourse occur in *The Testament of Benjamin* [Ꙁавѣт Веныамновъ]: 'I gather from the words of the righteous Enoch that you must not give yourselves up to Sodomite fornication' [раꙁумѣхомъ же о словесн ієноха праведнаго съблюдитежеса чада моıа блоуженыıа содомьска; var. раꙁоумехомъ же во словесн Еноха праведнаго соблюдетежесıа чада моıа блоуженнıа содомска]; see I. Porfir'ev, 'Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoĭ Biblioteki', p. 193; see also N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, p. 229. However, in some cases, as in *The Testament of Asher* [Ꙁавѣтъ Аснровъ], when the Slavonic text gives a reference to 'the books of the righteous Enoch' (see I. Porfir'ev, 'Apokrificheskie Skazaniia o Vetkhozavetnykh Litsakh i Sobytiiakh po Rukopisiam Solovetskoĭ Biblioteki', p. 187), this very reference may be missing from the extant Greek versions; the latter case suggests that Slavonic recensions most probably preserve earlier redactions.

107 Cf. *2 Enoch* 30:9.

108 Further on the relationship between *Enoch* and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (which circulated as part of the text of the *Palæa*), see Forbes and Charles, '*2 Enoch*, or *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*', pp. 428–429; F. Badalanova Geller, *Second* (*Slavonic Apocalypse of*) *Enoch: Text and Context*, p. 5. See also the discussion in A.J.B. Higgins, 'Priest and Messiah', *VT*, vol. 3: 4 (1953), pp. 322–324, 326–332]; Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (*Chapters 1–36; 81–108*), p. 96.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV



FIGURE 22.3A The Devil holding a mirror in front of a maiden putting on her face make-up; fresco from the Monastery of St George, Petrich county, South-Western Bulgaria. Painted in 1858
PHOTO: AUTHOR

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV



FIGURE 22.3B The Devil holding a mirror in front of a maiden putting on her face make-up, detail
PHOTO: AUTHOR

thorny matter of the relationship between 'the longer' and 'the shorter recension.' From the same period (concurrent with that of the *Florilegium*) comes yet another compilation, the anthropogonic account of which parallels some ideas featuring in the 'longer recension' of *2 Enoch* 30:13–14. The examination of additional sources contemporary to the *Florilegium* sheds additional light on the matter in question. Let us examine the evidence.

2.3 *Enochic Traditions and the Slavonic Redactions of Byzantine Chronographa: Parabiblical Intertextuality* (*the Case of The Slavonic Derivative of the Chronicle of George Synkellos*)

As pointed out earlier, concurrently with the *Symeonic Florilegium* there appeared in medieval Bulgaria an historiographic compilation based on redrafted extracts from the chronographies of George Synkellos (d. 810)[109] and Julius

109 While referring to extracts from *The Chronography of George Synkellos* [Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας], the present author follows the English translation of the text by W. Adler and P. Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*: *A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, Oxford, 2002.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV



FIGURE 22.4 The Devil—depicted above two young women dressed in traditional clothes putting make-up on their faces—shown defecating into the vessel containing cosmetics. Fresco from the church of St Nicholas, Cherven Breg, South-Western Bulgaria. Painted in 1882
PHOTO: AUTHOR

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV



FIGURE 22.5 The Devil—depicted above the heads of three young women dressed in traditional clothes putting make-up on their faces—shown defecating into the vessel containing cosmetics. Fresco from the church of St George, Sandanski county, South-Western Bulgaria. Painted by Teofil and Marko Minov, 1876 (?). The inscription reads: 'Моми който ке царвѣтъ а дявола се сери во панищата' ('Maidens who put on [their faces] white and red [colouring matter] have the Devil defecating into the bowl [containing their cosmetics]').
PHOTO: AUTHOR

Africanus (ca. 160–240).[110] As indicated above,[111] we prefer to designate it as *The Slavonic Derivative of the Chronicle of George Synkellos*[112] (hereafter *Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos*).

110 The extant fragments of the *Chronographiæ* of Julius Africanus are translated by W. Adler and published in collaboration with U. Roberto and K. Pinggéra under the editorship of M. Wallraff, *Iulius Africanus: Chronographiæ. The Extant Fragments* [*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*, NF 15], Berlin–New York, 2007. Of particular importance for the current discussion is Africanus's description of the antediluvian period (F23 The Circumstances of the Flood); the chronographer argues that 'the sons of God' should be identified with the descendants of Seth, who mingled with the descendants of Cain (i.e. the human seed), thus triggering God's anger:

> When humankind became numerous upon the earth, angels of heaven had intercourse with daughters of men. In some manuscripts, I found: 'the sons of God'. In my opinion,

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

It is well known that Synkellos was one of the last Byzantine writers to refer to the writings of Enoch.[113] Included in his *Ekloge chronographias* [Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας] is a long (albeit extensively reworked) excerpt, 'From the first book of Enoch, concerning the Watchers' [Ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου βιβλίου Ἐνὼχ περὶ τῶν ἐγρηγόρων] (i.e. *1 Enoch* 6.1–9.11).[114]

---

this is to be understood figuratively: ⟨the descendants⟩ of Seth are called 'the sons of God' by the Spirit, since the genealogies of the righteous and the patriarchs up until the Saviour are traced from him. But the descendants of Cain it designates as human seed, as having had nothing divine because of the wickedness of their line and the dissimilarity of their nature, so that when they were mingled together, God grew angry. [Quoted after M. Wallraff et al., *Iulius Africanus: Chronographiæ*, pp. 49–50].

But immediately afterward Africanus reluctantly contemplates the possibility that 'the sons of God' might not be a figurative phrase, but a literal, direct designation, in which case it should be interpreted as the 'angels of heaven' (instead of 'the sons of Seth'):

> But let us suppose they refer to 'angels'. Then it was they who transmitted knowledge about magic and sorcery, as well as the numbers of the motion of astronomical phenomena, to their wives, from whom they produced the giants as their children; and when depravity came into being because of them, God resolved to destroy every class of living things in a flood. [Quoted after M. Wallraff et al., *Iulius Africanus: Chronographiæ*, p. 51].

The latter statement indicates that Africanus was certainly acquainted with Enochic traditions; see also the discussion in G. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (*Chapters 1–36; 81–108*), p. 92.

111 See note 24 above.

112 Among the first to discuss this text was V. Istrin, 'Iz oblasti drevne-russkoĭ literatury', *ZhMNP* vol. 8 (Avgust 1903), pp. 381–414; see also the first chapter (entitled 'Khronika Georgiia Sinkela') of his monograph *Issledovaniia v oblasti drevnerusskoĭ literatury*, Sankt Petersburg, 1906, pp. 2–34. A text-critical edition of the *Chronicle* was published by A. Totomanova, with the 15th–16th century Russian redaction from the Undolsky Miscellany from the Palæographic collection of the Russian State Library in Moscow (Ms. 1289) as a primary text witness (see id., *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel: Izdanie i Komentar*, Sofia, 2008). A. Totomanova was also the first to point out that the Slavonic version of the *Chronicle* recycles rephrased fragments from Julius Africanus. Our analysis is based on Totomanova's edition of *The Slavonic Version of the Chronicle of Synkellos*.

113 See W. Adler and P. Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, pp. liv–lv; L. Arcari, 'Are Women the *Aition* for the Evil in the World? George Syncellus's Version of *1 Enoch* 8:1 in Light of Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*', *Henoch* vol. 34, issue 1 (2012), pp. 5–12, 18–20. It has been argued that Synkellos's excerpts represent re-writing of traditions transmitted by the early fifth century Alexandrian monks Panodorus and Annianus; see W. Adler, *Time Immemorial*, pp. 73–74; G. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (*Chapters 1–36; 81–108*), pp. 12–13; A.Y. Reed, 'Enoch in Armenian Apocrypha', in K.B. Bardakjian and S. La Porta (eds), *The Armenian Apocalyptic Tradition: A Comparative Perspective*, Leiden, 2014, p. 165. For Panodorus's use of *1 Enoch*, see W. Adler, 'Berossus, Manetho, and *1 Enoch* in the World Chronicle of Panodorus', pp. 419–442; id., *Time Immemorial*, p. 81, pp. 86–96, p. 154, p. 177, p. 179.

114 See K.W. Dindorf, *Georgius Syncellus et Nicephorus Cp* vol. 1. Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

While listing the sins committed by the Watchers[115] who engaged in carnal relationships with 'the beautiful daughters' of men and initiated them into the esoteric illicit lore of potions and spells (thus trespassing both cosmological

Byzantinæ, Bonn, 1829, pp. 20–30; W. Adler and P. Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, pp. 16–23. On textual emendation in Synkellos's Enoch excerpts, see W. Adler, *Time Immemorial*, pp. 175–182.

115 The amount of literature on the *Watchers myth* (along with the *Shemihazah myth* and/or the *Asael myth*) is considerable; for a concise survey of scholarly discourse on the topic see the publications of the following authors (in alphabetical order): A. Annus, 'On the Origin of the *Watchers*: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Traditions', *JSP* vol. 19, 2010, pp. 277–320; L. Arcari, 'Are Women the *Aition* for the Evil in the World? George Syncellus's Version of *1 Enoch* 8:1 in Light of Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*', *Henoch* vol. 34, issue 1 (2012), pp. 5–20; J.S. Bergsma, 'The Relationship between *Jubilees* and the Early Enochic Books (*Astronomical Book* and the *Book of the Watchers*)', in G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba (eds), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah. The Evidence of Jubilees*, Grand Rapids, MI–Cambridge, UK, 2009, pp. 36–51; S. Bhayro, *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary with Reference to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents*, Münster, 2005; K. Coblentz Bautch, 'What Becomes of the Angels' 'Wives'? A Text Critical Study of *1 En.* 19: 2', *JBL* vol. 125, issue 4 (2006), pp. 766–780; J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, pp. 47–59; id., *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*, pp. 289–298; id., *Apocalypse, Prophesy, and Pseudepigraphy*, pp. 301–307; P. Crone, '*The Book of Watchers* in the *Qur'ān*', in H. Ben-Shammai, S. Shaked and S. Stroumsa (eds), *Exchange and Transmission Across Cultural Boundaries: Philosophy, Mysticism and Science in the Mediterranean*, Jerusalem, 2013, pp. 16–51; M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, pp. 20–21, 72–74, 77–78; R. Lesses, '*The Most Worthy of Women is a Mistress of Magic*: Women as Witches and Ritual Practitioners in *1 Enoch* and Rabbinic Sources', in K.B. Stratton with D.S. Kalleres (eds), *Daughters of Hecate: Women and Magic in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 2014, pp. 74–78; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, pp. 22–41; G. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (*Chapters 1–36; 81–108*), p. 7, pp. 12–13, pp. 165–201; A.Y. Reed, 'From Asael and Šemiḥazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: *3 Enoch* 5 (§§ 7–8) and Jewish Reception-History of *1 Enoch*', *Jewish Studies Quarterly* vol. 8 (2001), pp. 106, pp. 114–136; id., 'Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent, and the Transmission of Knowledge in *1 Enoch* 6–16', in R. Boustan and A.Y. Reed (eds), *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 47–66; id., *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity. The Reception of Enochic Literature*, New York–Cambridge, 2005; id., 'Gendering Heavenly Secrets? Women, Angels, and the Problem of Misogyny and Magic', in K.B. Stratton with D.S. Kalleres (eds), *Daughters of Hecate: Women and Magic in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 2014, pp. 110–138; P. Sacchi, '*The Book of the Watchers* as an Apocalyptic and Apocryphal Text', *Henoch* vol. 30, issue 1 (2008), pp. 9–26; P. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, pp. 53–67; M. Stone, 'Enoch and the Fall of the Angels: Teaching and Status', *DSD* vol. 22, issue 3 (2015), pp. 342–357; L. Stuckenbruck, 'The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions', *DSD* vol. 7, issue 3 [*Angels and Demons*] (2000), pp. 354–377; id., 'The Origins of Evil in Jew-

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

and epistemic boundaries),[116] Synkellos provides a long register of the transgressions attributed to different angels.[117] Thus he points out that the chief of the Watchers, Semiazas, disclosed to mankind knowledge about the roots of plants.[118] Azaël (the tenth leader) taught men technologies of extraction of 'the metals of the earth and gold' and the deadly craft of smithing 'swords and armour and every instrument of war.' He also made them acquainted with the art of cosmetics and manufacturing colouring tinctures (i.e. alchemy). The resourcefulness of beautification and enhancement of the countenances of 'the daughters of men' is classified as a subset of war-craft. Flesh is weapon. Erotic is entrapment. Sexual inducement is implicitly defined as warfare. The impact of the 'manmade' carnal beauty is equated to that of deadly armaments.

