



*Selected Studies
in the Slavonic
Pseudepigrapha*

STUDIA IN VETERIS TESTAMENTI PSEUDEPIGRAPHA 23

ANDREI A. ORLOV

BRILL

Selected Studies in
the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha

Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha

Series Editors

H.J. de Jonge
J.-C. Haelewyck
J. Tromp

VOLUME 23

Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha

By
Andrei A. Orlov



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Orlov, Andrei A., 1960–

Selected studies in the Slavonic pseudepigrapha / by Andrei A. Orlov.
p. cm. — (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha ; v. 23)

Includes index.

“This volume is a study of two of the most important Slavonic apocalypses, the Apocalypse of Abraham and 2 Enoch, as crucial conceptual links between the symbolic universes of Second Temple apocalypticism and early Jewish mysticism. The study seeks to understand the mediating role of these Slavonic pseudepigraphical texts in the development of Jewish angelological and theophanic traditions from Second Temple apocalypticism to later Jewish Merkabah mysticism attested in the Hekhalot and Shi’ur Qomah materials. The study shows that mediatorial traditions of the principal angels and the exalted patriarchs and prophets played an important role in facilitating the transition from apocalypticism to early Jewish mysticism”—ECIP data view.

ISBN 978-90-04-17879-3 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Apocalypse of Abraham—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Slavonic book of Enoch—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 3. Apocryphal books (Old Testament)—Translations into Slavic—History and criticism. 4. Mysticism—Judaism. I. Title. II. Series.

BS1830.A62O75 2009
229'.913—dc22

2009031410

ISSN 0169-8125

ISBN 978 90 04 17879 3

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For Deirdre Dempsey

CONTENTS

Preface	xiii
Locations of the Original Publications	xv

INTRODUCTION

The Jewish Pseudepigrapha in the Slavic Literary Environment	3
---	---

PART I

STUDIES IN THE *APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM*

Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the <i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>	21
The Pteromorphic Angelology of the <i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>	41
“The Gods of My Father Terah”: Abraham the Iconoclast and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the <i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>	55
The Fallen Trees: Arboreal Metaphors and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the <i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>	75

PART II

STUDIES IN 2 (*SLAVONIC*) *ENOCH*

The Pillar of the World: The Eschatological Role of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in 2 (<i>Slavonic</i>) <i>Enoch</i>	93
The Heir of Righteousness and the King of Righteousness: The Priestly Noachic Polemics in 2 <i>Enoch</i> and the Epistle to the Hebrews	111
The Watchers of Satanail: The Fallen Angels Traditions in 2 (<i>Slavonic</i>) <i>Enoch</i>	133

In the Mirror of the Divine Face: The Enochic Features of the <i>Exagoge</i> of Ezekiel the Tragedian	165
Moses' Heavenly Counterpart in the <i>Book of Jubilees</i> and the <i>Exagoge</i> of Ezekiel the Tragedian	183

PART III

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE
TRANSMISSION OF THE JEWISH PSEUDEPIGRAPHA
IN THE SLAVIC MILIEUX

1. Slavonic Pseudepigrapha	203
1.1. Collections of the Slavonic Pseudepigraphical Texts	203
1.2. Collections of the Translations of Slavonic Pseudepigraphical Texts	204
1.3. Bibliographies of the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha	204
1.4. Pseudepigraphical Works and Fragments:	207
Fragment "Seventy Names of God"	207
Fragment "About All Creation"	207
Slavonic Life of Adam and Eve	208
The Story of God's Creation of Adam	211
Adam Octipartite	213
Adamic Fragments in the Apocryphal Circle about the Tree of the Cross	214
Adamic Fragments in the Discourse of the Three Hierarchs	216
Adamic Fragments in the Homily of Adam in Hades to Lazarus	219
Satanael Text (Tentatio Adae et Evae a Satanael)	220
Adamic and Satanael Fragments in the Legend about the Tiberian Sea	220
The Apocryphon about the Struggle of the Archangel Michael with Satanael	222
2 Enoch	222
Enochic Fragment about the Two Tablets	243
Fragment about the Flood	243

Noachic Fragments in the Revelation of Pseudo-Methodius	244
Fragment about Lamech	246
Apocalypse of Abraham	246
Testament of Abraham	256
Apocryphal Fragments about Melchizedek	257
Ladder of Jacob	259
Joseph and Aseneth	261
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	262
Testament of Job	264
Life of Moses	264
Apocryphal Fragments about David	267
Apocryphal Fragments about Solomon	269
Apocryphal Fragments about Elijah	274
Fragments about Elijah in the Narration of Our Father Agapios	274
Ascension of Isaiah	276
3 Baruch	278
4 Baruch	284
Pseudo-Danielic Fragments	285
Apocalypse of Zosimus	287
Ahiqar	288
Adarian	290
The Word of the Blessed Zerubbabel	291
The Josippon	292
The Wisdom of Menander	296
The Twelve Dreams of Sehachi	297
2. Transmission of the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha	299
2.1. Palaeas:	
Palaea Historica	299
Palaea Interpretata	300
Palaea Chronographica	303
2.2. Chronicles:	
The Chronicle of George Syncellus	306
The Chronicle of George Amartolos	306
The Chronicle of John Malalas	311
The Chronicle of John Zonaras	314
The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses	315
The Chronicle of Simeon Logothetes	317

2.3. Chronographs:	
Chronograph po Velikomu Izlozheniju	318
Russian Chronograph	319
Troickij Chronograph	322
Letopisec Ellinskij i Rimskij	323
Arhivskij Chronograph	325
Sofijskij Chronograph	326
Vilenskij Chronograph	326
Akademicheskij Chronograph	327
Tihonravovskij Chronograph	328
2.4. Other Compilations and Works:	
Povest' Vremennyh Let	328
The Izbornik of 1073	333
The Izbornik of 1076	338
Alexandria Chronographica	342
Serbian Alexandria	344
Torzhestvennik	346
Prologos	348
Great Menologia	352
Chudovskie Menologia	357
Azbukovniki	358
Hexaemerons	359
Cosmographies	364
Zlatostruj	368
Zlatoust	370
Izmaragd	371
Margarit	374
Physiologus	375
Trepetnik	377
Melissa	378
Just Balance	380
Golden Chain	381
Zlataja Matica	384
The Book of the Dove	385
Secretum Secretorum	386
3. Related Studies	389
3.1. Jewish Pseudepigraphical Works and Traditions in the Slavic Milieux	389
3.2. "Prohibited Books"	413

CONTENTS

xi

3.3. Bogomilism and the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha	418
3.4. "Heresy of the Judaizers"	423
3.5. Khazars and Slavs	427
3.6. Translations from Hebrew in the Slavic Milieux	432
Modern Author Index	435
Subject Index	438

PREFACE

This book contains several essays previously published in journals inaccessible to many interested readers. I am thankful to the editors of these journals for permission to re-use the material. The format and the style of the original publications have been changed to comply with the standards of the collection. Some alterations also have been made due to printing errors or obvious errors of fact. Some footnotes have been omitted as they appeared in more than one article.

I would like to express my appreciation to Alan Ball, Rebecca Hylander, Oleg Makariev, Nikolai Seleznyov, Dan Shapira, Michael Stone, and Mark Trump who read various parts of the manuscript and offered numerous helpful suggestions.

I owe special thanks to my colleagues at the Department of Theology of Marquette University for their continued human and scholarly support and encouragement.

I am grateful to Prof. Henk Jan de Jonge for accepting this volume for the *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* series. I am also indebted to Ms Camila Werner, Ms Gera van Bedaf and Brill's editorial team for their help, patience and professionalism during preparation of the book for publication.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this work to my dissertation director, Prof. Deirdre Dempsey, a teacher and mentor *par excellence*.

Andrei Orlov
Milwaukee
Feast of the Ascension, 2009

LOCATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

“The Heir of Righteousness and the King of Righteousness: The Priestly Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch* and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007) 45–65.

“Moses’ Heavenly Counterpart in the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian,” *Biblica* 88 (2007) 153–173.

“The Pillar of the World: The Eschatological Role of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*,” *Henoch* 30.1 (2008) 119–135.

“Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127.1 (2008) 53–70.

“‘The Gods of My Father Terah’: Abraham the Iconoclast and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18.1 (2008) 33–53.

“In the Mirror of the Divine Face: The Enochic Features of the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian,” *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (eds. G. Brooks, H. Najman, L. Stuckenbruck; Themes in Biblical Narrative, 12; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 183–199.

“The Pteromorphic Angelology of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (2009) (forthcoming).

“The Fallen Trees: Arboreal Metaphors and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,” *Harvard Theological Review* (2009) (forthcoming).

“The Watchers of Satanail: The Fallen Angels Traditions in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*,” (unpublished).

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

THE JEWISH PSEUDEPIGRAPHA IN THE SLAVIC LITERARY ENVIRONMENT

I. *Transmission of the Jewish Pseudepigraphical Works and Traditions in the Slavic Milieux*

The majority of the Jewish extra-biblical materials that circulated in the Slavic lands came from Byzantium which exercised an unmatched formative influence on the development of the Slavic literary heritage. An important witness to the early existence and scope of the Jewish extra-biblical writings circulated in the Slavic lands can be found in the so-called “Lists of the True and False Books” – the indexes of non-canonical works brought from Byzantium and then translated, revised, and incorporated in various Slavonic collections, such as the *Izbornik (Florilegium) of 1073*. The remarkable fluidity found in these lists can be explained by the peculiarities of dissemination of the non-canonical materials in the Eastern Orthodox environment in which the apocryphal texts and fragments were not sharply demarcated from ideologically mainstream materials and were preserved alongside each other in the same collections. Many ancient Jewish documents and traditions were adopted into the framework of Eastern Orthodoxy in a new theological capacity. Thus, for example, some pseudepigraphical texts and fragments about Adam, Enoch, Noah, Jacob, Abraham, Moses, and other exalted patriarchs and prophets were often viewed as the lives of the protological saints and were incorporated in hagiographical collections.

Eastern Orthodoxy represented a literary environment in which the Jewish pseudepigraphical texts and fragments were usually transmitted as part of the larger historiographical, moral, hagiographical, liturgical, and other collections that contained both ideologically marginal and mainstream materials. In these compilations the Jewish pseudepigraphical materials were often rearranged, expanded, or abbreviated. There were several types of collections by which the Jewish pseudepigraphical documents and fragments were perpetuated in the Slavic milieu.

One type of media that played a major role in dissemination of the Jewish pseudepigraphical traditions were historiographical compendiums known as “Palaeas.” The *Palaeas* are historiographies in which canonical biblical stories are mixed with non-canonical elaborations and interpretations. The Slavic Orthodox literary heritage knew several versions of “Palaeas,” including the so-called *Palaea Interpretata* (*Tolkovaja Paleja*) which contained the biblical and Israelite history embellished with the apocryphal stories about Adam, Eve, Abel, Cain, Noah, Isaac, and other figures of primeval and Israelite history.

Another important category of historiographical media which served as a vehicle for the preservation of early Jewish pseudepigraphical traditions was the chronographic compilations: the chronicles and the chronographs. This category included the Slavonic translations of the accounts of such Byzantine authors as George Hamartolos, John Malalas, Constantine Manasses, George Synkellos, and John Zonaras along with anonymous chronographic compilations originated in the Slavic lands on the basis of earlier sources. Similar to the *Palaeas*, these chronographic materials did not merely retell the canonical materials but compiled extensive extracanonical additions dealing with the characters of biblical and Israelite history.

Finally, the Jewish pseudepigraphical texts and traditions were also included in the various collections of a moral and liturgical nature, such as the *Great Menologia* (*Velikie Chetii Minei*), *Zlatostruj*, and the *Just Balance* (*Merilo Pravednoe*), among others.

Given the aforementioned peculiarities of the transmission of the Jewish pseudepigraphic materials in the Christian historiographical, liturgical, and moral collections, the task of discerning the possible provenance and purposes of the original pseudepigraphic texts and fragments is made very difficult by the numerous editorial additions, abbreviations, and rearrangements. In recent years, however, several promising methodological approaches to the study of Jewish texts preserved in the Slavonic language have come to surface.¹ These studies help to distinguish between various levels of transmission and adaptation of the early Jewish materials in the Slavic literary environment.

There have been a number of studies that attempted to explicate the theological tenets found in the Slavonic translations of some pseude-

¹ A. Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (TCS, 3; Atlanta: Scholars, 2004).

pigraphical works through their alleged connections with the Bogomil movement, a dualistic sect that flourished in the Balkans in the middle ages. These studies argued that the large number of Jewish pseudepigraphical writings preserved in Slavonic appear to contain Bogomil interpolations.² Some scholars have even proposed the possibility that works like *2 Enoch* were composed in the Slavonic language by the Bogomils between the 12th and 15th centuries C.E.³ Recent scholarship however is increasingly skeptical of such radical proposals and generally finds little or no connection between the aforementioned pseudepigraphons and the Bogomil movement.⁴

A classic study by A.I. Jacimirskij, which still remains unsurpassed in its thoroughness, distinguishes more than twenty clusters of pseudepigraphical works and fragments preserved in the Slavic milieu and organized around major biblical characters.⁵ One of the most extensive clusters of the Jewish traditions circulated in the Slavic literary milieu includes materials dealing with the stories of creation and the fall of the protoplasts. The impressive bulk of materials pertaining to the story of Adam and Eve is represented by the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, a Slavonic version of the Primary Adam Books. It contains some material absent in other versions of the Primary Adam Books, including the story of Satan's second deception of Adam and Eve and the legend of the contract or cheirograph that Satan made with the protoplasts. The *Slavonic Vita* is a translation from Greek and exists in longer and shorter recensions.

Another cluster of important Adamic materials circulated in the Slavic environment includes a fragment known as the *Adam Octipartite*, the so-called *Satanael Text*, and the *Story of God's Creation of Adam*. The *Adam Octipartite* contains the tradition about the creation of Adam's body from eight elements. The *Satanael Text* is an Adamic fragment interpolated into the Russian manuscripts of the Slavonic

² J. Ivanov, *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София: Придворна Печатница, 1925[1970]).

³ A.S.D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316.

⁴ É. Turdeanu, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981); F.I. Andersen, "Pseudepigrapha Studies in Bulgaria," *JSP* 1 (1987) 41–55.

⁵ A.I. Jacimirskij, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников). Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Petrograd: The Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1921).

version of 3 *Baruch*. It attests to the traditions of Satanael's refusal to venerate Adam and his deception of Eve by using the serpent as a proxy. The *Story of God's Creation of Adam* exhibits strikingly dualistic tendencies, portraying the creation of the protoplast as the work of both God and Satan.

A number of significant early Jewish traditions pertaining to the story of the protoplasts were also incorporated in the Christian Adamic writings circulated in the Slavic milieu, such as the *Legend about the Wood of the Cross*, the *Struggle of the Archangel Michael with Satanael*, the *Legend of the Tiberian Sea*, the *Discourse of the Three Hierarchs*, and the *Homily of Adam to Lazarus in Hell*. Although these macroforms have distinctive Christian features, it is clear that they contain a wealth of early Jewish pseudepigraphical traditions. The themes of creation are also reflected in the fragments *Seventy Names of God* and *About All Creation*, both published by N.S. Tihonravov.⁶

The cluster of unique traditions about the Flood is represented by the Enochic *Fragment about the Two Tablets* from the *Palaea Historica* and the Noachic narrative known as the *Fragment about the Flood*.

Several pseudepigraphical works preserved in the Slavic milieu are also known to scholars from their other versions in other languages. These pseudepigraphons include the Slavonic versions of the *Testament of Abraham*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Testament of Job*, *Life of Moses*, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 3 *Baruch*, 4 *Baruch*, *Apocalypse of Zosimus*, *Ahiqar*, and the *Word of the Blessed Zerubbabel*. Yet despite the existence of the Greek and other versions of these works, the Slavonic materials sometimes attest to more ancient readings missing in other extant translations of the documents.

There are also quite extensive clusters of works and fragments pertaining to the stories of David, Solomon, Elijah and Daniel. However the large bulk of the materials pertaining to these clusters appears to derive from later medieval Byzantine circles.

As has been already mentioned the majority of the pseudepigraphical materials circulated in the Slavic milieu were also preserved by other Christian traditions and survived not only in Slavonic, but also in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, Armenian, and other languages of the Christian East and West. Yet, among the great variety

⁶ N.S. Tihonravov, *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 vols.; St. Petersburg/Moscow: Obschestvennaja Pol'za, 1863) 2.339–344.

of the pseudepigraphical materials that circulated in the Slavic literary environment, several documents survived solely in their Slavonic translations. Two of the most important Jewish pseudepigraphical writings which survived only in the Slavonic language are *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. Since the current collection will deal mainly with the traditions found in these two Slavonic apocalypses it is important to introduce these two unique documents in greater detail.

II. *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*

2 Enoch is a Jewish pseudepigraphon preserved solely in its Slavonic translation. The central theme of the text is the celestial ascent of the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch through the heavens, his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory, and his initiation into the heavenly mysteries.

Structure

The book, which combines the features of an apocalypse and a testament, can be divided into three parts. The first part (chapters 1–38) describes Enoch's heavenly journey that culminates in his encounter with the Deity revealing to the seer the secrets of creation. After the encounter Enoch returns to earth to instruct his children in the celestial knowledge received from God and the angels. The second part (chapters 39–67) begins with Enoch's testamentary admonitions to his sons during his short visit to earth and ends with the second ascension of the patriarch. The third part of the book (chapters 68–73) describes the priestly functions of Enoch's family and the miraculous birth of Melchisedek, and ends with the Flood.

Manuscripts and Recensions

2 Enoch has survived in more than twenty Slavonic manuscripts and fragments dated from the 14th to 18th centuries C.E. These Slavonic materials did not circulate independently but were included in collections that often rearranged, abbreviated, or expanded them. Typically, Jewish pseudepigraphical texts in the Slavic milieu were transmitted as part of larger historiographical, moral, and liturgical codexes and compendiums where ideologically marginal and mainstream materials

were mixed with each other. Only a small number of the manuscripts, namely A (0:1–72:10), U (0:1–72:10), B (0:1–72:10), and R (0:1–73:9), give a full account of the story leading up to the Flood. Manuscript J (0:1–71:4) goes to chapter 71. Manuscripts P (0:1–68:7), N (0:1–67:3), V (1:1–67:3), and B² (1:1–67:3) contain only the first two parts of the book and end with Enoch's second ascension. Manuscript L (0:1–33:8) goes to chapter 33. The rest of the manuscripts give only fragments of the different parts of the book: P² (28:1–32:2), Tr (67:1; 70–72), Syn (71–72), Rum (71:1–73:1), G (65:1–4; 65:6–8), Chr (fragments from 11–58), Chr² (11:1–15:3), K (71:1–72:10), I (70:22–72:9). A large group of the manuscripts (MPr, TSS 253, TSS 489, TSS 682) are copies of the compilation of rearranged materials from chs. 40–65 of *2 Enoch* from a judicial codex the *Just Balance* (*Merilo Pravednoe*).

Scholarly consensus holds that *2 Enoch* exists in longer and shorter recensions, although some scholars proposed the existence of three or even four recensions.⁷ The longer and shorter recensions of *2 Enoch* differ not only in length but also in the character of the text, and both of them preserve original material. MSS R, J, and P are the manuscripts of the longer recension. MSS U, A, B, V, N, B², and L represent the manuscripts of the shorter recension. P², Tr, Syn, Rum, MPr, TSS 253, TSS 489, TSS 682, G, Chr, Chr², I, and K represent fragments of the longer or shorter recensions.⁸ Although several stemmas of the relationships between the manuscripts were offered, they can be considered only as provisional until the critical editions of the major manuscripts become available.⁹

⁷ F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.93.

⁸ On the manuscripts of *2 Enoch*, see M.I. Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский перевод и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изданию М. Сперанский," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1910) 1–167; Jacimirskij, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности*, 81–88; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952 [repr. Paris, 1976]) iii–viii; Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.92–93; idem, "Enoch, Second Book of," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2.517–519; C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSRZ, 5.7; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995) 788ff.

⁹ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.93.

Original Language

Most scholars believe that the Slavonic version was translated from Greek, since the text attests to some traditions that make sense only in the Greek language, for example a tradition found in *2 Enoch* 30 that derives Adam's name from the Greek designations of the four corners of the earth. The Semitisms, such as the words *Ophannim*, *Raqia Arabot*, and others found in various parts of the text, point to the possibility of the Semitic *Vorlage* behind the Greek version. Nevertheless, some scholars warn that the Semitisms might be "due to the cultivation of a biblical style in the Greek original."¹⁰ The hypothesis about the possibility of direct translation from Hebrew into Slavonic was also proposed.¹¹ Yet this suggestion met strong criticism from experts who "find it thoroughly unlikely that translations from Hebrew into any sort of written Slavic were made in any region of Slavdom before the middle of the fifteenth century."¹²

Date

The date of the text can be deduced solely on the basis of the internal evidence since the book has survived only in the medieval manuscripts. It is noteworthy that the overwhelming majority of the crucial arguments for the early dating of the text have been linked to the themes of the Jerusalem Temple and its ongoing practices and customs. The vast majority of scholarly efforts have been, in this respect, directed toward finding possible hints that might indicate that the Sanctuary was still standing when the original text was composed. These discussions are not new, since already in his first systematic exploration of the text published in 1896, R.H. Charles used references to the Temple practices found in the Slavonic apocalypse as main proofs for his hypothesis of the early date of the apocalypse which he placed in the first century C.E. before the destruction of the Second Temple.¹³

Charles and scholars after him noted that the text gives no indication that the catastrophe of the destruction of the Temple had already

¹⁰ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.94.

¹¹ N. Meshcherskij, "К вопросу об источниках славянской Книги Еноха," *Краткие Сообщения Института Народов Азии* 86 (1965) 72–78.

¹² H.G. Lunt and M. Taube, "Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?" *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988) 147–187 at 160.

¹³ R.H. Charles and W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896) xxvi.

occurred at the time of the book's composition. Critical readers of the pseudepigraphon would have some difficulties finding any explicit expression of feelings of sadness or mourning about the loss of the sanctuary.

Affirmations of the value of animal sacrifice and Enoch's halakhic instructions found in 2 *Enoch* 59 also appear to be fashioned not in the "preservationist," mishnaic-like mode but rather as if they reflected sacrificial practices that still existed when the author was writing his book. There is also an intensive and consistent effort on the part of the author to legitimize the central place of worship, which through the reference to the place Akhuzan – a cryptic name for the temple mountain in Jerusalem – is explicitly connected in 2 *Enoch* with the Jerusalem Temple. Scholars have also previously noted in the text some indications of the ongoing practice of pilgrimage to the central place of worship. These indications could be expected in a text written in the Alexandrian Diaspora.¹⁴ Thus in his instructions to the children, Enoch repeatedly encourages them to bring the gifts before the face of God for the remission of sins, a practice which appears to recall well-known sacrificial customs widespread in the Second Temple period.¹⁵ Further, the Slavonic apocalypse also contains a direct command to visit the Temple three times a day, an advice that would be difficult to fulfill if the sanctuary had been already destroyed.

Authorship

Although several hypotheses about Christian authorship of the book were proposed, none of them was able to withstand scholarly criticism. Besides the early hypothesis about the Bogomil provenance of the work¹⁶ that was met with skepticism, the most consistent effort of justifying the Christian provenance of the work was offered by the French Slavist André Vaillant.¹⁷ His position was later supported by Josef Milik who argued that the apocalypse was written by a Byzantine monk in the ninth century C.E.¹⁸ Both Vaillant's and Milik's positions

¹⁴ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813.

¹⁵ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813.

¹⁶ A.S.D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316.

¹⁷ Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, x.

¹⁸ J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 114.

generated substantial critical responses since the vast majority of readers of *2 Enoch* had been arguing for the Jewish provenance of the original core of the text.

Geographical Provenance

Since the pioneering work of R.H. Charles the hypothesis about the Alexandrian provenance of the apocalypse has dominated the landscape of scholarly discussion. Charles proposed that the apocalypse was written by a Hellenized Jew in Alexandria. The text appears to attest to some themes that were distinctive of the Alexandrian environment. One such cluster of motifs deals with the Adamic tradition that is salient in the Slavonic apocalypse. Thus in *2 Enoch* 30:13 the Lord tells Enoch that he created Adam out of the seven components and assigned to Adam a name from the four components: from East – (A), from West – (D), from North – (A), and from South – (M). The early testimony to this tradition about the anagram of Adam's name can be found in the third book of *Sibylline Oracles*, a composition probably written in Egypt around 160–50 B.C.E. Another reference also comes from the Egyptian milieu and is found in the writings of the Hermetic author Zosimos of Panopolis who lived in Alexandria in the late third or early fourth century C.E.¹⁹

Some other Adamic motifs found in *2 Enoch*, such as the tradition about Adam's role as the governor of the earth, also seem to stem from Alexandrian milieu, exhibiting similarities to the developments found in Philo (*Opif.* 88; 148).

The description of phoenixes and chalkydras, the mythical creatures whom Enoch encounters during his celestial tour, might also point to Egypt. Already Charles was arguing about the Egyptian provenance of this imagery.²⁰ Van den Broek's study of the phoenix traditions confirms Charles' hypothesis, proposing that the symbolism found in the Slavonic apocalypse stems from the Egyptian syncretism of Roman times.²¹

¹⁹ C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995) 23–27.

²⁰ R.H. Charles and W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896) xvii.

²¹ R. Van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (EPRO, 24; Leiden: Brill, 1971) 260.

Theology

The theological universe of the Slavonic apocalypse is deeply rooted in the Enochic mold of the Jewish apocalypticism of the Second Temple period. Yet along with appropriations of ancient traditions about the seventh antediluvian hero, the text attempts to reshape them by adding a new mystical dimension to the familiar apocalyptic imagery. The figure of Enoch portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch* appears to be more elaborate than in the early Second Temple Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*. For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world.²² In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, that was developed much later in rabbinic Merkabah and Hekhalot mysticism – the image of the supreme angel Metatron, “the Prince of the Presence.” The titles of the patriarch found in the Slavonic apocalypse appear to be different from those attested in early Enochic writings and demonstrate a close resemblance to the titles of Metatron as they appear in some Hekhalot sources.²³ These developments demonstrate that *2 Enoch* represents a bridge between the early apocalyptic Enochic accounts and the later mystical rabbinic and Hekhalot traditions.

III. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* is another Jewish pseudepigraphon preserved solely in its Slavonic translation. It provides a unique insight into the complex world of the Jewish sacerdotal debates in the early centuries of the Common Era. It was a time when, faced with a wide array of challenges involving the loss of the terrestrial sanctuary, the authors of the Jewish apocalyptic writings tried to embrace other theological alternatives for preserving and perpetuating traditional priestly practices. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* is drawing on one of those alternatives connected with the idea of the celestial sanctuary represented

²² A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ, 107; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2005) 148–208.

²³ H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) 52–63.

by the divine Chariot when it offers the story of the young hero of the faith who travels from the destroyed terrestrial shrine polluted by the idols of his father to the heavenly Temple.

Structure

The Slavonic text of the apocalypse can be divided into two parts – “haggadic” and “apocalyptic.” The first part (chaps. 1–8) represents an haggadic elaboration of the story of Abraham’s rejection of the idols. This portion of the text depicts the young hero of the faith as a reluctant witness of the idolatrous practices of his immediate family. Such midrashic expansion of Abraham’s story is not an entire novelty created from scratch by the authors of the pseudepigraphon, but rather an important link in the chain of a long-lasting interpretive tradition attested already in the *Book of Jubilees* and further developed by other pseudepigraphical and rabbinic sources. The haggadic section of the pseudepigraphon ends with fiery destruction of the temple of idols.

The second, apocalyptic, part (chaps. 9–32) depicts the patriarch’s ascension to heaven where he is accompanied by his angelic guide, Yahoel, and becomes initiated into the heavenly and eschatological mysteries connected with the celestial sacrificial practices and the worship in the heavenly Temple. According to some scholars the two parts of the Slavonic apocalypse might have originally existed independently²⁴ and probably were written by different authors. Yet in the pseudepigraphon they appear synthesized into a coherent unity, sharing common theological themes.

Manuscripts

The extant text of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is known only in East Slavic manuscripts. Six of them, dated from the 14th to 17th centuries, contain a relatively full text of the pseudepigraphon.²⁵ Most of them are incorporated into the so-called *Palaea Interpretata (Tolkovaja Paleja)*, a historiographical compendium in which canonical biblical stories are mixed with non-canonical elaborations and interpretations.

²⁴ L. Ginzberg, “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” *Jewish Encyclopedia* (10 vols.; eds. I. Singer et al.; New York/London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901–1906) 1.92.

²⁵ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 3.

As has been already mentioned such integration represents the typical mode of existence of the Jewish pseudepigraphical texts and fragments in the Slavic milieu when they were usually transmitted as part of the larger historiographical, moral, hagiographical, liturgical, and other collections that contained both ideologically marginal and mainstream materials. Thus, in the *Palaea Interpretata*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is conflated with other Abrahamic traditions and supplemented with Christian anti-Jewish polemical exegesis.²⁶ The only independent manuscript containing the full text of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is the so-called Sylvester Codex (*Sil'vestrovskij Sbornik*) – one of the oldest witnesses to the Slavonic prototext.²⁷ It is also considered by scholars as the “most obscure” and “extremely faulty” evidence, abundant “in errors major and minor.”²⁸ It is possible that the scribe’s *Vorlage* was in “an unfamiliar archaic orthography, strongly influenced by glagolitic habits.”²⁹

²⁶ H.G. Lunt, “On the Language of the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 7 (1985) 55–62 at 55.

²⁷ For the published Slavonic manuscripts and fragments of the *Арос. Аб.*, see I. Franko, “Книга о Аврааме праотци и патриарси,” in: *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (5 vols.; Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum] 1–5; L’vov: Schevchenka, 1896–1910) 1.80–86; A.I. Jacimirskij, “Откровение Авраама,” in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности*, 99–100; P.P. Novickij, ed., “Откровение Авраама,” in: *Общество любителей древней письменности* 99.2 (St. Petersburg: Markov, 1891); I. Ja. Porfir’ev, “Откровение Авраама,” in: *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки* (Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской академии наук, 17.1; St. Petersburg: The Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1877) 111–30; V. Philonenko-Sayar and M. Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes* (Semitica, 31; Paris: Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1981) 36–105; A.N. Рурин, *Ложные и отреченные книги славянской и русской старины. Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко Том 3* (St. Petersburg: Kulesh, 1860–62) 24–36; R. Rubinkiewicz, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en vieux slave. Édition critique du texte, introduction, traduction et commentaire* (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: Źródła i monografie, 129; Lublin: Société des lettres et des sciences de l’Université catholique de Lublin, 1987) 98–256; I.I. Sreznevskij, “Книги Откровения Авраама,” in: *Известия Императорской академии наук по отделению русского языка и словесности. Том 10* (St. Petersburg: Russian Academy of Sciences, 1861–63) 648–665; N.S. Tihonravov, *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 vols.; St. Petersburg/Moscow: Obschestvennaja Pol’za, 1863) 1.32–77.

²⁸ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 3.

²⁹ Lunt, “On the Language of the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham,” 55–62 at 56.

Original Language

Many features of the text point to the fact that the original language of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* was Semitic, either Hebrew or Aramaic. The numerous features of the Semitic original have been noticed already by L. Ginzberg³⁰ and G.H. Box³¹ and then further explored by A. Rubinstein,³² R. Rubinkiewicz,³³ and M. Philonenko.³⁴ The recent study of A. Kulik demonstrates that the literal renderings of Hebrew or Aramaic are attested on several linguistic levels in the text thus proving beyond any doubt the existence of the Semitic original of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.³⁵

Most scholars also believe that the Slavonic prototext of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* similar to almost all early Slavonic texts was translated from an intermediate Greek *Vorlage*.³⁶ The hypothesis about the possibility of direct translation from a Semitic language into Slavonic was also proposed.³⁷

Date

The general scholarly consensus holds that the apocalypse was composed after 70 CE and before the end of the second century CE.³⁸ The depiction of the destruction of the Temple in chapter 27 and the peculiar interest in the idea of the celestial sanctuary represented by the divine Chariot hint to the fact that the earthly sanctuary was no longer standing. Another significant chronological marker is established by the second century work – the *Clementine Recognitions* 32–33 which

³⁰ Ginzberg, "Abraham, Apocalypse of," 1.91–92.

³¹ G.H. Box and J.I. Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham. Edited, with a Translation from the Slavonic Text and Notes* (TED, 1.10; London, New York: Macmillan, 1918) xv.

³² A. Rubinstein, "Hebraisms in the Slavonic 'Apocalypse of Abraham,'" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (1953) 108–115; idem, "Hebraisms in the Slavonic 'Apocalypse of Abraham,'" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5 (1954) 132–135.

³³ R. Rubinkiewicz, "Les sémitismes dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham," *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1989) 141–148.

³⁴ Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 23–24.

³⁵ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 61.

³⁶ Lunt, "On the Language of the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham," 55–62, at 56.

³⁷ R. Rubinkiewicz, "The Apocalypse of Abraham," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985[1983]) 1.683.

³⁸ Rubinkiewicz, "The Apocalypse of Abraham," 1.683.

provides one of the earliest external references for the dating of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.³⁹

Authorship

Scholars point to the fact that both the content of the pseudepigraphon as well as its “linguistic features” testify to its “undoubtedly Jewish origin.”⁴⁰ Like in the case of *2 Enoch* some suggestions have been made about the influences of the Bogomils’ ideology on the text.⁴¹ Yet, in the recent scholarship these hypotheses about the Bogomils’ editorship and interpolations have been met with increasing skepticism and recognized as based on the misinterpretation of the text.⁴²

Geographical Provenance

Several scholars noticed that the priestly concerns that loom large in the text appear to correspond well to the conceptual tenets of the Palestinian priestly environment.⁴³ Some doctrinal and linguistic affinities of the *Apocalypse* with the Qumran writings give rise to the hypothesis of a connection between the pseudepigraphon and the Essene milieu.⁴⁴ Yet, to date there has not been a convincing study which would prove that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* was generated from the Essene environment.

Theology

Several distinguished scholars of early Jewish mysticism have previously noted that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* might represent one of the earliest specimens of Merkabah mysticism, the Jewish tradition in which the divine Form ideology arguably receives its most advanced articulation.

Yet, although apocalyptic imagery found in the second part of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon stems from early Merkabah speculations

³⁹ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 3.

⁴⁰ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 3.

⁴¹ Rubinkiewicz, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en vieux slave*, 67.

⁴² Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 3.

⁴³ R. Rubinkiewicz, “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 1.41–43.

⁴⁴ Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, 21; P. Rießler, “Apokalypse des Abraham,” in: *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg: B. Filser Verlag, 1928) 13–39, 1267–1269.

similar to the ones found in Ezekielian and Enochic traditions, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse appear to exhibit consistent efforts to re-fashion this traditional anthropomorphic imagery in accordance with a new aniconic template that insists on expressing the divine Presence not in the form of a human-like *Kavod*, but in the form of the divine Voice and the divine Name. In view of these developments it is possible that the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, in which the aural praxis of the divine Name was unfolded amid the familiar Merkabah imagery, can be seen as an important conceptual nexus where the traditions of the divine Name become polemically engaged with the visionary Merkabah paradigm, thus anticipating the process of the gradual unification of both conceptual streams in the later Jewish mystical lore.

IV. *The Present Study*

The current collection of articles will deal with the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and *2 Enoch* in an attempt to understand their mediating role in the development of Jewish angelological and theophanic traditions from Second Temple apocalypticism to later Jewish Merkabah mysticism attested in the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. A number of scholars have previously noted that such pseudepigraphical texts as *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, and the *Ladder of Jacob* preserved only in their Slavonic translations, seem to share a highly developed mystical imagery that makes them stand out in the corpus of Jewish apocalyptic works.⁴⁵ This book represents an attempt to

⁴⁵ On Jewish mystical traditions in these texts, see P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.247–248; idem, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 102–111; C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992) 109–114; idem, "Beobachtungen zum Midrash vom 'Leben Henochs,'" *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44–83; A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996); M. Himmelfarb, "Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses," in: *Mysteries and Revelations; Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (eds. J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth; JSPSup., 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 79–90; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955) 5.161–164; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 50–51;

study two of the most important Slavonic apocalypses, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and *2 Enoch* in their capacity as the crucial conceptual bridges between the symbolic universes of Second Temple apocalypticism and early Jewish mysticism.

The collection also includes a bibliography on the Jewish pseudepigraphical texts and traditions in the Slavic milieu and the ways of transmission of these pseudepigraphical materials in the eastern orthodox environment. While numerous bibliographical tools were consulted in preparation of the bibliographical section of the book, special recognition is due to Dmitrij Lihachev's *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1987–98).

J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985); idem, "Colossians 1,15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201; idem, *The Image of the Invisible God. Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; J. Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88 (1995) 209–227; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) 52–63; W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinic and Mediaeval Judaism* (New York: Macmillan, 1920) 236; M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" in: *Religions en Égypte: Hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 109–116; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1954); idem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965); idem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991).

PART I

STUDIES IN THE *APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM*

PRAXIS OF THE VOICE: THE DIVINE NAME TRADITIONS
IN THE APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM

Introduction

A large portion of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish work known only in its Slavonic translation, deals with the celestial tour of the eponymous hero of the text. In the work's elaborate account of the tour, which depicts Abraham's initiation into the heavenly mysteries, an important detail often found in other apocalyptic texts is missing. The authors of the Slavonic work seem to deliberately eschew anthropomorphic depictions of the Deity that often mark climatic points in other early Jewish apocalyptic accounts. This reluctance in endorsing traditions of the divine Form appears to be quite unusual, given that other features of the pseudepigraphon exhibit explicit allusions to motifs and themes of the Merkabah tradition. Several distinguished scholars of early Jewish mysticism have previously noted that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* might represent one of the earliest specimens of Merkabah mysticism, the Jewish tradition in which the divine Form ideology arguably receives its most advanced articulation.¹ Yet despite many suggestive allusions in their depiction of the heavenly realities, the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* appear very reluctant to endorse one of the most crucial tenets in the divine Chariot lore: the

¹ On the Jewish mystical traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, see: Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, xxix–xxx; M. Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Judentum und Umwelt, 8; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1984) 251–53; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism* (AGAJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 55–56; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 103ff.; Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 83ff.; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 28–33; C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982) 86ff.; Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 76–83; M.E. Stone "Apocalyptic Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M.E. Stone; CRINT, 2/2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984) 383–441; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1961) 52, 57–61, 72; idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965) 23–24; idem, *Kabbalah* (New York: Quadrangle, 1974) 18.

anthropomorphic depiction of the Glory of God. The reluctance seems rather puzzling in view of some close similarities in angelological imagery that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* shares with the first chapter of the book of Ezekiel, the formative account of the Merkabah tradition, where the ideology of the divine Form looms large.²

It has been previously noted that the seer's vision of the divine Throne found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* relies significantly on Ezekiel's account and stands in direct continuity with Merkabah tradition.³ At the same time, however, scholars observe that the Slavonic pseudepigraphon shows attempts to depart from the overt anthropomorphism of this prophetic book. Christopher Rowland, for example, notes that the shift from anthropomorphism is apparent in the portrayal of the divine Throne in chapter 18 of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.⁴ Notwithstanding the many allusions to Ezek 1 in the depiction of the Throne room in chapters 18 and 19 of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, Rowland highlights a radical paradigm shift in the text's description of the Deity, noting "a deliberate attempt... to exclude all reference to the human figure mentioned in Ezek 1."⁵ For Rowland this shift entails that "there was a definite trend within apocalyptic thought away from the direct description of God..."⁶

These observations about anti-anthropomorphic tendencies of the Slavonic apocalypse are intriguing and deserve further investigation. Even a cursory look at the text reveals that, despite an extensive appropriation of the visionary motifs and themes, the authors appear to be avoiding anthropomorphic depictions of the Deity and some other

² Ryszard Rubinkiewicz in his monograph provides a helpful outline of usage of Ezekielian traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. He notes that "among the prophetic books, the book of Ezekiel plays for our author the same role as Genesis in the Pentateuch. The vision of the divine Throne (*Apoc. Ab.* 18) is inspired by Ezek 1 and 10. Abraham sees the four living creatures (*Apoc. Ab.* 18:5–11) depicted in Ezek 1 and 10. He also sees the wheels of fire decorated with eyes all around (*Apoc. Ab.* 18:3), the throne (*Apoc. Ab.* 18:3; Ezek 1:26), the chariot (*Apoc. Ab.* 18:12 and Ezek 10:6); he hears the voice of God (*Apoc. Ab.* 19:1 and Ezek 1:28). When the cloud of fire raises up, he can hear 'the voice like the roaring sea' (*Apoc. Ab.* 18:1; Ezek 1:24). There is no doubt that the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* takes the texts of Ezek 1 and 10 as sources of inspiration." Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 87.

³ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 228–229. John Collins also notes that Abraham's vision "stands in the tradition of 1 En. 14, conveying a sense of the visionary's experience of awe and terror." *ibid.*, 229.

⁴ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 86.

⁵ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 87.

⁶ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 87.

celestial beings.⁷ This tendency leads to the creation of a new apocalyptic imagery that combines traditional and novel elements. This study will investigate these new conceptual developments in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and seek to understand their place in the larger anti-corporeal ideology of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon.

Biblical Background of the Shem Tradition

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* is a Jewish work probably composed in Palestine in the early centuries of the Common Era.⁸ The text can be divided into two parts. The first part (chs. 1–8) of the work represents a haggadic account of Abraham's rejection of the religious practices of his father Terah. The second, apocalyptic part covers the rest of the work (chs. 9–32) and depicts the patriarch's ascension to heaven where he is accompanied by his *angelus interpres* Yahoel during his initiation into the heavenly and eschatological mysteries.

The first eight chapters of the pseudepigraphon take the form of midrashic elaboration and recount the early years of Abraham who is depicted as a reluctant helper to his idolatrous father Terah. The conceptual developments found in this section of the work, especially in the depictions of the idolatrous statues, seem to play an important role in the work's overall retraction of the anthropomorphic understanding of the Deity. Possibly mindful of the broader extra-biblical context of Abraham's biography and his role as the fighter with the idolatrous practices of his father Terah, the work's authors seem to be appropriating the patriarch's story for their anti-corporeal agenda.⁹ In

⁷ It should be noted that an anti-anthropomorphic reinterpretation of Ezekiel's vision can be also detected in the Targums. For the extensive discussion on avoidance of anthropomorphism in the Targum to Ezek 1, see Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 120ff.

⁸ On the date and provenance of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, see: Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, xv–xix; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*. 34–35; Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," 1.681–705 at 683; idem, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 70–73; A. Kulik, "К датировке 'Откровения Авраама,'" *In Memoria: Памяти Я. С. Лурье* (под ред. Н. М. Ботвинник и Э. И. Ванеевой; С.-Петербург, 1997) 189–195; idem, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 2–3.

⁹ For the background of this story in the *Book of Jubilees*, Josephus, Philo and the later rabbinic materials (*Genesis Rabbah* 38:13, *Tanna debe Eliahu* 2:25, *Seder Eliahu Rabba* 33), see: Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, 88–94; Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 43–49.

the depictions of the idol Bar-Eshath (“the Son of Fire”)¹⁰ and some other human-like statues, whose features are vividly reminiscent of the familiar attributes of the anthropomorphic portrayals of the Deity in Ezekiel and some other biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts, one can detect a subtle polemic with the divine body traditions. I have previously discussed the scope and nature of the anti-anthropomorphic developments in the first part of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.¹¹ The current study can be seen as the continuation of the ongoing inquiry into the anti-anthropomorphic tendencies of *Apoc. Ab.*, as it will deal with the polemical developments in the second, apocalyptic section of the pseudepigraphon. The second portion of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon takes the form of a visionary account and deals with celestial and eschatological revelations to Abraham after his open renunciation of idolatrous practices.

One of the important features of this section of the text is the authors’ apparent anti-anthropomorphic attitude reflected in their peculiar portrayals of the Deity and the heavenly hosts in chapters 8–19. Although apocalyptic imagery found in this portion of the pseudepigraphon appears to stem from the theophanic paradigm of the early Merkabah speculations, similar to those found in Ezek 1, *1 En.* 14,¹² and the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian, the authors of the Slavonic text appear to exhibit consistent efforts to re-fashion this traditional theophanic imagery in accordance with a new anti-anthropomorphic template that insists on expressing the divine Presence in the form of the Deity’s Voice.¹³ In his comparative analysis of the accounts from Ezekiel and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, Christopher Rowland notes that, while preserving the angelology of Ezekiel’s account, the author of the Slavonic apocalypse carefully avoids anthropomorphic

¹⁰ On Bar-Eshath and the background of this name, see Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 63.

¹¹ A. Orlov, “The Gods of My Father Terah’: Abraham the Iconoclast and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18.1 (2008) 33–53.

¹² George Nickelsburg notices that “Abraham’s ascent and throne vision stand in a tradition that stretches from *1 En.* 12–16 to the medieval mystical texts.” G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005) 288.

¹³ On the hypostatic voice of God, see J.H. Charlesworth, “The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986) 19–41.

descriptions of the *Kavod* substituting them with references to the divine Voice.

These anti-anthropomorphic tendencies can be observed already in the very beginning of the apocalyptic section of the work. The very first manifestation of the Deity to the seer found in chapter 8 takes the form of theophany of the divine Voice that is depicted as coming from heaven in a stream of fire.¹⁴ This peculiar expression of the Deity as the voice erupting in a fiery stream will subsequently become a customary theophanic expression appearing multiple times in the apocalypse, including the climatic account of the revelation given to Abraham in the seventh firmament. There in his vision of the throne room, which evokes memories of Ezekielian angelology, the hero of the faith sees not the human-like form of God but the Deity's formless voice.

This tendency to substitute the anthropomorphic depiction of the Deity with expressions of the divine Voice or Name is, of course, not a novel development of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* authors, but a specimen of the long-lasting tradition whose roots can be found already in the biblical materials.

The Hebrew Bible reveals complicated polemics for and against an anthropomorphic understanding of God. Scholars argue that the anthropomorphic imagery found in biblical materials was "crystallized" in the Israelite priestly ideology, known to us as the Priestly source. Moshe Weinfeld points out that the theology of worship delineated in the Priestly source depicts God in "the most tangible corporeal similitudes."¹⁵ In the Priestly tradition God is understood to have created humanity in his own image (Gen 1:27) and is thus

¹⁴ Scholars have previously noted that the patriarch's vision reflected in the second part of the Slavonic apocalypse seems to be reminiscent not only of Ezek 1 but also of the visionary account in Gen 15 ("with an allusion to Gen 22 insofar as the sacrifice is located on a high mountain." Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 226). Thus, H. Box notes that "the apocalyptic part of the book is based upon the story of Abraham's sacrifices and trance, as described in Gen xv." Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, xxiv. Both in Gen and *Apoc. Ab.* the patriarch is asked to prepare sacrifices, and the content of the sacrifices is also very similar. Yet, the theophanic tradition of the divine Voice does not play a prominent role in Gen 15. Although it mentions the word of God given to Abraham, it does not say anything about the voice in the fire, a standard theophanic formulae found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. It is also noteworthy that at the end of Genesis' account the patriarch sees the vision of a fiery phenomenon – a smoking fire pot with a blazing torch.

¹⁵ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomical School*, 191.

frequently described as possessing a human-like form.¹⁶ Scholars have shown that the anthropomorphism of the priestly authors appears to be intimately connected with the place of divine habitation – the Deity possesses a human form and needs to reside in a house or tabernacle.¹⁷ Weinfeld argues that the anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly tradition, but derived from early pre-exilic sacral conceptions about divine corporeal manifestations found in Mesopotamian literature.¹⁸ Scholars observe that the priestly understanding of the corporeal representation of the Deity finds its clearest expression in the conception of the “Glory of God” (כבוד יהוה).¹⁹ This conception is always expressed in the Priestly tradition in the symbolism grounded in mythological corporeal imagery.²⁰ One of the paradigmatic accounts of the portrayal of the divine *Kavod* can be found in the first chapter of the book of Ezekiel, which can be seen as the manifesto of the Priestly corporeal ideology. There the *Kavod* is portrayed as an enthroned human form enveloped by fire.²¹

While containing forceful anthropomorphic ideologies, the Hebrew Bible also attests to polemical narratives contesting the corporeal depictions of the Deity. Scholars have long noted a sharp opposition of the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic school to early anthropomorphic developments. In fact, the Deuteronomistic school is widely thought to have initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity, which were subsequently adopted by the prophets Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah.²² Seeking to dislodge ancient anthropomorphism, the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic school promulgated an anti-corporeal theology of the divine Name with its conception of sanctuary (tabernacle) as the exclusive dwelling abode of God’s Name.²³ Gerhard von Rad

¹⁶ Ludwig Köhler and Moshe Weinfeld argue that the phrase, “in our image, after our likeness” precludes the anthropomorphic interpretation that the human being was created in the divine image. L. Köhler, “Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei Lehre, Genesis i, 26,” *ThZ* 4 (1948) 16ff.; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 199.

¹⁷ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191.

¹⁸ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 199.

¹⁹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 200–201.

²⁰ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 201.

²¹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 201.

²² Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 198.

²³ Trygve Mettinger observes that the concept of God in the *Shem* theology is “...strikingly abstract... God himself is no longer present in the Temple, but only in heaven. However, he is represented in the Temple by his Name...” Mettinger, *The*

argues that the Deuteronomic formulae “to cause his name to dwell” (לשכן שמו) advocates a new understanding of the Deity that challenges the popular ancient belief that God actually dwells within the sanctuary.²⁴ It is noteworthy that, while the Deuteronomic *Shem* ideology does not completely abandon the terminology pertaining to the concept of the divine Glory (*Kavod*),²⁵ it markedly voids it of any corporeal motifs. Weinfeld observes that “the expression כבוד, when occurring in Deuteronomy, does not denote the being and substantiality of God as it does in the earlier sources but his splendor and greatness,” signifying “abstract and not corporeal qualities.”²⁶

One of the early examples of the polemical interaction between the corporeal ideology of the divine Form (*Kavod*), which is often labeled in the theophanic accounts as the divine Face (*Panim*), and the incorporeal theology of the divine Name is possibly seen in Exod 33 where upon Moses’ plea to behold the divine *Kavod*, the Deity offers an aural alternative by promising to reveal to the seer his Name:

Then Moses said, “Now show me your glory (כבודך).” And the Lord said, “I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name (שם) (וקראתי בשם), the Lord, in your presence...but,” he said, “you cannot see my face (פני), for no one may see me and live.”

This account appears to highlight the opposition between visual and aural revelations, focusing on the possibility of encountering the Deity not only through the form but also through the sound. One mode of revelation often comes at the expense of the other – the idea hinted at in Exod 33 and articulated more explicitly in Deut 4, “You heard the sound of words, but saw no form (תמונה).” Scholars point to a paradigm shift in Deuteronomy’s switch of the revelatory axis from the visual to the aural plane.²⁷ In this new, theo-aural, as opposed to theo-phanic, understanding, even God’s revelation to Moses on Mt. Sinai in Exod 19, an event marking a vital nexus of the visual anthropomorphic paradigm, becomes now reinterpreted in the terms of its

Dethronement of Sabaath. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies, 124. See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 193.

²⁴ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 193.

²⁵ This tendency for polemical re-interpretation of the imagery of the rival paradigm is also observable in the *Kavod* tradition which in its turn uses the symbolism of the divine Voice and other aspects of the *Shem* symbolism.

²⁶ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 206.

²⁷ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 207.

aural counterpart. Deut 4:36 describes the Sinai theophany as hearing of the divine Voice: “Out of heaven he let you hear his voice, that he might discipline you; and on earth he let you see his great fire and you heard his words out of the midst of the fire.” Here the revelation is received not in form of tablets, the medium that might implicitly underline the corporeality of the Deity; rather “the commandments were heard from out of the midst of the fire... uttered by the Deity from heaven.”²⁸ This transcendent nature of the Deity’s revelation that now chooses to manifest itself as the formless voice in the fire eliminates any need of its corporeal representation in the form of the anthropomorphic Glory of God.

