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Long abstract.

So far only a limited number of biblical books in Church Slavonic has been studied and edited, and the book of *Ecclesiastes* does not feature among these. *Ecclesiastes* is not a mainstream book such as the *Gospels* and the *Psalter* but rather a peripheral biblical text never used in Eastern Orthodox liturgical services. Its late date and small number of witnesses, which also reflect its marginal status, are additional reasons why this particular book has not attracted much scholarly attention in the past. This thesis is intended to contribute to studies in the history of the Church Slavonic Bible by editing the unpublished text of *Ecclesiastes* including its catenary versions and discussing its textual tradition.

*Ecclesiastes* surfaces as a complete text relatively late: the earliest extant Cyrillic manuscripts are from the 15th century. Such a late date may be an indication that there was no pressing need for translating the non-liturgical book of *Ecclesiastes*. Two Church Slavonic translations of *Ecclesiastes* are extant: one, attested in Cyrillic manuscripts, survives in three distinct types: a continuous version of the text (32 manuscripts of the 15th-17th centuries), a fragmentary commentated version (1 manuscript of the 16th century), a fragmentary commentated insertion (8 manuscripts of the 15th-16th centuries). The other translation is a Croatian Church Slavonic version in Glagolitic breviaries (17 manuscripts of the 13th-16th centuries).

The structure of the thesis is determined by the nature of the subject, which deals with textual criticism. The chapters are organised into a series of sections which all have headings. This somewhat ‘atomistic’ approach is necessitated by the fact that we are faced with fragmentary and incomplete evidence of manuscript sources, and therefore only detailed examination and comparison of various manuscripts and versions of the text will enable us to solve, at least in part, the textual history of the book in question. The limitations of the present study are the scarcity of manuscripts and the lateness of the
tradition. These, however, are familiar ‘obstacles’ recognised by Slavists working on similar subjects.

The thesis consists of an introduction, which presents a brief historical outline of the Church Slavonic biblical translations, 4 chapters, conclusion, bibliography and 2 appendices: the first of these contains a variorum edition of the continuous text of Ecclesiastes; the second, the parallel texts from continuous, commentated and interpolated versions.

Chapter 1 gives a list of all the extant manuscripts of Ecclesiastes with short descriptions including dating (on palaeographical grounds), and investigates the textual relationships between various groups of manuscripts using the classical method of textual criticism and stemmatics. This leads on to a discussion of the type of edition to be used. At the end of the chapter a *stemma codicum* is constructed. Analysis of the language is carried out in an attempt to date the translation on linguistic grounds.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the Greek and Slavonic catena and explores some of the key issues arising out of the existence of several versions and early fragments of Ecclesiastes. It deals with problems concerning the date and place of the translation of Ecclesiastes. Detailed analysis sheds some light on the textual peculiarities of the three versions: commentated, interpolated and continuous. The complex interrelationship between these three versions is investigated further and a comparison with the earlier extant fragments of the catena is also carried out.

Chapter 3 deals with the quotations from Ecclesiastes in early translated texts and in original Old Russian literature. Quotations found in medieval Slavonic texts, both translated and original, appear to be independent of the translation of continuous Ecclesiastes known from manuscripts of around the 15th century. However, the quotations prove that parts of Ecclesiastes were known in some form of exegetical compilations.

Chapter 4 investigates the translation of Ecclesiastes in the Croatian Church Slavonic breviary tradition. It examines claims made by scholars in the past and present with regards to its authorship and to the language of the source from which this text was translated. The conclusion is drawn that the text was translated purely from Latin. This conclusion is based on a number of findings: errors of translation, divergences in wording
and grammatical forms between the Croat Glagolitic and Cyrillic Church Slavonic texts, and certain syntactical constructions such as periphrastic expressions for the future, which point unambiguously to a Latin original. In addition the date of the translation is placed roughly between the 12th and the 13th centuries.

The conclusions summarize the findings of the study: textual analysis of the continuous text of Ecclesiastes indicates that all the extant Cyrillic manuscripts come from a single translation; this translation was made at some time between the 10th century and the beginning of the 15th century. Commentated and interpolated versions should be treated as redactions deriving from a fuller catena. This fuller catena may have given rise to the continuous text through the removal of the commentary. Alternatively, the original plain text may have been added to the newly translated commentary to produce a commentated version. Bearing in mind that it is hard to decide conclusively between these possibilities, the difficulties of reconstructing archetypes of the plain text and the commentary are shown. The investigation of the text in the Croatian tradition demonstrates that the translation in the breviaries was made from Latin, and thereby eliminates the hypothesis that Methodius was the translator of this version.

GB is chosen as a base text for the edition in Appendix 1. The main reason for doing so is pragmatic, for it offers as complete a text as is available to us. Besides, the availability of information on the cultural and historical circumstances surrounding the production of GB, in addition to its importance for the history of the East Slavonic biblical tradition makes it more worthwhile. By publishing the text from manuscript Sinodal’nyj 915 (GB) with a critical apparatus, supplying variants from other manuscripts, the editorial ‘control’ which the compilers of GB exercised while working with the text translated from Greek is illustrated. They appear to have compared their exemplar with another Slavonic witness to fill a lacuna in the middle of the text, and they shortened the interpolation by removing the commentary. It seems that they deliberately left the biblical verses in the interpolation intact. The textual evidence does not support the supposition that the compilers of GB collated their text of Ecclesiastes with any Greek or Latin sources. The choice of GB for the edition constitutes a significant step towards wider research into and eventual publication of the Gennadian Bible, which has
received little attention hitherto, despite its significance as the first complete Church Slavonic Bible.

In appendix 2 three versions of Ecclesiastes are presented in a tabular form: the continuous version is taken from the manuscript Sinodal’nyj 915 (GB), the commentated version from the manuscript Undol’skij 13, and the interpolated version from the manuscript Pogodinskij 1 with variant readings from the manuscripts of group 1.

In the thesis several new findings are presented. These are: the absence of any link between the versions of Ecclesiastes in the Cyrillic and in the Glagolitic manuscripts, and the implausibility of a Methodian origin for the Croatian Church Slavonic text. Our review of evidence from quotations from Ecclesiastes in other sources shows that they do not give positive support for the existence of a complete translation before the 15th century. The edition locates the GB version textologically and shows that it is a conflation of two branches of the tradition.

This study of Ecclesiastes shows that certain views of the history of the text are untenable, fills a lacuna in the investigation of the Church Slavonic biblical translations, and will contribute to the eventual production of a complete critical edition of the text.
Abstract.

This thesis is intended as a contribution to studies in the history of the Church Slavonic Bible by editing the unpublished text of Ecclesiastes and discussing its textual tradition. Two Church Slavonic translations of Ecclesiastes are extant: one, attested in Cyrillic manuscripts, survives in three distinct types: a continuous version of the text, a fragmentary commentated version, a fragmentary commentated insertion. The other translation is a Croatian Church Slavonic version in Glagolitic breviaries.

The thesis consists of an introduction, 4 chapters, conclusion, a bibliography and 2 appendices: the first appendix contains an edition with the critical apparatus of the continuous text of Ecclesiastes, the second the parallel texts from continuous, commentated and interpolated versions.

The introduction presents a brief historical outline of the Church Slavonic biblical translations. In Chapter 1 short descriptions of all known Cyrillic manuscripts are given, followed by an investigation of the textual relationships between various groups of manuscripts. This leads on to a discussion of the type of edition to be used in the present study. At the end of the chapter a stemma codicum is constructed. In Chapter 2 an examination of the three versions (continuous, commentated and interpolated) is carried out. In Chapter 3 quotations from the book of Ecclesiastes in early translated texts and in original Old Russian literature are investigated. In Chapter 4, the version of Ecclesiastes in Croat Glagolitic breviaries is examined.

The conclusions summarize the findings of the study: the textual analysis of the continuous text of Ecclesiastes indicates that all the extant Cyrillic manuscripts come from a single translation; this translation was made at some time between the 10th century and the beginning of the 15th century. The investigation of the text in the Croatian tradition demonstrates that the translation in breviaries was made from Latin, and so eliminates the hypothesis that Methodius was the translator of this version. This study of Ecclesiastes fills a lacuna in the investigation of the Church Slavonic OT translations, and will contribute to the eventual production of a complete critical edition of this book.
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Introduction.

This study aims to provide insight into the textual history of the Church Slavonic translation of the biblical book Ecclesiastes. Prior to discussing Ecclesiastes itself a brief historical outline of the Church Slavonic translations of OT books in general needs to be given.

Corpus of Biblical books in Church Slavonic.

Written sources suggest that there was an Old Church Slavonic translation of the whole Bible in the 9th century. It is assumed that liturgical books were translated by Cyril and Methodius during the early Moravian period, continuous books were translated by Methodius shortly before his death also in Moravia and books with commentaries appeared at a later stage (in Bulgaria in the 10th century). This hypothesis, however, is not fully proven and is not unanimously accepted.

Church Slavonic biblical books and their translation and transmission were for the most part shaped by liturgical use or the absence of it. Hence, not only historical information but also common sense prompts us to conclude that the first texts needed for religious services among the Slavs were the Gospel Lectionary, the Epistle Lectionary, and the Psalter. For the Gospels, the Epistle, and Psalter a full translation is attested, and they have a long and complicated textual history. The entire Psalter is necessary for celebrating the liturgy in the Orthodox Church; all other biblical texts can be drawn from Lectionaries and the Prophetologium arranged in order of their use during the liturgical year. Given this situation, it is fair to surmise that the language and the vocabulary of the Prophetologium are earlier than the translations of complete Biblical books.

---

1 In Chapter 15 of the Life of Methodius it is stated that he translated the whole of the Bible apart from Maccabees. There is also the testimony of the Bulgarian writer of the 10th century John the Exarch, who in his preface to the translation of John Damascus' De fide orthodoxa indicates on the basis of hearsay that Methodius translated all the sixty canonical books of the Bible. See Lavrov, 1934:160.
4 See the recent critical edition of the Grigorovičev parimejnik by Ribarova and Hauptová. 1998.
5 Mixajlov, 1912: CCCII
Scholars try to assign translations of biblical books to different historical periods. But at present scholarship cannot with certainty date or locate these translations because we do not have a complete Bible translation by Methodius. What we have extant from the early period are Gospels, Psalter, the Prophetologium and some commentated books, while other books are attested later. All this makes the manuscript tradition of the Church Slavonic Bible fragmentary and difficult to work on. Since not all OT books have been studied and edited, scholars continue to work on various books but the evidence is still very fragmentary.

No complete codex of biblical books in Church Slavonic is extant before the 15th century. Even in Byzantium codices of the complete Bible were rare, as they were expensive and were produced as special gifts for monasteries. There had been attempts among the Slavs to compile a fuller bible prior to the end of 15th century. The earliest known collection of biblical books which had previously been in separate manuscripts was made in 14th century Bulgaria. MS F.1.461 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg containing 1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings, Prophets, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiasticus, Job is an example of such compilation.

In 1499, Archbishop Gennadij of Novgorod accomplished the compilation of the entire Bible. For the books that could not be found, new translations were made from Latin. Thus the Gennadian Bible contains books translated not only in different periods but also from different languages. It is pertinent for this study as it contains one of the extant versions of Ecclesiastes. Moreover, the Gennadian Bible became an important text to serve as a basis for subsequent revisions.

---

6 It is hard to imagine that Methodius’ entire Bible was copied many times during his life and that the disciples of Cyril and Methodius carried with them into exile heavy parchment manuscripts. Nowadays scholars tend to think that Methodius’ entire biblical translation did not reach Bulgaria. Even if parts of it reached Bulgaria, they may well have been revised. Cf. Thomson, 1998:646 and Thomson, 1999:149-64.

7 To avoid confusion the English titles and numbering of the biblical books are used in all instances. In this I follow the established practice, cf. Thomson, 1998:698, footnote 485.

Investigations of OT books.

It is not my intention here to give a detailed examination of Church Slavonic Old Testament studies since this has been provided recently by Francis Thomson (1998: 605-920) and Anatolij Alekseev (1999). However, I shall mention several works relevant to the history of the Church Slavonic Bible. The beginning of Russian scholarship with regard to the Slavonic Bible is connected with the publication in 1855 of the first volume of ‘Opisanie slavjanskix rukopisej moskovskoj Sinodal’noj biblioteki’ by Gorskij and Nevostruev. They gave a detailed description of the Gennadian Bible (1499) and other Church Slavonic MSS and compared these with the Greek originals. Their observations continue to be of interest to modern scholars.

The Commission for the Critical Edition of the Slavonic Bible, founded in 1915 and inspired by the Göttingen production of a critical edition of the Septuagint, aimed to produce an edition of the Church Slavonic Bible within fifty years. The chairman of the Commission, I. E. Evseev, compiled an inventory of Church Slavonic OT manuscripts and distributed the work among various scholars. Ecclesiastes was to be prepared for publication by X. M. Loparev. Another prominent member of the Commission was A. M. Mixajlov who wrote his dissertation on the textual tradition of the book of Genesis. He also studied the Croat Glagolitic texts as sources for the history of the Slavonic Bible. Evseev and Mixajlov identified and studied translations of OT books made during the ‘golden age’ of Bulgarian literary culture in the 10th century. Members of the Commission wanted to invite Joseph Vajs, the famous authority on the Croat Glagolitic liturgical texts, to join their ranks, but sadly historical events intervened.

Vajs made important contributions to the publication and study of Croatian Church Slavonic biblical texts. He initiated the series Analecta Sacrae Scripturae for which he edited several OT books from Croat Glagolitic sources: Job, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, and several of the Minor Prophets. In the last 20 years scholars have resumed textual studies of several OT books which in the past had already been investigated. Among these are studies of the Psalter by E. V. Češko, I. Karačorova and C. M. MacRobert, Octateuch

---

(Exodus) by A. A. Pięxdzade, Esther by Horace Lunt and Moshe Taube, Minor Prophets by Rumjana Zlatanova, Ezekiel with commentaries by L. Taseva and M. Jovčeva.

At the same time they have scrutinised previously unstudied biblical books; to give but a few examples, the investigation of Job by E.V. Afanas’eva and A. Zaradija Kiš and the Song of Songs by A. A. Alekseev. None of these scholars has focused on the book Ecclesiastes. Even so, their research is helpful in providing background information for my present study.

Books not used liturgically in the Eastern Orthodox tradition.

The non-liturgical book Ruth found in the Croat Glagolitic breviary may be an early Bulgarian translation. What the case of Ruth tells us is that it is not altogether impossible that a translation of a non-liturgical book was made prior to or around the 10th century. However, results obtained from the study of one particular biblical book cannot be automatically extended to another book. Each book has its own history. And therefore we cannot assume that a 10th century translation of Ecclesiastes was also made.

Attention should be drawn to some of the texts that seem parallel: two other OT books, the Song of Songs and Esther, like Ecclesiastes, are examples of non-liturgical texts. Like Ecclesiastes, Esther is extant only in late East Slavonic manuscripts, and since we find both Esther and Ecclesiastes in later manuscripts we do not have evidence for their earlier existence in South Slavonic tradition. The question as to when the Church Slavonic translation of Esther was made is still an open one. The Song of Songs, however, (closer to Ecclesiastes by virtue of its inclusion in the Sapiential collection), is attested, in its continuous text, in the South Slavonic tradition and in its

---

10 Vajs, 1905.
11 For Ecclesiastes, however, there is some evidence of its existence prior to the 13th century in the form of the Croatian Church Slavonic translation found in Croat Glagolitic breviaries. (This translation will be discussed in chapter 4).
12 While Mešerskij (1956: 198-219) and Alekseev (1988: 154-96) are in favour of a translation of Esther from Hebrew into Russian Church Slavonic made in Kievan Russia, Lunt and Taube (1998) are of the contrary opinion that the translation was made from Greek and at a later date. Thomson (1998:788) supports the view of Lunt and Taube with regard to its dating, saying that if the Ruthenisms in the text were in the original translation and are not the result of later scribal activity then the translation can be dated to the 14th century. If the Ruthenisms are secondary, then the early linguistic features indicate an early
exegetical version only in the East Slavonic manuscripts. It is debatable whether these exegetical versions were produced by East Slavs, which might imply the existence of a school of translation in 12th century Kievan Rus'. Many swords have been broken over this issue, and I have nothing to add to the debate at present. On the whole, I would not exclude the possibility of Ecclesiastes having been translated by East Slavs.

The book of Ecclesiastes.
The Hebrew original and its early translations.

Ecclesiastes is a book of wisdom writing in the OT of the Bible, a philosophical essay on the meaning of human life. The Greek title is a rendering of Hebrew Qohelet, which is generally translated as 'preacher', but the precise meaning is not clear. The author identifies himself at the beginning as the son of David, king of Jerusalem, and by implication the book of Ecclesiastes has traditionally been ascribed to the Israelite king Solomon. Qohelet is one of the mysterious books of the Bible. It is claimed that the book was written around 300 BC, but scholars still disagree about its origin, language, and literary genre.

It is now accepted that the Greek bible translation may have been associated if not directly with Aquila, then with a translator of his school, since it is a very literalistic translation which retains certain features of its Hebrew original such as οὐν representing the Hebrew accusative particle, and followed by an accusative in Greek. Rahlfs admitted that the Greek of Ecclesiastes is so strange that it probably suffered badly in transmission, as scribes tried to make sense of impossible constructions.

There are also various other translations: Vetus Itala, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, etc. The Latin translation of the Vulgate was apparently made by Jerome from Bulgarian origin prior to the 11th century. Cf. also the conclusions of Lysen (2000), the comments on the subject by Peresvetoff-Morath (2002:73-8) and the latest article by Alekseev (2003:185-214).

A view advocated by Meščerskij and Alekseev, cf. the previous footnote.

Aquila is known as a representative of the so-called kaige recension, which was not a single recension but rather part of a Palestinian trend towards revising parts of Old Greek translations in the direction of MT. This tendency became more and more compelling and culminated in the revision of Aquila in the 1 AD. See Wevers, 1996:90.

Rahlfs tried to reconstruct an 'original' text of the Greek Ecclesiastes, using the Hebrew to correct the Greek of the manuscript tradition, often along the lines suggested by Lagarde, see Hall, 1993: 2.
the Hebrew. Though Ecclesiastes was not often quoted by early Christian writers, it was frequently commented on.¹⁷

The Greek manuscript tradition and editions of Ecclesiastes.

In the Byzantine tradition the book of Ecclesiastes is known in both plain and exegetical versions. In total there are approximately a hundred extant manuscripts of Ecclesiastes dating from about 300 AD to the 17th century. Among the extant copies are 5 papyri as well as 6 manuscripts written in uncial and about 92 manuscripts written in minuscule.

Unfortunately the manuscript tradition of Ecclesiastes remains largely unexplored and there is no comprehensive edition of this book yet. Currently it is in preparation under the auspices of Septuaginta Unternehmen in Göttingen. In the absence of the new critical edition this study employs extant editions of Ecclesiastes as follows: for the plain Greek text I have used Rahlfs’s 1979 edition of the Septuagint. I have also made use of Grabe’s 1707-20 edition of the Codex Alexandrinus. However, Rahlfs’s edition does not explain all the readings of the Church Slavonic translation. For the textual variations from Rahlfs’s text I have used the edition of Holmes and Parsons (1798-1827). Their main text is based on the codex Vaticanus of the 4th century according to the Sixtine edition of 1587. In their critical apparatus for the book of Ecclesiastes Holmes and Parsons used variant readings from 18 manuscripts of the 5th–15th centuries, from printed editions of the Greek Bible, namely Aldine (1518), Complutensian (1514-17), and Alexandrine (in Grabe’s edition of 1707-20), as well as quotations from Church Fathers.

In their edition Holmes and Parsons employed Latin numbers to denote the manuscripts written in uncial and Arabic numerals for those in minuscule. Their numeral system was adopted by Rahlfs with some changes and alterations. The alterations were necessitated by certain inaccuracies in the classification of manuscripts by Holmes and Parsons. Some of their minuscules were in reality uncials, and manuscript 23 could be given as an example of such wrong classification. It is not in minuscule but in uncial, codex Venetus of the 8th–9th centuries from Biblioteca Marciana, Venice. Changes

¹⁷ Starowieyski (1993: 405-40) lists in his article all known ancient commentaries with their editions and studies.
introduced by Rahlfis included the use of capitals of the Roman alphabet for the uncials. Thus he designated manuscript 23 as V and MS III (Codex Alexandrinus of the 5th century from the Library of the British Museum) as A. These changes allowed the well-established numbers of Holmes and Parsons to stand despite a few alterations. The notation for minuscules is still retained by scholars today and the normal and standard procedure is to use Rahlfis's correlated numbers which are often the same as those of Holmes and Parsons.\textsuperscript{18}

Several commentaries on \textit{Ecclesiastes} exist,\textsuperscript{19} but here I shall concentrate on one in particular, the Commentary by Olympiodorus of Alexandria, since it is believed to be the possible source of the Church Slavonic translation of the catena.\textsuperscript{20} There are 21 manuscripts containing Olympiodorus' Commentary which are known to the scholarly public.\textsuperscript{21}

For the commentated text of \textit{Ecclesiastes} I have used Migne's edition of Olympiodorus' Commentary published in PG, vol. 93, 477-628, a reprint of Fronton du Duc's 1624 edition. In addition to Migne I have made use of the most recent edition of Olympiodorus' Commentary produced by Theodora Boli.\textsuperscript{22} As references will be made to this edition later on in my thesis it is appropriate to provide the reader with a short overview of it here.

\textbf{New edition of Olympiodorus' Commentary by Theodora Boli.}

Boli has produced an edition with a critical apparatus providing a hypothetical reconstruction of the original text based on the ten manuscripts she used. While Migne based his edition on two manuscripts, Paris gr. 174,10-11 century (siglum B in Boli's

---

\textsuperscript{18} From here on I use siglum A for the codex Alexandrinus but retain both siglum V and number 23 for the single manuscript, codex Venetus. With the exception of these two the rest of the designation for manuscripts used by Holmes and Parsons remains the same. For correlation between numbers used by Holmes-Parsons and Rahlfis I have used the table in Jellicoe, 1968:221-2.

\textsuperscript{19} A discussion of the commentaries is on pages 100-1.

\textsuperscript{20} See Alekseev, 1988: 186.

\textsuperscript{21} For the list of existing manuscripts of Olympiodorus see the appended microfiche in Sinkewicz, 1992.

\textsuperscript{22} I am grateful to Professor D. Hagedorn of Heidelberg University for providing me with the edition of T. Boli.
list) and Paris gr. 175, 14 century (siglum H in Boli’s list), which contain a shorter
version of the commentary. Boli in addition to these two manuscripts used manuscripts
which offer a longer version of Olympiodorus’ commentary. In a short preface to her
edition she gives a list of these manuscripts with sigla. They are as follows: Marcianus
gr. 22, 12-13 century (A); Paris gr. 153, 10-11 century (Γ); Flor. Laur. Plut. X 29, 13-14
century (Δ); Genua Durazzo-Giustiniani A.1.10, 9-10 century (E); Marcianus gr. 23, 10-
11 century (Z); Vatic. Ottob. gr.75, 16-17 century (Θ); Athos, M. Lauras MS gr. Gamma
38, 14 century (Ι); Athos, M. Iberon Ms. gr. 614, 13 century (Κ). Thus altogether Boli
has used 10 manuscripts out of 21 listed by Sinkewicz. The remaining manuscripts were
either copies of the ones which she already had or were unavailable to her.

Boli constructs the *stemma codicum* and discusses the textual relationships among
these 10 manuscripts. They are divided into groups. One group is formed by manuscripts
BHΘ, i.e. the shorter version. Within the other group of manuscripts ΑΓΔΕΙΚ belonging
to the longer version Boli separates manuscripts ΑΓΖ from the rest on the basis of
common variant readings. She sets apart manuscript E, which has a number of individual
readings and additions, from the remaining manuscripts ΑΙΚ. Boli distinguishes
manuscripts ΔΙΚ, for they contain many common readings such as ὁ θεῖος δὲ vs. ὁ δὲ
θεῖος in the comment to verse 1:8, παρεκτενώμενα vs. συμπαρεκτενώμενα in the comment
to verse 1:9, δόξης vs. γνώσεως in the comment to verse 1:18. These common readings
are all indicated as found in the commentary rather than the biblical text itself.

When considering the textual tradition of Olympiodorus’ commentary there is an
important issue to remember: the relationship among the manuscripts based upon the
commentary may or may not be the same as the relationship represented by the biblical
text of the commentary. It is fully possible that these are two distinct and separate textual
traditions. However, my observation of the texts leads me to believe that the biblical text
accompanied by Olympiodorus’ commentary does not have a separate tradition.

Comparison of the biblical text in Rahlfs’s edition with the one in Boli’s edition
reveals that the two texts remain close. The differences between them amount to mostly
low level variation such as absence or presence of articles, particles, differences in cases,
etc. It seems to me that on various occasions the text in Rahlfs’s edition is closer to the
Greek manuscripts ΔΕΙΚ, two of which come from Athos. The following examples (all of
which are of minor variation) are sufficient to show their proximity. In 8:14 the form of 
εἰπα in the text of Rahlfs is the same in ΔΕΙΚ, while in the reconstructed text of
Olympiodorus we read εἰπον. In 10:6 in Rahlfs’s text we have prepositional phrase ἐν
ὑψοι and the same in ΔΕΙΚ, while in the reconstructed text of Olympiodorus the
preposition is omitted. In 9:8 in the text of Rahlfs the article τὰ before the noun ἵματα
is omitted (it is cited in his critical apparatus as belonging to S); it is also omitted in
ΔΕΙΚ, while in the reconstructed text of Olympiodorus the article is present. This issue
should be further researched by the editors of the Greek Ecclesiastes, and when the new
edition of Ecclesiastes is published, we will be in a better position to determine the
relationship of the biblical text to the commentary.

My primary interest in the Greek text is in its relationship to the Church Slavonic
translation. In my thesis I shall be addressing three main questions: 1. can a relationship
be discerned between the Church Slavonic version and some specific part of the Greek
tradition? 2. Are there any differences between the biblical text in the plain version and
the biblical text in the commentated versions which go back to Greek variants? 3. Is there
any secondary correction against Greek in individual Slavonic manuscripts, that is to say,
do any of the variants found in these go back to Greek variants?

The Church Slavonic translations.

The Church Slavonic translations of Ecclesiastes survive in four distinct types: 1. a
Cyrillic continuous version of the text (32 MSS of the 15th-17th centuries), 2. a Cyrillic
fragmentary commentated version of the text (1 MS of the 16th century), 3. a Cyrillic
fragmentary commentated insertion (8 MSS of the 15th-16th centuries), 4. a Croatian
Church Slavonic version in Glagolitic Breviaries (17 MSS of the 13th-16th centuries).

There are two translations of the book of Ecclesiastes, one from Greek and one from
Latin. The former is preserved in East Slavonic Cyrillic manuscripts, the latter is to be
found in the Croatian Glagolitic Breviaries23 (this translation is discussed in chapter 4).
The evidence for the early existence of Ecclesiastes is fragmentary and puzzling, making
the study of this book difficult. The fact that *Ecclesiastes* was not included in the *Prophetologium* may be an indication that there was no pressing need for translating a non-liturgical book of *Ecclesiastes*. *Ecclesiastes* surfaces as a complete text more or less late, the earliest extant Cyrillic MSS are of the 15th century. Prior to this we have only several commented passages in an Izbornik of the 13th century and a number of quotations from this book in early Slavonic translated and original literature. A Church Slavonic translation was made at some time before the 15th century, but the exact time and place are not known. The situation is no clearer when one looks at the South Slavonic tradition, i. e. Croatian Church Slavonic. In this tradition we find *Ecclesiastes* included in the Croat Glagolitic Breviary according to the Roman rite.

As it is clear that the version of *Ecclesiastes* extant in East Slavonic manuscripts was translated from Greek not Latin, it is automatically excluded from the books translated from Latin for the Gennadian Bible. As the Gennadian Bible is a product of East Slavonic scholarship, then the book of *Ecclesiastes* must have existed in the East Slavonic tradition prior to its inclusion. But it is hard to be more precise at this stage.

Convoy.

*Ecclesiastes* is a part of the *Sapiential* books, the well-defined varieties of which were transmitted from Byzantium to Slavonic soil. *Ecclesiastes* is usually accompanied in the stable Byzantine florilegia by *Proverbs, Job, Wisdom of Sirach, Song of Songs,* and *Wisdom of Solomon.* In its complete form it is extant in 25 Greek MSS from 9-15th centuries, sometimes accompanied by the books of *Prophets.* We see a similar pattern in the extant East Slavonic MSS where *Ecclesiastes* is found with the same convoy, sometimes with the addition of the book *Menander.*

One might reasonably expect that *Ecclesiastes* would be included in the *Sapiential* collection in South Slavonic manuscripts, but puzzlingly, *Ecclesiastes* is not present among them. For example, the well-known manuscript RNB, F.I.461 of the late 14th

23 Cf. Vajs, 1910: 34.
24 Information on Greek manuscripts is taken from Rahlfs, 1914: 410-14.
century, the so-called South Slavonic Bible, does not contain Ecclesiastes, though it contains other Sapiential books: Proverbs, Song of Songs, Wisdom of Sirach, and Job. This raises the question of whether it was translated in the South Slavonic lands but did not survive there, or whether Ecclesiastes was translated exclusively in the East Slavonic area.

The catenary version.

The Church Slavonic Ecclesiastes has survived in two forms in the East Slavonic tradition: as a plain text and a text with commentary. Although in the Byzantine tradition a number of commentaries on Ecclesiastes are known, none of these can be identified as a direct source for this Church Slavonic catena, which is extant only in fragments.\(^{25}\) The Church Slavonic catena is predominantly based on the Commentaries of Olympiodorus of Alexandria (PG, 93).

It is known that a number of texts with commentaries were produced in Bulgaria in the 10\(^{th}\) century and survived in East Slavonic copies. These include: the commentary of Hippolytus of Rome on the book of Daniel found in a 13\(^{th}\) century manuscript; the books of the Prophets with commentaries, extant in a large number of later manuscripts of the 15-17\(^{th}\) centuries, which can be traced back to an 11\(^{th}\) century manuscript, copied from a South Slavonic exemplar;\(^{26}\) Theodoret of Cyrrhus’ commentary on the Psalms, which is extant in a number of manuscripts, the oldest being an East Slavonic copy from the 11\(^{th}\) century;\(^{27}\) the catena on the Song of Songs compiled from the commentaries by Hippolytus of Rome, Gregory of Nyssa, and Procopius of Gaza, preserved in thirty-one manuscripts, the oldest of the 13\(^{th}\) century; and the earliest copy of the Church Slavonic translation of the Commentary on the book of Job by Olympiodorus of Alexandria, dating from the end of the 14\(^{th}\) century. Non-commentated versions were sometimes extracted from the commentated ones; for example, the text of Job was extrapolated twice from the catena: the first extrapolation is found in South Slavonic manuscripts, the

\(^{25}\) For the list of commentaries I have consulted CPG and the article of Starowieyski, 1993:405-40.

\(^{26}\) Tunickij, 1918.
second extrapolation was made by the compilers of the Gennadian Bible. 28 Since such extrapolations are known for other books including Job, we may entertain the possibility that this also happened in the case of Ecclesiastes.

If we assume that the majority of these texts were also circulating amongst the East Slavs in the 12-15th centuries, then it is possible that Ecclesiastes is another example of such a text. But as all the extant manuscripts of the book are of late date (15-16th centuries) and the textual tradition appears to be late (see chapter 1) it is difficult to say when the text appeared and whether there was any revision prior to this.

Such revision of biblical books among the Slavs was not unusual and was normally done by consulting the Greek originals or by collating the available Slavonic copies. For example, this was often done with books used for liturgical purposes such as the Psalter. The extent to which Ecclesiastes, a non-liturgical text, was checked against the Greek remains to be established.

---

27 See Pogorelov, 1910.
Chapter 1.
Comparison of Cyrillic manuscripts.

It is known that medieval texts underwent modifications during copying, either accidental, when a scribe inadvertently made a slip in copying a source text, or deliberate, when a scribe consciously changed a source text in order to correct what he believed to be an error or to improve it. The evolution of orthographical and linguistic norms was one of the reasons lying behind conscious changes. A scribe could change a word if he considered it inappropriate and replace it with a different variant or a synonym. Scribes might introduce some changes while working with one or two manuscripts of the same text or after consulting Greek manuscripts. The ubiquitous and familiar text of the *Psalter* underwent such changes. Scribes who knew this text by heart could introduce changes because they knew better or thought that they knew better, or were more familiar with the older wording.

But *Ecclesiastes* probably did not belong to the type of text which they knew by heart, and therefore in copying they had to pay far closer attention to their exemplars. Even very attentive and careful scribes could produce mechanical errors, and one can see examples of such errors in any manuscript tradition of Church Slavonic texts. Thus we must expect a number of scribal errors in manuscripts of *Ecclesiastes*.

My task is to establish from the evidence of the manuscripts which are available to me the transmitted text or the *paradosis*; this term was used by Martin West as ‘a convenient term meaning the data furnished by the transmission, reduced to essentials’, and has been adopted by Slavists. In this chapter I first give a brief description of manuscripts, then I turn my attention to the reconstruction of the archetype and the intermediary stages. The conclusions about the archetype will provide grounds for the choice of a particular manuscript for the present edition. At the end of the chapter the *stemma codicum* is given.

---

1 West, 1970:53.
The appended description of MSS contains the name of the MS, its present location, date, number in brackets under which the manuscript is listed in ‘Predvaritelnyj spisok’ and in ‘Dopolnenija k predvaritel’nomu spisku’[^3], format, number of folia, its contents, the folia on which the text of Ecclesiastes is found and wherever possible the water mark identification, the abbreviation used to refer to the MS in the dissertation. In order to establish whether extant MSS of Ecclesiastes predate the Gennadian Bible, all the water marks were checked irrespective of any published descriptions of the MSS. Where a relevant description of the water marks was available, these were then cross-checked to confirm my own identification to those already made. And only where no relevant literature was available, was my own identification used. In all these cases the folia on which the water marks are found have been noted. The watermarks were identified by reference to standard reference works[^4] and to published descriptions of MSS which include references to water marks. In the latter case I tested several conclusions by cross-referencing existing identifications. As a result I was able to correct the water mark identification and dating in several cases. However, the quality of the paper and the density of the script obscured the outline of some of the water marks, thus making their identification practically impossible to the naked eye.[^5]

The book of Ecclesiastes is preserved in 33 Cyrillic manuscripts, all of which are of East Slavonic provenance. These manuscripts are written on paper, apart from Pg.l, which is written on parchment. All MSS with the exception of Rumjancevskij 36 are roughly in the same type of hand, i. e. semiuncial.

Their brief descriptions:

1. Pogodinskij 1, RNB, Pogodin collection, No 1, Sbornik, first half of 15 c., (PS 444), 1°, 60 ff., contents: Song of Songs with commentary, Discourse of John of Thessalonica, Ecclesiastes (f. 47'-59'). (Pg.1) [^6]

[^3]: ‘Predvaritelnyj spisok’ and ‘Dopolnenija k predvaritel’nomu spisku’ do not extend to the 16th century.
[^4]: See the list of cited literature.
[^5]: It should be noted that working conditions (absence of reference works and table lamps in the manuscript department of RSL) were not ideal for this study.
[^6]: 1°, 60 ff., contents: Song of Songs with commentary, Discourse of John of Thessalonica, Ecclesiastes (f. 47'-59'). (Pg.l)
There is no chapter division. It contains corrections inserted between the lines, and there is one instance of a conflated passage. There are visible signs of overwriting of faded words. The scribe obviously was not a very careful one.


There is chapter division written in the margins, no traces of correction. There are several glosses in the margin.


water marks: 1. Letter P with a quatrefoil above ff. 1,3,7 – Briquet N° 8660 (1474-5); 2. Bull’s head f. 245 – similar to Lixačev N° 1116-1119 (1466/7); 3. Collared dog ff. 259, 272, 298 (this particular type of dog has not been found).

There is no chapter division; it displays a few minor corrections in the main text and two in the margins. The confused order of verses is caused probably by the wrong binding of folia in the quire in the exemplar.

4. Undol’skij 1, RSL, Undol’skij collection 310, No 1, Sbornik, last quarter of 15 c., (PS

6 All Pogodin MSS are described in Tvorogov, O. V. and Zagrebin V. M. eds, 1986.
1699), 1°, 476+3 ff., contents: Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-2 Kings, Wisdom of Solomon, Song of Songs with commentary, Ecclesiastes (ff. 296°-304°), Esther, articles from Chronograph. (Und.1)

water marks: 1. Three mounts with cross ff. 5, 31 - Lixačev N° 2683-4 (15 4/4 c); 2. Large letter X with crown and a cross above f. 3 - Lixačev N° 2679 (15 4/4 c); 3. Bull’s head with eyes but no nose and with a double line between the horns with a large crown at midpoint and a six-petalled flower at its extremity f. 1 - Lixačev N° 2685 (15 4/4 c); 4. Bull’s head with mast and a cross above ff. 20, 186, 189 - similar to Piccard, Die Ochsenkopf vol. II, part 3, type XI, N° 227 (1473), 230-35 (1471-80); 5. Crown with cross f. 475 - Lixačev N° 2686 (15 4/4 c).

There is no chapter division, no traces of correction, the biblical verses are written in red ink in the interpolation.

5. Soloveckij, RNB, Soloveckij collection, No 807/917, Sbornik, last quarter of 15 c., 4°, 442 ff., contents: Life of Theodosius of the Caves Monastery, The Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery, Discourse on faith by Gennadius, archbishop of Constantinople, Ecclesiastes (ff. 135°-149°), the book Kaaf, short erotapokriseis commentaries on OT, Pseudo-Athanasian Commentary on Psalter, Song of Songs with commentaries, brief erotapokriseis commentaries on Gospels and Apostol, brief commentaries on Solomon’s books, Dream of King Jehoash, Discourse of Gregory the Theologian. (Sol.)

water marks: 1. Bull’s head ff. 1, 7, 9, 22 – Piccard, Die Ochsenkopf vol. II, part 3, type XV, N° 233 (1478-82) and another variant ff. 418, 420, 435 – Piccard, type XVI, N° 102 (1496-99); 2. Three mounts with a long cross rising from centre, ff. 204, 205, 208 - distorted mark Lixačev N° 2623 (1460-70); 3. Letter P ff. 211, 213, 219 - Briquet N° 8692 (1473), another variant of letter P ff. 355, 358, 400 - Briquet N°

7 For comments on this watermark see Simmons, 1994, vol.1:119. See also Kloss, 1971:68.
8 MS Sol. is not listed in the PS.
8606 (1470); 4. Letter Y ff. 345, 352 - Briquet N° 9183 (1472); 5. Collared dog with a flower on its back ff. 401, 407, 412 - similar to Briquet N° 3624 (1476-82); the dog’s tail is closer to Briquet N° 3623 (1475).

There is no chapter division. The scribe was a careful one. There is one single gloss in the margin.

6. Pogodinskij 78, RNB, Pogodin collection, N° 78, Sbornik, end of 15 c., (PS 443), 4°, 76 ff., contents: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (26'-34'), Song of Songs, Menander, Ecclesiasticus. (Pg.78)

water marks: 1. Pot ff. 52, 64, 76 - Briquet N° 12478 (1481).

There is no chapter division. The text of 5:16: и вси дине его въ тьмѣ и плачѣ и въ дрости is omitted from the body of the text but inserted in the margins; individual scribal errors of dittography are crossed out: 5:15 недоучѣ, 7:2 сраце.


water marks: 1. Three mounts with serpent-entwined mast and a cross above ff. 6, 7, 46, 126 - similar to Piccard vol. XVI, part 2, type VII, N° 2620 (1480-81).

There is chapter division. The text has minor editorial corrections in the margin and erasure in the main text that indicate comparison of this copy with another Church Slavonic MS.

8. Gennadian Bible, GIM, Synodal collection, No 915, 1499, (PS 336), 1°, 1007 ff.,
contents: biblical books, Ecclesiastes ff. 437'-443' (GB) 9

water marks: 1. Bull's head with a cross and an entwined serpent ff. 1-16 (Introduction), 972-8 - Lixačev N° 1279 (1499), another variant as preceding but with the monogram - Lixačev N° 1280 (1499); 2. Large and wide tall crown ff. 15, 979-86 - Lixačev N° 1287 (1499), cf. Briquet N° 4902 variants (1480); 3. Small sphere with the letters I and B on either side surmounted by a fleur-de-lis ff. 1-16 - Lixačev N° 1288 (1499), cf. Briquet N° 14056 (1548-52); 4. Large pot with a cross ff. 1-971 - Lixačev N° 1287 (1499), cf. Briquet N° 12481-6 (1468-1515). The main text is separately foliated. The water mark in it is large pot except for the inserted f. 913 which has a bull's head. It follows then that an initial stock of possibly French paper was used which had the pot water mark and when this was exhausted further paper with the bull's head and tall crown was bought. A sheet of paper used in the binding contains N° 1288 which shows that the MS was rebound in the second half of the 16 century.

There is chapter division. The text has glosses and insertions in the margins.

9. Arxangel'skij, BAN, Arxangel'skij collection, N° 3, Sbornik, end of 15—beginning of 16 c., (PS 2496), 4°, 135 ff., contents: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (53'-69'), Song of Songs, Hosea, Jonah, Amos, Nahum, Obadiah, several small articles, letter of Gennadius about the coming of Christ; ff. 64 and 71 are missing (the first and the last of the 9th gathering). (Arx.)

water marks: 1. Bull's head with a serpent-entwined shaft above, ending in a cross ff. 3, 7, 9 – Piccard, Die Ochsenkopf, vol. II, part 3, type XVI, N° 204 (1498); 2. Gloved hand gauntleted under a star ff. 80, 83, 105 – Briquet N° 11154 (1482); 3. Circle with

---

9 For codicological description of GB see Levočkin, 1985:90-6. In his article he does not make his own inspection of the water marks but refers to Lixačev's identification. I have not been able to inspect the manuscript and the water marks but used comments in Simmons (1994, vol.1, 54). It would be desirable to inspect all the water marks in GB afresh.

There is chapter division written in the margins. It has a number of individual omissions, scribal blunders, corruptions and a lacuna 8:8-8:17 because of a missing folio. There are no traces of any correction.


There are no chapter divisions in the text.


---

10 MS TSL 730 is not listed in the PS.
11 I was unable to identify these water marks apart from N° 1 and 4.
There is no chapter division, there are a few corrections in the text and in the margins; after Ecclesiastes 11:9 the commentary on the Song of Songs 2:10-17 follows. The end of chapter 11 and the whole of chapter 12 are missing. This confusion could have resulted from the quires being lost or mixed up in the exemplar.


water marks: 1. Hand under a quatrefoil ff. 171a, 254, 255 – Piccard, vol. XVII, type III, № 901, 902 (1527, 1535); another variant f. 171b – Piccard, type III, № 983 (1498); 2. Three fleur de lis in a shield with a quatrefoil above ff. 187, 208, 277 – Briquet № 1811 (1483), 1812 (1496).

13. Pogodinskij 81, RNB, Pogodin collection, № 81, Sbornik, end of 15- middle of 16 c., ⁴⁰, 175+1 ff, contents: Discourse of John Chrysostom, Song of Songs, Song of Songs with commentary of Philo of Carpasia, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (ff. 116'-126'), Ecclesiasticus (without end). (Pg.81)

water marks: 1. Letter P ff. 19, 23, 26 - Briquet № 8727 (1539-44); 2. Three fleur de lis on a shield with a quatrefoil above ff. 29, 35, 101 - Briquet № 1743 (1480-88), could be also Briquet № 1744 (1482, 1502-09); 3. Coat of arms f. 53 - Briquet № 1808 (1480-86); 4. Bull's head ff. 72, 79, 83 – Piccard, Die Ochsenkopf vol. II, part 2, type IX, № 161 (1492) and № 162 (1488).

There is no chapter division. It displays a low level of corruption. The text may have been checked against the Greek in a number of places.

¹² MS Egorov 891 is not listed in the PS.
¹³ MS Pg. 81 is not listed in the PS.


There is no chapter division. It has a number of individual readings, no visible traces of correction, a few omissions and corruptions. The scribe, Matthew the Tenth son, was a careful scribe.

15. Rumjancevskij 204, RSL, Rumjancev collection 256, N° 204, Polemical sbornik, first third of 16 c., 2°, 491 ff., contents: Discourse against the Novgorodian heretics by Iosif of Volokolamsk, Discourse against the Latins, Ecclesiastes (ff. 350v-370v), Questions and answers of Basil the Great and Gregory the Theologian, Letters of Russian Metropolitanans Cyprian and Photius to Pskov. (Rum.204)


There is no chapter division, no traces of correction.

14 The expression ‘Sixteen Prophets’ is not in English practice, in using it I follow the Church Slavonic usage, in doing so I reproduce the printed Russian description of the MS. However, below under N° 24 I list all the Prophets because again I continue to follow the printed description of this MS.
15 For the description of the MS see Alekseev and Lixacheva, 1978:54-88.
16 See the discussion of this water mark in Briquet, 1907, vol. 2: 510.
16. Volokolamskij, RSL, Volokolamsk collection 113, N° 14, OT books, first half of 16 c., 4°, 360+3 ff., contents: Song of Songs, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (ff. 199r-223r), Ecclesiasticus with additions. (Copy of Vol.13)

water mark: 1. Pot with a quatrefoil on it ff. 3, 8, 200 – similar to Briquet N° 12660 (1534).

17. Uvarovskij 652, GIM, Uvarov collection, No 1 (652), Bible, first half of 16 c., 1°, 885 ff., Ecclesiastes ff. 411r-416r. (Uvar.652)

water marks: 1. Boar ff. 201, 233, 384, 400 - not identifiable but close to Piccard, vol. XV, part 3, type II, N° 68 (1527) and N° 70 (1531); 2. Coat of arms (not identifiable) ff. 423, 429, 460; 3. Coat of arms (not identifiable) ff. 481, 539.

There is chapter division, the first word of each chapter starts with a red initial, there are corrections and glosses in the margins.

18. Čudovskij 200, GIM, Čudov collection, N° 200. Sbornik, first half of 16 c., 1°, 234 ff., contents: Commentary on the Apocalypsis of Andrew of Caesaria with other articles, Tale of Andrew of Caesarea about the Apocalypsis, commentated Apocalypsis, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (ff. 135V-149V), Song of Songs, Ecclesiasticus. (Čud.200) ¹⁷

water marks: 1. Pot with letters BR ff. 21, 29, 73 – Briquet N° 12704 (1542); 2. Unicorn ff. 114, 119 - Lixačev N° 2947 (1529); 3. Hand under a quatrefoil ff. 205, 207 – Briquet N° 10749 (1504); 4. Shield charged with a sun in a circle, there is a crown above the shield ensigned with a quatrefoil and letter B below it ff. 208, 223, 230 - Lixačev N° 2946, 2957 (1515, 1520). ¹⁸

¹⁷ For the description of this MS see Protas’eva, 1980:108.
¹⁸ See also the recent correction of date to 1533-43 in Simmons, 1994, vol.1, p.135.
There is no chapter division, no traces of correction.


water marks: 1. Letter P ff. 4, 9, 11 – similar to Briquet № 8538 (1505); 2. Crown with a shaft ending in a cross ff. 150, 151 – similar to Piccard, Kronen, vol. 1, type X, № 4 (1550-54); 3. Fleur de lis on a shield with letter C underneath ff. 159, 163, 165 - exactly such a water mark is not found in the albums, shield could be the type of Piccard vol. XIII, type III, № 1450 (1505), though the letter C is of a different configuration, similar type can be found in Briquet № 8159 (1520) but with other letters. It belongs to French manufacturers of the 16th century (1520s), Namur 1525, similar type could be found in Lixačev № 2879 (1530).

There are no chapter divisions in the text. The confused order of verses is caused probably by the wrong binding of folia in the quire in the exemplar.19

20. Sofijskij, RNB, Sofijskij collection, № 1323, Mineja-ćetja, second half of 16 c., 1°, 470 ff., contents: Mineja-ćetja for July, Prolog, Discourse against the Latins, Ecclesiastes (ff. 336°-342°), Discourse on Nativity. (Sof.)

water marks: 20 1. Hand in a cuff, quatrefoil above ff. 9, 16 - Lixačev № 1725 (1547), Lixačev № 1603 (1535), Briquet № 11430 (1547); 2. Small pot with letters SM with crown and a quatrefoil ff. 132, 133, 138 – distorted mark Briquet № 12812 (1559-65), Briquet № 12768 (1558/9), Lixačev № 1522 (1527).

There is no chapter division. It has a number of omissions, one correction in the margin.

19 This confusion was noted by Gorskij and Nevostruev (1855, 197) in their description of the manuscript No 251.

water marks: 1. Flower ff. 20, 56 - similar to Lixačev N° 1908 (1567), 3204 (1564) though the middle circle is smaller than in Lixačev’s album; 2. Ship ff. 138, 139 - close to Lixačev N° 4110 (1565); 3. Crown ff. 233, 234, 271 - Piccard, Kronen, vol. 1, type X, N° 6 (1557-1559); 4. Sphere ff. 280, 281 283 - similar to Lixačev N° 2996 (1562) though at the bottom is a round drop as in Lixačev N° 2849 (1560) but the star above is like N° 2996; 5. Small unicorn f. 272 (this mark is not identified).

There are no chapter divisions in the text.

22. Sinodal’nyj 21, GIM, Ioakimov Bible, 1558. (Copy of GB), 1°, 1043 ff., Ecclesiastes (ff. 492r-499v).

water marks: 1. Several variants of small narrow tall crown, some with symbols or monograms within the tall crown or below it (passim) - Lixačev N° 1814-23 (1558), cf. Briquet N° 4971 (1538), N° 5004 (1550), N° 5007 (1550); 2. Fantastic animal f. 498 - Lixačev N° 1824 (1557/8), cf. Briquet N° 2203 (1571).

23. Sinodal’nyj 30, GIM, Bible, second half of the 16 c. 1°, 1013 ff. (Copy of GB), 1°, 1013 ff., Ecclesiastes (ff. 420r-425v).

water marks: 1. Orb with a cartouche below ff. 10, 204, 921 - Lixačev N° 1800-2 (1551 mould-dated); 2. Cartouche ff. 974, 977 - Lixačev N° 1804 (1561-3); 3. Shield with three fleur-de-lis with a quatrefoil above and a long cartouche below ff. 997,
999, 1002 – type of Lixačev N° 3049 (1570), cf. Briquet N° 1844 (1562); 4. Sphere with a star above and a circle at the end of a line below-Lixačev N° 1803 (1561-3?).


   watermarks: Hand in a cuff with a star above the middle finger and letter B on the hand ff. 597, 598, 705 - Lixačev N° 1902 (1567).


   (water marks are not identified)

27. Undol’skij 13, RSL, Undol’skij collection 310, N° 13. Commentary, 16 c., 4°, ff. 14+1, contents: Ecclesiastes with commentary. (Und.13)

21 The water mark N° 4 appears to be on one leaf, which I was unable to identify. The description of it is taken from Simmonos (1994, vol.1, 73), where it is also stated that the erased colophon is dated 1570/1 but the MS itself was in all probability written earlier over a period of several years, about 1561-3.
water mark: Shield charged with a letter N and with a crown above ensignied with a quatrefoil f. 3 - Lixačev N° 4059 (1533), cartouche with the legend ‘Jean Nivelle’ f. 15.

28. Undol’skij 1121, RSL, Undol’skij collection 310, N° 1121, Bible books with additional articles, 16 c., 22 2°, 153+ 2 ff., contents: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (ff. 47°-62°), Song of Songs, Ecclesiasticus, Menander. (Und.1121)

water marks: 1. Letter P ff. 5, 68, 111 (not identifiable); 2. Crown and coat of arms with lions ff. 153, 155 – similar to Lixačev N° 4260 (1710).

There is no chapter division, no traces of correction.


water marks: 1. Easter lamb ff. 77, 100, 103 – Geraklitov N° 1480 (1658); 2. Foolscap ff. 15, 24, 36 – Geraklitov N° 1378 (1680); 3. Cross f. 58 – Geraklitov N° 356 (1643).


water marks: 1. Shield with fleur de lis and a crown with a small trefoil, underneath letters BA? ff. 30, 41, 69 (is not identifiable); 2. Circles with a cross and letter B? ff. 155, 173, 180 – Dianova N° 606 (1697), though it is not an exact match, analogues could be seen in Dianova N° 956 (1655-56).

31. Q.I.4, RNL, OT books, second half of the 17 c., 4°, 94 ff., contents: Song of Songs, Jonah, 1–2 Esdras, Ecclesiastes (ff. 24°-46°), Daniel.

---

22 The date of the MS is taken from the library catalogue. I should point out that water marks do not seem to support this dating.
water marks: 1. Fleur de lis ff. 25, 30, 36, 102 – Dianova N° 909 (1646-54), N° 912 (1653).


water marks: 1. Foolscap ff. 446, 625, 671 – Geraklitov N° 1357 (1665), another variant ff. 965, 970 similar to Geraklitov N° 1222 (1681), on f. 956 foolscap with letters AD in a frame – Geraklitov N° 1338 (1659), also Dianova N° 149 (1667); 2. Pot ff. 921, 923 – Heawood N° 3679 (1674); 3. Strasbourg lily 23 ff. 410, 426, 926 – Churchill N° 428 (1678).

33. Rumjancevskij 36, RSL, Rumjancev collection 256, N° 36 (from the collection of Moscow Theological Academy, N° 9. (19-th century copy of an older unspecified MS)

The text of Ecclesiastes is incomplete, it ends in verse 7, chapter 9.

Two questions follow from our re-examination of the water marks. First, does it make the dating of the manuscripts more accurate and second, does it support the view that some of the extant manuscripts of Ecclesiastes predate GB? Our answer to the first question can be both ‘yes’ and ‘no’ inasmuch as we should always allow a degree of imprecision when dealing with water marks. This imprecision arises partly from the time which elapsed between the production of the paper and its actual use as a writing material. Moreover, the use of a single water mark could span a considerable period of time, thus adding difficulty in dating the manuscripts.

23 The water mark N° 3 is Strasbourg lily and not the coat of Amsterdam as stated in the published description of the MS. See Tvorogov O.V. and Zagrebin V.M., eds., 1986:69.
One example of such difficulty is the case of dating manuscript Undol'skij 1121. The water mark ‘Letter P’ was used continuously during the 15th and 16th centuries, therefore it is not easy to decide to which one it belongs. The fact that the manuscript is not included in ‘Predvaritel’nyj spisok’ suggests that someone thought it was 16th rather than 15th century, but that dating is only as good as the judgement of the person who decided not to include it in the ‘PS’.

Generally the dating of a manuscript depends on water marks, colophons, paleography, not on scholarly judgements, and the example below shows we cannot always rely on the latter. There are no other water marks in the manuscript apart from the ones found on the empty ff. 153, 155. However, these pages bearing a later-date water mark and being the end ones could have been added at a considerably later stage. I was not able to date with confidence manuscript Undol’skij 13 which is incomplete as it contains only 14 ff., and thus may have had other water marks; therefore in this case I suggest a broad range of dates.

On the other hand, after the examination of the water marks of MS Q.1.795 (number 30 in my list) I changed its date to the 17th century, rather than 15th century as in ‘Predvaritel’nyj spisok’ of manuscripts belonging to the 15th century where it is listed under number 430.24 My dating is also corroborated by the text of Ecclesiastes which shows clearly the signs of later revisions and corrections. However, as I failed in a number of cases to identify the water marks I still cannot give a definitive answer to my first question.