Last but not least, Azaël taught men how to make gold and silver adornments for their wives. Yet it was not just the specialized craft skills of jewellery-making that he bestowed upon them; the implied subtext is that Azaël instructed men how to produce amulets and talismans, since it was the protective function of metal ornaments as charms that was at stake here, not just their æsthetic properties. At the same time, metalwork was further linked to wealth and social stratification, of which jewellery became the ultimate marker. Thus the knowledge revealed by Azaël is branded as lethal arts causing the destruction of mankind, both physical and moral.

The eleventh Watcher, who revealed 'the uses of potions, spells, lore, and the remedies for spells,'[119] was called Pharmaros [Φαρμαρός]. In this connection Adler points out that the latter appellation was a deliberately altered form

ish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–4 in the Second and Third Centuries BCE', in Ch. Auffarth and L. Stuckenbruck (eds), *The Fall of the Angels* [Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 6], Leiden–Boston, 2004, pp. 99–118; id., '*The Book of Enoch*: Its Reception in Second Temple Judaism and in Christianity', *EChr* vol. 4, issue 1 (2013), pp. 14–15; id., 'The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Ethics and Theological Anthropology', in M. Konradt and E. Schläpfer (eds), *Anthropologie und Ethik im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament: wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen*. Internationales Symposium in Verbindung mit dem Projekt Corpus Judæo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti (CJHNT) 17.–20. Mai 2012, Heidelberg [Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament vol. 322], Tübingen, 2014, pp. 163–176; id., *The Myth of the Rebellious Angels. Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, Tübingen, 2014, pp. 12–35, p. 43, pp. 47–48. See also the discussion below.

116 See P. Crone, '*The Book of Watchers* in the *Qur'ān*', p. 18.

117 Cf. Adler, Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, pp. 16–17.

118 Cf. Adler, Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, p. 17.

119 Cf. Adler, Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, p. 17.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

of the angelonym Harmoni (i.e. 'from Mt. Hermon'); by using it, the author intended to turn the Watcher's name into the eponym of his revelations (i.e. the lore of using potions and remedies).[120] But while the Ethiopic version of *1Enoch* (8:1–17) quotes the names of the chief Watchers responsible for the transmission of different kinds of proscribed knowledge one by one (i.e. Baraqiel, Kokabel, Tamiel, Asradiel), Synkellos's list is somewhat abbreviated. The Byzantine chronographer simply clarifies which types of 'exact' sciences concerning particular terrestrial and celestial matters are illicitly disclosed to the human race by the rebellious angels (whose names he occasionally omits). Unnamed in his Chronicle, for instance, is the third chief of the Watchers, who is portrayed as the demiurge of *geomancy* and/or *seismomancy* (i.e. the skills of prophesying/forecasting by means of 'encoding' calendric characteristics of earthquakes), since he is reported to have taught people 'the signs of the Earth.' The rest of the anonymous Fallen Angels are connected with illicit revelations of esoteric knowledge concerning various aspects of astronomy, with special emphasis on astrology and divination. Thus the ninth chief Watcher is reported to have taught mankind 'the study of the stars'—a rather broad epistemic category, most probably enveloping all kinds of sciences about celestial bodies, including skills for mapping the sky and calculating the trajectories of heavenly luminaries (stars and/or planets, including the positioning of constellations), locating and tracking them within the specific time/seasonal coordinates. This particular Watcher was most probably considered to have likewise taught time-measurement and time-keeping (i.e. calendar as a subset of astronomy). His functions are intertwined with those of the fourth chief Watcher (who instructed the human race about astrology). Similar is the role of the eighth chief Watcher, who trained people in the art of 'divination by observing the heavens' (that is, the skills of interpreting the 'language' of celestial signs and stellar omens). The seventh is portrayed as the demiurge of heliomancy, since he taught mankind 'the signs of the Sun' (i.e. sun-related omens, with reference to solar eclipses?), while the twentieth revealed 'the signs of the Moon' (i.e. *selenomancy*, or moon-related omens). All of them, as summarized by Synkellos, revealed 'mysteries to their wives and offspring.'[121]

Significantly, the famous narrative unit, 'From the First Book of Enoch concerning the Watchers' (Ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου βιβλίου Ἐνὼχ περὶ τῶν ἐγρηγόρων), as

120 Cf. Adler, Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, p. 17 (note 4); W. Adler, *Time Immemorial*, p. 176 (note 61).

121 Cf. Adler, Tuffin, *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, p. 14.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

attested in the original text of *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, is missing from its rewritten Slavonic descendant. Yet the latter text contains some intriguing details indicating that its compilers were aware of the existence of *1Enoch*. Thus in the opening chapter of *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos*[122] one finds a short paragraph[123] making the following important statements:

1) Enoch was 165 years old when he became the father of his firstborn son Methuselah [Енох бывъ лѣт рѯе лѣт родн мафоусал8] (Fol. 406r, line 23);[124]
2) he was a pious, reverent man who 'pleased God' [н оугодн Енох Бгоу] (Fol. 406r, line 24);[125]
3) after Enoch's having followed the path of righteousness without deviating from it for two hundred years after Methuselah's birth, another—more grand—life was bestowed upon him [пожывъ к снмъ лѣт .с̄. не ѡбраащіе сѧ преставлен бо бъıс в болшую жъıѕнь] (Fol. 406r, lines 24–25);[126]
4) Enoch, who was seventh from Adam, was presented (to God) [седмъın съı ѡ̄ адама преставн сѧ] (Fol. 406r, lines 24–25);[127]
5) the tradition holds that the narrative of 'his prophesy' is preserved 'in five secret /esoteric / hermetic books' [н мнѧт же н пророчство сего в патерыхъ книгах въ танныıх] (Fol. 406r, lines 26–27).

The concluding phrase of the above quoted fragment from *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* undoubtedly indicates that reference is being made here to *First*, rather than to *Second Enoch*, since only *First Enoch* is known to be a *Pentateuch*.[128]

122 Used in the current discussion is A. Totomanova's edition of the text from the aforementioned Ms. № 1289 (the Undolsky Miscellany) from the Palæographic collection of the Russian State Library in Moscow (see note 112 above).

123 See A. Totomanova, *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel*, p. 33.

124 Cf. (LXX) *Gn.* 5:18.

125 Cf. (LXX) *Gn.* 5:22, 24; *The Epistle to Hebrews* 11:5.

126 Cf. (LXX) *Gn.* 5:22, 24.

127 Cf. *The Epistle of Jude* 1:14.

128 On the term *Enochic Pentateuch*, see (the now classical) study of J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone 'The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the *Similitudes*', pp. 51–65. While J. Milik maintains that a Greek Enochic Pentateuch had developed by the year 400 C.E. and hence functioned as the basis for the Ethiopic version, J. Greenfield and M. Stone, on the other hand, argue that '[i]t is by no means evident that, because five works are combined in the Ethiopic version of Enoch, they were considered by the Greek or Ethiopic compiler to be a Pentateuch. If such a title is to be meaningful, presumably it implies that they were arranged as a Pentateuch based on the model of the Mosaic Pentateuch. Even if

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

After the laconic statement about Enoch and his 'five secret/esoteric/hermetic books,' *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* gives a concise list of his offspring (with Methuselah being the eighth after Adam) up to the generation of Noah and his three sons Sim [Снмъ], Ham [Хамъ] and Japhet [Афетъ], in the days in which people multiplied greatly on earth [мно^{ж}ствоу ѵ҃лькь бывъшоу на ꙁемлн] and the angels of heaven [аг҃лн н҃бн҃їн] mixed with the daughters of men [къ дцеремъ ѵлѵ^{с}кымъ прнмѣсншa сѧ] (Fol. 406^{v}, lines 6–8);[129] there follows a short note that 'in other scriptures' [въ дроугїн^{х} же пнсанїнхъ] the divine husbands of earthly women were identified as 'sons of God' [сн҃ве б҃жїн] (Fol. 406^{v}, line 8).[130] The offspring of Seth remained righteous, while those of Cain were wicked, and the sins committed aroused the wrath of God, who sent the Flood to wash away the unrighteousness and purify the earth.[131]

But why is the narrative unit about the Watchers missing from *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos*? The argument of A. Totomanova that the initial chapters of its corpus followed the account of Julius Africanus (the surviving excerpts of which do not contain fragments from *The Book of Watchers*) rather than that of Synkellos (which does contain such fragments), might just provide a clue to a convincing answer.

On the other hand, the corpus of *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* contains some small, but recognisable quotations from *2 Enoch*; this, in turn, would indicate that the scribe(s) who translated the former were most probably acquainted with the latter. Thus the laconic account about the creation of man in *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos*, which is encapsulated in the cosmogonic scenario of the sixth day, redrafts some distinctive formulaic expressions that are likewise attested in *2 Enoch* 30:10–12 (the longer recension). But in contrast to *2 Enoch*, where the anthropogonic story is part of God's testimony and thus

---

this were true for the Ethiopic book, nothing in the evidence adduced by Milik shows that it was true at Qumran' (see id., 'The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the *Similitudes*', p. 53).

129 Quoted after A. Totomanova, *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel*, p. 34.

130 Quoted after A. Totomanova, *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel*, p. 34. Cf. Synkellos, *Chron*. 19: 24–26 (from Africanus): Πλήθους ἀνθρώπων γενομένου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄγγελοι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θυγατράσιν ἀνθρώπων συνῆλθον. ἐν ἐνίοις ἀντιγράφοις εὗρον· οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ['When humankind became numerous upon the earth, angels of heaven had intercourse with daughters of men. In some manuscripts, I found: the "sons of God"']; see F23 (lines 1–2) in *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae*, p. 48. The English translation by W. Adler.

131 The narrative appears to follow a tradition (first attested in Julius Africanus and subsequently adopted by George Synkellos) according to which God was angered by the sinful mixing of the lineages of the righteous Seth and the sinful Cain; see note 110 above.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

is presented as a first-person narrative, in *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* the statement concerning the creation of man is rendered as a third-person narrative:

> сего бѡ мъıслнвъ хнтрое слово скаꙁатн. н жнвотъ еднnъ ѿ обоего ѿ внᴬнᴴмагᶜᵏо рекоу н nевнднмаго естьства. съꙁᴬа ѹ̀лка од вецıн же вꙁемъ:. велнкоу. на ꙁемлн поставн. агг̀ла дроугаго. ѵᶜтна велнка славna. ц̃рѧ ꙁемnъımъ. црᶜтво нмоуцıа ѿ б̄а.[132]
>
> Thence [He] thought of uttering a wise word, and a sole living creature from both the invisible and visible natures [came into being]; [He] created man, having taken him from the material substance; [He created him] great, and appointed him to be the second angel on earth: honourable, great and glorious, and to be the King [of everything dwelling] on earth. And his kingdom was granted to him by God.[133]

In *2 Enoch*, on the other hand, the creation of man is described in a much more elaborate fashion,[134] but the central storyline is based on a template analogous to that attested in the aforementioned anthropogonic narrative of *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos*. The fragment in question (that is, *2 Enoch* 30:10–12) runs as follows:[135]

---

132 Cf. A. Totomanova, *Slavianskata Versiia na Khronikata na Georgi Sinkel*, pp. 31–32 (Fol. 405a, lines 21–22 and Fol. 405ᵛ, lines 1–7).