The depiction of the Deity’s activity and presence as the voice in the fire thus becomes one of the distinctive features of the *Shem* theology.²⁹ The classic example of this imagery can be found in the account of God’s appearance to Elijah on Mount Horeb in 1 Kings 19:11–13:

He said, “Go out and stand on the mountain before the Lord, for the Lord is about to pass by.” Now there was a great wind, so strong that it was splitting mountains and breaking rocks in pieces before the Lord, but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake, but the Lord was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a sound of sheer silence. When Elijah heard it, he wrapped his face in his mantle and went out and stood at the entrance of the cave. Then there came a voice to him that said, “What are you doing here, Elijah?”

This passage vividly recalls the description found in chapter eight of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* where the Deity is described as “the voice of the Mighty One coming down from the heavens in a stream of fire.” And although in the account found in 1 Kings 19 the fire is not mentioned directly, the fiery nature of the divine Voice is implicitly reaffirmed through the portrayal of the seer wrapping his face in the mantle to shield himself from the dangerous nature of the encounter with the divine Voice.

²⁸ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 207.

²⁹ Mettinger notes that “it is not surprising that the Name of God occupies such central position in a theology in which God’s words and voice receive so much emphasis.” Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 124.

*The Voice of the Mighty One: The Aural Mysticism of the
Apocalypse of Abraham*

Keeping in mind the aforementioned biblical specimens relating to the *Kavod* and the *Shem* conceptual developments, we will next examine the imagery of the divine Presence in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.

The Revelation of the Divine Sound

Depictions of theophanies of the divine Voice in *Apoc. Ab.* reveal marked similarities with the traditions in Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic materials.³⁰ Already in chapter eight, which marks a transition to the apocalyptic section of the work and narrates the patriarch's response to the divine call in the courtyard of Terah's house, the divine Presence is depicted as "the voice of the Mighty One" coming down in a stream of fire.³¹ This self-disclosure of God in the formless "voice" (Slav. *глас*) rather than some angelic or divine form becomes a standard description adopted by the author(s) of the apocalypse to convey manifestations of the Deity.³²

The divine Voice appears continually in the narrative. More notably, in *Apoc. Ab.* 9:1 the voice of "the primordial and mighty God" commands Abraham to bring sacrifices, and in chapter 10 it appoints the angel Yahoel as a celestial guide of the exalted patriarch.

Similar to the developments in the *Kavod* tradition, the aural expression of the Deity evokes veneration. The epiphany of the divine Voice is repeatedly depicted as accompanied by veneration of the seer, in a fashion that recalls veneration of the *Kavod* in the apocalyptic visionary

³⁰ The affinities with the Deuteronomic materials can also be seen in the implicit and explicit connections between the vision of Abraham and the Deuteronomic version of Moses' Sinai encounter. In this respect David Halperin notes that the author of *Apoc. Ab.* "... gives us several clues that he is modelling Abraham's experience after Moses' at Sinai. The most obvious of these is his locating the experience at Mount Horeb, the name that Deuteronomy regularly uses for Sinai." Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 109–110. Halperin also notices the allusion to the Deuteronomistic traditions including the story of Elijah.

³¹ *Apoc. Ab.* 8:1: "The voice (*глас*) of the Mighty One came down from heaven in a stream of fire, saying and calling, 'Abraham, Abraham!'" Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 16; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 54.

³² See, for example, *Apoc. Ab.* 18:2 "And I heard a voice (*глас*) like the roaring of the sea, and it did not cease because of the fire." Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 24; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 76.

accounts. Thus, in the dramatic portrayal of the seer's encounter of the aural revelation of the Deity in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:1–3, the visionary's spirit is said to have been affrighted, his soul to have fled him, and he “became like a stone (*быхъ яко камыкѣ*), and fell down upon the earth (*и падохъ [яко] ниць на земли*).”³³ Transformational prostration of an adept during his dramatic encounter with the Deity is not a novel feature and is customarily encountered in theophanic narratives as early as the Book of Ezekiel that depicts a visionary's prostration while approaching the Glory of God.³⁴ There is, however, a significant difference between these two mystical traditions since in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* the visionary's prostration occurs not before the divine Form but before the divine Voice. Veneration of the divine Sound can be found in other parts of the text where not only Abraham but also his celestial companion, Yahoel, is depicted as a worshiper of this peculiar divine manifestation:

And while he was still speaking, behold, a fire was coming toward us round about, and a sound was in the fire like a sound of many waters, like a sound of the sea in its uproar. And the angel bowed with me and worshipped (*и поклѣче съ мною ангель и поклонися*) (*Apoc. Ab.* 17:1–2).³⁵

The Singer of the Eternal One

It is important not to underestimate the figure of Abraham's celestial guide in the theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse. Indeed, Yahoel can be seen as one of the decisive symbols for understanding the overarching theological thrust of the pseudepigraphon. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* defines him as the mediation of “my [God] ineffable name (*неизрекомаго имени моего*).”³⁶ Even apart from this explanation of the guide's spectacular office, the peculiar designation “Yahoel” (Slav. *Иаоиль*) in itself reveals unequivocally the angelic creature as the rep-

³³ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 17; Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 126; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 58.

³⁴ See also *1 En.* 71; *2 En.* 22.

³⁵ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 22; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 72.

³⁶ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 17; Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 128; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 58.

resentation of the divine Name. It is no coincidence that in the text, which exhibits similarities with the Deuteronomic *Shem* theology, the angelic guide of the protagonist is introduced as the Angel of the Name. Scholars have previously noted the formative role of the figure of the Angel of the Name (or the Angel of YHWH) in the conceptual framework of the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic *Shem* ideologies. According to one of the hypotheses, the figure of the Angel of the LORD (or the Angel of the divine Name) found in the Book of Exodus constituted one of the conceptual roots of the *Shem* theology. Tryggve Mettinger observes that “it appears that when the Deuteronomistic theologians choose *shem*, they seized on a term which was already connected with the idea of God’s presence. Exod 23:21 tells us how God warned Israel during her wanderings in the desert to respect his angel and obey his voice, ‘for my name in him.’”³⁷

Yahoel can be seen both as a manifestation and a non-manifestation of the divine Name. He is in many ways a paradoxical figure at once reaffirming the divine Presence through mediation of the Tetragrammaton and challenging its overt veneration.³⁸ This ambiguity in his mediating role of the divine Presence is very similar to the later role of the angel Metatron in the Merkabah tradition who represents there not only the divine Name but also the Form of the Deity, his *Shi-ur Qomah*.³⁹ In this capacity of being a representation of the divine body, the great angel finds himself in a rather awkward position, as he becomes a stumbling block for the infamous visionary of the Talmud, Elisha b. Abuyah, who according to *b. Hag. 15a* took Metatron as the second deity in heaven which led him to the heretical conclusion about two “powers” (ב' רשויות) in heaven. Still in both accounts (talmudic and pseudepigraphical) the difference between the Deity and his angelic manifestation is properly re-affirmed. In *Apoc. Ab.* Yahoel prevents Abraham from venerating him by putting the patriarch on his feet. In *b. Hag. 15a* the distance between the Deity and his vice-regent, angel Metatron, is reaffirmed even more radically – the supreme angel is publicly punished in front of celestial hosts with sixty fiery lashes in order to prevent future confusions between the Deity

³⁷ Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 124–125.

³⁸ *Apoc. Ab.* 10:4: “...he took me by my right hand and stood me on my feet.” Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 17.

³⁹ On the formative influence of the Yahoel lore on the figure of Metatron, see Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, 51.

and his angelic replica. Despite these reaffirmations, the boundaries between the Deity and his angelic manifestation in the form of his *Shi'ur Qomah* or the divine Name do not remain entirely unambiguous. The paradoxical nature of this angelic mediation of the divine Name appears to be hinted at in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* through the depiction of Yahoel delivering a prayer to the Deity, a hymn that now paradoxically includes his own name, “Yahoel.”⁴⁰

Praxis of the Voice

The identification of divine manifestation with the Voice or the Sound in *Apoc. Ab.* underlines the importance of praise as a parallel process of the aural expression of creation in relation to its Creator. Also the authors of the text seem to view the praising of God as a mystical praxis that in many ways mirrors the visionary praxis of the *Kavod* paradigm. Scholars have previously observed the importance of aural invocation or “calling upon” in the *Shem* paradigm that had come to function there as an act of actualization of the presence of God.⁴¹ By invoking the Deity (or more precisely the divine Name) in praise, the practitioner “brings” the Deity into existence,⁴² summoning him from non-being into being, thus replicating the prototypical event of creation recounted in Gen 1 where God himself brings everything into being by invoking the divine Name.⁴³

Time and again the angel Yahoel poses as a faithful adept of this mystical praxis of praise. The text defines him as the Singer of the Eternal One (*Apoc. Ab.* 12:4). He is exceptional both as a practitioner

⁴⁰ *Apoc. Ab.* 17:7–13: “And I recited, and he [Yahoel] himself recited the song: O, Eternal, Mighty, Holy El, God Autocrat... Eternal, Mighty, Holy Sabaoth, Most Glorious El, El, El, El, Yahoel...” Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 23.

⁴¹ Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 125.

⁴² The process of constitution of the angelic or divine Presence or re-constitution of a human nature into a celestial one through the invocation of the divine Name can be seen in the traditions about Moses’ investiture with the divine Name during his Sinai experience and Jesus’ investiture with the divine Name at his baptism. For a detailed discussion of these traditions, see J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Mediation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 76–112.

⁴³ In the Palestinian targumic tradition (*Targ. Neof., Frag. Targ.*) the divine command *וְהָיָה* uttered by God during the creation of the world is identified with the Tetragrammaton. For a detailed discussion of this tradition, see Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Mediation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism*, 80.

and as an instructor of this “aural mysticism,” conveying the teachings of the praxis to various types of God’s creatures, earthly as well as celestial. In *Apoc. Ab.* 10:8–9 he is described as the celestial choirmaster of the *Hayyot*:

I am a power in the midst of the Ineffable who put together his names in me. I am appointed according to his commandment to reconcile the rivalries of the Living Creatures of the Cherubim against one another, and teach those who bear him [to sing] the song in the middle of man’s night, at the seventh hour (*Apoc. Ab.* 10:8–9).⁴⁴

This role can again be compared to the future office of Metatron who often posits in the *Hekhalot* and *Shi’ur Qomah* accounts as the celestial choirmaster⁴⁵ conducting the liturgies of the Living Creatures.⁴⁶

Yahoe!l’s expertise in heavenly praise does not seem to be limited to heavenly matters. In the apocalypse he is also depicted as the one who initiates a human visionary, the patriarch Abraham, into this mystical praxis of praising the Deity that serves here as an alternative practice to the vision mysticism.

⁴⁴ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 18. For the extensive discussion on the passages about the rivalries of the *Hayyot* in the *Apoc. Ab.* 10:8–9 and 18:8–10 see: William Whitney, Jr., *Two Strange Beasts: Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (HSM, 63; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006).

⁴⁵ On Metatron’s role as the celestial choirmaster of the *Hayyot*, see A. Orlov, “Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and Merkabah Tradition,” in: idem, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJSup., 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 197–221.

⁴⁶ “One *hayyah* rises above the seraphim and descends upon the tabernacle of the youth whose name is Metatron, and says in a great voice, a voice of sheer silence: ‘The Throne of Glory is shining.’ Suddenly the angels fall silent. The watchers and the holy ones become quiet. They are silent, and are pushed into the river of fire. The *hayyot* put their faces on the ground, and this youth whose name is Metatron brings the fire of deafness and puts it into their ears so that they could not hear the sound of God’s speech or the ineffable name. The youth whose name is Metatron then invokes, in seven voices, his living, pure, honored, awesome, holy, noble, strong, beloved, mighty, powerful name.” P. Schäfer et al., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) 164. Another *Hekhalot* passage attested in *Synopse* §385 also elaborates the liturgical role of the exalted angel: “...when the youth enters below the throne of glory, God embraces him with a shining face. All the angels gather and address God as ‘the great, mighty, awesome God,’ and they praise God three times a day by means of the youth...” Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, 162–3. The designation of Yahoe!l as the Singer of the Eternal One in *Apoc. Ab.* 12:4 is also intriguing. It again recalls the description of Metatron in the aforementioned account where he is depicted as the leading singer of the heavenly host, the one who is able to invoke the divine Name in seven voices.

And he said, “Only worship, Abraham, and recite the song which I taught you.” ... And he said, “Recite without ceasing.” And I recited, and he himself recited the song (*Apoc. Ab.* 17:4–7).⁴⁷

Our previous remarks about the connections between the visionary and aural praxis make it intriguing that veneration of the Deity is described in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* through the paradoxical formulae of seeing/not seeing: “He whom you will see (*его же узриши*) going before both of us in a great sound of *qedushah* is the Eternal One who had loved you, whom himself you will not see (*самого же не зриши*)” (*Apoc. Ab.* 16:3).⁴⁸

This ambiguous mixture of the paradigms of vision and voice can be seen in other parts of the text as well. For example, in the depiction of Abraham’s fast in 12:2, two mystical practices appear to be mixed:

And we went, the two of us alone together, forty days and nights. And I ate no bread and drank no water, because [my] food was to see the angel who was with me, and his speech with me was my drink (*Apoc. Ab.* 12:1–2).⁴⁹

Here the traditional motif found in the visionary accounts – viz., the motif of nourishment through the beholding of a celestial being, often in the form of the *Kavod*, that is especially famous in the later interpretations of Moses’ story where he is often depicted as a being fed through the vision of God’s *Shekhinah* – is paralleled with the motif of nourishment through the voice of the heavenly being, the angel Yahoel.⁵⁰

Also noteworthy is that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* the praise seems to be understood as a sort of garment that envelops the formless Deity, similar to the Merkabah tradition where the divine Form is enveloped in the garment known as the *Haluq* (חלוק), an attribute that

⁴⁷ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 22–23.

⁴⁸ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 22. Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 70.

⁴⁹ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 19.

⁵⁰ David Halperin notices some similarities between the celestial nourishments of Abraham and Moses. He observes that “... Moses also discovered that the divine Presence is itself nourishment enough. That is why Exod 24:11 says that Moses and his companions beheld God, and ate and drank. This means, one rabbi explained, that the sight of God was food and drink to them; for Scripture also says, In the light of the King’s face there is life.... We may assume that the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* had such midrashim in mind when he wrote that ‘my food was to see the angel who was with me, and his speech – that was my drink.’” Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 111.

underlines there the anthropomorphic nature of the divine Extent. In contrast, in *Apoc. Ab.* 16:2–4 the Deity is enveloped in the sound of angelic praise, a description that may serve to reaffirm the bodiless presence of the Deity:⁵¹

And he [Yahoel] said to me, “Remain with me, do not fear! He whom you will see going before both of us in a great sound of *qedushah* is the Eternal One who had loved you, whom himself you will not see. Let your spirit not weaken <from the shouting>, since I am with you, strengthening you” (*Apoc. Ab.* 16:2–4).⁵²

The importance of angelic praise is also highlighted in the depiction of the divine Throne in chapter 18, which draws on the imagery found in Ezek 1. One of the new details there, however, is the persistent emphasis on the symbolism of vocal praxis: in their portrayals of the Living Creatures (the *Hayyot*) and the Wheels (the *Ophannim*), the authors accentuate their role in the praising of the Deity:

And as the fire rose up, soaring higher, I saw under the fire a throne [made] of fire and the many-eyed Wheels, and *they are reciting the song*. And under the throne [I saw] four *singing* fiery Living Creatures (*Apoc. Ab.* 18:3).⁵³

Thus, instead of emphasizing the role of the *Hayyot* as the foundation of the Throne, which in the formative account found in the Book of Ezekiel holds the divine Presence/Form, the Slavonic apocalypse stresses the praising functions of the Living Creatures depicted as “singing the divine Presence.”

“No Other Power of Other Form”

The most striking detail in the description of the divine Throne in chapter 18, which radically differs from the Ezekielian account, is that at the climactic moment of the seer’s encounter with the divine Chariot – which also curiously appears to be missing a rider – the text does not give any indications of the presence of the anthropomorphic Glory of God which in Ezek 1:26 is described as **דמוֹת כְּמֵרָאָה אָדָם**.

⁵¹ The concept of praise as a garment seems to be connected with the tradition of investiture with the divine Name discussed earlier in our book.

⁵² Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 22.

⁵³ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 24, emphasis mine.

Instead of the Ezelikean anthropomorphic extent, the visionary encounters the already familiar Voice in the midst of fire surrounded by the sound of the *qedushah*:

While I was still standing and watching, I saw behind the Living Creatures a chariot with fiery Wheels. Each Wheel was full of eyes round about. And above the Wheels there was the throne which I had seen. And it was covered with fire and the fire encircled it round about, and an indescribable light surrounded the fiery people. And I heard the sound of their *qedushah* like the voice of a single man.⁵⁴ And a voice came to me out of the midst of the fire.... (*Apoc. Ab.* 18:12–19:1).⁵⁵

Polemics with the divine body traditions is then further developed in chapter 19 which can be considered as the climatic point of the anti-corporeal ideology of the apocalypse. Here the seer is allowed to take a final look at the upper firmaments so that he and, more importantly his audience, may be assured that no divine Form is present there. The account detailing this final gaze is rather lengthy:

And he [God] said, “Look at the levels which are under the expanse on which you are brought and see that on no single level is there any other but the one whom you have searched for or who has loved you.” And while he was still speaking, and behold, the levels opened, <and> there are the heavens under me. And I saw on the seventh firmament upon which I stood a fire spread out and light, and dew, and a multitude of angels, and a power of the invisible glory from the Living Creatures which I had seen above. <But> *I saw no one else there*. And I looked from the altitude of my standing to the sixth expanse. And I saw there a multitude of *incorporeal spiritual angels*, carrying out the orders of the fiery angels who were on the eighth firmament, as I was standing on its suspensions. And behold, neither on this expanse was there *any other power of other form*, but only the spiritual angels, and they are the power which I had seen on the seventh firmament (*Apoc. Ab.* 19:3–7).⁵⁶

Intriguingly, the text repeatedly stresses the absence of any corporeal manifestation of the Deity, in one instance even using the term “form”

⁵⁴ Halperin noticed the paradigm shift from the visual plane to the aural plane when he observes that “Ezekiel’s phrase ‘like the appearance of a man,’ becomes, in a concluding sentence, that plainly draws on the end of Ezek 1:28, ‘like the voice of a man.’” Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 108.

⁵⁵ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 24.

⁵⁶ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 24–25, emphasis mine.

(Slav. *образ*):⁵⁷ "...and behold, neither on this expanse was there any other power of other form (*образом силы иноя*)..."⁵⁸

Further the text seems to deny even the presence of angelic "bodies" on the upper firmaments, constantly referring to angelic creatures found there as "incorporeal" (*бесплотныхъ*) or "spiritual" (*духовныхъ*) angels. Importantly for our ongoing inquiry, according to the *Apocalypse of Abraham* it is not a manifestation of the Deity but the incorporeal angels who now represent "the power" (Slav. *сила*) which the seer beholds on the seventh firmament.

The Idol of Jealousy

The polemical "clash" between the *Kavod* and *Shem* ideologies reaches eschatological proportion in chapter 25 where God allows Abraham to behold the future Temple polluted by the idol of jealousy:

I saw there *the likeness of the idol of jealousy (подобие идола ревнования)*, as a *likeness (подобие)* of a craftsman's [work] such as my father made, and its statue was of shining copper, and a man before it, and he was worshipping it; and [there was] an altar opposite it and youths were slaughtered on it before the idol. And I said to him, "What is this idol, and what is the altar, and who are those being sacrificed, and who is the sacrificer, and what is the beautiful temple which I see, art and beauty of your glory that lies beneath your throne?" And he said, "Hear, Abraham! This temple and altar and the beautiful things which you have seen are my image of *the sanctification of the name of my glory (святительства имени славы моея)*, where every prayer of men will dwell, and the gathering of kings and prophets, and the sacrifice which I shall establish to be made for me among my people coming from your progeny. And the statue you saw is my anger, because the people who will come to me out of you will make me angry. And the man you saw slaughtering is he who angers me. And the sacrifice is the murder of those who are for me a testimony of the close of the judgment in the end of the creation" (*Арос. Ab. 25:1-6*).⁵⁹

⁵⁷ The Slavonic word "образ" can be also translated as a "type," an "image," an "icon," or a "symbol." See I. Sreznevskij, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам* (3 тома.; С-Петербург: Типография Императорской академии наук, 1883-1912), 2.539-542.

⁵⁸ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 25; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 80.

⁵⁹ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 29. Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 92, emphasis mine.

This description once again provides a graphic example of the polemical interaction between the traditions of the divine Glory and the divine Name where the imagery of both trends becomes closely intertwined. In this pivotal passage the earlier motifs that the readers encountered in the first section of the pseudepigraphon, dealing with the idolatrous practices of Abraham's father become explicitly invoked. The statues similar to those made in the house of Terah are now installed in God's Temple. This idolatrous practice of worship to the statue of shining copper, labeled in the story as "a likeness (*подобие*) of a craftsman's work," seems to be cautiously invoking the language of "likeness" known from the Priestly theophanic paradigm exemplified in Gen 1:26 and Ezek 1. The idolatrous practices are then contrasted to the true worship which is described in the now familiar language of the *Shem* tradition. Here the future eschatological Temple is portrayed as a dwelling place, not for the abominable shining statue, but for "the image of the *sanctification of the name of my [God's] glory* (*святительства имени славы моя*), where *every prayer of men will dwell* (*в нюже вселится всяка молба мужьска*)." ⁶⁰ It is apparent that the authors try to re-interpret the technical terminology of the *Kavod* tradition merging it with the formulae borrowed from the *Shem* ideology. There is also no doubt that the authors' attitude to the anthropomorphic ideology remains polemical which is unabashedly shown through labeling the shining statue as the idol of jealousy.

Conclusion

As has been shown, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* offers a complex mix of the *Kavod* and *Shem* conceptual developments where promulgation of the theology of the divine Name and the praxis of the divine Voice become linked with the theophanic imagery from the Priestly source, Ezekiel, *1 En.* and some other Second Temple accounts. The consequences of this polemical encounter between two important revelatory trends appear to have exercised lasting influence on both traditions. The developments found in the Slavonic apocalypse should not be interpreted simply as a rejection of anthropomorphic theism through the aural paradigm of the divine Name. Rather, they should be seen as

⁶⁰ Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 92.

an adaptation of Merkabah imagery into the framework of this aural paradigm that has led to the construction of a new symbolic universe⁶¹ in which two trends can coexist with each other.⁶² This synthesis is intriguing and might provide important insights for understanding the character of later Jewish mystical developments where the traditions about the divine Form and the divine Name appear to undergo creative conflation. As has been mentioned, the protagonist of the later Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* accounts, the supreme angel Metatron, is often depicted in these materials as the celestial choirmaster who instructs the Living Creatures on fitting ways of praising the Deity. These later mystical traditions also portray him as יהוה הקטן,⁶³ the lesser manifestation of the divine Name, the office which is reminiscent of the role of Yahoel in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.⁶⁴

These later conceptual developments bring to memory Scholem's hypothesis about the existence of two streams that in his opinion constituted the background of the Metatron figure: one connected with Yahoel's figure and the other with the figure of the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch.⁶⁵ The roles and offices of these two apocalyptic heroes, who can in many ways be seen as exemplars of the revelatory paradigms of the divine Form and the divine Voice, later became reconciled in the figure of the chief protagonist of the Merkabah lore. In view of these important developments attesting to the afterlife of

⁶¹ This new symbolic universe manifests itself for example in the depiction of the Throne room with its paradoxical imagery reflecting the visual and the aural traditions.

⁶² The synthetic nature of adaptations taken place in the Slavonic pseudepigraphon has been noticed previously by other scholars. Thus, John Collins observes that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* "belongs to the same general period of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch and shares some of their concerns about theodicy. In place of the Deuteronomic tradition, which informs these books, however, the mystical tendency of the early Enoch books is taken up here." Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 225.

⁶³ On Metatron's title יהוה הקטן, see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 136–143.

⁶⁴ John Collins notes that "in all, Jaobel bears striking resemblance to Metatron in Hekhalot literature. Metatron is 'the little Yahweh' (3 En. 12), whose name is like the name of God himself (b. Sanh. 38b)." Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 228.

⁶⁵ The classical study by Gershom Scholem differentiates between two basic aspects of Metatron's lore which, in his opinion, were combined in rabbinic and Hekhalot literature. These aspects include the Enochic lore and the lore connected with the exalted figures of Yahoel and Michael. Scholem writes that "one aspect identifies Metatron with Jaobel or Michael and knows nothing of his transfiguration from a human being into an angel. The talmudic passages concerned with Metatron are of this type. The other aspect identifies Metatron with the figure of Enoch as he is depicted in apocalyptic literature. . . . When the *Book of Hekhaloth*, or 3 Enoch, was composed, the two aspects had already become intertwined." Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, 51.

the *Shem* and the *Kavod* trends in the later Hekhalot mysticism, the changes that take place in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* should not be underestimated. It is possible that the Slavonic apocalypse, in which the mystical praxis of the divine Name was unfolded amid the familiar Merkabah imagery, can be seen as an important conceptual nexus where the traditions of the divine Name become polemically engaged with the visionary Merkabah paradigm, thus anticipating the process of the gradual unification of both conceptual streams in the later Jewish mystical lore.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Alexander Kulik observes that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* can be seen as “representative of a missing link between early apocalyptic and medieval Hekhalot traditions.” Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 1.

THE PTEROMORPHIC ANGELOLOGY OF THE
APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM

Introduction

In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish work composed in the early centuries of the Common Era, God invites Abraham on the celestial journey to receive heavenly and eschatological secrets. To secure Abraham's celestial tour, the Deity appoints Yahoel to be his *angelus interpres*. The pseudepigraphon describes the patriarch's angelic guide as a glorious creature whose body is reminiscent of sapphire¹ and whose face looks like chrysolite.² Scholars have previously noted that the peculiar imagery used in the depiction of Yahoel's physique recalls portrayals of the anthropomorphic Glory of God, *Kavod*.³ Such transference of the *Kavod* imagery to angelic figures is not uncommon in the Jewish apocalyptic and early mystical accounts where the principal angels or the exalted patriarchs and prophets are often portrayed as representations or even measures (*Shi'ur Qomah*) of the glorious anthropomorphic extent of God.⁴ What is, however, unusual and even puzzling in the tradition found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is that the work's authors seem to depart from the familiar anthropomorphic descriptions of angels by seeking to portray Yahoel as a pteromorphic creature who possesses the body of a griffin. This departure from the traditional angelic imagery does not appear coincidental. It has been previously observed that, despite the *Apocalypse of Abraham* authors' reliance on Ezekielian imagery in their descriptions of the celestial realm, they shun the book's explicit anthropomorphic references.⁵

¹ Slav. *сапфиръ*. Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 60.