I cannot give a single answer to my second question which is closely linked with the first, in so far as it requires more accurate dating of the manuscripts. According to Lixačev the water marks in GB show that it cannot have been written before 1499, whereas an earlier date in the last quarter of the 15th century is possible for several manuscripts which I list before GB. At the same time, the verification of water marks in GB, acribed by Lixačev to the year 1499, could shed additional light on the amount of time for which GB’s paper was kept and the period over which the manuscript itself was written. Furthemore, it leaves open the possibility that there are even earlier manuscripts, such as Pogodinskij 1 which is assigned in my description to the 1st half of the 15th

24 The editors have given the same dating in their ‘Dopolnenija’. 
century. However, it must be said that there is no certain way of dating of Pogodinskij 1 manuscript more precisely, as it is written on parchment. My conclusion is that though on average the differences in date between the manuscripts containing Ecclesiastes and GB are insignificant in terms of manuscripts of this period, being no greater than 10-20 years, there is some room for doubt over the answer to the second question and therefore the answer ‘yes’ cannot be excluded.

Out of 33 known manuscripts 26 were available to me at the time for collation (N° 1-9, 11, 13-18, 20, 24-32). Of these manuscripts N° 16 is excluded as codex descriptus; N° 17 is excluded because it was copied from GB; N° 24-26, 29-32 are not taken into account since these manuscripts are reproduced from later printed copies of the bible; while N° 27 represents a commented version; N° 22 and 23 are excluded because they are later copies of GB. In my research of the continuous text I have used No 1-9, 11, 13-15, 18, 20, 28. Thus 16 manuscripts are used in the present study.

On the basis of their content and structure these 16 manuscripts can be divided into two branches: one which contains an insertion with commentary and a second which consists of the plain text. The former branch (with the insertion with commentary) can be further divided into two groups: a group with the full commentary and one with commentary mostly removed. The resulting divisions are important because they tell us much about the development of the textual tradition:

A. The MSS with lacuna and the insertion with commentary (Pg.1, Und.1, Sol, TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof.)
B. The MSS with the insertion with the commentary mostly removed (MS2, GB)
C. The MSS with the plain text (Pg.81, Vol.13, 1-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200)

At first glance there seem to be three distinctive families of manuscripts, however on textual grounds, as we shall see, Rum.204 and Sof. are more closely related to MS2 and

25 MSS Egorov 891, Barsovskij 12 and Čerkovskij 192 were unavailable for collation because of the long time closure of GIM where they are currently kept. These were checked for water marks at a later stage.
GB than to other manuscripts listed under A. From now on we shall operate with the following slightly different division into three groups: group 1: Pg.l, Und.l, Sol, TSL 730; group 2: Rum.204, Sof., MS2, GB; group 3: Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200. The evidence for the position of Rum.204 and Sof. will be given later on page 65.

There are 8 MSS with the insertion. The order and number of verses in the insertion which occurs in the middle of verse 1:12 is exactly the same in these 8 manuscripts. It is as follows: 2:14, 3:5, 4:6, 4:9, 5:5, 7:3-4 (with abridged commentary in MS2, GB), 7:5, 7:6 (with short commentary in MS2, GB), 7:7, 7:16 -23 (7:20 with commentary left in MS2), 26 7:29, 10:7, 8:2-4, 8:8, 9:4, 10:1 (with short commentary in MS2, GB), 10:2 - 8, 10:16, 10:17, 11:2-3, 11:4, 12:5. 27

Probably at an early stage a scribe inserted these verses with a commentary and in this form subsequent scribes copied the text. The editors of MS2 and GB removed most of the commentary but left the verses intact. Whether the plain version came into being as the latest development (with the insertion being gradually removed) in the textual tradition, or on the contrary, it represents an early stage of the tradition is not absolutely clear at present.

The standard order in which these manuscripts are quoted is: Pg.l, Und.l, Sol., TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof., MS2, GB, Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200.

---

26 In the insertion after verse 7:20 MS2 contains part of the commentary which is the same as in gr.l but which is not found in GB: НИКТОМЕ ТАКО ВЪЩА. ИХУМИН' НЕ ВЪ ТО. ИКО МЪДРЪ. Е МЕ ПА? ДЕСАТ И ВЛАСИНИ. 27 There is confusion among scholars about the number of the inserted verses. Gorski and Nevostruev (1855, 68) counted 38. Alekseev (1988, 185) remarked that they were mistaken and that verses 8:2 and 8:3 are not there, consequently there are 36 in total. Thomson (1998, 845) however, gives the number as 37. I can confirm that the number of verses is 39 in total but verse 10:7 occurs twice, and that verses 8:2 and 8:3 are present in the insertion of GB.

28 Gorski and Nevostruev (1855, 68) remark that the text of Ecclesiastes as it appears in inserted verses differs greatly from the continuous text.
Textual characteristics relevant to all 16 manuscripts.

On page 74 the stemma codicum is given in order to clarify the relations between all the manuscripts discussed. The comparison of the manuscripts and their textological analysis permit us to suppose the existence of several stages $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\gamma$, $\delta$, $\epsilon$ etc. anterior to the manuscripts under discussion. The first and second stages are identified in the stemma by letters $\alpha$ and $\beta$, where $\alpha$ represents the initial translation of Ecclesiastes into Church Slavonic. The $\alpha$ stage is characterized by a number of variants and omissions which are paralleled in Greek. $\beta$ represents a copy made from the $\alpha$ manuscript. This $\beta$ stage is characterized by a number of mistakes which stem from misreadings of Church Slavonic. The $\beta$ stage gave rise to the stages $\gamma$ and $\delta$.

In order to show the development of the textual tradition a set of indicative errors, including variants, omissions, additions and misreadings of the Church Slavonic text, is used. By looking at variants in a group of manuscripts we can hypothesise about the relations that exist between them. For example, if they all share variants we can suggest that the group of manuscripts descended from one common parent manuscript. If variants occur in all the available manuscripts, then it is evident that they either appeared at a very early stage (maybe in the archetype), or were present already in the Greek source.

The examples provided below illustrate the different sorts of evidence that various readings, omissions, additions and errors may produce. In some cases, a mistake arose in Greek or the stage of translation from the Greek, whereas in other cases the error can only have arisen within the Church Slavonic tradition. Some cases are ambiguous, so it is not possible to determine the point at which the error arose. The orthographical variants are not included here because, unlike the lexical and grammatical variants, they appear not to be significant for the textual tradition.

I start with a section on variant readings, omissions and additions that are paralleled in the Greek. In doing so I attempt to locate the Greek original of the Church Slavonic text as far as this is possible. I compare the biblical text in Rahlfs's edition with the text in Boli's edition to see whether these furnish any relevant variants. For all examples I quote the Greek text of the LXX from the edition of Rahlfs first (in the form closest to the Church Slavonic), then the Church Slavonic from GB. For those Greek variants close
to the Church Slavonic, which are absent from Rahlfs's edition, but which are found in
the editions of Holmes and Parsons and Boli, I use square brackets. Words omitted in the
Church Slavonic version are underlined in the Greek. To elucidate the readings of the
Church Slavonic translation that differ from the text in Rahlfs's edition but have
similarities to the readings in the critical apparatus of Holmes and Parsons, the number of
coincidences between the Church Slavonic readings and individual Greek manuscripts
was counted.

The order of Greek manuscripts which I quote starts with the text or manuscripts used
by Rahlfs, continues with the manuscripts employed by Holmes and Parsons and ends
with the text or individual manuscripts used by Boli. This order of manuscripts is for
convenience only, it does not necessarily reveal the importance of the sources; obviously,
later Byzantine manuscripts are more important and relevant for the Church Slavonic
tradition than the early uncials. Sometimes the same capital letters are used by Rahlfs and
Boli to denote sigla of their manuscripts. To avoid confusion which may be caused by the
same lettering I accompany Boli's sigla with the abbreviation com., for example $A_{\text{com}}$.

Church Slavonic text reflecting Greek variants.

2:3 εἰ ἡ καρδία μου
ς με εφ' ιε μοε

In editing this passage Rahlfs emended the reading of Greek manuscripts ... εἰ ἡ καρδία
μου ἐλκύσει ὡς οἶνον..... το ἐν καρδία μου τοῦ ἐλκύσαι εἰς οἶνον... In doing so he
adapted his reading to the Latin text. The Church Slavonic text starts as in Greek
manuscripts with $\mu$με εφ' ιε μοε, but has lost the intervening text before the next
occurrence of εφ' ιε - καρδία. This omission will be discussed later in the section on
omissions.

2:3 ἐπ' εὐφροσύνη
ς ἑκελιν
Rahlfs emended the main text by putting the word ἀφροσύνη following the Latin. The Church Slavonic text follows the reading of the Greek manuscripts.

2:24 οἶκ ἐστὶν ἄγαθῶν ἐν ἀνθρώπω [ἐλ μή] ο νάγεται καὶ ο πέται

Boli’s text has the variant reading ἐλ μή and so do the MSS 147, 154, 157, 159, 161, 248, 252, 296, 299, Compl. Ald. in the apparatus of HP. The variant reading ἐλ μή which is a common Greek equivalent for the expression ἢ ποτε forms the basis for the Church Slavonic translation. Rahlfs in his critical apparatus indicated the reading πλήν preserved by the MS S. This reading also features in the MSS 23, 254 in the critical apparatus of HP. However, I consider Boli’s text and the manuscripts mentioned by HP in their apparatus to be more relevant sources than the ancient codex Sinaiticus. Though the reading of S is preserved in two later manuscripts, the first reading is preferable as it is supported by the majority of manuscripts.

3:10 ἄνθρωπων in B (=Boli) vs. τοῦ ἄνθρωπου

The reading of gen. plural ζῷος reflects the variant found in the Vaticanus codex and in Boli’s Olympiodorus as opposed to gen. sing. in the main text of Rahlfs.

3:16 ἐκεῖ εὐσεβὴς (=Boli)

The Church Slavonic text follows the reading εὐσεβῆς, found in both plain and commentated versions, while Rahlfs has chosen the reading ὁ ἠσβηυς following Grabe and Complut. Ald. Rahlfs’s emendation is an accordance with the the Masoretic text, where in both instances the word ἡσβηυς is found; but the textual tradition of the Greek manuscripts displays here an antithesis of impious and pious. It is worth mentioning here that the case of the Church Slavonic adjective is not explicable from the masc. nom. sing. in the Greek tradition.
3:17 ... καὶ ἐπὶ ποιήματι ἐκείνῳ [ὁ θεός]

The reading τό corresponds to the Greek variant ἐκεῖ in A given in the critical apparatus of Rahlfs. Holmes and Parsons have ἐκεῖ + ὁ θεός in MSS 23, 253, 254. Holmes and Parsons state that in this sequence it is preserved in the MSS 106, 155, 159, 161, Ald. Alex. It is absent in Boli's edition.

4:4 ἄνδρι in B (=Boli) vs. ἄνδρος

The reading of dat. sing. ἄνδρος (ἄνδρος gr. 1, 3) is closer to the variant found in the Vaticanus codex and in Boli's Olympiodorus than to the gen. sing. ἄνδρος in the main text of Rahlfs.

5:1 μὴ σπεύδε ἐπὶ στόματί σου ἐξαμαρτήσαι

Rahlfs has placed the infinitive ἐξαμαρτήσαι, -ταῦτα S*, -τέλειν AS° not in the main text but in his critical apparatus with reference to Thackeray who noted that the verb is used 'in causative sense'. Thackeray must have referred back to the Hebrew text where we find hiphil infinitive construction in place of ἐξαμαρτήσαι. The reading ἐξαμαρτήσαι in Rahlfs's critical apparatus is not present in either HP or Boli's editions. I presume that the infinitive may have appeared here because of its close proximity to verse 5:5 where it is used in almost the same context. It must be said, however, that the rendering of ἐξαμαρτήσαι by the verb ἀπίστης αὐτοῦ remains somewhat odd.

5:2 περισσομοῦ (=Boli)

The Church Slavonic text corresponds to the reading found in Greek MSS and not to the reading περισσομοῦ given by Rahlfs in the main text following Grabe's emendation.

29 Thackeray, 1909:234.
The Church Slavonic text reflects the reading οὐ found in Greek MSS and not the reading οὐν ὅσα ἦν given in Rahlfs’s main text as followed the emendation by Klostermann according to the codex A.

Rahlfs in his critical apparatus gives the variant reading αὐτοῦ AS, which agrees with the reading of the commentated version in Boli’s edition. The Church Slavonic pronoun ερό corresponds to the reading of the Greek MSS AS and not to the reading οὐν found in the main text of Rahlfs; the word ξινὸς corresponds to the neut. acc. sing. γένημα.

The Church Slavonic text corresponds to the reading of MSS BS*A indicated in Rahlfs’s critical apparatus and not to the reading ἄλλος ἦ (supported by MSS S^V) given in the main text. HP indicate that the reading ἄλλος ἦ is found in MSS 23, 253, 254.

In Rahlfs’s edition we find the verb ἔξουσιασεν in the main text. The Church Slavonic translation reflects the reading καὶ ἔξουσιαν found in MS 298 (MSS 106, 252 - καὶ ἔξουσιας) in the critical apparatus of HP. In Boli’s edition the reading is ἔξουσιαν ἐν αὐτῷ.

The Church Slavonic text corresponds to the reading of MSS BS*A indicated in Rahlfs’s critical apparatus and not to the reading ἄλλος ἦ (supported by MSS S^V) given in the main text. HP indicate that the reading ἄλλος ἦ is found in MSS 23, 253, 254.

In Rahlfs’s edition we find the verb ἔξουσιασεν in the main text. The Church Slavonic translation reflects the reading καὶ ἔξουσιαν found in MS 298 (MSS 106, 252 - καὶ ἔξουσιας) in the critical apparatus of HP. In Boli’s edition the reading is ἔξουσιαν ἐν αὐτῷ.
It seems likely that the Church Slavonic text is a corruption of the Greek variant ou πολλάς.

7:2 ... + ἀγαθὸν MSS εἰς καρδίαν αὐτοῦ (=Boli)

... ἐντὸς εἰς εἰρήνευσεν

Rahlfs in his critical apparatus does not specify which particular manuscripts have this reading.

7:15 [ἐν ἡμέραν]

The reading ἡμέρα is closer to the Greek acc. sing. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ given in the MSS 298, 299 of HP critical apparatus (Boli’s main text ἐν ἡμέρᾳ) than to the form of ἐν ἡμέραις dat. pl. found in the main text of Rahlfs. In the Church Slavonic text, however, the equivalent of the preposition ἐν is missing.

7:21 εἰς πάντας τοὺς λόγους οὓς λαλήσουσιν + ἀσεβείς BS μὴ θής καρδίαν οὐ = HP, Boli

8:10 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου

Rahlfs’s word τόπου in the main text is a reconstruction on the basis of Vetus Latina, and in this case the Church Slavonic translation faithfully follows the Greek MSS where we find the article τοῦ which is usually omitted in translations.

11:9 καὶ περιπάτει ἐν ὀδοῖς καρδίας σου + ἄμωμος B καὶ ἐν ὑπάρξει ὀφθαλμών σου η ἀδικία καὶ κάπακε τοῦ ἔθεος. = HP, Boli
Rahlfs's edition is a reconstructed one, in many places he suggested his own emendations. Thus the correspondence of the Church Slavonic version with variants not from his main text but from the extant manuscripts including those of Holmes-Parsons and Boli is what we would expect. On many occasions the Church Slavonic version agrees with both Greek early uncial manuscripts and later extant manuscripts. However, the agreement of the Church Slavonic text with the variant readings from later Byzantine manuscripts, contemporaneous with the Slavonic version, is of far more importance than the same agreement with the early uncial manuscripts, on which Rahlfs based his edition, which can have had no direct influence upon the Church Slavonic text.

On a number of occasions the Church Slavonic text reflects the variant readings found not only in the Greek plain version but also in the commentated one. This proximity to the commentated version reveals its significance for the textual history of the Church Slavonic text.

**Omissions resulting from homoeoteleuton in all 16 MSS.**

Below I present examples where omissions resulting from homoeoteleuton in all 16 manuscripts are paralleled in Greek. Thus it is plausible to conclude that they appeared in the archetype and even possible that they already occurred in the Greek exemplar, which may therefore have been defective. However, since this type of mistake can easily happen independently in both original and translated texts it is still not certain whether the omission occurred early in the Church Slavonic manuscript tradition or already existed in the Greek *Vorlage.*

1:2 ματαιότητις ματαιοτήτων εἶτεν ὁ Ἑκκλησιαστὴς ματαιότητις ματαιοτήτων

---

τὰ πάντα ματαιότης.

*Всё писать" срета срета*  

HP in their critical apparatus note the omission of ματαιοτήτων 1° - ματαιοτήτων 2° in MS 157.
1:5 καὶ ἀνατέλλει ὁ ἡμιὸς καὶ δύνει ὁ ἡμιὸς καὶ εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ ἔλκει ἡ καταλείπῃ σοιμε —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— καὶ κεκτήστε ἑαυτοῦ καὶ μέστο εστε κλεεί

HP in their critical apparatus note the omission of δύνει and ὁ ἡμιὸς in MS 23.

1:16-17...καὶ καρδία μου εἴδεν πολλά, σοφίαν καὶ γνώσιν.
...ἐρήμω καὶ θλήσω πρεσβυχρότητι καὶ ῥαζοχώμῃ...
καὶ ἔδωκα καρδίαν μου τοῦ γνώαι σοφίαν καὶ γνώσιν,
[-----------------------------------------------]
παραβολάς καὶ ἐπιστήμην ἑγνών...

In Boli’s main text we find the same omission. HP in their critical apparatus note the omission starting with καὶ ἔδωκα... in MSS 68, 106, 248, 253, 261, 296, 298.

It must be noted that the order of these particular versicles in the editions of Rahlfs and HP is reversed. While in Rahlfs’s text the order is the same as presented above, in HP text the words καὶ ἔδωκα καρδίαν μου τοῦ γνώαι σοφίαν καὶ γνώσιν are placed before καὶ καρδία μου εἴδεν πολλά σοφίαν καὶ γνώσιν.

3:21 εἰ ἀναβαίνει αὐτὸ εἰς ἄνω καὶ πνεῦμα τοῦ κτήριου εἰ καταβαίνει αὐτὸ κάτω εἰς γῆν ἀμέ παρεξηγητὶ εἴδη [-----------------------------------------------] ἀσμὴ (sic) ἐν ζεμλῳ.

Boli notes in her critical apparatus the omission of εἰς ἄνω - κτήριους in MS Γ_com.

4:1 καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς παρακαλῶν καὶ ἀπὸ χείρὸς συκοφαντοῦντων αὐτοῖς ἱσχὺς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς παρακαλῶν
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ τῆς ὀρθοκληρίας...
[--------------------------]

Boli notes in her critical apparatus the omission of καὶ ἀπὸ - παρακαλῶν in MSS AE_com.

6:4 ὅτι ἐν ματαιότητι ἦλθεν καὶ ἐν σκότει πορεύεται καὶ ἐν σκότει ἄνωμα αὐτοῦ ἢ φήμα τοῦ ἑω τον δοκεὶ καὶ προφήτησαι καὶ καλυφθήσεται

HP noted the omission starting with the words καὶ ἐν in MS 254. Boli notes in her critical apparatus the omission of ἐν1 and καὶ ἐν σκότει πορεύεται in MS A_com.

Although the omission in Boli’s text is not an exact match to the Church Slavonic
omission, it nevertheless illustrates the difficulties caused by so many repetitions in the text of Ecclesiastes.

8:11-12 ...ποίησαι τὸ ποιητῶν ὃς ἠμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ ποιητῶν ἀπὸ τότε...

...τεφρὴν ἀδάμως. [-----------------------------------------------] ἦ ζώοτω ... 

HP in their critical apparatus note the omission of ὃς ἠμαρτεν ἐποίησεν τὸ ποιητῶν in MSS 23, 106.

Omission due to homoeoarcton that is paralleled in Greek.

For the following omission in verse 9:9 we lack evidence from manuscripts of group 1, Rum.204 and Sof. because of the lacuna, therefore it may be of less weight than the others. However, I feel that it would be appropriate to incorporate this example together with the other omissions in all 16 manuscripts which all have parallels in Greek.

9:9 πάσας ἡμέρας ζωῆς ματαιότητός σου τὰς δοθείσας σοι ὑπὸ τὸν ἔλεον

ΚΑ ΔΗΝ ΣΕΤΕΤΕΙ ΧΙΒΟΤΑ ΤΒΟΕΤΟ, ΔΑΝΗ ΠΟΔΙ ΣΙΝΤΕΛΕΜ

πάσας ἡμέρας ματαιότητός σου ὃτι αὐτὸ μερίς σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου

[-----------------------------] ΙΑΚΟ ΧΑΤΤ ΤΒΟΕ ΧΙΒΟΤΕ ΤΒΟΕΜ

This omission resulting from a homoeoarcton was recorded by Boli as occurring in manuscripts ΑΓΔΖΚ. Rahlfs registered in his apparatus this omission as occurring in manuscripts ΑΒ. Holmes and Parsons have an omission in their main text in accordance with codex Vaticanus. They note in their critical apparatus that in manuscript 252 the words πάσας ἡμέρας ματαιότητός σου are written in the margin.

The relatively large number of omissions suggests that the Greek source may have been defective. We can see this happening in verses 1:2, 1:5, 1:16-17, 3:21, 4:1, 8:11-12 where there are omissions in the manuscripts containing both plain and commented versions of the biblical text. It seems that manuscripts 23 and 106 used by Holmes and Parsons have more omissions due to homoeoteleuton than the rest. To these examples I shall add the omission due to homoeoarcton in 9:9. This omission has also taken place in some of the Greek sources both plain and commented.
However, it is still possible that the omissions occurred independently within the Church Slavonic tradition at an early stage and not necessarily in the Greek source. Because omissions due to homoeoteleuton are a common phenomenon in manuscripts, both Greek and Slavonic scribes can be equally susceptible to it. At the same time, the large number of omissions may have arisen because the text is very repetitive. A scribe might easily have lost his place during copying and accidentally missed out some sections or parts of text. Considering that Ecclesiastes is not a narrative book omissions and mistakes might not have been immediately recognizable.

In the section above we have looked at the omissions for which there are parallels in Greek. Though omissions of this kind could happen spontaneously in both traditions, there is nevertheless a strong possibility that the Greek exemplar used for the Church Slavonic translation was already defective. With this section we leave behind the hypothetical Greek copy which was our ‘starting point’ and turn our attention to the Church Slavonic tradition. This tradition appears to be imperfect from the beginning due to a faulty Greek exemplar or to careless translation. Although now we examine mistakes peculiar to Church Slavonic, there are several mistakes that could happen in the process of translation. The following examples may serve as an illustration to the process of translating the Greek text into Church Slavonic.

Common errors in all 16 MSS which may be due to misreading of Greek. 30

5:5 ἵνα μὴ ὀργισθῇ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ φωνῇ σου
εδώ προσφέρεται σα ἢ ὁ μυστήριον θεοῦ.

30 Thomson’s remark (1998:843) about the confusion of γεννάω with γίνομαι in the Church Slavonic translation of 6:3 is incorrect. In all the manuscripts examined the text of Ecclesiastes has προσφέρεται - beget. His allegation is repeated in his later article, cf. Thomson, 2006: 37. It is possible that he based his assertion on the reading from the Ostrog Bible.
The Greek scribe in this context may have confused the word φωνή by some association of his own with the noun γνώμη or alternatively the word μύσα may have resulted from misreading of the noun φωνή as γνώμη. However, the second possibility seems less likely.

5:15 καὶ τίς περισσεία αὐτῷ ἤ μοχθεὶ εἰς ἄνεμον

I do not have a ready explanation for the occurrence of the lexeme μύσα in this passage except that the confusion of ἄνεμον and κόσμον may have somehow happened in the Greek copy which in turn caused this translation.

12:5 καὶ γε ἀπὸ ψυχος ὁψονται καὶ θάμβοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ

One explanation seems plausible enough, that it was a misreading of the Greek θάμβοι ‘fears’ as θάμνοι ‘bushes, shrubs’.

It is clear that these three mistakes may have resulted from mistranslation of the Greek text or from a faithful translation of an already corrupted Greek text. We do not have any evidence for such corruptions in the Greek textual tradition. Thus, the first possibility seems to be more likely.

Omissions which might have happened in the Church Slavonic text.

2:17 ... τὸ ποίημα τὸ πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τῶν ἕλμον...

This omission might occur in Greek or Church Slavonic text, though we do not have evidence of it in either HP or Bolli’s critical apparatus. However, it may be easier for a Slav scribe to miss out the participle στορενοί because of its close proximity to the noun
Therefore on paleographical grounds it seems to me that it is more likely to be a mistake in copying Church Slavonic.

This example may have been prompted by two instances of the word συμφωνία standing next to each other, so it would not be difficult to miss one while copying Church Slavonic. On the other hand, the Greek source might have an omission of the words τούς ἁγία ἀποδανώτας as Holmes and Parsons indicate in their apparatus referring to the reading in Origen's version.

In the section above the two classes of omissions are evident. The misreading of Church Slavonic text is most likely in 4:2, while the other example might have happened either in the Greek or Church Slavonic text. Misreadings of Church Slavonic make it likely that there was at least one intermediary copy β from which all the MSS descend.

Omissions from homoeoteleuton in all 16 MSS for which no parallels in Greek are found.

2:3 καὶ κατεσκεψάμην εἰ ἡ καρδία μου ἔλκυσει εἰς οἶνον τὴν σάρκα μου καὶ καρδία μου ὠδήγησεν

3:1-2 ...καίρος τοῦ τεκείν καὶ καίρος τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν καίρος τοῦ φυτεύσαι καὶ καίρος τοῦ ἔκτιλαι πεφυτευμένον

καταρρίζατε εἰςενεο
Omissions of a single word and omissions by homoeoteleuton of less weight than others.

For the following omissions in verses 8:17, 9:6, 9:11 we lack evidence from manuscripts of group 1, Rum.204 and Sof. because of lacuna. Therefore these examples are excluded from the main list of all 16 manuscripts. However, I feel that it would be appropriate to incorporate them together as a separate group. These omissions are not paralleled in Greek.

8:17 ὅσα ἄν ὁ μοχθήσῃ ὁ ἀνθρώπος τοῦ ζητήσαι καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσει καὶ γε ὅσα ἄν ἐλικὸς ἐμε [-----------------------------------------------] εἰπός ὁ σοφὸς ρεῖ' ἠδραίως

9:6 καὶ γε ἀγάπη αὐτῶν καὶ γε μίσος αὐτῶν
[-----------------------------] ἡ οἰκονομία ἡς
(the beginning of the verse is omitted)

9:11 ὅτι οὐ τοῖς κοῦφοις ὁ δρόμος καὶ οὐ τοῖς δυνατοῖς ὁ πόλεμος καὶ γε οὐ τοῖς σοφοῖς ἀρτος
ιακὸ [---] λεγεῖς τεσσεσσάμην καὶ σιλήνας. [---] εἶποι" λογοθήμα ταλάκη

Omission of a single word or phrase in all 16 MSS.

The following variants are not paralleled in Greek.

1:9 καὶ τί τὸ πεποιημένον

1:10 καὶ ἐρεῖ Ἰδὲ τότο

cf. also omissions of Ἰδὲ in 7:27, 7:29 in the Church Slavonic text.
2:5 ἐποίησα μοι κήπους καὶ παραδείσους καὶ ἐφύτευσα συντροφικό οργανώ [----------] καὶ μάκαρις...

2:7 ἐκτραμώνυμι δούλους καὶ παιδίσκες καὶ οἰκογενεῖς πριτάκα [----------] παιδικά καὶ δομοχαζιμ

HP in their critical apparatus note that in MS 296 the word παιδας appears in the main text while δούλους is placed in the margin. Could the two similar words παιδας and παιδίσκες or παιδικά and παιδικά written next to each other have led to the eventual loss of one of them and consequently to the omission in Church Slavonic?

2:9 ἐμεγαλύθησα καὶ προσέβηκα βυχελίνη [----------]

2:19...ἐν παντὶ μόχθῳ μου ὡς ἐμισθηθα καὶ ὡς ἐσοφιασάμην... δεξιὰ τρόλωμα σωμάτ [----------] εἰς μῆρωκας...

2:22 ἐν προαιρέσει καρδίας αὐτοῦ κύκλως ἱσχύεται [-----] εἶναι

3:1 καίρος τῷ παντὶ πράγματι ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν κρεμα ἐκεῖνον κεκλίμ [----------]

3:10 εἶδον σιν τὸν περιπατημὸν ὅτι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου νική [---] περιεχεῖ τὸν [----------] καὶ τὸν

3:15 ὡστὶς οὕτω ἐγένετο ὡς σιν ἔδωκαν σιν τὸ ποίημα τὸ τοῖον εἰμίν' ἐν εἴ [----------] ζωοεῖν ἀδικάκο

4:3 ὡστὶς οὕτω ἐγένετο ὡς ὦ τὸ ποίημα τὸ τοῖον εἰμίν' ἐν εἴ [----------] ζωοεῖν

4:4 ὡστὶ αὐτὸ ἔμεθα ἂν ἔμεθα ἀνὴρ τῆς ζωοεις [------- -----] ὀμμεθήν

4:15 τοῖς περιπατητοῦντας ὑπὸ τὸν ἠλιόν μετὰ τοῦ νεανίσκου τοῦ δευτέρου ὃς στήρεσαι αὐτῷ ἡ τοῦ νεανίσκου [----------] ἐνεκεὶ εἴς τὸ νεανίσκου τοῦ δευτέρου ἐνεκεὶ εἴς τὸ νεανίσκου τοῦ δευτέρου...
4:16 τοῖς πᾶσι πᾶσιν ἐγένοντο ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν
καὶ ἔκλεισε [-------] πρὶς ἦννι

4:17 ὑπαί σου ὅτι οὐκ εἰσαν εἰδότες τοῦ ποιήσαι κακὸν
κρατεί τὰ αὐχ [-----------------------------] (the end of the verse is missing)

5:3 μὴ χρονίσης τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτὴν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστω
νε ὀμαλοὶ ἡδιαν [-----] ἦν ἅκητη

5:5 καὶ διαφθείρῃ τὰ ποιήματα χειρῶν σου
καὶ βαστής [----------------] τοῖς

5:7 ἵνα εἰν χώρῳ

5:13 καὶ οὐκ ἔστω ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν
καὶ ἅκητη καὶ ἰδία [-------] ἦντο

6:6 καὶ εἴ ζησαν χιλίων ἑτῶν καθόδους καὶ ἀγαθωσύνην οὐκ εἶδον
[-----------------------------] ἰδαποτήνα ἦν βιάκ
(the beginning of the verse is omitted)

7:14 ἐν ἁγαθῷ καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κακίας

7:14 ἵνα μὴ ἔφη ὁ ἀνθρωπος ὅπισώ αὐτοῦ μηδὲν
dὸ ἐσπευσίμε [-------] ἢςου* ἦντο
* ζὰ σοιον gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof. gr. 3

8:3 ὅτι πᾶν ὃ ἐὰν θελήσῃ ποιήσῃ

11:5 τίς ἂν ὁδὸς τοῦ πνεύματος
πρὸ ἐπετη [--] ἄχα
The word \( \text{n}^\text{Th} \) is omitted in all the MSS, and the verb \( \text{βάδετ} \) seemingly has no support in the Greek.

There is a comparatively large number of omissions of single words, but they do not always affect the meaning of the text. Given that these omissions appear in all the manuscripts, they may have happened either in the Church Slavonic archetype or already taken place in the Greek text, since we do not know what the Greek exemplar was from which the Church Slavonic translation was made. However, we find no support for the second possibility among the Greek manuscripts and it seems less likely. It is also possible that the omissions of words at the beginning or the end of verses were the result of converting commented into plain text. This question will be addressed in the following chapter.

Additions that are apparently independent of the Greek text.

2:15 τοῦ ἀφρόνου [-----] καὶ γε ἐμοὶ συνάντησεται

3:11 σὺν τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν [ ] καλὰ ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ

8:12 ὅπως [ ---] φοβοῦται

The negation is absent in Greek text, thus the Church Slavonic translation gives the opposite meaning to this passage.

In proportion to the number of omissions the additions are relatively rare. This is to be expected as in Scriptural texts the material generally was not added while copying. After
the examination of omissions and additions in all 16 manuscripts under scrutiny, there remains a need to search for the errors that occurred in the text.

**Mistakes in copying Church Slavonic abbreviations.**

7:19 ἡ σοφία βοηθήσει τῷ σοφῷ

\[\text{M. M. Поможьтесь мне.}\]

This mistake is due to the misreading of the abbreviated word μυστικό as миесто.

9:3 καὶ γε καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιθρόην ποιητοῦ

\[\text{и саце сине в. илне ипакем са лакастиа} \]

(gr. 1 - lacuna)

A wrong word appeared in the text as a result of misreading the abbreviated ердяе as саце.

10:20 καὶ γε ἐν συνείδησιν σου βασιλέα μὴ καταράσῃ

\[\text{и ть в. иквети скове ердяе не клени} \]

This is a similar example of misreading a word ура as ердя.

There are three mistakes of this kind. All these examples are errors in copying abbreviations. They indicate that all Cyrillic manuscripts derive from β which is an intermediary stage in the stemma.

**Other errors in copying Church Slavonic text.**

Below are more examples of errors in copying Church Slavonic text. These errors might have been caused by a visual difficulty during the copy process. When an unusual change is found in a manuscript involving letters which look alike, then it is possible that this error arose from confusion of letters. There are also errors caused by mental lapse: by sight, by transposition of letters, by mishearing, by misreading, etc.
3:14 καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἓνα φωτισθῶσιν

The verb ἔδωκε was written as ἐδοκε in the process of copying and was probably understood as two separate words ἐδοκε - 'so' and ἔ - 'is' a form of 3rd p. sing. praes. of the verb 'to be'. I have no ready explanation for the Church Slavonic singular when Greek has plural. Could it be a Serbian spelling?

5:7 ἐὰν συκοφαντάων πέντετοι

Miscopying of the letter B as T in the noun ὄμιλος or, perhaps, mishearing resulted in the form of the 1-st p. sing. verb ὄμιλος. All the MSS have the ligature ὧ at the beginning of the word. There is another problem there with the form ὅμιλος instead of gen. sing. ὅμιλον.

5:19 ὅτι οὐ πολλὰ μην θηρίσται τὰς ἡμέρας

This particular mistake resulted from the accidental omission of the second letter ὦ in the word ἡμερότης.

6:9 ἀγαθὸν ὁραμά σφαλμένῳ

A misreading of ἂναθένα as ἅναθεία led to this mistake.

7:2 καὶ ὦ ὃς δώσει

The wrong word division of the collocation ἦ κιβών ἀστῇ caused this mistake.

7:18 ἐν τούτῳ καὶ γε ἀπὸ τούτου

It is possible that with the variants ὦ κιβὼν - ὦ κιβών appear under the influence of the word κιβών which is found at the end of the verse.
Misreading or miscopying of one letter ι or ε for the letter ο led to the misinterpretation of the participle θὰδσι into the gen. sing. form of the noun ὕδως - 'water'. This mistake is easier to imagine within the immediate context where there is mention of clouds.

For the errors below the original readings, which can be reconstructed on the basis of Greek, are given on the right.

2:3 χωρεῖ - διηρεῖ; - τῶν cf. also 9:9
This particular error resulted from transposition of letters.

2:15 ἔπο σάκι - σάκι αὐτό; - ὅς συνάντημα

2:19 τὸ εἰς - κτὸς εἰς; - τῖς οἴδεν

It looks like both Church Slavonic words in 2:15 and 2:19 lost their initial letters.

4:16 καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης καὶ προσαρέσεις πνεύματος
πακο ἡ σετᾶ ἡν ἦσσολεινε α交易中心. [ε; - τοῦτο; ἢ; - καὶ]
The negation is not in Greek. I assume that these negations resulted from miscopying the Church Slavonic words ce and ἢ at an early stage.

5:11 ὄσιμολα - ὄσιμολα; - ἀφίων (cf. 2:18 ὄσιμολα - ἀφίω)

6:9 χαράματο - χαράματο; - πορευόμενον

6:10 σετᾶτι σα - σετᾶτι σα; - κριθῆναι

6:10 κῇ ποιμενι - κρῆπομενϊ; - ἱσχυροτέρου
The Church Slavonic reading should correspond to the variant found in S according to the critical apparatus in Rahlfs edition.

9:9 ἡ θυμία κυρίου και θηνομο - βίωκα? - ἢδε

It is likely that the transposition of letters was helped by alliteration. And perhaps, the substitution of the imperative βίωκα with θυμία makes a better collocation in this context.

10:4 ἀνά ἁν (μὴ ἄν, ἁν Pg.81) - ἄν τά? - ἐπὶ σέ

12:5 ἵππο Bεῆ - σῆς - γὰρ σά? - ὅτι ἐπορεύθη ὁ ἀνθρώπος

10:18 ἐν ὀκνηρίας ταπεινωθῆσθαι ἡ δόξως

The current mistake may have resulted from the misreading of perhaps what was not such a common word στροφεῖον - 'wood beam' as στροφεῖο - 'obstinately'.

8:8 σάββα - ἀποστολή

I do not have a ready explanation for this reading and can only suppose that there was some corruption in Church Slavonic.

Although the next three examples do not fully conform to the definition of common errors observed in all 16 MSS, I nevertheless have included them here. In contrast to the previous examples where errors were simply copied by scribes, the three examples below show attempts by scribes to emend and 'improve' the text.

3:18 ὅτι διακρίνει αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός

6:3 εἴπα ἀγαθὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τὸ ἐκτρωμα

I do not have a ready explanation for this reading and can only suppose that there was some corruption in Church Slavonic.
In 3:18 and 6:3 MSS Supr. and Pg.81 retain individual readings.

Dittography.

3:19  

Conclusions about the archetype.

There is no critical edition of the Greek text of *Ecclesiastes*, therefore it is not possible to relate the Cyrillic archetype α precisely to the Greek manuscript tradition. However, comparison of variants given in the critical apparatus of Holmes and Parsons and Boli reveals that there are omissions in the Greek plain and commented versions which correspond with the Church Slavonic text. Though the precise textual characteristics of the Greek exemplar which the Slavonic translator used are not known, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Greek text was defective. Therefore copy α could have flaws from the start. In addition to omissions this stage α could have been characterized by mistakes made in the process of translation. Concerning the other errors and omissions the possibility remains that they appeared during successive copying of the Church Slavonic text. Furthermore, errors in copying Church Slavonic speak strongly for the existence of an intermediary stage β.

The number of coincidences between the variants readings in the Church Slavonic text with the readings in Greek manuscripts is not large and is distributed more or less evenly. The coincidences with codex Vaticanus are six, with codex Alexandrinus five, with MS 23 also five, with MS 106 four, with MS 254 also four, with MSS 157, 253, 298, 299 two. However, no clear pattern emerges from these correspondences.
Manuscript 106 is a Bible of the 14th century, MS 23 or codex Venetus is a complete Bible of the 8th century, MS 254 is Sbornik of the 10th century containing Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus. The Church Slavonic version seems closer to these manuscripts though they are not closely related.

The next logical step to take is to establish the relationship between the groups of manuscripts. Groups 1, 2 of the branch γ and group 3 of the branch δ have been already mentioned. Group 3 in δ branch contains a plain text not contaminated by interpolation and therefore prima facie has a stronger claim to be closer to the tradition. However, the absence of the interpolation does not necessarily make this group earlier than the branch γ. The omissions and corruptions in δ which are not found in γ make it possible to suppose that this group could derive from a poorer copy of the β MS. If we are to suppose that branches δ and γ were almost contemporaneous, it might be feasible to argue a case for both groups having developed independently from each other.

The methodology used to posit the former existence of α and β is also applied for the reconstruction of the later stages γ and δ. The group 3 in branch δ is chosen in the first place because it seems to be less structurally complicated and is more straightforward than groups 1 and 2 in branch γ with their intricacy of the insertion and the lacuna.
Relationships of MSS in group 3.

Omissions in Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200 MSS.

The following omissions demonstrate that these MSS are related to each other. 31

7:10 ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ ταύτας
*μεταξύ παρε...σι* (gr. 1, 2)
* - om. gr. 3

7:28 καὶ οὐχ εὑρον ἄνθρωπον
καὶ οὐ * σωφρόνος μάκα (gr. 1, 2)
* - om. gr. 3

7:28 εὑρον καὶ γυναῖκα
σωφρόνος * καὶ θεί (gr. 1, 2)
* σωφρόνος - om. gr. 3

The word σωφρόνος occurs 5 times in verses 7:27-7:29 so it could easily be missed once by a copyist.

8:10 καὶ ἐκ τόπου ἄγιον ἐπορεύθησαν
καὶ στὸ σωφρόνος (gr. 1, 2)
* σωφρόνος - om. gr. 3

The reading in group 3 is closer to the standard Greek text where no equivalent for the word σωφρόνος is found.

31 These are the examples of major variation which consist of the omission of a content word: 1:9, 7:26, 11:6. Certain linguistic characteristics such as differences in case endings, aspects of verb, short and long adjectives, absence or presence of certain conjunctions, particles, etc. are qualified as minor variation. They are nevertheless important because they form a pattern which distinguishes this group of MSS from the rest, e.g. 2:14, 11:3 ὦ vs. ἢ; 2:25 ὦ vs. κτός; 4:8 ὦ vs. ἥ; 8:9 ὦ vs. ἢ; 10:11 ὦ vs. ἢ.
Addition.

10:17 ις σιλκ ρατι πε, ς πος τυδατ

The reason for the inclusion of the word ρατι is not entirely clear, this could be an interpretation on a part of a scribe.

Apart from omissions and the addition there are variant readings which unite manuscripts Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200 as a group descending from the hyparchetype δ.

Variant readings common to group 3.

There are variants (1:13, 4:6, 6:2, 10:6, 11:3, 12:5, 12:9) that may stem from scribal errors in copying Church Slavonic. For example, in 6:2 the adjective Δολτά may be a corruption of the word ζολά. In 11:3 we have the reading Ραβνά μεστά in group 3 vs. Κωρνιμ μεστά in Rum.204, MS2, GB vs. εκσερνά μεστά in gr. 1 and Sof. The reading in MSS Rum.204, MS2, GB is a truncation of the adjective εκσερνά when the first syllable was lost. But the reason behind the reading in group 3 is not entirely clear, it may be banalisation. It is not easy to explain the corruption of the noun Δομ into Δημ in 12:5 Β Δημ B ΒΕΚΑ ΒΕΚΕ ΒΕΚΕ ΒΕΚΕ ΒΕΚΕ ΒΕΚΕ ΒΕΚΕ. A scribe may have thought that Δημ ΒΕΚΑ is obviously a more appropriate collocation than Δομ ΒΕΚΑ and consequently may have changed it. In 10:6 there is a slight possibility that the form Καζάτω in group 3 might resulted from a confusion of ‘jusy’ – Κ and Χ and the substitution of letter Ε for Β in the verb Καζάτω found in gr. 1 and 2. In 12:11 gr. 3 has the variant reading Παςτύξα vs. Παςτέξα in gr. 1 and 2.

7:26 Παςτύνετ ΤΑ vs. Παςτύνετ ΤΑ gr. 1, 2 Παςτύνετ ΤΑ?

ΗΡ Καζάτωςта MSS 147, 157, 159.
Sreznevskij following Vostokov presents the word ИЗВИНИТЬ СА with this particular quotation from Ecclesiastes 7:26 under the entry ИЗВИНИТЪ СА - 'to be delivered', 'to be saved' with the Greek parallel ἔξορισθε. Sreznevskij's second example under the same entry is a quotation from the Pandects of Antioch ΠΕΡΙ ΙΣΚΑΔΑΝ ΣΑ ΕΝ - 'to be justified' with the Greek parallel οὐ ἀδικοθεταῖ. This particular quotation in the Pandects is drawn from Proverbs 6:29. In LLP under the entry ИЗВИНИТЪ СА we find the same quotation (Proverbs 6:29) from Zaxarjin and Grigorovitch parimejnik: ΠΕΡΙ ΙΣΚΑΔΑΝ ΣΑ ΕΝ - οὐκ ἀδικοθεταῖ - 'anyone will not be held guiltless who touches her'.

Vostokov's sources for Ecclesiastes in his dictionary were two MSS of the 16th century from Rumjacevskij museum and St. Petersburg Theological Academy. In 1842 Vostokov published his 'Opisanie russkix i slovenskix rukopisej Rumjancevskago muzeuma'. I assume that for his dictionary he probably used Rumjancevskij 204 and MS 9 from St.Petersburg Theological Academy. However, Rum.204 has the reading ИЗВИНИЙ СА, therefore Vostokov must have used another manuscript.

I presume that Sreznevskij simply repeated the quotation of Vostokov in giving the first Greek parallel. In my opinion it is more likely to be an erroneous reading in Ecclesiastes. I have two explanations for this error. Firstly, there could be a scribal mental lapse in confusing the wording in verse 6:29 from Proverbs with the wording of 7:26 of Ecclesiastes. Their contexts are similar purely for the reason that women are the subject of both quotations. Secondly, there could have been a scribal error in incorrectly copying the word ИЗВИНИТЪ СА from ИЗВИНИТИ СА which according to LLP is a translation of the Greek ἔξορισθε - 'to be delivered', 'to be saved'; this suggestion, however, seems to be less plausible on palaeographical grounds. At the same time it is quite obvious that at an early stage the text existed in a poor quality form, which engendered the copying mistakes in later Church Slavonic MSS.

In addition there are cases (4:10, 5:7, 8:11) where variants might arise from scribal endeavor to 'improve' the text. 3:13 ЖИВОТЪ gr. 3 vs. ЖИТЪ Sol., TSL 730, gr. 2 vs. ЖИВОТЪ Pg. 1 (no is crossed out), Und.l. 4:10 КОЛЪ gr. 3 vs. В ТОГО gr. 1, 2. 5:7 о

32 I have been unable to get access to MS 9 from Theological Academy. This MS is incomplete, it ends 9:7.
Since ἐβίβαζεν could render the Greek verb πραγματεύεσθαι, the reading ἐβίβαζεν may be 'better' Church Slavonic usage. 8:11 ἱσχύσας ἐγενετον gr. 3 vs. ἰσχύθηκεν Pg.1, Sol., Und.l vs. ἰσχύθηκεν TSL 730, gr. 2. It seems obvious that something went wrong here. The reading of group 3 is a puzzling one, it may be taken as a translation of the Greek word ἀντίρρησις. The readings of groups 1 and 2 can be explained on palaeographical grounds, as they are very close in appearance: ἰσχύθηκεν could have changed into ἰσχύθηκεν, besides the word ἰσχύθηκεν is quite frequently repeated in the text.

There is a number of minor variations between group 3 and groups 1 and 2. The importance of these variations is that they form a pattern which distinguishes group 3 from other groups. A few examples are presented here, and the rest are given in the footnote.

1:16 εὐεμν vs. λοεμ
2:8 ἰδίᾳ ἱψκα vs. ἰδίᾳ ἱψκα
2:11 έίπεν πειπῆξαν vs. έίπεν πειπῆξαν
2:12 τομαρτά vs. τομαρτά

Conclusions about the archetype of group 3.

On the basis of omissions, addition and variant readings peculiar to group 3, which contains a plain text, it could be presumed that these MSS go back to a hyparchetype δ. A number of scribal errors indicate that this branch of the tradition has become corrupted during successive copying. Lexical variants do not necessarily imply that a correction against the Greek was made. The variant readings peculiar to these manuscripts divide

---

33 The Greek word ἀντίρρησις meaning here 'controversy, contradiction' is considered to be a neologism by J. Lust (1992, 41).
them into two subgroups: η which includes Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605 and θ which includes Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121 and Čud.200.

Variants common to Pg.81, Vol.13 and I-Vol.605

MSS Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605 agree against other manuscripts in the following readings:

2:23 noTeneme vs. noneHeme Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200
5:8 e^e e^e e^e e^e e^e Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200
5:4 ηαη vs. ηη all other MSS
9:3 ηοη
In 7:5 Pg.81, I-Vol.605 have the reading Μη ήμεν ουκ εξετάσθη — (ἀνδρα ἀκούσα ζώμα ἀφρόνων) which is also attested in MS2 and GB vs. Μη ήμεν ουκ εξετάσθη in all other manuscripts. A copyist misread a letter n as H and consequently wrote it as ΜΗ instead of Μη. It is especially difficult to distinguish when written, as it seems to be in our case, under a τίτλο. The reading ΜΗ which unites Pg.81, I-Vol.605 and is found in MS2 and GB, may be either a result of independent correction by the scribes of A. and K (perhaps by reference to Greek ζώμα, or by a happy surmise of a scribe). Alternatively Μη may have been corrected on the basis of Κ or vice versa.

It seems that I-Vol.605 could not have inherited it from Pg.81 directly but via some intermediary copy, since the order of verses in I-Vol.605 is incorrect due to some confusion with the folia in its antigraph. It needs to be said however, that this example is not a very effective one, as these two abbreviated words are not irreversible and they can be easily confused. Furthermore, Vol.13 seems to be the only MS to share glosses in 12:5 λίγαλα, προς with GB.

The peculiarities of Pg.81.

The further examination of the relationship between Pg.81 and other manuscripts in group 3 reveals that in two instances (3:3, 7:17) Pg.81 gives the readings closest to the standard Greek text within group 3. In 3:3 Pg.81 has the reading θρήνα κατά while all the other MSS do not have such reading. In 3:5 Pg.81 has an individual reading θρήνα μάκατι while all other manuscripts omit this phrase. A similar picture may be observed in 7:14 where in place of the correct reading κατά αὐτού· ἐν έγκρισθῷ Pg.81 has the reading οὔτω while all other MSS have κατά ίςαν. Perhaps, this was a scribal attempt to remedy the text.

In 7:17 Pg.81 stands out as having a reading which follows the standard Greek exactly: οὔ πο οὖρμα σως. However, this particular example carries less weight because such omission/inclusion of the negative particle could happen independently, as might be the case with TSL 730, which has the same reading. In all other manuscripts there is no second negative particle: καὶ οὔ χρήσιν [- -] κατά θρήνα σως - ἡμα μὴ ἀποθανείς ἐν οὐ
καιρῷ σου. While in 2:13 all other MSS in group 3 share a conjunctive error, a dittography: η θεών ἀνέλκαι εἴκος θεών, in Pg.81 there is no dittography: η θεών ἀνέλκαι εἴκο. In 3:7 Pg.81 has the individual reading Πνεαρητίν. In 4:1 Pg.81 has an omission of a pronoun ης, while all the other MSS contain this word. In 9:3 Pg.81 has a corrupt reading λογία. In addition Pg.81 also displays differences in low level variation in a number of places: 6:3, 7:3, 7:26, 8:3, 8:5, 9:17, 10:1, 10:9, 10:13, 10:15.

As we can see Pg.81 presents a small number of readings closer to the standard Greek text. Although Vol.13 and I-Vol.605 share the same filiation with Pg.81, they do not fully contain these readings. It might be that individual readings (2:13, 3:3, 3:5) in Pg.81 are secondary rather than inherited. In all probability it was the scribe of Pg.81 who introduced these corrections.

Pg.81 was compared to group 1 to investigate whether they share significant common readings which are not found in group 3. If they share common readings, then we may assume that Pg. 81 can be conservative in these readings which might go back to the archetype. But I could not find strong enough examples of common readings shared with group 1 to prove the case. However, Pg.81 still may be conservative in some readings and innovative at others. Because not all the MSS have been available for collation there may be some additional information found as to the position of Pg. 81.

Variants peculiar to Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200

MSS Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200 have common errors in 3:22 θανεωνικον σα vs. θανεωνικον σα all other MSS, 10:1 τὰ μᾶςλο μαρτιν vs. τὰ μᾶςλο μαρτιν all other MSS. The mistake in 10:1 could be a result of substitution of a similar word, especially when in the same sentence earlier there is another instance of the word μᾶςλο. In 4:8 (μᾶςλο vs. κόμπα μᾶςλο), and in 5:4, 5:5, 9:7 all these 5 manuscripts have omissions as opposed to the rest of the MSS. Other divergences, given here in the footnote, display minor variation but nevertheless these seem important as they form a pattern which
distinguish this group from other MSS. On the basis of variant readings this subgroup θ is further divided into two: μ with Und.1121, Çud.200 and ν with Pg.78, Arx., Supr.

**Variants peculiar to Und.1121 and Çud.200.**

Und.1121 and Çud.200 share omissions which distinguish them from the rest of group 3 in 4:12 (ςτανετα [...] σελοχ vs. στανετα προτινε σελοχ all other MSS) and in 9:10 (Ø vs. εισικη τι σιλα τθντοτι = gr. 2). The rest are examples of minor divergences which form a pattern distinguishing this subgroup from other MSS. 37

**Variants peculiar to Pg.78, Arx., Supr.**

1:3 στιςθενην vs. στιςθενην all other MSS
10:13 начала словесъ [...] его vs. начала словесъ оущет его Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Und.1121, Çud.200

**Variants peculiar to Pg.78 and Arx.**

Arx. and Pg.78 seem close because they share an omission in 6:4 (in Pg.78 it is written in the margin: υπο πανε εγο и въ христи пане ако въ сеетκ.) Therefore we may reasonably assume that this omission was already in a hyparchetype π from which both of them might have descended. Alekseev (1983, 232) suspects that Pg.78 is a copy of Western Russian provenance. Thus it could come from the same geographical area as Supr. Besides omissions there are a few scribal errors and a variant reading peculiar to Pg.78 and Arx. in 7:6 σκηρι Arx. and σκηρι Pg.78 (πι in Pg.78 is crossed out) = σκηρι. There is some evidence of scribal correction on the basis of other MSS. In 7:10 Arx. and Pg.78

---

36 1:16, 2:26, 3:5, 4:6, 4:8, 4:13, 5:3, 5:8, 5:9, 5:17, 7:1, 7:20, 8:9, 8:12.
37 2:9, 3:11, 7:16, 8:1, 8:13, 10:14, 10:16, 11:8, 12:8, 12:10.
share the same reading κιμως vs. κιμως in all other MSS. The following examples cited below demonstrate the minor divergences of Pg.78 and Arx. from the rest of group 3, while the rest of the minor divergences are given in the footnote. 38

1:13 πρεμοξαροςτη vs. μωξαροςτη
4:10 παδεντ ςα vs. παδεντ ςα
5:1 η ς ςες vs. ς ςες

It might be concluded that, in addition to errors peculiar to all manuscripts from group 3, these two manuscripts share certain errors and omissions which are not found in the other manuscripts of the same group. While Arx. bears no traces of any correction, Pg.78 displays some signs of correction which may have resulted from collation with a copy like Supr.

Conclusions about group 3.

The text of the MSS of group 3 displays a comparatively high level of corruption, which may suggest that it was subject to more copying than the other two groups. Despite this, in my stemma I have drawn the hyparchetype δ for the manuscripts in group 3 descending directly from β because there is insufficient evidence to support the hypothesis that the textual tradition was more complex.

From the stemma we can see that the five manuscripts Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121 and Čud.200 are closely related to each other, and so they derive from the single hyparchetype θ. Und.1121 and Čud.200 have variant readings peculiar to them, and therefore seem to derive from the younger hyparchetype μ. On the other hand, we can see that three manuscripts Pg.78, Supr. and Arx. are closely related to each other, and so they have their own single hyparchetype υ.

Pg.78 and Arx. share an omission which is not in Supr., and therefore derive from the younger hyparchetype π. It is suggested that Pg.81, Vol.13 and I-Vol.605 constitute a separate group η on the basis of variant readings. Pg.81 and I-Vol.605 seem closer to

38 9:1, 9:11, 10:15, 11:5, 12:5.
each other because they have the same variant reading in several places: 1:3, 3:11, 6:8 and particularly in 7:5 ἱκνεῖν vs. ἱκνεῖν, which they share together with MS2 and GB and which is not to be found in any other manuscripts including Vol.13. Therefore it could be presumed that Pg.81 and I-Vol.605 have their own junior hyparchetype λ. As was already discussed on page 38 I-Vol.605 could not be directly descended from Pg.81.