133 Author's translation.

134 Cf. *2 Enoch* 30:8–18; 31:1–3.

135 Unless otherwise mentioned, references to the original Slavonic text of *2 Enoch* in the present article are based on the Bulgarian redaction of *The Books of the Holy Secrets of Enoch* [*Кнnгн сг̑нˣ танnь Енохоᵛ*] (that is, Ms. S). The text was copied in a miscellany (Ms. № 321, fols 269ʳ–323ʳ) formerly kept in the palæographic collection of the Serbian National Library in Belgrade. However, there is no consensus concerning the chronological characteristics of this text witness; some scholars (e.g. M. Sokolov and Ĭ. Ivanov) date Ms. S to the 16th–17th centuries, while others (e.g. B. Khristova)—to the 14th century. We follow M. Sokolov's edition (*Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*, pp. 1–80), the amended version of which was subsequently published by Ĭ. Ivanov in his *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, pp. 167–191 (with parallel readings from other text witnesses); see also F. Badalanova Geller, *Second* (*Slavonic Apocalypse of*) *Enoch*: *Text and Context*. The version preserved in Ms. S represents the longer recension of *2 Enoch*; see Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 2, pp. 8–32), as well as Morfill and Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, pp*. xiii–xiv; A. Iatsimirskiĭ, *Bibliograficheskiĭ Obzor Apokrifov v Iuzhnoslavianskoĭ i Russkoĭ Pis'mennosti*, p. 83 (список No. 4); A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, pp. iii–iv, p. vii, pp. 86–119]. As for Ms. № 321, it was destroyed during the bombardment of Belgrade in

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

се помъслнˣ хнтрое слово. скаꙁатн ѿ невнднмаго же н внднмаго єс҃тва съꙁдаˣ ѵл҃ка ѿ обоего съмрᵀь н жнвоᵀ. н ѡбраꙁь вѣсть слово, ıакъı нѣкакоу тварь йнж въ велнцѣ малж, н пакъı въ малѣ велнкж. н на ꙁемлн поставнˣ ѣго аг҃ла втораго устна н велнка н славнаа. н поставнˣ ѣго ц҃рѣ ꙁемлн. црство нмаıа моеа мждростїж, н не бѣ ѣмоу подбна на ꙁемлн н ѿ сжцınˣ тварн монˣ.[136]

Thence I thought of uttering [this] wise word: from invisible and visible natures I created man, from both death and life. The image came to know the Word and a new small creature [came into being]—small in greatness and great in smallness. And I placed him on earth as a second angel, honourable, great and glorious. And I put him as the King on earth, having [rule through] My wisdom, and there was no equal to him on earth among My creatures.[137]

To sum up; the parallel use of matching phraseological units (e.g. 'thence He/I thought of uttering this wise word,' 'from invisible and visible natures,' 'the second angel (on earth): honourable, great and glorious,' 'the King on earth,' etc.) in the anthropogonic account of *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* and that of *2 Enoch* 30:10–12 (the longer recension) suggests that the scribes who produced the former were familiar with the latter. This certainly indicates that the longer recension of this apocryphal composition was already in circulation at the time when the earliest edition of *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* was made. This, in turn, may support N. Schmidt's hypothesis, that there were most probably two Greek recensions that were translated by different Slavonic scribes at different times.[138] Alternatively, it may likewise imply that the longer recension of *2 Enoch* preceded the shorter one (since *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* was among the earliest documents to occur concurrently with the *Symeonic Florilegium*).

Then again, the lack of any, even redrafted, quotations from *The Book of Watchers* in *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* stands in sharp contrast to the numerous attestations of the parallel use of identical phraseological expressions employed in both *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* and *2 Enoch* 30:10–

1941; the material absence of the actual codex makes the issue of its dating even more complicated.

136 Cf. Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*, p. 30 (lines 59–63), Ĭ. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, p. 177.

137 Author's translation.

138 Cf. N. Schmidt, 'The Two Recensions of *Slavonic Enoch*', p. 310.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

12. This may well indicate that the Slavonic scribes most probably treated *2 Enoch* as part of a collection akin to *1 Enoch*; thus the former may have been perceived as a substitute for the latter.

2.4 *Shared Mythologemes in Anthropogonic Templates in 2 Enoch and John the Exarch's Hexæmeron: The Name of Adam as Acronym-Tetragram*

Apart from *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos*, during the reign of Symeon in the literary landscape of the First Bulgarian Kingdom, there also circulated a cluster of other parabiblical works (likewise translated / compiled /edited by the scribes from the Preslav Literary School) that contained cosmogonic and anthropogonic narratives akin to those attested in *2 Enoch* (the longer recension).[139] One such work is John the Exarch's *Hexæmeron*.[140] The account of the creation of man, and especially the micro-narrative about the origin of his name, as presented in the *Homily on the Sixth Day*, renders an anthropogonic scenario similar to that in *2 Enoch* 30:13–14.[141] According to the latter, the biblical anthroponym *ADAM* is composed of four letters signifying the four cardinal directions of the Universe:

139 That is, Ms. S, Ms. J, Ms. P and Ms. SokRum.

140 See § 2.1 above, note 19.

141 Consult also Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*: *A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Medieval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books and Local Legends* vol. 1, Copenhagen, 1955, entry A1281.6.1: *Adam's name composed of initial letters of four stars from the four quarters of the heaven*. Among earlier sources in which the anthroponym *Adam* is envisaged as an acronym composed of the initial letters of the words denoting the four corners of the Universe (East, West, North and South) are *The Sibylline Oracles* (3: 24–27); cf. J. Collins, 'Sibylline Oracles', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, p. 362. For an overview of texts and traditions in Medieval Greek and Slavonic sources interpreting the idea of the appellation 'Adam' as an acronym (and thus constructing the name of the primordial man as a verbal icon of the Universe), see W.R. Morfill and R.H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, pp. xvi, xxvii; Ch. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos*, pp. 17–34, 59–72; A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism*, pp. 158–161; W. Ryan, 'Curious Star Names in Slavonic Literature', *RL* vol. 1 (1974), pp. 139–142; id., 'Astronomy in Church Slavonic: Linguistic Aspects of Cultural Transmission', in G. Stone and D. Worth (eds), *The Formation of Slavonic Literary Languages*, Columbus, OH, 1985, p. 56; F. Badalanova, 'The Bible in the Making: Slavonic Myths of Creation', in M.J. Geller and M. Schipper (eds), *Imagining Creation*, Leiden–Boston, 2008, pp. 233–235; S. Voicu, 'Adamo, acrostico del mondo', *Apocrypha* vol. 18 (2007), pp. 205–230; id., 'Gematria e acrostico di Adamo: nuovi testimoni', *Apocrypha* vol. 25 (2014) pp. 181–193.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

> н поставнˣ ѣмоу нма ѿ ѵетърн съставь[142] ѿ въстокь, ѿ ꙁапаᴬ, ѿ сѣвера, ѿ юга. Н поставнˣ ѣмоу .а҃. ꙁвѣꙁды нароѵнтн, н рекь нма ѣго адаᴹ.[143]
>
> And I assigned to him a name from four elements: from East, from West, from North, and from South.[144] And I assigned to him four special stars; and I called his name 'Adam.'[145]

However, the decipherment of the name of Adam as an acronym-appellation composed from the first letters of the words denoting the four principal corners of the Universe—A for Ἀνατολή (East), D for Δύσις (West), A for Ἄρκτος (North) and M for Μεσαμβρία (South)—was far from transparent for those among the Slavonic readers who were not acquainted with the Greek subtext of this linguistic riddle. In fact, it is exactly this particular fragment to which many scholars refer when arguing for the existence of a Greek protograph of *2 Enoch*, on the basis of which the Slavonic translation/edition was made, rather than directly from a Semitic *Vorlage*.

In a similar way, in John the Exarch's *Hexæmeron*, the 'etymology' of the biblical anthroponym *ADAM* is explicated as a symbolic designation of the Universe; as such, it is identified as a verbal icon of the 'micro-cosmos.' As in *2 Enoch* 30:13–14, in the *Homily on the Sixth Day*, it is emphasized that each letter of Adam's name is bound to the Greek terms denoting the four cardinal directions (Ἀνατολή, Δύσις, Ἄρκτος, Μεσαμβρία).

But while the anthropogonic fragments in *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* and *2 Enoch* 30:10–12 use almost identical phraseological expressions, representing two congenital renditions of one and the same intrinsic narrative (thus showing common origin and similar transmission history), the case with the parallels between *2 Enoch* 30:13–14 and John the Exarch's *Homily on the Sixth Day* is of a totally different nature. Although the content of the two anthropogonic narratives is anchored by one and the same mythologeme—that of

142 The Old Bulgarian/Old Church Slavonic lexeme съставь may well be used in other sources to render Gr. στοιχεῖα, φύσις, ὑπόστασις, thus denoting scientific, philosophic and theological concepts such as 'element' / 'component' / 'ingredient' / 'constituent' / 'essence'/ 'hypostasis', but also 'letter' / 'grapheme'. Thus the biblical anthroponym Adam is transformed by Enochic taxonomy into an ontological category.

143 Cf. Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*, p. 30 (lines 59–63), Ĭ. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, p. 177.

144 The same in Ms. J. In Mss. P and SokRum: from East, from West, from South and from North.

145 Author's translation.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

the name of Adam being an acronym of the four cardinal directions of the Universe,—their modes of explication are totally different.

It should be noted that John the Exarch's edition of the narrative about the creation of man and the origin of Adam's name is based on an excerpt from Severian of Gabala's *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ VI*,[146] which in Greek Byzantine tradition was conventionally appended to Basil of Cæsarea's *Homiliæ IX in Hexæmeron*.[147] In contrast to the Antiochian exegete Severian, the Cappadocian Church Father Basil never mentioned the appellation *ADAM* in his *Hexæmeron*; this is why Severian's anthropogonic account became the primary constituent of John the Exarch's *Homily on the Sixth Day*.[148]

Having adopted Severian's exegetical discourse on the hermeneutics of Adam's name, the medieval Bulgarian scholar John the Exarch constructs his own deliberations as a two-fold nexus. Thus, while redrafting in his *Homily on the Sixth Day* the narrative template akin to that attested in *2 Enoch* 30:13–14, he implicitly refers to the comments of the Antiochian exegete Severian regarding the Greek linguistic ancestry of the acronym-tetragram 'Adam.' John the Exarch embarks, following in the steps of his predecessor, on the decipherment of yet another philological riddle, but this time aiming at proving a new, alternative, Hebrew-based etiology of the name of Adam.

In Severian's *Homily*, this argument is based on wordplay (constructible only in Hebrew) between the appellation for 'man' [אישׁ] and that for 'fire' [אשׁ] (see below). Obviously, on this occasion the Antiochian exegete refers to one of the most fashionable cosmological concepts within his intellectual environment, that of the four primordial elements from which the Universe is constituted: earth, water, air and fire,[149] with fire having a different mode of being in contrast to the other three. By the same token, Severian states: the nature of fire should be considered as comparable to that of man, since the modes of existence of the former shape the ontological paradigm of the latter.

146 See also in this connection G. Barankova and V. Mil'kov, *Shestodnev Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo*, pp. 955–966; G. Barankova, 'K voprosu o perevodakh *Shestodneva* Severiana Gaval'skogo v drevneslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ knizhnosti', in *Lingvisticheskoe istochnikovedenie i istoriia russkogo iazyka*: 2001, Moscow, 2002, pp. 7–8; L. Sels and S. Van Pee, 'Scholia from Severian of Gabala's *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ* in the 14th-century Slavonic *Hexæmeron* Collection', p. 94.

147 Basil of Cæsarea's *Ninth Homily*, which is devoted to the creation of terrestrial animals and mankind, offers a general exegetical discourse on *Genesis* 1:26 ('Let us make man in our image'), but lacks a detailed anthropogonic narrative *per se*.

148 In John the Exarch's text the authorship of this fragment is ascribed to John Chrysostom; see the discussion above, note 19.

149 This epistemological model originated in Greek pre-Socratic philosophy, and in particular in Empedocles's theory of the four 'root elements', to be developed later in Plato.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Severian's discourse is enhanced by a rather sophisticated—resembling the style of rabbinical exegesis—elegant linguistic pun which, as already pointed out, can only be constructed in Hebrew, since the word for 'man' ('*ish*' [איש]) is a near homonym of that for 'fire' ('*esh*' [אש]).[150] Using the rhetoric of paronomasia, Severian designs and formulates an idiosyncratic hermeneutical algorithm for encoding not only the mystery of anthropogenesis, but also the very ontological principle of man's existence.