² Slav. *хрусолитъ*. Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 60.

³ J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Mediation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 319.

⁴ On this tradition see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 165–176; idem, “The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*,” in: A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJS, 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 399–419.

⁵ Christopher Rowland, for example, notes that the shift from anthropomorphism is apparent in the portrayal of the divine Throne in chapter 18 of the *Apocalypse of*

Instead of depicting God in the form of a glorious anthropomorphic extent enthroned in heaven, the Slavonic apocalypse persistently portrays the manifestations of the Deity as a formless voice coming in a stream of fire.⁶

In view of some anti-anthropomorphic tendencies detected in the Slavonic pseudepigraphon, it is possible that its authors' agenda might go beyond the distinctive noncorporeal depictions of the Deity and encompass the imagery of other celestial beings found in the book. The purpose of this study is to explore the anti-anthropomorphic features of the angelological developments in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.

Yahoel, the Bird of Heaven

One of the possible clues to understanding the mysteries of the text's angelology might lie in the rather cryptic conceptual developments surrounding the figure of Abraham's celestial guide, Yahoel. This angelic character first appears in chapter 10 as "the namesake of the mediation of God's ineffable name."⁷ The close association of the chief angelic protagonist with the office of mediation of the divine Name does not seem coincidental in light of the work's engagement of the aural symbolism in its depiction of the Deity as the divine Sound or Voice driven by the authors' aforementioned anti-anthropomorphic

Abraham. Notwithstanding the many allusions to Ezekiel 1 in the depiction of the throne room in chapters 18 and 19 of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, Rowland highlights a radical paradigm shift in the text's description of the Deity, noting "a deliberate attempt...to exclude all reference to the human figure mentioned in Ezekiel 1." For Rowland this shift entails that "there was a definite trend within apocalyptic thought away from the direct description of God..." Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 86–87.

⁶ Such polemical development which attempts to confront the anthropomorphic understanding of the Deity with the alternative depictions of God through the imagery of the divine Voice or Name has its roots already in the biblical materials, particular in the Book of Deuteronomy and later deuteronomistic developments. On these traditions, see O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament* (BZAW, 64; Giessen: Toepelmann, 1934) 1–58; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191ff.; Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 124ff.; I. Wilson, *Out of the Midst of Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy* (SBLDS, 151; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995) 1–15; C.A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGAJU, 42; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998) 51–123.

⁷ Scholars trace the origin of Yahoel's figure to the biblical imagery of the Angel of the Lord found in Exodus. On this connection, see Fossum, *The Name of God*, 318.

tendency to find a viable alternative to the visionary *Kavod* paradigm.⁸ It is this divine Voice that in chapter 10 appoints the angel Yahoel as a celestial guide of the exalted patriarch. *Apocalypse of Abraham* 11:2–3 unveils further features of the angel’s unique identity by providing a depiction of his physique:

The appearance of the griffin’s (*ногуецо*)⁹ body was like sapphire, and the likeness of his face like crysolite, and the hair of his head like snow, and a turban on his head like the appearance of the bow in the clouds, and the closing of his garments [like] purple, and a golden staff [was] in his right hand.¹⁰

The Slavonic word “*ногуецо*,” used in the description of Yahoel’s body, has puzzled scholars for a long time. It can be translated as “his leg” (*ногу ецо*), but this rendering does not fit in the larger context of Yahoel’s description. Previous translators therefore preferred to drop the puzzling word and translated the first sentence of Yahoel’s description as “the appearance of his body was like sapphire.”¹¹ Recently Alexander Kulik offered a hypothesis that the Slavonic term “*ногуецо*” might derive from the Slavonic “ногъ” or “ногуи” – “a griffin.”¹² Kulik proposes that the whole phrase can be translated as “the appearance of the griffin’s (*ногуева*) body” and thus refers to the eagle-like body of Yahoel. He further suggests that Yahoel might be even a composite creature, a man-bird, since he is depicted in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:4 as the angel who is sent to Abraham in “the likeness of a man.” Kulik argues that

⁸ Scholars have previously noted the formative role of the figure of the Angel of the Name (or the Angel of YHWH) in the conceptual framework of the deuteronomistic and deuteronomistic Shem ideologies. According to one of the hypotheses, the figure of the Angel of the LORD (or the Angel of the divine Name) found in the Book of Exodus constituted one of the conceptual roots of the Shem theology. Tryggve Mettinger observes that “it appears that when the deuteronomistic theologians choose *shem*, they seized on a term which was already connected with the idea of God’s presence. Exod 23:21 tells us how God warned Israel during her wanderings in the desert to respect his angel and obey his voice, ‘for my name in him.’” Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 124–125.

⁹ The reading is supported by mss A, C, D, I, H, and K. It is omitted in mss B, S, and U. For the sigla of the known manuscripts of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, see Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 97.

¹⁰ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 19.

¹¹ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 83.

¹² Izmail Sreznevskij in his dictionary traces the Slavonic terms “ногъ” and “ногуи” to the Greek word γρῦψ. See I. Sreznevskij, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам* (3 vols.; С-Петербург, 1883–1912) 2.462. See also R.I. Avanesov, *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)* (10 vols.; Москва: Русский Язык, 1988) 5.429.

since Yahoel has “hair on his head” and also hands – since he is able to hold a golden staff – it appears that “only the torso of Yahoel must be of griffin-like appearance, while his head is like that of a man.”¹³ To provide evidence of such puzzling angelic imagery, Kulik points to some examples of “griffin-like” angels in the Hekhalot writings.

Kulik’s hypothesis about the pteromorphic features of Yahoel has been recently supported by Basil Lourié who provides references to the tradition of transporting angels in the form of griffins.¹⁴ Both Kulik’s and Lourié’s findings are important for understanding Yahoel imagery. It should be mentioned, however, that while some Jewish visionary accounts indeed contain references to the psychopomps and some other angelic servants possessing pteromorphic physique, the primary angels in the apocalyptic and Merkabah materials are usually depicted as anthropomorphic creatures. Further, as has been already mentioned, these primary angels often serve as representations or even “mirrors” of the anthropomorphic glory of God.¹⁵ The tendency of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* to depict the primary angel in the form of a bird looks quite unusual in this respect. What is even more intriguing is that in the case of the angel Yahoel and his composite pter-anthropomorphic corporeality one can possibly witness polemical interaction with the anthropomorphic traditions of the divine Glory. Also it appears that the remnants of the underlying anthropomorphic traditions are not entirely abandoned by the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse and can be clearly detected in the text. Drawing on the account offered in *Apoc. Ab.* 10:4 that God sent Yahoel to Abraham “in the likeness of a man,”¹⁶ Fossum observes that “the mention of human likeness is a constant trait in the representation of the Glory.”¹⁷

¹³ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 83.

¹⁴ Lourié points to “...a medieval legend of the ascension of Alexander the Great, which goes back to the Hellenistic era. In the legend Alexander reaches the heaven (or even heavenly Jerusalem) transported by four griffins. This motif suggests that the griffins as the psychopomps transporting visionaries to heaven were not an invention of the authors of the hekhalot literature but were a part of the early Jewish environment...” B. Lourié, “Review of A. Kulik’s *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*,” *JSP* 15.3 (2006) 229–237 at 233.

¹⁵ On these traditions see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 165–176; idem, “The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*,” in: A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJS, 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 399–419.

¹⁶ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 17.

¹⁷ Fossum, *The Name of God*, 319.

He further notes that other depictions of Yahoel bring to memory various traditions of the divine Glory as well. Thus, for example, *Apoc. Ab.* 11:2–3 tells that Yahoel’s body was “like sapphire, and the likeness of his face like chrysolite, and the hair of his head like snow, and a turban on his head like the appearance of the bow in the clouds, and the closing of his garments [like] purple, and a golden staff [was] in his right hand.”¹⁸ Fossum suggests that

... this description contains adaptations of various portraits of the Glory. The radiant appearance of the body of the Glory is mentioned already in *Ez.* i.27. In the Book of Daniel, the angel Gabriel, who is represented as the Glory, is in one place described in the following way: “His body was like beryl, his face like the appearance of lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like gleam of burnished bronze...” (x.6). In the *Shi’ur Qomah* texts, there is frequent reference to the shining appearance of the body of the Glory, and chrysolite is even used expressly to describe it: “His body is like chrysolite. His light breaks tremendously from the darkness [...]”... The rainbow-like appearance of Yahoel’s turban is reminiscent of *Ez.* i.28, which says that “the appearance of the brightness round about” the Glory was “like the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud on the day of rain.”¹⁹

It is noteworthy that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* these spectacular features of the anthropomorphic divine Glory became applied to the composite creature that combines anthropomorphic and pteromorphic features, which clearly demonstrates the polemical character of the text’s angelology.

The Turtledove and the Pigeon: Pteromorphic Psychopomps

Suggestions about Yahoel’s possession of a griffin body deserve careful attention since in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* pteromorphic imagery appears to be applied to other angelic beings as well. Another example can be found in chapters 12 and 13 where Yahoel conveys to Abraham the following instructions about the sacrifices:

And he said to me, “Slaughter and cut all this, putting together the two halves, one against the other. But do not cut the birds. And give them [halves] to the two men whom I shall show you standing beside you,

¹⁸ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 19.

¹⁹ Fossum, *The Name of God*, 319–320.

since they are the altar on the mountain, to offer sacrifice to the Eternal One. The turtledove and the pigeon you will give me, and I shall ascend (*возидь*) in order to show to you [the inhabited world] on the wings of two birds....” And I did everything according to the angel’s command. And I gave to the angels who had come to us the divided parts of the animals. And the angel took the two birds. (*Apoc. Ab.* 12:8–13:1).²⁰

Although this description appears to rely on the Abrahamic traditions found in Genesis,²¹ it also contains some important additions to the biblical narrative.²² Thus, the birds that in the Genesis account serve merely as sacrificial objects appear to have some angelic functions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. Yahoel, who requests two birds from Abraham, mentions that later the birds will serve as the psychopomps of the visionary and his celestial guide. Yahoel’s prediction about the birds is fulfilled in *Apoc. Ab.* 15:2–4 where the seer and his angelic guide are depicted as traveling on the wings of the pigeon and the turtledove:

And the angel took me with his right hand and set me on the right wing of the pigeon and he himself sat on the left wing of the turtledove, since they both were neither slaughtered nor divided. And he carried me up to the edge of the fiery flame. And we ascended <like great winds to the heaven which was fixed on the expanses....> (*Apoc. Ab.* 15:2–4).²³

In view of the established tradition of angelic psychopomps in the apocalyptic accounts it appears that the pigeon and turtledove here fulfill functions traditionally performed by angels.

²⁰ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 19–20; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 64.

²¹ Gen 15:8–12 reads: “But he said, ‘O Lord God, how am I to know that I shall possess it?’ He said to him, ‘Bring me a heifer three years old, a female goat three years old, a ram three years old, a turtledove, and a young pigeon.’ He brought him all these and cut them in two, laying each half over against the other; but he did not cut the birds in two. And when birds of prey came down on the carcasses, Abram drove them away. As the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram, and a deep and terrifying darkness descended upon him.”

²² Scholars have previously noted that the patriarch’s offerings are reminiscent of Genesis 15, “with an allusion to Genesis 22 insofar as the sacrifice is located on a high mountain.” Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 226. H. Box notes that “the apocalyptic part of the book is based upon the story of Abraham’s sacrifices and trance, as described in Gen xv.” Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, xxiv. Both in Gen and *Apoc. Ab.* the patriarch is asked to prepare sacrifices, and the content of the sacrifices is also very similar.

²³ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 22.

Fallen Angel Azazel, the Impure Bird

Another important feature in the text's angelology providing further support for the hypothesis about the pteromorphic, eagle-like body of Yahoel and for the general polemical tendency of the text against anthropomorphic portrayals of celestial beings is that the negative angelic protagonist in the text, the fallen angel Azazel, is also depicted as a pteromorphic creature – an impure bird (Slav. *птица нечистая*).²⁴ Azazel first appears in chapter 13 that deals with the story of the patriarch's offering of animal sacrifices to God. Like in the case of the sacrificial birds refashioned into angelic psychopomps, the authors of the apocalypse again try to expand here the details of the biblical story of Abraham's sacrifices that refers to the birds of prey coming down on the carcasses of the patriarch's offerings. Thus, Gen 15:11 informs that the birds of prey came down on Abraham's sacrifices and he drove them away. In the Slavonic apocalypse, however, the reference to the birds of prey becomes appropriated into the book's angelology. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* 13:2–6 reads:

And I waited for [the time of] the evening offering. And an impure bird (*птица нечистая*) flew down on the carcasses, and I drove it away. And the impure bird spoke to me and said, "What are you doing, Abraham, on the holy heights, where no one eats or drinks, nor is there upon them food of men. But these will all be consumed by fire and they will burn you up. Leave the man who is with you and flee! Since if you ascend to the height, they will destroy you." And it came to pass when I saw the

²⁴ On Azazel's traditions, see: J. De Roo, "Was the Goat for Azazel Destined for the Wrath of God?" *Biblica* 81 (2000) 233–241; E.L. Feinberg, "The Scapegoat of Leviticus Sixteen," *BSac* 115 (1958) 320–31; L.L. Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JSJ* 18 (1987) 165–79; B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterchrift und der Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (WMANT, 55; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982); B. Jurgens, *Heiligkeit und Versöhnung: Leviticus 16 in seinem Literarischen Kontext* (New York: Herder, 2001); R.D. Levy, *The Symbolism of the Azazel Goat* (Bethesda: International Scholars Publication, 1998); O. Loretz, *Leberschau, Sundenbock, Asasel in Ugarit und Israel: Leberschau und Jahwestatue in Psalm 27, Leberschau in Psalm 74* (UBL, 3; Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1985); J. Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology* (SJLA, 36; Leiden: Brill, 1983); H. Tawil, "Azazel the Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 43–59; M. Weinfeld, "Social and Cultic Institutions in the Priestly Source against their ANE Background," *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983) 95–129; D.P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature* (SBLDS, 101; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987).

bird speaking I said to the angel, “What is this, my lord?” And he said, “This is iniquity, this is Azazel!”²⁵

It is intriguing that later in chapter 23 dealing with the story of the fall of the protoplasts, Azazel is described as a composite creature – a serpent with human hands and feet and with wings on his shoulders:

And I saw there a man very great in height and terrible in breadth, incomparable in aspect, entwined with a woman who was also equal to the man in aspect and size. And they were standing under a tree of Eden, and the fruit of the tree was like the appearance of a bunch of grapes of vine. And behind the tree was standing, as it were, a serpent in form, but having hands and feet like a man, and wings on its shoulders: six on the right side and six on the left. And he was holding in his hands the grapes of the tree and feeding the two whom I saw entwined with each other (*Apoc. Ab.* 23:5–8).²⁶

Since this description is given in the middle of the Adamic story, it is not entirely clear whether this composite physique represents Azazel’s permanent form or whether it is just a temporary manifestation acquired during the deception of the protoplasts. It is possible that here the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse are drawing on the cluster of traditions reflected in the Primary Adam Books where the tempter uses the serpent’s form as a proxy in his deception of Adam and Eve. It is interesting, though, that the pteromorphic features of the negative protagonist are reaffirmed in the description found in the Slavonic apocalypse that portrays Azazel as a winged creature.

Along with Adamic motifs, the descriptions of Azazel found in the *Apocalypse* appear to provide some hints that the text’s authors were cognizant of the broader traditions about Asael/Azazel found in the Enochic materials. Scholars have previously noted that some details in the story of the punishment of Asael/Azazel found in *1 Enoch* 10,²⁷ where the fallen angel is tied as a sacrificial animal and thrown into the hole in the desert, are reminiscent of the scapegoat ritual with its release of the sacrificial animal into the wilderness. Here one might

²⁵ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 20; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 64.

²⁶ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 27.

²⁷ *1 Enoch* 10:4 “And further the Lord said to Raphael: ‘Bind Azazel by his hands and his feet, and throw him into the darkness. And split open the desert which is in Dudael, and throw him there.’” M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 2.87.

have one of the first attempts of the angelological reinterpretation of the scapegoat myth. The authors of the Slavonic apocalypse, who are also reinterpreting the Azazel story in angelological terms, appear to be familiar with the early Enochic developments. Some Enochic motifs appear in chapters 13 and 14 where Yahoel delivers a lengthy speech condemning Azazel and instructing Abraham how to deal with the “impure bird.”

In Yahoel’s discourse one can find several peculiar details pertaining to the anti-hero story that seem to provide some allusions to the Enochic traditions about the Watcher Asael and his angelic companions who according to the Enochic myth decided to abandon their celestial abode and descend on earth. *Apoc. Ab.* 13:8 says the following about Azazel: “Since *you have chosen it [earth] . . . to be the dwelling place of your impurity.*”²⁸ The passage refers to the voluntary descent of the anti-hero on earth which might hint to the Enochic provenance of the tradition. In contrast to the Enochic mythology of evil, the Adamic etiology, reflected in the Primary Adam Books, insists that their negative protagonist, Satan, did not descend of his own accord but rather was forcefully deposed by the Deity into the lower realms after refusing to venerate Adam.²⁹

The reference to the impurity is also intriguing in view of the defiling nature of the Watchers’ activities on earth. Further, there also seems to be a hint about Asael/Azazel’s punishment in the abyss. In *Apoc. Ab.* 14:5, Yahoel offers the patriarch the following incantation to battle Azazel: “Say to him, ‘May you be the fire brand of the furnace of the earth! Go, Azazel, into the untrodden parts of the earth. . . .’”³⁰ Here one might have an allusion to the aforementioned tradition from *1 Enoch* 10, in which the place of Azazel’s punishment is situated in the fiery abyss. Similar to *1 Enoch*, the Slavonic apocalypse authors seem to combine here traditions about the scapegoat and the fallen angel by referring to the wilderness motif in the form of “untrodden parts of the earth.”

There is also a possible allusion to the Watcher Azazel’s participation in the procreation of the race of the Giants. In *Apoc. Ab.* 14:6, Yahoel teaches Abraham the following protective formula against the

²⁸ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 20.

²⁹ For the comparison of two mythologies of evil (Adamic and Enochic) see J. Reeves, *Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).

³⁰ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 21.

“impure bird”: “Say to him . . . since your inheritance are those who are with you, *with men born with the stars and clouds. And their portion is you*, and they come into being through your being . . .”³¹ The reference to human beings “born with the stars” is intriguing since the Animal Apocalypse of *1 Enoch* conveys the descent of the Watchers through the peculiar imagery of the stars falling from heaven and subsequently depicts the Watchers as participants in the procreation of the new race of the Giants.

In concluding this section of the study it should be noted that the aforementioned parallels demonstrate that in their re-interpretation of Azazel’s figure the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse seem to rely on some angelological understanding of Azazel’s figure found in the Enochic materials. Yet, while the Enochic tradition envisions Azazel and his angelic companions as anthropomorphic creatures able to seduce women of the earth to procreate the new race of the Giants, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* insists on the pteromorphic physique of the fallen angel. As in the case of Yahoel and the pteromorphic psychopomps, the peculiar imagery used for depicting Azazel signals the authors’ reluctance to identify unambiguously the celestial beings with the traditional human-like appearance which seems to reflect the pseudepigraphon’s anti-anthropomorphic tendency.

Invisible Angels

The anti-anthropomorphic thrust of the pseudepigraphon’s angelology seems also to be reflected in the text’s insistence on the invisibility of certain classes of angelic beings. The reader encounters this trend already in the beginning of the apocalyptic section of the work, in the cryptic statement of Yahoel that follows immediately the description of his unusual bird-like physique. There the angel reveals to Abraham that his strange composite body is just a temporary manifestation which will not last long and that he will become invisible soon:

And he said, “Let my appearance not frighten you, nor my speech trouble your soul! Come with me and I shall go with you, visible until the

³¹ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 21.

sacrifice, but after the sacrifice invisible (*невидим*) forever” (*Апок. Аб. 11:4–5*).³²

This deconstruction of the visible form of the primary angel and insistence on his eternal incorporeality seem to reveal some persistent, deliberate motifs deeply connected with the notion of God’s own incorporeality. It unveils the striking contrast with the visual ideology of the Merkabah tradition where the body of the primary angel is often envisioned as God’s *Shi’ur Qomah* – the measurement and the visual reaffirmation of the Deity’s own anthropomorphic corporeality. Yet, in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* one can see a quite different picture.

It does not appear coincidental that, as the story unfolds and the visionary progresses in his celestial journey to the upper firmaments and the abode of the bodiless Deity, the references to the incorporeal or “spiritual” angels occur more and more often. In fact, the idea of the incorporeality of the angelic hosts inhabiting the upper firmaments looms large in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. Thus, according to *Апок. Аб. 19:6–7* in the upper firmaments the seer beholds

...a multitude of incorporeal (*бесплотное множество*) spiritual (*духовныхъ*) angels, carrying out the orders of the fiery angels who were on the eighth firmament.... And behold, neither on this expanse was there any other power of other form, but only the spiritual angels.... (*Апок. Аб. 19:6–7*).³³

Yet here again, as in the previous descriptions, one can see the transitional nature of the pseudepigraphon’s angelology, since with a new incorporal understanding of the celestial retinue these new angelological developments also preserve some anthropomorphic details of the *Kavod* paradigm. Thus in addition to insisting on the incorporeality of angelic beings, the authors occasionally designate celestial servants – for example, the angels who received the sacrifices from Abraham – as “men.” This once again appears to indicate the fluidity of angelic imagery in the Slavonic apocalypse which in many ways stays on the threshold of the *Kavod* and *Shem* traditions, sharing both conceptual worlds.

³² Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 19; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 62.

³³ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 25; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 80.

Conclusion

Almost thirty years ago Christopher Rowland suggested that the tendency to spiritualize angelic beings and depict them as bodiless and pure spirits in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* might be part of the authors' polemical stand against the anthropomorphic understanding of God.³⁴ There seems to be no coincidence that these anti-anthropomorphic developments took place in the pseudepigraphon written in the name of the hero of the faith known in Jewish lore for his fight against the idolatrous statues.

That the authors' choice of the hero is purposive can be seen already in the first eight chapters of the pseudepigraphon which take the form of midrashic elaboration of the early years of Abraham who is depicted as a fighter with the idolatrous practices of his father Terah. Well aware of the broader extra-biblical context of Abraham's biography, the authors of the apocalypse are appropriating the patriarch's story for their anti-corporeal agenda.³⁵ In depictions of the idol Bar-Eshath ("the Son of Fire") and some other anthropomorphic statues whose features are strikingly reminiscent of the corporeal portrayals of the Deity in Ezekiel and some other biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts, one can detect a subtle polemic with the divine body traditions.

It has been previously proposed that the authors of the Abrahamic pseudepigrapha directed their polemics beyond the classical theomorphic and angelomorphic depictions found in the Book of Ezekiel and possibly targeted the afterlife of these anthropomorphic developments as they were manifested in the Enochic tradition. In this respect, it is no coincidence that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* many peculiar Enochic "iconic" portrayals of God and angels became reinterpreted in the new anti-anthropomorphic way. Of course, the iconoclastic story of Abraham was the ideal literary playground for such deconstructions. The anti-anthropomorphic polemical potential of Abraham's story is not limited solely to the *Apocalypse of Abraham* but also includes other pseudepigrapha circulated in the name of the patriarch.

³⁴ C. Rowland, "The Vision of God in Apocalyptic Literature," *JSJ* 10 (1979) 137–154 at 151.

³⁵ For understanding the background of this story in the *Book of Jubilees*, Josephus, Philo and the later rabbinic materials (*Genesis Rabbah* 38:13, *Tanna debe Eliahu* 2:25, *Seder Eliahu Rabba* 33), see Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, 88–94; Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 43–49.

Philip Munoa observes that the *Testament of Abraham* exhibits anti-anthropomorphic tendencies in highlighting God's invisibility, repeatedly emphasizing his unseen (ἀόρατος) nature.³⁶ It appears that the *Testament of Abraham* is even more radical and denies the visionary the possibility of close contact with the Deity. While in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* the visionary has access to the Deity through the audible revelations of the voice of God speaking in the fire, in the *Testament of Abraham* this audible aspect of divine revelation appears to diminish.³⁷ Munoa stresses that in the *Testament of Abraham* Abraham never hears the voice of God while alive but only after death (*T. Ab.* 20:13–14), and even then without certainty.³⁸

In light of the aforementioned developments detected in the Abrahamic pseudepigrapha, the repeated tendency to challenge the traditional anthropomorphic portrayals of celestial beings with the alternative pteromorphic depictions found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* does not appear coincidental. Yet along with insistence on the invisibility of some classes of angelic beings and the Deity himself, the dynamics of the patriarch's celestial trip unavoidably require the protagonist's interaction with other characters of the story. The authors of the apocalypse therefore cannot keep the angelic figures of the narrative completely invisible as the story unfolds and the plot requires the interaction between the visionary and other characters of the celestial realm. In this context pteromorphic angelic imagery seems to serve as a useful device for sustaining the anti-anthropomorphic agenda of the pseudepigraphon without interrupting the dynamics of the patriarch's celestial trip.

³⁶ He illustrates this tendency by referring to the passage from chapter 16 where the following tradition about the invisibility of God can be found: "When Death heard, he shuddered and trembled, overcome by great cowardice; and he came with great fear and stood before the *unseen Father*, shuddering, moaning and trembling, awaiting the Master's demand. Then the *unseen God* said to Death. . . ." (*T. Abr.* 16:3–4). P. Munoa, *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSup., 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 141.