Further consideration must be given to the fact that Pg. 81 deviates sometimes from the rest of the manuscripts and is closer to the standard Greek than the other manuscripts. If there was evidence to suggest that the readings in Pg.81 were conservative, we might suppose that they went back to an earlier, perhaps, Bulgarian source and that the rest of the MSS followed a more corrupt tradition; but if the deviant readings in Pg.81 are the result of correction, then their time and place of origin are an open question. MS Pg.81 is a typical East Slavonic copy of the period demonstrating Second South Slavonic influence. Therefore it could reflect the spelling habits of an east Slavonic scribe and does not necessarily reproduce the spellings of a South Slavonic exemplar of whatever date. This in turn may be an impediment to suggestion that corrections were made to the text using the Greek manuscripts in the East Slav area.

The textual analysis shows manuscripts from group 3 do not look very promising as the source for the base text because of their corruptions, and in the case of Pg.81, some later editorial corrections. Thus dismissing group 3, we turn our attention to groups 1 and 2 in order to determine what divergences there are between all three groups, and whether any manuscript contained within the first two groups is a suitable candidate to be the base text for the edition.

**Relationships of MSS in group 1.**

Although the manuscripts Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., TSL 730, Rum.204, and Sof. form a separate group because they share an insertion with the commentary, and they all have a lacuna (8:16-9:14) which shows that they all go back to one copy, a number of omissions, additions and common errors in Rum.204 and Sof. and in MS2 and GB allow Rum.204 and Sof. to be grouped together with MS2 and GB. Therefore Rum.204 and
Sof. will be examined jointly with MS2 and GB as a separate group. Prior to this, however, the relations between Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., and TSL 730 will be analysed.

**Variant readings common to Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. and TSL 730.**

3:13 καὶ γε πᾶς ὁ ἀνθρωπος ὃς φάγεται καὶ πίεται καὶ ἔδη ἄγαθον

*καὶ ἔπε σακχάρος καόμενος ἥπιε * καὶ ἔκτυ ** δεινός 

* καὶ ἔπε — ρ. Und.1

**κατε Sol., ἐκτε TSL 730, ἕκτε gr. 2, 3

It is worth noting that in 3:13 the word order is different from the Greek. The scribe of Und.1 added the noun ἔπε — 'wine', a certain elaboration, which may not have been so uncommon in the production of medieval texts. In TSL 730 there is some minor correction of the first letter in the word κατε but it is not possible to guess from the photocopy what it is. It may be κατε or κατε or even κατε which makes it the word κατε. However, paleographically these possibilities do not seem to be very probable for two reasons. Firstly, the scribe of TSL 730 writes the letter κατε quite wide and secondly, he displays the habit of abbreviating the word κατε.

I assume that the reading κατε in group 1 was corrected rather than inherited. Thus group 1 could be innovative here. All the manuscripts in groups 2 and 3 share the corruption of the word κατε-φάγεται into κατε- a negated verb 'to be'. It is plausible that the common source was not very legible and misreading of κατε as κατε has resulted in convergent errors in groups 2 and 3. The variant readings in the footnote are examples of minor variation.

Though Pg.1, Sol., and Und.1 share a few variant readings with TSL 730, the one in 3:13 being especially significant, at the same time in a number of instances these three MSS agree against TSL 730. The majority of these divergences, however, are examples of minor variation.

---

Variant readings that unite Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. against TSL 730.

2:11 створенина vs. створена
2:26 да есть vs. да есть
3:14 оживит vs. стаити

In a number of instances (1:13, 3:13, 4:10, 10:20, 11:3) Pg.1 and Und.1 can be grouped against Sol. and TSL 730. These are the examples of minor variation. However, the variants in 6:3 возврат Pg.1, Und.1 vs. и възръст Sol., TSL 730 are more important. All the manuscripts in this place display corrupted readings. As the usual tendency in medieval writing practice was to trivialise, the unfamiliar возврат in Pg.1, Und.1 could have given rise to the more common възръст found in Sol., TSL 730. TSL 730 seems quite often to agree with group 3 (2:9, 2:24, 5:18, 10:18) but these are examples of minor variation.

The examples below display superficial trivial differences but these are not supportive in defining the textual relationship.

7:18 ва̀гести есть Pg.1, Und.1 vs. ва̀го есть Sol. vs. ва̀го есть TSL 730
8:8 владу́щего Pg.1, Und.1 vs. влдао́у Sol. vs. влады́щего TSL 730
8:12 ва̀го ва̀го во́щинача Pg.1 vs. ва̀го во́щинача Sol., Und.1, TSL 730
2:11 моя мъ Pg.1, Und.1, TSL 730 vs. моя Sol.
2:12 нѐк и пома̀ет Pg.1, Und.1, TSL 730 vs. нѐк пома̀ет - о̀с епеле́усет Sol.
3:12 твори Pg.1, Und.1 vs. сътвори Sol. vs. твори TSL 730

Though the differences between Pg.1, Und.1 and Sol., TSL 730 are minute, nevertheless these examples are suggestive because they form a pattern. This pattern shows that sometimes Und.1 is closer to Pg.1, while TSL 730 may be closer to Sol.

41 In Pg.1 the second владо is written above the line.
Conclusions about group 1.

A smaller number of omissions and textual corruptions in group 1 could indicate that γ was a more accurate copy of β than δ, and that ε, the hyparchetype of group 1, was in its turn fairly close to γ. On the other hand, it has a structural deficiency - a lacuna. It is very likely that the lacuna resulted from a missing folio and this in turn indicates that the MSS Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof. derived from one copy.

Relationships of MSS in group 2.

As has been already stated, in terms of textual tradition as opposed to terms of content Rum.204 and Sof. seem closer to MS2 and GB. Yet the lacuna peculiar to Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., TSL 730, Rum.204 and Sof is not in MS2 and GB. My working hypothesis is that the antigraph of Rum.204 and Sof. going back to the hyparchetype ζ served as one of the sources for MS2 and GB. This seems plausible not only because of the presence of identical readings, but also because Sof. comes from the Novgorod area, where Gennadij compiled his Bible. The compilers in all probability turned to local resources. And it seems reasonable to assume that at this stage the commentary in the insertion was largely removed.

Variant readings common to Rum.204, Sof., MS2, GB.

The examination revealed that these MSS share an omission in 10:12-13, additions in 7:29 ἐζήτησαν λογισμούς πολλοὺς — αυτοθεσία πογμάς — ἀπεφέλλη μνῆμα and in 7:26 δεσμοὶ (HP δεσμός 253, Alex.) χείρες αὐτῆς — συγχύ (sic) [gr. 3 συγχύ] ἀπεφέλλη ρύμα ἐπα. The reason for these additions is not known. In 10:10 μη σπάδετς σκόπεα τῷ σαμῷ μη σπάδετς καὶ σματετ — the second occurrence of the verb σπάδετ stems from the Church Slavonic tradition where a scribe could have absent-mindedly repeated the same word twice.
Apart from omission and additions Rum. 204, Sof., MS2, GB show an agreement in common errors which set them apart as a group.\textsuperscript{42} To give but one example: 2:12 \texttt{име не понет} vs. \texttt{име и понет} Pg.1, Und.1, TSL 730 (и с.л.); \texttt{име понет} Sol., gr. 3 (о̀ς ἐπελεύσονται). This error was probably made by association with the well-known line from the Psalm 1 where there is a negation: \texttt{благенъ мымъ име не вдетъ…}

There are examples (2:11 and 3:5) of variant readings peculiar to this group, the cause of which is ambiguous. It is possible that variant readings in 2:11 \texttt{изрекениа} vs. \texttt{изовбишн} and in 3:5 \texttt{рассынати} vs. \texttt{сопрати} may be the result of scribal errors in copying Church Slavonic. At the same time I would not completely exclude the possibility that these go back to the variation in Greek. As can be seen from the critical apparatus to the edition of the Septuagint the variation between the nouns \texttt{προαίρεσις} and \texttt{περισσεία} is attested in the Greek manuscript tradition. \texttt{рассынати} is an odd rendering of \texttt{συναγαγεῖν}, but it may go back to the reading \texttt{τοῦ ῥήσατi}. Though in the critical apparatus of Holmes and Parsons it is said that this reading is encountered in the margins in MS 161, it is still possible that at some point this marginal reading may have found its way into the main body of Greek text. However, I must admit that this is a very remote possibility. Below are examples of minor variation.

12:1 \texttt{речеши ли} vs. \texttt{речеши}
2:16 \texttt{выша} vs. \texttt{выша}
7:10 \texttt{что бо} vs. \texttt{что бы}

The significance of these and other examples is in their forming a pattern that unites Rum. 204, Sof., MS2, GB against other MSS.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{42} 1:14, 1:15, 2:1, 2:17, 3:18, 5:8, 8:10, 10:15, 12:6, 12:11.
Readings peculiar to Rum.204, Sof.

These variant readings (1:17, 2:1, 3:11, 5:1, 5:7, 5:14, 5:18x3, 7:15, 11:2, 12:3, 12:5) demonstrate that Rum.204 and Sof. belong to the more corrupt branch of the tradition. In Rum.204 and Sof. we find a nonsensical word ceprakio in 2:1. A later scribe may have thought that this mistake was a simple case of metathesis. He then corrected it into a meaningful word cekapio - 'wood cutter'. This correction differs from the reading in the majority of manuscripts where a correct reading cepalio can be found. We may safely assume that this scribe did not compare his text with other Church Slavonic copies. This case proves, firstly, that Ecclesiastes was not such a familiar text for a scribe to spot mistakes easily and secondly, that thorough revision of the whole text was not undertaken.

In 5:14 we read nocrit vs. nocritck in MS2 and GB, whereas all other MSS have nocritkweim. And in 12:5 we find pazroy vs. pazrjwmt ca in MS2 and GB. In these two instances the incomplete meaningless words were either reinstated in MS2 or GB or alternatively the complete words might have been inherited from a less faulty manuscript than the antigraph of Rum.204 and Sof. The reason behind the reading enem of Rum.204 and Sof. in 5:18 vs. aame in all other MSS is not known.

Readings peculiar to MS2, GB.44

If the antigraph of Rum.204 and Sof. served as an exemplar for MS2 and GB, the evidence for the idiosyncratic editorial work carried in MS2 and GB can be gleaned from a few examples provided below.

3:5 kaipoce to wpalcoi livious, kaic kairo to wouwagexei livious
vremea paklatai kameioi, vremea raswpati* kameioe** (Rum. 204, Sof.)
\* - ** - cebpati kameine (gr. 1, 3)
** - kameioe om. MS2, GB

O. 2:12, 3:14, 4:4, 5:15, 6:2, 6:3, 7:15 \* vs. \*
In MS2, GB the phrase may have been edited and καμενος dropped.

6:4 ὅτι ἐν ματαιότητι ἦλθεν καὶ ἐν σκότει πορεύεται καὶ ἐν σκότει ὄνομα αὑτοῦ καλυφθῆσται

* - εἷς om. MS2, GB
* - ημών pr. gr. 1, 3

In MS2 and GB the pronoun εἷς could have been intentionally omitted as making no sense.

11:1 ἀπόστειλον τῶν ἄρτων σου ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ ὦδατος ὅτι ἐν πλῆθει τῶν ἡμερῶν εὐρήσεις αὐτόν

* - η om. MS2, GB
* - ἡμῖν pr. gr. 1, 3

In Rum.204 and Sof. we find two η; they may result from a truncation of ἡμῖν? In MS2, GB the word ἡμῖν is omitted, however the passage makes sense without it. Scribes or editors of MS2 and GB in an attempt to fix a text that was garbled could have dropped η as nonsensical and retained instead a single η. These readings seem to imply that Rum.204 and Sof. represent an earlier stage in corruption than GB and MS2.

The variant reading of MS2 and GB in 1:14 ἡμῖν vs. ἡμῖν perhaps happened as assimilation by reminiscence with the previous verse 1:13 where we find the expression ἡμῖν. The erroneous reading of MS2 and GB in 3:10 ημῖν vs. ημῖν is caused by graphic confusion of letters η and ε. The erroneous reading ημῖν found in MS2 and GB in 10:1 vs. ημῖν in Rum.204, Sof., ἡμῖν -'honour' (τίμην) in group 3, was probably a scribal mistake or a misinterpretation of the abbreviated word.

In 7:5 the reading ημῖν in MS2 and GB is shared with MSS Pg.81, 1-Vol.605 vs. ἡμῖν in all other manuscripts. It is not exactly known whether this is a case of a horizontal transmission or an independent reference to Greek. However, the possibility of a horizontal transmission is more likely given that filling of the lacuna implies use of a manuscript from group 3 tradition. There is another possibility, however slight, that the
correction of ἐκκοπή in κ was done against the same verse 7:5 in the insertion where a correct reading ἐκκοπή is found.

Conclusions about group 2.

Rum.204 and Sof. seem to represent the more corrupt branch of the tradition, while GB suggests that an attempt was made to improve the text of the antigraph of Sof. and Rum.204. Although manuscripts in the γ branch of the stemma share the lacuna, it is not found in MS2 and GB. Therefore it was probably filled from the MSS of group 3, but if these manuscripts were not consulted at the time where else could the correctors have looked? Theoretically they could have used the Greek text, since it was a recognised practice in the 14-15th centuries to do so.\(^{45}\) However, in the case of Ecclesiastes there are not strong enough examples of variant readings to support this assumption. Besides, we have no evidence for the presence of Greek Biblical codices at Novgorod.\(^{46}\) Thus the probability of translating afresh the section of text equivalent to the lacuna from a Greek copy is rejected as groundless and unjustifiable.

However, the reinstated lacuna could have been compiled from the Church Slavonic texts which were available to the scribes at the time, and these might have been MSS from group 3. In order to decide whether manuscripts from group 3 served to fill the lacuna in GB and MS2, the comparison of the segment of text 8:16-9:14 with the available manuscripts from group 3 needs to be carried out.

---

\(^{45}\) Evidence for revision of biblical translations by South Slav scribes in the 14th century can be found in Thomson, 1998: 605-920 who gives further references. For the East Slavonic practices see, for example, Alekseev, 1999:191-5 on the revision of the Čudov New Testament and Lunt and Taube, 1998 on the translation of Esther. Professor Thomson, however, has a very pessimistic view of the knowledge of Greek among the East Slavs, therefore he regards any reference to a Greek text as impossible.

\(^{46}\) Thomson, 2002:34.
The filling of the lacuna.

Unlike other manuscripts in group 3 the provenance of MSS Pg.78 and Pg.81 is not known. This means it is impossible to speculate whether these two manuscripts were available to the editors of GB. In Arx. there is a lacuna at 8:8-8:17 due to a missing folio. It is theoretically possible that this lacuna in Arx. might have happened at a later stage after the editors of GB consulted this copy.

There is one place 9:12 where MS2 and GB diverge from the manuscripts of group 3.

9:12 си делаляемы * такое. ико ты * сать * ейше (MS2, GB)
    * сать – po. Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605 (is crossed out), Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200

In examples 9:1, 9:3, 9:7, 9:9 and 9:10x2 MSS Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200 share variant readings with MS2 and GB. It may be a simple coincidence, but on the other hand, these could be cases of horizontal transmission.

9:1 ико все дахь кь срдце * и срдце мое все видь (MS2, GB = Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200)
    * мое – po. Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605

9:3 ико случай * всех (MS2, GB = Arx., Und.1121, Čud.200)
    * случай и -Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Supr., ложца и всех - Pg.81

9:7 и пин вь * база вино свое (MS2, GB = Pg.78, Supr., Arx., Und.1121, Čud.200)
    * срдиць - po. Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605

9:10 рука твоя створити * твори ико нь * створения (GB, MS2 = Und.1121, Čud.200)

9:10 амо же * ты идеши (MS2, GB = Pg.78, Supr., Arx., Und.1121, Čud.200)
    * и - po. Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605
The readings in 9:1, 9:7 and 9:10 (2) coincide with the subgroup θ represented by MSS Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200, while example in 9:12 demonstrates some minor variation. The first example in 9:10 presents a particular problem because GB and MS2 diverge from Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr. in omitting 'ELIKA TH CIAA TBOPHTh'. This may be a result of omission due to homoeoteleuton or some minor correction as the verb TBOPHTh in PG.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, PG.78, ARX., SUPR. has no equivalent in Greek. Interestingly, Und.1121 and Čud.200 share the same omission, cf. also 9:3. This suggests that their antigraph might have been the source for the editors of GB. This evidence, however, is not conclusive by itself because scribes could have made such an omission independently of each other. Overall it is quite probable that the antigraph of Und.1121 and Čud.200 was consulted. It is, perhaps, not surprising because prior to taking up his see in Novgorod Gennadij was archimandrite in the Čudov monastery in Moscow and might have requested the available manuscripts to be sent to him.
Conclusions drawn from the collation of MSS.

It is clear that all MSS under scrutiny go back to the same archetype. The text displays mostly low level variation among the manuscripts, and there is no trace of any systematic revision. There are no clear signs of reference to the Greek text, though there is some evidence that some scribes consulted more than one Church Slavonic manuscript. It seems likely that the archetype was defective: there are a number of omissions that could conceivably have occurred in either the Greek or the Church Slavonic exemplar, and others which resulted from transmission in the Slavonic MSS.

The corrections made by scribes present a problem in deciphering the textual relationships: it seems that the text has undergone certain improvements as a result of correction, while becoming corrupted in other places. The stemma I have drawn shows that the hyparchetype δ, to which manuscripts of group 3 belong, descends directly from β, but I also had to consider the possibility that group 3 could be chronologically the latest development in the textual tradition. The manuscripts in group 3, despite the fact that they contain a plain text, show a number of corruptions which are not in groups 1 and 2. It is possible that the textual development resulted here from moving from interpolated to plain text by gradual removal of the insertion. Thus the manuscripts with the plain text in group 3 may not represent the earlier stage of the tradition.

As can be observed in the case of Rum.204, Sof and Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. and TSL 730 the structural grouping conflicts with the grouping of manuscripts based on common errors and omissions. However, the recensio allowed us to establish hyparchetypes of these manuscripts. Furthermore, MS Sol. demonstrates sporadic scribal changes like ἀργαῖοι in 4:10 and στυγτητ in 11:10. The present situation may of course change when more MSS are examined and more readings may come to light.

The enigmatic position of Pg.81 introduces an element of complexity into group 3. Pg.81 furnishes reading supported by different groups of Church Slavonic MSS, and therefore suggestive of a common ancestry. At the same time Pg.81 has a number of individual readings which are closer to the standard Greek text. At present it is not known whether Pg. 81 displays later editorial changes or conservatism. Until more manuscripts are examined this question cannot be solved. The minority reading ἄκεμι of Pg.81 in 7:5
can be explained by consultation of Greek or a happy surmise of a scribe in a subsidiary part of the tradition of group 3.

An antigraph of Rum.204 and Sof. with the lacuna may have served as an exemplar for GB and MS2. The lacuna may have been filled with the text from a manuscript similar to Čud.200 or Und.1121. It is not certain whether GB was checked against the Greek; the variants in GB could have resulted from collation with another Church Slavonic copy and not necessarily with a Greek manuscript. There is no evidence for any of the variants found in individual manuscripts going back to Greek variants, i.e. there is no secondary correction against Greek.

Alekseev’s (1988, 158) remark that MS2 could have been copied from GB as a second volume of the Bible since it contains books translated from Latin needs further clarification. With regard to Ecclesiastes the textual variants in MS2 demonstrate that it may represent an earlier stage in the relationship between GB and MS2 because it retains the commentary in 7:20 in the interpolation. In GB 9:9 the scribe has placed the reading ἘΧΙΣΤΕ ΤΕΡΕΜΑ in the main text and the reading Ἐ ΤΕΡΕ ΤΕΡΕ in the margin. In MS2 and group 3 the latter is placed in the main text. This shows that MS2 was not a direct copy of GB but that MS2 and GB in turn draw on group 3. I must admit, however, that this is not a strong argument given that we think manuscripts from two traditions were used in the preparation of MS2 and GB.

The relationships between the manuscripts and their filiations are shown in a stemma codicum.
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Stemma codicum
Comments on the *stemma codicum*:

α – translation into Church Slavonic perhaps with omissions

β – a copy with misreadings of the Cyrillic

γ – a hyparchetype with the insertion and lacuna 8:16 - 9:14 and variants common to groups 1 and 2

δ – a hyparchetype with variants common to group 3

ε – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.1, Und.1, Sol, TSL 730

ζ – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Rum.204, Sof., MS2 and GB

η – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.81, Vol.13 and I-Vol.605

θ – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200

ι – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.1, Und.1 and Sol.

κ – a junior hyparchetype of GB and MS2 with lacuna filled and insertion reduced

λ – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.81 and I-Vol.605

μ – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Und.1121 and Čud.200

ν – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.78, Arx. and Supr.

ο – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.1, and Und.1

π – a junior hyparchetype with variants common to Pg.78 and Arx.

χ – commentated version

In drawing this stemma I have encountered difficulty with two readings *некъ*/*нектъ* in 7:5 and *токъ*/*токъ* in 3:13. They seem to contradict the whole stemma, but in my opinion, they may be disregarded because neither of them is irreversible, being the type of mistakes that easily occurs. And they cannot affect the stemma in any serious way.

However, I have to take into account certain assumptions regarding the readings in 7:5 and 3:13, in particular:

1. Distribution of *некъ* (in MSS deriving from γ and δ) might seem to be evidence for presence of *нектъ* in β; but this hypothesis implies that *нектъ* → *нектъ* independently in other MSS descended both from γ and δ. Alternatively, *нектъ* is a secondary innovation – a lucky scribal guess or a restoration based on the reading of the insertion or the Greek.
This might have happened independently in the antigraphs of Pg.81 and 1-Vol.605 and of GB and MS2, but perhaps more likely to have happened in the first of these and have been adopted in the second, which we know was a compilation on the basis of other evidence.

2. Similarly, if we assume that θερή in Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. And TSL 730 is inherited from β, we have to suppose that ηθα in the other MSS is the result of multiple independent misreadings (at least twice). Given that the Church Slavonic text in any case is at variance with the standard Greek order of verbs, it is simpler to posit early corruption in α and β, and a felicitous scribal emendation in the hyparchetype of Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. and TSL 730, with conservatism elsewhere.

In resolving the conflicts over these two sets of variants, I apply the principle of preferring the ‘more difficult’ reading: ηθα and θερή are ‘easier’ because they are supported by Greek and could have been restored by an alert scribe even without the help of the Greek.
Linguistic Evidence.

Below I examine morphological and lexical characteristics, clues that scholars usually use to identify early texts and translations, in order to see if there is any linguistic evidence which will allow us to date the text of Ecclesiastes with any degree of precision.

It must be said, though, that due to its brevity, a linguistic analysis of the text - as has been possible in longer texts, such as the Gospels and Psalter - is itself problematic since it offers limited scope for such an analysis. What appears to be even more important is the fact that early witnesses to the Gospels and Psalter allow scholars to trace the historical progression of their language. However, in my research I do not have such early witness serving as a reference point due, perhaps, to the non-liturgical status of Ecclesiastes.

The following criteria are employed to attempt to date the text linguistically: the use of the dual, old forms of the nouns with - s - , old accusative forms, including the use of the accusative case of the pronoun и, short adjectives, supine, asigmatic aorist, vocabulary. The orthographical characteristics are not taken into account as they present no valid clues to the date of the translation, since all the manuscripts are of East Slavonic provenance circa 15-16 centuries, and were exposed to the Second South Slavonic influence.

The examples of morphological forms found in the text of Ecclesiastes are set out below.

**Dual forms.**

4:9-10 въ трудѣ ея, 4:2 паре обою сею, 4:6 двою горестію, 5:10 очима его, 11:7 очима", 11:9 очие скою. As the examples below show, in the text of Ecclesiastes we find 3rd person dual forms with the endings of the 2nd person dual forms: 2:10 въпроси стъ мон очи, 2:11 мон роциѣ створиста, 4:11-12 очиѣта два, два стамета.

In the Old Church Slavonic manuscripts, such as Savvina kniga or Codex Suprasliensis, replacements of 3rd dual -τе by -та had already taken place; in the latter there are no forms with – τε. Thus, in canonical OCS the forms of 3rd person dual were becoming obsolescent already. However, the dual forms cannot be a sufficient measure for early
dating, for the dual was a category which was lost slowly, and in some regions later than
in others. What is more, scribes prized it as a symbol of literary style and therefore used
it actively for centuries after it disappeared from the vernacular. This literary factor
makes it extremely difficult to estimate just when the dual ceased to be an obligatory
grammatical category. Thus, we cannot make use of the dual forms as the indication of
the text’s antiquity as it may be merely a sign of a conservative tradition.

Old noun forms with –s-.

Cлобеса (14) 48, 10:13 слобекс, 8:2 и слобеси, 8:3 в слобесы. 5:1 неби, небемь (2). 2:6
древесъ, 12:5 древеса. 12:6 коло – колесо gr. 3.

All the words appear to be traditional, therefore they cannot serve as clues to the date of
translation.

Animate accusative = genitive and old accusative (m., f. s. and pl.)

There is a single example of the old accusative for a noun denoting a human in 5:13 роди
съя. acc. m. s. The example in 9:15 овразекъ « в немъ мъжъ нимъ и мъкръ 49 is unclear; it
is possible to reconstruct the old accusative for a noun denoting a human on the basis of
Greek, where the word ἄνδρα is used in acc. sing. However, the particle съ found in GB
and MS2 may imply that the collocation мъжъ нимъ и мъкръ could have been understood
by a scribe as nominative rather than accusative case. It has been suggested 50 that at the
time of the early translations the distribution of the gen.-acc. of masculine singular nouns
denoting rational beings was governed by a semantic hierarchy. The hierarchy was such
that the higher the position of the noun in it, the more likely was the accusative to be
homonymous with the genitive, whereas the lower the position, the more likely was the
accusative to be homonymous with the nominative. If this is the case, then the noun съборъ
occupied the position right at the top, cf. 2:13.

47 Lunt, 1985: 287.
48 The figure in brackets indicates the total number of occurrences in the translation.
49 съ om. gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof., gr. 3.
In 10:8 the pronoun и (и) is used: ограшуна и (и om. Sol., Rum.204, Sof., in TSL 730 written above the line; in Čud.). The example in 11:1 ἀν θελω νόητα εἰς ὑπαρξεῖν is ambiguous because here ἐν could be a truncation of ἀνεν and not necessarily an accusative case of the pronoun. There are some newer features, such as plural animate genitive-accusative in 9:14. Generally, in later Church Slavonic texts gen.-acc. case of plural becomes usual for those pronouns and adjectives which are not accompanied by nouns,51 (though not necessarily so for 7:22 and 7:24, 8:10).

Singular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>acc. = gen. m. s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:28 его възика</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13 бъг бое са</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 бъгне гонимаго</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 въздигненъ причастника своего.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:7 клевета лъстъ вмъдрало.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1 помани створшаго та (acc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>acc. = gen. m. s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:28 възникна възникна</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13 бъг бое са</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 бъгне гонимаго</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 въздигненъ причастника своего.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:7 клевета лъстъ вмъдрало.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1 помани створшаго та (acc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be said that though the evidence is not conclusive, it is not incompatible with early translations.

Short form of adjective/participle.

8:10 видах нечтины в гробы несомы (несены gr.3) The corresponding forms of Greek adjective and participle are indefinite (without an article). For the Greek indefinite forms of adjectives the Church Slavonic short forms are used. For example, 4:13 бъг рабъ нишъ и вмъдръ паче ёгъ стара и вехъма. 7:5 мушка слащца EccP vs. слащца Und.13 It is worth pointing out that in EccP we have a short form of participle which could be older than the forms in the other versions. In general, short form were replaced by longer

---

50 Huntley, 1984, 8 (4):112-5.
51 Vaillant, 1952:208.
ones in Church Slavonic. However I would not regard it as a solid evidence. In Greek we have an indefinite form (there is no article before the noun ἀνδρα).

Asigmatic/sigmatic aorists.

There are no asigmatic aorists in the text, but the forms of the first sigmatic, πέλαξα (6) and the second sigmatic πέλαξον (2) are both used, though we can see that πέλαξα is used more frequently than πέλαξον. Though both forms are characteristic of early texts, they were used continuously during the later period. According to Gippius, “v var’irovanii staryx i novyx form [v drevnerusskoj pis’mennosti] osoboj logiki ne prosmatricaetsja”. It must be also pointed out that the text offers scope for early forms, but does not give examples of these, such as the verb ἀνασβά in 8:10, where we have only the secondary form and not the asigmatic ἀνά.

Perfects.

In Church Slavonic texts the use of perfect 2nd person sing. is quite frequent. This is due to the fact that the form of aorist 2nd person sing. is ambiguous, as it is homonymous with the form of 3rd person sing., and for the verbs in -νθ with the 2nd and 3rd person of imperative. Hence the form of perfect 2nd person sing. grammatically is more transparent, and so the Greek aorists in the Church Slavonic translations are rendered frequently by perfects. It should be noted that the use of perfect for 2nd sing. aorist starts early; examples of parallel use of perfect and aorist 2nd and 3rd person sing. are found in the recurrent readings in Lectionary: дей - да ль кестъ; май остави - май кеи оставиъ; не приде - н'есть пришълъ; въпроси. аще оуке окумъре тъ - въпроси къд още оуке окумъръ кестъ.

---

52 Gippius, 2001:147.
It has been noted by Grünenthal (1911, 32:18) and Večerka (1993, vol. 2:164), who cite the relevant passages from the Gospels, that the Church Slavonic aorist translates not only the Greek aorist but also perfect or praesens historicum.

In the translation of Ecclesiastes the following examples are observed:


2. Church Slavonic aorist – Greek praesens historicum: 5:14 приде - ἤκει (present act. ind. 3rd p. sing.).

3. Church Slavonic aorist – Greek perfect 6:10 мрече - κέκληται (perf. pass. ind. 3rd p. sing.).

The Greek perfect act. ind. 3rd p. sing. оилев is translated by the form of present tense 3rd p. sing. въстъ (5). The Greek medio-passive perfect 3rd p. sing. ппййттт is translated by a complex verb form of passive past participle and auxiliary verb створено бысть in 8:9 and створена есть in 8:14.


Church Slavonic perfect 3rd p. sing. translating Greek aorist: there are 7 equivalents даал есть of the Greek ἔδωκεν where the aorist is rendered by perfect (with the variant readings дастъ in 2:26). 8:9 овдайлъ есть - ἐξουσιάσατο aor. md. 3rd p. sing. Use of perfect in place of 3rd aorist is a late development in Church Slavonic, of the circa 16th century. However, there are not enough examples in the text for convincing argument.

---

55 3rd sing. perfect for Greek aorist starts to appear in the Psalter revised by Maxim Grek. It is possible that such usage may be an East Slavonic phenomenon. See, for example, Kvtun et al.,1973:109; Kravec, 1991:267; Živov and Uspenskij, 1986:260.
Supine.

The supine occurs in 4:14 ἴπτετεν εὐρέον (εὐρέον Ῥουμ.204) (in gr. 1 and in Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121 there is an infinitive - εὐρέον; and in Chud. 200 - εὐρέον). However, as Sobolevskij (1907:257) has stated, the forms of supine in the Church Slavonic and Old Russian texts are used frequently till the end of the 14th century. Thus, the use of a single supine form cannot serve as an indication of an early date of the translation.

Examination of morphological forms does not provide us with clear cut clues as to the date of the translation. Besides, morphological forms are not always very reliable, since scribes tend(ed) to change or update them. The following examples taken from the recurrent readings in Lectionary demonstrate this point: ιερέων - ιερέω; κυρία - κυρία; ἡγαδα - ἡγαδα χε.⁵⁶ Scribal changes could have been made with or without reference to Greek.

The revision of the texts used in the liturgy, particularly of the Psalter, must be seen as an ongoing process rather than a single act (between ninth-fourteenth centuries there were at least 5 revisions of the Psalter text).⁵⁷ Often these revisions were done on the basis of comparison with Greek texts. Since Psalter manuscripts contain variants corresponding to Greek, they were obviously compared with Greek texts available to Slav scribes. It would suffice here to give one example of the distinctive variant readings found in the ‘Russian’ redaction which appear to derive from Greek, but which are alien to the Archaic and Athonite redactions. Ps. 21:9 εἰ θέλει αὐτὸν ἂμε χομέτε vs. ὅτι θέλει αὐτὸν ἂμο χομέτε (ἀκοιμε χομέτε).⁵⁸ This particular example is not dissimilar to the one in Ecclesiastes 2:21 where the variants ἄμε and ἄμο in Und.13 and EccP may go back to the Greek variants ὁδ and ὅτι respectively. However, we should not exclude the possibility that the variation in these two examples could have occurred also within Church Slavonic.

The examples of morphological forms are very limited, besides, they could have been used continuously during the period of the tenth to the fourteenth centuries, thus they do not allow us to draw a borderline within this period.

In addition to morphological forms vocabulary is also important when examining evidence of an early date of the translation. My next step therefore is to scrutinize vocabulary for traces of the text’s existence prior to the 15th century. In the absence of earlier manuscripts I have to apply tests based on general principles. Loanwords are typical of the earliest translations and tend to be replaced later by native equivalents. There are systematic differences in vocabulary, conventionally associated with Ochrid and Preslav, which are thought to distinguish earliest from early translations. First, I shall treat the issues of loanwords and then discuss distinctive ranges of native vocabulary.

Untranslated Graecisms.

Unlike a number of untranslated Graecisms in the Song of Songs which can point to its early origin: 4:4 ταλάνισιτς, 4:14 λαος, 5:14 ταρσίς (the use of τ for Greek θ could also serve as a sign of antiquity), the translation of Ecclesiastes contains a single example of Graecism κάππαρις - caper, which was rendered by καναφρ - (καναφρ in group 3).59 Miklosich under the dictionary entry καναφρ - κάππαρις ‘bylie’ cites the works of John Climacus in Moscow edition of 1647. This word is not listed in LLP and Sreznevsji. In addition to this particular loan word we can refer to a gloss μιγδαλη in the same verse which accompanies the word καλαμίς in several manuscripts, including GB. The loanword μιγδαλη is borrowed from the Greek μύγδαλον - almond tree. Miklosich cites the word μιγδαλη as occurring in Vita Alexandri Magni of the 16th century. Sreznevsji gives the form μιγδαληκα with the collocation δοξαμε μιγδαληκα from the Menaion of the 16th century. The two loanwords are attested in late manuscripts of the 16th century, and the word καλαμίς which is not a loan is attested in the manuscripts of the 13th century. For the
Miklosich gives entries from the work of John the Exarch in the manuscript written in 1263 and the text of Ecclesiastes in the Gennadian Bible, referring to the description of Gorskij and Nevostruev. In Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI-XVII vekov the word ka\-pup\-nyi is illustrated by the same quotation from Šestodnev of John the Exarch in the MS written in 1263. It is also illustrated in Sreznevskij's dictionary by the quotation from Oglashenie of Cyril of Jerusalem in the 13th century MS.

Like many other texts which might have originated in Bulgaria, Ecclesiastes has been preserved exclusively in East Slavonic manuscripts. Yet in view of the absence of manuscripts prior to the 15th century, it is difficult to date the translation with any degree of precision. In addition, a linguistic analysis, when it is carried out on this particular text, is apt to be limited by the largely standardized character of Church Slavonic. The lexicon appears to be neutral with the result that it cannot be pinned down to any particular period, as the same vocabulary was used throughout the 10th – 15th centuries.

Lists of words constituting ‘Preslav’ and ‘Ochrid’ terminology have been compiled by scholars. However, Ecclesiastes does not use enough of this set vocabulary, even though several ‘Preslav’ lexemes such as источникъ, велике, масло, ладъ, надежда are found in the text. But by 15th century Preslav and Ochrid readings would become pretty standard, and therefore we should not automatically assume that these are either helpful or reliable in our case. The reason for this is that if the tradition is conservative, words which are characteristic of the early translations can be found also in later manuscripts.

For example, the word ešut' in the translation of Ecclesiastes in the Croatian Glagolitic tradition points to a conservative tradition, but the translation itself may not be early, as this word continued to be used at a later period. The same applies to the word rěšnota, when occurring in the Croatian Glagolitic tradition. If it were to be found in the Cyrillic texts, we might consider the possibility of its early origin. However, in the Croat

---

60 For words ešut' in 12:3 and rěšnota in 12:11, considered rare by Evseev, see the remark of Thomson, 1998:845 who proved them not to be in the least rare by referring to LLP, vol.4, p.85 and vol. 2, p. 574 and Sreznevskij, vol. 3, p. 368 and vol. 2, p. 749.
tradition it was used at a later period. Hence, this shows that lexical variants are not necessarily indicative of the date of the translation.\(^6^2\)

In his recent article Francis Thomson writes that “Other books with typical ‘Preslav’ terminology which were clearly translated in Bulgaria at this time [i.e. late ninth and tenth centuries- L.O.] include Job and Ecclesiastes”.\(^6^3\) Yet, it seems to me that his claim is in contradiction with his earlier paragraph on page 35 in which he states that “...not only do many translations, including Biblical ones, contain elements of both terminologies, which may to some extent be the result of late revision and other scribal alterations, but in addition there are no reliable criteria concerning their dialectal appurtenance or for any precise dating of the use of the synonyms. Nevertheless the terms are useful as the “Ochridisms” are indeed typical of early translations, although since they continued to be used in some translations after “Preslavisms” had begun to be used, they cannot be interpreted in a purely geographical and chronological way for situating and dating all translations made in Bulgaria in late ninth and tenth centuries”.

In my opinion, grouping Ecclesiastes with Job is not very appropriate on this occasion because while Job is a liturgical text and is found in early South Slavonic copies of prophetologium, we do not know at what date, where and why a need was felt for a Church Slavonic translation of Ecclesiastes. I cannot see how Thomson arrives at the conclusion that the book of Ecclesiastes was translated in the late 9th -10th century Bulgaria since he does not adduce any [linguistic?] proof. But I entirely agree with his

\(^6^2\) Gorski\' and Nevostruev (1855-59:73) did not attempt to date the translation of Ecclesiastes. Instead they simply remarked: “Перевод книги Екклесиаста по языкку представляется новое перевода Притчей. Впрочем и в нем встречаются слова и обороты речи, впоследствии вышедшие из употребления.” They give a few examples of words later out of use, in particular 12:6 נֶּשֶׁר נֹּעַם - dv
g|i|aio|v t|ou |e|k|l|i|a|o|u. It must be noted that the reading נֹּעַם is found in manuscripts of group 3, groups 1 and 2 give the reading נֹּעַם. However, the reading in 12:6 may be a special case as its Greek equivalent δυνάμεων is a hapax legomenon in the LXX. Therefore it is impossible to compare this particular translation with other similar occurrences in the biblical texts, which makes it altogether problematic. The Greek δυνάμεων τοῦ χρυσίου in turn is the translation of the Hebrew construct הַנִּבְנֶת הָעֵשָׁה meaning ‘the golden bowl’. The noun הָעֵשָׁה, according to BDB dictionary, can refer to a basin or bowl (of a lamp or portion of capitals of the two pillars in temple). The Greek translation therefore might have reflected the meaning of this type of decoration on the column. The Croatian Church Slavonic following the Vulgate, however, has a different translation: kokulica zlata - vitta aurea. It is not clear to me how Jerome came to translate the Hebrew word with the lexeme ‘headband’. Perhaps, he read it as a derivative מַעַל from מַעַל - crown. (cf. Field, 1875: vol. 2, p. 400) It seems to me that we should not take into account this Church Slavonic collocation כָּלֶב כָּלֶב since, in my view, it appears to be a puzzling translation.

\(^6^3\) Thomson, 2006:35-37.
statement on the lack of reliable criteria for dating Church Slavonic translations on the basis of 'typical' terminology.

Thus, as I have demonstrated, it would be both difficult and imprudent to use linguistic evidence to date *Ecclesiastes* text, as it offers few cogent leads. I would reiterate that these points must be understood in light of the absence of starting point for comparison. In other early translations such as the *Song of Songs*, linguistic clues undoubtedly have helped to date those texts. However, we do not find similar evidence in the text of *Ecclesiastes*.

---

Rationale for the present edition.

Given the debates on the origins and manuscript tradition of the Church Slavonic Ecclesiastes, the question of the present edition deserves special attention. It is essential for the purpose of this study to determine what type of edition should be produced. The choice of edition depends on the type of manuscript tradition, therefore both need to be explored. Slavists dealing with medieval texts identify them in terms of open and closed, controlled and uncontrolled textual traditions.65

Original medieval Slavonic texts such as chronicles, lives of local saints, tales about finding miracle-working icons serve as an example of the textual tradition that is open to modification. Despite the fact that the categories open and closed are somewhat conventional, they have a certain pragmatic value. The term open is more useful when talking about original literature. The term closed tradition is more helpful when dealing with translated texts, which tend to be placed towards the closed end. Sometimes texts cannot be classified in such a strict way but should be viewed as a matter of degree on some scale from very open to very closed.

Biblical books occupy a peculiar position: in content they are closed (that is to say no portions of text could be subtracted or added when scribes attempted to reproduce the text exactly), but in wording they are open (i.e. corrected according to the notions of linguistic norm of scribes). When copying such texts the demand for accuracy is sustained with the utmost rigour (at least in theory). At the same time biblical translations could be controlled against Greek or Slavonic versions, as the scribes’ usual practice was to consult or conflate different copies or check the Slavonic text against the Greek. The question remains as to whether they were doing this continually or sporadically with every individual biblical book.66 Consequently I find the term controlled to be a more useful category than the terms open and closed when dealing with biblical texts.

65 The terms ‘open’ and ‘closed’ tradition were suggested by Pasquali (1962) to characterise the transmission of classical texts.
66 Bakker (1996: 165) calls the Slavonic tradition ‘open’ with regard to the Greek MSS, meaning that in cases of corruptions Slav scribes have resorted to Greek manuscripts rather than Slavonic. However, he was, perhaps, carried away by his textological zeal in calling the Old Slavonic version a targum of the Greek tradition. Cf. also Alekseev, 1986: 8-19, and Alekseev, 1999: 54.
As biblical texts were understandably ignored by Soviet scholarship, Russian scholars have mostly concentrated on editing and developing the editorial principles of the books of other genres. These scholars have mostly dealt with the texts belonging to the *open* tradition and followed Bédier’s practice in editing as a text a ‘best’ manuscript with correction of its mechanical errors and variants from other manuscripts worthy of attention. D. S. Lixačev and his school advocated this method, and I shall call it *editio variorum*.\(^{67}\) A good feature of the *variorum* edition is that the main manuscript chosen as a *codex optimus* is published in full. The drawback of the *variorum* edition is that the *codex optimus* is often viewed as a *text*. One needs to distinguish between the manuscripts and the text.\(^{68}\) Manuscripts are unique but the texts they transmit have a tradition that descends from their ancestor (archetype), via intermediate generations (hyparchetype) to the extant manuscripts.

Classical scholars in the West followed Lachmann’s practice of reconstructed editions comparing all the available manuscripts and making conjectures where necessary. Their decision to do so was based on the assumption that they could reconstruct the text as it might have appeared in a single manuscript, which originated in late antiquity. However, scholars have shown the limitations of this method even with regard to classical texts. It has been argued that the tradition cannot possibly be traced to one manuscript, but often to more manuscripts reproducing different branches, which have ceased to exist.\(^{69}\) The advantage of the reconstructed edition is that in the reconstructed text we may get closer to the text as it originally was.

Slavists, on the other hand, have been reluctant to produce reconstructed texts because the medieval Slavonic tradition does not lend itself easily to reconstruction. The

---

\(^{67}\) See Lixačev, 1983: 479-98, Pop, 1996: 242-5, Alekseev, 2003: 50-7. The footnote to Pop, 1996:245 states that “v otechestvennoj tradicii vyraženiju *editio cum notis variorum* sootvetstvuet termin ‘kritičeskoe izdanie’, toga kak *collated editions* obyčno nazyvajut rekonstrukcijami ili ‘svodnymi izdaniami’ ”, my use of the terms stems from this usage. However, the meaning ‘critical edition’ can be sometimes vague in English language too: according to the title of his thesis Ralph Cleminson’s goal was to produce a full critical edition of the text of ‘Stefanit i Îxnilat’, yet it seems to me that his edition is merely diplomatic with an apparatus of variant readings (see the appended bibliography).

\(^{68}\) This distinction was somewhat blurred in the works of Russian and Soviet scholars for two reasons: the first is the influence on Paleoslavistics exerted by 19th-century German philology that labelled both MSS and texts *Denkmal*, which is reflected in the Russian term *pamjatnik*; the second is the more modern use of Aesopian language: ‘pamjatniki tradicionnogo soderžanija’ practised by Soviet scholars in order to carry out their studies of scriptural texts.

\(^{69}\) Reynolds and Wilson, 1991: 214.
reason why reconstructed editions of the chronicles are not common is precisely because the chronicles are an example of an open textual tradition, and so it is not self-evident what stage in the tradition one should reconstruct, and on what basis. Besides, the existence of the different types of tradition (open, closed, controlled, uncontrolled) in the medieval Slavonic literary heritage also accounts for why individual manuscripts are published in preference to reconstructions.  

Classicists frequently are interested in texts of such early date (4th–5th centuries) that their orthography cannot be reconstructed with confidence. That is why they use the standard orthography. Slavists, unlike classicists, have no convention of producing normalized orthography for texts, similar to the one used in published dictionaries of Old Church Slavonic. Slavists instead often publish the text of a particular manuscript. In doing so they kill two birds with one stone: making available the text and making available for the linguists the language of this manuscript. Often texts as they appear in a particular manuscript are more of interest to linguists than reconstructed texts. This is one of the reasons why Slavists do not have standard orthography. Therefore if I were to make a reconstruction, it would be a problem to use standardized orthography. However, it seems to me that the point about orthography is less important because the dating of the text cannot be determined.

Recently, however, some Slavists have turned to reconstructed editions and commended Vajs’ attempts to move away from manuscripts to text in his reconstruction of the Gospels. He was one of the first scholars among Paleoslavists to use standardized orthography and to choose between variants. However, Vajs has been criticised for selecting readings which correspond to the Greek in preference to the readings which render Greek in more idiomatic and hence fairly free way [which is] characteristic of the original translation.

70 There are several reasons why Slavists do not attempt to produce reconstructions of biblical texts in Church Slavonic. One reasons is the linguistic interest of the extant manuscripts; another reason is the focus of scholarly interest on the earliest versions of these texts, which is the most difficult to reconstruct. Control of the tradition has led to recurrent textual interventions (such as revisions, secondary translations, blends of one and several redactions) and made reconstructions of the original translation in some cases a matter of unresolvable speculation. Therefore the prospect of a full reconstruction of the Cyrillo-Methodian translations of the New Testament and Psalter remains a matter of controversy. However, it is possible to reconstruct some of the later redactions or secondary translations with a fair degree of confidence.
72 Thomson, 2006:19.
As regards Church Slavonic biblical texts, these belong to closed and controlled traditions. Consequently there could be blends of one and several redactions, secondary revision, etc. Therefore the text is likely to appear in contaminated forms in most or all manuscripts, making it almost impossible for an editor confidently to produce a reconstructed text that is free of contamination. The reconstruction of orthography is also problematic, as better readings may be chosen from different manuscripts with different orthographical norms. Reconstructions are rarely used for the medieval Slavonic texts, while conversely variorum and diplomatic editions are not so common in the editorial practice of classical scholars.

*Ecclesiastes* is a text with a relatively closed tradition because it is part of Scripture and therefore scribes could not of their own volition add to or subtract from the text. It may be controlled against the other Slavonic copies as medieval scribes could have worked with more than one exemplar. The usual practice among Slav bookmen for main Church Slavonic liturgical texts was to check them against the Greek. However, it is less likely, though not impossible, that this was the case with *Ecclesiastes*, which is a non-liturgical book.

Although at the beginning of my research I intended to produce a reconstructed edition of the text, I decided against it for the following reason. As the textual analysis (see chapter 1) has demonstrated, the earliest attainable text was already substantially defective: the archetype from which the manuscripts of the 15th-16th centuries derived was faulty. The Church Slavonic version of *Ecclesiastes* in all available manuscripts has omissions and several manuscripts have a considerable lacuna.\(^{73}\) Thus, it would not serve a useful purpose to reconstruct such a faulty archetype.

Rather than producing a reconstructed edition, I believe it is more useful to present a variorum edition of the text with an apparatus of variant readings.\(^{74}\) The textual tradition of the continuous *Ecclesiastes* is represented by 3 groups of manuscripts. Consequently

---

\(^{73}\) In case of reconstruction how am I to fill the existing omissions and lacunae? It is not the task of an editor to retranslate the missing fragments of text from Greek.

\(^{74}\) I feel that there is no such urgent need for a diplomatic edition of *Ecclesiastes* since there is the edition of GB produced by Moscow Patriarchate in 1992 which would serve the purpose. Though the production of this multi-volume edition has stopped (only the volumes containing the Gospels and the Psalter have been published so far), it may still be resumed in the future with a different editor.
for the basis of my edition I had to choose between these groups of manuscripts. The manuscripts of group 3 could not be used because the corruptions and omissions in this group show that this is on the whole not the best preserved branch. Pg.81 has the most complete text among the manuscripts. However, it deviates from the main textual tradition and it may have been subjected to later editorial corrections. The lacuna precludes the selection of manuscripts from group 1 because in this case an editor is presented with the difficult task of filling this lacuna. As a result my decision against groups 1 and 3 was dictated by the fact that group 1 is defective and group 3 is more corrupt.

In selecting a representative manuscript of group 2 as the basis for my edition I acknowledge the importance of control in the tradition of biblical texts, since group 2 seems to be a conflation of the texts of the other two groups. This leaves me with a choice of two manuscripts in group 2 (without the lacuna): MS2 and GB. Since all the manuscripts are late in date, certainly none of them comes before the 15th century, the pre-eminence given to GB requires some justification and hence explanation of its relations with MS2. MS2 appears to have some primary readings and corrections if compared with GB (see examples below), though they were almost certainly copied from the same exemplar.

We can presume that the scribe of MS2 was more attentive in copying the text, since this MS contains fewer scribal errors. (GB scribal errors are on the left and the readings from MS2 are on the right). 2:6 εκτελωματα [ e ] καιναι - e om.; 2:12 preceding - εκτε; 3:9 ισοδε - ισοδιαλε; 3:21 δωμα - δωμ; 7:14 ζαονο - ζα σαονο. In addition certain corrections have been carried out in MS2. These are the erasure of ζα in the participle ζανευμαι in 4:1; the change of the infinitive ζακτι - του δραυ (the reading in all manuscripts) into the noun ζακτια in 1:8 (not supported by Greek). I have already mentioned the case of 9:9 on page 73, where it was said that the scribe of GB placed the reading ε γινοτε τρεμαται in the main text and the reading ε εικα τρεμεται in the margin; while in MS2 and group 3 the latter is placed in the main text. My conclusion was that MS2 was not a direct copy of GB, but that both manuscripts draw on group 3.

However, it is not possible to say whether these corrections were introduced piecemeal by a scribe, or a redactor at the time of copying the manuscript or at some later
date. For MS2 has been corrected: while all the manuscripts display in 3:18 the corrupt reading ΜΗΚΠΞΙΝΤ, in MS2 it is crossed out. The question then follows whether the scribe of MS2 crossed out this reading of his own volition or referred to some manuscripts where it was already crossed out. The same applies to 3:19 where the second ΤΑΚΟ is crossed out in MS2 and 4:11 where Ρ ΤΑΡΟ is crossed out in MS2. In 7:2 ΗΕΝΕΕΠΕ written in small letters is added to ΑΗ in MS2 to form ΗΕΝΕΕΠΕ ΑΗ versus ΑΗ or ΗΗΑΗ in other manuscripts.

The case of 12:6 ΗΚΡΒΣΙΝΤ ΑΑ with the inserted Ρ vs. ΗΚΡΒΣΙΝΤ ΑΑ in all the other manuscripts makes it even more problematic. If the scribe of MS2 had not checked this particular reading against some other Cyrillic manuscript (I have examined all the manuscripts and the reading ΗΚΡΒΣΙΝΤ ΑΑ does not occur in them), where would he have found the correct reading without referring to the Greek? Thus the readings in MS2 might represent a later revision of the text by an editor intent on correcting that text. This certainly cannot be ruled out, especially since editorial improvements were often made by scribes and there are clear examples of such editorial work in our manuscripts. I would argue that some readings in MS2 might be a result of correction by some later hand, and thus will not prevent me from choosing GB as the basis for the edition. 75

The choice of GB is based on the pragmatic grounds that it offers as complete a text as is available to us. The textual evidence in chapter 1 shows that there is no such thing as codex optimus in the circumstances; instead GB presents us with a tradition which is a compilation of the two branches. I am publishing GB not as a codex optimus, but rather to restore its cultural and historical importance, for without doubt, GB is most interesting precisely because of its cultural importance.

Although the majority of the manuscripts are contemporaneous with GB, dating from the second half of the 15th century, GB alone can be placed more securely within a historical and cultural context. The provenance of some of the manuscripts containing Ecclesiastes is not known, so that not much can be said about their background. The provenance of GB furnishes greater information on the history of the manuscript than the provenances of other manuscripts. GB is in a way a 'definitive' text, significant for the

---

75 Minimal reconstruction at a lower level of stage κ (the putative antigraph) of GB and MS2 is possible, its purpose would be to remove some trivial mistakes (in GB) which are of little or no interest to the reader. However, my argument against this is that some of the 'better' readings in MS2 may in fact be secondary corrections.
history of the Church Slavonic Bible, because it formed the basis for all subsequent revisions. The manuscript MS2 was a more careful copy of the text but it has not been copied as often as GB. In view of its importance GB unquestionably merits a separate edition.

My edition is not diplomatic in a strict sense as represented by a recent edition of Josephus’ ‘The History of the Jewish war’ produced by Pićxadze et al., 2004. In this edition the text is reproduced following the layout of the manuscript: line for line, ligatures expanded, letter for letter, plus diacritical marks (titlo, paerok, oksija and varija). In my edition, on the other side, there is no attempt made to represent exactly the layout of the text preserving the number of lines and the amount of words on each line. The reason for this is that the manuscript Synodal’nyj 915 is tightly bound and the xerox copy of GB available to me is therefore imperfect: the last two letters on each line are not clearly legible. While every precaution has been made to reproduce the text exactly, I feel that I am in no position to produce the diplomatic transcript of the text unless I examine the actual manuscript in its unbound state. Besides I omit the diacritical marks.

It is not my aim to insert superior readings from other manuscripts into the main text where it has corruptions. Instead only corrections of the errors which are directly traceable to the scribe of manuscript Synodalnyj 915 and not to previous copyists of its underlying text are introduced in the edition (see the introductory note to the edition on pages 211-212).

The projected edition presents GB as a characteristic text for its time. The critical apparatus which I provide is the result of an analysis of the textual tradition and is organised in such a way as to show how its text relates to various groups of manuscripts which represent different branches of the tradition. In the critical apparatus a reader is given the material on the basis of which he can make his own reconstruction if he wishes to do so. By using GB for my edition, the textual transmission of the Church Slavonic Ecclesiastes can be described in terms of what can happen to a ‘controlled’ text. By making GB central to my discussion, I show where GB fits in the tradition and what the relationships reveal about the type of ‘control’ which the editors of the Gennadian Bible exercised.
The text of *Ecclesiastes* allows us to demonstrate the editorial process and technique of the time. Previously scholarly attention has been focused mainly on those books in GB which were translated from Latin.\(^7^6\) Therefore the publication of *Ecclesiastes* would broaden our understanding of the editorial practice adopted by the compilers of GB when working with texts translated from Greek.

\(^7^6\) See, for example, Foster, 1996; Freidhof, 1972; Platonova, 1997; Romodanovskaja, 2001 and the recently published collection of papers under the title: *Biblija*...Moscow, 2001.
Historical and cultural context in which GB was produced.