Unfolded in Severian's (and subsequently, John the Exarch's) discourse, along with the Greek 'etymology' of Adam's name, is thus one further strategy for illuminating its hermetic meaning, referring to man's nature as a manifestation of the superior among the elements of the Universe—fire. Once again the acronym-tetragram is interpreted as an appellation of the Cosmos/Universe itself, but this time the emphasis shifts to Adam's function as a progenitor of mankind, since, as the text states, it is from him, from the primordial human, that the terrestrial realm, up to its four corners (East, West, North and South), is to be inhabited and filled up by people; Adam is likened to a vessel of cosmic fire from which the candles of his progeny are to be set alight. Henceforth the 'archetypal' meaning of the biblical phrase 'Let us make man' (*Genesis* 1:26), Severian argues, is to be read as 'Let us make fire.' Here follows the relevant fragment from Severian's *Homily*, as rendered in John the Exarch's edition:

> ѵ҃ѵе нмѧ еврѣнскъı. огнь сѧ скаꙁаеть. вънимаⷭ молю тѧ.[151] [...] ѵ҃къ еврѣнскоⷪ бесѣдоⷪ огнь сѧ г҃ть. се нмѧ не дастьсѧ адамоу праꙁдьно. но ѹетърн соуть вещн въ оутварн сен. пакъı естьствословлю. аще н не хотѧть ꙁемлѧ, вода, въꙁдуˣ˙, огнь. н нꙑı вещн іакъı же соуть къıаждо. тако же пребъıваютъ. тако же се. аще въꙁмешн грдоу ѿ ꙁемлѧ. тѡ прилѡжнтн кˑ нен не можешн ѿ того дерˑжнмаго. но іака же есть. така же пребъıваеть. водꙉ аще вълѣешн мѣроⷪ нѣкакоⷪ. то пребъıваеть то же. вода прнбъıтъка не прнемлеть. въꙁдоуха аще нанмешн мѣхъ мѣра пребъıваеть. нного мѣха наполˑнитн ѿ того не мᵒжешн. а огнь не пребъıваеть іакъ же съı. мала свѣща въжˑжетˑсѧ. н несъвѣдн ѿ неѧ въжˑжешн доуплѧтнць. пещьнцю всю пламъı многъı горьщь въ своемь оустьн. но елнко же аще прнемлеть древо то множнтˑсѧ огнь. елˑма же н преже вѣдаше бъ̃. іакоже ѿ еднного тѣлесе ѵ҃ѵѧ. нсполˑнитˑсѧ

150 See also the analysis of this topic in L. Sels and S. Van Pee, 'Scholia from Severian of Gabala's *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ* in the 14th-century Slavonic *Hexæmeron* Collection', p. 94; consult also S. Voicu, 'Adamo, acrostico del mondo', pp. 212–214.

151 Quoted after G. Barankova and V. Mil'kov, *Shestodnev Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo*, p. 629 (Fol. 258ᵛ, lines 2–4).

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

вьселенъıа кран. н еднна свѣщıа толнко въж‘жеть свѣщъ. н ꙁападъ, н въстокъ. н полоудьнїе. н полоуночїе. положн нмѧ достонно того дѣла. сего дѣла н нмѧ то адамово въꙁванїе бѣаше оуселенѣн. понеже хотѣахоуса, н четърн странъı ѿ него нсполнntн. положн ада[м‘]. въстокъ ꙁападъ полоуночь пладьнnна. се же по елнньскоу сѧ. ıаꙁыкоу клıоуаеть тако нмѧ. н нмѧ н дѣлеса сьвѣдѣтельствѳеть у҃лкоу, ему же нсполънntн бѣаше вселенноуж. ꙁоветь же сѧ оубо еврѣнскъım г҃сомъ огнь.[152] [...] прїем‘лн оубо нмѧ достонн‘но вещн. нм‘ же бо ѿ огнѧ ıакоже н въıше гла҃хъ. ѿ мала велнкъ бъıваеть. н у҃лкъ ѿ мал[а] краѧ ꙁемнъıа нспол‘нн. проꙁванъ бъıсть у҃лкъ огнь. сего дѣлѧ сътворнмъ у҃лка еврѣнскож бесѣдож гле҃т‘сѧ.[153]

The word ‘man’ in Hebrew designates ‘fire.’ Please consider [diligently], I urge you. [...] In Hebrew language, ‘man’ designates ‘fire.’ This name was not given to Adam in vain, because there are four elements in the Universe: earth, water, air, and fire; and here I am talking about the nature of [matter], although this is not acceptable for many. All the elements exist and are present in one and the same content / volume. If you take a clod of earth, you cannot extend its quantity [var. volume, size] to more than what it already contains. It will remain the way it was [in its original state]. If you pour a certain quantity of water [into a vessel], it will remain the same and will not expand its contents. The measure of air, if you fill a bellows, remains the same and you cannot fill other bellows with the same air. As for fire, it does not remain the same. You light a small candle and from it you can light countless candelabra, and then a furnace, engulfed in huge flames, as the wood catches fire, the fire multiplies. This is how God envisaged that from one single human body, the four corners of the universe will be filled up. Just like one candle may kindle as many candles as in the West and East and South and North, He gave a name which is suitable to the deed. This is why the name of Adam was [designed as] the appellation of the Universe, because from it the four corners of the Universe were supposed to be populated; and [hence] God gave him [i.e. man] the name ‘Adam.’ This is in Greek that such a name can be assigned. The name and the deeds attest to man being tasked with filling the Universe. In Hebrew, ‘man’ designates ‘fire.’ [...] Consider a designa-

152 Quoted after G. Barankova and V. Mil’kov, *Shestodnev Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo*, pp. 629–630 (Fol. 258^{v}, lines 10–25; Fol. 259^{r}, lines 1–25).

153 Quoted after G. Barankova and V. Mil’kov, *Shestodnev Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo*, p. 631 (Fol. 260^{r}, lines 1–8).

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

> tion which substantiates the matter/object. Since fire, as I said previously, from small may become big, so does man, who, being one small [creature], is [assigned] to fill the Universe up to its corners. This is why man is given the appellation 'fire,' while the [phrase] 'Let us make man' means ['Let us make fire'[154]] in Hebrew.[155]

To sum up, Severian builds his argument by narrativization of *ad hoc* etymological constructions, while philological deliberations are transformed into theological discourse. Of particular importance for the current discussion, however, is the fact that the Antiochian scholar recycles the tale about the meaning of the name of the first man (with a glossed reference to its Greek-bound exegesis); it indicates that at the time when Severian composed his *Homily*, this tradition was already in circulation. It is most probably in the same period when the Greek protograph of what we now designate as *2 Enoch* was taking shape; the mythologeme of Adam's name as an acronym-tetragram was just one among many cosmogonic and anthropogonic motifs that was drawn into its fabric.

As for the transmission history of Severian of Gabala's anthropogonic excerpt in *Slavia Orthodoxa*, it continued to be copied in later renditions of various Slavonic *Hexamæral* collections (e.g. *Shestodnevnik*, etc.),[156] but the circle of its transmission remained relatively limited within the scope of this particular genre.[157]

In contrast, the mythologeme attested in *2 Enoch* 30:13–14 enjoyed immense popularity in medieval Slavonic cosmological writings, and especially in erotapocritic compilations. Among the typical representatives of this discursive realm is the fifteenth-century Serbian recension of the *Razumnik* (*Разꙋмникъ*) erotapocritic apocryphal text (published by N. Tikhonravov in the second vol-

154 Reconstructed on the basis of some other Slavonic witnesses of the text of Severian of Gabala's *Homily* (e.g. *Codex Athous Chilandaricus* 405, dated to s. 1400); see *Scholion Slav5* in L. Sels and S. Van Pee, 'Scholia from Severian of Gabala's *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ* in the 14th-century Slavonic *Hexæmeron* Collection', pp. 100–101. See also G. Barankova and V. Mil'kov, *Shestodnev Ioanna Ekzarkha Bolgarskogo*, p. 957 (note 222).

155 Author's translation.

156 See the discussion in L. Sels and S. Van Pee, 'Scholia from Severian of Gabala's *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ* in the 14th-century Slavonic *Hexæmeron* Collection', pp. 89–110.

157 As pointed out by scholars, the full text of Severian's composition *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ VI* was translated in the 13th–14th centuries in Bulgaria; fragments from it were found in some miscellanies produced during the reign of Tzar Ivan–Alexander, and in later periods; see G. Barankova, 'K voprosu o perevodakh *Shestodneva* Severiana Gaval'skogo v drevneslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ knizhnosti', p. 5.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

ume of his *Monuments of Proscribed Russian Literature*). The micro-narrative about the creation of the primordial man out of eight[158] substances is followed by yet another one about the origin of his name, which is untangled as an abbreviation containing four separate letters gathered from the four corners of the Universe (East, West, South and North) by the Archangels Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel. Each of the heavenly protagonists was given an assignment by God to bring along a letter, while each of these four letters was supposed to be extracted from the respective name of a designated star. Having thus fetched from the heavenly luminaries the desired four letters, the Archangels delivered them before God who assembled them into one single entity, thus forming the name of the primordial man, *ADAM*. The Archangel Uriel was the first to read it out, hence proclaiming its creation. Then again, the spelling of the archetypal anthroponym *ADAM* is rendered by the Serbian scribe according to the conventions of the Slavonic alphabet, in which every single letter is assigned a unique designation.[159] Thus the name of the letter *А* (A) is 'Азъ' (which is the form for the first person singular pronoun 'I'); the name of the second letter, *Д* (D), is 'Добро' (denoting 'goodness'), while the name of the letter *М* (M) is 'Мыслите' (which means 'think'). At the same time, these same four Slavonic letters are identified by the scribe as phonetic constituents extracted from the names of the four heavenly luminaries: *Ana-*

158 There are other cases (e.g. *The Discussion Between the Three Hierarchs*, *The Legend About the Sea of Tiberias*, etc.), in which the number of substances may be seven (as in the anthropogonic template attested in *2 Enoch* 30:8–9). It should be noted in this connection that the recurring shift between the two numerical icons of divine Creation (i.e. 'seven' and 'eight') is typical for anthropogonic narratives attested in *Slavia Orthodoxa*; see the discussion in V. Mochul'skiĭ, 'Istoriko-literaturnyi analiz *Stikha o Golubinoi Knige*', *RFV* vol. 17, issue 1 (1887), pp. 174–177; R. Nachtigall, 'Ein Beitrag zu den Forschungen über die sogenannte 'Беседа трехъ святителей' (Gespräch dreier Heiligen)', *Archiv für Slavische Philologie Bd.* 23 (1901), 1–95; *Bd.* 24 (1902), pp. 321–408; F. Badalanova Geller, '*The Sea of Tiberias*: Between Apocryphal Literature and Oral Tradition', pp. 73–78. For a detail survey of mythological motifs attested in the narrative about the creation of the first man from the element of the cosmos (with a special emphasis on *2 Enoch* and other related compositions, such as the spiritual folk poem *The Book of the Dove*) within the context of other Indo-European traditions, see B. Lincoln, *Myth, Cosmos, Society*: *Indo-European Themes of Creation and Destruction*, Cambridge, MA–London, UK, 1986, pp. 10–26. See also the discussion in G. Macaskill, 'Adam Octipartite/Septipartite', in R. Bauckham, J.R. Davila and Al. Panayotov (eds), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures* vol. 1, Grand Rapids, MI–Cambridge, UK, 2013, pp. 3–21.