³⁷ Munoa, similar to Rowland, sees the *Testament of Abraham* and other Abrahamic pseudepigrapha as the case of ongoing polemics against the anthropomorphic thrust of the Enochic literature. He observes that in contrast with *1 Enoch*, another Hellenistic Jewish text that makes use of Daniel 7, recension A of the *Testament of Abraham* gives prominence to Abel as the enthroned judge without making any reference to Enoch. Recension B does refer to Enoch, but he is in a subservient role to Abel (11:3–10). Munoa concludes that these two apocalyptic works (*Testament of Abraham* and *1 Enoch*) "may be witness to the competing interpretations of different communities – each championing their mediators." Munoa, *Four Powers in Heaven*, 145.

³⁸ Munoa, *Four Powers in Heaven*, 141.

“THE GODS OF MY FATHER TERAH”:
ABRAHAM THE ICONOCLAST AND POLEMICS WITH
THE DIVINE BODY TRADITIONS IN THE
APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM

Introduction

It has been previously noted that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* exhibits subtle polemics against an anthropomorphic understanding of God.¹ The second part of this pseudepigraphic text deals with Abraham’s celestial ascent to the realm of the divine Chariot. While drawing on some features of the traditional Ezekielian account of the Merkabah,² the authors of the apocalypse appear to carefully avoid any references to anthropomorphic portrayals of the Deity, prominent in the classic prophetic account, and instead repeatedly try to depict the divine Presence as the formless Voice proceeding in the stream of fire.³

While the anti-corporeal tendencies discernable in the second, apocalyptic part of the text have already been established in previous studies,⁴ no sufficient explanation has been offered of how the first, haggadic part of the pseudepigraphon (chs 1–8), which depicts the patriarch as a fighter against the idolatrous statues of his father Terah, fits into the anti-anthropomorphic agenda of the text’s authors.

¹ C. Rowland, “The Vision of God in Apocalyptic Literature,” *JSJ* 10 (1979) 137–154; idem, *The Open Heaven*, 86–87; A. Orlov, “Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,” *JBL* 127.1 (2008) 53–70.

² Scholars previously noted that the seer’s vision of the divine Throne found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* “draws heavily on Ezekiel and stands directly in the tradition of Merkabah speculation.” Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 183. See also I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGAJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 55–57; Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 86–87.

³ In his comparative analysis of the accounts from Ezekiel and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, Rowland demonstrates that the author of the Slavonic apocalypse, while preserving the angelic depictions of Ezekiel’s account, carefully avoids the anthropomorphic description of the *Kavod*, substituting it with the reference to the divine voice. Rowland concludes that “there appears here to have been a deliberate attempt made to exclude all reference to the human figure mentioned in Ezekiel 1.” Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 87.

⁴ See Orlov, “Praxis of the Voice,” 53–70.

It is possible that this haggadic portion of the apocalypse, which envisions the hero of the faith as a tester and destroyer of human-like idolatrous figures, plays a pivotal role in the anti-corporeal polemics employed by the authors of the pseudepigraphon. It does not seem coincidental that the arguments against the divine body traditions were situated in the midst of the story of the patriarch known in Jewish pseudepigraphical and rabbinic materials for his distinctive stand against idolatrous figures. It has been observed that besides the *Apocalypse of Abraham* other texts of the Abrahamic pseudepigrapha, such as the *Testament of Abraham*, also deny the possibility that God has a human-like form. Philip Munoa notes that “the *Testament of Abraham* studiously avoids physical description of God when describing Abraham’s heavenly ascent and tours of heaven explicitly identifying God with invisible...”⁵ Munoa further argues that the *Testament of Abraham* clearly exhibits anti-anthropomorphic tendencies in highlighting God’s invisibility,⁶ repeatedly emphasizing his unseen (ἀόρατος) nature.⁷

It appears that the iconoclastic thrust of the patriarch’s story, elaborated already in the *Book of Jubilees*, offered an ideal literary setting for the unfolding of polemics with traditions of divine corporeality. It is no coincidence that these anti-anthropomorphic developments also appear in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the pseudepigraphon written in the name of the hero of the faith known in Jewish lore for his opposition to idolatrous figures of the divine.

In view of these tendencies it is likely that in the distinctive depictions of Abraham’s struggles with idolatrous anthropomorphic figures manufactured by his father Terah, whose features are strikingly reminiscent of the corporeal portrayals of the Deity found in the Book of Ezekiel and some other biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts,

⁵ P. Munoa in *Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism. A Collage of Working Definitions* (forthcoming).

⁶ Here the constraints on the visual representation of the Deity are even more demanding than in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, since the authors of the *Testament of Abraham* render the Deity as completely invisible, lacking any visible representation.

⁷ Munoa illustrates these tendencies by referring to the passage from chapter 16 where the following tradition about the invisibility of God can be found: “When Death heard, he shuddered and trembled, overcome by great cowardice; and he came with great fear and stood before the *unseen Father*, shuddering, moaning and trembling, awaiting the Master’s demand. Then the *unseen God* said to Death...” (*T. Abr.* 16:3–4). P. Munoa, *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSup., 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 141.

one can detect ongoing polemics with the divine body traditions.⁸ The purpose of this study is to explore the possible anti-anthropomorphic tendencies of the first, haggadic portion of the pseudepigraphon that might lie behind the intriguing portrayals of the patriarch as a fighter against corporeal representations of the Deity.

Abraham the Iconoclast: The Background of the Imagery

As has been previously noted, the first eight chapters of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish work likely composed in the early centuries of the Common Era, take the form of a midrashic exposition dealing with the early years of Abraham. This portion of the text depicts the young hero of the faith as a reluctant witness of the idolatrous practices of his immediate family. Such haggadic elaboration of Abraham’s story is not an entire novelty created from scratch by the authors of the pseudepigraphon, but rather an important link in the chain of a long-lasting interpretive tradition attested already in the *Book of Jubilees* and further developed by other pseudepigraphical and rabbinic sources.

Although the Genesis account of the early years of Abraham does not elaborate his struggles with idolatry in his father’s house, the story found in the *Book of Jubilees* provides a rather lengthy narration of such activities. *Jubilees* 11:16–12:14 portrays the child Abram fiercely resisting the problematic religious routines of his relatives.⁹ The text

⁸ For the discussion of the divine body traditions in biblical, pseudepigraphical, and rabbinic materials see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 143–146; 211–252; idem, “Without Measure and Without Analogy’: The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*,” in: A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJSup., 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 149–174.

⁹ “The child [Abram] began to realize the errors of the earth – that everyone was going astray after the statues and after impurity. His father taught him (the art of) writing. When he was two weeks of years [= 14 years], he separated from his father in order not to worship idols with him. He began to pray to the creator of all that he would save him from the errors of mankind and that it might not fall to his share to go astray after impurity and wickedness. During the sixth week, in its seventh year, Abram said to his father Terah: ‘My father.’ He said: ‘Yes, my son?’ He said: ‘What help and advantage do we get from these idols before which you worship and prostrate yourself? For there is no spirit in them because they are dumb. They are an error of the mind. Do not worship them. Worship the God of heaven who makes the rain and dew fall on the earth and makes everything on the earth. He created everything by his word; and all life (comes) from his presence. Why do you worship those things which have no spirit in them? For they are made by hands and you carry them

depicts the young hero of the faith involved in extensive disputations with his father in an attempt to persuade Terah to abandon his abominable practices of manufacturing and serving idols. Although Abram's arguments seem to convince his father, they anger his two brothers. The account ends with Abram setting on fire the temple of idols, an event which leads to the death of Haran who perishes in flames attempting to save the statues. Although the *Jubilees* provides a less elaborated account of the story in comparison with the one found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, it attests to a formative initial core of the story which would be expanded or altered by subsequent pseudepigraphical and rabbinic developments.¹⁰

The rendering of the story found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* appears to constitute one of the early attempts at such an extensive elaboration. The uniqueness of this account in comparison with the versions preserved in other pseudepigraphical and rabbinic materials is that the many peculiar details of the Slavonic text, including the references to the enigmatic names of various idols manufactured by Terah and their elaborate portrayals appear to be preserved only here. Yet, behind the enigmatic details one can see a persistent ideological tendency. Readers attuned to the theological reluctance of the second, apocalyptic section of the pseudepigraphon to endorse traditions of the divine form, can also detect traces of the same anti-anthropomorphic tendency in the first section of the pseudepigraphon. There, in

on your shoulders. You receive no help from them, but instead they are a great shame for those who make them and an error of the mind for those who worship them. Do not worship them.' Then he said to him: 'I, too, know (this), my son. What shall I do with the people who have ordered me to serve in their presence? If I tell them what is right, they will kill me because they themselves are attached to them so that they worship and praise them. Be quiet, my son, so that they do not kill you.' When he told these things to his two brothers and they became angry at him, he remained silent. ... In the sixtieth year of Abram's life (which was the fourth week in its fourth year), Abram got up at night and burned the temple of the idols. He burned everything in the temple but no one knew (about it). They got up at night and wanted to save their gods from the fire. Haran dashed in to save them, but the fire raged over him. He was burned in the fire and died in Ur of the Chaldeans before his father Terah. They buried him in Ur of the Chaldeans." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO, 510–11, *Scriptores Aethiopici* 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 2. 67–70.

¹⁰ It should be noted that the subtle allusions to the traditions of the divine form might already be hinted at in the account found in the *Jubilees* which attempts to depict Terah as the priestly figure serving in the "presence of the statues." One of the intriguing parallels here is that similar to the Living Creatures (the *Hayyot*) predestined to carry on their shoulders the divine anthropomorphic extent in the classic Ezekielian account, Terah too carries the idolatrous statues on his shoulders.

distinctive depictions of the idols Bar-Eshath, Mar-Umath, and other human-like figures, whose features are reminiscent of the familiar attributes of the anthropomorphic portrayals of the Deity in the Book of Ezekiel and some other biblical and pseudepigraphical accounts, one can discern subtle polemics with the divine body traditions.

Bar-Eshath, the Son of Fire

One of the striking features of the text is the authors' extensive elaboration of idolatrous figures who appear in the pseudepigraphon as independent characters in fierce rivalry with other, human heroes of the text. In depictions of these idols, some of whom become known to the readers by their proper names, one can detect subtle allusions to the imagery prominent in the divine body traditions. The story involving one such idol, Bar-Eshath (Slav. Варисать), appears to stand at the center of the haggadic account of Abraham's fight against idolatry and might indeed constitute one of the most important nexuses in the polemical interactions with the divine body traditions found in the first part of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. The story of this enigmatic figure begins in chapter five where Terah orders his son to gather wooden splinters left from the manufacturing of idols in order to cook a meal. In the pile of wooden chips Abram discovers a small figure whose forehead is decorated with the name Bar-Eshath.¹¹ The curious young hero of the faith who doubts the power of idols decides to test the supernatural abilities of the wooden statue by putting Bar-Eshath near the “heart of the fire.” While leaving the idol near the heat Abram ironically orders him to confine the flames and, in case of emergency, to “blow on the fire to make it flare up.”¹²

Yet, the powers of the wooden idol fail to overcome the flames as he is not able to sustain the fiery test. Upon his return the future patriarch discovers the idol fallen with his feet enveloped in the fire and terribly burned. Abram then sees the demise of the idolatrous statue as the flames turn Bar-Eshath into a pile of dust.

Several details in this ironic account of the destroyed anthropomorphic figure that fails the test of the blazing furnace seem to point not

¹¹ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 12.

¹² Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 12–13.

only to the stance against idolatry but also to subtle polemics with the divine body ideologies. The first important detail is that the graphic portrayal of the anthropomorphic statue embraced by flames brings to memory familiar depictions found in the biblical theophanic accounts. In this respect it is intriguing that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse portray the statue of a deity with his feet enveloped in fire. In *Apoc. Ab.* 5:9, Abram conveys that when he returned he “found Bar-Eshath fallen backwards, *his feet enveloped in fire* (нозѣ его обятѣ огнемъ)¹³ and terribly burned.”¹⁴ This detail invokes an important theophanic feature often found in several visionary accounts where the anthropomorphic figure of the Deity is depicted with fiery feet or a fiery lower body.

For example, in the paradigmatic vision recounted in Ezekiel 1, where the seer beholds the anthropomorphic *Kavod*, he describes the fiery nature of the lower body of the Deity. Ezek 1:27 reads:

I saw that from what appeared to be his waist up he looked like glowing metal, as if full of fire, and *I saw that from what appeared to be his waist down he looked like fire* (וממראה מתניו ולמטה ראיתי כמראה אש) and brilliant light surrounded him....

A similar depiction can be also found in Ezekiel 8:2 where a visionary again encounters the celestial anthropomorphic manifestation with fiery loins:

I looked, and there was a figure that looked like a human being; below what appeared to be its loins it was fire, and above the loins it was like the appearance of brightness, like gleaming amber.

Another important testimony to this prominent motif can be found in the first chapter of the Book of Revelation, a text possibly contemporaneous with the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, which in many aspects shares the theophanic paradigm of the Book of Ezekiel and the Book of Daniel.¹⁵ Rev 1:15 reads:

¹³ Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 46.

¹⁴ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 13.

¹⁵ It should be noted that the Book of Daniel and the Book of Revelation refer to fiery feet of not only divine but also angelic manifestations: Dan 10:5–6: “I looked up and saw a man clothed in linen, with a belt of gold from Uphaz around his waist. His body was like beryl, his face like lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze, and the sound of his words like the roar of a multitude.” Rev 10:1: “And I saw another mighty angel coming down from heaven,

His head and his hair were white as white wool, white as snow; his eyes were like a flame of fire, and his feet were like burnished bronze, refined as in a furnace (καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένης), and his voice was like the sound of many waters...¹⁶

It is apparent that the tradition found in the Book of Revelation is related to the one found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* since it refers to the feet of the Deity “refined as in a furnace,” a feature which might implicitly point to the theophanic traditions of the fiery test, that will be explored in detail later in our study.

For now, we will focus on another portentous detail of the aforementioned passage found in the Book of Revelation, which might also be linked to the conceptual developments found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. This feature concerns the title of the anthropomorphic divine manifestation with fiery feet, a figure whom the Book of Revelation designates using the expression “like a son of man” (ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου). This enigmatic designation deserves special attention. It is no secret that the son of man figure represents an important conceptual locus in the Second Temple anthropomorphic ideologies. This portentous title, which is well known from the Book of Daniel, the *Similitudes of Enoch*, *4 Ezra* and New Testament materials, was often used to label the luminous anthropomorphic manifestations of the Deity. It is possible that this title invokes subtle allusions to the name of the wooden idol of the Slavonic apocalypse.

One should recall that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 5:5 mentions that the idol that the patriarch discovered among the wooden chips in the house of his father was labeled on his forehead as “god Bar-Eshath.”¹⁷ Scholars have proposed a Semitic background for this enigmatic name, tracing it to the Aramaic expression (א) בר אשת – “the son of fire.” This connection was first noticed by Louis Ginzberg¹⁸ and recently was supported and investigated in depth by Alexander Kulik. Kulik links the origin of the title בר אשת to Mesopotamian traditions of the

wrapped in a cloud, with a rainbow over his head; his face was like the sun, and his legs like pillars of fire....”

¹⁶ This tradition is then reaffirmed in Rev 2:18 “These are the words of the Son of God, who has eyes like a flame of fire, and whose feet are like burnished bronze....”

¹⁷ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 12.

¹⁸ Ginzberg, “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1.91–92.

deities of fire noting that their names were often rendered into Greek by several terminological designations including the Greek word $\phi\omega\varsigma$.¹⁹

Kulik's reference to the Greek term $\phi\omega\varsigma$ is intriguing since the term was often used in Jewish theophanic traditions to designate the glorious anthropomorphic manifestations or replicas of the Deity, including the luminous extent of the Protoplast often depicted in such accounts as the celestial Anthropos. These traditions often play on the ambiguity of the term which, depending on accent, can designate either $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ "a man" or $\phi\hat{\omega}\varsigma$ "light," pointing both to the luminous and anthropomorphic nature of the divine body.²⁰ It seems that the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* might also be cognizant of this correlation of man/light when in *Apoc. Ab.* 23:10 they choose to label the Protoplast as the *light of men* (свѣтъ чл(о)в(ѣ)чь).²¹ It is possible that the play on $\phi\omega\varsigma$ terminology could again be manifested in this enigmatic expression from the Slavonic apocalypse, whose Semitic original many scholars have argued underwent a Greek stage of transmission. In view of these peculiar terminological correlations, is it possible that in the name Bar Eshath (the "Son of Fire") the play on the ambiguous $\phi\omega\varsigma$ terminology might be present? If so, how could this hypothetical terminological correspondence uniting luminosity and anthropomorphism find its Semitic expression in the original textual framework of the Slavonic apocalypse? In this respect it should be noted that besides the pun on the Greek word $\phi\omega\varsigma$ (man/light) some scholars of Jewish theophanic traditions propose the possibility of another, Semitic pun on $\Psi\aleph/\Psi\aleph$ (fire/man)²² which might already be manifested in Ezek 8:2.²³ It appears that Ezekielian terminological interplay intensifies the connections between the fiery and anthropomorphic charac-

¹⁹ A. Kulik, "The Gods of Nahor: A Note on the Pantheon of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*," *JJS* 54 (2003) 228–232; idem, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 63.

²⁰ On the $\phi\omega\varsigma$ traditions see G. Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13 at 6–7; J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Mediation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 280; idem, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 16–17; S. N. Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord in Ezekiel the Tragedian: On the Roots of a Merkabah Text* (Ph.D. diss.; Marquette University, 2005) 92ff.

²¹ Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 88.

²² Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord in Ezekiel the Tragedian*, 111–112.

²³ For the discussion of the terminological interplay $\Psi\aleph/\Psi\aleph$ in Ezek 8:2, see Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord in Ezekiel the Tragedian*, 111.

teristics of the divine Extent. In view of these terminological links it is possible that by naming the anthropomorphic idol as the Son of Fire the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse might have sought to engage the interplay with another prominent Aramaic designation which stands at the centre of Jewish anthropomorphic developments, the title “Son of Man” (בר אנוש) which linguistically is very similar to בר אשת.

Our ongoing research will demonstrate that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse were very familiar with Adamic lore,²⁴ the mediatorial stream where the correlations between light/man or fire/man were first developed. In view of these developments the possibility of the pun on words “fire” and “man” in the title of Bar-Eshath cannot be completely excluded.

Testing by the Fire

It is time to return to the motif of the fiery test that turned our wooden idol into a pile of dust. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* 7:2 reminds its readers that fire “mocks with its flames the things which perish easily.”²⁵ It appears that the early biblical and extra-biblical testimonies to this tradition of the fiery test hint at the fact that this motif might have originated within anthropomorphic currents. From them one learns that the divine body traditions have their own use of the fiery testing – its purpose is to underline the distinction between true and false representations of the Deity where the divine form’s endurance against the element of fire testifies to its authenticity. This theological conviction that the celestial bodies are somehow not consumed by fire and may even be composed of the fiery substance can be found in several places in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* where fiery imagery is often employed in portrayals of divine and angelic manifestations.²⁶ Moreover it appears that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse believe that fire represents the substance that surrounds the very presence of the Deity.²⁷ Here the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* are drawing on the established visionary tradition already manifested in several

²⁴ One such development is the repeated portrayal of Terah fashioning idols in the manner similar to the Genesis’ depictions of the Deity fashioning the Protoplast.

²⁵ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 15.

²⁶ See *Apoc. Ab.* 18:2; 18:3; 18:12; 19:4; 19:6.

²⁷ See *Apoc. Ab.* 8:1; 18:2.

biblical accounts, including Exodus' theophany of the burning bush, where the son of Amram encounters the celestial manifestation enveloped by fire but not consumed by its flames. The motif of the celestial form embraced by fire also brings to memory another, already mentioned paradigmatic account found in the first chapter of the Book of Ezekiel, where the seer beholds the divine anthropomorphic extent enveloped by fire or perhaps even composed of it. It is also intriguing that in some Second Temple apocalyptic materials the divine corporealities endure a test of the blazing furnace very similar to the one that destroys the wooden "body" of Bar-Eshath in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. One of the distinctive specimens of such a tradition can be found in Daniel 3, a composition well known for its promulgation of anthropomorphic ideologies. There one can find an elaborate account depicting the appearance of the divine corporeal manifestation in the blazing furnace. In Daniel, the story of the fiery test finds its place, as it does in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, in the midst of debates about the essence of true and false (idolatrous) representations of the Deity. There, Nebuchadnezzar gives orders to put into the furnace of the blazing fire three Israelite youths – Shadrach, Mashach, and Abednego, who refused to worship the golden idol of the king. In the course of the fiery test these three men are rescued by the divine manifestation²⁸ which miraculously appears in the midst of fire. Commentators of this tradition have noted that the Aramaic text preserves the mystery of the divine Presence in the furnace and does not reveal the identity of the divine manifestation. However, the authors of the Greek version of Daniel 3 fill the exegetical lacunae by recounting the story of the angel of the Lord descending into the furnace in order to rescue the three faithful Jews.²⁹ It is clear that this divine corporeality unharmed by the fiery test is polemically juxtaposed in the text with the idolatrous "image" of the king and appears to be understood as a "statue" superior to the idol created by Nebuchadnezzar. The fiery test of the human bodies of Shadrach, Mashach, and Abednego, who endure the deadly flames along with the divine form, is also noteworthy. The imagery of the blazing furnace in Daniel 3 appears to represent an important theophanic locus where the human corporealities are able to encounter

²⁸ Dan 3:25 דמה לבר אלהין ("like a son of the gods").

²⁹ C.L. Seow, *Daniel* (Westminster Bible Companion; Westminster John Knox Press: Louisville, 2003) 59.

the divine extent in the midst of fire. Choon Leong Seow underlines this important theophanic aspect of the passage when he remarks that “the Jews do not only survive the ordeal, they even encounter divine presence in the fire ordeal.”³⁰ He further notes that

... the narrator does not say that the four individuals are walking in the furnace, but that they are walking amid the fire... the story is that they are with a divine being *in the midst* of the fire. They encounter divine presence in the middle of the fire. Here, as often in the Old Testament, fire is associated with the presence of God. On Mount Sinai, the presence of God was accompanied by, perhaps even made manifest by, the appearance of fire (Exod. 19:16, 19; 20:18, 21) and in Israel’s hymnody fire is often associated with the manifestation of God (e.g., Pss. 18:8–16; 77:17–20)...³¹

In this respect the evidence found in Daniel 3 appears to represent a link in a long-lasting development within the divine body traditions in which several distinguished individuals, including the patriarch Enoch or the prophet Moses, were depicted as enduring the fiery test of the encounter with the dangerous divine extent emitting light and fire. In the course of this deadly encounter these human exemplars often undergo a radical transformation, acquiring for themselves fiery luminous corporealities³² or “faces.” The traditions thus envision these figures as representations of the Deity and even as closely associated with the divine *Kavod* itself.

The authors of the Slavonic apocalypse appear to be cognizant of these theophanic currents when in the story of Bar-Eshath they choose fire as the testing ground for the authenticity of the anthropomorphic figure representing a deity. The Danielic background of the fiery test’s

³⁰ Seow, *Daniel*, 60.

³¹ Seow, *Daniel*, 59, emphasis mine.

³² 2 *Enoch* 22 serves as an early attestation to this tradition. We can find a detailed description of this process in another “Enochic” text, *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into the fiery representation serving as a replica of the divine corporeality: “R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire.” 3 *Enoch* 15:1. Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.267.

motif³³ seems to be also implicitly reaffirmed in the final destiny of Terah (in *Jubilees* – Haran) who in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 8 perishes in the fire along with his household and idols.³⁴ These members of Abraham's family, unlike Shadrach, Mashach, and Abednego, share the same destiny as idolatrous anthropomorphic figures whom God also turns into piles of ashes.

It has already been noted that, despite the apparent anti-anthropomorphic thrust of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon, the symbolism of fire, so prominent in the biblical theophanies, was not completely

³³ Another proof that the fiery test in the apocalyptic account of Abraham's fight against idols might be informed by the Danielic traditions can be supported by the pseudepigraphical and rabbinic testimonies attested in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo 6:5–18; *Genesis Rabbah* 38:13, *Tanna debe Eliahu* 2:25, *Seder Eliahu Rabba* 33 where similar to Bar-Eshath the patriarch himself undergoes the fiery test which he unlike the wooden idol successfully passes. *Genesis Rabbah* 38:13 reads: "And Haran died in the presence of his father Terah (xi, 28). R. Hiyya said: Terah was a manufacturer of idols. He once went away somewhere and left Abraham to sell them in his place. A man came and wished to buy one. 'How old are you?' Abraham asked him. 'Fifty years,' was the reply. 'Woe to such a man!' he exclaimed, 'you are fifty years old and would worship a day-old object!' At this he became ashamed and departed. On another occasion a woman came with a plateful of flour and requested him, 'Take this and offer it to them.' So he took a stick, broke them, and put the stick in the hand of the largest. When his father returned he demanded, 'What have you done to them?' 'I cannot conceal it from you,' he rejoined. "A woman came with a plateful of fine meal and requested me to offer it to them. One claimed, 'I must eat first,' while another claimed, 'I must eat first.' Thereupon the largest arose, took the stick, and broke them." 'Why do you make sport of me,' he cried out; 'have they then any knowledge!' 'Should not your ears listen to what your mouth is saying,' he retorted. Thereupon he seized him and delivered him to Nimrod. 'Let us worship the fire!' he [Nimrod] proposed. 'Let us rather worship water, which extinguishes the fire,' replied he. 'Then let us worship water!' 'Let us rather worship the clouds which bear the water.' 'Then let us worship the clouds!' 'Let us rather worship the winds which disperse the clouds.' 'Then let us worship the wind!' 'Let us rather worship human beings, who withstand the wind.' 'You are just bandying words,' he exclaimed; 'we will worship nought but the fire. Behold, I will cast you into it, and let your God whom you adore come and save you from it.' Now Haran was standing there undecided. If Abram is victorious, [thought he], I will say that I am of Abram's belief, while if Nimrod is victorious I will say that I am on Nimrod's side. When Abram descended into the fiery furnace and was saved, he [Nimrod] asked him, 'Of whose belief are you?' 'Of Abram's,' he replied. Thereupon he seized and cast him into fire; his inwards were scorched and he died in his father's presence. Hence it is written, and Haran died in the presence of (*al pene*) his father Terah." *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.310–311.