Parallels among the Slavs to the cultural trends in Western Europe.

In the 15th century printing of the Gutenberg Bible established a new era of book culture. Though the Latin Bible was the most frequently published book,77 bibles in vernacular languages also began to appear in print in Western Europe. A similar though not identical picture can be found in the Slavonic world. There, an interest in continuous and exegetical types of biblical texts became more apparent. Book printing in Slavonic languages appeared as early as the 1480s.78 Among the East Slavs the awakening interest in theological enlightenment can be traced in the compilations of biblical books, such as the collection of biblical books produced by Ivan Černýj, the Moscow scribe of the 15th century (MS Undol’skij 1, RSL), and the collection of biblical books compiled in the Suprasl’skij monastery by Matfej Desjatyj (MS 24.4.28., BAN). This interest may have been connected with the high level of theological awareness among the learned Slav clergy, or the adoption of a new liturgical canon, which led to the gradual redundancy of lectionary and prophetologium.79

The Gennadian Bible project.

The first complete Bible canon of the Slavonic world was compiled in 1499 by Archbishop Gennadij of Novgorod. The original manuscript is kept in the State Historical Museum in Moscow (Sinodal’nyj 915). Two more copies of the original manuscript are also kept in the same museum. These are Sinodal’nyj 21 and Sinodal’nyj 30. Both copies are dated from the 16th century. Whilst it is not known exactly when the work on the project started,80 its completion date is mentioned in the colophon.81 The work on the

78 The first Glagolitic book was printed in 1483, the Czech Bible in 1488.
79 Though Alekseev (1999:199) does not specify which liturgical canon, it is likely that he has in mind the Jerusalem canon.
80 The approximate date when the work on the project started is known from the colophon in MS 802/694 from the Solovki Monastery which contains the passages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel translated from the Vulgate. This indirect evidence points to 1492. See Thomson, 2002:32, footnote 15.
81 See the colophon in MS 915 from GIM in Gorskij and Nevostruev, 1855:1.
project was carried out in several stages. Firstly, the compilers had to collect all the available translations. Secondly, these were collated with various degrees of thoroughness, and several texts were extrapolated from their commentaries. Thirdly, for the books that could not be found, new translations were made from Latin. For this complete canon the following books were newly translated from Latin: 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, 1-2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, 1-2 Maccabees. In all probability, the compilers spent most of their time concentrating on these translations. They also translated the accompanying commentaries of Nicholas de Lyra in Koberger’s edition of the Vulgate and prefaces from Kessler’s Bible. The overall order of books and division into chapters was that of the Vulgate.

Translations from Latin for the GB and its implications.

What were the reasons behind the undertaking of a Slavonic translation from a Latin Bible and not from the Greek, as had been the tradition since Cyril and Methodius? Several explanations have been put forward. One reason given is the lack of evidence for the presence of Greek manuscripts in Novgorod at the time and the presumptive low general level of knowledge of Greek among the East Slavs. We must remember that in the first quarter of the 16th century Maxim the Greek was invited from Athos to translate certain texts from Greek. If the case of Maxim the Greek strengthens the assumption that no 16th century Russian was capable of translating Greek texts, it also raises the question why Gennadij did not send to Athos for a translator.

It seems that this question should be addressed by viewing Gennadij above all as a practical man, who used whatever sources he needed to attain his goal. To invite somebody from Athos might have been the prerogative of the Grand Prince of Moscow, as was, indeed, the case with Maxim the Greek. In the light of the strained relations between Gennadij and the Metropolitan and Ivan III, it is hard to imagine that Gennadij was even able to contemplate inviting Greek translators from Athos. Therefore, Gennadij’s use of Latin and German texts to complete his project must be seen in the

---

83 The Western European sources for this project were established by Wimmer, 1975:444-58.
context of the contemporary situation, and not be presented as evidence of Gennadij's affinity to Latins.

Besides, there was no printed edition of the Greek Bible, while a printed version of the Vulgate was available to the compilers.84 The Russian biblical scholar Evseev argued, however, that the fact that some books were newly translated from Latin for this enterprise by the Croatian monk Veniamin (who may have belonged to the Dominican order) 85 suggests that the GB was produced under strong Catholic influence.86 Evseev believed that Veniamin brought with him some Croat Glagolitic breviaries to align the Church Slavonic translation with the Vulgate.

By comparing several quotations from Ecclesiastes in the Gennadian Bible with the ones found in Croat Glagolitic breviaries, Evseev tried to present the similarities in both texts as evidence for the influence of the Croat Glagolitic text on GB. Evseev's view of the close similarities between these two texts has to be rejected, however. Firstly, the citations are not as similar as Evseev claimed, and secondly, all the existing similarities are purely coincidental.87 What is more important, the GB readings are known within the rest of the Cyrillic textual tradition of Ecclesiastes, and therefore need not have been in the least influenced by the Croat text.

On Evseev's hypothesis Veniamin arrived in Novgorod armed with a ready-made translation of the biblical books in breviaries; the only remaining thing for him to do was to transliterate these from Glagolitic into Cyrillic.88 This suggestion, though, was proved to be wrong by Lur'e (1961:68-77) and later Romodanovskaja (2001:278-305), who have shown beyond any doubt that the translations from the Latin Bible were made on the spot, at the episcopal scriptorium in Novgorod and not earlier, as Evseev had suggested. Working copies containing the name of Veniamin and books translated from Latin as a preparation for the codex have been preserved, albeit in later manuscripts. In these copies after chapter 25 of the book of Jeremiah it is stated that from here on other chapters up to chapter 46 are written in another book. We must bear in mind that parts of Prophetic books were translated prior to the 15th century from Greek, like Jeremiah. Thus, the later

84 See note 59.
87 Evseev, 1914:22.
scribes in the 16th century simply copied these draft copies without analysing which books were translated from Greek and which from Latin. That Veniamin might arrive in Novgorod knowing beforehand which books were already translated seems highly unlikely. Veniamin could have brought translations with him, but in parts they would have been superfluous, and there is no strong evidence that he did so. Therefore new translations had to be done on the spot.

Reasons for compiling a Pandect.

The reasons why Gennadij undertook the compilation of a complete Bible could have been various. It has been suggested that Gennadij believed that a complete compilation of Scripture would not only increase the proficiency of his clergy, but would also facilitate debate with the contemporary heretics and lend the Russian church an air of scholarly competence in scriptural studies and the interpretation of Holy Writ.\(^8^9\)

As in 16th century Europe, where the Bible served as a weapon for the Reformation, the complete Biblical canon in Russia was compiled against the background of Gennadij’s struggle with the heretical Judaizers. This observation, made in passing by Gorskij and Nevostruev,\(^9^0\) has been seized upon by subsequent scholars as the primary motivation.\(^9^1\) In so doing, modern scholars have conflated various reasons for the production of GB into one. Thus, the suggestion that the complete biblical canon of 1499 owed its existence to the fact that the heretics had in their possession the Scriptures appears to be an underestimate of Gennadij’s aims and accomplishments.

The Judaizers were a group of clergy and laity in Novgorod and Moscow whose ideas brought them into confrontation with the Orthodox Church. Judaizers were accused of denying Christian dogma, of anti-trinitarianism and iconoclasm. This conflict between the heretics and the authorities resulted in the punishment and execution of some of the

---

88 Evseev, 1914:10-22.
89 Fedotov, 1960:42.
91 The main proponent of such a view was the late Ja. S. Lur’e (1960:193).
heretics in 1490 and 1504. However, apart from these known facts there is no agreement on the nature of the heresy, its affinity to Judaism and its overall importance.92

Evidence for anti-judaizer polemic.

During his time as the Archbishop of Novgorod Gennadij was faced with three serious troubles: the controversy surrounding the approaching end of the world in the year 7000 (1492), the rise of the Judaizers' heresy, and the secularization of church lands. In order to deal with these pressing matters Gennadij ordered the translation, production and copying of texts needed to support his dogmatic and theological position. Even so, it is almost impossible to find direct evidence for the production of the GB as a countermeasure to oppose the Judaizers' influences. The few pieces of information that have been handed down to us with regard to the Judaizers' involvement in criticism of the Biblical texts are hard to interpret, thus leaving the frequently quoted passages from Gennadij's letter to Joasaf, former bishop of Rostov, open to interpretation.

Ино нынешнее иудаизм еретическое предание держать, псалмы Давидови или пророчества исправлены по тому, как им еретици предали - Акила и Симмач и Теодотий.93 - 'The Jews of today maintain a heretical tradition; they have distorted the Psalms of David or the Prophets in accordance with the way that the heretics Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion have handed them down to them'.

I am of the opinion that Gennadij was referring to the heretics of ancient times and, perhaps, thinking also of the contemporary Jews. Although some Church Slavonic translations of Greek exegesis contain references to Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, from these references it does not necessarily follow that in 15th century Russia, where knowledge of Greek was at best meagre, there were people capable of such expertise in matters of biblical textual criticism. At any rate Gennadij’s statement is not sufficient to

92 The question of Judaizers and the heresy is beyond the scope of the present study. The literature on Judaizers is substantial. To list but a few: Klibanov, 1960; Lur’e, 1960; Hösch, 1975; Howlett, 1976; Seebohm, 1977; Taube, 1996. For recent publications on the subject see the bibliography in Peresvetoff-Morath (2002). For primary sources see Kazakova, Lur’e, 1955. For a concise account in English of the genesis and spread of the Judaizers heresy see Fennell, 1961:324-33. For the diffusion of the terms ‘judaizing’, and ‘judaistically philosophising’ in the Byzantine antithetical literature see Pliguzov, 1992:270; Howlett, 1993:64. I am grateful to Professor Taube for sending me his article on 'The Fifteenth-Century Ruthenian Translations from Hebrew and the Heresy of the Judaizers: Is there a Connection?'.

establish a clear link between the Judaizers’ heresy and Gennadij’s desire to compile a Pandect. 94

A second quotation concerns the well-known list of books which ‘

The books mentioned by Gennadij are not heretical, the list contains biblical books (the *Prophets, Genesis, Kings, Proverbs* and *Ecclesiasticus*) and some theological works (*Sylvester – Pope of Rome, Athanasios of Alexandria, the Discourse against the Recent Heresy, Bogomilism* by Presbyter Kozma, the *Epistle of Patriarch Photios to Boris, Prince of Bulgaria, Dionysios, the Areopagite* and sayings of a playwright *Menander* and the book *Logic*). It is not obvious whether Gennadij wanted to obtain copies for himself or to send them to Joasaf, and thus we cannot draw conclusions about his intentions on compiling the codex on the basis of these quotations alone.

**Alternative explanations of GB.**

Evseev was the first scholar who put forward an alternative explanation for the production of GB as the result of pressure from the Catholic Church, which has been mentioned above. 96 In recent years Romodanovskaja 97 has studied the dissemination of Cyrillic manuscripts containing the texts newly translated from Latin and concludes that the main goal of the Gennadian circle was the creation of a glossed biblical text. She

94 Whilst interpreting Gennadij’s words I tend to favour the opinion of Lur’e (1984:155) who thought that this particular quotation had nothing whatsoever to do with the Novgorod heresy of the late 15th century in preference to that of Thomson (2002:32) for whom ‘it is clear that the project to compile a Pandect was undertaken as part of the efforts to counter Judaizer influence’. 95 Kazakova, Lur’e, 1955:409.
96 Evseev (1916:14) accused Gennadij not only of surrounding himself with an unhealthy Catholic atmosphere but also of allowing himself to be influenced by it.
97 Romodanovskaja, 2001: 278-305.
rejects the possibilities that GB was the result of a desire to combat the heresy of Judaizers, or of pressure from a Catholic Church.

My work proceeds from a similar understanding of the history of GB. In my view, the main goal of Gennadij’s circle was to produce a complete Biblical canon and to resolve the canon question. What did the redactors of GB know about the canon of the OT biblical books? Since this codex was, in fact, the first complete collection of biblical books among the Orthodox Slavs, the redactors were faced with the challenge of determining the canon of both the Old and New Testaments. This was an immensely complicated undertaking considering the quantity of manuscripts, claiming biblical status, that existed in Church Slavonic manuscript tradition by the end of the 15th century. For example, in the compilation of biblical books produced by Matfej Desjatyj, the sayings of Menander were included among other biblical texts. Gennadij’s choice of a canon was followed by all Church Slavonic Bibles to be produced in Russia for the next five hundred years. The fact that the Ostrog Bible of 1581, Moscow Bible of 1663, Elizabeth Bible of 1751, all follow the canon of the Gennadian Bible testifies to the importance of the latter for the Russian culture.

The compilers of the first codex of Biblical books, headed by Gennadij, must have had a variety of sources at their disposal to determine the composition of the codex in general, and the Old Testament in particular. By the end of the 15th century there were in circulation nine indexes in Church Slavonic translation of the Old Testament books. The majority of these indexes were included in the Kormčaja kniga ‘Collection of canon laws’.

As noted by Foster, the Old Testament of the 1499 Bible does not correspond to any single Graeco-Byzantine index of books from the nine lists known to exist in the Slavonic translation by the end of the 15th century. It has often been maintained that the compilers of GB based their index on the Latin Vulgate. This does not mean, however, that the canon of GB was ‘Latin’ or ‘Roman Catholic’. Foster comments that the canon of the OT books of GB, like the Vulgate, preserves an older canon, based on the Alexandrian tradition. He concludes that this canon could have been derived, not from a
single index, known in Slavonic translation, but from a compilation of several of the indexes. 98

We should remember that the word *biblija* – 'sacra scriptura' is first encountered in Church Slavonic lettering in the colophon of the Bible. So only with GB the word *biblija* entered the Russian lexicon. The indexes contained the words 'canon' and 'canonical' which might or might not be equal to the Bible. While the Bible contained all of the texts useful to the Christian reader, the canon was limited to those texts on which dogma and church law can be based. Until the end of the 15th century the Bible played no important role in Russia. All prior discussion of the canon was theoretical in nature as the complete Church Slavonic Bible in one volume did not exist. In 1499 the Slavonic canon was moved from theory to practice, for Gennadij presented his canon not in the form of a list or index but in a form of the first complete Bible.

It cannot be ruled out, of course, that, under more propitious circumstances, GB might have appeared in print. 99 Gennadij was an ambitious and learned man who was not unaware of what was happening in the West; and Novgorod was not an isolated city completely closed to foreign ideas. 100 The production of a translation that could be printed was entirely consonant with the prevailing intellectual trends from the Iberian Peninsula to the German speaking lands of Central Europe.

**Position of Ecclesiastes.**

That the text of *Ecclesiastes* was of lesser importance in ecclesiastical debates is indicated by the absence of any marginal comments in manuscript Undol'skij 1 101 by Ivan Černyj, who made some glosses and corrections in the manuscripts containing other
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98 Foster, 1996:81.
99 It is known that the printer Bartolomeus Gotan from Lübeck was welcomed at the time at Gennadij's palace. See Miller, 1978:395-412.
100 'The Latin atmosphere' in Novgorod can be explained through its long established tradition of links with Hanse and the presence of many foreigners. On the existence of foreign yards and the Catholic church in Novgorod at the time see Rybina (1986). Interesting observations on the Latin texts on birch bark in Novgorod dating to the 15th century can be found in Picchio (1979-80:650-1).
101 MS Und.1 was copied by several scribes. Unfortunately, I cannot say whether the text of *Ecclesiastes* was written by Ivan himself or somebody else.
OT books. At the same time several slips of the pen may show less diligence in handling this text. It may simply follow that at the time there existed no other copy of Ecclesiastes for Ivan Černyj to compare it with.

With the text of Ecclesiastes it looks as if there was a limited number of copies circulating in the same Moscow-Novgorodian milieu which came from the same source (with the lacuna and interpolation). Ivan Černyj most probably did not have access to the copies of the plain text as Matfej Desjatyj or the compilers of GB did. The manuscript Undol’skij 1 was the most complete collection of the OT books at the time before GB as it contained all the biblical books with the exception of those translated from Latin. It is not known on whose orders manuscript Undol’skij 1 was copied, but we know from the colophon of another book, the so-called Ellinskij letopisec, that it was copied by Ivan Černyj in 1485 on the order of the Grand Prince Ivan. Based on this example, one might conjecture that that in all probability manuscript Undol’skij 1 was also intended for the same high Moscow circles.

Attention should be drawn to the position of Ecclesiastes in the Gennadian Bible. It was not translated from Latin or specifically for GB. It was copied instead from an existing manuscript. It seems most likely that the copy used by the compilers contained the interpolation and the lacuna. As a result of our investigation it has been established that in the compilers’ exemplar the text of Ecclesiastes preserved the interpolation containing biblical verses with comments. Textual evidence suggests that the compilers were responsible for removing comments on Ecclesiastes in the interpolation whilst leaving intact the biblical verses.


103 Apparently the scribe Ivan Černyj was a member of the Moscow circle of the judaizing heretics whose chief was Fedor Kuricyn. According to modern scholarship (Thomson, 1998:651-2) the Judaizers were the first Slavs who revealed an interest in textual criticism of the Church Slavonic translations of the Old Testament and who initiated the removal of the Biblical texts from their Christian commentaries. His opinion is, perhaps, too categorical. We know about a certain Gabriel of Hilandar (Thomson, 1998:763). He is, however, different from Ivan Černyj, who was supposedly only a scribe and not a translator. Gabriel is thought to have translated a catena on Job, and, perhaps also the one on Samuel and Kings, revising the biblical texts in the process of translation. Similar revisions for commented versions were undertaken in 10th century Bulgaria.

104 With regard to the other OT books, namely, the Song of Songs and the Prophets Thomson (1998:657) alludes to the discrepancies between the texts available to the Judaizers and the compilers of GB.
There may be different explanations for this fact. Firstly, the editorial job was not completed very thoroughly. Secondly, the compilers might have felt that the biblical verses were more important than the commentary, and left these on purpose. They clearly collated their text with another copy to fill the lacuna. At the same time no examples can be found to show that the editors used the text of the Vulgate for correction of errors in their copy. But there is a slight possibility that at least once in 7:5 they may have checked against the Greek. It must be said, though, that if we take into account the lack of evidence for the presence of Greek manuscripts at that time in Novgorod, such verification remains highly questionable.
Chapter 2.

The catena on *Ecclesiastes* in the Church Slavonic translation.

Fragments of Church Slavonic translations of a catena on *Ecclesiastes* have survived in various *florilegia*. The study of the catena is important because it is not known whether the plain text of *Ecclesiastes* originated independently or was generated from the commentated version. In the Church Slavonic tradition there were precedents for the generation of plain biblical texts from the commentated ones.\(^1\) Examination of the extant fragments of *Ecclesiastes* included in various compilations may shed light on whether these fragments might once have been parts of a whole catena. The largest number of biblical verses with commentary, 56 in total, can be found in the MS Undol’skij 13. The description of this MS is given in the previous chapter. The selection of commentated passages is as follows: 1:6-7, 1:9-11, 2:14, 2:21, 2:24-26, 3:15-21, 4:4-6, 4:9-17, 5:2, 5:5, 5:9-10, 5:18-19, 6:7-9, 7:1-6, 7:8, 7:11, 7:14-22.

In addition to this fragmentary catena, several East Slavonic manuscripts with the continuous text contain an interpolation of 38 verses accompanied by commentary in the middle of 1:12. As was already discussed in the previous chapter, the Gennadian Bible retains this interpolation whilst omitting the commentary.

Three *florilegia* containing a selection of biblical passages from *Ecclesiastes* are known to me at present. These are:

1. Izbornik, beginning of the 13\(^{th}\) century, parchment, No Q.p.1.18, RNL (2:14, 4:12, 7:4, 10:1-2)\(^2\)
2. Sbornik, 16\(^{th}\) century, paper, Kirillo-Belozerskij collection, No 43/1120, RNL (10:7, 3:5, 2:14 – the actual verse is missing, 4:6, 4:9, 5:5)
3. Meleckij sbornik, 16\(^{th}\) century, paper, Mel.m./p.119, CBAN, Kiev (the selection starts from 10:1)\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) The text was published by Wątrobska, 1987.
\(^3\) I have seen Sbornik from the Kirillo-Belozerskj collection; the Meleckij sbornik at present is unavailable to me but in the future I hope to familiarise myself with it.
In this chapter I summarise what is known about *catenae* in Greek and Church Slavonic. I compare the commentated version with the relevant passages from the continuous text and the interpolation. In so doing, I am looking for any possible textual dependency between the continuous, interpolated, and commentated texts. Such an analysis raises a number of significant questions, the answers to which may however prove unattainable due to a lack of sufficient evidence. Among these questions are the following: did the text of Undol’skij 13 ever exist in a more complete form or in its entirety? What is the relationship between the commentated text of Undol’skij 13 and the continuous text? What is the relationship between the continuous and the interpolated text? What is the relationship between Undol’skij 13 and the interpolated text? What is the relationship between any of these and the fragments in the florilegia? Did the continuous text emerge independently, or was it generated from the commentated version? Which version came first: continuous, commentated or interpolated?

It can be argued that EccP 4 could have been generated from a fuller version of EccC (Und.13), since there are other examples where the biblical text has been extrapolated from the commentaries. The *Song of Songs* and the prophetic books seemingly underwent such transformations, apparently made by the Judaizers (Thomson 1998:651-2). Around the same period the texts of *Job, Isaiah, the Song of Songs, Daniel* were extrapolated by the editors of the GB who for some reason or other did not use the earlier extrapolations of the Judaizers (Thomson 1998:657).

If it is at least possible that EccC and EccP arose from the same Church Slavonic translation, then it is useful to explore the relationship between them by comparing the text in Und.13 with a manuscript from the group which contains the continuous text of *Ecclesiastes*. Should it be determined that EccC and EccP do share a common source, the reconstruction of part of this source might be feasible.

As yet it is not known whether the commentated and interpolated texts go back to the same Church Slavonic archetype or represent independent translations. The question of

---

4 For ease of reference in this study I shall call the continuous text of *Ecclesiastes* - EccP (*Ecclesiastes*, plain text), the commentated text of *Ecclesiastes* – EccC = Und.13 (*Ecclesiastes*, commentated or exegetical text), and the interpolated text of *Ecclesiastes* – Eccl (*Ecclesiastes*, interpolated or exegetical text).
differentiation between separate translations and separate redactions of a translated work continues to be contentious among scholars. Since the Greek prototype which lay behind them is also unknown, no conclusions can be reached at present. As the textual relations between different versions of the text of Ecclesiastes are not transparent, it is methodologically important firstly to separate the biblical passages from the commentaries and secondly to examine different types of variants in the texts.

My aim is to select and classify the existing textual material. I approach my subject in two ways:

- I identify parts of the commentary which correspond to the supposed Greek source, i.e. the commentary of Olympiodorus.
- I check the divergence of the Church Slavonic biblical verses from the standard Greek text of Ecclesiastes in the LXX, using the variant readings from the edition of Vetus Testamentum by Holmes and Parsons and Boli.

Thereafter, I outline several possibilities for the textual relationships between the three versions. At the end of the chapter these hypotheses are subjected to criticism on general historical grounds and in the light of the textual findings of the chapter. The condition and paucity of textual material determines the order in which the material is presented and examined.

Before discussing the Church Slavonic translation I briefly touch upon the formation in the Greek tradition of this type of exegetical text, a genre which was inherited by medieval Slavonic literature from Byzantium. Since the Church Slavonic catenary translations derived primarily from Greek patristic works, I shall highlight the differences and similarities between the Greek and the Church Slavonic versions of catenae.

---

5 Redactions were the product of revisions of the Church Slavonic translations based on the Greek text. Medieval Slavs starting from the 10th century periodically revised liturgical books by collating them with the Greek. A redactor can work simultaneously with the old text, transfer some wording from it and revise this old text by referring to Greek. Thus redactors changed Slavonic words and grammatical forms which did not correspond to the Greek manuscripts available to them.
The catena as a literary form of exegetical literature.

A catena is a collection of excerpts taken from scholia or commentaries by Church Fathers on texts from the Bible. Usually these excerpts are preceded by the names of their authors. This method of exegesis appears around the beginning of the 6th century when production of the original commentaries by the Church Fathers was in decline. In this transitional period new commentaries on the OT were no longer being written but the old existing commentaries were reworked and turned into catenae. Procopius of Gaza († 530) is assumed to be the first to have started such compilations (Wilson 1983:32-3). As different texts were blended together they became known under the name of their catenist with the result that they are attributed to their compilers.

The problem of attribution was equally difficult for the Byzantine and Slavonic scribes because the commentaries were drawn from various sources. Sometimes the names of the authors were put in the margins, which could lead to confusion and the eventual loss of the names during the process of subsequent copying. In this case they were indicated by ἄλλος, which is translated as nst.

Greek catena vs. Slavonic catena.

The first difference between Greek and Slavonic catenae lies in the fact that the biblical text in the Greek catena remained practically the same, and commentaries could only be added to it. In the Church Slavonic tradition, however, the commentaries were not copied, but translated instead. Therefore the translator was presented with several possibilities. Firstly, he could translate the commentaries and add these to the already existing biblical text, secondly, he could translate the biblical text afresh together with the commentaries, and thirdly, he could make some changes and corrections in the existing Church Slavonic translation of the biblical text.

7 For general works on the catenae I consulted Devreesse (1928:1084-164), who in turn draws largely on work of Faulhaber (1909:383-95), and Dorival (1985:209-26); for a survey of the subject see also Marcos (2000:287-301).
The second difference lies in the arrangement of the page in the Greek and Slavonic Cyrillic manuscripts. In Byzantine manuscripts one may find various arrangements of catenae: the biblical text, ranging from a few words to several verses, could be written in the centre with the extracts from Church Fathers in the margins; or the biblical passages and corresponding commentaries could be written in two parallel columns.

It has been argued (Marcos 2000: 291-2), however, that the first catenae followed the example of biblical commentaries from the 3rd to 5th centuries, which were used as a model for the page layout. In other words, the original layout for the first Byzantine catenae consisted of writing the biblical verse, then the extracts from the Fathers relating to that verse, after this the subsequent passage, followed by its relevant commentary and so on. From the 11th century, the catenae turn to the alternating pattern of commentary again as a model for the page layout.

The page layout in the Cyrillic manuscripts did not have a marginal structure, but usually followed the arrangement of the so-called *catena alternata.* In this the biblical text was usually written in red ink, and the lemma ΤΟΑΚΤ* and the name of the exegete, the author of the commentary, preceded the commentary. The order of comments on the relevant verses could vary from manuscript to manuscript. A possible reason for this is that in the Greek manuscripts commentaries were placed in the margins; in the copying process, the commentaries were transferred to the text itself and as a result mismatches could occur. In the Slavonic manuscript tradition discrepancy between the sequence of comments on relevant biblical passages is fairly common. There could also be some omissions in the biblical texts themselves, because verses that did not have commentary could be left out.

Sources for the Church Slavonic catena.

It is not possible at the moment to indicate the direct Greek source for our Church Slavonic catena. It has been suggested that the commentary of Olympiodorus of Alexandria on *Ecclesiastes* might have served as one of the sources for the Church Slavonic translation (Alekseev 1988:186). Very little is known about Olympiodorus

---

8 Term used by Labate (1979: 333).
himself. He was supposedly ordained by 505–515, so he might have been born between 470-490. At the end of the Commentary to *Job* it is stated that Olympiodorus wrote a commentary on *Ecclesiastes* on the commission of John and Julian, respected men of the 6th century. He was considered an important author for hundreds of years: Anastasius of Sinai called him μεγας φιλόσοφος, probably mistaking him for another neoplatonist philosopher by the name of Olympiodorus (Každan and Talbot 1991, III:1524).  

The following Church Slavonic commentated passages are translated from the commentary of Olympiodorus on *Ecclesiastes* which was published by Migne in *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 93. These are 2:14 PG 500D; 4:6 PG 528 CD; 4:9 PG 530C-D; 5:5 PG 541A; 7:2 PG 560D; 7:3 PG 560D; 7:4 PG 561B; 7:5 PG 561C; 7:6 PG 561C; 7:16-17 PG 568C-D; 7:18 PG 569A; 7:21-22 PG 569 D; 8:4 PG 576A; 8:8 PG 577C; 10:1 PG 596A; 10:2 596 B; 10:3 596B; 10:4 PG 596C; 10:5-6 PG 597 A-B; 12:5 PG 617 B-C. Migne’s edition of the commentary is based on two manuscripts from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France Gr. 174 and Gr. 175. Migne may have been unaware of the manuscripts 733 and 734 from the Marcianus library in Venice which contain the longer version of Olympiodorus’ commentary. Comparison of the microfilms of these manuscripts kept in Göttingen in the Septuaginta-Unternehmen with the Church Slavonic translation revealed 5 more comments based on Olympiodorus. These are 7:2 (MS 734 f. 42r), 7:15 (MS 733, f. 93B), 7:22 (MS 733, f. 94B), 10:7 (MS 733, f. 102B), 10:17 (MS 733, f. 104B).  

In some later manuscripts one can see an increase in scholia written by Olympiodorus. His importance as an author at a later time can be inferred from the layout of his commentary on *Ecclesiastes* in the Marcianus Gr.22 manuscript from the library in Venice: Olympiodorus’ text is in the middle while the catena compiled by Procopius is in the margins (Leanza 1977:551).

Apart from Olympiodorus’ commentary several Greek catenae on *Ecclesiastes* are known to scholars at present: Catena Procopii, Catena Polychronii, Catena Barberiniana, Catena Procopii, Catena Polychronii, Catena Barberiniana.
Until recently the only person who had studied the commentaries on Ecclesiastes was M. Faulhaber, who compared Olympiodorus’ commentary with the Catena of Procopius and Polychronius (Faulhaber 1902). The recent publications by Labate (1979:333-39) and Leanza (1977:545-52) have returned to this subject.

Faulhaber thought that the three Greek catenae on Ecclesiastes of Olympiodorus, Prokopios and Polychronius were related to each other in some way. He says that all the catenae with the exception of Trium Patrum derive from the original and complete Catena of Procopius. Labate (1992, XXXVI-VIII) however, argues that Faulhaber’s view is no longer acceptable. He points out that in the 6th century three catenae (the Commentary of Olympiodorus, Catena of Procopius and finally Catena Hauniensis) already existed. Labate agrees with Faulhaber that these three catenae are closely related to each other. He supposes that this is because they were written at the same time. In his opinion, all the other catenae, including Catena Barberiniana, are more recent. Faulhaber had already suggested that Catena Barberiniana depends on the Commentary of Olympiodorus with which it shares many similarities, especially starting from chapter 7 till the end.

Agreeing with him, Labate points out that the Commentary of Olympiodorus appears to be older because on f. 72r of Catena Barberiniana the lemma Ολυμπιοδόρου can be read. So, Labate and Faulhaber believe that Catena Barberiniana depends on Olympiodorus. Leanza, however, does not agree with this idea. Leanza points out that in Catena Barberiniana the names of the authors are given, while in Olympiodorus they are not present. He suggests that the similarities between these two (Catena Barberiniana and Olympiodorus) either depend on Procopius, or that Olympiodorus depends on Catena Barberiniana (Leanza 1977: 550). Besides this, there is no agreement about the nature of Olympiodorus’ commentary on Ecclesiastes; while some scholars consider it to be a commentary, others regard it as a catena.12

10 Theodora Boli under the supervision of Dieter Hagedorn of Heidelberg university prepared the new critical edition of the Olympiodorus Commentary on Ecclesiastes.
11 CPG. vol. 4
12 The reason for this disagreement lies in the fact that Olympiodorus used the works of early authors without naming them. There are frequent uses of the lemma ἄλλος in his commentary, and the difficulty here is that it is impossible to say that they are direct borrowings, because none of them have been pinned
In addition the short collection of scholia found in codex Hierosolymitani Tάφου 370 also depends on Catena Polychronius. There are differences between Polychronius and Olympiodorus in word order, and in the amount of exegesis. The Polychronius Catena is shorter (and Faulhaber calls it ‘mechanische Auszugscatene’) but at the same time it has some additional material which does not derive from the Olympiodoros Catena. Scholarship suggests that Olympiodorus served as one of the sources for the Catena Polychronius.

It is possible to see Catena Polychronii and Catena Barberiniana as probable sources for the Church Slavonic translation since they contain a number of loci communes with Olympiodorus. However, at present it is hard for me to come to any conclusions and draw parallels between the Church Slavonic translation and its untraced Greek source since we still do not have critical editions of all the catenae on Ecclesiastes.

Greek and Slavonic florilegia.

Excerpts from a catena on Ecclesiastes are found in various Slavonic florilegia in the form of questions and answers. The genre of aporiai or erotapokriseis was rooted in the Hellenistic tradition of glossa and scholia, and played an important part in Byzantine exegesis (Marcos 2000:275). Treating a topic by means of a series of questions and
down as direct quotations. Hagedorn and Hagedorn do not think of the Olympiodorus commentary as a catena, however, postulating that a sequence of quotations and the use of someone’s arguments do not turn a commentary into a catena. They do not specify, however, the criteria that distinguish a catena from a commentary (Hagedorn and Hagedorn 1984: XXXIX-XL).

13 The Catena Barberiniana is a double palimpsest containing the commentaries on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. An additional intriguing point is that it contains fragments of the Church Slavonic translation of the Oktoix in the Serbian recension. Slavists have known Catena Barberiniana for some time, see Lavrov (1914:173), Lunt (1958:196), Džurova (1985:179-82). The most recent publication is by Totomanova (1996: 26-40), who published the fragments of the Church Slavonic Oktoix-Paraklitik.

The Catena Barberiniana is of special interest to me since it contains a number of anonymous comments on passages that are also commented on in the Church Slavonic translation. The existence of these passages was revealed by Labate, who does not give a transcript but lists the folia on which they occur. I was prompted to look at the microfilm of the Catena Barberiniana in order to find out whether these passages bear any resemblance to the corresponding passages in the Church Slavonic translation. A brief preliminary examination of the microfilm of the Catena Barberiniana during my recent research trip to Göttingen did not reveal any parallels with the Church Slavonic catena, but further investigation will be needed.

14 The Italian scholars of the so-called Messina group are working at present on a critical edition, and so far Leanza has only published the fragments of the Procopius catena and Labate has published Catena Hauniensis. When more critical editions are printed, they may help to elucidate the possible source for the Church Slavonic translation.
answers, it was particularly suited to biblical exegesis as many passages in the OT posed problems of inconsistency and contradictions. Theodoret of Cyrrhus was famous as the author of such works, his *Questions on the Octateuch* being an example. This work was translated into Church Slavonic (Slavova 2000:8).

Put together around the 5th century, numerous Byzantine collections of excerpts or testimonies of ancient patristic writers, most often of an edifying nature, arose out of a need for teaching or for polemics associated with various schools of thought. Being subject to further reworking, these collections would be extended with new articles when new issues caught the attention of theologians. Some collections appear to have enjoyed a wide circulation, the custom of the prescribed monastic readings being one of the reasons underlying this. For historians these collections present a dual interest: firstly, they frequently preserve important fragments of lost works; secondly, these compilations allow us to establish the average level and scope of historic and dogmatic knowledge in a certain epoch. They tell us more about the readers than about the writers.

Medieval Slavs were familiar with this type of exegesis. Several works, such as the *Pandects of Antioch*, *Questions and Answers* of Anastasius of Sinai, etc. are known in the early Church Slavonic translations. The elementary unit composed of question and answer could be easily added to or taken out of florilegia. This factor has caused a certain instability and fluidity of the erotapokriseis texts included in florilegia. This is important for my investigation, since it is only by examination of the fragments of the catena on *Ecclesiastes* that we can shed some light on the question whether a complete translation of the catena ever existed. 15

The first step is to look at the fragments of the catena on *Ecclesiastes* that are present in the oldest surviving manuscript. Based on the commentary of Olympiodorus, they are included in the Izbornik of the 13th century, an exegetic florilegium, compiled from Slavonic sources, almost all of Old Bulgarian provenance. Since Helena Wątrolska has transcribed this text, I shall use the text in her transcription, introducing where appropriate slight changes in word division.

---

15 At the moment not all the fragments of the catena are available to me, therefore I intend to return to this question in the future.
Comparison of fragments of the catena.

The same passages with commentaries that are preserved in the Izbornik are present also in Und.13 and Eccl, therefore it is interesting to compare these. In the case of the Izbornik and Undol’skij 13, only one copy of the text has survived; consequently, it is hard and often impossible to judge what belongs to the text itself and what was on occasion introduced by a scribe either unconsciously or deliberately.

I quote the Church Slavonic text from the Izbornik, giving variant readings from Und.13 and Eccl. For Eccl here and elsewhere I use variant readings from Pg.1. If there are further divergences within the Eccl version, I quote separate MSS.

Verses for which we have parallels in all three MSS. 17

2:14 μουδρομογ ὁ ἐγγόνος ἐστὰ III μεθοδήμων ἐστὰ IV τὸ ὑπὸ χαίνει (lzb.) 18
T. Глава выше всего тълата есть. ножъ же низъко къ земли прикасеатса са. тъмо и
къда ика охъмуть чтъ походятъ. въныихъ смотрѣвать. а не иже на земли. таковыми
въ главѣ оны иматъ. икѣдѣ же ли въ земныхъ помышалъ имать. въ ногою имать они къ
земныхъ приливай.
T. б. Глава церкви Хсъ. к неиже мудрыи възира сходить. такоже е и онъ. а реку Хсъ.
vъ главѣ оны имать. мудрыи же въ тъмъ ходить. екѣдѣ земныхъ хра. омраченна
имъ вѣдою. наже есть охъмъ.

(Und.13)

οξόμη ωνημα ναιριαεται и во главѣ его именуетъ сърдцъ выписръ а не низъ ико оширенъ охомъ
во главѣ предышаетъ сърдцъ выписръ зриать а егда въ земныхъ прилежитъ тогда бывалъ
омраченвемъ низъ.

(Eccl)

Толкъ.
Охъмъ головою именуетъ егда охъмъ шчиститъ тогда выписръ зриать а егда въ земныхъ
tогдѣ охи низъ.

16 Watrobska. 1987:ii.
17 Verse 2:14 is on f.174 with the title ἀνεκανιστὰ. The verses 7:4, 10:1-2 with comments are on ff.152-
153 with the title ἤται ἀνεκανιστὰ σε ἐκκυκσεμίνα. Short quotations 4:12 and 11:2 are discussed in chapter 3.
18 Here and afterwards the variant readings are given in the footnotes. 1 μάρτυρο Und.13, Eccl. II om. Und.13.
With regard to the biblical passage we can see that differences in the use of cases unite Eccl and Und.13 against the Izbornik: there is dative case in the Izbornik and genitive in Und.13 and Eccl. The absence in the biblical passage of the dual form of the verb ‘to be’ in Und.13 and Eccl could be a sign of more literal translation of the Greek text, where the auxiliary verb is not present.

The commentary in the Izbornik differs from the ones in Und.13 and Eccl: the former corresponds to the Greek text of the commentary of Olympiodorus of Alexandria PG 500D, while the two other commentaries do not have exact parallels in Olympiodorus’ text. The commentary in Eccl is shorter than in Und.13: these are different commentaries though they express similar ideas. There is a possibility that they may have been revised and shortened by Slavonic editors.¹⁹

The Greek parallel is found in Olympiodorus PG 561B.

The reading beceÄ in the biblical text itself in Und.13 and Eccl corresponds to the standard Greek text, where we have ēφρασώντως, while the reading in Izb. does not. In the commentaries there is slight variation in word order, as well as morphological variation. The expression ὁ τὰ τοῦ ἀπόθανον ἀπὸ τῆς σοφίας –‘from decay’ was probably corrupted in a common Church Slavonic source for Und.13 and Eccl into ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς – ‘from grief’. All three versions share the confusion of τραυματίζω –’delight’ with τραυματίζω –’food’ in na piņiu.

¹⁹ Compare the opinion of Evseev (1897: 166) on the reduction of comments on the book of Isaiah. He thought that Byzantine compilers of the catena did the initial abridgement and a Slavonic translator could have taken part in some further modifications.


If the variants shared by Und.13 and Eccl go back to a common Church Slavonic source, then this is important for the interpretation of their textual relationship.

Passages in Izbornik and Eccl which do not have a parallel in Und.13.

10:1 Чьмо мало мощрости, паче славы великий беозумы. (Izb.)
Т. Прославиша са много, въ везаомисы множество, ие въ мирѣ бьшатъ и грядъ въикъ. ие въникшена мощрость. въ сохотыныхъ трудящися са. въ ни прикладникъ длна неизвѣстн. кро и начинан по бѣко мощрости, въ той въ вѣдимъ и прикасати са въ начинанъ. (Izl.)

The Greek parallel is in Olympiodorus PG 596A.

The variant reading въ беозумы in Eccl has a basis in Greek ἀφροσυνη, whereas the reading in Izb. apparently has not. The preposition ὑπ. vs. ἐπι can be easily explained on paleographical grounds: it is very easy to miss the upper letter τ in this ligature.

10:2 съцие мограомо въ сећени иго. съцие же беозумомо въ шиоци иго. (Izb.)
Т. съцие овмь разумѣти. телесномъ въ срѣде всегда на щивому мѣстѣ лежить въ оутросѣ. ие зовомок перепона. тѣмъ же муцараго овмь всегда лѣпис и ухилана. разумѣти же и дѣлать. беозумаго же овмь зла и противна мѣткѣ.

The Greek parallel is in Olympiodorus PG 596B.

There is no equivalent in the Greek text of the PG for the third instance of the noun овмь found in Izb., which in this case might have been inserted by an oversight under the influence of муцараго овмь. The variation displayed in these texts is usual in the process of multiple copying. The translation is very literal, and follows the Greek word for word in the passages corresponding to those of Olympiodorus (with the exception of the verb дѣлать in 10:2).

---

22 мъррар Sol. II ие om. Pg.1, Sol., TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof.
23 мъррар Sol. И енже om. Pg.1, Sol., TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof.
We recognize that the passages based on Olympiodorus were translated literally, however, we cannot say this with certainty about the other comments in 2:14 because their possible Greek prototypes are unknown. If the Slavonic compilers used a shortened Greek version, that would mean that their sources were different while if they abridged it themselves they could have used the same source. Although the amount of material is very limited and does not allow much textual comparison, still there is a small overlap of 15 commentated verses between Und.13 and Eccl which are compared below.

Comparison of commentaries between the commentated and interpolated versions.

Verses with commentary that do coincide in one or both texts are listed below; however in a few instances there are biblical verses which have comments attached to them that are present in one text but not in the other. There is one place (2:14) where the comments in Und.13 and Eccl diverge significantly. I indicate the divergencies with the * sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Und.13</th>
<th>Eccl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2:14</td>
<td>≠</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4:6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 4:9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 4:10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 5:5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 7:2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 7:3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 7:4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 7:5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 7:6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 7:15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 7:16-17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 7:18 25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 7:19-20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 7:21-22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one looks at the transcript of EccC and EccI one can observe the coincidence not only in content but also in wording. This is why it is unlikely that these versions of the

25 There is an interpolation in 7:18 of Und. 13, a quotation from Skorina’s translation (Thomson: 1998, 844, footnote 1127).
commentary result from two independent acts of translation from Greek. If one compares
the commentary in EccC and EccI, one finds a number of places (5:5, 7:2-3) where
divergences in wording could be explained as errors or misunderstandings by copyists of
the EccI tradition and variants in 7:6 seem to be errors in the EccC tradition.

5:5 веостраеть на похоть (Und.13) vs. охыстращеть на похоть (EccI)

In this case we can find a corresponding passage in the Greek commentary of
Olympiodorus (see PG 93, 541A), therefore веостраети corresponds to the Greek
ἐρεθίζειν – 'to provoke, to excite', while охыстращети на похоть means 'to hasten for
lust'. Such a change in the verb could easily happen during copying within the Church
Slavonic tradition, especially when both verbs make sense in this collocation.

7:2 гонацие сикеръ (Und.13) vs. ғгөналчы (EccI)

This part of the comment is found in the longer version of Olympiodorus’ commentary.
A scribe perhaps did not understand the expression гонацие сикеръ – 'distilling fermented
liquor' with the Greek loanword σίκερα or сикъ going in turn back to a Semitic
loanword, and сикеръ was consequently dropped and the collocation changed into
ғголчы. The lexeme сикеръ, сикера was known in Church Slavonic translated texts of
the Gospels Luke 1:15 и вина и сикера не имать пити. 26

7:6 невидящимъ (Und.13) vs. невидящимъ (EccI)

The Greek reading is μὴ ὀρώσω PG 93, 561C (such lapsus calami as in Und. 13 could
occur during copying).

7:6 разиимъ (in the mg. образъем) (Und.13) vs. образъетъ (EccI) χαρακτηρίζει

26 Our collocation may be an example of one of the earliest usages of the expression meaning 'to distil an
alcoholic drink', cf. modern Russian 'гнать водку'.


The verb χαρακτηρίζειν – 'to designate' is a comparatively late verb in the Greek language, used by the Church Fathers. The equivalent ἐφανέρωσεν in Eccl is an unusual, but nevertheless an acceptable translation, whereas the reading in Und.13 is hard to explain. Could it be a marginal remark which got into the text? There was obviously a correction by an editor of Und.13 against some manuscript of the Eccl type.

7:18 ΒΟΙΑΝΙΜ ΣΑ (Und.13) vs. omission (Eccl).

Likewise one can find in Eccl some evidence of change which could be deliberate (the abridged comment in 2:14, sporadic East Slavonicisms, such as ρόλοςος in 2:14. There is no certainty, however, with regard to the lexical variation in Eccl such as ἰμανύθη in 2:14, μιρισίζονα in 7:4 (as in Izbornik), назвывается in 7:22 simply because it is just as likely that Und.13 has changed reading here. These peculiarities in the tradition of Eccl suggest that Eccl may be a revised version derived from a fuller text of EccC than is known in Und.13. Moreover, the fluidity in a number of comments attached to biblical verses might have arisen through selection from a fuller source.

The limited number of biblical passages common to Und.13 and Eccl prevents extensive textual comparison. There is, however, a much larger overlap between the biblical material in Und.13 and EccP. In the next sections I offer a textual analysis of the text of Ecclesiastes in all three versions in order to explore the relationship between them and to see whether they share a common source.

Possible influence of commentated texts in EccC and Eccl on their biblical texts.

In the previous section we looked at the comments shared between commentated and interpolated versions. Our next step will be the comparison of biblical verses in commentated and continuous texts. But before proceeding with this comparison we need to analyse the similarity which exists between the biblical text in the commentated versions and the commentaries that accompany them. Such similarity suggests without a doubt that there has been some interaction between them. One possibility might be the
influence of commentary texts in EccI and EccC on the wording in the biblical verses. Another possibility is the opposite of the first one, that is the influence of biblical verses on commentary. Influence of the commentary on EccC (and also EccI) is best observed in the verses presented below. I quote the Church Slavonic text from the GB manuscript as a representative of the continuous tradition.

2:24 ὁ πάγεται καὶ ὁ πίεται καὶ ὁ δείξει

The text is not continuous in the commentary: the passage is separated from a biblical verse by a number of lines. In Boli’s edition MSS EIKcom. omit the relative pronoun before the verb δείξει.

2:26 τὸ προσκίνει καὶ τὸ συναγαγεῖν ... καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης

The verb ποιητι in Und.13 may have been inserted mistakenly by a scribe into the biblical verse from the commentary, where the expression ποιητι καὶ συναγαγεῖν is written next to the expression ἁνὴρ καὶ συναγαγεῖν.

4:14 ὁ χαὶ γε ἐν βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐγεννηθή πένης

The final verb ποιηθεῖ τὸ in the commented version belongs to the commentary and not to the text itself and by some oversight may have been added from the commentary since the whole expression is repeated again later in the commentary. It seems as though most of the phrase from the commentary has been substituted for the biblical one.

7:14 ὁ τίσιοι αὐτοῦ μηδέν

The phrase θα σοκοῦν γνῆτα in EccP vs. θα νεῶ γνῆτομε in EccC = θα νεῶ γνῆτομε in the Commentary.
HP critical apparatus - \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \varepsilon \zeta \) Ald.

The wording of EccP follows the standard Greek text of the LXX. Though the pronoun \( \eta \varepsilon \kappa \eta \) could reflect the Greek variant gen. sing. \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \varepsilon \zeta \) found in the critical apparatus of Holmes and Parsons, the influence of the wording from the commentary seems to be a more likely possibility.

10:7 \( \dot{\omega} \zeta \delta \dot{\omega} \lambda \delta \sigma \varepsilon \) \( \epsilon \pi \tau \iota \tau \chi \gamma \xi \)

\( \text{λάκα ραμ} \) \( \nu \chi \varepsilon \omega \lambda \nu \) in EccP vs. \( \eta k\nu m \) in EccI = \( \eta k\nu m \) in the Commentary.

The wording of EccP is closer to Greek. The word \( \eta k\nu m \) in the EccI usually translates the Greek \( \pi \xi \zeta \omega \varsigma \). Seemingly the verse in the EccI is not reproduced completely by an editor, since it misses the comparison.

There is a chance that these coincidences between biblical text and commentary appeared at a later stage in the copying of an original commentated version. For instance, a scribe’s eye could easily skip from one place to another similar one in the process of copying a commentated text. Indeed, we have seen examples of this happening with the plain text of Ecclesiastes. The layout of the text arranged in columns in the Appendix 2 may look deceptive. Whereas the passages in the commentary are separated from a biblical verse by a lot of text, in reality the same readings in a manuscript could be positioned quite close, let us say, on two parallel lines with nothing in between. But even if there was some text between them, it could still result in a common scribal error, especially with such repetitive text as Ecclesiastes. At the end all depends on the skill of an individual scribe and his experience in copying texts. Simple scribal eye skipping may explain some of the coincidental changes. However, this explanation is less suitable for other instances, for which a different interpretation is required.
The example below stands out from the rest because in this case we have evidence from both EccC and Eccl.

7:18 ἀντέχεσθαι το

The Greek middle verb ἀντέχεσθαι has several meanings: 'to hold on by', 'to cling to'; 'to care for', 'to support'; 'to resist'; 'to adhere'. It seems that the meaning 'to hold on by' is relevant to 7:18. The meanings of the verb βοηθήσατε are: 'to abstain from', 'to restrain oneself', 'to hold back'. Therefore it is more likely to translate the verb ἀνέχεσθαι - 'to hold oneself up', 'to bear up' rather than ἀντέχεσθαι in 7:18. According to LLP the active verb ναθανάται is an equivalent of ἀνέχεσθαι. LLP for the active verb ναθανάται - 'to endure' gives an equivalent ἀνέχεσθαι. It is possible that EccC, EccP and Eccl all reflect here a (mis?)reading of ἀνέχεσθαι as ἀνέχεσθαι, but EccP may have adopted a different sense of ἀνέχεσθαι from EccC and Eccl.

The word ἀνέχεσθαι is used in a quotation within the commentary. The use of the common reading ἀνέχεσθαι suggests that EccC and Eccl go back to a common source here. The reading βοηθήσατε in the plain text differs from the reading ἀνέχεσθαι in the two commentated versions, where the biblical verse could have been affected by the wording in the commentary. We need to consider which variant, ἀνέχεσθαι or βοηθήσατε, is original.

I suggest two scenarios which, in my view, offer possible explanations of the relationship among the versions on the basis of this difference in wording. In the first scenario we may consider the plain text as being primary. At a later stage somebody decided to produce a commentated version of Ecclesiastes. He took the Greek commented version, translated the commentaries from the Greek version and combined them with the already existing Church Slavonic text. Inherent to this scenario are certain possibilities which need to be examined. What evidence might be taken to support the claim that the plain text was primary? Given that the plain text was original, it would be easier to explain how ἀνέχεσθαι in 7:18 got into the text of commented versions. Not
satisfied for some reason with the reading въздержати са a scribe could have translated ἀντέχοσθαι by the verb приимати са.

In the second scenario we suppose the commentated text to be primary. In this case we may assume the plain text was extrapolated from the commentated one. But then the question arises: if EccP goes back to the earliest version of the commentated text, how does it get the reading въздержати са? We need to make a further assumption that extrapolation was done with some occasional reference to Greek and that the example of въздержати са was just such a case of referring back to Greek and translating it differently. It must be said though that the example 7:18, in addition to the opposition of въздержати са to приимати са, has several other peculiarities which cannot be easily explained; these peculiarities will be discussed later. Though both scenarios have possibilities, we need to examine whether the textual evidence supports them.

Besides the examples already examined there are other cases worthy of consideration. These demonstrate that there may be more influence from the commentary on the wording in the biblical text.

2:25 ὅτι τίς φάγεται καὶ τίς φέσεται
αὸκο κτὸς πῖετη ὑνὶ κτὸ ἔστη in EccP vs. αὸκο κτὸ πῖετη ὑνὶ in EccC = ἐμὲ πῖετη in the Commentary.

3:19 συνάντησε τοῦ κτήμους
σαβχαν σκότηνα in EccP vs. σαβχαν σκοτεί in EccC = σαβχαν σκοτεί in the Commentary.

With regards to this example and to the one in 7:1 it is not possible for me to decide which version is more literalistic in translating the Greek construction of genitive of possession.27

4:12 ἀπορράγησεν
περεβρὰτ ὑα in EccP vs. παστέργατεν ὑα in EccC = παστέργατεν ὑα in the Commentary.

27 The presence of both constructions was observed by Karačorova (1989:179-80) in the 14th century Psalter redactions.
The two words appear to be synonyms, but in EccP the verb is used in the plural form. The only known attestation of the plural form in Greek is the verb διαρρήγνυμαι in the accompanying commentary according to Boli’s edition of Olympiodorus.

5:9 ἐν πλήθει αὐτῶν γένημα ἢ β' μικροστεφ ής 'ν ημοιο in EccP vs. β' μικροστεφ ής Πασάμ in EccC = ὁ θεμνυμον Πασάμ in the Commentary.

Rahlfs’s critical apparatus: αὐτοὶ AS, γενήματα S; Boli’s reconstructed text - γενήματα

It seems that on this occasion the reading Πασάμ in Und. 13 is a more regular translation of the Greek text (it reflects the plural Greek form γενήματα) than the reading θεμνυμο in EccP. The Greek noun γένημα - 'product, fruit' is generally translated with the Church Slavonic θεμνυτο, cf. the quotation in LLP from the text of Proverbs 15:29 in the oldest Slavonic Grigorovičev and Zaharjin parimejniks: θεμνυμο Πασάμ θεμνυμο έν ημηρόδολ - γενήματα. As a parallel I can refer to verse 6:10 in the Church Slavonic translation of the Song of Songs where the word θεμνυτο is preserved only in the East Slavonic redaction while the South Slavonic MSS give θεμνυτο. Alekseev (1983:240) considers the word θεμνυτο to have been the original translation; according to him, θεμνυμο was not a recognized translation of γένημα, nor was it semantically motivated, whereas θεμνυτο is well attested in the texts of the Psalter, Apostol [Acts and Epistles], and Prophetologium, cf. LLP. Overall, I would not rule out the possibility that θεμνυτο could be simply a corruption of θεμνυτο. Yet it is impossible to say exactly at what stage this corruption might have occurred.

However, if we suppose that the plain text was primary and gave rise to the commented version, then the lexeme θεμνυτο could have been the original reading in the plain text. In this instance the translator of the commented version might have considered θεμνυτο to be a wrong translation and corrected it from Greek by choosing instead the word Πασάμ. In this case we might conjecture the same scenario as the one with the verb β'δερκατη in 7:18 (with the plain text as original).

28 Cf., however, the variant readings Πασάμ γενημα in place of καταγον γενημα in verse 106:37.
5:10 τί ἀνδρεία
κατορθεὶς μυστερίῳ in EccP vs. καὶ μυθήστω in EccC = καὶ ἔρχε μυστερίῳ in the Commentary.

7:1 καὶ θεοτόκοι
ἀνδραὶ in EccP vs. ἀνδραὶ EccC = ἀνδραὶ in the Commentary.