159 Cf. R. Mathiesen, 'A new reconstruction of the original Glagolitic alphabet', in M.S. Flier, D.J. Birnbaum and C.M. Vakareliyska (eds), *Philology Broad and Deep*: *In Memoriam Horace G. Lunt*, Bloomington, IN, 2014, p. 190, p. 206.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

toli, Disis, Artos and [*Me*]*sevria*.[160] Intriguingly, but not surprisingly, these four quasi-astronyms represent domesticated Slavonic (occasionally erroneous)[161] transcriptions of the Greek lexemes denoting the four corners of the Universe: East (Ἀνατολή), West (Δύσις), North (Ἄρκτος), and South (Μεσαμβρία); but, most importantly, the somewhat mosaic yet lavishly elaborated narrative about the creation of primordial man and the ætiology of his name, as presented in the erotapocrisis *Razumnik* (*Разѹмникъ*), redrafts virtually all the basic motifs constituting the anthropogonic storyline in *2 Enoch* 30:7–14; these include the list of substances involved in the crafting of the primordial man and the astral constituents of the anagram of his name, thus manifesting the association of *ADAM* with 'the four special stars' assigned to him by the Creator. Below follows the fragment in question from the erotapocrisis *Razumnik* (*Разѹмникъ*):

> ѿ что сътворн бь Адама?—ѿ.: ѿ н҃ честн ·а҃· чес тело его ѿ ꙁемлє ·в҃· чес ѿ морѣ ·г҃· чес ѿ каменїа ·д҃· чес ѿ вѣтра ·е҃· чес ѿ облак ·ѕ҃· чес ѿ слн҃ца н ѿ росы ·ꙁ҃· чес ѿ помысла ѿ брьꙁостн агг҃льскых ·н҃· чес ѿ сг҃го дха. ѿ того събра бь н сътвотн в еднн8 чес. н реч. аще юс семѣ ѿ ул҃ка того ѿ мѡрѣ то лакѡм, аще юс ѿ слн҃ца семѣ то в8деть м8дрь оумень. ащелї юс ѿ облака семѣ то прѣльстнво. аще ѿ вѣтра семѣ то срьднто. ащелн ѿ каменїе семѣ то в8деть млстнво; аще лн ѿ дха сг҃а семѣ то смѣрено н доброволно кь всемь. въпрос. кто обрете нменїн его. ѿвѣт. ·д҃· анг҃лн архг҃ль мнханль нꙁыде на въстокь. н вндѣ sвѣꙁд8 нме ен анатолн. н въꙁемь слово ѿ нюе аꙁь. н прїнесе прѣд г҃а. архг҃ль гаврїнль нꙁыдѣ на ꙁапад. н вндѣ sвѣꙁд8 нмѣ ен днснсь н въꙁемь слово ѿ нее добро. н прїнесе прѣд г҃а. рафанль нꙁыдѣ ѿ пол8дне н вндѣ sвѣꙁд8 нме ен артось. н въꙁемь слово ѿ нѣе слово аꙁь. н прїнесе прѣд г҃а. оурнль нꙁндѣ на пол8ноць н вндѣ sвѣꙁд8 нмѣ ен. севрїа[162] н въꙁемь слово ѿ нѣе слово мыслнте. н прїнесе прѣд г҃а. н речь г҃ь ѹьтн оурнле н реч оурнль адамь.[163]

> [Question:] From what [substances] did God create Adam? Answer: From eight parts; the first part, the flesh of his body [was] from earth; the second part—from the sea [intended for his blood]; the third part—from stone [intended for his bones]; the fourth part—from the wind [intended

160 See also the discussion in W. Ryan, 'Curious Star Names in Slavonic Literature', *RL* vol. 1 (1974), pp. 141–142.

161 See in this connection notes 162, 166, 167.

162 The quasi-astronym севрїа should be interpreted as abridgement of месеврїа (= Gr. Μεσαμβρία); see note 167 below.

163 Quoted after N. Tikhonravov, *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury* vol. 2, pp. 443–444.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

> for his breath]; the fifth part—from cloud [intended for his faculties]; the sixth part—from the sun and dew [for his eyes]; the seventh—from angelic alacrity [intended for his thoughts], the eight part—from the Holy Spirit [intended for man's soul]. From all these [elements] God created one entity and said, 'If in the seed [i.e. progeny] which comes from this man supremacy were given to sea, [the offspring] would be greedy; if only to the sun, [the offspring] would be wise and reasonable. If [supremacy were given] only to the cloud, [the offspring] would be prone to temptation; if only to the wind, [the offspring] would be angry. If only to the stone, [the offspring] would be merciful. If only to the Holy Spirit, [the offspring] would be humble and good towards everybody. Question: Who instituted his name? Answer: Four angels. The Archangel Michael went to the East and saw a star whose name was *Anatoli*.[164] From it he took the letter 'Az' [= A] and presented it before God. The Archangel Gabriel went to the West, and saw a star whose name was *Disis*.[165] From it he took the letter 'Dobro' [= D] and presented it before God. Raphail went to the South and saw a star whose name was *Artos*.[166] And he took from it the letter 'Az' [= A] and presented it before God. Uriel went to the North and saw a star whose name was *Sevria*.[167] He took from it the letter 'Myslite' [= M] and presented it before God. And God said: 'Uriel, read [it] out!' And Uriel said: 'Adam.'[168]

In general, the types of vernacular parabiblical compositions, similar to the one quoted above, follow the (somewhat abridged and redrafted) storyline of *2 Enoch* 30:8–13 (the longer recension); as a rule, the account concerning the origin of appellation *ADAM* is presented in them as the final sequel in a series of flexible text-units tailored in an elaborate, manifold anthropogonic tale. The

164 Cf. Greek Ἀνατολή (East).

165 Cf. Greek Δύσις (West).

166 The Slavonic scribe renders the designation of the star from the South as *Artos*, thus erroneously associationg it with the Northern corner of the Universe (Gr. Ἄρκτος); see also the next note.

167 The star fetched from the North appears to be called *Sevria* (from Gr. Μεσαμβρία, denoting South); this would indicate that the scribe copied his text from an earlier Slavonic version which no longer preserved the correct spelling of the Greek terms denoting the corners of the Universe. Furthermore the copyist obviously had rather scarce (if any) knowledge of Greek; hence the confusion in translating Ἄρκτος as South and Μεσαμβρία as North.

168 Author's translation.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

17th century Russian version of the apocryphal *Legend About How God Created Adam* [Сказанне, како сотворн Богъ Адама] (published by A. Pypin)[169] exemplifies yet another such a case.

The first of the narrative sequels in its storyline deals with the creation of man out of eight substances (e.g. his body—from earth, his bones—from stones, his blood—from sea, his eyes—from the Sun; his thoughts—from clouds, his brightness—from the primordial light, his breath—from the wind, his warmth—from fire).[170] The second sequel (which has numerous parallel attestations in other dualistic cosmogonic compositions, such as *The Legend About the Sea of Tiberias*, etc.)[171] is about the Devil's attempt to defile the body of the primordial human; the next, third, sequel relates God's countermove against his adversary's harmful actions. It is the fourth sequel that explains the etymology of the appellation *ADAM*; the ensuing subplot is rather similar to that found in the above-mentioned fifteenth-century Serbian recension of the erotapocrisis *Razumnik* (published by N. Tikhonravov). Stated in the text of *The Legend About How God Created Adam*, however, is that the letters of which the name of primordial man consists—A, D and M—are brought, following God's command, from the four corners of the Universe by one single angel (in contrast to the erotapocrisis *Razumnik*, according to which God's celestial envoys are four), with the letter *A* being fetched from the East, *D* from the West, and *M* from both North and South:

> Н посла Господь ангела своего, повелѣ взѧтн азъ на востоцѣ, добро на западѣ, мъислете на сѣверѣ н на югѣ. Н бысть человѣкъ въ душу жнву, нарече нмѧ ему Адамъ.[172]
>
> And the Lord sent his angel, and ordered him to take the letter *A* [= *az'*] from the East, the letter *D* [= *dobro*] from the West, the letter *M* [= *myslete*] from the North and from the South. And the man became living soul, and He assigned him the name of Adam.[173]

169 Cf. *Lozhnyia i otrechennyia knigi russkoĭ stariny. Sobrannyia A.N. Pypinym. Pamiatniki starinnoĭ russkoĭ literatury, Izdavæmye Grafom Grigoriem Kushelevym-Bezborodko*, Vyp. 3, Sankt Petersburg, 1862, pp. 12–14.

170 See note 158 above.

171 Cf. F. Badalanova Geller, '*The Sea of Tiberias*: Between Apocryphal Literature and Oral Tradition', pp. 78–80.

172 Quoted after A.N. Pypin, *Lozhnyia i otrechennyia knigi russkoĭ stariny*, p. 13.

173 Author's translation.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Missing from this abrupt anthropogonic narrative, however, is the motif of the 'four special stars' assigned to the primordial man by God (as in *2 Enoch* 30:14). Significantly, these types of omissions became emblematic for the cosmogonic accounts copied in the later period, perhaps due to the increased interest (on behalf of both the scribal community and the reading audience) towards the indigenous, home-spun exegesis of their content. The substitution of the list of the 'four special stars' by the narrativized spelling of the appellation-acronym *ADAM*, according to the conventions of the Slavonic alphabet, becomes their hallmark. *The Legend About How God Created Adam* is among the typical representatives of these types of para-Enochic anthropogonic narratives.

In contrast, the sub-plot about the creation of the first man from the elements of the cosmos (as in *2 Enoch* 30:8–9) became one of the most popular *topoi* featuring profoundly and intensely in the orally transmitted verses of folk spiritual chants, originally composed by the itinerant singers of tales ['калики перехожие'] in *Slavia Orthodoxa*. The survey of anthologies published at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries in Russia and elsewhere shows that these types of vernacular religious stanzas circulated under the general title *The Rhyme of the Book of the Dove* ['Стих о Голубиной книге'].[174] In fact, these songs—which may be labelled as oral best-sellers of the Middle Ages—are still being performed in remote parts of Russia; as such, *The Rhyme of the Book of the Dove* religious chants can be regarded as surviving witnesses to ancient Enochic traditions.

One further point; as already emphasised, the micro-narrative about the 'etymology' of the biblical anthroponym *ADAM* as a verbal icon of the 'microcosmos' (with each letter being bound to the Greek lexemes denoting the four cardinal directions—Ἀνατολή, Δύσις, Ἄρκτος, Μεσαμβρία) features concurrently in both John the Exarch's *Homily on the Sixth Day*, and in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* 30:13–14. If we were to consider the hypothesis that the translation of *2 Enoch* into Old Church Slavonic occurred concurrently with the compilation/translation of John the Exarch's *Hexæmeron*, then we ought to confirm once again the conjecture that the longer recension most probably represents an earlier stage in the transmission history of *2 Enoch* in *Slavia Orthodoxa*.[175]

174 Cf. *Kaleki Perekhozhie*: *Sbornik stikhov i issledovanie P. Bezsonova*, Chast 1, Vypusk 2, Moskva, 1861, pp. 269–275 (text 76), pp. 299–305 (text 82), pp. 316–323 (text 86).

175 See the discussion above (§ 2.4).

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

3 *Slavia Orthodoxa* Domesticating Enochic Vocabulary

Although the chapter Ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου βιβλίου Ἐνὼχ περὶ τῶν ἐγρηγόρων (i.e. *1 Enoch* 6.1–9.11) was omitted from *The Slavonic Derivative of Synkellos* (see § 2.3 above), the term originally used by the Byzantine Greek chronographer to designate the Watchers, *Gregoroi* [Γρήγοροι, Ἐγρήγοροι],[176] survived in *Slavia Orthodoxa* as a *hapax* attested exclusively in the lexicon of *2 Enoch*. As in Synkellos' extract, 'From the First Book of Enoch concerning the Watchers,' this same term (the transliterated versions of which appear in various orthographies, e.g. *Grigore* [Грнгоре],[177] *Grigorě* [Грнгорѣ],[178] *Grigori* [Грнгорн],[179] *Grigorie* [Грнгорїе],[180] *Grigorii* [Грнгорїи/Грнгорнн],[181] *Grigor'i* [Грнгорьн],[182] *Grigory* [Грнгоры],[183] *Egrigorъ*, *Egrigori*, *Egrigorii* [*Егрнгорь, Егрнгорн, Егрнго-*

176 See also the discussion in N. Forbes and R. Charles, '*2 Enoch*, or *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*', in R. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* vol. 2: *Pseudepigrapha*, Oxford, 1913, pp. 439–440 (note xviii.3); F. Andersen, '2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*', p. 130 (note 18a); G. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (*Chapters 1–36; 81–108*), p. 80. See further the linguistic data presented by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott in their *Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford, 1963. The authors provide exhaustive analysis of the semantic coverage of the verb γρηγορέω (formed from ἐγρήγορα, *to be* or *become fully awake*, *watch*), and some of its cognates (e.g. γρηγόρησις, *wakefulness*; γρηγορικός, *wakeful*, *watchful*); see ibid., p. 360. Taken into consideration are also related forms, such as ἐγρηγορικός (*waking*); ἐγρηγορος (*wakeful*); ἐγρήγορσις (*waking*, *wakefulness*); ἐγρηγορτέον (*one must keep awake*); ἐγρήγορσις (*waking*, *wakefulness*); ἐγρηγορτί (*awake*, *watching*); see ibid., p. 475. Significantly, the term Ἐγρήγοροι was also used by Mani; see W.B. Henning, 'The Book of the Giants', *BSOAS* vol. 11, issue 1 (1943), p. 53; E. Morano, 'Some New Sogdian Fragments Related to Mani's *Book of Giants* and the Problem of the Influence of Jewish Enochic Literature', in M. Goff, L.T. Stuckenbruck and E. Morano (eds), *Ancient Tales of Giants from Qumran and Turfan. Contexts, Traditions, and Influences*, Tübingen, 2016, p. 187.