³⁴ *Apoc. Ab.* 8:6 "... when the sound of thunder came forth and burned him and his house and everything in the house, down to the ground [to a distance of] forty cubits." Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 16. *Jub.* 12:14 "...Haran dashed in to save them, but the fire raged over him. He was burned in the fire and died in Ur of the Chaldeans before his father Terah. They buried him in Ur of the Chaldeans." VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.70.

abandoned by the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, who repeatedly choose to portray the divine Presence through the imagery of the Voice coming in the stream of fire. Here one can see the formative influence of the Deuteronomic tradition with its promulgation of an aural rather than corporeal manifestation of the Deity.³⁵

Nevertheless, the symbolism of fire does not remain entirely unambiguous in the Slavonic apocalypse, and it is possible that there one encounters subtle polemics even against this theophanic element prominent in the corporeal ideologies. Thus, although the *Apocalypse of Abraham* also reaffirms the language of fire in its theophanic depiction of the divine Voice, in the patriarch’s speech about the hierarchy of natural elements found in chapter 7 the fire occupies the lowest grade, being easily “subdued” by water, the next element in the hierarchy:

Fire is the noblest [element] in the image [of the world], since even the things which are [otherwise] unsubdued are subdued in it, and [since] it mocks with its flames the things which perish easily. <But I would not call it a god either, since it is subjugated to water.> Water is indeed nobler, since it overcomes fire and soaks the earth (*Apoc. Ab.* 7:2–4).³⁶

³⁵ The tendency to substitute anthropomorphic depictions of the Deity with expressions of the divine Voice manifesting itself in the fire, of course, is not a novel development of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* authors, but a specimen of the long-lasting tradition whose roots can be found already in the Book of Deuteronomy. Scholars have long noted a sharp opposition of the book of Deuteronomy and the deuteronomic school to early anthropomorphic developments. In fact, the Deuteronomic school is widely thought to have initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity, which were subsequently adopted by the prophets Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah. Seeking to dislodge ancient anthropomorphism, the book of Deuteronomy and the deuteronomic school promulgated anti-corporeal theology of the divine Name with its conception of sanctuary (tabernacle) as the exclusive dwelling abode of God’s name. One can see in the deuteronomic school a paradigm shift of the revelatory axis from the visual to the aural plane. In this new, theo-aural, as opposed to theo-phanic, understanding, even God’s revelation to Moses on Mt. Sinai in Exodus 19, an event marking a vital nexus of the visual anthropomorphic paradigm, becomes reinterpreted in the terms of its aural counterpart. Deuteronomy 4:36 describes the Sinai theophany as a hearing of the divine Voice: “Out of heaven he let you hear his voice, that he might discipline you; and on earth he let you see his great fire and you heard his words out of the midst of the fire.” On the formative role of the Deuteronomic tradition for the theophanic imagery of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, see Orlov, “Praxis of the Voice,” 58–60.

³⁶ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 15.

Mar-Umath, the One Who is “Heavier than Stone”

Our study has suggested that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse appear to be involved in polemics with the divine body traditions by consciously deconstructing theophanic imagery and even technical vocabulary distinctive to the classic anthropomorphic developments. Further support for this hypothesis can be found in the peculiar conceptual elaborations involving another problematic figure of the story – a statue of the stone idol Mar-Umath.

Although the idols produced by Terah are said to be made of gold, silver, copper, iron, wood, stone and other unanimated materials, the authors of the text refer to them as the “bodies” (Slav. тѣла). In view of our previous research pointing to the possibility of polemics with the divine body traditions, this use of “corporeal” terminology does not appear coincidental. It is also intriguing that the context where this corporeal terminology is applied in the apocalypse implicitly invokes the account of creation, an important biblical locus which promulgates anthropomorphic priestly ideology. This creational *topos* shaped by a corporeal motif also appears to be polemically refashioned by the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse. In this new polemical framework, Abraham’s father Terah now assumes the place of God and poses as a “creator” of the idolatrous “bodies,” a role reminiscent of the protological position of the Deity who once shaped the body of the first human after the likeness of his own image. Thus in *Apoc. Ab.* 6:2–3 the following passage can be found:

And I [Abraham] said, “How can the creation of the body (створеніе тѣла) (of the idols) made by him (Terah) be his helper? Or would he have subordinated his body (тѣло) to his soul, his soul to his spirit, then his spirit – to folly and ignorance?”³⁷

It is remarkable that the text tells about the “creation of the body” (створеніе тѣла) of the idols, thus clearly applying corporeal terminology to the inanimate objects. More intriguing is that the “corporealities” of the idols, similar to the Genesis account, are placed in an unambiguous connection to the corporeality (тѣло) of their master and creator – the craftsman Terah. As is common in the divine body

³⁷ Rubinkiewicz, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en vieux slave*, 114.

tradition, the passage also makes an explicit terminological connection between the body of the Master and its corporeal replica.

The terminological choice involving the word “creation” (створение) also does not seem coincidental but rather serves as an important pointer to the protological biblical counterpart. In *Apoc. Ab.* 6:7 this term is used again in relation to the idol Mar-Umath.³⁸

It has already been noted that, like the account of Bar-Eshath, the story of the stone idol Mar-Umath appears to represent another important nexus in the text where polemical interactions with the divine body traditions unfold in the midst of already familiar imagery.

In the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 1:3–4 the following description of this stone idol is found:

I, Abraham, having entered their temple for the service, found a god named Mar-Umath, carved out of stone, fallen at the feet of an iron god, Nakhon. And it came to pass, that when I saw this, my heart was troubled. And I fell to thinking, because I, Abraham, was unable to return him to his place all by myself, since he was *heavier* (тяжекъ) than a great stone.³⁹

It is possible that the description of Mar-Umath in this passage invokes the technical terminology of the *Kavod* paradigm.

This terminological link with the divine body traditions pertains to the designation of Mar-Umath as “being *heavier* than a great stone.” The Slavonic term used here for the word “heavy” – “тяжекъ” appears to be an allusion to the technical terminology reserved for the designation of the divine Glory (*Kavod*) in Ezekielian and priestly materials. There the quality of “heaviness” serves as one of the meanings of the Hebrew word *Kavod*.⁴⁰ It appears that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse know this facet of the term’s meaning and even use it interchangeably for *Kavod* in another passage found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.

³⁸ See also 6:18 “Today I shall create (сътворю) another one...” Rubinkiewicz, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en vieux slave*, 116.

³⁹ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 9.

⁴⁰ The term כבוד can be also translated as “substance,” “body,” “mass,” “power,” “might,” “honor,” “glory,” “splendor.” In its meaning “glory” כבוד usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God’s appearances in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe כבוד as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, “כבוד,” *TDOT*, 7.22–38.

Ryszard Rubinkiewicz has argued that the Slavonic term for “heaviness”⁴¹ (Slav. *тягота*) found in another passage *Apoc. Ab.* 14:13 serves as a technical term for rendering the Hebrew *Kavod*. *Apoc. Ab.* 14:13 reads: “. . . Since God gave him [Azazel] the *heaviness* (*тяготой*) and the will against those who answer him. . . .”⁴²

Rubinkiewicz notes that the original text most likely had *כבוד*, which has the sense of “gravity,” but also of “glory,” and the meaning of the verse would be: “the Eternal One . . . to him he gave the glory and power.” According to Rubinkiewicz, this ambiguity lays at the basis of the Slavonic translation of the verse.⁴³

If the term “heaviness” is indeed associated in the mind of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*’s authors with the *Kavod* terminology, it is intriguing that this notion was used solely in the description of the negative protagonists of the text – the stone idol Mar-Umath and the fallen angel Azazel. Such usage might again point to the polemical stance of the authors of the pseudepigraphon against the *Kavod* tradition with its peculiar theophanic imagery.

“A Likeness of a Craftsman’s Work”

Another important facet of the anti-anthropomorphic thrust of the conceptual deliberations detected in the Slavonic apocalypse pertains to their polemical appropriation of the “likeness” language which often permeates the conceptual core of corporeal theophanic traditions. One will recall that in the paradigmatic theophanic priestly template reflected in the Book of Ezekiel and the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, the language of “likeness” comes to the fore. The authors of the Book of Ezekiel repeatedly strive to describe their vision of the divine and angelic phenomena through the language of “likeness.” The same tendency is discernable in Genesis 1 where the Deity creates humans in the likeness of his image.

The formulae of “likeness” also looms large in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, but the text’s authors use it in a distinctively polemical way.

⁴¹ The Slavonic noun “тягота” (*Apoc. Ab.* 14:13) is derived from the same root as the adjective “тяжекъ” (*Apoc. Ab.* 1:4).

⁴² Rubinkiewicz, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en vieux slave*, 150.

⁴³ Rubinkiewicz points to the presence of the formulae in Lk 4:6 “I will give you all their authority and splendor . . .”

Thus in chapter 25 of the apocalypse, God offers to the seer the vision of the future Temple polluted by the idol of jealousy, an appearance which is conveyed through the language of likeness:

I saw there *the likeness of the idol of jealousy (подобие идола ревнования)*, as a likeness (*подобие*) of a craftsman’s [work] such as my father made, and its statue was of shining copper, and a man before it, and he was worshipping it; and [there was] an altar opposite it and youths were slaughtered on it before the idol. And I said to him, “What is this idol, and what is the altar, and who are those being sacrificed, and who is the sacrificer, and what is the beautiful temple which I see, art and beauty of your glory that lies beneath your throne?” And he said, “Hear, Abraham! This temple and altar and the beautiful things which you have seen are my image of *the sanctification of the name of my glory (святительства имени славы моей)*, where every prayer of men will dwell, and the gathering of kings and prophets, and the sacrifice which I shall establish to be made for me among my people coming from your progeny. And the statue you saw is my anger, because the people who will come to me out of you will make me angry. And the man you saw slaughtering is he who angers me. And the sacrifice is the murder of those who are for me a testimony of the close of the judgment in the end of the creation” (*Апок. Аб. 25:1–6*).⁴⁴

In this pivotal passage the earlier motifs that readers of the apocalypse encountered in the first section of the pseudepigraphon dealing with the idolatrous practices of Abraham’s father are explicitly invoked. The statues similar to those made in the house of Terah (“a likeness (*подобие*) of a craftsman’s [work] such as my father made”) are now installed in God’s Temple. This idolatrous practice of worshipping the statue of shining copper, labeled in the story as “a likeness (*подобие*) of a craftsman’s work,” seems to cautiously invoke the language of “likeness” known from the priestly theophanic paradigm exemplified in Genesis 1:26 and Ezekiel 1. This reference to “craftsman” invokes again the story of Terah and his creation of the idols. The tendency to label the idolatrous figures as “bodies,” already detectable in the early chapters, is again reaffirmed here. The idolatrous practices are then contrasted to true worship which is described in the now familiar language of the aural paradigm of the divine name that denies that the Deity can possess a body. Thus the future eschatological temple is portrayed as a dwelling place, not for the abominable shining statue,

⁴⁴ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 29, emphasis mine. Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 92.

but for “the image of the *sanctification of the name of my [God’s] glory* (святительства имени славы моя), where *every prayer of men will dwell* (в нюже вселится всяка молба мужьска).”⁴⁵ It is apparent that the authors try to re-interpret the technical terminology of the divine Glory tradition by merging it with formulae borrowed from the *Shem* ideology. There is also no doubt that the authors’ attitude to the anthropomorphic ideology remains polemical which is unabashedly shown in labeling the shining statue as the idol of jealousy.

Conclusion

The elaboration of the story of Abraham’s struggle against idols found in the Slavonic apocalypse provides unique insight into the complex world of the Jewish liturgical debates in the early centuries of the Common Era. It was a time when, faced with a wide array of challenges involving the loss of the terrestrial sanctuary, the authors of the Jewish apocalyptic writings tried to embrace other theological alternatives for preserving and perpetuating traditional sacerdotal practices.⁴⁶ One such viable tradition was connected with the idea of the celestial sanctuary represented by the divine Chariot.

Of course the concept of the heavenly temple as the locus of liturgical and mystical experience was not an entirely novel development but rather the legacy of the complex theological climate of the Second Temple period when various sacerdotal groups and clans competed for the primacy and authority of their priestly legacy by looking for alternative sacerdotal practices involving the heavenly counterpart of the terrestrial temple. This contention-ridden sacerdotal environment created a whole gallery of ideal priestly figures, including Michael, Yahoel, Enoch, Melchisedek, and Levi, who were depicted as distinguished servants of celestial sanctuaries. In this respect the story of the young hero of the faith who travels from the destroyed terrestrial sanctuary polluted by the idols of his father to the heavenly temple is not an invention of the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* but rather is one of the links in the established literary and mystical tradi-

⁴⁵ Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham*, 92.

⁴⁶ On this issue see R. Elijor, *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism* (Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2004).

tion attested already in the early booklets of *1 Enoch* where the seventh antediluvian patriarch ascends to the heavenly temple in order to behold the divine *Kavod*.⁴⁷ The difference here, however, is that while trying to embrace the liturgical and sacerdotal significance of the journey to the heavenly sanctuary, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse at the same time appear to be quite reluctant to embrace the visual praxis of the Enochic paradigm and its anthropomorphic tenets. Instead, another, aural praxis involving revelation of the divine Voice and veneration of the divine Name unfolds. Such polemical interaction between two prominent conceptual trends involving the idea of the celestial temple might provide important insights for understanding the character of later Merkabah and Hekhalot developments where the traditions about the divine Form and the divine Name appear to undergo creative conflation.

⁴⁷ For a discussion of this tradition, see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 70–76.

THE FALLEN TREES: ARBOREAL METAPHORS AND
POLEMICS WITH THE DIVINE BODY TRADITIONS IN THE
APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM

Introduction

The first eight chapters of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish pseudepigraphon preserved solely in its Slavonic translation, deal with the early years of the hero of the faith in the house of his father Terah. The main plot of this section of the text revolves around the family business of manufacturing idolatrous divine statues. Terah and his sons are portrayed as craftsmen carving religious figures out of wood, stone, gold, silver, brass and iron. The zeal with which the family pursues its idolatrous craft suggests that the text does not view the household of Terah as just another family workshop producing religious artifacts for sale. Although the sacerdotal status of Abraham's family remains clouded in rather obscure imagery, the Slavonic apocalypse's authors seem to envision them as cultic servants whose "house" serves as a metaphor for the sanctuary polluted by idolatrous worship. From the very first lines of the apocalypse the reader learns that Abraham as well as Terah are involved in sacrificial rituals in temples.¹ The haggadic section of the text, which narrates Terah's and Abraham's interactions with the "statues," culminates in the destruction of the "house" along with its idols in a fire sent by God. It is possible that the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, which was written in the first centuries of the Common Era when Jewish communities were facing a wide array of challenges, including the loss of the Temple, was drawing here on the familiar metaphors derived from the Book of Ezekiel that construes idolatry as the main reason for the destruction of the terrestrial Sanctuary. Similar to the prophetic account, the hero of the Slavonic apocalypse is then allowed to behold the true place of worship – the heavenly shrine associated with the divine Throne. Yet despite the fact that

¹ *Apoc. Ab.* 1:2–3 "...at the time when my lot came up, when I had finished the services of my father Terah's sacrifice to his gods of wood, stone, gold, silver, brass and iron, I, Abraham, having entered their temple for the service..." Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 9.

the Book of Ezekiel significantly shapes the Abrahamic pseudepigraphon, there is a curious difference between the two visionary accounts. While in Ezekiel the false idolatrous statues of the perished temple are contrasted with the true form of the Deity enthroned on the divine Chariot, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* denies to its hero a vision of the anthropomorphic Glory of God. When in the second part of the apocalypse Abraham travels to the upper heaven to behold the Throne of God, which invokes memories of the classic Ezekielian description, he does not see any divine form on the Chariot. Scholars have previously noted that while preserving some features of Ezekiel's angelology, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse appear to be carefully avoiding the anthropomorphic description of the divine *Kavod*, substituting it with a reference to the divine Voice.² The common interpretation is that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* deliberately seeks "to exclude all reference to the human figure mentioned in Ezekiel 1."³

In view of this polemical stance against the anthropomorphic understanding of God detected in the second part of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, it is possible that the first part of the pseudepigraphon imbued with imagery of the divine idolatrous figures might also contain polemics against the divine body traditions. This study will try to explore the possible anti-anthropomorphic tendencies of the first part of the Slavonic apocalypse.

² Such polemical development which attempts to confront the anthropomorphic understanding of the Deity with the alternative depictions of God through the imagery of the divine Voice or Name has its roots already in the biblical materials, particular in the Book of Deuteronomy and later deuteronomistic developments. On these traditions, see O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament* (BZAW, 64; Gieschen: Toepelmann, 1934) 1–58; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191ff.; Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 124ff.; I. Wilson, *Out of the Midst of Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy* (SBLDS, 151; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995) 1–15; C.A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGAJU, 42; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998) 51–123. On the formative role of the Deuteronomistic tradition for the theophanic imagery of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, see A. Orlov, "Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*," *JBL* 127.1 (2008) 53–70 at 58–60.

³ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 87.

Bar-Eshath

The introductory chapters of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* entertain their readers with elaborate mocking portrayals of the idols produced in the household of Terah. Often, the main purpose of these narrations is to demonstrate the limited supernatural prowess of the anthropomorphic figures whose spiritual impotence is then contrasted with the power of the incorporeal God. It is possible that in these mocking accounts of the idolatrous statues found in the first eight chapters of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the reader encounters one of the more vivid testimonies to the work's overall retraction of an anthropomorphic understanding of the Deity. Possibly mindful of the broader extra-biblical context of Abraham's biblical biography and his role as a fighter against the idolatrous practices of his father Terah, the work's authors seem to use the patriarch's story to advance their own anti-corporeal agenda.

The limited scope of this investigation does not allow us to explore all of the depictions of the idolatrous figures found in the first part of the pseudepigraphon. This study will investigate only one polemical portrayal – the account involving the wooden idol Bar-Eshath (Slav. Варисать).⁴ This mysterious idol first appears in chapter five, where Abraham is sent by his father to gather wooden chips left from manufacturing idols in order to make a fire and prepare a meal. In the pile of wooden splinters Abraham finds a small figurine whose forehead is decorated with the name Bar-Eshath.⁵ Skeptical of idols, Abraham decides to challenge their supernatural power by placing Bar-Eshath near the fire and, with irony, ordering him to confine the flames.⁶ The challenge leads to disastrous consequences for the wooden figurine, whom Abraham observes turn into a pile of dust after being enveloped and toppled over by fire.

The story of the fiery challenge of the wooden idol appears to fit nicely into the overall anti-anthropomorphic argument of the text. It polemically invokes the memory of Ezekiel 1 and Daniel 3, two pivotal biblical theophanic accounts associated with the promulgation of the divine body ideology where one encounters depictions of divine

⁴ On Bar-Eshath and the background of this name, see Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 63.

⁵ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 12.

⁶ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 12–13.

beings in the midst of fire. Although the purpose of these two biblical accounts is to underline the distinction between true and false representations of the Deity where the form's endurance against the element of fire testifies to its authenticity, in the Slavonic apocalypse the argument takes a different turn. There, it is not a fiery divine form but its incorporeal manifestation – the divine Voice appearing in the midst of fire⁷ – that is contrasted with the anthropomorphic idolatrous figure that perishes in the flames. I have previously explored this aspect of Bar-Eshath's narrative, arguing that it represents a polemical variation with the divine body traditions.⁸ In this study I will continue to probe the polemical features of the Bar-Eshath account by focusing on the symbolic dimension of his story reflected in chapter six of the Slavonic apocalypse. There, the story of the "fall" of the wooden idol is poetically retold, this time in the mythological language reminiscent of depictions in the Book of Ezekiel and the Book of Daniel, two central biblical writings where the ideology of the divine body comes to its most emphatic, developed articulation.

The Biblical Background of the Tale of the Fallen Tree

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* 6:10–17 offers the following poetic tale about the origin and the final destiny of the wooden statue conveyed through primordial mythological imagery:

... But Bar-Eshath <, your god, before he was made had been rooted in the ground. Being great and wondrous (*великъ съ и дивен*), with branches, flowers and [various] beauties (*похвалями*). And you cut him with an ax, and by your skill the god was made. And behold, he has dried up, and his sap (*тукота его*) is gone. He fell from the heights to the ground, and he went from greatness to insignificance, and his appearance has faded.> [Now] he himself has been burned up by the fire, and he turned into ashes and is no more...⁹

⁷ On hypostatic voice of God, see J.H. Charlesworth, "The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986) 19–41.

⁸ See A. Orlov, "The Gods of My Father Terah': Abraham the Iconoclast and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18.1 (2008) 33–53.

⁹ Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 48; Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 14.

This description of the wondrous tree found in the Slavonic apocalypse appears to draw on the biblical arboreal metaphors reflected in Ezek 31¹⁰ and Dan 4.¹¹ It is no happenstance that the Slavonic apocalypse's authors bring into play these two theophanic accounts.¹²

¹⁰ Ezek 31:2–14 reads: “Mortal, say to Pharaoh king of Egypt and to his hordes: Whom are you like in your greatness? Consider Assyria, a cedar of Lebanon, with fair branches and forest shade, and of great height, its top among the clouds. The waters nourished it, the deep made it grow tall, making its rivers flow around the place it was planted, sending forth its streams to all the trees of the field. So it towered high above all the trees of the field; its boughs grew large and its branches long, from abundant water in its shoots. All the birds of the air made their nests in its boughs; under its branches all the animals of the field gave birth to their young; and in its shade all great nations lived. It was beautiful in its greatness, in the length of its branches; for its roots went down to abundant water. The cedars in the garden of God could not rival it, nor the fir trees equal its boughs; the plane trees were as nothing compared with its branches; no tree in the garden of God was like it in beauty. I made it beautiful with its mass of branches, the envy of all the trees of Eden that were in the garden of God. Therefore thus says the Lord God: Because it towered high and set its top among the clouds, and its heart was proud of its height, I gave it into the hand of the prince of the nations; he has dealt with it as its wickedness deserves. I have cast it out. Foreigners from the most terrible of the nations have cut it down and left it. On the mountains and in all the valleys its branches have fallen, and its boughs lie broken in all the watercourses of the land; and all the peoples of the earth went away from its shade and left it. On its fallen trunk settle all the birds of the air, and among its boughs lodge all the wild animals. All this is in order that no trees by the waters may grow to lofty height or set their tops among the clouds, and that no trees that drink water may reach up to them in height. For all of them are handed over to death, to the world below; along with all mortals, with those who go down to the Pit.” [NRSV].

¹¹ Dan 4:10–17 reads: “Upon my bed this is what I saw; there was a tree at the center of the earth, and its height was great. The tree grew great and strong, its top reached to heaven, and it was visible to the ends of the whole earth. Its foliage was beautiful, its fruit abundant, and it provided food for all. The animals of the field found shade under it, the birds of the air nested in its branches, and from it all living beings were fed. I continued looking, in the visions of my head as I lay in bed, and there was a holy watcher, coming down from heaven. He cried aloud and said: ‘Cut down the tree and chop off its branches, strip off its foliage and scatter its fruit. Let the animals flee from beneath it and the birds from its branches. But leave its stump and roots in the ground, with a band of iron and bronze, in the tender grass of the field. Let him be bathed with the dew of heaven, and let his lot be with the animals of the field in the grass of the earth. Let his mind be changed from that of a human, and let the mind of an animal be given to him. And let seven times pass over him. The sentence is rendered by decree of the watchers, the decision is given by order of the holy ones, in order that all who live may know that the Most High is sovereign over the kingdom of mortals; he gives it to whom he will and sets over it the lowliest of human beings.’” [NRSV].

¹² Alexander Kulik (*Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 72) also points to the similarities with Isa 44:14–20: “He cuts down cedars or chooses a holm tree or an oak and lets it grow strong among the trees of the forest. He plants a cedar and the rain nourishes it. Then it can be used as fuel. Part of it he takes and warms himself; he kindles a fire and bakes bread. Then he makes a god and worships it, makes it a

Several studies have previously observed that these two biblical texts, permeated with corporeal ideology, exercise a formative influence on the theophanic and angelological imagery found in various parts of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. To better understand its appropriation in the Slavonic account we must now explore the ideological background of the arboreal portrayals in Ezekiel and Daniel.

As has been noted above, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* draws on a cluster of motifs from the Book of Ezekiel, while at the same time reshaping them by eliminating their anthropomorphic details.¹³ The authors' peculiar use of the Ezekielian Chariot imagery in Abraham's vision of the upper heaven has been investigated in detail in previous studies.¹⁴ Although the anthropomorphic thrust of Ezekiel understandably comes to its fore in the account of the vision of the divine Chariot where the seer beholds the human-like *Kavod*, other parts of the book also contain implicit and explicit reaffirmations of the corporeal ideology of the priestly tradition. It is noteworthy for our investigation that the corporeal ideology of both Ezekiel and the priestly source is shaped by the tenets of the Adamic tradition and its technical terminology.¹⁵ One of the examples of these corporeal developments involving Adamic imagery might be in Ezekiel 31 where one finds a portrayal of the wondrous tree first flourishing in the Garden of God and then doomed by the Deity and destroyed by the foreigners.

carved image and bows down before it. Half of it he burns in the fire; over this half he roasts meat, eats it and is satisfied. He also warms himself and says, 'Ah, I am warm, I can feel the fire!' The rest of it he makes into a god, his idol, bows down to it and worships it; he prays to it and says, 'Save me, for you are my god!' They do not know, nor do they comprehend; for their eyes are shut, so that they cannot see, and their minds as well, so that they cannot understand. No one considers, nor is there knowledge or discernment to say, 'Half of it I burned in the fire; I also baked bread on its coals, I roasted meat and have eaten. Now shall I make the rest of it an abomination? Shall I fall down before a block of wood?' He feeds on ashes; a deluded mind has led him astray, and he cannot save himself or say, 'Is not this thing in my right hand a fraud?' [NRSV].

¹³ On the author's use of the Ezekielian traditions, see: Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," 1.685.

¹⁴ C. Rowland, "The Vision of God in Apocalyptic Literature," *JSJ* 10 (1979) 137–154; idem, *The Open Heaven*, 86–87.

¹⁵ In recent years scholars have become increasingly aware of the formative value of the Adamic traditions in the shaping of the corporeal ideologies about the anthropomorphic body of the Deity. Already in the Book of Ezekiel the imagery of the human-like *Kavod* is connected with the protological developments reflected in the Genesis account where humanity is told to be created in the image of God.