In EccP we find a Preslav word ἀνδραὶ which may have been regarded as standard in the 15th century.

7:1 ἡμέρα τοῦ θειάτου
ἀπὸ τοῦ σκότους in EccP vs. ἀπὸ σκότους in EccC = ἀπὸ τοῦ σκοτί in the Commentary.

7:16 περισσότερον
βελλίθ in EccP vs. ηλιασμένες in EccC and λισσέ in EccL = ηλιασμένες in the commentaries (to 7:17).

The adverb ηλιασμένες is not listed in the LLP, only the form ηλιασμά. The variant λισσέ is a more exact translation of the Greek περισσότερον than βελλίθ. I presume that the wording of the commentary ηλιασμένες could be behind the reading in both EccC and EccL. On the other hand, the scribe/editor of EccP could have written the adverb βελλίθ a second time in the same sentence by an oversight under the influence of the same adverb immediately preceding it: οὐ τί πραβεδέλθε βελλίθ.

8:4 λάλει
γαλή in EccP vs. λαβεῖν in EccL = λαβεῖν in the Commentary.

8:8 καὶ οὐ διασώηται ἀσφαλεία τοῦ παρ' αὐτῆς καὶ ης ἐπετ θεοτεμεν εἴμας καὶ ἐν μέλλ in EccP vs. ης ἐπετ θεοτεμεν ἐφάμας καὶ ἐμε in EccL = ποιήθεκεμή in the Commentary.

HP: MS 261 - ἀσφαλεία, MS 296 - ἀσφαλής.

In EccL the noun ἀσφαλεία in genitive sing. may be interpreted as a direct object of the verb ἐπετ, while the passage in EccP is a formally closer rendering of the standard Greek text.
Out of the given examples three can be qualified as synonyms translating a single Greek word (4:12, 5:10, 7:1). There is, however, a difference in the number of the verb in example 4:12 and in 5:9 there is a possibility of corrupted reading in EccP.

These coincidences between the wording in commentary and the biblical verses in both EccI and EccC create a difficulty for determining the relationships among the three versions, in particular, for assuming that EccC, and not EccP, was primary. Yet I may argue that at the time when the original commented version (the precursor of both EccC and EccI) gave rise to EccP by way of removing the commentary from it, the wording in the biblical verses in the commented and plain text could have been similar to one another. The differences in wording might have been introduced later when the commented version was reduced to produce EccC and EccI.

In the following verses the readings in EccP are paralleled by the readings in the commentaries in EccC and EccI. However, it seems to me that these coincidences do not carry much weight, as they are mostly accidentals, which could easily happen either through scribal error, or in the process of copying.

1:11 οὐκ ἐστὶν μνήμη

In EccP = οὐκ ἔχεις παματί in the Commentary vs. οὐκ ἔχεις παματί in the biblical verse of EccC.

6:8 oíde

κέκτη in EccP = κέκτη in the Commentary vs. μακά in the biblical verse of Eccl.

7:5 ἐπιτίμησιν

ζαντρεμένει in EccP = ζαντρεμένει in the Commentary vs. πρεμενεί in the biblical verses of EccC and Eccl.

7:14 ἐν ἀγαθῷ

καὶ ἐκλή in EccP (καὶ in Pg.81) = ἀκομὴ ἐκλή in the Commentary vs. ὑπὸ ἔργῳ in the biblical verse of EccC.

10:3 ὅστερησεν

ληστὴ in EccP - οὐδεστὰτοι ληστὴ σα with ληστὰ σα and ληστὰς λοι in the Commentary vs. οὐδεστὰτοι στεστῆ in the biblical verse of Eccl.

The desire for semantic accuracy may have been behind the verb ληστὴ which is in this context and in 9:8 corresponds to the Greek verb ἔστρεμεν. The verb οὐδεστὰτοι usually translates the Greek verb λείπονθαν.

10:17 ἵσχοντες

κρασί in EccP = κρασί in the Commentary vs. βοάρυ in the biblical verse of Eccl.

However, apart from the cited examples that are transparent enough, there are others which confuse the picture. In the readings presented below could there be a different Greek behind the wording in EccP?

1:10 τοῦτο καλών οὐσίν - ὅστε σιμων ἐστί in EccP vs. οὐκ ἐστί in EccC.

The adverb σιμων usually translates the Greek adverb δυνατὸς. The reason behind the wording in EccP is not obvious.

3:16 ἐκεῖ ὁ ἁσθής - τῷ ἀγαθῆς ὑμῖν in EccP vs. τῷ ἄσθαντι ὑμῖν in EccC.

* ἐσθής MSS = Boli, Olympiodorus

Rahlfs, reasoning that it might be a more difficult reading, placed the word ἁσθής twice in this verse. In doing so he followed the text in Grabe and Compl. Ald. These editions
conform with the reading of Latin and Masoretic texts where a pessimistic view is expressed by stating that there is iniquity in both places.

There are two problems here. Both Church Slavonic readings diverge from the standard Greek text. Firstly, the case of the adjective $\text{πάροχος τεμάχιον}$ in the continuous text cannot be explained by the variant reading $\epsilonωβής$ found in Greek manuscripts, cf. the critical apparatus to Ecclesiastes in the edition of the LXX. Secondly, the noun $\text{неправедливость}$ found in EccC cannot be an exact equivalent of the Greek adjective $\epsilonωβής$. However, it must be said that in the earliest Church Slavonic texts a faithful, basically word-for-word translation does not necessarily entail grammatical equivalence. Whether a scribe had referred at that point to the Latin text with its ‘ibi iniquitas’ is open to speculation.

5:2 $\text{παραγίνεται ενύπνιαν - προιδέτες σοινίε} \text{ in EccP vs. προσόδετε σοινιε} \text{ in EccC}$
Rahlfs - $\text{ενύπνιαν om. in S}$

The variant in EccP is a somewhat unusual translation of the Greek $\epsilonυύπνιον$, since the noun $\text{σοινίε}$ commonly translates the Greek $\text{κατάβασις}$.

8:8 $\text{ἀποστολή} \text{ - εδών in EccP vs. ποσα in Eccl and ποσαλία Commentaty.}$

The Church Slavonic equivalent in Eccl is a closer rendering of the standard Greek text while the translation in EccP is freer. The reason behind the wording in EccP is not obvious, making it problematic.

The above examples show the influence of the wording in the commentary on the biblical text and the occasional curious wording in the plain text. But we cannot limit ourselves to only these examples and need to explore other features in the commentated and plain versions which could explain their relationship.
Comparison of the verses in commentated and continuous texts.

I start with omissions which distinguish the two texts, EccC and EccP, because they may be indicative of their textual relationship. However, the omissions do not carry the same weight here as evidence because the commentated texts are so fragmentary.

Omissions in Und.13 but not in EccP.

1:6 ἐπιστρέφει τὸ πνεῦμα

οὐραὶ αὐτ. (Und.13)

οὐραὶ αὐτ. ἀχ. (EccP)

1:7 αὐτοὶ ἐπιστρέφουσιν τοῦ πορευόμενοι

τι αὐτ ὁμαραμάτων. (Und.13)

ti ca oμαrhoμαtoo wth. (EccP)

2:26 καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης καὶ προσάρευς πνεῦματος

καὶ σε ετέ cβητ (Und.13)

καὶ σε cβητ ἀχα (EccP)

5:9 καὶ γε τοῦτο ματαιότης

καὶ γε σε cβητ (EccP)

6:8 ὅτι τίς περισσεία ...

παραν cβοιλαὶ (Und.13)

παραν cβοιλαὶ (EccP)

Rahlfs’s critical apparatus: τίς om. BS* ; HP: τίς MSS 106, 161, 248, 252, 261, 296, 298, Comp., Alex.

7:19 ἡ σοφία βοηθᾷ τῷ σοφῷ

πρεμ'ρος τῷ μάδαρο (Und.13)

πρεμ'ρος τῷ μάδαρο (EccP)

In the margin of MS 252 according to HP’s critical apparatus there is a variant reading ἐνισχύει τῶν σοφῶν.

Variation μάδαρο vs. μάδαρο.
Thomson (1998:794-5) demonstrates how the process of incomplete extrapolation of a biblical text from its catena can occur. Yet his description of the book of *Job* also illustrates the difficulties experienced by a medieval Slav scribe when faced with the task of selecting material from a catena for the compilation of a florilegium. The first 4 examples demonstrate the omission of the last word in the biblical verse. This word is followed by commentary. In such instances it would not be easy for a scribe to separate the biblical text from the commentary. And it is conceivable that omissions in Und. 13 could have come about through a process of extrapolation. In this case we have to assume that the text of Und. 13 is derived from a fuller version of the commentary. In the absence of any further evidence we cannot determine whether such omissions were a feature of the earliest Church Slavonic text.

If we assume that EccP could have derived in part from the commentated version (which would have been a more complete source than the extant Und.13), how we are to explain omissions that occur in Und.13 and not in EccP? We may presume that either the earlier version of Und. 13 was free from these omissions (in which case we need to allow the possibility that omissions in the antigraph of Und.13 happened at some later stage in the process of reducing the number of verses in the catena), or that the compiler of EccP could have filled the missing words by referring back to Greek.

**Omissions in EccP but not in Und.13**

3:21 εἰς ἄνω καὶ πνεύμα τοῦ κτήμους εἰ καταβαίνει αὐτὸ κάτω
    
    (Und.13) 30

3:21 (EccP) 30

There is an omission of εἰς ἄνω - κτήμους in Boli’s MS Γ₁com., which could suggest flawed manuscript tradition.

4:15 μετὰ τοῦ νεανίσκου τοῦ δεύτερου
    
    (Und.13)

4:15 (EccP)

30 For omissions in EccP see the previous chapter.
7:14 αὐτοῦ add. S

Rahlfs's critical apparatus shows that in MS S the pronoun is added.

HP: + αὐτοῦ in MSS 147, 157, 159, 298, 299, Ald.

The following omissions in EccP could be accounted for as errors during the subsequent copying process (3:21 and possibly 4:15). In 7:14 it is possible that the plain Church Slavonic text was at that point close to the tradition of the Greek manuscripts 23, 68, 106, etc. where the pronoun αὐτοῦ is omitted. The only omission shared by Und.13 and EccP is in 4:4 where the Greek word ζηλος -'zeal' is missing. Whether this loss had already taken place in Greek or only in Church Slavonic is not known.

The plain text of Ecclesiastes has a number of omissions, which however do not occur in Und.13. The reason for these omissions is not known. One possible explanation is that there was an earlier and 'better' version of EccP which was free of omissions than the one that has survived. The other interpretation is that these omissions in EccP would have been filled in Und.13 with the caveat that the missing words were added in the process of compiling the commentated version by consulting the Greek. This in turn presupposes the plain text being primary. There exists also the possibility that EccP was extrapolated from EccC and material was lost in the process (that is the same type of error as we assume between EccC and its hypothetical source).

Though omissions are important, neither of these can clinch the argument, and we should examine other textual features to find out which hypothesis they support: that of the plain or the commentated text being primary.

Lexical variants.

The variants in this section could belong to two different types. One is lexical substitution viewed here as a feature of deliberate redaction. The other is the gradual evolution and corruption of the text.
2:21 σὺ* μόχθος
ιππε τράξη (Und.13)
ιππε τράξη (EccP)
*στι MSS, σφ Alex.

There is a problem with the variant ιππε found in the continuous text which cannot be immediately resolved. The replacement of ιππε with ιππε seems to be an unlikely one unless it is considered a scribal mistake. One explanation for this variant reading is that it may go back to the reading στι of Greek manuscripts in Grabe’s edition as indicated in the critical apparatus of the LXX. These variant readings point to independent use of Greek for EccC and EccP.

The next example can be regarded as scribal error (through oversight) within the Church Slavonic tradition.

2:24 ἐν μόχθῳ αὐτοῦ
προ τράξη συνεσι (Und.13)
προ ζευστά συνεσι (EccP)

The reading προ ζευστά could have appeared as reminiscence, unconsciously inserted by a scribe, of similar readings in the Church Slavonic text in 3:12, 6:12, 9:3, 9:9.

The evidence for the lexical variants is sparse and does not allow us to form conclusions. The example in 2:21 suggests that the text of EccP or EccC might have been revised against the Greek. (Such revision was a common practice at the time for books normally used in liturgy. However, non-liturgical texts probably were not routinely revised against Greek). Part of this revision might have been to introduce a range of words considered to be more standard at the time.

Variation in translation technique (literalism).

Note the difference in usage of the genitive and nominative cases with negation: Und.13 follows the Greek more closely.

2:24 οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθόν
ιππε εἰς εἰ (Und.13)
ιππε εἰς ἐλάσω (EccP)
4:13 ὁσφός
πρεμ'ρυ (Und.13)
mδρυ (EccP)

7:12 περισσεία γυνώσκων τῆς ὁσφίας
ισουσιαίε ραγδώσ πρεμ'ροστ (Und.13)
ισουσιαίε ῥαγδα ραγδα τιμ (EccP)
1 - πρεμ'ροστ written twice in Und.13

The variation in Und.13 may go back to Greek, cf. Rahlfs's critical apparatus to 7:12 where S has the reading τῇ ὁσφίᾳ in dative rather than genitive case and η ὁσφία is preposed to the verb ἐωστοῆσε in S (it is also preposed in MSS 147, 157, 159, 259, Ald. in the critical apparatus of HP).

A limited number of examples, taken on their own, do not allow me to establish a pattern and decide whether they characterise two different redactions or are simply modifications introduced in the course of subsequent copying.

Transposition.

2:25 φαγεται καὶ τίς πίεται
αετῇ ὃς πίετ (Und.13)
πίετ, ἢ μὴ αετ (EccP)

3:18 αὐτοὶ κτήνη εἶσιν
ἐίν συῖ κοτῖ (Und.13)
κοτῖ σύτ (EccP)

3:19 ἐπερίσσευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος
ισδίσειν χαὶ ἢματ (Und.13)
ισδίσειν ἢματ χαὶ (EccP)

4:10 ὅπο ἰᾶμ
αικο ἀμή (Und.13)
ἀμή ἀικο (EccP)
4:12 οὖ ταχέως
νέο σκορό (Und.13)
σκορό νέο (EccP)

4:13 βασιλέα πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἄφονα
στάρα ιύρα βεζυμνα (Und.13)
ιύρα στάρα ἡ βεζυμνα (EccP)

7:14 καὶ ἐν ημέρᾳ κακίας ἴδε
καὶ καθάδους μικρὰς κακώσει
ἐνχος'ενεμ' ὕλος ἐν μνημείῳ (Und.13)
ἐνχος'ενεμ' νομίζω ὕλος (EccP)

Cf. Rahlfs’s critical apparatus to Ecclesiastes 7:14 in the edition of the LXX where we find the transposed word order in ΣΤV ἴδε ἐν ημέρᾳ κακίας. The same word order is found in the commentated text of Olympiodorus in Boli’s edition.

It is not easy to decide whether transposition in these examples has occurred in Church Slavonic or in Greek as transposition is very common in Greek MSS. Consequently transposition is less helpful in determining the textual relationship between Und.13 and EccP.

As we can see, variation in translation technique, transposition and lexical variants are not entirely helpful in determining the textual relationship between Und.13 and EccP. Thus the case rests mostly on the evidence of corruptions and omissions in EccP. However, we cannot totally rely on omissions for these could have been filled in the process of producing either plain or commentated versions. At the same time the exact stage at which the corruptions (2:24 and 7:22) had occurred in EccP is not known, but I could speculate that they happened after the plain text was extracted from commentated, or alternatively, the better and fuller readings in Und.13 may reflect an earlier and less corrupt version of EccP. As a result the evidence presented above is not quite sufficient to determine the textual relationship between Und.13 and EccP.
Comparison of verses in interpolated and continuous texts.

The following sentence, quoted in full, shows the differences in lexis and grammar that point to different versions.

10:8 δόρυσων βόθρον ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπεσεῖται καὶ καθαρρόντα φραγμὸν ὁδήγεται αὐτὸν δόφις
κοπάλ τις καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐθανάτῳ ἐφράζεται ἡ γῆ (EccP)
ῥύμαι ῬΩΜ. ἐθανάτῳ ἑαυτῷ, καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν ΠΩ (Eccl).

I cannot ascertain whether these passages are different reworkings of an original translation, i.e. redactions, or different translations. I prefer to use instead the word version which because of its looser meaning can be applied in equal measure to both redaction and translation.

Prima facie it looks as if the passage in EccP might reflect an earlier tradition than Eccl; which in turn would mean a corruption in Church Slavonic followed by scribal attempts to improve the text in Eccl. It is possible that there was a confusion of justy in a hypothetical middle-Bulgarian exemplar (if such one existed), i.e. smēa changed into smik which led to the form zlēniv. The word ozhrniv in Eccl may be a corruption of the verb γράφεται.

Another, though somewhat weaker suggestion is that ozhrniv may go back to the Greek verb δέξεται (3rd. p. sg. fut.) from δέρκωμαι - 'to see clearly'. The verb δῆξεται - 'he will bite' had already become corrupted in the Greek textual tradition into forms δείξεται from δεικνύω - 'to show' and δέχεται from δέχεσθαι - 'to receive' which are attested in Greek MSS. 31 The fact that such corruptions occur in the Greek tradition makes it easier to suggest a possible misreading of the Greek word by a Slavonic translator. In the first part of the verse a scribe of Eccl may have alluded to the comparable wording of Proverbs 26:37 and the Psalter 7:16. Lexical variants displayed in these versions are noted in the relevant section on pages 136-7.

31 These variants readings are noted in the collation book on Ecclesiastes at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen.
Omissions.

7:28 σώι ευρον ἀνθρωπον
        ιπ εν ωιρτοχ θάκα (EccP)
        μυσα ωμρή (EccI)

8:3 εὰν θελήσῃ ποιήσει
        αιμε εστωρή' (EccP)
        αιμε βοεχτιτη κεστωρή (EccI)

The verb βοεχτιτην -'to seize' in EccI may be a corruption of the verb βεσχοτκητην - 'to wish'.

9:4 αὐτὸς ἅγεθος ὑπὲρ τὸν λέοντα τὸν νεκρὸν.
        το βάριν παρε λεα μρηκα (EccP)
        το ε βάριν πεχα λγακς (sic) (EccI)

It looks as if the biblical verse in EccI containing the erroneous reading (which will be discussed later on page 140) was not reproduced in full.

Omissions in the interpolated version may have arisen because the passages would not necessarily be reproduced in full.

Lexical variants.

As in the earlier section on lexical variants lexical substitution here is regarded as a feature of deliberate redaction. The variants in the examples below are synonyms which render the same word in Greek.

7:28 ἀνθρωπον
        θάκα (EccP)
        μυσα (EccI)

Both expressions would appear to correspond to the same word in Greek because μυσα can be used to translate ἀνθρωπος, e.g. Pr. 3:13 in the Zaharjin parimejnik: βλασκην μυσα ηκε οβρκτε μοχροτζ, while in the Grigorovičev parimejnik we have in the
corresponding passage the variant χαστική. However, in the critical apparatus of HP the
variant ἀνέρα is found in MSS 106 and 261.

8:2 ἔνθα στουδάσας
   ἐν τῇμιም ἑα (EccP)
   ἐν τοχοὶ ἑα (EccI)

9:4 ἐλπίς
   μαρμέκα (EccP)
   ὅπωδενίς (EccI)

The example below may be motivated by divergent nuances of meaning or usage.

10:4 ἀνάβηθε
   καθα (EccP)
   καθα (EccI)

10:6 ἐν ὑψει μεγάλοις
   μα ψεστα δελεκχρ (EccP)
   μα ψεστα δελεκχρ (EccI)

The reading in EccI could be based on different Greek: according to HP the MS 106
contains the reading ἐν υψει, MS 248 ἐν υψώμασι. In MS 545 there is a correction
μεγάλου.32 Boli - ἐν υψει μεγάλοις DEIKcom.

10:8 ὁ ὀρύσαων βάθρουν
   καπαλα μας (EccP)
   ρούμπα μας (EccI)

10:16 ἐν πρωίσα
   χαντρα (EccP)
   ραχό (EccI)

Both Church Slavonic variants could be the equivalents of the Greek wording.33

11:3 πληρωθῶσιν
   ἱππαναν αἄ (EccP)
   ἱππανανα (EccI)

Variation in Greek could be behind the Church Slavonic variants here: MS B has the reading πληρωθῶσι. EccP is fairly consistent in translating the Greek verb πληροῦν with the same Church Slavonic equivalent, cf. 1:8 and 6:7.

It is not easy to distinguish between the modifications introduced by individual scribes and purposeful revisions giving rise to separate redactions. We may assume that variants which reflect variation in the Greek manuscripts are a sign of revision on the basis of the Greek text, however sporadic it may be. The other explanation which may be put forward is that synonyms could have been introduced piecemeal by scribes without referring to Greek. But the problem remains: how much can we distinguish between these two possibilities? For example, lexical revision could be introduced either with reference to Greek or independently of it. There are various possibilities which are open. Firstly, the Church Slavonic variant goes directly to a Greek variant. Secondly, a scribe might have looked at Greek and improved the translation. Thirdly, a scribe might have replaced the Church Slavonic reading with a synonym without looking at Greek. Thus we may be faced with instances of various types of revision without the ability to distinguish between them.

Variation in translation technique (literalism).

8:2 στόμα βασιλέως φύλαξ
οφετα νῦν εκρανι (EccP)
οφετας τι χρανι (EccI)

The differences in these two passages may be an indication of different redactions or versions. The wording of EccP is closer to Greek. This in turn would create a problem if EccP derived from a commentated version. The translator of the EccI may have been familiar with the expression στόμα βασιλέως, going back to the Hebrew phraseologism, as he rendered it as οφετας - 'commandment'. According to LLP οφετας - 'rule', 'principle', 'regulation' is a translation of Greek πρέπειον στόμα with an example given
from the Euchologion 69a8 ΤΑΧΥ ΒΟ ΟΥΣΤΑΤΥ ΕΣΤΥ ΟΤ ΕΙΔΑ ΠΡΕΔΗ ΕΗ. The translation of the expression ουστατυ πρα in the EccP is more literal than the one in the interpolation.

8:3 ὁτι πᾶν ὅ ἐν

ἐπάκο χα αείει ἀμή (EccP)
ελικό ἀμή (Eccl)

The change in subordinating expressions is a sign of a different version. The wording in EccP follows the standard Greek text word for word. This in turn would mean that EccP cannot simply be derived from Eccl.

10:2 καρδία σοφοὺ ... καρδία ἄφρονος
σφ' χε άδαρμο ... σφ' χε βεγάμων (EccP)
σφ' χε μγαρδοπ ... σφ' χε βεγαμων (Eccl)

10:2 εἰς δέζον αὐτοῦ

δ. δεζέον (EccP)
δ. δεζεον (Eccl)

10:5 ως ἀκούσαν

ἐχε νεβολον (EccP) νεβολον - TSL 730, gr. 3
ιπρο νεβολον (Eccl)

11:2 μερίδα τοις ἐπτὰ καὶ γε τοῖς ὀκτῶ

παί πασ; ἐν τοίν; (EccP)
παί πασ; τας; ωκμολυ (Eccl)

The text in EccP became corrupted at a late stage, since we find the correct reading πας τας; ωκμολυ in Pg.1 and other MSS in groups 1 and 3. The wording in Eccl is different from EccP even in group 1 and is comparable to the quotation used by Metropolitan Kliment Smoljatić (1147-1155, † after 1164) in his letter to the priest Thomas of Smolensk: δαμε πας τας; πασ; τας; ωκμολυ. 34 This parallel could suggest that a [Eccl?] translation of Ecclesiastes already existed in Kliment’s time. The question of quotations

34 Published by Ponyrko (1992:133)
from Ecclesiastes in translated and original medieval Slavonic literature is addressed in the next chapter.

11:3 καὶ ἐὰν πέσῃ ξύλον ἐν τῷ νότῳ

καὶ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΕΤ ΑΡΒΟ ΝΟΤΟΣ (EccP)

καὶ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΕΤ ΑΡΒΟ ΝΟΤΟΣ (EccI)

The Greek prepositional construction ἐν + dative case, which is itself a Hebraism in the LXX, may be rendered in Church Slavonic with the instrumental case without a preposition. Alternatively it may be translated with ἐν + locative case in closer correspondence with the Greek. This depends on the date and translation technique: ἐν + locative becomes more common in later translations.

In many respects EccP seems to be a literal translation of the standard Greek text, whereas this cannot be said about EccI because its Greek source is not known. How different Byzantine catenary texts were from the plain ones is not known. In the absence of a critical edition of the Greek Ecclesiastes the question must remain open.

Misreadings in the Church Slavonic text.

9:4 αὐτὸς ἡγεθος ὑπὲρ τῶν λεοντα τῶν νεκρῶν.

τὸ βάζο παῦλος λεα μέτα (EccP)

τὸ βάζο πεια λεας (sic) (EccI)

In the EccI we have a slip of a pen in the word παῦλος producing πεια in place of παῦλος. Later copyists may have a different word-division interpreting it as πειαλβ βαμ — ‘sorrow to you’, especially if the biblical verse was not reproduced in full and was finished at this point.

10:8 φραγμὸν

σφρααθ (EccP)

παο (EccI)

In EccI there is a confusion of ποδικ - ‘fruit’ and ποτακ - ‘fence’ which is a synonym of the word σφρααα. This confusion could easily happen especially with the superscript letters in a not so common word occurring in a not very familiar text. Cf. the confusion between
and ἐπάλληλον that occurs in Psalterium Bononiense, Psalm 61:4: ἵνα πάντα θάνατον ἐπάλληλον καὶ πάλιν ἐπάλληλον (Ps. Pog.), whereas the Bologna copy of the Psalter gives the variant πάλατον. 35

Misreadings are not numerous (2 in total) and in 9:4 may have been caused by a slip of the pen and consequent misinterpretation of the text. The example 10:8 may signal two different lexical traditions.

Transposition.

7:28 οὖς εἴρον ἀνθρωπόν

and οὐκ εἴρον ἀνθρωπόν (EccP)

μεμέριστος κακά (EccI)

HP MSS 106, 261 have the lexeme ἀνδρα that could be the equivalent of μυχά found in EccI.

10:1 ὑπὲρ δόξαν ἀφροσύνης μεγάλης

παρελάβας ἁγιασμένη ἐξ θεοῦ (EccP)

καὶ παρελάβας ἁγιασμένη ἐξ θεοῦ (EccI)

10:8 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπεσεῖται

ἐν ηὗ ἐπιλείπεται (EccP)

ἐπιλείπεται (EccI)

HP: MS 106 ἐμπεσεῖται ἐν αὐτῷ, MS 253 ἐμπεσεῖται ἐν αὐτῷ.

The passages in the EccP follow the word order of the standard Greek text. The transposed word order may be a sign of different versions. It looks as if EccP is nearer to standard Greek, while EccI is closer to the reading in the Greek manuscripts 106, 253.

All the above examples taken together indicate that EccP and EccI are two separate versions and that it is easier to derive EccI from EccP than vice versa.

35 See editions of the Bologna Psalter by Jagić (1907:293) and Dujčev (1968:197).
Comparison of verses in commentated, continuous, and interpolated texts.

EccP diverging from Und.13 and Eccl.

7:5 ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἀκοῦσαι ἐπιτίμησιν αὐθοῦ

Und.13: ἀγαθὸν σαλώσασθε πρεμύσεις μυράραγο

EccP: ἀγαθὸν εὐ' σαλώσασθε, ἐπιρημένεις μοῦνα

Eccl: ἀγαθὸν σαλώσασθε, πρεμύσεις μυράραγο

The variant μοῦνα in EccP could have appeared as the result of scribal blunder under the influence of the word μυράμα present in the second part of this verse. A scribe copying from the antigraph confused two words starting with the same syllable ‘μη’ – μυράμα and μυράραγο. The chance for the variant μοῦνα giving rise to the reading μυράραγο appears to be less likely than the opposite process, i.e. the reading μυράραγο transformed into μοῦνα. Therefore I would regard this case as evidence in favour of EccC giving rise to EccP. Perhaps the editor of EccP attempted to achieve formal morphological equivalence with the Greek noun ἐπιτίμησις, translating the morpheme ἐπι as εὐ’. Additionally there may be some semantic difference in the meaning of the Slavonic word: ἐπιρημένεις as a rule translates the Greek ἐπιτίμησις – ‘rebuke’ or ἐπιτίμησις – ‘punishment’, while the word μοῦνα generally is an equivalent of the Greek noun ἀπειλή – ‘threat’. For the coincidence of the word ἐπιρημένεις in EccP and the commentaries to EccC and Eccl see page 127.

The opposition of verbs приимати са vs. въз'ервати са in 7:18 has already been discussed earlier in the section devoted to the problem of commentated texts in EccC and Eccl affecting their biblical texts. However, as was previously mentioned, there are other differences between the three versions and these will be dealt with here.

7:18 ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἀντέχεσθαι σε ἐν τούτῳ καὶ γε ἀπὸ τούτου μὴ ἀνητερικοῦ τὴν χειρά σου ὅτι ἄφθος ἐν αὐτῷ ἑξελέγεται τὰ πάντα

Und.13: ἀγαθὸν τι εἶναι ἐπιμαθησεὶ σα πρὸς τοὺς άκουσμένους τῶν θεῶν ἑξελεφείται σάλα πάντα

EccP: ἀγαθὸν τι εἶναι ἐπιρηματισθαι σα πρὸς τοὺς άκουσμένους τῶν θεῶν ἑξελεφείται σάλα πάντα

Eccl: ἀγαθὸν τι εἶναι ἐπιμαθησεὶ σα πρὸς τοὺς άκουσμένους τῶν θεῶν ἑξελεφείται σάλα πάντα
The Church Slavonic translation follows the reading μη μιάνης of the Greek manuscripts BSA.

It seems that with the variants δέκαμ - δέκα in EccP stand further away from the Greek. (Cf. page 49 in chapter 1). The variant readings προσπερη - ίσωστη/ισνας between the text in EccI and the texts of EccC and EccP cannot be immediately solved. The verb προσπερη-'to reconcile' ordinarily translates the Greek καταλάβαςων and not ἐξέρχομαι according to LLP. I would not exclude the possibility that a translator was faced with a slightly different Greek text or that he might have confused the forms of two verbs. However, this is purely my conjecture as I do not have any proof of the confusion.

There is an inconsistency in the relationships among these three texts. On one hand, EccC agrees with EccP against EccI: both have the same verb ισωστη of ισνας (as in the commentaries) as opposed to προσπερη in EccI. But on the other hand, EccC agrees with EccI against EccP: the former two share the verb προσατης as opposed to βασιδερητης in EccP. At the same time EccP agrees with EccI against EccC: both have the singular masculine nominative participle δος as vs. plural masculine dative δοσιμα in EccC. There is variation in Greek text between the forms φοβομενος found in A and φοβομενος vs. B. The lexical differences between the three Church Slavonic texts are not easy to explain; but it seems likely, though not necessarily so, that these redactions were made on separate examinations of the Greek.

7:21 μη θης καρδίαν σου ὑπος μη

μη προκλομι σφια τσεογο μα μα (Und.13)
μη μλοει σφια τσεογο, μα μα (EccP)
μη προκλομι σφια τσεογο λακο μα μα (EccI)

μη δος S - Rahlfss; MSS 23, 147, 157,159, 252, 299 - HP.

The most readily available explanation for these Slavonic variants is that they may represent different redactions. Here the editor of EccP strives for a close rendering of the Greek text. Νε μλοει is a literal translation of μη θης. The imperative προκλομι of the commentated versions could hardly be the literal translation of the variant δος found in
some of the Greek manuscripts. The lexeme ἀναργυρός is a more common rendering of the Greek verb δώς. Cf. the translation in verse 5:5 of Ecclesiastes ἔν αὐτοῖς - μὴ δῶς. The verses 7:21-22 share the same commentary, but there is no direct comment on verse 7:21. Therefore there is no way to discover what was behind the wording of the commentated versions. ΠΡΙΚΛΟΝΗΤΙ - ‘to incline’, ‘to bow’ usually translates the Greek κλίνειν. Whether in this instance a scribe may have been influenced by an expression from Psalm 118:36 ΠΡΙΚΛΟΝΗ έΡΑΜΕ ΜΟΕ - κλίνον τὴν καρδίαν μου and worded it accordingly would be open to speculation.

The cases where EccP diverges from Und.13 and Eccl involve lexical variation considered to be a feature of deliberate redaction. However, on the basis of such fragmentary evidence it is not always possible to distinguish between changes which allow us to talk about a separate version arising from deliberate revision, and changes which have come about simply through the process of transmission.

**Eccl diverging from Und.13 and EccP.**

**Omissions in Eccl.**

4:9 οἷς ἔστων αὐτοῖς μισθῶς ἀγαθῶς ἐν μάχῳ αὐτῶν
   ὑμᾶκε εἰσὶν ἔπαθη ἔν τριάδι ἐν
   ὑμᾶν εἰσὶν μιχ' ἔπαθη ἔν τριάδι ἐν (Und.13)
   (Und.13)
   (EccP)
   (Eccl)

5:5 μὴ δῶς τὸ στόμα σου τοῦ ἐξαμαρτήσαι τὴν σάρκα σου
   οὐδὲ οἰκτῆσαι σωμαῖς σωρᾶσθαι πλησιν σωσθεί (Und.13)
   (Und.13)
   οὐδὲ οἰκτῆσαι σωμαῖς σωρᾶσθαι πλησιν σωσθεί (EccP)
   (EccP)
   οὐδὲ οἰκτῆσαι σωμαῖς σωρᾶσθαι σε ἀπὸ οὐσίαν (Eccl)
   (Eccl)

7:6 καὶ γε τοῦτο μετατιθῆς
   ἡ καὶ σε σῖτα (Und.13)
   (Und.13)
   καὶ σε σῖτα (EccP)
   (EccP)
   (Eccl)
The omissions in EccI may occur because the verses are not reproduced fully in the commentated text, so these examples are not conclusive.

**Lexical variation.**

4:6 δρακών μόχθων

- ὑποβίβασται τῷ ἄγῳ (Und.13)
- ὑποβίβασται τῷ ἄγῳ (EccP)
- ὑποβίβασται τῷ ἄγῳ (EccI)

Usually the noun τιμαίῳ in Church Slavonic texts renders the Greek lexemes αὐτοῦ and προθύμια. In the interpolation the Greek noun μόχθως is translated as τιμαίῳ meaning here ‘diligence’. Under the entry τιμαίῳ Sreznevskij in his dictionary gives a quotation from Ecclesiastes 2:11 in the Pandects of Antioch, 11th century. Thus, this verse in the insertion is identical with the early reading. We can see that this was possibly not so literal a translation as the noun τρχαῖ. However, this evidence is not enough to be taken as conclusive proof for an early date of Ecclesiastes because it is a single verse in the Pandects and it does not necessarily represent an early version of the book of Ecclesiastes, but part of the translation of the whole Pandects.

7:2 ἀγαθῶν πορευόμεναι εἰς οἶκον πένθους ἢ ὅτι πορευόμεναι εἰς οἶκον πότου καθότι τούτο τέλος

- ἐδώριον χορητήτι εἰς δομῷ πλακᾶ. ἥξειλι χορητήτι εἰς δομῇ πορᾶ. ὅπερει εἰς κονέη (Und.13)
- ἐδώριον χορητήτι εἰς δομῷ πλακᾶ ἡ χορητήτι εἰς δομῷ πορᾶ πονε" κονέη (EccP)
- ἐδώριον χορητήτι εἰς δομῷ πλακᾶ. ἥξειλι χορητήτι εἰς δομῷ μι πορᾶ. ὅπερει εἰς κονέη (EccI)

According to LLP the conjunctions μερίσκε (comparative) and πονεσκε (causative) can both translate the Greek καθότι. Note the difference in translation of the Greek genitive of possession οἶκον πότου and also χορητήτι/ χορητητί/ χορητῆτι. EccI also differs from the other two in the verb ἤτη, the use of which could be deliberate.
7:16 καὶ μὴ σοφίζου

(UND.13) η· καρδία εα (ECCP) η· καρδία εα (ECCI)

Both UND.13 and ECCP follow the standard Greek text more closely, having the form of the imperative.

7:16 μὴ ποτε

(UND.13) εδα κορδα (ECCP) εγδα κορδα (ECCI) ΔΑ ΝΕ ΚΑΚΟ

The use of conjunctions εδα κορδα and ΔΑ ΝΕ ΚΑΚΟ characterizes different redactions. There may be an interaction of different traditions: εδα κορδα being an earlier one and ΔΑ ΝΕ ΚΑΚΟ a later one. The use of εδα (εγδα) κορδα is characteristic of the archaic group of Psalter MSS according to Karacorova (1989:176).

7:17 μὴ ἀκρόβατης πολύ

(UND.13) η· βεβηγετημεν η· μενο (ECCP) η· βεβηγετημεν ΒΕΛΜΗ (ECCI)

7:19 ἐξουσιάζεται τοὺς δύνας ἐν τῇ πόλει

(UND.13) ΔΕΣΑΤΗ ΒΔΛΑΔΗΟΜΗΙ ΒΤ ΓΡΑΦΗ (ECCP) ΔΕΣΑΤΗ ΒΔΛΑΔΗΟΜΗΙ ΒΤ ΓΡΑΦΗ (ECCI)

The lexeme ΒΔΛΑΔΗΟΜΗΙ found in the ECCI is a sign of a different redaction.

7:21 καὶ γε εἰς πάντας τοὺς λόγους οὓς λαλήσωσιν

(UND.13) η· ΜΕΛΑ ΟΥΡΟ ΣΛΟΒΕΣΑ ΜΗ ΒΕΤΕΡΑΝ (ECCP) η· ΜΕΛΑ ΟΥΡΟ ΣΛΟΒΕΣΑ ΜΗ ΒΕΤΕΡΑΝ (ECCI)

The use of the prefixed verb ΒΕΤΕΡΑΝ with the meaning ‘to speak’ could be a sign of an East Slavonic editor/scribe since in the Church Slavonic and modern South Slavonic
languages the main meaning of the word μακάβιτι is ‘to make noise’. Cf. also 8:4 on page 114.

7:22 οτι πλειονάκης πανηγυρίζεται σε καὶ καθόδους πολλάς κακώσει καρδίαν σου ὅπως καὶ γε σε κατηράσω ἑτέρους

πάντοτε γνωρίζοντα τὸ παραπέτωμα καὶ κατακατέβη καὶ κατακαθήμερον τὸ σπέρμα τῆς σου.

πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐστὶ διὰ τῶν πέντεν ὁμολογιῶν. (Und.13)

πάντα γνωρίζοντα τὸ παραπέτωμα καὶ κατακαθήμερον τὸ σπέρμα τῆς σου.

πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐστὶ διὰ τῶν πέντεν ὁμολογιῶν. (EccP)

πάντα γνωρίζοντα τὸ παραπέτωμα καὶ κατακαθήμερον τὸ σπέρμα τῆς σου. (Eccl)

HP critical apparatus + πολλοῦς in MSS 157, 159, 298, 299, Ald.

The reading μνημία in Und.13 corresponds to the variant πολλοῦς found in several manuscripts in the critical apparatus of Holmes and Parsons. While the text in EccP follows the Greek word order more closely, albeit with a mistake due to wrong word division, there is transposition in Und.13.

EccP and Und.13 agree repeatedly against Eccl. This again could reflect their mutual relationship. These two versions are closer to each other in their choice of words and on some occasions they appear to follow the standard Greek text more accurately.

Grammatical variations.

7:3 ἀγάθον θυμός

βαῦν αὐροτὶ (Und.13)

βαῦν αὐροτὶ (EccP)

βαῦν αὐροτὶ (Eccl)

At some earlier stage in the common tradition of EccC and EccP a scribe understood βαῦν as an adjective which should agree with the feminine noun αὐροτὶ and consequently changed the ending.

7:5 ἄνδρα ἀκούοντα ἄπω ἀφρόνων

ἐμφακά εἰς ἄφωνον ἀχόνα (Und.13)

ἐμφακά εἰς ἄφωνον ἀχόνα (EccP)

ἐμφακά εἰς ἄφωνον ἀχόνα (Eccl)
Grammatical variants, if taken separately, are not very decisive in determining the textual relationship between the three versions because such variation could happen in the process of multiple copying. They can be, however, supportive in conjunction with other similar evidence, i.e. lexical which is by far more significant.

**Und.13 diverging from EccP and EccI.**

7:3 ἀγαθωθῆσαι καρδία

- ἐξελικτε ἐρ ἐρ (Und.13)
- ἀγαθωθῆσαι ἐρ ἐρ (EccP)
- ἀγαθωθῆσαι ἐρ ἐρ (EccI)

The prefixed verb ἀγαθωθῆσαι ἐρ could be a formally closer rendering of the Greek future passive indicative 3rd p. sing. verb ἀγαθωθῆσαι. A scribe might have been familiar with the expression from Psalm 124:4 ἀγαθωθῆσαι ἐρ ἐρ - ἀγαθωθῆσαι ἐρ καρδία ἐρ.

7:4 καὶ καρδία ἀφρόνων

- ἐρ ἐρ ἐρ (Und.13)
- ἐρ ἐρ ἐρ (EccP)
- ἐρ ἐρ ἐρ (EccI)

The adjective ἐρ may have been perceived as slightly outdated and consequently replaced with ἐρ. The divergences above could have resulted from lexical revision in the traditions of both EccP and EccI or a change by the scribe of Und.13. It is not known whether Und.13 was innovative or conservative here.

36 This quotation is taken from the LLP.
The commentary is the same in these 15 verses but the verses themselves are not.

The 56 shared verses between EccC and EccP are similar, whereas the 38 shared verses between Eccl and EccP are not.
Conclusions.

There are a number of problems concerning the date and place of the translation of Ecclesiastes and the relationship between the different versions of the text(s) under scrutiny. There is no evidence currently available on the early South Slavonic translation from which Ecclesiastes could have been derived. The text of Ecclesiastes was not included in the so-called South Slavonic Bible of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century among other Sapiential books.\textsuperscript{37} The reason for this is unknown. It is theoretically possible that there was also a commentated translation which did not survive and was preserved only in fragments in the late East Slavonic manuscripts.

Ecclesiastes is a difficult text, the meaning of which is not always transparent, and in addition its gnomical nature makes it particularly susceptible to changes and variation in the manuscript tradition. The coincidences between the three versions (EccC, EccP and EccI) suggest that they are not entirely independent translations. At the same time there are divergences between these versions which are not the result of accident but could signal different redactions.\textsuperscript{38}

The relationship between the three versions, particularly between EccC and EccP, is not absolutely clear. Since the extant manuscripts are almost contemporaneous, it is hard to decide which redaction appeared earlier. Because EccI is embedded into the plain text it is at least as old as group 1, so no later than the 15\textsuperscript{th} century. It is obvious that EccP and EccI stand further away from one another, and therefore have no direct relationship (but only via EccC). It was suggested by Thomson, although he did not elaborate on the subject, that the Slavonic catena contains a different translation of the biblical text.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{37} Alekseev 1999:133-40.

\textsuperscript{38} The possibility of revision with reference to the language from which the translation was originally made is implied in my definition of ‘redaction’ throughout chapter 2, although redactions might be produced within Church Slavonic without reference to Greek. There is not complete uniformity in terminology pertaining to textual criticism in the field of Paleoslavistics. Lunt’s attempts (1983, 1985) to introduce clarity to the field, where a degree of precision is not always possible, are commendable. However, the dividing line between ‘revision’ and ‘secondary translation’ (a thorough revision according to Lunt, 1985:290) is not a clear-cut one. And in the case of Ecclesiastes where only fragments of catena have survived, it is not possible to decide whether it is a thorough and systematic revision or not.

\textsuperscript{39} In this he followed Gorskij and Nevostrovev (1855:67-73) who in their publication demonstrated the difference between the verses in the interpolated and the plain texts. It seems that at the time Gorskij and Nevostrovev were unaware of the existence of EccC. Thomson’s (1998) broad survey does not detail the different types of the catenary version, and therefore his readers might infer from his work that there was only one version of the catena. In his more recent publication (2006:37) Thomson states that a catena on
However, my research on the textual history of *Ecclesiastes* does not entirely support this statement.

To follow Thomson’s line of thought I postulate the following relationship diagram. This diagram shows a possible solution to the claim that a hypothetical catena may have contained a different translation of the biblical text. This diagram relies on the existence of two early independent translations: one plain, one commentated. Eccl may contain remnants of the earlier translation of the catena, though it may not simply continue the hypothetical text from which C also derived (the number of verses in Eccl might have been further reduced). However, this catena, though obviously fuller than the existing Eccl and EccC, could have always been fragmentary.

As has already been pointed out, on the one hand, EccC largely shares the biblical verses with EccP, whilst on the other hand EccC shares the commentary but not the biblical verses with Eccl. This suggests a connection between EccC and each of the plain and interpolated versions. In this case we must allow for the possibility that a commentated version might have been created by combining a translation of the plain text (EccP) with the commentary extracted from a fuller version of Eccl to produce, with some revision, a commentated (EccC) version. The question then arises was it really necessary to compile another commentated version of such a ‘marginal’ text as *Ecclesiastes* in this way? This idea does not fit comfortably with our knowledge of the production of biblical translations.

If we were to assume that EccC derived as a result of revision from both plain and interpolated texts, then we would need to suppose that EccP and Eccl preceded EccC chronologically. However, the textual evidence here is insufficient to support such an assumption. The weakness of this hypothesis is that it is not, as it stands, susceptible of proof or disproof by the textual evidence but only of being regarded as more or less plausible. Since not all the manuscripts containing the text of *Ecclesiastes* have been examined, the question of whether any further evidence can be found for or against this hypothesis remains for the future.

If we were to assume that Eccl was a separate translation altogether, then the

*Ecclesiastes* was also translated but only fragments have been preserved, although they are sufficient to reveal that the Biblical text had been retranslated.
similarities in the commentary which it shares with EccC make this hypothesis hard to prove or disprove. Given the literalistic approach to Church Slavonic translation, it seems likely that two independent translations could have the same wording in places. Thus, it is not possible to decide whether two versions, which sometimes coincide but sometimes diverge, represent two independent translations, or just one translation of the same version, which was revised by subsequent scribes, resulting in different redactions. As the number of verses shared by all three versions is small (15 verses), the question of differentiating between these two possibilities is hard to resolve because the evidence could be taken either way. This is the crux of the matter. Therefore I must admit that at this stage of the investigation the puzzle posed by the relations between the versions cannot be explained satisfactorily.

If we are to discount the possibility of independent translations, we need to find other solutions which are based, at least in part, on the textual evidence which has been uncovered. The textual evidence shows that all three versions are defective: there are fragments of catena, omissions in EccP but not in EccC, omissions in EccC but not in EccP. As chapter 1 demonstrates, EccP is characterised by inexplicable divergences in wording and mistakes, such as εδίη, ειναί, etc. There could be various reasons for the deficiencies of the Church Slavonic plain version: defective Greek exemplar, cases of mistranslation of the Greek text (as seen in chapter 1: in verses 5:5 мысλ, 12:5 древеса, etc.), at stage β carelessness of a Slavonic scribe, who ‘made a mess’ of the text. Consequently, the inference that the whole tradition of EccP is flawed is significant in determining the relationship between EccP and EccC.

Below I outline two possible interpretations of the data. These interpretations, however, encounter difficulties because of conflicting evidence. To facilitate the discussion I propose my own diagram on page 149 for one of the interpretations. As the diagram shows I proceed from the assumption that the continuous text was translated first. Someone wanted a Church Slavonic translation of the catena on Ecclesiastes, and decided to produce this by using the pre-existing Church Slavonic translation of the plain version of Ecclesiastes and adding a Church Slavonic translation of the commentary. Since no original commentaries on Ecclesiastes existed, it was necessary to translate
them from Greek. A translator after getting hold of the Greek commentated version would have to translate the comments and combine them with the already existing Church Slavonic text. In the process of translating and adding the commentary to the pre-existing Church Slavonic version of Ecclesiastes, the compiler noticed that some parts of the biblical text were missing or were translated in a way inconsistent with his Greek text and commentary, and so he made corrections, or alterations, thus producing (a fuller version) of EccC. Alternatively the fuller versions of the biblical verses in EccC may reflect an earlier and less corrupt version of EccP.

If we are to assume that the plain text was original, we face the problem of omissions in EccP. In this case we may presume that EccP was originally better or was improved while compiling (the commentated version resulting in) EccC and Eccl. The advantage of this development is that there is no need to assume secondary consultation of Greek, or the existence of complete commentated versions. Thus, if we take into account the rule of Occam’s razor, this solution appears to be more ‘parsimonious’.

Another problem is the divergences in biblical verses between EccC and Eccl. If both versions go back to the same contaminated commentated version why would they be different? In this case we might presume that EccC was further adjusted, perhaps, with renewed reference to the Greek catena, to produce Eccl. Yet there is a further problem with the origins and textual history of Eccl. Pondering over this problem, I have considered the question of the relationship of Eccl to EccC and the Izbornik. As Eccl is even more fragmentary than EccC, the possibility remains that it was never a full translation of the catena on Ecclesiastes, but only a collection of quotations of the kind found in Izbornik. There are verbal coincidences in verses from Ecclesiastes 7:4 and 10:1-2 between Eccl and the Izbornik which may hint at mutual relationship (they also have an affinity with the plain text). Yet the question remains whether certain deviations in the Izbornik, such as ἄνω in 7:4 and ὢν σιγάσθαι in the commentary to 10:1, might be explained as modifications to fit particular contexts. If we were to admit this, could then divergences in Eccl (such as the ones in 10:8) be also considered as modifications to fit particular contexts?

On the alternative hypothesis for the relationship between the versions I posit the commentated version as primary. The assumption that EccP was generated from the
commentated version (EccC) by removing the commentary is, however, hard to prove. The accepted method of work for determining whether the text has been extrapolated is to look for traces of extrapolation. But sometimes they are few and far between: if a scribe managed to extrapolate the plain text accurately, without leaving bits of commentary, we would not know that extrapolation had taken place at all.

In the manuscripts with the continuous text which I have examined there are no unambiguous traces of extrapolation. There are, however, some omissions at the end and beginning of several verses peculiar to the whole textual tradition of the plain text. These omissions might have resulted from the labours of industrious scribes who, whilst trying hard to free the text from the commentary, slightly overdid their job by removing more of the biblical text rather than by leaving bits of commentary. As I have said earlier, the tradition of EccP is flawed: besides omissions it has various mistakes. Extrapolation could be one of the easiest explanations for their occurrence. However, I lack decisive proof for extrapolation taking place and consequently for the omissions and mistakes resulting from extrapolation. Besides, the omissions in EccP and Und.13 cannot be relied upon as evidence of priority because they might have been filled in during the process of producing either plain or commentated versions, or alternatively, they might represent later stages of the traditions which had become more corrupt.

I have to admit that the similarities between the commentary texts in EccC and EccI and their biblical texts in contrast to the wording in EccP create complications for my hypothesis that EccC and not EccP was primary. In order to overcome this complication I might argue that these similarities could have arisen at a later stage in the process of copying. In discussing the lexical variation between the three versions in verse 7:18 I also raised the question: if EccP went back to the earliest version of the commentated text, how did it get the reading ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΑ? In this case we need to make a further assumption that extrapolation was done with some reference to Greek. Given the general inferiority of EccP and absence in individual manuscripts of signs of consultation with the Greek, divergences in wording (such as ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΑ in EccP versus ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΣΑ in EccC and EccI) are more easily explained as the result of influence from the commentary on EccC/EccI than as the outcome of sporadic retranslation from Greek.
I have only one example in 2:21 where the variant readings ἔνε and ἔνασ may point to independent use of Greek for EccC and EccP. However, even on this occasion the possibility that the variation in these two examples could have occurred also within Church Slavonic should not be excluded. Still, the evidence is insufficient to allow me to decide between the two possibilities.

Supposing that EccC was not a full version but simply extracts which were used in compiling EccP, we are presented with the question where did the rest of EccP come from, and where and when was the compilation carried out? If EccP was produced from EccC by extrapolation how did the readings in EccP closer to Greek get into it? We need to allow that extrapolation was done with some secondary reference to Greek. If we assume that both EccC and EccI were incomplete, then the supplementary use of Greek to assist the production of EccP is more understandable, but then the question arises who and when and where could have had access to Greek sources? The other question is what were the origins of EccI and when and where did it come into existence? Given that EccI, though clearly a different redaction, is on the whole closer to EccC and EccP than the quotations discussed in chapter 3, could EccI also derive from a fuller version of EccC which has not survived?

It is not possible to find answers to all these questions. However, we need to consider the broader historical circumstances, such as the knowledge of Greek amongst the East Slavs, to arrive even at tentative answers. It is now generally accepted that in the 15th-century Medieval Russia there was not sufficient knowledge of Greek to carry out the translations. Even several decades later Maxim the Greek had to translate his works first into Latin, and afterwards his assistant translators translated the texts from Latin into Church Slavonic. All this makes it unlikely that EccP could have come into existence as a partial translation directly from Greek in the East Slav area. We also may ask ourselves whether there was a need to produce several versions of commented Ecclesiastes? There may be not sufficient evidence to resolve these questions. The main interest lies in the possibility that the textual tradition can therefore be traced back, at least in part, to a time before the 15th century. This possibility is explored further in the next chapter.
Chapter 3.

Quotations from Ecclesiastes in Church Slavonic texts.

It has been assumed that there was an early translation of Ecclesiastes. If we are to accept the assumptions that Ecclesiastes was translated either by Methodius or in 10th century Bulgaria as a basis for argument, then there is a gap of almost 500 years between this hypothetical date and the extant manuscripts of the translation. It may be possible to trace the history of the text through these 500 years and to bridge this gap by examining quotations from Ecclesiastes in Medieval Slavonic texts. Although stylistic and textological aspects of biblical quotations in Medieval Slavonic texts have been studied by Slavists, the quotations from Ecclesiastes have been overlooked. But only if the textual history of Ecclesiastes were known, would it be possible to compare the quotations with the continuous text to see if there was a textual link and to evaluate the evidence provided by quotations. Otherwise we would be falling into the trap of circular argument.

In this chapter I compare firstly the quotations from Ecclesiastes found in the Medieval Slavonic translations of the Pandects of Antioch and Pœela (Byzantine Melissa) with the relevant passages from the continuous and commentated texts of Ecclesiastes. Then I compare the quotations from Ecclesiastes which occur in original Old Russian texts. In this way I shall try to establish whether these quotations were simply extracted from the existing continuous or commentated texts, or whether they were translated afresh along with the whole body of the texts in which they appear, or alternatively quoted from memory or even various florilegia. The quotations from Ecclesiastes found in the 13th century Izbornik were discussed in chapter 2.

I start with the largest and the earliest body of quotations: 56 in total as they appear in the Pandects of Antioch. This book, composed by the monk Antioch in the 7th century, is a guide to Christian morality and spirituality. His compilation is based on excerpts from Holy Scripture and the Church Fathers. The Pandects were translated in all probability in
Bulgaria in the 10th century. They became known in medieval Russia soon afterwards as the earliest extant East Slavonic manuscript dates from the 11th century. Archimandrite Amfiloxij (1880) and Josif Popovski (1989) published the text from this manuscript. The length of quotations varies from one verse (complete or partial) to a combination of several verses. Sometimes verses are combined from different chapters and are not necessarily in strict sequence. Out of 56 quotations 5 are repetitions of the same quotations. The biblical passages quoted below are from Popovski’s edition with the chapter number, the page and the subdivision if necessary and the line number.

**Comparison of quotations from Ecclesiastes in the Pandects of Antioch with continuous and the commentated texts.**

It is not my intention here to attempt a detailed textological analysis of this material. Instead examples of lexical variants from the biblical passages are given as the clearest and most compelling evidence to support my argument that the passages belong to different translations, while other types of divergences are characterised only briefly. First the Greek parallel from the standard text of the Septuagint is given, followed by the variants from the continuous or (if available) commentated texts. The list is arranged according to the usual order of the verses in the book of Ecclesiastes and not in order of appearance of the quotations in the Pandects.