177 Cf. Ms. S: Na .ē-ж нб҃о. н вндѣˣ тоу мноγыж вое неиʒуьтеннїе рекомїн *грнгорε*.

178 Cf. Ms. U: н восл8жниша *грнгорѣ*, ꙗко еднмѣᴹ гл꙾мь вʒнᴬ глаᴳ꙾нˣ в лнце гн҃е.

179 Cf. Ms. P: Вʒꙗша ма м8жїе на е҃нб҃о, н поставниша ма, н вндѣхъ т8 вон многн н неисчетны, рекомїа *Грнгорн*; Ms. S: Сн сжт *грнгорн*, нже ѿвръгошжс꙾ѿ г҃а .с҃. тьмж съ кнаʒем своим сатананлем; Ms. S: въспѣшж *грнгорн* еднногласно. н въʒыде глаᴳ꙾нˣ прѣᴬ лнцеᴹ гнᴬ.

180 Cf. Ms. J: н рекошᴀ къ мнѣ мжжїе ѡны сн сжт *грнгорїе* нже ѿвръгошᴀᴳ꙾ѿ г҃а. сѣᴹ съ кнᴀseᴹ своᴹ сатананлеᴹ.

181 Cf. Ms J: Н въʒꙗше ма на крнлѣˣ своˣ мжжїе ѡны, н поставнста ма на пѣтое нб҃о, н вндѣˣ тоу многы вон неисчетенн, рекомыᴀ *грнгорїи*; Ms U: сн соуᵀ *грнгорнн* нж ѿторгоу ѿ себе с҃кнʒь с҃ходацинˣ во слѣᴬ.

182 Cf. Ms U: н воʒнесоста ма на патое небо. н вндѣˣ тоу многа всᴀ. н *грнгорьн* вндѣ кї ꙗко вндѣннᴀ ᴜлвуᴳ꙾ко велнуьствожˣ нхъ вацїе ᴜюдоᴮ꙾велнкыˣ.

183 Cf. Ms. P: Н рекоша ко мнѣ. сїн с8тъ *Грнгоры*, нже ѿвергошасᴀ Г҃а с҃г҃а со кнаʒеᴹ своимъ Сатананломъ.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

рнн],[184] *Igrigory* [Игригори], *Gory* [Горы],[185] *Govory* [*Говоръı*],[186] etc.) are likewise used by the Slavonic scribe(s) to designate the Fallen Angels. In fact, the domesticated (Slavicised) versions of the Greek angelonym *Gregoroi* [Γρήγοροι, Ἐγρήγοροι] occurs *only* in Enoch's testimony about the Fifth Heaven (that is, *2 Enoch* 18:1–9), described by the visionary as a celestial dungeon, where the condemned brotherhood of the Watchers is sentenced. Their appearance was like that of humans [вндѣнїе нˣ ѩко вндѣнїе ѵлв҃ѵе], yet their immensity was even bigger than the vastness of huge/great giants [велнчьство нхь вещıе ц҆ждовь велнкъıˣ]. Their faces were morose [лнца нˣ дрѧхла] and their mouths are constantly silent [мльчанıе оусть нˣ въсегда]. Enoch finds it important to emphasise that in the Fifth Heaven there was no divine service [не бѣ служенїа на ѥ̄-мь нб҃сн]. The latter detail indicates that the celestial realm is imagined as a temple in which the heavenly liturgy is held; the only exception is the place where Watchers were sentenced.[187]

Enoch is even explicitly informed about their exact number since, as he himself admits when he first encountered them, they seemed to him as a great assembly of countless warriors [многыж вое ненз҆ѵьтенїе]. The shorter recension of *2 Enoch*[188] agrees with *1 Enoch* 6:6, that the number of Watchers 'who came down' on 'the summit of Mount Hermon' is two hundred, while in the longer recension (*2 Enoch* 18:3), it is maintained that it was 'two hundred myriads' of *Gregori* that 'parted from God with their prince Satanail' [нже ѿвръгошѫ҆ ѿ Гa҃ с҃ тьмж съ кназ҆ем свонм Сатанаилем]. Yet in both *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch*, the summit of Mount Hermon is imagined as the standard topos of wickedness. According to *1 Enoch* 6:6, this is the spot where the Watchers came down and swore their oath. In *2 Enoch*, however, the narrative is more elaborate: the crest of Mount Hermon [на рамѣ горы Ермонскые; на мѣсто Ермона][189] is described as the place where *Gregori* descended from the Throne of the Lord [нже съндошѫ҆ на з҆емла ѿ прѣстола гн҃ѣ] (a detail missing from *1 Enoch*) and broke their covenant with Him [прѣтръгошѧ ѡбѣщанїе],[190] thus polluting the Earth with their deeds [ѡсквръннсѧ з҆емла дѣламн нˣ]. The longer and the

184 Attested in Ms. Bars/Sok.

185 Cf. Ms. N: Н вьз҆несоста ме мѫжа на петое небо, н вндѣхь тѫ многые вое, н *горы* вндѣнıе нхь ѩко вндѣнıе ѵловѣѵе н велнчьство же нхь паѵе ѵюдесь велнкынхь.

186 Attested in Ms. Bars1/Sok.

187 See Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*, pp. 15–17. See also in this connection the discussion in M. Himmelfarb, *An Apocalypse: A Brief History*, pp. 76–78.

188 For Ms. U, see A. Pennington, '*2 Enoch*' (§ 7: 4), p. 335; see also F. Andersen, '*2* (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*', (§ 18: 3), p. 131.

189 See F. Andersen, '*2* (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*', p. 132 (note 18e).

190 See Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*, p. 16. Cf. *1 Enoch* 6:7.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

shorter recensions of *2 Enoch* diverge at this point. In the longer recension it is emphasised that the daughters of men sinned greatly [велнко ꙁло творѧт] during all times of that epoch [въ всѧ врѣмена вѣка сего], by lawlessly committing the mixing of species [беꙁаконоужіе твораціе смѣшенїа], giving birth to giants [раждажт сѧ нсполн] and enormous colossi [ціждове велицн], thus bringing about great malevolence [велнка непрїѧꙁнь];[191] because of this, God condemned those who seduced them to 'the Great Tribunal' [ѡсждн нˣ Бъ̄ велнкоᵐ сждѡᵐ]. The shorter recension lacks the details about the birth of the giants [нсполн, ціждове] and simply states that the *Gregori* were condemned by God because they defiled themselves with human women.

Encouraged by Enoch to serve God, so that they do not anger him further, the *Gregori* listened to the visionary's advice [послоушаше накꙁанїа]; having lined up in four ranks in their heavenly prison [сташж на ѵетнрн ѵнин нб̄сн сеᵐ], they began singing in one voice [въспѣшж грнгорн ѣдиногласно], and their chant ascended to God's face [въꙁыде гла͡нˣ прѣ лнцеᵐ гн̂а̂]. Thus Enoch's mystical encounter with the angelic prisoners sentenced on the Fifth Heaven is rendered (in both shorter and longer recensions of *2 Enoch*) as a narrative about their atonement, with the visionary acting as their human solicitor and intercessor, advising them to commence their repentance before the Lord. In a similar way, in *The Book of Watchers* 'Enoch the scribe' communicates with the Fallen Angels and mediates between their petitions for forgiveness and God's declaration of judgment (*1 Enoch* 12–16).[192]

Then again, in *The Book of Watchers* Enoch is instructed in 'a vision of wrath' (*1 Enoch* 13:8–9),—given to him 'by the waters of Dan in Dan, which is south-west of Hermon' (i.e. on earth, but not during a celestial journey)!—that he 'should speak to the sons of heaven and reprove them,' and tell them 'with the tongue of flesh' (14:2), that their petition will not be granted 'for all the days of eternity, and complete judgement has been decreed' against them (14:8). The events in the Slavonic text follow a somewhat different, 'open-end' scenario. In *2 Enoch* the fate of *Gregori* is not sealed; there is no oracle of judgement—the matter remains open. The visionary is not informed about God's rejection of the Watchers' petition; there is no final sentence pronounced, apart from the general statement concerning their condemnation to 'the Great Tribunal' (see above). This vagueness about the *Gregori*-destiny is one of the most peculiar

191 Cf. *1 Enoch* 7:1–3, 9:8–10; see Sokolov, 'Materialy i zametki po starinnoĭ slavianskoĭ literature. Vyp. Tretiĭ (vii/2): Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha. Tekst s latinskim perevodom', p. 16.

192 See also the discussion in L. Stuckenbruck, 'The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of *Genesis* 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions', p. 367.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

features of *2 Enoch*, especially in the light of the visionary's intervention into their silent existence, when he persuades them to resume their former services, 'in the Lord's name,' and they begin to do so by singing with a single voice.

The domesticated Slavonic versions of the Greek appellation *Gregoroi* [Γρήγοροι, Ἐγρήγοροι], as attested in *2 Enoch*, are absent from the main lexicographic sources of Old Church Slavonic, such as the *Lexicon Linguæ Palæoslovenicæ*,[193] the *Palæoslavonic Dictionary*,[194] the *Dictionary of Old Church Slavonic Language*,[195] etc. Yet the use of this distinctive term in both *The Chronography of George Synkellos* and *2 Enoch* is one of the strongest arguments indicating that the Slavonic protograph of this apocalyptic work must have originated from an earlier Greek translation of the apocryphon, rather than directly from its Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage*;[196] it further suggests that in the Byzantine Commonwealth there existed a certain common Enochic thesaurus which was attested in both Greek and Slavonic versions of the pseudepigraphic corpus, as well as in chronographic tradition.[197] Shared terminology is likely to suggest a common intellectual and ideological background, and this particular methodology of linguistic archæology has so far remained unexplored in the studies of Enochic heritage in the Byzantine Commonwealth.

4 Demarcating Magic and Mysticism: The Enochic Epistemology in *Slavia Orthodoxa*

While in *The Book of Watchers* (i.e. *1 Enoch*) the emphasis is put on the concept of the illicit transmission of knowledge from heaven to earth, from angels to humans, in the case of *2 Enoch* the opposite concept predominates. Once more the focal point of the narrative is the disclosure of esoteric knowledge to a mortal man by angelic agency, but this time the revelation is endorsed by the Lord himself. Furthermore it is not Enoch's decision to become an eyewitness to the mysteries of the universe; on the contrary, he is the one chosen by the Most High to become a recipient of divine wisdom, and to learn the eter-

193 Cf. A. Dostál et al. (eds), *SJS/LLP* vol. 8, Praha, 1964.

194 Cf. R. Tseĭtlin et al. (eds), *Staroslavianskiĭ Slovar'* (*Po Rukopisiam X–XI vekov*), Moscow, 1994.

195 Cf. A. Bonchev, *Rechnik na Tsŭrkovnoslavanskiia Ezik* vol. 1.

196 One of the strongest advocates of an opposing hypothesis was N. Meshcherskiĭ, 'K istorii teksta slavianskoĭ knigi Enokha', pp. 93–102.

197 To the same cluster of witnesses to *1 Enoch* in the Byzantine Greek historiographical tradition belongs *The Chronicle of* (*Skylitzes-*)*Kedrenos*; see Ĭ. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, p. 186.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

nal secrets unknown even to the angelic host. In contrast to the Watchers, who challenge God's commands and therefore fall, Enoch is granted angelic status, since he obeys the Lord's will unconditionally. While Watchers descend from God's Throne to Earth, Enoch ascends from Earth to God's Throne. In the case of the Watchers, the practices of esoteric knowledge—magic and divination—are revealed to women (and hence illicit). At the same time, Enoch becomes the first visionary and recipient of the mystical experience endorsed by God.

To sum up, the Watchers are markers of magic, Enoch—of mysticism. Enoch is 'the anti-Watcher.' Not only are the divine secrets disclosed in his ascent, but he also becomes God's scribe, his heavenly amanuensis. *Slavonic Enoch* focuses on the specific particulars of his mystical mission.