The passages below, i.e. PA in contrast to GB, etc. clearly belong to different versions.

7:7 ὅτι ἡ συκοφαντία περιφέρει σοφὸν καὶ ἀπόλλυσι τὴν καρδίαν εὔτοινας αὐτοῦ
κλέβεται ἐνυπνώται ἔμαθαμα ἰδάνακο. ἤ πορωσᾶται ἐρίες ἐλαφροῦν ἰδανακοί ΠΑ (39: 64,14:2-3)
κλέβεται λυτὺ' ἔμαθαμά ἱδάνακο ἐλαφράλε' ἐρίες ἐλαφράλα νομί προ ΠΑ

The translator of PA later probably misread εὔτοινας as εὐγενίας.

---

1 The Greek text is published by Migne, 1865 (PG, v. 93. col. 1428-1849).
A scribe or the translator perhaps made a mental slip by associating the first part of the verse γυνώναι σοφίαν with the expression γυνώναι ἀμαρτίαν from the Psalm 50:5 and Psalm 31:5. A copyist possibly misread the last letter ρ as syllable ρο in the word οὐκ. Popovski divides the text as follows: ρο οὐκετε, while Amfiloxij reproduces it in one word.

We have a number of quotations included in different chapters of the Pandects. If the existing version of Ecclesiastes was consulted, then they should appear similar. However, the divergences in repeated biblical quotations, given below, demonstrate that these were translated afresh on each occasion. If this is the case, then it seems unlikely that they were copied from a hypothetical early version either. The other possibility exists that the translator simply did not know the early version or chose not to quote from it.
5:12 ἀρρωστία

νεπρᾶξεν λῶτα PA (12; 24, 9: 4-9)

νεδικύσε P (119; 176, 33-35)

νεδάγγι GB

5:15 ἤ μοχθεὶ εἰς ἄνεμον

καὶ τροόθκ ἴδον ἐν βάτρῳ PA (12; JP, 24, 9)

καὶ οὐσίας ἐξ οὗ Πάνω ἐν βάτρῳ PA (119; 176, 37)

καὶ εἰπόθηκεν εἰς μπρός GB

6:8 διότι ὁ πένης

ζανεθεν νιμμία P (9; 20, 7)

ζανεθεν οὐσία P (119; 176, 42)

πολεθεν νιμμία GB, Und. 13

8:5 ῥῆμα ποιητρῶν

καὶ τὸ χῦλα P (79; 116, 60)

γὰρ χῦλα P (114; 170, 93-4)

γὰρ οἰκον P GB

A quotation from 8:1 is repeated twice in two different chapters with minor variations only, but this single example does not affect the overall tendency of translating the quotations anew.

8:1 καὶ ἀναίθες προσώπων αὐτοῦ μισηθήσαται

καὶ στεφάδισιν ἔνεμεν καὶ θυμαμαθεῖς βοήκετ P (16; 29, 2:2-3)

καὶ στεφάδισιν ἔνεμεν καὶ θυμαμαθεῖς βοήκετ P (32; 56, 8:2-4)

καὶ στεφάδισιν ἔνεμεν καὶ θυμαμαθεῖς βδέλετ GB

Syntactic variants, given below, such as variation in the use of verbal forms, aspect, participles, conjunctions, particles and word order, as well as transpositions are frequent in the manuscripts and could also be observed in the quotations from the Pandects. Transpositions may be typical errors of memory. Therefore these spontaneous changes could have been introduced unconsciously.
2:11 ροφή μου ΡΑ - μοι ροφή GB; 4:10 ἣκο λίστε ΡΑ - λυτε λακo GB; 5:11 σαλάδκη σκίν

τελού ΡΑ - σον σαλάδκη σαλο GB

10:14 μνοχίτη ΡΑ - 8μνοχίτη GB; 5:3 οπίμα ΡΑ - οπίμεςκι GB; 4:12 ουκρήπλετε

ΡΑ - ουκρήπιντ σα GB; 5:14 πρίδε ΡΑ - ιτίδε GB; 5:5 προγνήελετ σα ΡΑ - προγνήελετ

σα GB

4:12 κμοβ ΡΑ - σεμοβ GB; 11:10 σβενο ΡΑ - τβενο GB; 10:4 τη ΡΑ - κα GB; 5:12 τη 

ΡΑ - κα GB

5:16 α βίστι δήνε ΡΑ - κ βοι νε δήν GB

1:8 πάντες οί λόγοι έγκοποι

κέλκλο σέβο τροφήνο ΡΑ (91; 134, 24)

κέλκλο σέβουσα τράδα, GB

1:13 τού κατασκέψασαι εν τῇ σοφίᾳ

ποσλότριτι πρόκλωάρδασίς ΡΑ (14; 25, 2-4)

σκλήτριτι μακροτην GB

1:13 περισπασμόν ποιητήν

μλάγιαν λυτο ΡΑ (14; 25, 2-4)

ποπεσενείς λοκαλo GB

cf. also 2:26, 5:13

1:13 περισπασμό

μλάγια ΡΑ (14; 25, 2-4)

πεσιμο GB

2:11 ποτήμασιν

τζενενία ΡΑ (14; 25-6, 6-9)

τζενενία GB

2:26 εὐφροσύνην

ράλλοτι ΡΑ (14; 26, 2-8)

ευφροσία GB, Und.13
2:26 Περιπαιδεύον

μιλήσαντες ΡΑ (14; 26, 2-8)

πες GB

παλαμένει Und.13

cf. also 1:13, 5:13

3:1 χρόνος

άκτο ΡΑ (91; 134, 12)

gόδα GB

3:7 λαλεῖν

βέβαια ΡΑ (91; 134, 13-14)

gάτι GB

3:20 ἐπιστρέφει

βέβαια σα ΡΑ (14; 26, 2:9)

βέβαια σα GB

4:1 τὰς υποκαταστάσεις

καλείται ΡΑ (39; 64, 13:1-4)

καλείται GB

4:9 ἀγαθοῖς

οὐχ ἔσται ΡΑ (80; 118, 64-5)

οὐχ ἔσται GB, Und.13, EccI

4:10 καὶ συγγείν

αὐτὰ ΡΑ (80; 118, 65-70)

αὐτὰ GB, Und. 13

4:11 κοιμηθῶσιν

βούδετε ΡΑ (2; 10, 2:2-3)

βούδέτα GB, Und. 13

5:2 Περιπαιδεύον

κατακτήσει ΡΑ (84; 124 1: 21-4)

κατακτήσει GB
5:3-4 εὐχὴν τῷ θεῷ

μελιτεύκ ἔκ ῬΑ (106; 156, 156-60)

σήμερον καὶ ἔς GB

5:3-4 μὴ χρονίσητε

κενοῦ κοιμήτω ῬΑ (106; 156, 156-60)

κενοῦ δια λίνος GB

5:4 ἄγαθῷν

δοσρῆ ῬΑ (106; 156, 156-60)

δολὸ GB

6:2 ἀνὴρ ξένος

στρανήμα ῬΑ (119; 176, 40-1)

στρανῆμα GB

6:8 κατέναντι τῆς ἰσορροπίας

πρᾶξα ἰσορροπία ῬΑ (119; 176, 42), ῬΑ (9; 20, 7)

πρᾷξα ἰσορροπία GB, Und. 13

7:4 ἀφρόνων

βεγαμομυθεῖ τῶν ῬΑ (90; 133, 27-8)

βεγαμομυθεῖ GB, EccI.

βεγαμομυθεί Und. 13

7:5 ἄγαθῷν

δοσρῆ ῬΑ (82; 121, 51-2)

δολὸ GB, Und. 13, EccI

7:9 ἐν κόλπῳ

μακάρι ῬΑ (24; 42, 8:1-2)

μακάρι GB

7:10 αἱ πρῶται

πρῶται ῬΑ (28; 51, 17:2-4)

πρῶται GB

7:16 πολύ

τόλμω ῬΑ (44; 71, 3:3-4)

τόλμω GB
7:16 περισσά
ακούει RA (44; 71, 3:3-4)
βελημένη GB
ισόθενει Und.13
λίθος EccI

7:16 ἐκπλαγής
αυκλονίσθη σα RA (44; 71, 3:3-4)
ισθάρησθη σα GB

7:17 ἐν ο̣̣̅υ̣̣̅ καιρῷ
ἐν βεγγαδίκ RA (38; 63, 15:2-4)
ἐν βρεμά GB
νεβά σε βρεμά Und.13, EccI

7:21 λαλήσασαν
σκέφθασα στί RA (31; 55, 5:1-2)
σκέφασθη στί GB, Und.13
σκεφτασθε EccI

7:26 σαγήναι
νεβατ στί RA (18; 33, 13:2-6)
στή GB

7:26 ἐξακρθήσεται
ισάρτ χαθήστη σα RA (18; 33, 13:2-6)
ισάρνησι σα GB

7:26 συλληψθήσεται
οφθαλμήστη σα RA (18; 33, 13:2-6)
νε ωβά βδήστη GB

9:10 εὕρη
ισάρτ σα RA (98; 143, 52-3)
σκεφτασθε GB
9:18 οἰκείη πολέμου
σκότα διαρρήνειν ΠΑ (101:147, 71-2)
σκότα τὰς ῥατίνας GB

10:18 ἡ ὀδόκωσις

μακεδονία ΠΑ (36: JP, 61, 6:2-3)

στροφημάτῳ GB

The translator possibly misunderstood ἡ ὀδόκωσις - ‘roofing’ which is a neologism in the LXX and associated it with the more familiar noun ἡ προοδοκία - ‘expectation’ and translated it accordingly as μακεδονία. The corrupted reading στροφημάτῳ is discussed in chapter 1, page 31.

10:20 ἐν ταμιείοις κοινών

ἐν τῷ σκηνοφιλίῳ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ΠΑ (31; 55, 5:3-6:1)

ἐν καθεῖ τούτῳ λογίσμῳ τοῦ ΠΑ GB

10:20 ἀποίσει

οἵκτεντα ΠΑ (31; 55, 5:3-6:1)

δοκεῖν τὸ GB

11:9 γνώθι

οὺπόρκα διδού ΠΑ (18; 33, 13:8-11)

ρανθομένη GB

11:9 ὁ θεός

γὰρ ΠΑ (18; 33, 13:8-11)

ἐθ ὸ ΠΑ GB

cf.also 5:3-4, 12:13

11:10 παράγαγε

ἀμισοῦμεν ΠΑ (24; 42, 3:3-4)

προφέδρο̣ν GB
11:10 ποιητήν
γλωσσής ΡΑ (24; 42, 5:3-4)
αδίκωσες ΜΗ

12:1 τοῦ κτίσαντός
σώζοντας ΡΑ (23; 41, 4:2-5)
σώζοντας ΜΗ

12:13 τῶν θεῶν
ό̣ι ΡΑ (127; 188, 31-2)
ό̣ι ΜΗ
cf. 5:3-4, 11:9

In the following examples underlining in brackets marks lexical variants (hendyadis notes) given by the translator, copied in the margin in the Voskresenskij manuscript of the 11th century, and entered into the text by all other manuscripts.

2:11 εἰν μόχθῳ ὃ ἐμάχθησα
(οὐσίας) ἐν τῷ τίτανίμῳ ἀι μὲ τ()(ς) τίτανίμῳ ΖΑ (14; 25-6, 6-9)
ἐν τῷ τίτανίμῳ ἀι μὲ τ()(ς) τίτανίμῳ ΜΗ

3:10 αἰ ρησπασμών
(τιμηματικὸν) ερωτήτη ΡΑ (91;135, 61-3)
πέριπτερι ΜΗ

9:12 ὅτι καί γε οὐκ ἔγνω
ἀκο ο (παραμυθι) οὐκέκτη ΡΑ (91; 135, 58-9)
ἀκο ο (παραμυθι) ΜΗ

Out of 56 quotations only the quotation in 5:9 λυσώμενα σκεφτή, οὐκ σκεφτήτη ΖΑ (9; 20, 3:5-6) corresponds with the text in the continuous and commented versions, but this single similarity is purely coincidental. There is enough evidence of divergences between ΖΑ and later attestations of Ecclesiastes in Church Slavonic to conclude that (even) if the quotations in ΖΑ were taken from a continuous version, it was not the same translation as the circa 15th-century one. It is possible to argue that the number and type
of differences between PA and the various Ecc versions suggests that the latter are more likely to derive, throughout various processes of redaction, from a single translation than to be separate translations.

**Comparison of quotations from Ecclesiastes in Pêela with commentated and continuous texts.**

Amongst the books of Holy Scripture included in Pêela are excerpts from the Gospels, Apostol and some OT books, namely *Wisdom of Sirach, Proverbs of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Job, Isaiah*, and *Leviticus* as well as extracts from the Church Fathers and antique authors. Pêela is divided into chapters, each chapter being devoted to a specific theme. Chapters have a specific structure: in the beginning there are excerpts from the Gospels, then Apostol, then quotations from the OT Wisdom books. Sometimes under the name of Solomon there are quotations from *Ecclesiastes* and *Sirach*. The quotations from *Ecclesiastes* are not numerous in Pêela: there are nine of them in total. The length of a quotation varies from one to several verses linked together. The Slavonic translation of the Byzantine text appeared not later than the 13th century. The text was published by Semenov (1893) from an East Slavonic manuscript of the 15th century. All the biblical passages from Pêela are quoted below from his edition with the page and line number. I give the biblical passages according to their sequence in *Ecclesiastes* and not in the order of their appearance in Pêela. 5

4:6 δό γραφών μάχαν

| Двои пригорьим съ роптаникою М (398, 7-10) | Двои горестю трьда GB, Und.13, PA |
| Двое горстью тслянна Ecc|  |

5 I use the identification of the quotations from Ecclesiastes in Pêela made by Makeeva and Piêxadze (2000:91).
5:2 περισσαμοῦν
ισχύσειν (πειρασμοῦ) 6 M (375, 3-4)
πεσαστή

7:2 εἰς οἶκον πένθους
καθ ἐπὶ τὴν παλάμα M (259, 21-3)

7:6 φωνῇ τῶν ἀκαυθῶν
γλαύκτριττήν καὶ τριβνήν M (372, 15-7)

A. I. Sobolevskij (1897:60) noted that the characteristic feature of Pēela is a double translation, i.e. one Greek word is rendered by two Slavonic synonyms. Makeeva and Pičxadze (2004:88) observed this peculiarity in the quotations from the biblical books in Pēela.

10:12-13 καταπουντιοῦν αὐτῶν
ποτεγηγματα M (358, 5-8)
ποτοπατήματα GB

10:13 καὶ ἐσχάτη στόματος αὐτῶν περιφέρεια ποιηρά
κι πολείκοδοκοὺς αὐτῶν κροχώτ έρθε τούτο Λουκάκων M (358, 5-8)
κι πολείκοδοκοὺς αὐτῶν κροχώτ έρθε τούτο Λουκάκων... GB

---

6 The reading supplied by Semenov according to the 11th-century Greek MS of Melissa from the Paris National library. However, it is possible that all three Slavonic variants may be different translations of the same Greek word, since the Greek variation in 5:2 between περισσαμοῦν - ‘distraction’, ‘worry’ and πειρασμός - ‘temptation’, ‘enticement’ is found in the textual tradition of the LXX. Cf. the translation of πειρασμός as (πο)νηκεῖν in 1:13, 2:23, 2:26, 3:10, 4:8, 5:13, 5:19, 8:16 in the EccP.
The notable differences between *Pêela* and *Pandects of Antioch* indicate that the quotations in *Pêela* were not drawn directly from *Pandects* and that *Pêela* does not depend on the Ecc versions. We thus have some evidence to assume that the translator of *Pêela* had not referred to an existing version of *Ecclesiastes*.

There is a quotation from *Ecclesiastes* in the story about the Dream of King Jehoash on f. 1\textsuperscript{v} – 2 of the *Izbornik* \(^7\) which has not been identified but which appears to be a paraphrase of verses 9:14-15. I consider this quotation as evidence for the adaptation of (approximate) quotations from *Ecclesiastes* to other contexts.

I now turn to quotations in the original medieval Slavonic texts. The small number of quotations from *Ecclesiastes* is perhaps not surprising owing to the fact that the book was not used liturgically and could have been known only or primarily through written form.

**Quotations from *Ecclesiastes* in original Old Russian literature.**

Kliment of Smolensk († after 1164).

**Epistle of Kliment of Smolensk to presbuteros Thomas.**

Kliment of Smolensk was the second Metropolitan of Russian origin after Ilarion. He is mentioned several times in the Old Russian chronicle, where he is called a bookman and philosopher such as there had not been in Rus. He is the author of the single surviving epistle to his contemporary bishop Thomas. In his epistle he quotes extensively from Scripture and patristics.

4:12 Υ&ε, τρεπε&ννε[τε][ν](sic) η σκόρα σα πρετ&γνετ. (Ponyrko, 1992:132)

ο&υε τρπεννν&ννο νε σκρα σα πρτ&γνετ. Izb. ⁹

и връй търпименна не скоро отъръбъкъ са. PA

и връй търпименя скоро не переръбът са. GB

и връй търпениа не скоро расторгънъ са. Und.13

11:2 Да же часть седми, таче и осломоу (Ponyrko, 1992:133)

дажь часть седми, таче и осломоу. Izb.

даже часть седми и бои са *, GB

дажь часть седами таче осломоу Eccl

(* for variant readings see the critical apparatus of the edition of *Ecclesiastes*)

There are a few passages corresponding to each other found in the texts of Kliment of Smolensk, the 13-th century *Izbornik* and Niketas of Heracleia, *Scholia in orationes* Gregory of Nazianzos. However, the relationship between these is not exactly clear. Scholars in the past (Nikolskij, 1892: 42-7) thought that Kliment of Smolensk had used

---

⁸ My choice of editions is dictated mainly by the factor that their editors identified and marked quotations from *Ecclesiastes*.

⁹ The quotation 4:12 appears on f. 161 and 11:2 on f. 176 of the *Izbornik*. 
either the passages from the *Izbornik* or its early prototype as one of his sources. The important point, however, is that the passages were circulating in the form of florilegia and erotapokriseis literature. Kliment in his letter has taken the two passages above almost *verbatim*, and within their larger contents, either from the *Izbornik* or the translation of Niketas of Heracleia. The correspondence between these two quotations in the letter of Kliment and the latter two corroborates the view of Thomson (1999: 71-2) that the quotations were not taken directly from Greek but through the intermediary of secondary sources in available translations.

The next example is from the popular anonymous work on the death and posthumous cult of the first Russian saints, brothers Boris and Gleb, murdered in 1015 for political reasons and canonized in 1072. The *Skazanie* could have been written in the late 11th or early 12th centuries.

*Skazanie o Borise i Glebe.*

The Tale and Passion and Eulogy of the Holy Martyrs Boris and Gleb.

Fennell and Obolensky (1969: 160) give a reference to verse 12:8 in *Ecclesiastes*, but it could equally be 1:2.

---

10 Modern researchers (Ponyrko, 1992:97-114) infer that the compiler of the *Izbornik* may have used the similar fragments from the letter of Kliment of Smolensk and the commentary of Niketas of Heracleia.

11 Quoted from *Uspenskij sbornik*, 1971.
Kievo-Pečerskij paterik. 12

The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery.

Slovo 21.

*У*не по е*сть* не ов*ѯц*ати са, не*жел*и ов*ѯц*авши са, не въздати. (p. 120)
5:4 бяго е*ть* не об*ѯц*авати са ли еже ве*Ѣц*ати са въздати. (GB)
добре не ов*Ѣц*ати, не*жел*и ов*Ѣц*ати и не въздати. (PA)

Kirill of Turov († 1182). 13

Kirill of Turov was a famous rhetorician whose compositions were popular during the medieval period.

On the tale of a layman.

и речи Соломоновъ о щутине, щутомъ буди! (TODRL, 12, p. 352)
1:2 О*Ѣ* щутствий и щутъ съета (GB)

Poslanie nekoego starca k bogoblažennomu Vasiliju o skime. 14

Epistle of a certain elder to the blessed archimandrite Basil.

И паче: Луче не об*Ѣц*ати са, не*жел*и об*Ѣц*авши са, не въздати. (Ponyrko, 1992: 168)
5:4 бяго е*ть* не об*Ѣц*авати са ли еже ве*Ѣц*ати са въздати. (GB)

---

12 Quoted from Biblioteka...vo3, vol. 4, 1997.
13 On the problems of consistency in the transliteration of proper names see the recent remarks of S. Franklin (2002: xi). The works of Kirill of Turov are quoted from the publication of Eremin, 1956.
14 Quoted from the publication of Ponyrko (1992: 155-65), who attributes this letter to Kirill of Turov.
Poslanie Jakova černorizca ko kniažju Dmitriju Borisoviču.

Epistle of Jacob to prince Dimitry.

Ponyrko, who published this epistle, assumes that it was written after 1276, possibly between 1281-88.

7:26 Голомон бо, ...всемъ заповѣда и глагола: ...и нѣвѣдъ во сердѣ ея, и сѣти узы ея (и узы в руку ея, и ловление всѣды ея add. in some MSS) (Ponyrko, 1992:199). 15
7:26 ...есть ловитва и сѣти срѣца ея и ссычъ любви ея рѣки ея GB

Slovo Daniila Zatočnika. 16

These passages from Daniil the Exile seem to be distant reminiscences of Ecclesiastes.

771:26 ... ecTh AOBMTBA H c-kTH cpVi e/x H c-h^t AWEBM 6A p^Kw BA GB

Slovo Daniila Zatočnika.

These passages from Daniil the Exile seem to be distant reminiscences of Ecclesiastes.

Они бо мудрых желают благых, а вѣзнаго - домъ пира. (p. 278) cf. 7:2-4 ...ли ходить в домъ пира [...] и срѣе вѣзнаго в домѣ вѣселъ 17

In the text of Ecclesiastes there is пре́щение - 'reproof' and not прѣ́щение - 'dispute'.

Povest' vremennyx let. 18

Russian Primary Chronicle.

Люти бо градъ той, в немь же князь умъ
cf. 10:16 Горе твр градѣ емогъ црк твои сынъ. GB

---

15 This passage is included in the longer sentence, the second part of it being identified by Ponyrko as Proverbs 7:21-23, 24. But the beginning of the sentence could be a paraphrase of Ecc 7:26.
16 Quoted from Biblioteka...1997, vol. 4, p. 278.
17 The quotation 7:4 in the Pandects and Daniil the Exile may have an affinity with EccP and Eccl as they have similar wording.
18 Quoted from Biblioteka...1997, vol. 1, p.184.
Ecclesiastes was not used liturgically and therefore could have been known only from written sources: either continuous or commented text or passages from florilegia. The case of Kliment of Smolensk may be an example of how Ecclesiastes could have been disseminated in various compilations from which one might draw one’s quotations. Some of the quotations above are so commonplace that they could have been quoted simply from memory even without reference to written sources.

There are no extant South Slavonic MSS containing Ecclesiastes, but there is a small number of quotations in the South Slavonic texts.

**Quotations from Ecclesiastes in South Slavonic tradition.**

The quotations given below are distinguished between the translated texts such as Suprasl’skij sbornik and Euchologium Sinaiticum and original Church Slavonic compositions.

Suprasl’skij sbornik. 19

3:4 вре́ма пла́кати са вре́ма сми́нати са (f. 356, 14)
вре́ма пла́кати са и вре́ма кла́нанти са (f. 364, 12)
време плаќати са и време смишати са. (GB)

Euchologium Sinaiticum.

5:4 ἢν οὐ πε πε, ἀπο μι πὲ τι σα ἀν πὸτατί. (f. 91α 23-25)
βἀγο σο ἢν πε βαζιάτι σα ἀπ ενε τε δατι σα βάζατι (GB)

Domentijan, život sv. Simeona. 20

11:9 ве́сели се јоше в јожност своји (241)
ве́сели са јжото в јжности свој GB

---

19 The two quotations below are taken from the publication of Dunkov, 1995.
20 All examples are quoted from Stanojević and Glumac, 1932.
Danilo, Danilov ucenik i nastavljaci

1:2 po glagolu: "Vesu bo zemeljnih soko cokut [k.b.: cokut] [968]

Ose' svetost flya zemeljih caketa GB

4:9-10 suncsa bo dva pace kadinog jedinog vo lutk (1034)

Bla' dua pacu jedinog... gore toms jedinom GB

suncsa bo dva pace jedinog EccI

suncsa bo dva pace jedinog [...] a lutk kadinom PA

Konstantin Filozof, život despota Stevana Lazarevica.

1:16 Solomon koga glagolu: "Pace vsxh byvshih prvixh mene v Kraljam (1475)

pace vsxh, ishe bysha preshe meni vjep'im GB

It is, perhaps, not altogether surprising that the quotation in Danilo is closer to the one found in Pandects than to the continuous or interpolated text. Quotations from Ecclesiastes might have been more easily disseminated and known through florilegia than through continuous version that is not attested in the South Slavonic tradition.
Conclusions.

In the medieval period Ecclesiastes remained a book which was more frequently commented on rather than quoted from. As there are so few quotations from this book which circulated in medieval Slavonic literature there is no hope of reconstructing the whole text of Ecclesiastes with their help, though it is possible to compare them with the fuller versions of the text which we have. Quotations found in medieval Slavonic texts, both translated and original, appear to be independent of the EccP translation of Ecclesiastes known from manuscripts circa the 15th century.

Moreover, as was previously mentioned in the discussion of PA, the different versions of the same quotation found there imply that the scribe did not have a preexisting translation to hand. This does not disprove the existence of Ecclesiastes before the 15th century: the text of Ecclesiastes might have been simply unknown to the translator or he had chosen not to use it; but the quotations differ radically from the text of Ecclesiastes, as we have it, therefore they offer no support to the existence of pre-15th century text. At the same time the differences between PA and the Ecc versions seem to be more helpful in reminding us that the divergences between the three fuller versions of Ecclesiastes are likely to be redactions of a single translation.

Thus the quotations do not prove the existence of the continuous or commented texts, as we know it. The only thing they prove that parts of Ecclesiastes were known in some form of exegetical compilations.

---

21 This assertion can be inferred from reading Starowieyski (1993: 405-40).
Chapter 4.

_Ecclesiastes in Croatian Glagolitic Breviaries._

In addition to the version of _Ecclesiastes_ found in Cyrillic manuscripts, this book also figures in the Croatian Church Slavonic tradition which uses the Glagolitic alphabet. There is no consensus among scholars about either the origin or the time of the Croatian translation of _Ecclesiastes_. Joseph Vajs believed that the Croatian version of _Ecclesiastes_ was translated directly from the Vulgate.¹ Anatolij Alekseev has argued that _Ecclesiastes_ was translated by Methodius, alleging that there were similarities between the two texts of _Ecclesiastes_ in the Croatian manuscripts and in the Croatian Glagolitic breviaries which supported his claim.² He also has suggested that several biblical books in the Croatian Glagolitic breviaries were initially translated from Greek but, at a later date, were revised on the basis of the Vulgate.³ If one removes the later layers of revision, one may find underneath them the texts translated from Greek that go back to the earliest translations. Alekseev has built his hypothesis on analogies with some other biblical texts, applying to _Ecclesiastes_ the same logic which was used for the examination of _Job_, the _Song of Songs_ or _Daniel_.⁴ It is true that some books such as _Ruth, Job, Minor prophets_ in the Croatian Glagolitic sources contain features which have since been lost in the Cyrillic

---

¹ Vajs, 1905:VI. Thomson (1998:844) repeated his assertion. Among scholars who studied biblical texts in the Croatian Church Slavonic tradition Joseph Vajs' contribution is very substantial. He launched a series called _Analecta Sacrae Scripturae_ for which he edited several biblical books, including _Ecclesiastes_. He published the text of _Ecclesiastes_ in Glagolitic script on the basis of the Vrbnik 1 Breviary (of the late 13th – early 14th centuries) chapter 1:1 – 11:5 with the ending based on the Breviaries Novianum (1459) and Vatican 5 (1379), providing variant readings from the five manuscripts: Vrbnik 2 (14th century), Vrbnik 3 (15th century), Novianum 1 (1459) and Novianum 2 (1495) and Vatican 5 (1379). Since Vajs's time more manuscripts of the breviaries containing _Ecclesiastes_ have come to light, and at present the text is known in 17 manuscripts, though not all the breviaries have the full text. For a synoptic table of the 17 breviaries containing the text of _Ecclesiastes_, see Zaradija-Kiš, 1997: 629-35.

² Alekseev has included _Ecclesiastes_ among the group of other biblical books supposedly translated by Methodius. He posits four criteria for ascribing biblical translations to Methodius; for _Ecclesiastes_ the following criterion is applicable: “При выявлении переводенных Методием текстов можно руководствоваться следующими критериями: единством текста в кириллических списках и в глаголическом бревиариях” (Alekseev, 1988:128). It appears that in his work Alekseev consulted only the publication of Evseev (1917:17-9) without directly referring to Vajs' edition of _Ecclesiastes_.

³ Mathiesen (1979:6) has stated that the assumption made by certain scholars (Evseev and Nachtigal) that these books belonged to a lost Methodian bible may be true of the extant translations of the books of _Ruth_ and _Daniel_, but that the published philological studies fall short of proving this hypothesis.
tradition and which may go back to earlier translations.\textsuperscript{5} This, however, may not be the case with *Ecclesiastes*, since the statement of Alekseev does not appear to be supported by detailed textual evidence.

Johannes Reinhart, who has studied biblical texts in the Croat Glagolitic manuscripts, found that passages from the so-called Sapiential collection in the missal which consisted of the books of *Proverbs*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Ecclesiasticus* and the *Song of Songs* were revised against Latin. He has confirmed the established view that the greater part of the texts goes back to the Latin Vulgate and conjectured that the remaining passages corresponding to the Greek go back to the OCS translations. However, he was cautious about his findings and stated that this result was based on a limited number of biblical books and needed corroboration with many more books of the Bible.\textsuperscript{6} In contrast to the fragments from the books of the Sapiential collection that are present in the missal,\textsuperscript{7} the earliest known text of *Ecclesiastes* is to be found in the breviary. The earliest copy dates from the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, but there is no indication as to when the text was first translated. Before examining the Croatian Church Slavonic translation, a brief note concerning the origins of the Croatian Glagolitic tradition needs to be given.

\textsuperscript{5} For criticism of Alekseev's argument see Thomson, 1998:645.
\textsuperscript{6} Reinhart, 1986:77–84.
\textsuperscript{7} Nazor (1986: 71) mistakenly refers to the presence of pericopes from *Ecclesiastes* in the *Hrvoje Missal*. 
The origins of the Glagolitic tradition in Croatia.

It is not known how the Slavonic liturgy and letters were introduced into Croatia.\(^8\) Croatia occupied a unique position in medieval Europe because, although it was Catholic and therefore separated from the Orthodox Slavdom, it retained some links with the Slavic East through its adoption of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition. It seems very likely that missionary activity had begun the process of christianisation in Croatia before the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition was adopted; details of this process, however, remain obscure. The geographical position of Croatia, on the border between Byzantium and the West, made the process of christianisation complicated, for this was an area where many different groups of missionaries were active. The scarcity of sources prevents us from knowing precisely when or how Croats received Christianity.\(^9\)

The Cyrillo-Methodian tradition must have played a part in the process of the christianisation of the Croats. The Glagolitic script was introduced to both Croatia and Dalmatia. This tradition probably came from Moravia via Pannonia, and by the middle of the 10\(^{th}\) century it was already established in Croatia and Dalmatia. The Glagolitic tradition therefore might have reached Croatia during or shortly after Methodius' term as archbishop of Pannonia, in 869-885, by which time the Croats were apparently initiated into Christianity.

The history of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in Croatia which included the Glagolitic script, however, cannot be explained thus simply. Croatia appears to have been influenced by a number of linguistic and liturgical traditions. It seems that alongside the Slavonic liturgy, which might have been introduced by Cyril and Methodius, the liturgy also existed in forms which could have been presented by other missionaries.\(^10\) Two Church Councils in Split, which took place in 925 and 928, attempted to restrict the use

---

\(^8\) There is a substantial bibliography on this subject; the books of Dvornik (1956), Vlasto (1970), Obolensky (1971), Fine (1983) remain the main publications in the English language. The recent book of Avenarius (2000) contains an up to date extensive bibliography. See also the recent article by Mihaljević and Reinhart (2005).

\(^9\) It seems plausible to assume that Christianisation happened as a result of Aquileian missionary activity since Croatia was under Frankish rule; more likely that it was an ongoing process rather than a single act (Vlasto, 1970:187-207).

\(^10\) Vavřinek, 1978:255-8. It has been suggested that Cyril and Methodius introduced the so-called Liturgy of St Peter.
of Church Slavonic as a liturgical language in Croatia. Although this seems to suggest that Church Slavonic was used quite widely as a liturgical language, some scholars consider the issue of language secondary to the question of jurisdiction discussed at these Councils.

The discouragement of the liturgy in Church Slavonic could not have been very successful, since it is apparent that in the mid-11th century it was still widely used in Croatian Dalmatia. In 1248 and 1251 Pope Innocent IV’s attitude towards the Slavonic liturgy in Dalmatia in Senj and Krk became more tolerant, although this liturgy was not fully legitimised. This shift in view indicates that by this time Church Slavonic in liturgy was too deeply rooted to be eradicated through prohibition. This is not surprising: only the more learned members of society might be presumed to have beenversed in Latin, while the population in general, and the local priests (the so-called glagoljaši) would have operated in Croatian Church Slavonic. Thus the liturgy in Latin excluded the majority of the populace from understanding it. Avenarius suggests that the liturgy in Slavonic which existed before 1248 was based on the Byzantine rite, but after this date its contents began to be gradually supplanted by the one originating in the Roman tradition. According to Avenarius (2000:149-50), it was this Rome-orientated Slavonic liturgy which was allowed by Innocent.

It is accepted that the material used by the Croatian glagoljaši came, at least in part, from the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition. The main OCS liturgical texts, such as the Gospels and the Psalter, probably reached the Croats relatively early, by the end of the 9th century. The following centuries, 11th - 15th, in the words of Banac (1984:200-01) were the Golden Age of Croatian Glagolitic. While in Bulgaria, Serbia and Rus’ the Glagolitic alphabet was replaced by Cyrillic, in Croatia Glagolitic script remained in use, though

---

11 It is a generally accepted view that these matters were on the agenda of these Councils; however, the possibility remains that these linguistic and ecclesiastical questions were not discussed at Church councils at this time but at a later date. (Fine, 1983: 273) with reference to Klaić describes the account of these Councils given by Thomas of Split as unreliable, which implies that it could be a later interpolation. For the text of the Chronicle of Thomas of Split the edition of Akimova (1997) is used.
13 The gaps in documents do not allow us to determine with any degree of certainty either the parameters of the spread of Slavonic liturgy or the extent of the measures taken by the Church against it. See Fine, 1983: 280, Vlasto, 1970:199-203.
14 For the characteristics of the Croatian Church Slavonic see Hamm. 1963:43-67; Mareš. 1985:177-81; Corin, 1991-93:155-98; Mihaljević and Reinhart. 2005: 31-82.
mostly limited to the monasteries on the Istrian peninsula and the Dalmatian islands. A
certain amount of evidence for this is provided by epigraphic material of the 11th century,
but the earlier period remains obscure. Among other non-liturgical sources the first *Life
of St Wenceslas* is worth mentioning. It apparently came to Croatia as part of the Cyrillo-
Methodian tradition from Moravia, where it became practically extinct, but has survived
to this day in its oldest form, in the Croatian breviaries.

Texts in Croatian Glagolitic sources preserve very archaic features which go back to
the early Cyrillo-Methodian translations. They also contain specific elements which have
come from Latin. Prior to the 12th century, Latin influence was sporadic and accidental.
This was because the *glagoljaši* preferred their native language to Latin in which they
were ill versed. After the 12th century the attempts to implement Roman tradition become
more determined. This was done through introduction of Latin texts for the correction of
extant Church Slavonic writings and for the translation of new texts.

According to Reinhart (1990:193-206), the earliest known revision of lectionary texts
which introduced corrections from Latin was made in the 12th century. In Alekseev’s
opinion (1999:145) the revision of the main texts in the breviary in accordance with the
Vulgate was not carried out thoroughly and consistently. It is, therefore, hard to imagine
that the book of *Ecclesiastes*, which was neither used liturgically, nor included in the
Prophetologium, or the Missal, was carefully revised.

The following is an attempt to examine the claims of Vajs and Alekseev through the
textual analysis of the Croatian Church Slavonic *Ecclesiastes* and to ascertain whether it
was based ultimately on Greek, revised against Latin or translated from Latin. For this
purpose the Croatian Church Slavonic text of *Ecclesiastes* will be examined against its
counterparts in the Latin Vulgate, the Greek Septuagint and the Cyrillic Church Slavonic
text (of the Gennadian Bible of 1499). For the Latin text, the standard Stuttgart edition of
the Vulgate is used. In accordance with recognized convention the Glagolitic Church
Slavonic text is transliterated into the Latin alphabet. In determining the language of the

---

15 See, for example, inscriptions of the Baška tablet, the Valun tablet, and the Plomin tablet from the 11th
century (Fućić, 1999).
17 Jagić, 1913:9-64. See also the recent publication by Dimitrova and Anguševa, 2002:182-96.
original the following criteria will be considered: types of vocabulary, grammatical and lexical differences between the texts translated from Greek and Latin, certain morphosyntactic features, and mistakes in the translation.

**Lexical variation in the text.**

In his edition of *Ecclesiastes* Vajs used for the base text a deficient manuscript, Vrbnik I Breviary. He supplemented the missing part from other manuscripts of various dates and origins. He provided a number of variants in his critical apparatus, but seemingly, his choice was selective and arbitrary. Besides, even manuscripts from which these variants were chosen were not presented quite consistently. As a result in his critical apparatus he provides an insufficient number of variants either because he did not possess all the manuscripts available to scholars at present, or if he did have them, then for some reason of his own he preferred not to use them. In addition his critical apparatus is marred with printing errors. From his data it is not always possible to work out the origin of these variants and to determine whether the text was revised against Latin. Therefore the question of a possible revision cannot be addressed in depth at present because the relationship between the Croatian Church Slavonic manuscripts of *Ecclesiastes* is still not elucidated fully. What can be assumed from these variant readings is the usual scribal practice of modifying the text sporadically. The examples below demonstrate that the scribes replaced certain words with synonyms, but they may not necessarily have consulted the Latin source.

1:10  vsagda [prisno N 1] - recens
2:5   nasēěh’ [nasadih” N 1, 2] - consevi
2:26  daet [darova Pr., N 1, 2] 20 - dedit

---

19 I intend sometime in the future to investigate the textual history of the Croatian Church Slavonic *Ecclesiastes* but this research is beyond the scope of the present thesis.
20 The following abbreviations are used for the manuscripts in Vajs’ edition of *Ecclesiastes*: N 1, 2 – Novianum 1, 2. Pr. – manuscript of Congregatio Propagandae Fidel (Illyricum 5 in the Vatican library).
3:17  gospod' [bog" Pr.] - Deus  
5:10  pol'znouet [ pilzouet' Pr., (sic!) prospēet' N 2] - prodest  
10:8  kačka [kača Pr., N 4, gad' N 1] - coluber  
10:16 gospodin' mlad' [kral' otrok" Pr., N 1, 2] – rex [est] puer  
10:17 gospodin' [kral' Pr., N 2] - rex

Other examples of variation in the text can be ascribed to simple corruption from multiple copying or scribal emendation. The variants below resulted from the trivial corruption of one or two letters in the process of copying the Croatian Church Slavonic text.

1:6  v'zvěščaet se [vzvraščaet' se N 1, 2] - regreditur  
4:12 rastegnet' [rastrgnet' N 1] – rumpitur  
5:12 sladost' [slabost' Pr., N 2] – infirmitas  
10:7 sèdešče [hodešče po Pr., N 1] – ambulantes

5:1  boudet' tebé sl(a)va tvoé [ boudout' … slovesa Codd.21] – pauci sermones  
5:14 ot imēnì svoih' [ot ousiliē svoego Pr., N 1, 2] de labore suo cf. Job 1:21

The correct readings are found in the Propagandae (Illyricum 5) and Novianum manuscripts. However, from Vajs’s edition it is not absolutely clear to me whether this was as a result of a more conservative tradition, or of correction against Latin. My next step will be to look closer at the lexis in the Croatian Glagolitic version.

21 From Vajs' edition it is not always clear to which MSS his references are given i.e. Pr., N 1, 2 or others.
Three groups of words in the Croatian Church Slavonic translation of Ecclesiastes.

The words examined fall into three categories: 1. Loan words directly borrowed from the Latin text. 2. Words with a Croatian linguistic background. 3. Words belonging to the older layer of the OCS lexicon. Criteria for each category were established as follows. The first category comprises Latin loan words found in the Croatian Church Slavonic text. These loan words occupy exactly the same position in the Croatian text as they do in the Latin text of Ecclesiastes.

Among the words that fall into the second category, the majority appears to be borrowed from vernacular Croatian. There are others which may have derived from the OCS tradition, although dictionaries indicate that they are present only in Glagolitic sources. The basic criterion used for the allocation of words to the second category is their presence in modern Serbo-Croat. I attempted to find these words in early Croatian texts before the 14th-15th centuries and, if possible, to locate them in the contemporary language and local dialects of the western South Slavs. One additional parameter chosen for this category was either the absence of these words from Sreznevskij’s dictionary, or their occurrence only in the translated texts which are associated with the Gennadian Bible (as one of the translators supposedly was a certain Veniamin, Croat by birth).

It should be noted that these words may appear in other Slavonic languages, but in order to qualify for inclusion in the second category their meaning must be different from other Slavonic languages. Words from the third category must be attested in the texts belonging to the OCS period.

To designate the words as belonging to these categories several dictionaries (which are given in the bibliography) were consulted. The dictionary material, however incomplete, enables me to establish whether a particular word comes from Old Church Slavonic or is specific to the Croatian tradition and is still used in modern Serbo-Croat. However, it remains to be said that in a few cases it is hard to categorise a word as belonging solely to one class and, therefore, the division between these categories can sometimes be blurred.

---

23 Lur’e, 1988, 133-5.
Loan words directly borrowed from the Latin text into Croatian.

vr’č – urceus
2:8 et urceos in ministerio ad vina fundenda
i vr’če na služenje k nálevanju vina

Miklosich and Skok consider it to be a loan word borrowed directly from Latin.

račun’-ratio
7:26 et quarerem sapientiam et rationem
i vziskal bim’ mudrost’ i račun’
cf. also 8:7; 11:5
cf. modern Serbo-Croat račun ‘reason, cause’. Reinhart (1990, 205) lists it as a Latinism occurring in the Croatian Church Slavonic redaction of the NT text in the 12th century.

kapar’- capparis
12:5 et dissipabitur capparis
i rasput’ se kapari
Skok remarks that the word is from Latin capparis.

moistr”- magister
12:11 quae per magistrorum consilium data sunt
iže moistrov’ svetom’ dani sut’
Miklosich gives the word “maistor” as a direct loan-word from Latin magister,
cf. modern Serbo-Croat majstor. In the Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae we find only the feminine noun moistrynija ‘female teacher’.

Words with a Croatian linguistic background:

okrišlo-circulus
1:6 et in circulos suos regreditur
v” okrišli svoem’ vzvraščaet’ se
Miklosich lists the word *okrišlo - tabernaculum* 'tent' as specific to the Glagolitic manuscript tradition; his datum is confirmed in the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. In *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* we find the noun *okrišal* with a remark that its origin and meaning are obscure. It is attested from the 16th century onwards. This word is not part of the Russian Church Slavonic lexicon according to Sreznevskij's dictionary.

In the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*, the noun *okrislo* is listed under the entry *tabernaculum*. Miklosich notes that the word *okrišlo - tabernaculum* is specific to the Glagolitic manuscript tradition. His datum is confirmed in the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. In *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* we find the noun *okrišal* with a remark that its origin and meaning are obscure. It is attested from the 16th century onwards. This word is not part of the Russian Church Slavonic lexicon according to Sreznevskij's dictionary.

In *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* we find the noun *okrislo* with a remark that its origin and meaning are obscure. It is attested from the 16th century onwards. This word is not part of the Russian Church Slavonic lexicon according to Sreznevskij's dictionary.

In *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* we find the noun *okrislo* with a remark that its origin and meaning are obscure. It is attested from the 16th century onwards. This word is not part of the Russian Church Slavonic lexicon according to Sreznevskij's dictionary.

In *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* we find the noun *okrislo* with a remark that its origin and meaning are obscure. It is attested from the 16th century onwards. This word is not part of the Russian Church Slavonic lexicon according to Sreznevskij's dictionary.
Skok gives the verb *manjkati* ‘to be lacking’ for example from the 13th century *Zakon vinodolski*, cf. modern Serbo-Croat *manjkati* ‘to be missing, lacking’. It is probably borrowed through Italian from Latin *mancus, mancare*.

6:3

izmetʻk' -abortivus
quod melior illo sit abortivus
ěko boli ego est’ izmetʻk'

In the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* this word is attested as a later reading in the Glagolitic Novianum manuscript in Job 3:16, cf. modern Serbo-Croat *izmetak* ‘prematurely born fetus’. However, it has to be said that the verb *izmetati* is attested in Sreznevskij’s dictionary with the same meaning ‘to abort’ in the 15th century manuscript of the 12th century Old Russian text *Poučenie Ilii arxiepiskopa novgorodskago*. Though it may conflict with the earlier chosen criterion for the vernacular Croatian lexis, it is nevertheless included here because in Sreznevskij’s dictionary only the verbal form is given and in addition the noun *izmetak* is not known in modern Russian. The Gennadian Bible has a corrupted reading and the Ostrog Bible has a noun *izverg* in the parallel place.

7:1

lęki-velut
et tempore quo velut umbra
i vreme lęki sěn’ mimohodit’

cf. also 8:14; 10:5; 10:7;

As with the previous example in the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* this word is attested in the Croatian Glagolitic sources only. Jagić (1913, 418) regards the word *lęky* as a later Pannonian or Croatian interpolation. The expression *lęky* according to Jagić does not occur in the oldest texts of the Gospels and the Apostol [Acts and Epistles]: it only seems to have been introduced in later copies. The word is known among Čakavian islanders.24

---

24 Jagić, 1913: 204.
nor-stultus

7:5 quam stultorum adulatione decipi
neže norih' l'stiju prêl'stiti se
cf. also 7:6; 7:26
cf. modern Serbo-Croat norija ‘foolish’.

praska diračie-sonitus spinarum

7:7 quia sicut sonitus spinarum ardentium sub olla
zane ēko praska diračie gorušča pod' gr'ncem


t'scad'-vanitas

7:16 vidi in diebus vanitatis mea
vidēh v'dni t'sčadi moee
cf.also 9:9; 11:10

This is a Croatian word with the same root ‘t'st’ as the previous one. Skok defines the meaning as ‘damage, harm, pity’.

zam'cnica-laqueus

7:27 mulierem quae laqueus venatorum est
ženu i zam'ćnicu loveščih

The word zamčica is found in the Rjecnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika as a feminine derivative from the word zamka ‘snare’.

mestr"-artifex

9:11 nec artificium gratiam
ni mestrov" milost'

Unlike the word moistr which was borrowed directly from the text (cf. 12:11), mestr was borrowed from Latin most likely through German.
In *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* the word *kača, kača* is attested in a 16th century text: *žala kačka jadovita*. The word *kačka* meaning ‘snake’ is only attested in the Serbo-Croat, in all other Slavonic languages this word has a different meaning, cf. Ukrainian-kačka, Czech kačka, Polish kačka ‘duck’.

This adjective is a loan word from the Croat; it is found in the Gennadian Bible in the book of Maccabees 4:7. The adjective *plemenit* is not a part of the OCS lexicon according to the evidence presented in the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslavonicae*. It is listed in Sreznevskij’s dictionary with reference to GB II Macc. 4:7, and Sreznevskij equates it with the Russian adjective *племенной* ‘noble’. The word *plemenit* is still present in the modern Serbo-Croat lexicon.

Skok gives an expression *truhla žena* ‘pregnant woman’ which is still used in modern Serbo-Croat.

The verb *maknuti, maci* ‘to move from one place to another’ is attested in mon. Croat.1451 in the *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, cf. modern Serbo-Croat *maknuti* ‘to move’.

---

25 See Foster, 1997:564.
omendula – amigdalum

florebit amigdalum
procvatat omendula

Skok describes the noun as a loan-word into Croat from Greek ἀμυγδάλη ‘fruit’ and ἀμυγδάλον ‘tree’. However, I tend to agree with Vasmer that it is more likely to be a direct loan-word from late Latin *amendola* ‘almond’.²⁶

kobilica- lucusta

inpinguabitur lucusta
i otlstee' kobilica

According to the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* this word is attested only in Croatian Glagolitic sources: manuscripts Lab., Nov II, Vat. In the corpus of the OCS texts the nouns *akrida* and *prug* were used in its place. *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI-XVII vekov* illustrates this word with a quotation from II Chron. 6:28 in the Gennadian Bible 1499.

večanstvie- aeternitas

ibit homo in domum aeternitas suae
ěko idetě člověk" v dom' večanstviě svoego

The word is attested in the Croatian Glagolitic sources. As with the early example in 6:3, it has to be said that the verb *vecnovati - aeternum esse* is attested in Sreznevskij’s dictionary with the similar meaning ‘to be forever’ in the 13th century May Menaion: 

motuzac-funis

rumpatur funis argenteus
skrušit se motuzac' srebrni

²⁶ See also the entry in Ernout and Millet (1939: 123).
Vasmer considers the word *motuz* 'rope, lace' to be a compound formed from the verb *motat* 'to spin' and *voz*' from 'knot', 'to make a knot', cf. modern Serbo-Croat *matuzica*.

In the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* we find the word *kokul* (m.) with a quotation from the Euchologium Sinaiacum 100a: *zenam kokulju s'rijati*, cf. modern Croatian *kokuljica* (f.) 'head cover with the opening for eyes'.

Words belonging to the older layer of the OCS lexicon.

1:2  *vanitas* omnia
*esut* *esut* i vsa *esut*


The OCS adverb *asut* means 'in vain, without reason', while the Old Czech noun *jesut* has a different meaning-'vanity'. In the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* *esut* is attested in the Croat Glagolitic sources only, while *asut* occurs in the text of the quotations from the Psalter in several early manuscripts, not only Croatian but Russian and Bulgarian as well: Clozianus, Grigovičev parimejnik, Praxapostolus Slepčensis, Homiliae s. Gregorii Magni *nenavidjaščii mene asut* - oj μουσούντες με δώρεαν Psalterium Sinaiacum 34:19. In Sreznevskij's dictionary *asut* is illustrated with the same quotation from the translated texts of the 11th century: Gregory of Nazianza and the *Pandects of Antioch*. Jagić thought that the occurrence of *asut* in the Psalter supports its Moravian origin.27 The editors of the *Etimologičeskij slovar’ slavjanskix jazykov* agree with Jagić that *asut* is an ancient, though certainly Western Slavonic, almost definitely Czech dialect word

---

27 However, he is less clear when speaking about the expressions: *esut*, *sueta*, *tšad'* and referring them to three different layers: Glagolitic, Cyrillic and Croatian. See Jagić, 1913:396.
and consequently it is justifiably characterised as a Moravianism. I assume that ěšut' and ašut' differ only phonetically because ěšut' is a Bohemism.

In the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* we find two quotations from the Cyrillic manuscripts of the Homilies of Gregory the Great (13th century) and the Vita of St. Wenceslas (16th century) where the noun *snaga* is defined as 'zeal, exertion, diligence'. Both Miklosich and Sreznevskij describe the meaning of this noun as 'success', 'activity' and they give examples from the text of the Palaeia of 1494. In *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* it is attested from the 16th century, though according to Skok its inherent abstract meaning 'attempt', 'effort' going back to its Proto-Slavonic origin is not preserved in modern South Slavonic languages but in Czech.

The word rěsnota - ἀληθεία, veritas is part of the OCS vocabulary according to the evidence presented in the *Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. The adjectives rěsn" and rěsnov'n" are attested in a number of Croatian Glagolitic MSS. The adjective appears as early as the Kiev Folia. In Sreznevskij’s dictionary the word rěsnota is listed with reference to the translated texts of the Psalter (12th century) and Ephraim of Syria (14th century). The noun rěsnost is listed in *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. 
After my investigation of the vocabulary we can see more about the three groups of words. Two groups are small; the large one specific to the vernacular points more clearly to the late date of the translation. The first group consists of 4 words directly borrowed from the Latin text into Croatian. These words do not occur in OCS or Russian Church Slavonic. The presence of loans borrowed immediately from our Latin text of Ecclesiastes provides further evidence that the source of the translation was Latin.

There is a second group of 21 word(s) in the text that are specific to the Croatian vernacular. The only exception is a word mestr” ’skilled’, which is found in Russian Church Slavonic with a meaning different from the one in the Croatian version of Ecclesiastes. The presence of a comparatively large number of Croatian words in the text may not be, in itself, sufficient proof as to the date and source of the translation. Nevertheless, taken together with the errors in the text as described below and the presence of loanwords from Latin, this factor presents a stronger argument in favour of a later translation from Latin.

The third group consists of only 3 words from the older layer of OCS. However, the words such as esut’ ’vanity’ and résnota ’truth’ need not pose an obstacle to the argument of the translation being late because these words continued to be used even later in the conservative Croatian Church Slavonic tradition. Therefore they could not serve as a clear marker for the early date of the translation.

Differences in wording.

The apparent divergences between the Croatian Church Slavonic and the Gennadian Bible and Latin and Greek respectively go back to the ambiguity of words in the Hebrew Bible.

1:8 vseh že reči neudobnih
cuncta res difficiles
BEA СЛОВЕЦА ТРЯДНА
πάντες οἱ λόγοι ἔρκωμι
1:8  vyprostrēti slovom
    explicare sermonem
    grații
    του λαλεῖν

1:13  prēd'polozih' v" umē moem'
    proposui in animo meo
    θ'λαχ'τρ' κρ'υε μοι
    ἔδωκα τὴν καρδίαν μου

1:13  pod' sl'cem'
    sub sole
    οδὴν ἔνεμον
    ἕπο τῶν ὀφρανῶν

cf. also 2:1, 3:1

1:14  umučenie duha
    adflictio spiritus
    ιερολειώμα ἄχα
    προαιρεσις πνεύματος

cf. also 2:11; 2:17; 2:22; 4:16

1:17  i misl' moē
    et mens mea
    κρ'υε μοι
    καρδίαν μου

cf. also 2:15; 2:23

2:3  i um' moi
    ut animum meum
    κρ'υε μοι
    καρδίε μου

2:8  čaše i vr'če
    scyphos et urceos
    βινηκυ και βινηθάνα
    οἶνοχόν και οἶνοχὸς
2:8 stvorih mně pěsni i pěsnivece [N1. 2 pěsnivece i pěsnivece]
fece mihi cantores et cantrices
ctveři postula. mohu'ska pohov i ménska
eposilná muž životu a tak životů

The textual variant pěsnivece—'male singers' and pěsnivece—'female singers of the MSS Novianum 1 and 2 is closer to the standard Latin text than the one in Vrbnik MS where we find pěsni 'songs' and pěsnivece 'male singers'.

2:12 césara s'zdatla svoego
regem factorem suum

1 - crk gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof., gr. 3

2:26 pečal'stva misli
cassa sollicitudo mentis

3:21 duh' čeď' adamovih'
spiritus filiorum Adam

4:8 umučenie gor'se
adflictio pessima

5:9 ne napl'naet se skrovišči
non implebitur pecunia

5:13 i umučeno i préljuto
in adflictione pessima

28 The change in grammar in the Croat text is not clear to me.
There is no variant reading for Latin *praesumptio*, so the Croatian reading is perhaps reminiscence from 1:14.