Concluding Remarks

The various strands of scribal production circulating in the Slavonic domain of the Byzantine Commonwealth in the second half of the 9th and the beginning of the 10th centuries appear to point in the same direction: that the first translation of the Greek *Vorlage* of the work we now designate as *2 Enoch* into Old Church Slavonic must have occurred in Preslav, the then capital of the First Bulgarian Kingdom. It is unclear whether the scribe who accomplished the original translation worked in the royal scriptorium or in one of the adjacent monastic centres, but there is no doubt that he belonged to the local community of intellectuals engaged in theology and science, astronomy and calendar, grammar and philosophy, historiography and geography. Most probably, he was a contemporary of John the Exarch—the scholar who was responsible for the translation into Old Church Slavonic of fragments from the *Homiliæ in Hexæmeron* of Basil of Cæsarea and *In Cosmogoniam homiliæ* of Severian of Gabala, along with *The Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* of John Damascene. The survey of questions discussed in John the Exarch's compositions—relating to cosmogonic and anthropogonic, astronomic and calendrical matters—shows close connection with themes presented in *2 Enoch*. Circulating during the same period were also important historiographical works, such as *The Chronography of John Malalas*, *The Chronography of George Hamartolos*, *The Chronography of George Synkellos* (containing, in fact, a cluster of abridged edited fragments from *The Chronicle of Julius Africanus*). The linguistic analysis of their glossaries indicates further connections with Enochic texts and traditions which so far remain understudied. As for the narrative about carnal encounters between the Fallen Angels and the beautiful daughters of men, it also survived as a demonological tale incapsulated in the various domesticated recensions

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

of *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, while the motif of cosmetics as a devilish matter (a hallmark of the *Watchers myth*) had a significant impact on vernacular iconography.

Acknowledgements

This article has benefited from the comments and insightful suggestions of William R. Veder and William Adler.

Appendix
Second (*Slavonic Apocalypse of*) *Enoch*: Survey of Published Text Witnesses[198]

Sigla and Abbreviations

ANL The Austrian National Library, Vienna [Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien]; formerly (until 1920) The Imperial Court Library [Kaiserliche Hofbibliothek]

BAN The Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Biblioteka Rossiĭskoĭ Akademii Nauk [Библиотека Российской Академии Наук]), Saint Petersburg; formerly (until 1992) The Library of the Academy of Sciences of USSR (Biblioteka Akademii Nauk SSSR [Библиотека Академии Наук СССР])

198 The current survey is based on earlier research carried out by various scholars; see Sokolov, *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha*; id., *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago* (Part 2), pp. 1–105; A. Iatsimirskiĭ, *Bibliograficheskiĭ Obzor Apokrifov v Iuzhnoslavianskoĭ i Russkoĭ Pis'mennosti* (*Spiski Pamiatnikov*: *Apokrify Vetkhozavetnye*), pp. 81–88; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch*, pp. v–x; Ĭ. Ivanov, *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*, pp. 165–167; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, pp. iii–viii; N. Meshcherskiĭ, 'Sledy pamiatnikov Kumrana v staroslavianskoĭ i drevnerusskoĭ literature (K izucheniiu slavianskikh versiĭ Knigi Enokha)', pp. 135–139; id., 'K istorii teksta slavianskoĭ knigi Enokha', pp. 93–95; P. Dinekov, K. Kuev and D. Petkanova (eds), *Khristomatiia po starobŭlgarska literatura*, Sofia, 1967, pp. 146–147; F. Andersen, '*2* (*Slavonic Apocalypse*) *of Enoch*', pp. 92–93; A. Pennington, '*2 Enoch*', pp. 321–323, pp. 326–327; A. de Santos Otero, 'Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)', pp. 147–157, 160; Ch. Böttrich, '*The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (*2 En*): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission (An Overview)', pp. 39–44; V. Mil'kov and S. Polianskiĭ, *Kosmologicheskie Proizvedeniia v Knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi* vol. 2: *Teksty Ploskostno-Komarnoĭ i Drugikh Kosmologicheskikh Traditsiĭ*, pp. 451–453; F. Badalanova Geller, 'Heavenly Writings: Celestial Cosmography in *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*', pp. 199–203; G. Macaskill, '*2 Enoch*: Manuscripts, Recensions, and Original Language', pp. 84–87; id., *The Slavonic Texts of* 2 Enoch, pp. 9–19.

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

BIHP The Institute of History and Philology of Count Bezborodko (Istoriko-Filologicheskiĭ Institut Kniazia A.A. Bezborodko [Историко-филологический Институт Князя А.А. Безбородко]), Nezhin; in 1919–1920 transformed into The Nezhyn Institute of People's Education [Нежинский Институт народного образования]; in 1939—into N. Gogol' State Pedagogical Institute in Nezhin [Нежинский государственный педагогический институт имени Николая Гоголя]; since 2004—Mykola Gogol' State University in Nizhyn [Ніжинський державний університет ім. Миколи Гоголя], Ukraine

GIM The State Historical Museum (Gosudarstvennyĭ Istoricheskiĭ Muzeĭ [Государственный исторический музей]), Moscow

RNB The M. Saltykov-Shchedrin National Library of Russia (Rossiĭskaia Natsional'naia Biblioteka imeni M. Saltykova-Shchedrina [Российская национальная библиотека имени М. Салтыкова-Щедрина]); between 1917 and 1925—The Russian Public Library (Rossiĭskaia Publichnaia Biblioteka [Российская публичная библиотека]); before 1917—The Imperial Public Library (Imperatorskaia Publichnaia Biblioteka [Императорская публичная библиотека]), Saint Petersburg

NLS The National Library of Serbia (Narodna Biblioteka Srbije [Народна библиотека Србије]), Belgrade, Serbia

RGB The Russian State Library (Rossiĭskaia Gosudarstvennaia Biblioteka [Российская государственная библиотека]); between 1925 and 1992—V.I. Lenin State Library of the USSR [Государственная библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина]; between 1862 and 1924—The Library of the Moscow Public Museum and the Rumiantsev Museum (or The Rumiantsev Library) [Библиотека Румянцевского музея], Moscow.

SANU The Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti [Српска академија наука и уметности]), Belgrade, Serbia

The Longer Recension

S Ms. № 321 (fols 269^{r}–323^{r}), NLS; Bulgarian redaction (between the 14th–16th centuries).
Designated by Sokolov as **A**; by Bonwetsch—as **S**; by Morfill and Charles—as **Sok**; by Schmidt—as ***Codex Belgradensis***; by Vaillant, Andersen, Pennington, Böttrich, Orlov, and Macaskill—as **R**.

J Ms. № 13.3.25 (fols 93^{r}–125^{r}), BAN; Bulgarian redaction (15th–16th centuries).
Designated by Sokolov as **Я** [= **Ja**]; by Bonwetsch, Vaiilant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov, Macaskill—as **J**.

P Ms. Khlud D. 69 [Хлуд. Д. 69] (fols. 58–82), *The Addendum to the Khludov Collection* [Хлудовское Дополнительное Собрание], GIM; Ruthenian redaction (copied from an earlier Bulgarian protograph in 1679 in *The Orthodox Monastery of the Exaltation of the Cross* in the city of Poltava).

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Designated by Sokolov as **П** (= **P**); by Morfill and Charles—as **A**; by Schmidt—as ***Codex Chludovianus***; by Bonwetsch, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov, Macaskill—as **P**.

The Shorter and Abbreviated Recensions

U Ms. № 3/18 (fols 626^{r}–638^{v}), *The Uvarov Collection*, GIM; Russian redaction (15th century, based on an earlier Bulgarian protograph), the shorter recension.

Designated by Sokolov as **У** [= **U**]; by Bonwetsch, Vaillant, Andersen, Pennington, Böttrich, Orlov, Macaskill—as **U**.

Srezn/Navt Ms. № 45.13.4 (fols 357^{r}–366^{v}), BAN; Russian redaction (16thcentury), the shorter recension.

Designated by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov and Macaskill as **A**.

N Ms. № 151/443 (fols 1^{r}–10^{r}), NLS; Serbian redaction (16th century, copied from an earlier Russian text); the abbreviated redaction.

Designated by Sokolov as **H** [= **N**]; by Charles (and Morfill)—as **B**; by Schmidt—as ***Codex Belgradensis Serbius***; by Bonwetsch—as $\mathbf{V^{N}}$; by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov, Macaskill—as **N**.

VL/Jov Ms. *Slave* № 125 (fols 308^{v}–330^{v}), ANL; Serbian redaction (copied in the 16th–17th centuries from an earlier Russian text); the abbreviated redaction.

Designated by Sokolov as **B** [= **V**]; by Bonwetsch—as $\mathbf{V^{v}}$; by Schmidt—as ***Codex Vindobonensis Slavonicus* 125;** by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov, Macaskill—as **V**.

MPU Ms. № 1828 (fols 522^{r}–544^{r}), *The Uvarov Collection*, GIM; Russian redaction (17th century), the shorter recension.

Bars/Sok Ms. 2729 (fols 9^{r}–34^{v}), *The Barsovian Collection*, GIM; Russian redaction (17th century); the shorter recension.

Designated by Sokolov as **Б** [= **B**]; by Schmidt—as ***Codex Moscovitanus Barsovii***; by Bonwetsch, Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov and Macaskill—as **B**.

Bars1/Sok Ms. № 2730 (fols 87^{r}–98^{v}), GIM; Russian redaction (copied in 1701); the abbreviated redaction.

Designated by Sokolov as $\mathbf{Б^{1}}$ [= $\mathbf{B^{1}}$]; by Bonwetsch—as $\mathbf{B^{1}}$; by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov, Macaskill—as $\mathbf{B^{2}}$.

Fragments (*in Chronological Order*)

MPr Ms. № 15/2026 (fols 36^{r}–38^{v}), *The Collection of the Trinity Lavra of Saint Sergius* (Troitse-Sergieva Lavra), RGB; part of the 14th century *Měrilo Pravednoe* [*Мѣрило праведное*] (*The Just Balance*)

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Designated by Bonwetsch as **M**; by Vaillant—as **Mpr**; by Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov, Macaskill—as **MPr**.

Gennadius Ms. № 730 [1855] (fols 246^{r}–253^{v}), from *The Collection of the Trinity Lavra of Saint Sergius* (Troitse-Sergieva Lavra), RGB; the fragment is inserted in *The Epistle of the Archbishop Gennadius of Novgorod to Archbishop Joasaph of Rostov* [*Посланіе Новгород. Архіеп. Геннадия къ Архіеп. Ростовск. Іоасафу*] from 1489; the copy is dated to the 16th century.

Designated by Bonwetsch as **Genn**; by Böttrich—as **G 38**; by Andersen, Orlov and Macaskill—as **G**.

GMR Makariĭ *The Great Menaion Reader* [Великие Четьи-Минеи], compiled in the 1530s–1540s; the Uspenskiĭ's edition [Успенский список] (№ 177, fols 688–689).

SokRum578/Pisk143 Ms. № 143 (fols 164^{v}–168^{v}) from *The Piskarëv Collection* [Собрание Д. В. Пискарёва], formerly Ms. № 578 from *The Rimiantsev Museum*, currently RGB; dated to the 16th century

Designated by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov and Macaskill as **Rum**.

Tikh/TSL Ms. № 793 [1639] (fols 401^{r}–402^{v}) from *The Collection of the Trinity Lavra of Saint Sergius* (Troitse-Sergieva Lavra), RGB; dated to the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century.

Designated by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov and Macaskill as **Tr**.

Pyp/Rum Ms. № 238 (fols 727^{v}–729), RGB; copied in 1620.

SokHSL Ms. № 253 (fols 543^{r}–545^{v}), GIM; dated to ca. 1622.

Designated by Andersen as **TSS 253**.

SokNezhin/IHP 39 Ms. № 39 (fols 16^{v}–17^{v}; fol. 20^{r}; fol. 20^{v}; fol. 36^{r}; fols 50^{v}–53^{r}), *IIHP* (Nezhin/ Nizhyn); dated to the 17th century.

Designated by Bonwetsch as **C**; by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov and Macaskill—as **Chr**.

Tikh/KBM Ms. № 27/1104, *The Collection of the Kirillo-Belozersky Monastery* (fols 232^{v}–238^{v}), currently kept in the RNB; dated to the 17th century.

Designated by Orlov as **K.**

SokRum Ms. № 3058 (fols 391^{r}–393^{r}), formerly kept in the collection of *The Rumiantsev Museum*, now *The Muzeĭnoe Collection* [Музейное собрание], RGB; the MS is dated to the 1730s.