The lexical divergences spreading throughout the whole text clearly show that the Croatian Church Slavonic version was based on the Latin source and the GB text on the Greek.

Divergencies in grammatical categories.

It is generally assumed that the biblical translations are characterized by an extremely faithful literalistic approach. In such translations we may find grammatical parallels with the original and even the same word order. This principle applies to Slavonic translators who, concerned with a close adherence to their sources, tend to be fairly consistent in translating the grammatical forms in the source language with equivalent forms in the target language. Therefore it would be worth examining and comparing the divergences in the text of *Ecclesiastes* in the early Croat Breviaries and in the Gennadian Bible with their respective sources.

Verb-noun

The difference in how the Latin and Greek versions rendered the Hebrew is reflected respectively by a verb in the Croatian Glagolitic text and a noun in Cyrillic.

24 See for example, Brock, 1979:69-87 and Barr, 1979.
There is no equivalent for *amplius* in the Croatian Glagolitic version. Cf. also 3:9: 6:8.

2:13  toliko prěvshodit' mudrost' bezumie
tantum praedeceret sapientia stultitiam
ακο" εστιν ἰσοβαλία μόδροτι πανε θεσσαλία
ὅτι ἐστιν περισσεία τῇ σοφίᾳ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀφροσύνην

3:19  ěkože umirajt' člověk' tako i oni umirajut'
sicut moritur homo sic et illa moriuntur
αακο εμρτυ εερο τακο. τακο (sic) εμρτυ εερο
ὡς ὁ θάνατος τούτου ὥτως ὁ θάνατος τούτου

3:19  t'kmeno dišut
simileter spirant
η ἄρκτα εφά
καὶ πνεύμα ἐν τοῖς πάσιν

Infinitive-noun

2:11  i niktože prēbti pod' sl'nce\m'
et nihil permanere sub sole
η μέκυ ἠσβολεία πουκ σιμπε\m
καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν περισσεία ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον

6:9  luće est vidēti
melius est videre
ἐν γό ύλαμία οὐχίο
ἀγαθὸν οραμα ὀφθαλμῶν

Noun-infinitive

4:14  vzidet' na cēsarstvo
egrediatur ad regnum
ινιὰε' ὑπὲρτοκατ
ἐξελεύοσαι τοῦ βασιλέως.
Noun-verb

In Latin we have gerunds, which are translated as abstract nouns in the Croatian version, while in Greek the infinitives are rendered as infinitives in the GB text.

1:8 ne nasišćet se oko viděniè
non saturatur oculis visu
non saturatur oculis visu

3:2 vrème saeniè i vrème podr'tiè
tempus plantandi et tempus evellendi

3:3 vrème ub'eniè i vrème iscèleniè. Vrème rasutiè ...
tempus occidendi et tempus sanandi, tempus destruendi

3:4 vrème pleskaniè i vrème igraniè. Vrème sméha i vrème plakaniè
Vrème sméha i vrème plakaniè. Vrème plesaniè i vrème igraniè Pr.
tempus flendi et tempus ridendi tempus plangendi et tempus saltandi

The Latin verb *plangere* has two meanings ‘to strike’, and ‘to weep’. I suppose that the translator rendered one of the meanings of the Latin verb *plangere* -‘to strike, beat’ as *pleskati* -‘to clap’. In the variant reading in the Propagandae (Illyr.5) manuscript we have a reversed order of semiverses, perhaps, based on a different Latin copy and *plesanije* instead of *pleskanije*. However, it is hard for me to say what was the primary reading.

3:5 vrème rasipanije kamene i vrème s'braniè. Vrème okročeniè i vrème
daleće biti ot okročenih [N 1, 2 ot okročenij]
tempus spargendi lapides et tempus colligendi, tempus amplexandi et tempus longeferi a complexibus

3:6 Vrème priobretenie i vrème pogublenie. Vrème hraneniè i vrème otrinutiè.
-tempus adquirendi et tempus perdendi, tempus custodiendi et tempus abiciendi.

3:7 Vrème razdr'tie i vrème svenie. Vrème ml'čaniè i vrème glagolaniè.
-tempus scidendi et tempus consuendi, tempus tacendi et tempus loquendi.

3:8 [Pr. N1 po. vrème ljubvi i vrème nenavistil]
-tempus dilectionis et tempus odii

Participle-noun

5:11 sladk' est' s"n' delajušcu
dulcis est somnus operanti
con' sladký panš

Noun – participle

2:26 grešniku že da
peccatori autem dedit

Infinitive-present

2:24 est' ésti i piti
est comedere et bibere
tokmo ţesti i piet

The grammatical divergences spreading throughout the whole text indicate how strikingly different the Greek and Latin versions are. The same can be said about the
translated Slavonic sources. Again, their divergences are preserved throughout the whole text in both Slavonic translations.

Notes on morpho-syntax (Peculiarities in translating the future form).

Just as one finds Latin influence on vocabulary (loanwords directly borrowed from the text of *Ecclesiastes*) one might expect to find some influence on morpho-syntactic usage. For instance, careful examination of Latin expressions for the future suggests that there may be some influence. In OCS there were three ways of expressing the future either aspectually or periphrastically:

1. **The Future simple** was formed using the present tense of the perfective and imperfective verbs. Depending on the context they could mean either present or future. However, the perfective verbs were used more often for expressing the future.

2. **The Future I** was a compound form consisting of the infinitives of the main verb and an auxiliary verb in the present tense. The verbs *načeti* ‘to begin’, *hoteti* ‘to wish’, *imeti* ‘to have’ were used as auxiliaries. The choice of auxiliaries depended on the lexical meaning of the above verbs.\(^{30}\)

3. **The Future II (future perfect)** was formed by the combination of the auxiliary verb *byti* in the future tense plus the 1-participle. It was used for expressing an action which would take place before another one in the future.

In 1:9 as in 5 more examples (3:15, 7:1, 7:3, 10:14, 11:2) a standard Church Slavonic construction *biti hošćet* is used for translating the Latin future form of the verb ‘to be’. These examples show that the translator quite consistently and without any difficulty rendered the Latin periphrastic future *futurum est* with the above expression.

\(^{30}\) For a detailed account of the periphrastic future tense in OCS see Birbaum, 1958.
1:9 quod futurum est
tō est' eže biti hoščet'
ti tō γεγονός αὐτῷ τὸ γενησάμενον
čto bimšeče to biti hoščom

The example below is of interest as here the translator deviates from the standard expressions of the future.

1:11 non est priorum memoria sed nec eorum quidem quae postea futura sunt erit recordatio apud eos qui futuri sunt in novissimo
nēst' drēvnih pameti ni onēh' ubo eže po tom' grduščai budet' spomenuti
[vspomenutie N 1] prēd imi iže budet' na poslēd'.
oük ēstīn mužma tois prōttois kai ge tois ēσhātoi̱s γενησάμενος oük ēstai aŭtoi̱s
mužma tōn ygenošēmēnu eis tēn ēσhātnu

In the translation of this verse we find different expressions for the Latin future forms. It seems that the translator was constrained in his choice of Slavonic equivalents of the Latin future forms by his Latin original. It maybe that he did not want to place the same word thrice and used the adjective grduščai̱ and the present form of the verb 'to be' to render Latin futura sunt in order to avoid repetition; this adjective was often used in Croatian Glagolitic sources for translating Latin futurus. 31 The adjective 'grduščai̱' is used as a direct translation of Latin futura. He was forced to do this because the future simple form erit followed immediately the periphrastic collocation. The form erit must be translated unequivocally as 'budet', as is the second Latin future form futuri sunt sut'.

2:19 utrum sapiens an stultus futurus sit...
ašče mudr' ili bezumni̱ budušči est'
ka tīs oǐde̱n ei sofōs ēstai n ēfrōv

Here the translator reproduces the Latin model precisely: budušči est'.

31 I am grateful to C.M. MacRobert for copying the relevant quotations in the Croat Glagolitic sources from the card index kept in the Church Slavonic Institute in Zagreb. For constructions with the future forms in OCS modelled on Greek see Večerkov (1961:70-92) and Ružičkova (1963:216-18).
Here a translator used participle and infinitive *hotěšče biti* to translate Latin *futuri*. In the Slavonic sentence there is a hybrid form: the first two words are close to the normal construction *hoščet biti*, but instead of the present verb *hoščet* the translator uses the plural masculine form of the participle *hotěšče* as part of the compound predicate. One possible explanation is that this form could appear in this particular sentence because of its close proximity to the perfect form *bili sut* and because it gives a deliberate parallelism to the literal translation of the Latin verb *sunt*.

The inchoative future.

This is the only example of the construction of *včeti* plus infinitive in future function. In Latin we have perfect and present subjunctive. In the Slavonic version the verbs are translated as a type of perfective future: *ziti včet, iměti včet, ne uživati včet, iměti včet*. The translator’s choice of the auxiliary verb was probably deliberate, as the auxiliary verb *načeti* in OCS implies perfective meaning, i.e. a total event, a mark of change. Since the verb *hoteti* does not have the perfective meaning the translator might have rejected it. The first predicate in the sentence is expressed with the perfective form *porodit*.

After discussing the following examples it can be said that the translator was quite competent in rendering the Latin periphrastic future with standard expressions. However,
he chose three different equivalents for the *futurum esse: gruduščae sut. budušči est*'. *hotěšče biti sut*. It seems that the translator wanted to stick to Latin constructions and he did so in 1:11 and 2:19. But as there are so few examples in the text where he deviated from the standard expressions, there is little ground for generalisation.

**Mistakes.**

Comparison with the Vulgate has shown a certain number of errors in the Croatian Church Slavonic text which could only result from misunderstanding or misreading of Latin.

```
1:10 nihil sub sole novum
ničtoze pod’ slncem novo est’ [Nl po. něst’] vrédno [noxam?]
```

The translator probably misread *novum* -‘new’ as *noxam* -‘harm’ and translated it as *vrédno*.

```
2:3 ad sapientiam devitaremque
k mudrosti prizval bim’ [devocarem?]
```

The translator misunderstood the verb *devitare* ‘to avoid’, he possibly misread it as *devocare* ‘to call upon’ and translated it as *prizval bim’*.

```
2:18 rursum detestatus sum omnem industriam meam
směh’ [risum?] otvr’goh’ i vsaku snagu moju
```

The translator misread *rursum*-'again’ as *risum*-'laughter’.

```
2:19 et est quicquam tam vanum
i est’ vsačskim takoe raz’lično [varium?]
```

The translator probably misread *vanum* as *vanum* -‘harm’ and translated it as *vrédno*.
The translator misread *vanum-*‘vain’ as *varium-*‘different’ and translated it as *raz'lieno*.

The Glagolitic text is corrupt, there could be scribal emendation as can be seen from the variant reading in the manuscripts Novianum 1, 2. The division into words was done by Vajs: *nine vinnoju*, rendering *per-* ‘through, of time’ as *nine* and *nocentem* – *nocens-*‘harmful’ as *vinnoju*. The other possibility would be to divide the words as *ni nevinnoju* < *nee innocentem*?

```
2:23
nec per noctem mente requiescit
na nevinno [N1, 2 nine vinnoju] [per innocentem?/ per nocentem?] misliju počivajut'
```

```
2:26
sed et/sedet
s ed et hoc vanitas
i sedit [sedet?] sie ešut'
```

The translator probably misread *sed et-*‘but also’ as the verb *sedet* 3-rd.p.sg. of *sedere-*‘to sit’. Note also the similarity in sound of the Slavonic and Latin verbs.

```
3:18
et ostenderet similes esse bestiis
i ukazet e čisti [simplices?] [Pr. N1, 2 slični-similes] sušče teplot'.
```

The Glagolitic text is corrupt, though the word *slični* in variant readings of the MSS Propagandae and Novianum 1, 2 correctly corresponds to *similes*. A translator could at some stage have mistaken *similes-*‘like’ for *simplices-*‘simple’ and rendered it as *čisti*. I suppose that it may be possible that a scribe mistook *bestiis-*‘beast’ for *bustum-*‘a place of burning (the dead)’ and translated it as *teplota*. This is conceivable but does cause difficulties because *bustum* is an uncommon word.

```
4:4
et cura superflua est
i pečal' na zlih' [N2 zalih'] est'
```
The text is obviously corrupt. Either a scribe mistook superfluos for superbus- ‘arrogant’, ‘insolent’ and translated it as zalih or more likely it was a corruption of the Slavonic variant reading zalih’ found in the MS Novianum 2, cf. modern Serbo-Croat zalisan – ‘excessive’, zalih – ‘idle’.

possessori-posteriori
5:10 et quid prodest possessori
i čto poľznuet poslednemu [posteriori?]

The translator misread possessor – ‘owner’ as posterior- ‘coming after’ and translated it as poslednij.

in ventum – inventus
5:15 quod laboravit in ventum
eže truždae se obrête [ inventus?]

The translator mistook in ventum – ‘wind’ for inventus- ‘found out’ and translated it as obrête. Vajs indicated this error in his introduction to the edition.

unum – vanum
7:28 ecce hoc inveni dicit Ecclesiastes unum et alterum...
sie obrětoh' reče Ekklisiest' suetu [vanum?] o druguju

The translator mistook unum- ‘one’ for vanum – ‘vanity’ and translated it as sueta.

infinitus – infidus
7:30 et ipse se infinitis miscuerit
i t" směši se s nečistivimi [infidus?]

The translator mistook the word infinitus – ‘countless’ for infidus – ‘impious, faithless,’ and translated it as nečistivii.

deierat- dei erat
9:2 sic et peccator ut perius uta ille qui verum deierat
tak' est' i grěšnik' ne bě boži [N2 ad.: ěž" že est' razvratnik" tako i on" iže rěsně bě boži] [dei erat?]
The translator mistook the verb *deierat* 3d. pers. sing. of *deierare*- to ‘swear, take an oath’ for two words: *dei* – *Deus* – ‘God’ and *erat* 3-rd. ps. sg. imperfect of the verb *esse*- ‘to be’.

*contignatio*-cogitatio

10:18  *in pigritis humiliabitur contignatio*
*v lénosti smérít se misl*’ [cogitatio?]

The translator mistook *contignatio* ‘roof timbers’ for *cogitatio* ‘thought’ and translated it as *misl*’. Vajs identified this mistake in his introduction.

Vajs in his introduction noted two errors of translation. But in fact an additional 12 have been discovered during my examination of the Croat Church Slavonic translation of *Ecclesiastes*. This makes the total number of translating errors 14. These errors clearly indicate that the original language for the Slavonic translation was Latin. Moreover, they are spread throughout the entire text, which proves that the whole text was translated from Latin, and not just certain parts.

We may observe that while some of the mistakes are reflected in all the sources, some are not. However, at present I am unable to discuss at length the significance of the presence or absence of variants in MSS N1, 2 and Pr. for the following reasons. In his introduction Vajs did not describe in detail the textual history of *Ecclesiastes*. He published the defective MS Vrbnik 1 supplementing the missing parts from the MSS N 1, 2 and Pr. justifying his choice of Vrbnik 1 MS as a base text by saying that it was the earliest copy.

From his edition it is not always clear whether the variants peculiar to MSS N1, 2 and Pr. were also present in Vrbnik1 MS, (their presence would suggest that they go back to the mutual archetype), or whether these variants were secondary corrections. Comparison of Vrbnik 1 with the recently published facsimile edition of MS N 2, together with some variant readings in MS Pr. recorded in the *Lexicon linguae Slovenicae redactionis croaticae*, revealed that Vajs was not very thorough in recording variant readings in his critical apparatus.
And so, from this publication of Vajs it is not possible to deduce which manuscripts preserved conservative readings and which were innovative (secondary): for example the presence of variants in N1, 2 may suggest that they were the result of a secondary revision against Latin rather than the initial reading. But even if they were, there is enough other evidence to support the claim that Latin was the original language for the text source.
Conclusions.

The textual analysis of the Croatian Church Slavonic book of *Ecclesiastes* allowed me to examine the claims made by Vajs and Alekseev. As a result of this examination no Greek underlying the Croatian translation was uncovered. Thus one can reject the possibility that the text was translated from Greek. The second possibility was that the text, having been initially translated from Greek, might later have been revised against Latin. In this case we need to presume that the text was so thoroughly revised that no signs of underlying Greek remained. Again as no such signs have been discovered, one can equally reject this possibility. After ruling out the first two possibilities one is left with the remaining one - that of *Ecclesiastes* having been directly translated from Latin.

And thus after my examination of *Ecclesiastes* in the Croatian Church Slavonic tradition I conclude that the text in question was translated only from Latin. In this I take the side of Vajs who stated that the text was translated from Latin. My conclusion, which I arrived at independently from Vajs, is supported by a large number of translating mistakes found throughout the entire text. These errors of translation unambiguously point to Latin being the source of the text. In addition, divergences in wording and grammatical forms which arose from their respective originals can be encountered between the Croat Glagolitic and Cyrillic Church Slavonic texts. The presence of loan words directly borrowed from the Latin text further strengthens the hypothesis of a Latin source behind the translation. Syntactic constructions such as periphrastic expressions for the future also point to a Latin original. Finally, the comparatively large number of lexemes in the text specific to a Croatian linguistic background suggests the possibility of a later date for the translation. The presence of *Ecclesiastes* in Croat Glagolitic breviaries cannot therefore be a criterion for ascribing this translation to Methodius. Thereby I reject those claims made by Alekseev on the similarities between the two texts, which in turn imply the involvement of Methodius in translating the book of *Ecclesiastes* from Greek.

The possibility that the translation originated prior to the year 925 when the Split Synod restricted the use of the Slavonic liturgy in Croatia is excluded, since the earliest known revision of the texts according to the Vulgate happened in the 12th century. In
Alekseev’s opinion (1999: 144), at the time of the formation of Slavonic liturgical books according to the Catholic rite, that is to say not earlier than 11th century, the Latin texts were not used. As I was unable to unearth any traces of a Greek original underlying the text I may place our translation of the book of Ecclesiastes no earlier than the 12th century. The earliest extant manuscript, containing Ecclesiastes, dates from the end of the 13th – beginning of the 14th centuries. Thus the translation can be dated roughly between the 12th - 13th centuries.
Concluding remarks.

Taking to heart the advice of Ecclesiastes to be economical with words I offer brief conclusions. The textual analysis has allowed me to group manuscripts according to their filiation, which is direct, and to demonstrate firstly, that they come from a single translation, and secondly, that the manuscripts of EccP which I have examined go back to the same archetype. On this basis it would be possible to reconstruct the archetype from which the extant manuscripts circa 15th century derived. However, I have confined myself to producing an edition with the apparatus of variant readings in preference to a reconstructed one, because such a reconstructed archetype would be flawed, containing errors from an earlier stage of transmission, and any attempt to go back beyond this archetype would mean leaving the firm ground of textual evidence.

My main reason for choosing to edit the GB manuscript of Ecclesiastes is pragmatic for it offers as complete a text as is available to us. Another reason is the availability of information on the cultural and historical circumstances surrounding its production, in addition to its importance for the history of the East Slavonic biblical tradition. By publishing the text from MS Sinodal'nyj 915 (GB) with a critical apparatus supplying variants from other manuscripts, I have illustrated the editorial ‘control’ which the compilers of GB exercised while working with the text translated from Greek. They appear to have compared their exemplar with another Slavonic copy to fill a lacuna in the middle of the text, and they shortened the interpolation by removing the commentary. It seems that they deliberately left the biblical verses in the interpolation intact. The textual evidence does not support the supposition that the compilers of GB collated their text of Ecclesiastes with any Greek or Latin sources. We may also dismiss Evseev’s hypothesis that the text of Ecclesiastes from GB was corrected or even collated with the one in the Croatian glagolitic breviaries as untenable.

The outcome of my investigation of the Croatian Church Slavonic translation permits me to say that this text was translated purely from Latin, and allows me to eliminate the possibility of Methodius’ authorship. By dismissing this possibility we are left with a ‘simple’ question: when and where was the Cyrillic text translated? For medievalists, including Slavists, such simple questions often turn into the most difficult ones for which
there are no definite answers. The lack of textual evidence prevents me from giving exact
dates and place for the translation. The beginning of the 15th century provides a terminus
ante quem. It is less easy to establish a terminus post quem. If we are to assume that the
continuous text derived from the commentated version, this commentated version, which
survives only in fragments, could have been translated in Bulgaria in the 10th century or
in the later medieval period, since we know that similar biblical translations were made at
this time. The approximate dates still cover a wide time span (10th century - beginning of
the 15th century). If we are to assume that the continuous text (an earlier and possibly
better version of EccP) was original and provided the Biblical translation for the
commentated versions (EccC and EccI), we need to take into account the verbal
 coincidences between the 13th century Izbornik and EccI, which suggest that EccI reflects
a fairly old tradition. If we suppose that EccI postdated EccP, then this would put EccP
back at least before the 13th century. However, linguistic evidence does not help us to
date Ecclesiastes text, as it offers few cogent leads. It has not been possible to bridge the
gap of several hundred years with the help of the quotations either, since the quotations
cannot prove or disprove the existence of the text, as we know it, prior to the 15th century.

My conclusions must remain tentative for two reasons. Firstly, I have suggested a
'parsimonious' solution to the relationships between the three versions, commentated,
interpolated and plain, but one needs always to bear in mind that the actual relationships
may be much more complex. Secondly, there are 33 known manuscripts of the Cyrillic
Ecclesiastes. Of these I have used 16 for my stemma codicum for reasons laid out in
chapter 1. I am reasonably confident that the yet unstudied MSS will not drastically
change the stemma. However, until all the extant MSS with the continuous text and
various fragments of the catena are examined my conclusions cannot be definitive.
Appendix 1.

Principles of the current edition.

I reproduce the text, preserving superscript letters, abbreviations but not line breaks. Apart from title other diacritics are not represented. Chapter divisions are given according to the Greek tradition. I have divided the text into words and have added the numbers of verses. In this I follow the Septuagint.

I follow the orthography of the Sinodalnyj 915 manuscript (the GB). In using capital letters and punctuation I reproduce those of the manuscript. Only corrections of the errors which are directly traceable to the scribe of Synodalnyj 915 manuscript and not to previous copyists of its underlying text are introduced in the edition. The following conventions are adopted in the critical apparatus: after the verse number the lemma is followed by variant readings with sigla of MSS. The order of manuscripts from which the variant readings are cited is as follows: group 1: Pg.1, Und.1, Sol, TSL 730; group 2: Rum.204, Sof., MS2; group 3: Pg81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200.

In my critical apparatus variants are cited in the orthography of the first relevant manuscript in the list. The second part of the critical apparatus contains readings that go back to certain Greek MSS. Greek variants (from Rahlfs’s and Holmes and Parson’s editions respectively) where appropriate are put below the Church Slavonic ones.

Variant readings similar to the ones given below are ignored as these are examples of variation in spelling and do not affect the text itself.

пotoчъ - пotoци, разрашенъ - разрашенo, въдъти - въдъти, забъена - забъена, печениъ - печени, млдъръ - млдъръ.

The following symbols and abbreviations are used in my critical apparatus:

\( \times \) = used for letters or words written above the line.
+ = plus
om. = omits
pr. = preposes
po. = postposes
add. = adds
corr. = indicates corrections done by scribes
mg. = margin
s. l. = indicates letters or words written supra linear
◊ = margin only in GB unless mentioned in apparatus
| - used to divide different variants of the same lemma
|| - used to divide different lemmata
] - used to separate lemma from variant readings

[ ] - used to mark corrections of scribal lapses made by the copyist of the Sinodalnyj 915 manuscript. These corrections are introduced when they are supported by groups 1 and 3 and by other manuscripts in group 2, including MS2.
Книги рекомендуется египетский свидетельства Соломона.

Глава 3.

1:1 Глоб (словеса) свидетельства, сна дважды царь имел в первых 2, святые свидетели. весь свидетельства свидетельства. 3. что изображено чашку, в весь свидетельства свидетельства. еже свидетельства по-свидетельствами. 4. родился и родился преобразует, а земля в языке стоит. 5. и въехала свидетельства и в мосто свое верное. 6. то Свяща тамо идет к 88. и свидетельства к северу, свидетельства окрестъ. идее, а царь и свидетельства его свидетельства са ахъ. 7. еже свидетельства идёт в море. и море не было насыщения. но в мосто этохъ свидетельства идёт, и тамо ти са въехала, царь идёт. 8. вся свидетельства трёхъ, не въезжает свидетельства, не можетъ ехать. не насыщают свидетельства око, не едятъ свидетельства са ахъ, не едятъ свидетельства. 9. что свидетельства то свидетельства и свидетельства то свидетельства. и мосто все ново по-свидетельствам. 10. иже въездовать и свидетельства речъ все сяло еже вы въ ручей, въ языке идёт. прежде насть. 11. мосто свидетельства прымъ свидетельства и свидетельства ежъ свидетельства на са имелъ. 12:14 Мёдрого они в головъ еже. свидетельства же въ тяве ходи. 3:5 время свидетельства са и время свидетельства са и въехала свидетельства са и въехала свидетельства, наблюдавшие свидетельства, наблюдавшие свидетельства. 4:6 Бого исполнение горестъ покор. паче неплениемъ двою: горестъ таинства. 4:9 Ваиа два паче единаго. 5:5 Не даждъ естъ свидетельства плотью.

1:1 (словеса) в the mg. Rum.204, Vol.13 ||
1:2 свидетелей] и pr. Pg.78, Arx. ||
4: a] и gr. 1, gr. 3 ||
5: и ей] и om. gr. 3 ||
6: овдовелъ] и pr. gr. 3 || и овдовелъ] и om. gr. 3 ||
7: насыщаютъ] насыщаютъ Pg.81 || мосто] моста gr. 3 ||
8: храни] храни MS2 (corr.?), Arx. | храни to 1-Vol.605 ||
9: о творимо] to om. gr. 3 ||
2:14 же въ тяве ходи. ] in the mg. Rum.204 ||
4:6 неплении] исполнение gr. 1 ||
5:5 плотью] с pr. gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof. ||
7:2 Благо ходи в домъ плача, нежели итти в домъ мировины. Ижохь конецъ всѣкомъ чльикѣ и живымъ дадь Благо въ сръцѣ его. 7:3 Благо возрастъ памяти. Яко въ злобы лица уничтожит съ сръцѣ. Барити са глядь слово. по слѣженію вывѣляемъ. Благо учителю и вѣки. такыми потребова слова. къ пощучникѣ Бляви створять и 7:4 Сръце моудрыхъ въ домъ плача, и сръце безумныхъ въ домъ весѣлъа. 7:5 И Благо слышатъ преченіе. моудраго. памяти моудраго слышающаго пѣпѣ безднаго. Ово слѣжаемъ моудраго же запрѣщеніе крепить и уставляе. 7:6 Яко глась терпѣ памятѣ. тако смычъ безднаго. 7:15 есть праведникъ погибав въ правдѣ его. и есть нечѣстивыя превыбав въ злобы его. 7:16 Не буди праведемъ велми ни муарѣ лице. да не како изумѣшш са. 7:17 ни вѣстѣкѣ велми. ни вѣди жестокъ да не 8премѣ въ врѣмѣ твое. 7:18 Благо преминга са въ семѣ. иво Его сего не осверниши рѣки твоеа. ико воли са имъ примнри вса. 7:19 Моудость моудраго скрѣпитъ. паче десати владѣющи въ градѣ. 7:20 Яко слѣкъ праведна въ на земли иже створить Благо и не сгрышнить. 7:21 Иво вса слова. таке възмѣливать нечѣстивы не приклони срѣцъ твого яко да не вѣльшиши раба твого кленѣцца. 7:22 Яко многие лѣкатъ ствует ти и многихъ и огловѣ срѣцѣ твое ижохь ты клѣтѣ никто. 7:28 Моудра житѣ единоаго въ тѣщіа жены же всѣ сихъ не житѣвтъ. 10:7 Видѣхъ рабы на конѣ и князіи науци пѣпи. 8:2 дѣставъ храни и въ словѣ клѣты быти, не тысиѣ са. 8:3 въ лица его понищши не стани въ словѣ лѣкатѣ.

7:2 ходи | ходи [TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof.] ны пировых [Gr. 1, ны is crossed out in TSL 730 | пировыми Rum.204, Sof.] ны пировыми is crossed out, ныра is written in the mg. in MS2 || и живымъ дасть] ны вѣдѣсть Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. || Благо | Благо TSL 730 ||
7:3 вывѣляемъ | вывѣляемъ [Sol. || kъ въ Sol. ||
7:15 превъшла] преввѣсла Pg.1 | и пр. Sol. ||
7:17 въ врѣмѣ] (не вѣ) Pg.1, Und.1, TSL 730, (не) MS2 ||
7:19 десати] (и. ти Pg.1, Und.1, TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof. || градѣ Pg.1, Und.1) ||
10:7 науци] науци Pg.1, TSL 730 | науци Sol. ||
8:4 И слово, которое Я сотворил, не вспоминайте его имени. 9:4 Солнце пришло над землей, и солнце положило свидетельство перед ним, и не дозволит ему никого делать ложь. 10:1 Следует сказать слово, которое Я сказал солнцу: 10:2 Следует сказать слово, которое Я сказал солнцу:
Въ иеремии 13. видѣхъ срѣче мое. взыскати. и съскѣти мудрости. въ всѣхъ выключающихъ подь нисемь. ико попеченіе лѣкаво да есть въ сиимъ чаянскимъ пещи о немъ 14. видѣхъ. всѣ сътвореніа сътвореніа подь нисемъ. и се всѣ суть свѢва изволеніеѧ дѢла.

15. разверзено не может са красити и дѣленіе не может са чисти. 16. глахъ азъ въ срѣци моемъ еже глахъ се азъ вѣквелиших са. приложих са мудрости паче всѣ ико выше прежде мене въ иеремии и срѣце мое видѣ мнох премудрость и разцоумъ. 17. притча и хиросости раздѣлѣш ихъ и се есть изволеніе дѢла. 18. ико въ мнох стѣ мудрости. мнохство раздѣлъ. и приложихъ раздѣлѣ ихъ приложити же болѣзнѣ.

12: Въ иеремии] бѣчисіясть сфора] пр. гр. 1, Рум.204, Соф. | цре соломона ро. Und.1 ||
13: съскѣти] съскѣти гр. 3 || мудрости] в пр. Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., гр. 3 || премудрости Pg.78, Arx. || попеченіе] попеченіе Pg. 1, Und.1, Rум.204, Sof. ||
15: дѣленіе] дѣленіе гр. 1, гр. 3 || чисти] чисти Sol. || чисти гр. 3 ||
18: раздѣлѣш] въ раздѣлъ гр. 1, гр. 3 ||

17: раздѣлѣш - єγων ἐγώ] ом. ἐγώ MSS HP ||
2:1. Рекохъ азъ секарю (сръцю) моемъ. прйдя да та нисъшъ въ веселии. и вижъ въ влъкъ и се сестьво. 2. смвъръ рекохъ повъженинъ. и веселие что всевъ творшии. 3. и посткий. аще сръце мою настави мъдрости. и еже дръжати въ веселии дохдемь живъ. которое влъкъ. и сынъшъ чицкъъмъ. и еъ створаъ подъ санъцемъ. въ чисълъ днъ живота иъ. 4. и възвеличи створеніе мою съдалъ домъ насадъ винограды. 5. и створиъ ограды. и насадиъ въ нъ древесъ. всакого плода. 6. створиъ и домъ чицъъкъ водныя. и напаль въ нъ прозавеніе древесъ. 7. притажаъ раяныя и домочачыши быша ми. и стражаніе скота и стадъ мишъли бы. па въ всъ бышиъ прежше мене въ иеръимъ. 8. и сърахъ же влъто и сребро. имъха цръкъъ створи поюцалъ. ноцъа полоу и женьска. и пища (sic) сьймбъ чицъ. винники и винницкъ. 9. и възвеличи паче всъ бышиъ. прежше мене въ иеръимъ. и монудростъ моя 8стави мъ см. 10. и всего егонъе въпросиста очи мой и не въ пръвъ сръцъ моемъ. въ всакого веселия. иако сръце мою възвысили са. въ всако смѣшени мое. и то бысть вся створена. моя створиста мою роучъ. и въ
трёдъ же поспѣши́й, твори́ть, и все сё́ва изволеніе дѣ́ла, и несть изволенія подъ ся́ще". 12. преображенъ азъ видѣ́ть мудростьъ, и лесть и беззміе. какъ кто чая́ть не имѣ́ть въ сядъ всѣ́ [свк] вса еликоу съ твори́ть емлъ. 13. и видѣ́хъ азъ какъ есть изволи́ть мудрости наче беззмія. како изволи́ть сбѣ́та, наче тымъ 14. мдраго и очи въ главѣ его беззміны, и въ тмѣ́ 15. и рѣ́ть азъ въ сръцы моемъ, како ложи беззомнаго мудрости, мнѣ́ же ложи ми са. всесою мудрѣ́й са. азъ тогда издане глахъ въ сръцы моемъ поне́же беззомной въ избыто́к гласть како се сбѣ́та. 16. како вт нѣ́ памяти мдраго съ беззомнымъ въ втѣ́, и како се втѣ́ въ днѣ́ градіяя вса звѣ́вны вѣ́йша, и како дмреть мудрости съ беззомнымъ. 17. и вызначенвидѣ́хъ съ животнымъ. како ложкаво на мѣ́ ств створеніе, подъ сбѣ́та". како всѣ́ сбѣ́та изволеніе дѣ́ла. 18. и вызначенвидѣ́хъ а* все поспѣ́щеніе оное еже азъ сбѣ́ть пож. сбѣ́челъ. како оставляло чая́о втдѣ́цомъ по мѣ́ж. 19. како то есть мдръ ли вѣ́дет ли беззоменъ. и ввла́дье ли имать всѣ́мъ тврдомъ монъмъ. еже мривахъ подъ сбѣ́целъ се же сбѣ́та. 20. и обратих са азъ. втрыщи са сръцы моемъ о семь тврдъ еже спѣ́шихъ подъ сбѣ́целъ. 21. како есть чая́о како


11: изволенія - прокораис] изволина gr. 1, gr. 3 - перипосія St || 21: об] об MSS - како
219

tвдь его въ мудрость и въ разуйте. и въ м8"ствѣ. и чйкъ иже не трдит са о немъ дастъ емого частя его и то сдает и алдквество велико. 22. иако вывати чйкъ въ всѣ трдѣ его. и въ изволении его еже трдяеет са подъ сллицемъ. 23. иако вси дйн его полкзии и ярості печении еч ико въ соции не спи срѣе его. и то сает есть 24. и вбйо чйкъ но токмо ысть и пйет иже показѣ дйн своем и бого въ животѣ своемъ и се же видѣ азъ иако въ рѣки вѣйа есть. 25. иако кто пйетъ или кто ысть языкѣ его. 26. иако чйкъ бого прѣ лицемъ его. да есть мудрость разъ и велели и сярѣшающемь далѣ есть печение приложити и собрати дати багое. прѣ лицемъ видимъ иако сает изволение дѣ.


26: мудрость разъ -софіав кай гивоив] разуйте и мудрость Pg.1, Und.1, Sol.- гивоив кай софіав HP MS 298||
Глава 4.

3:1 Всё в годь и время всякое веци. 2. время садить и врея воеврьдати саженое.

3. врея озбрити врея цвёлить. врея распьдшити. 4. и врея плакати са и врея смьшати са. врея пьэти и врея рыдать. 5. врея расклады каменье. и врея рассыхати врея вобъять. 6. и врея вискагати, и врея потьвнить. врея схранить и врея внять. 7. врея вдаряти, и врея сшить. врея млъчать и врьлла гать. 8. врея въвълывать. и врея вьзменавидьтми. врея рати. и врея мира. 9. что изобъе [изовилье] чйк въ вскъ вих же спьшни. 10. видъ печение все чйк почин в око. всл въ створи бъ. добра въ врея свое. ибо всякъ въкъ далъ е въ спцции в ико не обрьще чйкъ створение же створи въ в начала до конца. 12. распьдышъ ико икъ ибо в ичъ. но тогда е въввсельчинъ са и еще створи ибо в животъ своемъ. 13. ибо вслъ чйкъ и пе въ.

види" баго въ всемъ жити своиемъ. се даане више есть 14. разоумяъ. яко вса елико створи въ. тако въдет въ кѣки. къ тѣмъ и тѣмъ приложити. и въ тѣхъ и въ бѣ ставити. въ створи да 86 о. въ лица его 15. выщии. еже е. и елико" есть. быти и вмѣ выша. и въ вмѣ стѣ" гонимаго. 16. и еще видѣхъ по сѣнцемъ мѣсто. сдѣло тѣ нечистыны. и мѣсто праведно тѣ боючтивымъ. 17. и рѣкъ ахъ въ срѣци моемъ. съ праведными и съ нечистыми сдѣлъ въ. и како время всѧкон вѣчи. и на всѣко" створены тѣ въ. 18. и рѣкъ въ срѣци моемъ о глину сиѣ чѣй. яко раѣ въ. и еже показати имѣ. яко и смотрѣ сѣ. 19. ибо и тѣ" сдѣчанъ. яко сдѣчан сиѣ чѣй. и яко сдѣчан смотрѣ снѣтъ въ нѣ. яко смотрѣ сего тако. тако смотрѣ сего и вѣ стѣ и что изълише имать чѣй ныне смотрѣ. ничто" яко всѣ сказ свѣтъ. 20. вси вѣдѣть въ едино мѣсто. вси выша въ перші и вси въ прысть възираютъ са. 21. и кто вѣстъ ахъ сиѣ чѣй скѣя. аще въсходити емѣ домѣ [домѣ] въ землю. 22. и видѣхъ баго но токмо еже вѣзведені са чѣй въ твореніыхъ его. иако часть его яко кто доведетъ въ вида" в нѣже аще вѣдѣтъ что съ нимъ.

види"] видѣти gr. 3 || жити] житый Pg. 1 (bo is crossed out), Und.1 | житый gr. 3 ||
15: еже" га gr. 3 || и вмѣ] вмѣ и om. gr. 1, gr. 3 ||
16: нечистыми] нечисты Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., Supr. || тѣ боючтивымъ] тѣ боючтивымъ Und.1121, Суд.200 ||
17: и еже] и om. Pg.78, Arx., Und.1121, Суд.200 ||
19: и еже] и om. gr. 1, gr.3 || тако тако ] second тако is crossed out in MS2 ||
20: вси выша] и om. Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. ||
21: домѣ] домѣ gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof., MS2, gr. 3 ||

16: боючтивымъ - еуєφής MSS
17: тѣ вѣ - екек A ὑ θεός + HP MSS 23, 253, 254, 106, 155, 159, 161 ||
Глава 4.

4:1 И вкратчих са азъ, и видѣхъ всѧ цѣлеветания вѣялоца по сѣмъ слѣцемъ. и се слѣцы цѣлеветания и всѣ васъ цѣлеветаниемъ и всѣ васъ щиташаго. 2. и похвали всѣ оглѣшалъ. паче живыя елико же и живи сѣ доселе. 3. и бѣао паче овою сею. имѣ еще не бы е кръ створеніе лѣкаво створенаго по сѣмъ слѣцемь. 4. и видѣхъ азъ весь тѣдъ и велико мочество створенія. ико створенія моуежевъ вов подряда своеого. се сѣвета изволеніе Аха. 5. вездѣмно вѣлять роуѣ цъ своимъ и свѣсть плѣнъ свою. 6. бѣао исполненіе горести покоа на исполненіи двою горестій тѣдда изволеніе Аха. 7. и вкратчих са азъ и видѣ сдѣстество по сѣмъ слѣцемъ. 8. есть единич и всѣ втораго. ни сила же ни врата всѣ емѣ. всѣ конца всемѣ тѣдда его. ни око его не насыщает са могатства. и комѣ азъ тѣддяло са. и лишаю дѣлно мою вѣлостини. и се сѣвета и печенье лѣкаво. ест 9. вѣда два. па единаго. има есть мѣда вѣдь въ тѣддкъ ею. 10. аще ико падет са. едѣнъ ею вѣддянѣт причастника своего. и горе томѣ единомѣ егда со падеть и не вѣдают въ тѣддянѣт его. 11. и аще оусѣта два тепло има вѣдеть [въ тѣдъ] е единь како сгѣрѣт са. 12. и аще вѣрѣнѣт са единич. два станета противъ семѣ. и вервь.
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tреплетны скоро не перервёт са. 13. Быть рабъ нищъ и младъ. паче цри стара и вездина
иже не раздьлъ внимати и еще. 14. цело из домь оружинъ изиде црътворять. ико и въ
cртвъ его родит са нищъ. 15. и видѣ весьма живдали и ходалъ по слѣдѣ. иже встание в
него мѣсто. 16. и мѣстъ печения всемъ людей всѣмъ иже прес ними ибо послѣдний
въвреселит са о немъ. ико не суетъ ни изволении дѣл. 17. схрани ночь свою. егда идешь
в домъ биши ближъ слышати. па даний вездина црътворить твою.

13: иже и Арх. || раздьлъ врагу: Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Supr., Und.1121, Чуд.200 || еще ||
отм. Pg.78, Арх., Supr., Und.1121, Чуд.200 ||
14: ико || ико Sol. || изиде gr. 3 || црътворять || црътворять гри.1, Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78,
Arх., Supr., Und.1121 || црътворять Rum.204 || црътворять Chud. 200 || ико и || ико Sol. || и пр. I-Vol.605 ||
16: печения || печения || въвреселит || въвреселит са || не pr. gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof., gr. 3 || изволение || изволениемъ gr. 1,
gr. 3 ||
17: ближъ || и пр. gr. 3 || даний || даний gr. 3 ||
Глава 5

5:1. Не потрени съсъ своя враг си и съсъ своя враг си да не върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си. И това е какво е върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

3: не някой да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

4: да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

5: да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

6: да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

7: да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

8: да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

9: да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.

10: да върнете зле на врага си, а дадете си съсъ своя враг си.
11. сомь сладокъ равь аще мало или много снѣсть. и насѣяннымъ са богатѣція не,
овавшіе его посыпать 12. емѣдѣгъ иже видѣкъ по г самцемъ. богацтво хранимо и не его. в
члѣвѣ емоу 13. и посыване“ богацтво ино. в печеніи лѣкакиі роди сѣй и нѣсть в рѣчѣ ничто”
14. такоже и ныницѣ ерѣ чрева мѣтри своея и нагъ възбранацет са ити. такоже и приде. и ничто"
приимет въ посѣбѣ своемъ. да понадѣй в рѣчѣ его 15. се“ золѣ недѣгъ ико“ во придетъ тако
видѣть и что изображенъ его. и“ сплѣтъ въ мирѣ 16. и вси иже дѣни его въ такѣ и въ плаче. и въ
врасти нынѣ и въ гнѣбѣ и въ недѣлѣ 17. се же видѣдѣ дѣля богое еже дѣло. е“ фсити и еже
пители. и еже видѣтъ богастымъ въ всемъ сплѣтъ. иже сплѣтъ подъ сплечемъ число дѣни
живота е. иже е“ елмѣ въ далѣ ико то часть его есть 18. иже всѣкъ чѣйкъ еже далѣ емоу иѣ
е“ богацтво и имѣнѣ и власть на не“ и фсити и не его. и прияти части его и еже въвеличитель
са о трѣдѣ свое“ се далѣ же ейѣ есть 19. ико немогъ помлѣнѣ дѣни живота своего еко“ бѣ
печен са имѣ въ ввеличи спѣца его.

12: и не его] dittography Vol.13, 1-Vol.605, Pg.78  
14: посѣбѣ] посѣбъ Rum.204, Sof. || посѣбѣніяй gr. 1, gr. 3  
15: се“] и pr. gr. 1, gr. 3 || золѣ] зла Und. 1 || тако] и ро. gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof., gr. 3  
16: и вси … врасти] in the mg. Pg.78 || иже] отм. gr. 3 || ево] отм. Арх. || в плаче] в отм. gr. 3  
17: посѣбѣ] нынѣ gr. 3 || и еже пители} и отм. gr. 3 || иже сплѣтъ} еже сплѣтъ gr. 3 || е“ gr. 3 || вѣ далѣ} 
далѣ вѣ Pg.78, Arx., Supr., Und.1121, Čud.200  
18: еже далѣ] иво 1, gr. 3 || еже далѣ емоу иѣ] емоу“ далѣ вѣ Sol. || бѣ“] есть вѣ Arx. || и фсити] фсити Pg. 1, Und. 1 || нѣсть Rum.204, Sof. || исти Sol., TSL 730, gr. 3 || и емоу“ и“ gr. 3 || въвеличитель са} 
въвеличитель са TSL 730, Pg.78, Čud.200 || ее} отм. Rum.204, Sof. || далѣ“] сѣянге Rum.204, Sof. ||
Глава 5.

6:1. Есть ложь, которая уже видела по стадам и многих циклов. 2. Мы уже да-ем въ вога'ство, и нм'е и слави не писахъ дашъ своеа въ всего его' въ'елъе, и не дасть ему въ власти въ него цысти. Иако чю' м'жъ'сти има въ него, се'' стыла и нед'гъ' холь' е г.

3. Ище роди' моу' р' и л'та много пожив' и множи подать д'ние живота его, и даша его не н'ситъ са въ благостины, и погребе'ня не был' емоу, и р'хъ' бай' паче его в'иае' 4. Иако въ сть' крид' и въ тмъ' покрыть са. 5. И стыца' не вид' ие не разъ'к покол. се паче сего 6. Благостины не вид' егда не въ единъ м'сто вса люди' 7. всъ' тр'дъ' цыкъ въ еста его и даша же его не испь'нить са 8. Иако котором изъвили цыкъ м'дромоу па' въ'ельмого. поне'' нцмий въ'сть' хоздити противъ живота' 9. баго д'ляна очь' паче хотацаго д'ни, и се'' стыла изъолене д'ла. 10. ие был' ж'ке, и нарече има его и позна са еже есть цыкъ', и не въ'зможе' стыти са въ'кор' почетный'' паче се'ве. 11. Иако сть' словеса много сим'нанцае сть'мъ, что изъ'н'е цыкъ' 12. Иако кто въ'сть что баго цыкъ' въ живота его. число д'ни живота стыства его, и сътвори въ ст'хни, Иако кто въ'зь'стъ цыкъ', что вид'ет по'зда' его подь' стыце''

6:1 цыкъ' есть пр. гр. 1, Rum.204, Sof., гр. 3 ||
2: и нм'е и ом. Pg.1, Sol. || не и пр. Pg.1, Sol., TSL730, гр. 3 || его'' есть гр. 3 || се'' и пр. гр. 1, гр. 3 ||
3: р' сг гр. 3 || бай'' ... сц'к сг ом. Арх. || бай'' баго гр. 3 || в'иае' и пр. гр. 1, гр. 3 || въ'рать Pg.1, Und.1 въ'рать Sol., TSL730 въ'рать Vol.13, I-Vol.605 въ'рать Pg.81 въ'рать Pg.78, Supr., Und.1121 въ'рать' Cud.200 | па'' ро. гр. 3 ||
4: прьде' прьде Арх. || покрыть са има его ро. гр. 1, гр. 3 || его ро. Rum.204, Sof. ||
5: стыца' стыца гр. 3 ||
6: егда' едагр. 3 ||
7: еге его' еге Pg.78, Supr. ||
8: изъвили' изъвили Pg.81, I-Vol.605 цыкъ, м'демоу I-Vol.605 || и пр. Arx. ||
9: д'ляна' д'ляна гр. 3 || изъолене и пр. Арх. ||
10: въ'зможе' можеть Arx. || мо'' Supr. || можеть Und.1121, Cud.200 ||
12: баго' баго Pg.81, I-Vol.605, Und.1121 въ'рать Vol.13 || число' и пр. гр. 3 || стыства' стыство гр. 3 ||

7: даша же его - ка' ге въ'е яход'' + автор НР ||
Глава 3.

7:1 Было имя паче масла въ. и день смертный паче день вытій его. 2. Было ходить в домоу плача. ли ходить в домоу пира. понеем конец всякому часы і не выдасті вего в ср'це свое.

3. Было прость паче см'ха. ако въ злобь лица останавят са ср'це. 4. ср'це мудрено в домоу плача. и ср'це вздохны в домо всеція 5. вего е сть слышати запрещеніе мудрено. паче мудрено слышата п'сень вздохныхъ. 6. ако не глазомъ тр'пъ яко котлы тако смотръ вздохны и се сбєта 7. изр'же клевета листвъ м'дрого разлавлятъ ср'це вёрга моши его 8. Было посл'дано словес паче начала и'. Было тр'п'ливъ паче высокихъ х'хъ. не тыи са в д'чъ своеемъ пьрят са. яко простъ в м'дръ вздох' пониаетъ. 10. да не речешь что во ако дн'е древный въша влах не паче си'. яко не в м'дрости просилъ сей о се 11. Было мудрено сь разд'леніемъ по гречнью и изр'в'ень тв'жакимъ сознци. 12. ако в ст'кии са м'дрости ако ст'кии ср'вра изр'в'й разд'ма м'дрости. оживи' і не 8 менпя 13. вимь створенія б'л'а ако кто може' оукраси те вь' развратить 14. въ дн'е в'гостынна. жива и въ ѧд'
въ днѣ злобы вижь, ибо съ сѣла сего вѣкъ еже створи въ о Глѣ. да не овра精美 злобою [за совою] ничто•• 15. всѣсяка видѣхъ днѣ созвѣзда моего. есть праведныи погъваль въ своем правѣ, е• нечѣтвивы премываль и въ злобѣ своемъ 16. не вѣди праведнаго велми не мѣдри са велми егда когда изрѣкъ са 17. и не вѣрѣтвѣн много и не вѣди жестокъ да не бръми въ времѣ свое 18. онъ тѣ есть вѣдѣрѣдат са о всемъ и всѣего не оскривнии рѣкъ своєа ико воли са ии изидеть всѣ 19. мѣтъ помѣжет мѣдрымъ паче десати швалающии въ градѣ 20. иако чѣка исть праведа на земли. иже сътвори онѣе и не сгърѣшить. 21. и всѣ д" словаеа и" вѣтъ нечѣтвив и не вложи срѣца своего. да не сшлышпи раа своего кленнѣяза тебе. 22. иако мѣнѣахѣ и сдѣкоуѣ товѣо. обрѣченіене" моты озовыть срѣце твоѣ. 23. всѣ си искѣзъ въ мѣдроси и рѣкѣ дмода са 24. и тако влади са ии мене налѣче паче еже изъ глаѣка глаѣина. кто сѣверять в 25. и ввидѣзѣ аѣ и срѣце мое еже разрѣшати. и еже съсѣзэтіи са и еже взыкать мѣдроси и разрѣша. и еже разрѣшати нечѣтваго вѣрѣмѣ и стѣженіе и лесть 26. оврѣтъ аѣ то горѣе сѣмѣ с женою
никаке есть ловимъ и съти сръца ей и съдькъ любви ей рѣки ей. вѣчны пре́ лице' бѣйилъ извнинт са въ незъ и съборшали не вѣлъ встеть въ незъ. 27. се сихъ рѣчъ оврѣтохъ съборникъ единой единомъ еже оврѣсти помысль 28. его' вникъ диво мол и не оврѣтохъ чѣка единого въ тысячи оврѣто' и жень въ всѣхъ сихъ не оврѣто' 29. овчекъ ей оврѣто' еже створи въ съ чѣкомъ правомъ и ти вникша помыслъ довръ мнѣ'.

cѣти] сѣть Pg.81 || сръца] сръца Pg.81 ||
н съдькъ] и om. gr. 1, gr. 3 || съдькъ] съдькъ gr. 3 || любви ей] om. gr. 1, gr. 3 || извнинт са] извнинт са gr. 3 || не вѣлъ] не om. gr. 1, gr. 3 ||
первымъ Арх. || довръ] om. gr. 1, gr. 3 ||
8:1 кто въкъсть мъдрость и кто въкѣсть разрѣщеніе да. Мудрости чийѣ просвѣщаетъ лице его.

и вестъдныя лицевь своими възхненавидѣнъ вѣдетъ. 2. оуста црѣ схранѣ. и в словеси

клатвы бѣдна не тушая са. 3. црѣ въ его пондешни. не стани в словесѣ лѣкаравѣ. ико всѣ уже

аце створи. 4. также црѣ сълады глежеть и кто речеть емѣ и что створиши 5. храны

заповѣди. не вѣкѣсть гла лѣкарав. и врѣма сѣда вѣкѣсть. срѣце мѣдраго. 6. ико всѣон вѣцы е ор

время и сѣдѣ. ико рахѣмъ чиа мила на немъ. 7. ико нѣкѣсть вѣдѣнаго и что вѣдѣнѣе

аожѣ вѣдетъ. кто вѣдѣшитѣ емѣ 8. и вѣкѣсть чиа владѣща въ дѣка вѣдержаны с лѣкаравѣ. и

нѣкѣсть владѣшаго въ дѣкъ дѣрти. и нѣкѣсть сѣды въ дѣкъ браны. и не сѣпѣть вещество всѣнаго в

не. 9. и все видѣхъ и вѣдѣ. и срѣце мое въ всѣ створѣніе еже створено вы подъ сѣпѣемых

елико овздальъ есть чиа. въ чиа ико шлюбитѣ. 10. и тогда видѣхъ нечтнѣ въ гробы

несомы. и всѣ оттѣ идеиѧ идеала и похвалыца. и въ градѣ ико тако створиша всѣ же сѣта.

11. ико нѣкѣц калѣ сывлѣній вывалуц. и всѣ творящихъ лѣкарав вскорѣ сего рады всѣ ка срѣце.

сѣ чиа въ нихже створи лѣкарав. 12. ( и штѣлѣ) и всѣ дѣготы ихъ. ико видѣхъ а іако

---

Arx. - lacuna 8:8 - 9:1
gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof. - lacuna 8:16 - 9:14

3: е оно] е по Pg.81 || стани] станишн г р.3 ||
4: сълады] симъ влады г р.1 || и что] и отм. г р.1, г р.3 ||
5: е] отм. Pg.81 ||
6: е врѣма] врема е г р.3 ||
8: владѣшаго] владующаго Pg.1, Und.1 || са г р.3 || дѣка] дѣна Pg.81, Pg.78, Supr. || сѣпѣ] са ро. Pg.81, 1-Vol.605, Pg.78, Supr., Und.1121, Цуд.200 ||
9: срѣце] и отм. г р.1, г р.3 || створѣнѣ] творѣнѣ Pg.81, Vol.13, 1-Vol.605, Pg.78, Und.1121, Цуд.200 ||
10: гробу] гробу г р.3 || несомы] несомы г р.3 || идеиѧ] отм. г р.3 || похвалыца] похвалы вѣша г р.1, г р.3 ||
11: извѣленія] извѣленія Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. || извѣленія г р.3 || и всѣ] и отм. г р.3 || створи] створити г р.1, Rum.204, Sof., Pg.81, Vol.13, 1-Vol.605 ||
въдет бъдо. благоволицием са ба. да не воат са въ лица его. 13. и не въдет бъдо нечистовмою. и не предложихъ днн въ стъки. и нѣ въ ние воал са въ лица его. 14. есть света и акге створено есть на земля. иако суть праведници и достигають ихъ. (ако створеніе нечистивы. и съ нечистиви ая достигаю 2) иако створеніе праведнымъ. и рѣхъ все же света. 15. и похвалы съ се веселяемъ иако ность и въ бъдо члекъ подъ санцѣ. но такмо еже festivities и еже пити. и еже веселити са. и то привлъкъ его спасенію днн живота его. иако 2 далъ есть еломо въ подъ санцемъ. 16. въ нихъ дахъ срыче мое разломъти моудромъ. и еже въдъи печение створеное на земля. иако въ днѣ и въ ночи са въ очию своею ность вида 17. и видѣ вса створеніе бжды. иако не въможетъ члекъ изоврѣсти створеніемъ створенаго подъ санцемъ. елико же аще рече мѣрдры разломъти. и не въможетъ разломъти.

14: есть] и пр. gr. 3 || и шумъ и om. gr. 3 || все] се gr. 3 ||
15: нъ] и Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., Rum.204, Sof. || om. gr. 3 || еже пити] еже om. gr. 3 || еже веселити са] еже om. gr. 3 || то] и om. gr. 3 || спасенію] въ спасенію gr. 1 || въ спасенію gr. 3 || днн] сего pr. Pg.1, Und.1 | всро TSL 730 | его gr. 3 ||
16: печение] попечение gr. 3 || днѣ] днѣ Sol., TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof. || днѣ gr. 3 || ность - lacuna starts in gr. 1 and Rum.204, and Sof. ||
9:1. Иако все дахъ въ сръце, и сръце мое все видѣ тран превѣдній и дѣларп ныхъ въ рѣкѣ блэйо. и любви " " ненависти и въ вѣдк. и чѣй въ сц ал пре всѣ лицемъ его 2. сцета. въ всѣ слѣчай превѣдніемъ и ненависти вѣлъ его и чадо чистое и ненависти крещенъ и не крещенъ. Какъ бышес и иако сгѣрѣшили и иако клюни са и иако воли са клатвы 3. се дѣлваво въ все створѣнѣмъ подъ санцемъ иако слѣчи всѣхъ. и санце сидѣлъ чѣй исплѣни са дѣлствій и градо и лѣсть въ сръцы ихъ въ животѣ и и поздны къ мртвы 4. иако кто икъ приучаеет са къ всемъ живымъ есть надежа иако песь живъ то вѣлъ иако два мртва 5. иако живей разпѣдя яко брдеть мртвей не суть вѣдк_IMPL и ничего въ томъ нѣдѣ иако звѣвена есть память ихъ 6. и ненависти ихъ и ревнѣ ихъ 8же погъви. и части вѣсть ихъ въ вѣдк въ томъ въ всемъ творѣнѣ подъ санцемъ 7. приди и иакъ въ вселѣнѣ хлѣбъ свои и пѣй въ блѣк вино свое иако благоволи въ створѣнія твоя 8. въ всѣмъ время да суть ризы твоя вѣлъ и масла древняго да не лишит са глава твоя 9. и живи живо съ женою. иже еси вѣду мѣмъ вса дѣй сжества живота твоего. дани по санцемъ. иако часть твоя въ животе твоемъ (въ спѣкѣ твоя) икъ сжѣнщины подъ санцемъ 10. вса елика обрачей рѣка твоя створити. твори иако нѣтъ.

gr. 1, Rum.204, Supr.- lacuna 8:16-9:14

2: ненависть] нечистое Čud.200 ||
3: все створѣнѣмъ] всемъ творѣнѣмъ Čud.200 || слѣчай] локуак и Pg.81 | локуак и Vol.13, 1-Vol.605,
Pg.78, Supr. || санцемъ] срѣдце корт. into санцѣ въ MS2 || подадны] подади и Pg.81, Vol.13, 1-Vol.605 ||
мртвы] мртвы" gr. 3 ||
5: есть] вы" gr. 3 ||
6: творѣнѣм] створѣніемъ Supr. ||
8: всѣмъ] всѣ Supr. ||
9: дани] see Supr. || въ животѣ твоемъ] въ спѣкѣ твое" MS2, gr. 3 || мне] есьмь gr. 3 ||
ты] и пр. Pg.81 ||
стороння ни помысла, ни разъёма ни мъдрости въ адъ апо же ты идеши 11. и вѣратых са и видѣй по слянцемъ како легкомъ теченемъ и сильнымъ. крани" мудрымъ хлѣвъ ниже разоумны" вога"ство. ниже въдямимъ влагать како врема и славяни слѣдит са всѣмъ и" 12. ниже разъёмъ чйкъ времени своего. како рыбы славляемы въ мрежи хлѣвъ и како птица славляемы въ снѣтъ. и иакоже си славляемы тако. како ти" сгъть снѣве чѣччѣстѣй. въ врема лѣкаво вътежда нападѣй на на внерѣдѣ 13. и снѣже мудрость видѣй по слянцемъ. и велики су" мирове 14. гра" мѣлы. и молчей въ немъ мало. и прийде цыръ великъ и хкроти и" сѣдѣлъ о немъ цѣрогъ велики 15. опраще" ** въ немъ мѣха нищэ и мѣдръ и тъ сгѣть гра" мѣдрость своею. и чйкъ не памяновѣнъ съ мѣжемъ нищимъ о немъ 16. и рѣ" да йгла мѣдрость паче силны". и мѣдрость нищаго снѣччика и словеса въ сгѣть послѣшаеа 17. и словеса мудры" въ поконъ слышат са паче клича. овладаютъ" о везѣмъ 18. йгла мѣдрость паче сѣдѣвъ радны". и сгѣрѣша и единъ повѣдинъ благостѣню многѣ.

11: и славянъ и отм. Pg.78, Arx. [ ]  
14: сѣдѣлъ"] и пр. gr. 3 [ ] цѣрогъ цѣрогъ Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., Rum.204, Sof. [ ] цѣроги TSL 730 [ ]  
15: опраще" ** [ ] и пр. gr. 3 [ ] сгъ] отм. gr. 1, Rum.204, Sof., gr. 3 [ ] памяновѣнъ] влл" po. gr. 1, MS2, gr. 3 [ ]  
16: и словеса] ни словеса gr. 1, gr. 3 [ ] въ сгѣтъ] не om. gr. 3 [ ]  
17: в] и Pg.81 [ ] слышат са] слышат са Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Pg.78, Supr., Und.1121, Чуд.200 [ ]  
18: сѣдѣвъ] сгѣт gr. 1 [ ] сгѣт gr. 3, in the mg. Pg.78 [ ]
10:1 Мужы вмешивающего сглаз строение древнее масло сладости часть мало мудрости паче славь везёлма велика. 2. ср'це мудраго о десию её. ср'це везёлма в убою его.
3. и на путь везёлмы идеть и ср'це его лиши таке помышлять велу везёлма седь. 4. аще ахъ владычаго взыдет на на месте своего не встави вело вжде вставити гръхъ велики.
5. е. льбенстве е' вид'я по слыше еже новолю визде в' лица владычаго. 6. данъ везёлмы на высоты велики и богатии в сл'рены сал'е. 7. видлъ равы на копе и кнази надци вело равы по земли. 8. копалъ тамъ в нач апдеть и потребляющаго оградъ огрызне и зм'я.
9. земля и камышъ поболъ в м. съкнъ дрова вд'я премьлеть в нихъ. 10. аще спаде съчно и ть самъ лице спаде и схватъ. и сила внеможе изобиле масло мохрость. 11. аще съкны зм'я нь в шепт и нсть и смс я возвашемь.
12. словеса есть меры вагъть. 13. вездя везоумнаго потоплаеть его. 13. ного словесъ его везёлъй. и последняя 8сть е' есть лъкава. 14. и везёлмьй въможи словеса, не раздъш чькъ, что вьшее и что вд'яще.

3: лиши | лишии и Pg. 1, Und. 1, Соф. || лишии и TSL 730, Рум. 204, Соф., гр. 3 ||
4: на] на Pg. 81 || вставити] в ро. Pg. 1, Und. 1, Соф. ||
5: внеможе и пр. гр. 3 || новолю] новолю TSL 730, гр. 3 ||
6: лице] лице Pg. 81, Und. 1, Соф. | лице не гр. 3 || сад'е] вдоуць гр. 3 ||
7: и] и гр. 3 || мда] мда Pg. 1, Sol., TSL 730 | мда Und. 1 | мда Pg. 81 ||
8: в нь впадаеть] впадаеть в нь TSL 730 || огрызне || грызнеть гр. 3 || и зм'я] и ом. Соф., Рум. 204, Соф. ||
9: земля и] и гр. 1 | взыдь Pg. 81, и взыдь Vol. 13, I-Vol. 605, Pg. 78, Arx., Supr., Und. 112, Čud. 200 ||
10: и ть и Arx. | самъ] салъ гр. 3 || лице] лице гр. 1, гр. 3 || спаде и] ом. гр. 1, гр. 3 || схватъ] схватъ гр. 3 ||
11: лице] и Pg. 81, Supr. | лише] ом. гр. 3 || ом. гр. 1, гр. 3 || ом. гр. 1, гр. 3 || и зм'я] и ом. гр. 1, гр. 3 ||
13: везёлмъ] везёлмъ Pg. 81 ||
ихо походи его кто възкъсти' емъ 15. оуснѣ вверимыхъ и тгда могъ. иже не развълк ити в грѣ. 16. горе тевѣ граде емомуъ цвѣ твои звѣръ. и князи твои засушра тда. 17. врхена ты земле. ел цвѣ твои и стары свободны и князи твои въ врима жалат и силк не постыдл. 18. въ власности смирит са строптиво, въ праздыствство рѣк прокапла храмина. 19. въ цвѣ твори цвѣтъ. и вино веселит живыл. и серва послѣшавъ всачскала. 20. и ты въ съкъсти срѣца не клени. и въ клѣти ложници своеи. не клени богатаго иже птица не бьда донесе' гла твои. илѣ крикъ възлетить слово твое.
Глава. А.

11:1 Посемъ Хлѣвъ твоемъ на лице водѣ. Иоакимъ се въ лицѣ водѣ видѣлъ Тодоръ и пройдѣлъ 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво 85г. аще же на вѣтвѣ мѣстѣ, да останется вѣчное. 2. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра. 4. И навѣтъ Дрѣво, тоу вѣдетъ. 4. Власть вѣтра не се вѣти и смотрѣлъ въ облакахъ не посмѣлъ. 5. И навѣтъ вѣтра въ облакахъ, и вѣтра вѣтра въ чревѣ, та не разсмѣлѣлъ дѣль Божіихъ. елико же сотворитъ всѣя человекъ. 6. и вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра вѣтра.
ве́к си́ приведё́ тм бъ на съдъ. 10. и шеста́ и прость ср'ца твоё и приведи. лвкаства в' плоти твом ико внось и вече́й света.

10: света] и пр. гр. 1, Рум.204, Сол., гр. 3 ||

10: приведи - парáγαγε/πάραγε Β†] отпясти Сол. - ἀπαγείς S* † ||
12:1 И помяни сотворшаго тя въ днѣ сноства твоя. Дондеже не придасть днє злобы и приснпю* лкта речений мн. нкт* мн в них хотѣния 2. донде* не мркнє* сяще и схватъ и лдна и звзды. и овратат ся шалаци доцда домсд. 3. въ днѣ въ иже подвижат сн. страшіе домсд. и развратат ся мѣкіе сильы. и прорвзни* мелацця пако именогоша. и помрча* са глалацылъ въ кважк. 4. и ятврор* двери на тръжци въ немощи мелонша встаноцтъ гласъ птицы. и смфра* са вса дцера пѣтьма. 5. ибо на высотѣ охр* и древеса на пути. и прорцете* кълын*. (михда*) и штлсткетъ оврда. (проктъ) и разрвзитъ са вса кикаръ. како веде* чѣка въ домѣ вѣцъ своего. и швидоша и на тръжци плазцн. 6. донде* превратит сая. ояе сервра исквнти сая. исквшъ знанъ исквшит са вода 8 источника. и сломит са како коло въ колѣ. 7. и възратит са персть на земле пако 8 севѣ. и дѣхъ възратаит са къ бѣг. и есть далѣ. 8. сцета сцетствѣ рече хворникъ всѣ сцета сцета. 9. извилъ како бы* съврникъ мѣдръ. и сказа чѣкомъ и охро скдитъ красоты приточъ 10. многъ взиска. съврникъ еже овртсъ словеса хотенйн. и написана правосѣ словеса истинны 11. словеса мообръ како
шествии, как гвозди единочные и вложени дани вышла, и в пастырь единого низвили велико
в нихъ. 12. храни сие мон. створити книги миты. ньсть во конца учени мнн ~ трдь
плоти 13. конецъ же словоу. все послышан вд вра ся и заповдди его храни ико томуу вскъ
человкъ 14. ико все строее приведь въ на сдь вскомъ претрнне аще ~ благо аще ли
лжаво.

11: сложени сложени Sol., gr. 3 || пастырь пастырь gr. 3 || низвили низвили Rum., Sof., MS2 || низвили
Pg.1, Und.1, Sol., Pg.78, Arx., Supr. || низвили Pg.81, Vol.13, I-Vol.605, Und.1121, Чуд.200 ||
12: учени учени gr. 3 ||
13: храни храни Pg.1, Und.1, Rum.204, Sof. ||
14: вскомъ вскомъ Pg.1, Und.1, Sol. ||
Appendix 2.

Comparative table of continuous and catenary versions.

Principles of the edition.

The three versions are presented in a tabular form to ease comparison. I reproduce the texts, preserving superscript letters, abbreviations but not line breaks. Apart from tilia other diacritics are not represented. Chapter divisions are given according to the Greek tradition. I have divided the text into words and have added the numbers of verses. In this I follow the Septuagint. For the continuous text I follow the orthography of the MS Sinodal’nij 915 (GB), for the commentated text MS Undol’skij 13 (Und. 13) and for the interpolated text the orthography of MS Pogodinskij 1 (Pg.1).

The variant readings given in the third column seem to be mostly minor variations, however, these are represented without exception. For the letters that are missing or not legible the following symbol ◊ is used. The symbols used in the critical apparatus are the same as the ones in appendix 1.
1:6 ... идет токъ и окрывает его овращае’ са токъ.

Толк.
Вътрь токъ гдеть здне окрывает входить съита сего.

1:7 Ксли потоцы идзеть в море. И море икотъ насыщ, нон в мѣсто мложе потоцы идзеть. И тамо съ възралою ити.

Вкл.
1:6 Вс потоцы идзеть в море и море нѣсть насыщал са. Но в мѣсто мложе потоцы идзеть и тамо съ возвращают.

такоже бо ино и зводды овротъ земли входять и паки навращают са. Сице же рѣки и источники вси в море теченіе сотворыютъ. И паки въ моря начало соспрѣмъ на земле изливает са и круглопрапно входятъ. И паки тамо текотъ вникдже начало имотъ.

1:9 что вышее то вѣдащомъ. и творимое то творимомъ. и нѣсть всѣ ново подъслияню.

Вкл.
1:8 Что вышее то вѣдащемъ. и что сотворенное то творимомъ и нѣсть всѣ ново посляинкою.

1:10 Иже възглеть и речетъ все сильо і сже вы въ вѣцахъ вышш прехъ насъ. 

Толк.
Бышее вѣдающимъ гдеть и сотворенное сотвореномъ, срѣбъ цѣо сѣленна и питателна и растителна. Иже во что сокачает са всіе съ паки мѣсто новое возрастаетъ. и сего ради глеть
1:11 И́сть пама́ти пръвымъ и послядни́мь бывши. но в'едмина на послядния.

1:11 Исть памать первымъ и посляднымъ бывшимъ. ино ведями на послѣдокъ.

tol.

Глава 2.

2:14 Мудра́го вени во главъ его везу́мымъ и во томъ ходить.

2:14 Мудра́го вени во главъ его везу́мымъ и во томъ ходить.

tol.

2:21 Иако есть чйкъ тако страдь его в мо́дности и в разу́мѣ и в мствѣ.

2:21 Иако есть чйкъ иже не трудится о немъ дасть ему часть его и то сства и лукавство велико есть.
Во время мирных ночей, когда лицо его, да есть мудрость разума и веселые и соприглашающее, да есть печение приложить и собрать день благое. Преуспеем в силе, ибо света изволение Ахан.
Тако рече Багу дасть мрость и веселие, и в семь

подобно сему и дадь гле7 слава рече и богатство в доме его, и правда его превыше в во векы. согръшашючшему же повълять есть вала еже поити и собрати, сиръчь труда ил6 своея приложити и собрати, но и сие гръ т ег о рад я землет са, и даст са благом пре лицем. Экимъ и сие рече суета согръшашючшему в трудъ его, и печалованье дши.

3:5 время раскасти камене, и время растани врель В обитель.

3:15 въвидш. еже е т и елико т есть. быти и еже выша. и бъ вгнщ6 гонимаго.

3:16 и въвидъ пъ. санцемъ мст. сднное т8 нечестивы. и мст. о

3:5 Врель швуати7 и врель оustralи1 в швуатиа.

т. По закону маженцема врель оustralи1 швуатиа.

3:16 И еще въвидъ пъ санцемъ мст сднное, т8 нечестивы. и мст. о
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праведное тё благочестивым.

праведное, тё
несправедливость.

tol.
мость это праведное море.
хим мёсто правды ради
очинено есть. сиречь
избавити видимая нё рухи
видящаго. и также мёсто
праведно паче же судии
благочестив и праведну быти,
не толико во мёсто елико
правда. и в мёсто правды на
мёство праведнене везде
и неправда носредъ водворяет
съ. и сего ради рече.

3:17 и пх азь в ср'ци мое".
с праведными и с
честными еди' въ. и
како время всикои вещи. и на
всако" створений тё въ.
3:18 и пх в ср'ци моею о
глани снь чйч. иако рал въ.

3:17-18 И пх азь въ ср'ци
моемъ с праведными и с
честными судитъ въ.
како время всикои вещи и на
всакомъ сотворений. тё пх
азь въ ср'ци мое" въ гланй
сновъ честныхъ иако
рацдить ихъ въ.

tol.
сиречь аще и неправедемъ
socда судит са в насъ. но
праведемъ въ рацдить
всъ. и судь праведнымъ
tогда озёрн.".

и еже показати имъ. иако и
скити съть.
3:19 иво и т'хъ слдчаи. иако
слдчаи снь чйчъ. иако
слдчаи скитны слдчаи въ мнъ.
иако смерть сего тако. иако
смерть сего и дхь всъ.

3:18-19 И еже показати иако
син суть скоти. иво и т'лъ
иако случаи сновъ честныя и
случаи скотскихъ случаи в
нихъ. иако смерть сего. тако
и емеъ сего. и дхъ во всъ.

tol.
не по существу съво скоти
ными соломонъ чйки
нарица". но грешнъ по
случаю. сиречь по везаконю
ихъ и по ско́скомъ дѣ́ствію подобны скотомъ мв́нить. 
таетъ во яко случаи ско́ский случаи в ни. и яко смерть 
сего. тако и смерть сего. и дѣ́ствь сирѣ́чь дыханье во 
всѣ́. здѣ́ же ио есть 
существо. ино же случаи. 
существо оуьо 
непреставительное и 
непрелого. но не ио 
существу. и чи́ческое оуьо 
дѣ́ственное существо словесно и 
оуьо нарицает смо. яко 
агуяское подобье а не яко 
ско́ское. и всѣе существо 
непреставительное именует 
смо. сирѣ́чь словесно и 
оуьость непрелагает см. 
существене в 
вездесловесность. но по 
дѣ́ствію точно и по 
неприменію в неразсужденье. 
еже по самовластію а не по 
существу выывает. тѣ́м же 
оуьо по ваго́умленью чи́ка 
дѣ́е и не аггѣ́ сущ. но 
подобно аггѣ́ нарицает. 
яко же гя́еть дѣ́ств. что 
есть чи́къ яко поминиши и. 
ли си́я чи́къ яко посѣ́щаши 
и. оумали и си малыми 
мними и. аггѣ́ сирѣ́чь 
точно тѣ́лою сего плотио. 
подобне же и гя́еть 
воздуть рече яко аггѣ́. по 
бешаконному же и 
бешенавистному дѣ́ству 
члѣ́я скотомъ прилагает 
смо. яко и дѣ́ств 
свѣ́дѣ́льчествує. члѣ́я рече в 
чести си не разумѣ́ приложи 
смо скотомъ несмысленныи и 
оуговоди смо имя. и 
вже́твенное слово. не мечите 
висеръ ваши пре́ свиниалии. 
и прочь. здѣ́ же оуьо 
вже́твенаго писанія силѣ́,
3:19 и что излишне имать чайкъ паче скотины. ничто же како вслѣска съета. 3:20 вси идъть въ едино мѣсто. вси выша въ персти и вси въ прысть въз врашаютъ са.

3:21 и кто въсть дерь сны чайской. аще въсходити емѣ домѣ [Долѣ] въ землю.
скотъ оумираетъ, сице же и 
чакъ плотию радве душ. а 
еме рече, и кто въ стъ дѣхъ 
смокъ чическѣ аще восходи 
ему горѣ. и дѣхъ сокъ 
еме сходиши емѣ долѣ в 
землѣ. и сѣ рече невѣдети 
сего ради, здѣне не вѣмы что 
живемъ и что получимъ, 
бѣло ли по дѣломъ нашимъ 
или зло. горѣ ли мѣсто или 
долѣ вѣрше", и да никто 
же возьминитъ размѣнанѣ дѣ 
намѣнъ и ско словъ. но 
превыываетъ дѣш и по 
вѣсты тѣла сана и сѣ 
и сѣмь оуто тонъ же 
соломонъ гнѣтъ, вѣ 
прелѣ россѣ свои, дѣш рече 
правды в руцы бѣги 
си владѣли, и не 
прикоснетса и" мѣка, и паки 
рече лихви быша во чиѣ 
вѣдимыі у оумрети. вѣ 
ако не токмо сидѣдали в 
руцы бѣги, но и вѣсѣрными 
пождает. подовне же и инал 
многа в вѣстевомъ 
писаний вѣршины.

4:4 и видѣнъ азъ весь тѣдѣ 
и велико многоство створенія. 
яко створенія моужеви 
подрѣга своего. се сѣета 
изволеніе дѣш.

глава 4 ект.

4:4 Видѣнъ азъ весь тѣдѣ 
и всажко многоство 
сотворенаго. яко сотвореніе 
моужеви 
подрѣга своего и 
се сѣета.

Тол.
Весь тѣдѣ сотворенаго не 
его гнѣтъ, но иже 
восущенѣлѣмъ именѣтъ свое 
дѣло быти восприявѣ 
подрѣга своего, и се рече 
сѣета.

6кт.

4:5 вѣдѣмно швѣтъ руцы́
свои, и снёсши плоть свою.
свои, и снёсши плоть свою.
Тол.
Ненави́дя дух гнёты иже здобыо и духа́нствомъ снёсдае множество своего.
6кл.
4:6 Блага ест исполнение горесть покола пя́ исполнения двою горестью тру́да.
Тол.
лётче рече и в посрёдствии изятся превыхвати с покое́мъ неежели в богатстве́ тру́дне и в печа́ превыхвати.
инъ.
единя горсть д́бства целому́рдя́ а дво́ горести законны́ вре́ мазленьчемъ. не хвалимъ брака но первое похвалы́ке.

4:9 Блага́ два. па́ единаго. имя́ есть муда́ Блага́ въ тру́де ею.
екла.
4:9 Блага́ два паче единаго имя́е есть муда́ Блага́ въ тру́де них.
еклисасть.
4:9 Блага́ два паче единаго : т. Сва́й двою и въ Гвя вении д́бшимъ же д́ша с т́ломъ въ добрые ску́плюющи имать муду́ и бо. аще т́ло цело́мудрству́ть. треславити же д́ша всуе се цело́мудрое аще ли д́ша смирять. Блудить же т́ло. всуе то смирение части едином скуплюющи. мужа и другому части привлачать.
ску́плюющи] ску́плюющи Rum.204, Sof. || се...всуе - in the mg. TSL 730 || е] om. Sof. ||
4:10 И аще окурпнет са единъ. два станета противъ емъ. и верь треплетнъ скоро не перервът са.

4:11 И аще оусета два тепло има вдеть [в того] а единъ како съгръет са.
Гледът, и ако йажитъ сопражение и любовь чисто и съпризение Духъ съ тьхъ и противление съ диаволомъ, а еже рече вервь трепела не скоро растворнет съ. сиръ иже друзьяе по быкъ именъ то ако вервь ике въ трое вити имать паче единъ вить въ добродѣтелеъ вьнять и крѣпостью добродѣтеленъ едва паде" съ.

4:13 Бъгъ рабъ ниць и мѣдръ. паче цръ стара и беззъма ике не раздъятъ внимати и еже.

4:14 Иако изъ домъ оружникъ изде" црътовать. иако и въ цръткъ его родитъ съ ниць.

4:15 и видѣ" вса живущълъ и ходача по" слыше" иже въстане" въ него мѣсто.

4:13 Бъгъ рабъ ниць и премъ рабъ паче стара цръ беззъма. ике не раздъятъ внимати еже.

4:14 Иако изъ домъ юхонъ иыметь црътовати, и нарожены въ цръткъ ницетою погибнетъ.

4:15-16 И видѣхъ вса живущълъ и ходача пало" снимълъ съ юнымъ вторымъ. иже встане" в.
4:16 и место печеня всем людем всем иже пречными ибо посладений возвеселит са о немъ. Иако не света ни изволение Аха.

4:16 место и мсть печеня всемъ людемъ и всемъ иже предь ними ибо послѧдния възвеселит сѧ о немъ. Иако не света ни изволенѧѧ Аха.

4:17 сохраня ногт свой. егда аще идеш в домъ вкн близъ вспыхати. па даннъ безумны жертви твою.

4:17 И сохраня ногт твою. егда аще идеш в домъ вкн и близъ ослышали паче данен безумны жеста твоя. Иако не суть повъдлающи творити благое.

5:2 яко придетъ сните въ мноествѣ искѧса. и гласъ безымнаго въ мноествѣ словѣ."
5:5 не дай весть своих сокрушать плоти своих. да не речеши пред лице его
выхълт. ибо да невидене е ода проникнет са бо о мысли твоих и расте
твоеа

5:9 люби сребро не насъти са сребра и кто въздлоби въ вмно"ство его живо" и се же света

5:10 въ вмно"стве" багостына 8мно жишъл вадцыин и которое мок"ство е" штъл. ико на ло видъти очила его.

5:5 Не дай оусть своих сокрушни плоти своих.

Тол.
О срамослови тает срамологами бо пыкок все тъло усквернетъ и мужемъ з женами швостраетъ на похоть.

6:9 Любии сребро не насъти са сребра и кто въздлоби въ вмно"ство ихъ плоды.

тол.
Блуже аще оуможитъ са вога"ство то в лице не оуможитъ наче не ли в земны плодъ восприятъ требуется.

5:10 Во множествъ багостына оуможитъ са вадцыию и кое мок"ество в сеа аще начало видъти очила его.

Тол.
Идъже рече многое сверхне богатства. то мнизи вываютъ иже вдат в него. и сего ради что созирамъ много. но раздаваем
нишимъ и дадимъ вземъ бо"ш. кое же рече мъ"ство и разумъ еже вотче в семъ прилежати и трудися. и начало точиу видете еже ты трудишися. и миши подають иже скоты и волы и прочиа.

5:18 иже всякъ чькъ еже далъ емоу въ вога"ство и

6:9 Любии сребро не насъти са сребра и кто въздлоби въ вмно"ство ихъ плоды.

тол.
Блуже аще оуможитъ са вога"ство то в лице не оуможитъ наче не ли в земны плодъ восприятъ требуется.

6:9 Любли сребро не насъти са сребра и кто въздлоби въ вмно"ство ихъ плоды.

тол.
Блуже аще оуможитъ са вога"ство то в лице не оуможитъ наче не ли в земны плодъ восприятъ требуется.

экл.
5:5 Не дай же оустомъ сокрушати с плотию
т.
Еже срамословье срамологай бо пыкок все тъло ускверни. и мужемъ с женами оутстраетъ на похоть.
никто не властен на не" и "ст и не его. И притеснят ста его и сожжут в застене его о той своей се да име в тебе есть.

5:19 И како немогут помянуши дни живота своего како въ печете а им въ веселия срещу его.

5:19 Иако немогу помянутин дни живота своего како въ печаль его в веселия серцем его.

То.,
Не буду сю рече. Но материю и благопожелание к нимъ и твердой думе и немоги дни живота своего но вынуть смерть имъ прервать своихъ нижъ въ небо богатство мени не оправдалъ возлагон на ны како на Всаг. но бъ есть ане богатство печаль в веселии тевѣ.

6:7 всѣ тѣдъ чѣмъ въ ста его и дѣша же его не исполнит са

6:7 Весь трудъ чѣмъ во ста его и дѣша его не исполнит са.

то.,
Аще и по всѣ дни наслаждаемъ плоть свою. И весь трудъ нашъ сидѣляемъ. Но паки личинъ вываемъ. И сего ради очунуть на да не чревохвѣдатьли вѣдемъ но мякъ и оставъ содержимъ. И паки аще и сыты есмы. Аще и потребными довольни вывае" Иако и много привѣрысти. Дѣша же наша. сердце видѣннѣе не насъмет са. И не иматъ наполнити са желамѣнѣмъ.

6:8 Иако которое изговилѣ чѣмъ мѣркумахъ на ы

6:8 Иако изговилѣ чѣмъ мѣрому паече безумнаго.
въздухъ. поне" ницѣи вѣсть ходити противъ животъ.

поне" ницѣя видѣ ходити противъ животъ.
тол.
Изощрени ем'яомъ паче вѣдучія есть понеже аще и ницѣ есть, но вѣсть како полвчати бѣгі."  
6:9 Было дѣлани очно паче хотящаго дѣши. и се сѣйта изволеніе дѣха.

тол.
Сирѣчъ лутче е вѣдѣти и ширѣсти жемелемо. нечелѣ жемати дѣше сирѣчъ мѣлшью егоже не вѣдомо есть ширѣсти. таковое рече вотще дѣланіе. и се сѣюю нарицаетъ.
глава 7
ekл.
7:1 Было имѣ паче масла вѣръ. и дѣнь смртни паче дѣнь выйти его.

тол.
Было рече имѣ паче елемъ елекъ. здѣе добрѣнъ услаждаетъ бѣгіѣ славою. и наполняетъ жако сладостію слышамѣмъ ушека. не токмо бо вѣдоумій гортали усладити. елико было слышимое видѣти желающѣ полды ради дѣши своен. дѣнь же смртни паче дѣй роженія его глѣтѣ. здѣе родит са чѣкъ с плачею в мирѣ. и къ смртни есть изъшествіе его. омесрымъ же управлят са в іел. и въ смртни сподовише са. тако" и въ тлѣннягожъ житиа
7:3 Благо ярость паче смеха. Иако во злобы лица облакит са срце.

7:3 Благо ярость паче смеха. Иако во злобы лица облакит са срце.

cрдце.

7:3 Благо ярость паче смеха. Иако во злобы лица облакит са срце.

cрдце.
радовати са чуку диею.
са оустрашаеть и радовати
са чуку диею:

еже] име Sol. || птиттишему] птиттишему TSL 730 | огттишему Rum.204, Sof. || похужему и]
погуленем Und.1 | и отм. TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof. || халак] халак Sol. || ми] им TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof.||

дрити са гить слово. но
случению вываёмь. бого
учителю и в'якъ. такими
потребов слаовь. къ
подручникомъ бытъ
творят ихь :


7:4 ср'це мохъры в домоу
плача. и ср'це веъзмыхъ в
dom' веселя

tol.
мохъры плачь помышлялъ како
жела и како оудовь в'а" здѣ
принадаеть и прилагаетъ са.
вываётъ оуо мохъры
tакова терпщцій".
веъзмыхъ же твердь бытъ в
мировъ мнѣ недостоинаго
свого помышленія. ни на
в'дущее взира. но на пирь
и питье оупражнѣла са и
сласі. знаменетъ здѣ
екликаста разсужденіе. зѣме
многажды ея мироувѣй
лице подлагаалъ еже жасти и
пить позевлыаетъ еже бого.

7:5 баго е" слышати
запремѣнене моужка. паче
моужка слышаца п'єснь
веъзмыхъ

tol.
7:5 Баго слышати прержене
моужды. паче мѣща
слышацаго п'єснь
веъзмыхъ.

7:5 Е и баго слышати.
прежене моужды. пъ моужка
слышоаго п'єснь
веъзмыхъ.
7:6 тако глаў терния по котломь. 7:6 тако смѣхъ веґумагого и се сѣдѣ.

7:6:6 IAKO* BO KOTAW M TAKO M C6 C&6TA

Ονό ομλαμαετъ мдґрае же дапрежеиемъ крѣпнитъ и οσтаблаетъ.

Ονο οмламаетъ мудраго же дарешение крепитъ и οставляетъ:

Ονο съ ΤSL ΤSL 730 || крепить || крепость Sol. ||

Тлн.

Кипліе вѣша искпѣне смѣху веґумагого. подовен есть горацъ терпіеі под котломь. первое оуго іако οудерение во нъ. то ὥ во'торня терпіа. павлено есть и ненавидалымъ.

Кипліе еже тако же и веґумагого смѣхъ грохотаніа вѣ раздомѣ". in the margin: (образуем) также дымъ ὥ огна горнія. τδ ομраченіе ὥ τаковаого смѣха.

Тако терпіе раздирающи коновъ. ὥ гρѣхі вѣчніи ὥ ако σμανъ возглараютъ веґумагомъ. мдґры едва с кро"спіе οмлаетъ сѧ.

Тлн.

Кипліе вѣша и ниспяление. смѣхъ вѣчумага подовен горацъ терпіи под котломь. первое оуго іако οудерение во что. ὥ вѣторніа терпіа. павлено есть и ненавидалымъ. сильнать же тако и веґумагого смѣхъ ὥ грохотаніа шразаетъ. таке дымъ ὥ огна горніа. τδ οмраченіе ὥ τаковаого смѣха тако терпіе раздирающи коновъ. ὥ гρѣхі вѣчніи. σμανъ возглараютъ. веґумагому мдґры и ὥ σμα с кротостью οмлаетъ."
7:11 Бага моздро, с раздзеленем по жрэйню и изовилеым видацым рубацце.
7:12 іа к ёля ёла мэдрысть іо мэны срэбра изовиле раздзіла мэдрысть.
ожыви' інге 8 менг.

tаковое моленье бывает, но
їа л'яности и нераджым.
(sic)
tаково начыналень ны во что
же менить.
ёлка.
7:11-12 Бага мрость с
раздзеленем по жрэйню, і
изовилеым видацым рубаццём.
іако іо ёля іо мрость іако
стънь срэбра, изовиле
разздзіла премрость.
премрость (sic) оживляеть
інге оц неза.
tол.
Добро глядеть мрость с
раздзеленем по жрэйню
счастэ богатства. іа
мрынь ацэ велами ницы
вцёдет, то і мэдрысть его в
посмхь выявляеть. есть оцро
і самовалнай нницета.
іакоже іны дрозве і елісе. і
інынь прычыкм таковым.
но аце сэі орвоуны быша. но
д'овнове ібагатныя са. і
видацэ рубаццё творца нашага
'га вотце же мэдрыость еже
ничесо" имбрь. сирқь
багіх дрзневых. ниже
потребных потребныя.
плотных а э" рече. іако в
стънк іо мрость. іако і
стънь срэбра. сирқ мрость
і срэбро стъний нарицает.
іако да не ѣхалі' са мростью
і срэброю. іакоже мрость
позване же и вога'стко
надкыанием і помогацио
менить. но оваче мрость
паче вога'ства глеёт. іа
имынь мростью уживает
са. сирқь вяртает са і
устраляет са.
ёлка.
7:14 В' д'ын благостыны.
жыва і ізлы в' д'ын зловы

7:14 В' д'ын благостыны
своего живы в' бат' і вир' д'ын зловы.
Не дни овся и времена овся благи, овся же ганы нарицаетъ, гако же вкъддословцы глють. но днъ благостнымъ нарече сиръчъ врема благое и веселчаное данное бсмль. 
аукже имъ землъ швильд и врема мирно. и въ такое врема оучить на сомлбъ жить въ блхъ, сиръчъ въ 
млъти и во благодаренъ и въ прочи добрыйтеле. и сматрат днъ словъ. сиръчъ власъ са гыкъ влхъ 
квччны смртны чане непостаннно житие наше есть. по вкъддословонъ же 
днъ добръ словъ лгесловно глют са. чане аче бы днъ 
добръ и голь есть. то равно бы вслъ злее приложне 
са. но орт са овъ вь кгъ днъ овому добръ. овому же 
злъ вывле. и ю сего разумно есть како не ю вкъддъ 
доброе и благое намъ случает са. но ю содержанъ влс и строющаго 
премъре промыслъ вываетъ. и сего смиряетъ. а сего 
восноваетъ.

7:14 Викъ съ симъ согласие сихъ еже сотвори Ьтъ о 
Глхъ. да не вбрасаетъ чакъ 
за нею ничтоже.

вол.
Согласие овъ доброго и благо 
глеть. зане рече Ьтъ сотвори 
ихъ сиръчъ добръ и злъ ю гла 
подает са а не ю вкъддъ 
приложает са. и сего ради 
викъ рече. зане добръ дна 
согласи съ словъ. сиръ 
вскахь благостымъ.
7:15 всё склад видишь днём святствам моим. есть праведными погибали в своем правде. егда нечестивы пребывала и в злобе своенепостоянна. и радости кончина плача бывает. и сего ради разуме и рече. ибо всякое бытие непостоянно есть и паки пререкся. стопайте люди мои рече в кладь свою и затворите дверь свою. дондеже минет гневъ тый да же глаголь да не избраше члена да не имя токоже. сиреч в мечто блигини противны приключуением.

eкл.

7:15 есть праведны погибали в своем правде. и есть нечестивы пребывала в своем злобе. екл.

Тол.

Се о таковых апи огнить гла. не разумеюще правды бывает и свою ироде поставити правды егда не стажаша. праведнаго огнна здѣсь веща. неправевника. но иже правду гонаша ныне в себѣ праведенъ тон погибаетъ. и изгонитъ въ правды. нечестивы не погибаетъ въ вещества. ни изгонитъ въ злобъ своемъ воле вода.


7:16 не въди праведенъ велми ни мудръся велми егда когда изъмаешь са 6лк.

7:16 Не въди праведенъ велми. ни мудръся велми една когда изъмаешь са. екл.

7:17 и не веществи много и не въди жестокъ да не умерши въ время свое.

Тол.

Какъ о добрѣтель въ мѣру сущи принатн. попремногу

7:16 Не въди праведенъ велми. ни мудръся велми да не како изъмаешь сиреч. екл.

7:17 Ни веществти многъ. ни въди жестокъ да не оумрети не въ время свое.

Толк.

Какъ же добрѣтель въ мѣру сущи принатн. попремногу
не веди въцца праведенъ велми. 

ниче излъча ко слънчамъ ненавистни ненапряцъ веди къ съкрушението и жестокъ и не чакъ. но не мъдро излишъ да не изумванъ съламъ.

излъча съ ше кромъ животнаго ученья, и велико въщаніе на полза нами животнове скры слово нещемо. ио тѣхъ искать изумвани истоявіе самъ и по повелѣннъ" немного безчестѣ. потуци съ истина шверсти съ показаний извадить съкрушенія, и не веди въцца жестокъ, рѣше неумолимъ. и противнъ нападалъ дръмъ ученья. та" по шири наводитъ да не оумреи не во време. не во време (сич) во умиращи свершени ли добродѣтели. они, но по золовъ живымъ оуме скончаваетъ жсъ ако пшеница зребъ. въ добродѣтели совершенны, никако" прежде смрти тѣла душею оумираетъ смртю. во золовъ живымъ ниже въ настойцемъ житие выста. егда оумретъ, но да въ живы преставъ съламъ живо". оумира" жсъ ово не во време нечестивъ и овидишь онъ и лишимъдъръствули.

же злова належитъ. не богда въцца. праведенъ велми, неначе излъча къ здьмъ ненавистни ненапряцъ веди къ съкрушението и жестокъ и не чакъ. но не мъдро излишъ да не изумванъ съламъ. излъча съ ше кромъ животнаго ученья, и велико въщаніе на полза нами животнове скры слово нещемо. ио тѣхъ искать изумвани истоявіе самъ и по повелѣннъ" немного безчестѣ. потуци съ истина шверсти съ показаний извадить съкрушенія, и не веди въцца жестокъ, рѣше неумолимъ. и противнъ нападалъ дръмъ ученья. та" по шири наводитъ да не оумреи не во време. не во време (сич) во умиращи свершени ли добродѣтели. они, но по золовъ живымъ оуме скончаваетъ жсъ ако пшеница зребъ. въ добродѣтели совершенны, никако" прежде смрти тѣла душею оумираетъ смртю. во золовъ живымъ ниже въ настойцемъ житие выста. егда оумретъ, но да въ живы преставъ съламъ живо". оумира" жсъ ово не во време нечестивъ и овидишь онъ и лишимъдъръствули.
7:18 Если ты есть
въдержи въ всѣхъ вещахъ
всегда не оскверни рѣкъ
своихъ и не води съ бы
извьстны все

7:19 Если ты есть
въдержи въ всѣхъ вещахъ
всегда не оскверни рѣкъ
своихъ и не води съ бы
извьстны всѣ.

т. о добръдѣтели окупи и о
своихъ наведь, ибо и дѣло
наимыны въ словѣ твоемъ
щекущемъ, но чисто
совѣршила въ тѣхъ бо
имя, въ это ибо съ бохъ и
въся извьстны всѣ всѣ дѣлань
на добродѣтели исходъ.

7:20 Если ты есть
въдержи въ всѣхъ вещахъ
всегда не оскверни рѣкъ
своихъ и не води съ бы
извьстны всѣ.

добрь] добрь Рум.204, Соф.|| минуемь] минуемь Рум.204, Соф. || еклицается

7:19 Мудрость мудраго
паче десяти владычащихъ
въ градѣ.

7:20 Какъ члена праведнаго
въ землѣ и въ землѣ
совѣршить дѣло и не
совѣршить.

т. о добръдѣтели окупи и о
своихъ наведь, ибо и дѣло
наимыны въ словѣ твоемъ
щекущемъ, но чисто
совѣршила въ тѣхъ бо
имя, въ это ибо съ бохъ и
въся извьстны всѣ всѣ дѣлань
на добродѣтели исходъ.

7:19 Мудрость мудраго
оукрѣпитъ. Дѣти владычащихъ
въ градѣ.

7:20 Какъ члена праведнаго
въ землѣ и въ землѣ
совѣршить дѣло и не
совѣршить.

т. о добръдѣтели окупи и о
своихъ наведь, ибо и дѣло
наимыны въ словѣ твоемъ
щекущемъ, но чисто
совѣршила въ тѣхъ бо
имя, въ это ибо съ бохъ и
въся извьстны всѣ всѣ дѣлань
на добродѣтели исходъ.

7:19 Мудрость мудраго
оукрѣпитъ. Дѣти владычащихъ
въ градѣ.

7:20 Какъ члена праведнаго
въ землѣ и въ землѣ
совѣршить дѣло и не
совѣршить.
членов сила, но саму гь нашу не хс ючал мрость в онь вкрощал и вкрою мра вышла помогает паче десать заповедей сущих во градѣ иподѣйски. аще во и десать сохрани законный заповѣди. но истъ чала не пополниуть са., и законъ ни единаго исправда. и гь нашу ис хс самъ вьсть мрость, правда же и извлечение. а еже истъ праведника на землѣ иже сотворитъ благо и не согрѣшитъ не вѣрить яко никто сотвори бла, прно во сьтъ благотворующи но яко кто добродѣтельны сынъ и благо живьн не можетъ презрѣти что требуетъ и хс извлечение.


7:21 и вса га словеса и вѣртуть нечѣтвѣй и не влози срѣца своего. да не вслышши рава своего кленѣцца теѣ.
7:22 яко многаждѣ и слѣкоую тобо. обѣхѣнѣ ного отозвитъ срѣца твое. такоже и ты клалъ еси дрѣгѣ.

7:21 И вса омуо словеса изъ вѣртутъ нечѣтвѣй не приклоні срѣца твого га да не ослышши рава твоего кленѣца.
7:22 Яко многаждѣ слѣкуютъ тобо. обѣхѣнѣ ного изозвитъ многаго срѣца тво. яко да и ты клалъ еси дрѣгѣ.

толъ. 7:21 не поминающаго зла не вводить. нечѣтвѣй вѣще всудитель и грѣшки дозвѣтъ и множества строющинь нелѣпомѣ внима страшитель. вѣча. яко га и равд твоемѣ проклать тевѣ водившѣща са на аростъ. паче оуфо и различше мометь на та мыслити. то владующу ръкъ. па вола коа человѣческая сила. ино са лдѣрь. гь нашу ис хс га. во и вкрощал и вкрою мудра вышла. помогает паче десатъ заповѣдий. сущих в градѣ иподѣйски. аще во и десатъ сурани законны заповѣди. но и чала не пополниуть и законъ ни единаго исправда. гь нашу ис хс га вѣлъ мрѣтъ правда же и зравлен: я еже истъ праведника на землѣ иже створитъ благо и не согрѣшитъ не то гадъ яко никто створи бла прно во сцъ. благо дѣлающи. но яко кто добродѣтельны сынъ и благо живьн не можетъ презрѣти что. и требуетъ и хс извлечение.
всё есть, по сходу многохлы шадовить ср'це твое. тако клевета многохлы шадовить душу. аще во на коего с'о окехтетующих гн'квает са. лиши потерпност сходу влеком въ страсти просты и злоы исполнять душу свою. ии. 

В'т'а нечестивыхъ словеса. нечествы же елинишка мудрость. и цифове и еретицы. и вси иже неправъ въ молаца словесы.
8:3 У лица его поидеши не стани и словъ дукаевъ, елико аще восхитити и сотворити: толкъ.
Доно оюво земному цвътву покрасти са всѣхъ же цръю бы оустъ хранити писание поручаешь, се же есъ мнѣ Вась его тайнства и къ достоимынъ износити.
Соблюдати же его заповѣдаи.
Доро же хранити еже не кладися по быкъ. ниже тцати: кромѣ бина лица нити но все дѣлама. и бы ввидувъ, по иному же писанию тако паче и " словъ клатевы не тци са рѣкъ. не тени на клатевы (sic) идени ли иди. рѣку же вѣсаме не взати клати:" 

8:4 Такоже цръ съвладын глѣть и кто речетъ емѣ и что створиши

8:8 икръ послѣ въ днѣ
и не спьет вещество съцаго в нё.

9:4 иако кто иже прича"ает са къ всель живымъ есть надежа иако песь живъ то благо паче ляя мртва

10:1 Мохьбы 8мриввляющего
10:1 Чтоб мало мартьи. пад.
славы велики беъхима.

t.
Пропастищца много в
безумии многот. падъхъ безъ
правды попреьт. иже въ
мирѣ. патъ с.1. и городъ
бъвъ. иже въвѣшнео
мудростью въ глутияхъ
трудилища са. но ни
прикладнѣ дѣньле известне.
иже начинаа по едѣ
мудростью въ тѣхъ водимъ.
и прикааста са емъ начинаа.
но въ безумии славѣ не роди.

10:2 сръце мудраго о десицю
его. сръце беъхима в
шѣю его.

10:3 и на пѣсть" безѣмии
идеть и сръце его лиши" таке
помы шале" вса безѣмина

трудилища са) трудилище са TSL 730, Rum.204, Sof. ||
еклиниасъ.

10:2 Сръце мудрому в
десницъ его. сръце
безумному въ шуми его.

t.
Сръце оумъ разумѣть. и
tелесное во сръце всегда на
единомъ мѣстѣ лежать. во
утробѣ еже зовѣше
перепома. тѣмъ же мудрому
оумъ. всегда лѣпь и
почуванна разумѣсть же и
дѣлать. безумного же зламъ
противна имчца :

Sof. ||

еклиниасъ.

10:3 Ибо на путь егда
безумии иде и сръце его не
dостать"стуетъ. и вамъ
pоышалетъ всако безумна
су".

t.
Житье се путь зовѣло
безуменъ. и на шуми ильны
сръце. всегда недостатъки
лишала са несмотра. ткни
козданню вѣшня" въданиа.
ниже наперѣ" простирало.
10:4 аще Алъ владычаго 
вздает на на мъста своего 
не остави иако ищленье 
вставит грръхы велики

ни къ концу въсхода. не во 
"нить" лишает всл. и всл 
не свершена и бесловесна и 
дѣла и помышлана. аще ли 
же и путь исправленн. 
начнетъ биихъ заповедан. 
помеже срѣдне не в дескт. 
затворено лишаемъ и не 
разумѣна очинн. ниже 
твора по закону положенному 
хотѣнн.

недостатьки и ро. Rum.204 и всл. и отм. TSL. 730, Rum.204, Sof. и 
екл.настъ 
10:4 аще Алъ владычаго 
нане на тм. мѣста своего 
не остави. ако ищлени 
оуставит. грръхъ велики. 
тоакъ. 
Алъ владычаго. вѣка се 
сновъ не покоряющихъ. ниже 
не по цѣли покоряща. 
дьяволъ власть 
мучительствующее оуво 
вѣчна вѣшнихъ (тѣ 
имылы и вышнихъ s.1.) 
мѣру. несчасть на тм. Алъ 
владычаго покомитъ твое 
помышленн. ниже к 
вѣшнихъ исти хотлию 
вѣтрани затворену 
вчоженна. нить иже его 
восприима всл. своя посмоѣ 
загражда. ни словимъ же и 
вишнихъ ни вѣчнымъ вѣмъ 
ему поданни немѣ 
човѣственно. прежде во 
ст рѣдъ и щельлемо 
непостоянна начинанна. аще и 
мѣсь что влаждаетъ мѣста 
не оставлаетъ. затворена оуво 
вѣдь цѣломудриемъ. 
любовью же ненависть 
ѣрмомъ. подобковъ же 
кое вмѣсто мѣста. 
добрѣдѣтелы губиршему. аще 
во вѣчна оставишь. аще же 
есть пончитъ Алъ
покорившихся - нукхи} ом. Und.1 || нукхи нукхи Sol. || власть: власти || мучительствующей Rum.204 || мучит. мучит. Und.1 || иже к Рум.204 || ом. || ом. Rum.204, Soф.

10:5 Αδόκιμον εὑρεθέντα ποιε· σανζε εἴσε ἑνὸλυ 

10:6 ἐν βεζηέλυσιν ἐν 

вла́дьююго. Многии велики 

gрěхи сверет своею души аще искривляющею свою душу 

dородобытии прилежанием. и иако исцеленное поконй. 

gрěхи великина : 

10:5 ἔστι αὐτακτία εἰς ἑανὲν 

10:6 И да в безъялнны 

грěхи кем. и бяти в 

въ смирении садуть : 

Къ рѣ́нию огню имъ видить 

видить (sic) в чистыя. 

αὐτακτία въ 

многажды и невеле 

явлующе сл. стрвъ ради 

нѣ́кого. полаша илъя и 

славлишьа безъялнны. 

Батьям же исчие. данию 

явлующе поветкина ради 

невело. многажы бо 

цѣ́кыми поветкини князі 

невело штъяныють. по 

рахъю же волю чищі на 

слясти дѣ́льше са невеле 

что (s.l.ne) покоренью. рѣ́ку 

dѣ́лого. винич во. и чрево 

питаель всесловенными свое 

c рацъюча ἥλθενъ икъ. 

словесными дородобыти 

шво ако ἄνθρο πитающихъ. 

tъмь въголовольть бъ. рѣ́ку 

же влагаетъ. и любить 

такову дѣ́лания : 

Поветъяда въполну 

слово. ивъ рѣ́ку родъ. в 

тайн. причашение. еже 

воспиннюя ради бъ. 

нашего бо ради :

Къ ну Рум.204, Soф. || поветкину по рос. Und.1 || и чрево) и отм.Rum.204 || к рацъюча по рацъюча Рум.204, Soф. || άργκ тиин Soф., TSL 730, Rum.204, Soф. ||
10:7 Видя равы на коне и 
книги идиции како равы по 
земли.

10:8 копла залм в но 
впадает и потребляющаго 
ограда острый и ямь.

10:16 горе твя граде емою 
црь твои въ них и книжи твои 
запутра дала.

10:17 блажена ты земле еси. 
црь твои и сны свободны и 
книги твои въ время идат 
и силк не постяда.

и свою и отм. TSL 730 ||

10:7 Буду равы на 
коне, а книги идущие 
путь.

t.

Преде рави вали, како на 
коне всѣдши на евангелии 
слова и слова идиции, нуше 
суденіе спіть вты, а книги 
путь. идъки на земли 
поверхны, въ хъ оверкен 
йры ради :

идъ.

Пишами быти велить и 
"и гнушати са всякого 
грѣха":

ek.

10:8 Рыши ровъ. Впаде са 
во нь, и землами плае. 
оутрии землю :
	толкъ.
	Спио' законъ законъ (sic) 
заповѣди. а змию дьяволъ. 
раздаря законъ. и 
преступля заповѣди. и 
видрещь дьявола :

прово законъ законъ Und.1, TSL730, Sof. | законъ а законъ Sol. ||

10:16 Горе твя граде в 
немже црь твои оумъ. и 
боларе твои рано идатъ.

t.

По Хъ градъ есть Аша. а црь 
маречеть оумъ. а еме 
оумъ. слабъ болары же 
нлкъ свое полы къ злии 
работа.

и свою и отм. TSL 730 ||

10:17 Блажена ты земле еси. 
нице цръ твои еси свлюбоды. 
и боларе твои во время 
идущие въ сила не 
постяда.

t.

Аще Аша и оумъ 
вѣтвящими (заповѣдями с.1.)
11:2 Дажьча часть седми кон
сляй во не вси что будеть
въка вън възем.
съобны Си) оучини
воспитаетъ. се есть вьм
свободы. творил потребами
диш и т'кль. и есть же гра方言
есть цркви. и имут ира икя
ча. кнажи же апли.

11:3 аще исплянат са
шьващи докола. на землю
изливаютъ.

и аще падетъ древо 8рв". аще
ли на въкрне" мъстъ. иде"
падеть древо. тоу въздеть
11:4 Блуди büyü ne се’
и смотрели въ овлахы не поясне’.

Толкъ.
Древо наричать чьиц праведны и грѣшны, а огь увидѣла мѣста праведныя и сѣверъ въ темнѣ мѣста грѣшныя, по сѣрти гдѣ кто достигнет тебя и будеть.

въ темнѣ] въ отemoth, Rum.204. Соф. ||
11:4 Блуди вѣтра, не сѣять и смотрели во швакы не пояснеть.
Толкъ.
Многажды во днѣ и не вѣть, а ино сутра, еже мутити помысли.
Имъ.
Не дѣламо сѣять велить мѣить днить, а смотрели во швакы не поясне не велить имь смотрѣть, дѣлает мѣить кто праведников и кто ли грѣшникъ, да не погубимо времѧ мѣйни. Да имь всѣмь да имь пояснемъ его же а во чьиц много неправдли. дѣламо шпраѣетъ.

и не вѣть] инь вѣть Rum.204, Соф. || мутити] ловчите са Sol. || не пръ Rum.204, Соф. || и кто] и отm. TSL 730, Rum.204, Соф. ||
12:5 Ино на высокѣ озрѣ и древеса на пути и процветѣ клены, (мудра) и штѣлътѣть оврѣд.
(процѣ) и разрѣшит са всѧ капарь, ико веѣ чѣка в домѣ вѣка своего, и швирюща в на трѣхици пал цѣи.

Еквивалентъ
12:5 И процветет кланы и огнѣет оврѣд.

Толкъ.
Прежде во всѣхъ древо процветаетъ мудра.
трисутву има’ ество.
первое чѣло на скорущи и вну три идро. тако и чѣйы \\ wound \\ тѣла и дѣша и дѣлъ стоятъ.
Имъ.
По вьху процветет в
родить в чьих. суть вет
прудъ се и рт. грек. а еже
разрушить каньони. еже
есть гръцкимъ конецъ.
А еже вскънутъ. и
вскънутъ в гла в птичк.
Архангела етце подобает
въйти.

мигдала| мицдаль TSL 730 || има| съство| естество имать TSL 730 || внутри| внутри Sol., TSL 730.
Rum.204, Sof. ||
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