Designated by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov and Macaskill as **P^{2}**.

Vrbnik Ms. Vrbnik № 15 (fols 72–73); fragment in Glagolitic; copied between 1633–1652.

Designated by Orlov as **I**; by Macaskill—as **Vrbnik** [**Ivšic**].

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

SokRum590/Pisk155 Ms. F. 228 № 155 (fols 134ᵛ–136ʳ) of *The Piskarëv Collection*, formerly Ms. F. 178 № 590 from the collection of *The Rumiantsev Museum*, now RGB; the MS is dated to the 17th–18th centuries. Designated by Bonwetsch as **C**; by Vaillant, Andersen, Böttrich, Orlov and Macaskill—as **Chr²**.

Pop/Khron [1] Ms. № 1449, *The Pogodin's Collection*; RNB.

Pop/Khron [2] Ms. № 168, previously part of *The Collection of Count Tolstov* from *The Imperial Public Library*, now RNB.

Pop/Khron [3] Ms. № 108, previously part of *The Collection of Count Tolstov* from *The Imperial Public Library*, now RNB.

Pop/Khron [4] Ms. from Popov's private collection; to the best of my knowledge, there is no information about its current location.

Editions

Dolgov 1912. S.I. Dolgov (ed.). *Velikie Minei Chetii Sobrannye Vserossiĭskim Mitropolitom Makariem* (*Dekabr'*: *Dni 25–31*). *Izdanie Archeograficheskoĭ Komissii* Moscow: Sinodal'naia Tipografiia, 1912, pp. 2496–2499. (Ms. **GMR Makariĭ**)

Franko 1896–1910. Ivan Franko. *Apokrifi i Legendi z Ukraïnskikh Rukopisiv. Zibrav, upo-riadkuvav i poiasniv Dr. Ivan Franko*. Tom 1: *Apokrifi Starozavitni* (Codex Apocryphus e manuscriptis *ukraino-russicis collectus opera Dr. Joannis Franko*). L'viv: Nakladom Naukovogo Tovaristva Imeni Shevchenka, Vols 1–5, 1896–1910, pp. 39–64. (Ms. **P**)

Ivanov 1925. Ĭordan Ivanov. *Bogomilski Knigi i Legendi*. Sofia: Pridvorna Pechatnitsa (Izdava se ot Fonda D.P. Kudoglu), 1925, pp. 167–180. (Ms. **S**)

Ivšić 1931/1932. Stjepan Ivšić. 'Hrvatski Glagoljski Apokrif o Melhisedekovu Rođenju i Spasenju Za Općega Potopa.'—*Nastavni Vjesnik* (Zagreb, Matica Hrvatska), Knjiga 15 (1931/1932), pp. 101–108. (Ms. **Vrbnik**)

Jovanović 2003. Tomislav Jovanović. 'Apokrif o Enohu prema Srpskom Prepisu is Narodne Biblioteke u Beču.'—*AP* 25 (2003), pp. 209–238. (Ms. **VL/Jov**)

Kagan-Tarkovskaia, Tarkovskiĭ 2000. M.D. Kagan-Tarkovskaia, R.B. Tarkovskiĭ. 'Skazanie o Melkhisedeke.' In: Dmitriĭ Sergeevich Likhachev (ed.). *BLDR*, Vol. 3: *XI–XII veka*. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 2000, pp. 115–119, 374–376. http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4916 (Fragment from Ms. **Srezn/Navt**)

Lur'e 1999. Ia. S. Lur'e. 'Poslanie Gennadiia Ioasafu.' In: Dmitriĭ Sergeevich Likhachev, L.A. Dmitriev, A.A. Alekseev, N.V. Ponyrko (eds). *BLDR*, Vol. 7: *Vtoraia Polovina XV veka*. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 1999, pp. 540–553. http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=5073 (Ms. **Gennadius**)

Macaskill 2013. Grant Macaskill. *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013. (Ms. **J**; Ms. **Srezn/Navt**; Ms. **Gennadius**; Ms. **MPr**)

Mil'kov, Polianskiĭ 2009. Vladimir Vladimirovich Mil'kov, Sergeĭ Mikhailovich Polian-

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

skiĭ. *Kosmologicheskie proizvedeniia v knizhnosti Drevneĭ Rusi*, Vol. 2: *Teksty ploskostno-komarnoĭ i drugikh kosmologicheskikh traditsiĭ*. Sankt Peterburg: Izdatel'skiĭ Dom 'Mirъ', 2009, pp. 459–493. (Ms. **MPU**)

Navtanovich 2000. Liudmila Navtanovich. 'Kniga Enokha.' In: Dmitriĭ Sergeevich Likhachev (ed.). *BLDR*, Vol. 3: *XI–XII veka*. Sankt Peterburg: Nauka, pp. 204–241, 387–392. http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4921 (Ms. **Srezn**/**Navt**)

Novaković 1884. Stojan Novaković. 'Apokrif o Enohu.'—*Starine* (Zagreb, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti), Knjiga XVI (1884), pp. 67–81 (70–81). (Ms. **N**)

Popov 1869. Andreĭ Popov. *Obzor Khronographov Russkoĭ Redaktsii*, Vyp. 2. Moscow: A.I. Mamontov, 1869, pp. 162–169. (Mss. **Pop**/**Khron [1–4])**

Popov 1880. Andreĭ Popov. 'Bibliograficheskie Materialy, Sobrannye Andreem Popovym (iv): Iuzhnorusskiĭ Sbornik 1679 goda'.—*ChIOIDR* 3 (1880), pp. 89–139; 142–154. (Ms. **P;** Ms. **Gennadius**)

Pypin 1862. Aleksandr Nikolaevich Pypin. *Lozhnyia i otrechennyia knigi russkoĭ stariny. Sobrannyia A.N. Pypinym. Pamiatniki starinnoĭ russkoĭ literatury, Izdavaemye Grafom Grigoriem Kushelevym-Bezborodko*, Vyp. 3. Sankt Petersburg: Tip. Kulisha, 1862, pp. 15–16. (Ms. **Pyp**/**Rum**)

Reinhart 2007. Johannes Reinhart. 'A Croatian Glagolitic Excerpt of the *Slavonic Enoch* (2 *Enoch*).'—*FE* 4 (2007), pp. 31–46. (Ms. **Vrbnik**)

Schneider 1986. Rudolf Schneider. *Die Moralisch-Belehrenden Artikel im altrussischen Sammelband* (*Monumenta Linguæ Slavicæ Dialecti Veteris, Fontes et Dissertationes*, Vol. 23, eds R. Aitzetmüller, L. Sadnik, E. Weiher). Freiburg i. Br.: U.W. Weiher, 1986, pp. 93–99. (Ms. **MPr**)

Sokolov 1899. Matveĭ Sokolov. *Materialy i Zametki po Starinnoĭ Slavianskoĭ Literature*. Vyp. Tretiĭ (vii/ii): *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha. Tekstъ s latinskimъ perevodomъ* [*Матеріалы и замѣтки по старинной славянской литературѣ*, Вып. 3 (7/2): *Славянская книга Эноха. Текстъ с латинскимъ переводомъ*].—*ChIOIDR* 4 (1899). Moscow: Universitetskaia Tipografiia, 1899. (Ms. **S**; Ms. **Bars**/**Sok**)

Sokolov 1910. M. Sokolov. *Slavianskaia Kniga Enokha Pravednago. Teksty, latinskiĭ perevod i issledovanie. Posmertnyĭ trud avtora. Prigotovil k izdaniiu M. Speranskiĭ*. Izdanie Imperatorskago Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnosteĭ Rossiĭskikh pri Moskovskom Universitetě.—*ChIOIDR* 4/235 (1910). Moscow: Sinodal'naia Tipografiia, 1910. (Ms. **U**; Ms. **Bars1**/**Sok**; Ms. **SokRum**; Ms. **SokRum590**/**Pisk155**; Ms. **SokNezhin**/**IHP 39**; Ms. **SokRum578**/**Pisk143**; Ms. **SokHSL**; Ms. **Tikh**/**TSL**)

Sreznevskiĭ 1903. Vsevolod Izmailovich Sreznevskiĭ. 'Otchet Otdeleniiu Russkogo Iazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoĭ Akademii Nauk o Poezdke v Olonetskuiu, Vologodskuiu i Permskuiu Gubernii (Iun' 1902). Perechen' priobretennykh rukopiseĭ.'—*IORISIAN* 8: 4 (1903), pp. 109–111, 122–123. (Ms. **Srezn**/**Navt**)

Tikhomirov 1961. Mikhail Nikolaevich Tikhomirov. *Merilo Pravednoe po Rukopisi 14 veka*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1961, pp. 71–76. (Ms. **MPr**)

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

Tikhonravov 1863. Nikolaĭ Savvich Tikhonravov. *Pamiatniki Otrechennoĭ Russkoĭ Literatury*, Vol. 1, Sankt Petersburg, pp. 19–23 (Ms. MPr; Ms. Tikh/TSL).

Vaillant 1952. André Vaillant. *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch. Texte slave et traduction française*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952. (Ms. **U**; and fragments from Ms. **S**)

Bibliographic Abbreviations

AP	*Arheografski Prilozi*
BETL	*Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*
BF	*Bŭlgarski Folklor* [*Български фолклор*]
BLDR	*Biblioteka Literatury Drevneĭ Rusi* [*Библиотека Литературы Древней Руси*]
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
CCSA	*Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum*
ChIOIDR	*Chteniia vъ Imperatorskomъ Obshchestvě Istorii i Drevnosteĭ Rossiĭskikh pri Moskovskomъ Universitetě* [*Чтенія въ Императорскомъ Обществѣ Исторіи и Древностей Россійскихъ при Московскомъ Университетѣ*]
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EChr	*Early Christianity*
FE	*Fundamenta Europœa*
HTR	*The Harvard Theological Review*
HUS	*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*
IANSSSR/SLIA	*Izvestiia Akademii Nauk SSSR. Seriia Literatury i Iazyka* [Известия Академии наук CCCP. Серия литературы и языка].
IIBL	*Izvestiia na Instituta za Bŭlgarska Literatura* [*Известия на Института за българска литература*]
IIMK	*Izvestiia na Istoricheski Muzeĭ Kiustendil* [*Известия на Исторически музей Кюстендил*]
IORISIAN	*Izvestiia Otdeleniia Russkogo Iazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoĭ Akademii Nauk* [*Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук*]
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSP	*Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha*
JSQ	*Jewish Studies Quarterly*
JSOTSS	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*
JThSt	*The Journal of Theological Studies*
KMS	*Kirilo-Metodievski studii* (Kirilo-Metodievski Nauchen Tsentŭr, Bŭlgarska Akademiia na Naukite) [*Кирило-Методиевски студии* (Кирило-Методиевски Научен Център, Българска Академия на науките)]

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV

KSINAA	*Kratkie Soobshcheniia Instituta Narodov Azii i Afriki* [*Краткие Сообщения Института народов Азии и Африки*]
PI	*Problemi na Izkustvoto* [Проблеми на изкуството]
PrKnSh	*Preslavska Knizhovna Shkola* [*Преславска Книжовна Школа*]
RÉS	*Revue des études slaves*
RFV	*Russkiĭ Filologicheskiĭ Vestnik*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RL	*Russian Linguistics*
RS	*Ricerche slavistiche*
SbORIS	*Sbornik Otdeleniia Russkogo Iazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoĭ Akademii Nauk* [*Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук*]
SEER	*Slavonic and East European Review*
SH	*Slavica Hierosolymitana*
SJS/LLP	*Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského. Lexicon Linguæ Palæoslovenicæ.*
SC	*Studia Ceranea*
SL	*Starobŭlgarska Literatura* [*Старобългарска литература*]
TODRL	*Trudy Otdela Drevnerusskoĭ Literatury* [*Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы*]
VC	*Vigiliæ Christianæ*
VoprIazyk	*Voprosy Iazykoznaniia* [Вопросы языкознания]
VSK	*Vestnik Slavianskikh Kul'tur* [*Вестник славянских культур*]
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VV	*Vizantiĭskiĭ Vremennik* [*Византийский Временник*]
WSJ	*Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*
WSL	*Die Welt der Slaven*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZhMNP	*Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia* [Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения]

For use by the Author only | © 2021 Koninklijke Brill NV