As any profound religious symbol, this arboreal metaphor can be understood in a number of ways. This passage was often interpreted as a reference to the destruction of nations or their arrogant rulers. There is, however, another, more personalist reading of the story focusing on the memory of Adam's story. The peculiar reference to the location of the wondrous tree in the Garden of Eden (יִדְעָ) and its expulsion from this distinguished *topos* exhibits parallels with the story of the Protoplast who once also enjoyed an exalted status in the Garden but was then expelled by the Deity from his heavenly abode. Like the mysterious trees in the Ezekielian and Danielic accounts, the Protoplast too once possessed a gigantic and wondrous stature. Several passages found in Philo and some pseudepigraphical accounts, including the tradition that appears in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 23:4–6, describe the Protoplast's body as great in height, terrible in breadth and incomparable in aspect.¹⁶ This great body of the first human was also said to be luminous in nature and clothed with what was often described in Jewish traditions as the "garment of glory."¹⁷

¹⁶ Several early Jewish sources attest to the lore about the enormous body of Adam which the protoplast possessed before his transgression in Eden. Thus, Philo in *QG* 1.32 mentions a tradition according to which the first humans received at their creation bodies of vast size reaching a gigantic height: "... [the first humans] ... were provided with a very great body and the magnitude of a giant..." Philo, *Questions and Answers on Genesis* (tr. R. Marcus; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949) 19. Moreover, in some pseudepigraphic accounts the body of the protoplast is portrayed, not simply as gigantic, but even as comparable with the dimensions of the divine corporeality. Thus, in several pseudepigraphic materials depictions of Adam's stature are often linked to the imagery of the enthroned divine anthropomorphic extent known from the priestly and Ezekielian sources as God's *Kavod*. The pseudepigraphical and rabbinic sources also refer to the luminosity of the original body of the Protoplast which like the divine body was emitting light.

¹⁷ Thus, the Tarqums attest to the prelapsarian luminosity of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. The Biblical background for such traditions includes the passage from Gen 3:21, where "the Lord God made for Adam and his wife garments of skin and clothed them." The Targumic traditions, both Palestinian and Babylonian, read "garments of glory" instead of "garments of skin." For example, in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 3:21 the following tradition can be found: "And the Lord God made garments of glory for Adam and for his wife from the skin which the serpent had cast off (to be worn) on the skin of their (garments of) fingernails of which they had been stripped, and he clothed them." *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible, 1B; Colleeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 29. Targum Neofiti on Gen 3:21 unveils the similar tradition: "And the Lord God made for Adam and for his wife *garments of glory*, for the skin of their flesh, and he clothed them." *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (tr. M. McNamara, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible, 1A; Colleeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 62–63; A. Díez Macho, *Neophiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (6 vols.; Seminario Filológico Cardenal Cisneros del Instituto

Yet according to the Adamic traditions, the original condition of the Protoplast's body dramatically changed after the Fall when he lost his great beauty, stature, and luminosity. In view of these parallels to the Adamic developments, it has been previously proposed that in Ezek 31 and Daniel 4 one might have the symbolic rendering of the Protoplast story, where the metaphor of the fallen tree forewarns of the demise of the original condition of humanity.¹⁸

The memory of the Protoplast story as a metaphor for the Fall of the exalted, "divine humanity" has paramount significance in the conceptual framework of the corporeal ideologies found in the Book of Ezekiel and the Book of Daniel. Previous studies have noted that the divine body traditions often juxtapose dialectically the exaltation and demotion of the mediatorial figures to the end of both promoting and delimiting the divinization of humanity.¹⁹ The demise of the wondrous trees thus appears to fit well into this dialectical interplay of reaffirmations and deconstructions of various corporeal ideologies.²⁰

These conceptual developments involving the symbolism of the wondrous trees in Ezek 31 and Dan 4 bring us back to the arboreal imagery in chapter six of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. In the already

Arias Montano. *Textos y estudios*, 7–11, 20; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968–79) 1.19. The Fragmentary Targum on Gen 3:21 also uses the imagery of glorious garments: "And He made: And the memra of the Lord God created for Adam and his wife *precious garments* [for] the skin of their flesh, and He clothed them." M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch according to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AB, 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980) 1.46; 2.7. Targum Onqelos on Gen 3:21 reads: "And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife *garments of honor for the skin of their flesh*, and He clothed them." *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (tr. B. Grossfeld; The Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988) 46; *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (4 vols.; ed. A. Sperber; Leiden: Brill, 1959) 1.5.

¹⁸ See, for example, C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2002) 101–103; S. N. Bunta, "The Mēsu-Tree and the Animal Inside: Theomorphism and Theriomorphism in Daniel 4," in: *The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism* (eds. B. Lourie and A. Orlov; Scrinium, 3; St. Petersburg: Byzantinorossica, 2007) 364–384.

¹⁹ D. Arbel, "'Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty': The Enoch/Metatron Narrative of 3 Enoch and Ezekiel 28," *HTR* 98 (2005) 121–42.

²⁰ Another example of such dialectical interplay of reaffirmation and demotion can be found in Ezek 28:1–19 where one can find the symbolic depiction of judgment against the prince of Tyre. This account also appears to be informed by the Adamic traditions. As will be shown later, Ezek 28 also contributes to the background for the imagery found in the *Apoc. Ab.* since in both texts the idolatrous statues are destroyed by fire.

mentioned passage *Apoc. Ab.* 6:10–11 the authors seem to invoke cautiously the memory of the aforementioned biblical accounts when Bar-Eshath is compared with the wondrous tree. All three accounts emphasize the beauty of the protological tree. In all three stories the tree faces eventual demise in the imagery of a fall from heights to the ground.²¹

In highlighting similarities between biblical and pseudepigraphic accounts of the great tree, it is also important to note the distinctive purposes that arboreal imagery serves in Ezekiel and Daniel on the one hand and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* on the other. While the imagery of the fallen tree in Ezekiel and Daniel is employed to advance the ideology of divine corporeality, in the Slavonic apocalypse it is unambiguously set against traditions of divine corporeality. One peculiar detail illuminates the ideological difference. In the biblical stories the symbolic arboreal statue of exalted humanity is diminished by the

²¹ The concept of the cosmic tree as the building material for the divine figure found in the arboreal hymn of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* appears to be reminiscent not only of the descriptions in Ezek 31 and Dan 4 but also of some Mesopotamian traditions about the cosmic tree also known there as the Mēsu-Tree. In this respect scholars have previously noted that the tradition about the wondrous tree reflected in Ezekiel 31 seems to draw on the Mesopotamian traditions about the Mēsu-Tree, a cosmic plant envisioned there as the building material for the divine statues. The traditions about the mythological tree are documented in several sources, including the *Book of Erra*, a Mesopotamian work dated between the eleventh and the eighth century B.C.E. The *Book of Erra* 1:150–156 reads:

Where is the mēsu tree, the flesh of the gods, the ornament of the king of the uni[verse]?

That pure tree, that august youngster suited to supremacy,

Whose roots reached as deep down as the bottom of the underwor[ld]: a hundred double hours through the vast sea waters;

Whose top reached as high as the sky of [Anum]?

Where is the glittering *zaginduru* stone which I make choose....

Where is Ninildu, the great woodcarver of my godhead,

Who carries the golden axe, who knows his own.... [L. Cagni, *The Poem of Erra* (SANE, 1/3; Malibu: Undena, 1977) 32]. This passage vividly demonstrates that the Mesopotamian “matrix” of the traditions about the gigantic cosmic tree as the building material for the divine statues is still reflected not only in Ezekiel, but also in the Slavonic apocalypse where the “flesh” of the cosmic tree serves as the building material for the idolatrous statue of Bar-Eshath. It is striking that the account of the cosmic Tree from *Apoc. Ab.* and the passage in the *Book of Erra* share several similar features including the motif of a craftsman carving the wooden statues of a godhead with his axe. On the Mesopotamian traditions about the Mēsu-Tree and their connection with Ezek 31 and Dan 4, see Silviu N. Bunta, “The Mēsu-Tree and the Animal Inside: Theomorphism and Theriomorphism in Daniel 4,” *The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism* (eds. B. Lourié and A. Orlov; Scrinium, 3; St. Petersburg: Byzantinorossica, 2007) 364–384.

will of the Creator²² and both of the biblical trees are cut by celestial beings – in Ezekiel by God and in Daniel by the heavenly envoy. In contrast, in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* the tree is cut down not by the Deity but by Abraham's idolatrous father Terah who throughout the narrative is portrayed as a "creator" of his idols in a manner ironically reminiscent of God's role²³ in the biblical account of creation.²⁴ In *Apoc. Ab.* 4:3 Abraham tells Terah that he is a god to his idols since he made them. Here again, like the accounts found in Ezekiel and Daniel, the subtle presence of Adamic motifs can be discerned. Yet, unlike the prophetic books where the Adamic currents reaffirm the possibility of the human-like body of the Deity who fashions his beloved creature in his own image, in the Slavonic apocalypse these currents work against such a possibility.

The Demoted Cherub

The arboreal hymn of the demise of Bar-Eshath in *Apoc. Ab.* 6:10–17 that defines him as a god brings us to another important passage – Ezek 28:1–19 – which contains two oracles about an enigmatic celestial figure, an anointed Cherub (כְּרוּב מִמְשַׁח), whom the text defines as the prince of Tyre and who, like Bar-Eshath, appears to be envisioned as a demoted idol.²⁵

²² The motif of the Deity demoting or diminishing the original gigantic stature of the Protoplast is a dialectical device of re-affirmation widespread in the pseudepigraphical and rabbinic materials connected with the divine body traditions. Cf. J. Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis," in: *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (3 vols.; eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1996) 1.529–30.

²³ In *Apoc. Ab.* 4:3 Abraham compares Terah with the Creator telling him that he is a god to his idols since he made them.

²⁴ Thus, for example, *Apoc. Ab.* 6:2 tells about Terah's "creation" of the *bodies* of the idols.

²⁵ Ezek 28:1–19 reads: "The word of the Lord came to me: 'Son of man, say to the prince of Tyre, Thus says the Lord God: Because your heart is proud, and you have said, 'I am a god, I sit in the seat of the gods, in the heart of the seas,' yet you are but a man, and no god, though you consider yourself as wise as a god – you are indeed wiser than Daniel; no secret is hidden from you; by your wisdom and your understanding you have gotten wealth for yourself, and have gathered gold and silver into your treasures; by your great wisdom in trade you have increased your wealth, and your heart has become proud in your wealth – therefore thus says the Lord God: 'Because you consider yourself as wise as a god, therefore, behold, I will bring strangers upon you, the most terrible of the nations; and they shall draw their swords against the beauty

It is noteworthy that, like the wooden idol, the main character of this Ezekielian passage is also repeatedly described in ironic fashion as a god. Further it is intriguing that both the hymn from the Slavonic apocalypse and the account from Ezek 28 describe their “idols” as wondrous creatures decorated with “beauties.” Although the Slavonic text does not elaborate on the nature of Bar-Eshath’s “beauties” (Slav. *похвалы*),²⁶ the passage from Ezekiel describes the Cherub as “the model of perfection” (חֹתֶם תְּכֻנִית), “perfect in beauty” (וּכְלִיל יָפִי), and decorated with precious stones. It appears that in both accounts references to the characters’ “beauties” serve to indicate their exalted status.²⁷ Scholars have previously observed that the attribution of the “beauties” invokes the memory of another important “representation” of the Deity – the supreme angel Metatron – who according to the *Sefer Hekhalot* was also “enhanced” with various “beauties” in the form of precious stones.²⁸ In this context the reference to the protagonist of the Merkabah tradition does not seem out of place, given that

of your wisdom and defile your splendor. They shall thrust you down into the Pit, and you shall die the death of the slain in the heart of the seas. Will you still say, ‘I am a god,’ in the presence of those who slay you, though you are but a man, and no god, in the hands of those who wound you? You shall die the death of the uncircumcised by the hand of foreigners; for I have spoken, says the Lord God. Moreover the word of the Lord came to me: Son of man, raise a lamentation over the king of Tyre, and say to him, Thus says the Lord God: ‘You were the signet of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was your covering, carnelian, topaz, and jasper, chrysolite, beryl, and onyx, sapphire, carbuncle, and emerald; and wrought in gold were your settings and your engravings. On the day that you were created they were prepared. With an anointed guardian cherub I placed you; you were on the holy mountain of God; in the midst of the stones of fire you walked. You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created, till iniquity was found in you. In the abundance of your trade you were filled with violence, and you sinned; so I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God, and the guardian cherub drove you out from the midst of the stones of fire. Your heart was proud because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor. I cast you to the ground; I exposed you before kings, to feast their eyes on you. By the multitude of your iniquities, in the unrighteousness of your trade you profaned your sanctuaries; so I brought forth fire from the midst of you; it consumed you, and I turned you to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all who saw you. All who know you among the peoples are appalled at you; you have come to a dreadful end and shall be no more for ever.’”

²⁶ This Slavonic word can be literally translated as “praises.” For the discussion of the translation of Slavonic “похвала” as “beauty,” see Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 73, n. 6.

²⁷ Thus, Daphna Arbel observes that “the bejeweled garb covered with precious stones that adorns the primal figure further highlights his state of exaltation.” Arbel, “Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty,” 131.

²⁸ Arbel, “Seal of Resemblance, Full of Wisdom, and Perfect in Beauty,” 131.

he himself might also be viewed as a conceptual nexus reflecting both the dynamics of exaltation and demotion of humanity. In this capacity he could be envisioned as a sort of “idol” who serves as a stumbling block for the infamous visionary of the Talmud, Elisha b. Abuyah, who according to *b. Hag. 15a* takes Metatron as the second deity in heaven that leads him to the heretical conclusion about two “powers” in heaven. The passage from the *Hagigah* then depicts the demotion of the dangerous “idol”: the supreme angel is publicly punished in front of celestial hosts with sixty fiery lashes in order to prevent future confusions between the Deity and his angelic replica.

Returning to the similarities between the stories of the anointed Cherub and Bar-Eshath, it should be noted that both of them seem to contain traces of corporeal ideologies in their symbolic rendering of the Adamic story of the exaltation and fall of the Protoplast.²⁹ Thus in Ezekiel the Cherub, similar to Bar-Eshath, falls from “the heights to the ground” being cast out as a profane thing from the mountain of God.

It is noteworthy that both texts, like the Protoplast traditions, appear to envision the process of demotion as the loss of the original condition of the characters. Ezek 28 hints that the Cherub was originally installed like the divine *Kavod* on the holy mountain in the midst of fire: “you were on the holy mountain of God; in the midst of *the stones of fire* (אבני אש) you walked.” The story continues with the exalted figure expelled from the exalted *topos* by its guardians: “I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God (מהר אלהים), and the guardian cherub drove you out from the midst of the stones of fire.” According to the text, when the cherub was expelled from his origi-

²⁹ On the Adamic background of Ezek 28 see J. Barr, “‘Thou art the Cherub’: Ezekiel 28.14 and the Postexilic Understanding of Genesis 2–3,” in: *Priests, Prophets and Scribes. Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp* (eds. E. Ulrich, J.W. Wright, R.P. Carroll, P.R. Davies; JSOTSup., 149; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 213–223; N.C. Habel, “Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38 (1967) 516–524; K. Jeppesen, “You are a Cherub, but no God!” *SJOT* 1 (1991) 83–94; D. Launderville, O.S.B., “Ezekiel’s Cherub: A Promising Symbol or a Dangerous Idol?” *CBQ* 65 (2004) 165–183; O. Loretz, “Der Sturz des Fürsten von Tyrus (Ez 28,1–19),” *UF* 8 (1976) 455–458; H.G. May, “The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28:12–19,” in: *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (eds. B. Anderson and W. Harrelson; New York, 1962) 166–176; J.E. Miller, “The Maelaek of Tyre (Ezekiel 28, 11–19),” *ZAW* 105 (1994) 497–501; A.J. Williams, “The Mythological Background of Ezekiel 28:12–19?” *BTB* 6 (1976) 49–61; K. Yaron, “The Dirge over the King of Tyre,” *ASTI* 3 (1964) 28–57.

nal lofty abode he was “cast to the ground” and “exposed” before the spectators’ gaze. In light of the possible Adamic background for the Ezekielian oracles, demotion to the lower realm and exposure to the gazing public can be understood as references to the loss of the original luminous garment of the Protoplast after the Fall. A similar tradition about the loss of the shining attire of the Protoplast seems present in the Slavonic apocalypse that describes the “fall” of Bar-Eshath as the “fading” of his primordial condition. *Apoc. Ab.* 6:14–15 reads: “He fell from the heights to the ground, and he went from greatness to insignificance, and his appearance has faded...”³⁰

It is also intriguing that in both stories the characters share the same final destiny as their “bodies” turn into ashes by fire. As has been previously noted, in Ezekiel the demoted Cherub is clearly envisioned as an idolatrous statue destroyed by fire. Further it is pointed out that the “cremation of the king of Tyre resembles the burning of a statue and the scattering of its ashes on the ground or in the underworld. If the king of Tyre is identified as a cherub, represented as a statue, and punished for claiming to be a god, then the burning of this statue can be seen as the rite of disposal of the impurity of idolatry.”³¹

The divine body traditions, and especially their peculiar usage of the fire test in the adjudication between true and false representations of the Deity, appear to be present both in *Apoc. Ab.* and in the Ezekielian oracles since the anointed Cherub is first depicted as passing the fiery test (“in the midst of the stones of fire you walked”) and then failing it (“I brought forth fire from the midst of you; it consumed you, and I turned you to ashes”).

The Divine Face

There is no doubt that the symbolism of various Adamic currents permeates the story of Bar-Eshath. In this respect it is especially interesting to examine the aforementioned passage from *Apoc. Ab.* 6 where one finds some peculiar details accompanying the “fall” of the wooden idol. The text says that Bar-Eshath fell from the heights to the ground

³⁰ Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 14.

³¹ Launderville, “Ezekiel’s Cherub: A Promising Symbol or a Dangerous Idol?” 173–174.

and that his condition was changed *from greatness to smallness* (отъ велиства приде в малость).³² Although in the course of narration the wooden statue literally fell to the ground, it appears that the reference to the idol's fall has an additional symbolic dimension. The account of the infamous idol's "fall" again appears to be reminiscent of the story of the Protoplast. The "Adamic" aspect of the terminology in *Apoc. Ab.* 6:15 can be further clarified if the vocabulary of this passage is compared with the terminology found in another central pseudepigraphical account that survived in the Slavonic language, the 2 (*Slavonic*) *Apocalypse of Enoch*. There two conditions of Adam's corporeality – one original before the Fall and the other fallen after the transgression – are also conveyed through the terminology of greatness and smallness.

In the longer recension of 2 *Enoch* 30:10 the Lord reveals to the seventh antediluvian hero the mystery of the two conditions or "natures" of Adam, one original and the other fallen. It is striking that these conditions are rendered in the text through the familiar formulae of "greatness and smallness":

... From invisible and visible substances I created man.
 From both his natures come both death and life.
 And (as my) image he knows the word like (no) other creature.
 But even at his greatest he is small,
 and again at his smallest he is great.³³

Both recensions of the Slavonic text further invoke this terminology in 2 *Enoch* 44:1: "The Lord with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of *his own face*, both small and great (мала и велика),³⁴ the Lord created [them]."³⁵

It is intriguing that both the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and 2 *Enoch* use in their description of Bar-Eshath and Adam identical Slavonic terminology which unambiguously points to the Adamic "flavor" of the story of the wooden idol. The description of the fall of Bar-Eshath as the transition "from greatness to smallness" in *Apoc. Ab.* 6:14 further reinforces this connection with Adamic developments, given that

³² Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 116.

³³ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.152.

³⁴ Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 44, 96.

³⁵ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.170.

it recalls the tradition about the diminution of the Protoplast's stature after his transgression in Eden in *2 Enoch*.³⁶

Apoc. Ab. 6:15 depicts Bar-Eshath as the one whose "face" (Slav. лицо) has faded: "He fell from the heights to the ground, and he went from greatness to insignificance, and *the appearance of his face* (взор лица ero)³⁷ has faded."³⁸ The notion of Bar-Eshath's fading face is striking in that it again invokes conceptual developments found in *2 Enoch*, which widely operates with the imagery of divine and human "faces" and views "*panim*" not simply as a part of human or divine bodies but as a reference to their entire corporealities. The "fading of the face" in this context seems related to the adverse fate of the original body of the first human(s) which literally "faded" when their luminosity was lost as a result of the transgression in Eden. These terminological affinities demonstrate that the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* were well cognizant of the divine Face terminology and its prominent role in the divine body traditions.

Conclusion

At the conclusion of this study it should be noted that an investigation of Bar-Eshath's story can help clarify not only the broader ideological context of the anti-corporeal polemical currents found in the Slavonic apocalypse but also the textual issues pertaining to the provisional status of the passage with the arboreal tale. Since the passage containing the tale is absent from one of the important manuscripts of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the so-called Sylvester Codex, it has often been considered as a later interpolation³⁹ and scholars have been reluctant to attribute the arboreal tale to the original core of the apocalypse.⁴⁰ In this context the establishment of a relationship between the passage

³⁶ Cf. *2 Enoch* 30:10.

³⁷ Kulik traces this Slavonic expression to the Hebrew expression פניו פניו. See Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 14, n. 30; 72–73.

³⁸ Rubinkiewicz, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*, 116; Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 48.

³⁹ For example, G.H. Box and J.L. Landsman consider it as "a later interpolation." Box and Landsman, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, 41, note 5.

⁴⁰ For example, B. Philonenko-Sayar and M. Philonenko include the passage with the arboreal tale only in the footnotes of their critical edition of the text. Cf. Philonenko-Sayar and Philonenko, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, 48.

and the broader theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse is important. Our study demonstrates that the passage is consistent with the original theological argument of the work. The research therefore offers additional, this time theological, evidence that the story of the demoted tree does not seem to be an interpolation but may belong to the original core of the text, sharing with it common anti-anthropomorphic polemics consonant with its overall ideological agenda.

PART II

STUDIES IN 2 (*SLAVONIC*) *ENOCH*

THE PILLAR OF THE WORLD:
THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE SEVENTH
ANTEDILUVIAN HERO IN 2 (*SLAVONIC*) *ENOCH*

Introduction

In chapter 25 of the 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch* the Lord reveals to the translated antediluvian hero some unique details of the mysteries of creation found neither in earlier Enochic booklets nor in any other Second Temple Jewish materials. One of the important parts of this revelation deals with the order of events that preceded the visible creation. The Deity unveils to the seer that prior to visible creation he called out from nothing the luminous aeon Adoil, ordering him to become the foundation of the upper things. The account describes the process of Adoil's transmutation into the cornerstone of creation on which the Deity establishes his Throne.

Several distinguished students of Jewish mystical traditions, including Gershom Scholem and Moshe Idel, noticed that this protological account in chapter 25 dealing with the establishment of the created order appears to parallel the order of eschatological events narrated in chapter 65 where, during his short visit to earth, Enoch conveys to his children the mystery of the last times.¹ According to Enoch's instruction, after the final judgment time will collapse, and all the righteous of the world will be incorporated into a single luminous aeon. The description of this final aeon appears to bear striking similarities with the primordial aeon Adoil portrayed in chapter 25 as the foundation of the created order. The text also seems to hint that the righteous Enoch, translated to heaven and transformed into a luminous celestial creature, is the first fruit of this eschatological aeon that will eventually gather all the righteous into a single entity.

Moshe Idel observes that the motif of incorporation of the righteous into a single aeon recalls the idea of the righteous as the cosmological

¹ G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991) 98–101; M. Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism: Pillars, Lines, Ladders* (Past Incorporated. CEU Studies in Humanities, 2; Budapest: Central European University Press, 2005) 75ff.

foundation or pillar of the world reflected in some Jewish mystical writings. The idea of the righteous as the foundation of the world seems also present in 2 *Enoch* 66 where the final aeon is set in parallel with the protological foundation of the created order – the aeon Adoil.

In light of these correspondences it is intriguing that later Jewish mystical lore often portrays Enoch-Metatron as the cosmic foundation sustaining the world or even as the pillar linking the lower and upper worlds. It is possible that the roots of this tradition about the righteous antediluvian hero as the cosmic foundation of the world can be detected already in the Slavonic apocalypse where Enoch is portrayed as the first fruit of the future eschatological aeon of the righteous and the link between the upper and the lower worlds.

The purpose of this study is to explore the tradition of Enoch-Metatron as the foundation of the world and the possible roots of this motif in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*.

I. *The Protological Disintegration: Aeon Adoil as the Foundation of the World*

The theme of the secrets of creation occupies an important place in the Slavonic apocalypse. The significance of this esoteric subject among other mysteries which the translated patriarch received during his celestial trip is underlined by the fact that the secrets of creation were conveyed to Enoch personally by the Deity and that this knowledge was never revealed to any other creatures, including the angels. This supra-angelic disclosure given to the visionary after his celestial metamorphosis can be seen as the pinnacle of the esoteric knowledge obtained by the seventh antediluvian hero in the upper realm. Both shorter and longer recensions of 2 *Enoch* provide an extensive description of this revelation. The initial part of this mysterious disclosure deals with the order of events that had taken place immediately before the visible creation was established. In the shorter recension of 2 *Enoch* 25 the account has the following form:

And I commanded the lowest things: “Let one of the invisible things come out visibly!” And Adail descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great age. And I said to him, “Disintegrate yourself, Adail, and let what is disintegrated from you become visible.” And he disintegrated himself, and there came out from him the great age. And thus it carried all the creation which I had wished

to create. And I saw how good it was. And I placed for myself a throne, and I sat down on it. To the light I spoke: "You go up higher and be solidified and become the foundation for the highest things." And there is nothing higher than the light, except nothing itself. And I spoke, I straightened myself upward from my throne.²

The longer recension preserves the general narrative structure of the shorter one while slightly changing some terminology and supplying some small additional details:

And I commanded the lowest things: "Let one of the invisible things descend visibly!" And Adoil descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great light. And I said to him, "Disintegrate yourself, Adoil, and let what is born from you become visible." And he disintegrated himself, and there came out a very great light. And I was in the midst of the [great] light. And light out of light is carried thus. And the great age came out, and it revealed all the creation which I had thought up to create. And I saw how good it was. And I placed for myself a throne, and I sat down on it. And then to the light I spoke: "You go up higher (than the throne), and be solidified [much higher than the throne], and become the foundation for the highest things." And there is nothing higher than the light, except nothing itself. And again I bowed (?) myself, and I looked upward from my throne.³

The important character of the story is the aeon Adoil envisioned in the text as the starting point of creation.⁴ This enigmatic entity can be seen as the midwife of creation that comes to birth together with it through its creative act. The text emphasizes the enormous size of Adoil, defining him as "extremely large." He is portrayed to be "pregnant" with creation by containing a great aeon in the belly. It is not entirely clear if this is a description of the aeons emanating from one another, the process conveyed in the text through the enigmatic formulae "light out of light." It might also be plausible that Adoil's imagery is somehow connected with the Anthropos myth, especially its version in the *Corpus Hermeticum* where Anthropos becomes the blueprint for the created order by disintegrating into the physical realm, a motif conveyed in the *Poimandres* through the erotic metaphor of Anthropos falling in

² Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.145.

³ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.144.

⁴ On the etymology of the name Adoil, see A. Orlov, "Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," in: idem, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (SJS), 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 191–94.

love with Nature. In 2 *Enoch*, too, Adoil's disintegration provides the beginning for the visible reality and serves as the foundation on which God is able to establish the first visible manifestation of the created order – his Throne. It is significant that in both recensions the Deity also commands Adoil to become the foundation (Slav. *основание*) of the highest things.⁵ Adoil is thus clearly envisioned as the foundation or sustainer of creation. This terminological identification of Adoil with the concept of the foundation is important for our study.

Both recensions stress that Adoil's disintegration provides an important foundation on which the divine Throne is established. The seat of the Deity thus serves here as the locale from which God supervises the unfolding creation. The Throne plays a portentous role in the process of creation, being envisioned as the center of the created world.

Another significant feature relevant to our future discussion is the portrayal of Adoil in the longer recension as the "revealer." His revelations, however, encompass not verbal but rather "ontological" disclosure conveyed through the act of changing his nature. This mode of revelation is very important for our future analysis of Enoch's role as the revealer and his "ontological" participation in the disclosure of the eschatological aeon. Adoil's disintegration is identified in the text as the revelation of the created order: "And the great age came out, and it revealed all the creation which I had thought up to create."

Finally, another significant detail in the depiction of Adoil is the repeated references to his luminous nature. The emphasis on the luminosity of the primordial aeon is even more apparent in the longer recension which emphasizes not only the outer shining nature of the protological entity but also his internal luminous state depicted there as the pregnancy with great light: "And Adoil descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great light... there came out a very great light. And I was in the midst of the [great] light. And light out of light is carried thus."⁶

⁵ Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 25.

⁶ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.144.

II. *The Eschatological Reintegration: The Aeon of the Righteous*

The aforementioned primeval account of creation narrated by God in chapters 25 and 26 of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon is later invoked in a very abbreviated form in chapter 65 where Enoch seeks to transmit to his sons and people of the earth the knowledge he received during his celestial trip. In this rather terse account the reader also encounters some additional cosmological details pertaining not only to the beginning of creation but also to its final destiny.

Chapter 65 of *2 Enoch* deals with the final instructions which the translated hero of the faith hastens to unveil to humanity immediately before his second and final departure to heaven. The final place of this revelation among other mysteries conveyed by Enoch to humankind during his short visit underlines the significance of this disclosure. In many ways it appears to be set in parallel with the account of the Lord's own instructions about the secrets of creation which Enoch received also at the end of his heavenly trip from the Deity after the preliminary revelations conveyed to him by his psychopomps and angel Vereveil.

One of the intriguing features of this enigmatic revelation is that not only the format of the delivery of this final mystery transmitted by the seer to human recipients is set in parallel to the secrets of creation revealed by the Lord previously in chapters 25 and 26, but also that the peculiar content in many ways mirrors in rather abbreviated form the familiar conceptual framework of the protological revelation. The shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 65:1–11 reads:

Listen, my children! Before all things existed, (and) before all creation came about, the Lord established the age of creation, and after that he created all his creation, visible and invisible... When the whole creation, which the Lord has created, shall come to an end, and when each person will go to the Lord's great judgment, then the time periods will perish, and there will be neither years nor months nor days, and hours will no longer be counted; But they will constitute a single age. And all the righteous, who escape from the Lord's great judgment, will be collected together with the great age. And <the age> at the same time will unite with the righteous, and they will be eternal. And there will be among them neither weariness nor suffering nor affliction nor expectation of violence nor the pain of the night nor darkness. But they will have a great light for eternity, <and> an indestructible wall, and they will have a great paradise, the shelter of an eternal residence. How happy are the

righteous who will escape the Lord's great judgment, for their faces will shine forth like the sun.⁷

The longer recension provides the following description that differs in several details from the account found in the shorter recension:

Listen, my children! Before ever anything existed, and before ever any created thing was created, the Lord created the whole of his creation, visible and invisible. . . . And when the whole of creation, visible and invisible, which the Lord has created, shall come to an end, then each person will go to the Lord's great judgment. And then all time will perish, and afterward there will be neither years nor months nor days nor hours. They will be dissipated, and after that they will not be reckoned. But they will constitute a single age. And all the righteous, who escape from the Lord's great judgment, will be collected together into the great age. And the great age will come about for the righteous, and it will be eternal. And after that there will be among them neither weariness <nor sickness> nor affliction nor worry nor want nor debilitation nor night nor darkness. But they will have a great light, a great indestructible light, and paradise, great and incorruptible. For everything corruptible will pass away, and the incorruptible will come into being, and will be the shelter of the eternal residences.⁸

The patriarch begins his narration with references to the familiar theme of the primeval aeon already familiar to the reader from the story found in chapter 25. These protological events responsible for the unfolding of creation are then set in parallel with the chain of eschatological actions that, according to the authors of the apocalypse, will reintegrate the whole creation into a single aeon which will collect all the righteous of the world. According to the text, "all the righteous, who escape from the Lord's great judgment, will be collected together with the great age." The final consummation of all creation into a single aeon recalls the initial protological disintegration of Adoil who once gave birth to the multiplicity of the created forms. The account describes the cataclysmic collapse of the spatial and the temporal order that according to the text will lead to a situation when "all time will perish, and afterward there will be neither years nor months nor days nor hours. They will be dissipated, and after that they will not be reckoned. . . ."

⁷ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.191–193.

⁸ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190–192.

It appears that the final consummation of the created order in many ways “reverses” its protological unfolding in such a way that reintegration into the final aeon invokes memory of the disintegration of the primeval aeon Adoil. There are several distinctive features that in many ways unify both aeonic subjects.

The Motif of Luminosity

One of these features includes the luminosity of both entities. As may be recalled, the symbolism of light permeates the depiction of Adoil who according to 2 *Enoch*'s story not only has a luminous nature, but also is pregnant with the great light. This imagery of the external and internal luminous nature of the primeval aeon is conveyed in the Slavonic apocalypse through the expression “light out of light.” Similar to the protological “age,” the eschatological aeon is also resplendent with luminosity. Thus according to the longer recension of 2 *Enoch* 65:10, the righteous constituting the final aeon will “have a great light, a great indestructible light.” The shorter recension provides some additional details about the luminosity of the final aeon by telling that the faces of the righteous gathered there “will shine forth like the sun.”

The Righteous as the Foundation

As mentioned earlier, in the protological account dealing with the creation of the world Adoil is depicted as the foundation (Slav. *основание*) of the visible things, both earthly as well as heavenly, including the very seat of the Deity, his Throne. In view of the aforementioned parallelism between the descriptions of the first and the last aeons, it appears that the “eschatological age” is also connected with the idea of the foundation. Although the description of the eschatological aeon does not directly refer to this entity as the foundation, this idea is present in the text through several implicit details.

In commenting on the identification of the final aeon with the righteous, Moshe Idel notes that in Jewish mysticism the righteous are often portrayed as the cosmological foundation of the world. In light of this identification Idel proposes that in 2 *Enoch* the implicit connection might exist between the protological and eschatological foundations, the first represented by the primeval aeon Adoil and the second by the eschatological aeon of the righteous.

In his book about the symbolism of pillars in Jewish mysticism, Idel refers to a passage from the *Book of Bahir* that depicts the righteous person as the pillar reaching the heaven:

There is a pillar from earth to heaven, and its name is *Tzaddiq*, according to the name of righteous men. And when there are righteous men in the world, then the pillar is strengthened, but if not – it becomes weak. And it supports the entire world, as it is written: “the righteous are the foundation of the world.” But if it is weakened, it cannot support the world. This is the reason why even if there is only one righteous [in the world], he maintains the world.⁹

Idel points to the assumption about the dual status of the righteous discernable in the *Book of Bahir*'s passage: there are righteous men in the world, but there is also a cosmic righteous and the former depend on the latter.¹⁰ Idel traces the origins of this concept of the cosmic righteous to the conceptual developments found in the Slavonic Enoch where “the Great Aion, which is identical to the foundation, passes for the righteous.”¹¹

Idel also discusses the tradition found in *b. Hag. 12b* where the righteous are depicted not only as the ethical but also as the cosmological foundation of the world:

It is taught: R. Jose says: Alas for people that they see but know not what they see, they stand but know not on what they stand. What does the earth rest on? On the pillars, for it is said: Who shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble.... But the Sages say: [The world] rests on twelve pillars, for it is said: He set the borders to the peoples according to the number [of the tribes] of the children of Israel. And some say seven pillars, for it is said; she hath hewn out her seven pillars. R. Eleazar b. Shammua says: [It rests] on one pillar, and its name is “Righteous,” for it is said: But “Righteous” is the foundation of the world.¹²

It may be tempting to construe these rabbinic passages as mere references to the moral behavior that “sustains” the ethical order of the world. Idel, however, observes that the passage from the *Hagigah* has not just a moral but also a cosmological significance. He remarks that “...the *Hagigah*, a short but highly influential passage, is a part of

⁹ *The Book of Bahir* (ed. D. Abrams; Los Angeles: Cherub, 1994) 160–61.

¹⁰ Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism*, 80.

¹¹ Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism*, 81.

¹² *b. Hag. 12b*.

mythical cosmology rather than a mode of making sense of religious behavior. To be clear, the basic context of the discussion is cosmology, and its influence on the way in which the righteous should be understood is only an aside.”¹³

One of the features found in the *Hagigah*'s account is the reference to the sevenfold nature of the world's foundation.¹⁴ In this respect it is intriguing that the longer recension of 2 *Enoch* 66:8 insists on the sevenfold nature of the final aeon. According to the text: "...for in that age everything is estimated sevenfold – light and darkness and food and enjoyment and misery and paradise and tortures...."¹⁵ The emphasis on the sevenfold nature of the final aeon in 2 *Enoch* might point to parallels to the later rabbinic tradition about the seven pillars or foundations on which the earth stands.¹⁶

III. *Enoch-Metatron as the Foundation of the World*

Enoch's Righteousness

It does not seem coincidental that the portentous revelation about the final aeon of the righteous comes from the mouth of the seventh antediluvian patriarch, the hero known in Jewish lore for his exemplary righteousness. In light of this connection the motif of Enoch's righteousness should be explored more closely.

The epithet "righteous man" becomes an important designation of the seventh antediluvian hero already in the beginning of his story

¹³ Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism*, 75.

¹⁴ The passage found in the *Book of Zohar* also speaks about the seven pillars that sustain the creation. *Zohar* 1.231a reads: "Rabbi Jose began by quoting 'Upon that were its foundations fastened?' (Job 38:6). This verse was spoken by the Holy One, blessed be He, because when He created the world He created it upon pillars, the seven pillars of the world, as it is said 'She has hewn out her seven pillars' (Proverbs 9:1), but it is not known what these seven pillars stand upon, for it is a profound mystery, the most recondite of all." I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: Anthology of Texts* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1994) 2.571. Further in the *Zohar* the foundation stone of creation which stands in the center of the world representing the foundation of everything defined in the text as "the basis and sustenance of the world" – is described as an entity with "seven eyes": "Come and see. There are seven eyes on this stone, as it is said 'Upon one stone are seven eyes' (Zech 3:9)." Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 2.572.

¹⁵ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.194.

¹⁶ Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism*, 75.

where his righteousness is juxtaposed to the wickedness of the antediluvian generation and the transgressions of the Watchers. Thus already in the very first verses of one of the earliest Enochic booklets, the *Book of the Watchers* (1 Enoch 1:2), the patriarch is defined as a righteous man. In 1 Enoch 15:1 we hear again the same designation that now comes from the mouth of the Deity himself: “And he answered me and said to me with his voice: ‘Hear! Do not be afraid, Enoch, (you) righteous man and scribe of righteousness...’”¹⁷ Besides the patriarch’s exemplary behavior that allowed him to become the sign of righteousness for future generations, this passage also points to another important office of the seventh antediluvian hero as the teacher of righteousness – an office in which he was desperately attempting to rescue and sustain the moral and cosmological order of the antediluvian world by delivering calls to repentance and oracles of doom which he received from God and angels. Early Enochic materials (1 Enoch 12:4 and 1 Enoch 15:11) therefore repeatedly define him as the scribe of righteousness.¹⁸

Enoch’s connection with the eschatological destiny of the righteous may be already ascertained in the early Enochic writings. Thus according to 1 Enoch, the patriarch travels to the enigmatic location “the paradise of righteousness,” which might represent here another designation for the eschatological gathering of the righteous.

As has already been noted, early Enoch booklets seek to highlight the contrast between the righteousness of Enoch and the unrighteousness of the antediluvian generation where interference of the Watchers causes moral and cosmological collapse leading the environment and the human race toward an imminent catastrophe. In this catastrophic chain of events affecting the whole fabric of creation, Enoch can be seen as the righteous one who attempts to sustain the created order, in many ways serving as the pillar of the antediluvian world. This important role of the seventh antediluvian hero as the sustainer and protector of creation is reaffirmed in the *Book of Jubilees* that depicts the patriarch as the cosmic dam against the waters of the Flood. Thus

¹⁷ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.100.

¹⁸ Josef Milik suggests that the honorific “scribe of righteousness” can be related to the Aramaic term ספר קושטא. Cf. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 191. George Nickelsburg proposes that the title can be related to the Aramaic ספר די קושטא. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch I: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 65.

according to *Jub.* 4:24, thanks to Enoch “the flood water did not come on any of the land of Eden because he was placed there as a sign and to testify against all people in order to tell all the deeds of history until the day of judgment.”¹⁹

Enoch’s role as the pillar sustaining the world was not forgotten in later Jewish materials. Idel’s research identifies an important tradition preserved in later Jewish mysticism that portrays the seventh antediluvian hero as the foundation which sustains the world: “... the righteous is the foundation of the world. For [the sake of] one [single] righteous the world is maintained and it is Enoch the son of Yared.”²⁰ It is apparent that the author(s) of this tradition, which might stem from the early Enochic literature, were informed by the extra-biblical roles and actions of the seventh patriarch who served there as the pillar of the world attempting to sustain the moral and cosmological order of creation in the turmoil of the antediluvian generation.

It should be noted that this understanding of Enoch as the pillar or the foundation of the world is not atypical in Jewish mystical lore where the patriarch’s heavenly counterpart, the supreme angel Metatron, was traditionally understood as the force sustaining the world. These cosmological functions were exhibited first in Metatron’s role as the governor or the prince of the world²¹ (שר העולם) – an office already discernable in *2 Enoch*²² – and further developed in Hekhalot mysticism, including the *Sefer Hekhalot*.²³ It is intriguing that Enoch-Metatron’s governance of the world includes not only administrative functions but also the duty of the physical sustenance of the world. Moshe Idel refers to the treatise *The Seventy Names of Metatron* where the angel and God seize the world in their hands.²⁴ This motif of the

¹⁹ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.28.

²⁰ Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism*, 85.

²¹ The term “world” (עולם) in the angelic title appears to signify the entire creation. Peter Schäfer observes that in rabbinic literature the Prince of the World is understood as an angel set over the whole creation. His duties include praying together with the earth for the coming of the Messiah and praising God’s creative work. P. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorsestellung* (SJ, 8; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975) 55.

²² On the role of Enoch as the Governor of the World in *2 Enoch*, see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 159–161.

²³ Igor Tantlevskij observes that in *3 Enoch* 8, Enoch-Metatron has qualities by which, according to *b. Hag.* 12a and *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* A 27:43, the world was created and is sustained. I.R. Tantlevskij, *Knigi Enoha* (Moscow/Jerusalem: Gesharim, 2000) 185 [in Russian].

²⁴ Idel, *Ascensions on High in Jewish Mysticism*, 88.

Deity and his vice-regent grasping the universe in their cosmic hands invokes the conceptual developments found in the *Shi'ur Qomah* and Hekhalot materials where Enoch-Metatron possesses a cosmic corporeality comparable to the physique of the Deity and is depicted as the measurement of the divine body.²⁵

The question, however, remains about how all these later Jewish testimonies portraying Enoch-Metatron as the foundation or the pillar of the world are related to the developments found in *2 Enoch*. Is it possible that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse try to depict Enoch as the eschatological pillar of the world who already participates in the final aeon of the righteous and can thus be seen as the first fruit of this eschatological gathering? In this respect, like Adoïl who anticipates the protological aeon that gives the beginning to all creation, Enoch too anticipates the future eschatological aeon when the creation will collapse and all the righteous will be united together. Both Adoïl and Enoch can therefore be seen as outstanding exemplars preordained to manifest the protological and eschatological states through their ontological conditions, thus serving as “personifications” of these aeons. Both heroes are united by the quality of their luminosity that serves as an important sign of the beginning and the end of time.

Enoch's Luminosity

2 Enoch 65:11 elaborates the condition of the righteous in the final aeon depicting them as luminous beings: “How happy are the righteous who will escape the Lord's great judgment, for their faces will shine forth like the sun.”²⁶ This tradition of the righteous humans emitting light seems to be implicitly tied in the text to the story of its revealer, the seventh antediluvian patriarch, who himself several chapters earlier underwent a dramatic luminous transformation.

The passage may thus suggest that Enoch, who is depicted in chapter 22 as undergoing luminous metamorphosis before the Face of God

²⁵ One such description can be found in *Synopse* §12 (*3 Enoch* 9) which portrays the metamorphosis of Enoch's body into a gigantic extent matching the world in length and breadth: “I was enlarged and increased in size till I matched the world in length and breadth. He made to grow on me 72 wings, 36 on one side and 36 on the other, and each single wing covered the entire world...” Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.263.

²⁶ Andersen, “3 Enoch,” 1.193. See also *2 Enoch* 66:7 (the longer recension): “How happy are the righteous who shall escape the Lord's great judgment; for they will be made to shine seven times brighter than the sun.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.194.

that turns him into a shining celestial creature, becomes the very first fruit of this future aeon where all righteous persons would eventually regain the condition of luminosity. The eschatological luminosity here points to the protological condition of Adoïl and, more importantly, to the incorruptible luminous state of the Protoplast, a condition that humanity lost after Adam's fall.

Incorruptibility of Enoch

Enoch's metamorphosis into a luminous celestial creature presupposes another eschatological trait mentioned in his descriptions of the final aeon of the righteous, namely the state of incorruptibility. In *2 Enoch* 65:8–10 Enoch says that at the end of times all the righteous who will escape the Lord's great judgment will eventually attain the condition of incorruptibility since they "will be collected together into the great age. . . . But they will have a great light, a great indestructible light, and paradise, great and incorruptible. For everything corruptible will pass away, and the incorruptible will come into being, and will be the shelter of the eternal residences."²⁷

The longer recension's emphasis on the incorruptibility of the future condition of the righteous gathered in the final aeon seems again to recall the patriarch's newly acquired celestial state. One of the important features hinting at the patriarch's incorruptible nature is revealed during his brief visit to earth when, after his luminous transformation, God sends him back to the lower realm to deliver final directions to his children. In *2 Enoch* 56, during Enoch's instructions, Methuselah asks his father for a blessing so that he may prepare some food for him to eat. The translated hero, however, politely declines the offer to share earthly food lamenting that nothing earthly is agreeable with his current condition:

Listen, child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, food has not come into me, and earthly pleasure my soul does not remember; nor do I desire anything earthly (*2 Enoch* 56:2, the longer recension).²⁸

In the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*, the patriarch's rejection of food is even more decisive: "Listen, my child! Since the time when the Lord

²⁷ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.192.

²⁸ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.182.

anointed me with the ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food.”²⁹ Here an important link is made between the changes in his nature during his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory and his newly acquired condition of incorruptibility, which articulates the future state of the righteous in the final aeon.

Here again, through his connection with the eschatological state of incorruptibility, Enoch appears to be fashioned as the first fruit of the future aeon of the righteous, or maybe even as the one who already joined this final age. In this respect it is notable that in *2 Enoch* 55 Enoch tells his sons before his final departure that he shall go up to the highest heaven into his “eternal inheritance.”³⁰

Enoch as the Revealer

As has been previously mentioned, the cosmological account found in *2 Enoch* identifies Adoil as the revealer. The process of his disintegration in the narrative is rendered as the *revelation* of the created order: “And the great age came out, and it revealed all the creation which I had thought up to create.”³¹

It is intriguing that in the Slavonic apocalypse Enoch is not only envisioned as the first fruit of the last age by bearing many future qualities of this eschatological entity, but he also testifies about it by delivering a verbal revelation about this aeon, the disclosure that never appears in any other part of the pseudepigraphon, even in the elaborated address of the Deity who conveys to the seer the innermost secrets of the universe. The role of the seventh antediluvian hero as the revealer of the most recondite mysteries of the world is not an invention of the *2 Enoch* authors since this office appears as a constant feature of the hero’s biography, already found in the Mesopotamian materials constituting the conceptual background for this figure. Thus one of his Mesopotamian prototypes, the seventh antediluvian king Enmeduranki, is often described as the revealer and the “guardian (lit. guarding) of the secrets (*nāšir pirišti*) of the great gods.”³² These titles

²⁹ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.183.

³⁰ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.182–183.

³¹ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.144.

³² H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 188.

anticipate the future roles of the patriarch as the revealer and expert in secrets in the Enochic tradition and his designation as יודע רזים (“Knower of Secrets”) in the Metatron lore.³³ Esoteric dissemination will remain one of the major functions of the seventh patriarch in various Enochic traditions that depict him sharing astronomical, meteorological, calendarical, and eschatological knowledge with his sons and other people during his short visit to earth. Knowledge of secrets will also play a significant part in Metatron’s duties in the Merkabah tradition where he will be responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the princes under him, as well as to humankind.

What is striking in 2 *Enoch*, however, is that the seventh antediluvian patriarch reveals not only by word of mouth but by the very nature of his ontological situation – i.e., he discloses the condition of the last age through his unique transformation and his righteousness. He thus in many ways anticipates in the present age the things that will occur at the end of time when the righteous of this world will be unified together. Like Adoil who “reveals” the protological aeon concealed in his “belly” by his very nature and disintegration, Enoch too is “pregnant” with the eschatological aeon and thus manifests an ontological state that all the righteous will eventually acquire.

Enoch as the Sacerdotal Foundation

In our previous discussion about the primordial “pillar” Adoil, it has been noted that he seems to be identified with the upper sacred foundation that serves as the basis for the heavenly Temple represented by the Throne of God which is envisioned in the text as the center of the created order. It is intriguing that, similar to Adoil who serves as the upper foundation of the heavenly Temple, Enoch appears to be envisioned as the sacerdotal foundation of the earthly Temple. In 2 *Enoch* immediately after Enoch’s instructions to his sons before his second and final ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers constructed an altar at Akhuzan,³⁴ the exact location from which Enoch had been taken up. The place

³³ John Collins notes that “Enoch’s role as revealer is...illuminated by the parallel with Enmeduranki. The Sumerian king was admitted into the divine assembly and shown mysteries that included the tablets of heaven and the techniques of divination.” J.J. Collins, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (SJSJ, 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 45.

³⁴ Slav. *Ахузань*.

of the hero's departure then becomes envisioned in the text as the sacerdotal center of the earthly realm where priestly initiations and expiatory sacrifices involving animal blood take place. It is no coincidence, therefore, that *2 Enoch* identifies the place Akhuzan as the center of the world. This enigmatic Slavonic word is traced by scholars to the Hebrew word אֶחָזָא, "special property of God," which in Ezek 48:20–21 is applied to Jerusalem and the Temple.³⁵

Here, similar to Adoil's protological role connected to the motif of the Throne of the Deity, Enoch's eschatological role is tied to the idea of the earthly counterpart of the Throne, the earthly Temple. The vertical axis of the Throne and the Temple is thus explicitly reaffirmed in the text, as is the horizontal line connecting the protological and eschatological events.

Later in the text Akhuzan also receives the additional protological reaffirmation of being identified with the place of Adam's creation. Here the protological and eschatological "pillars" are erected on the same place and the starting point of creation becomes the place of the beginning of the eschatological consummation.

Enoch as the Redeemer

In chapter 64 of the longer recension of the Slavonic apocalypse, an interesting tradition can be found pertaining to the patriarch's unique role as redeemer of humanity. The chapter depicts the prostration of the elders of the people and of the whole community before Enoch at the place of his second departure to heaven. The people who came to bow down before the patriarch delivered to Enoch the following address:

O our father, Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your [sons], and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today. For you will be glorified in front of the face [of the Lord for eternity], because you are the one whom the Lord chose in preference to all the people upon the earth; and he appointed you to be the one who makes a written record of all his creation, visible and invisible, and the one who carried away the sin of mankind (*2 Enoch* 64:4–5).³⁶

³⁵ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 114.

³⁶ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190.

An important detail in this address is Enoch's designation as "the one who carried away the sin of humankind." This role of redeemer is intriguing and might be related to his salvific mission in the destiny of the future aeon of the righteous.³⁷ Here Enoch is envisioned not simply as one among many other righteous persons nor as the righteous person *par excellence*, but he is the one who is able to bring others to righteousness.

It also appears to be significant that the patriarch's redeeming role is conflated in this passage with the theme of visible and invisible creation and his role as the recorder and revealer of cosmological knowledge.³⁸ Here again, as in the case of Adoil who serves as the link

³⁷ For criticism of the concept of Enoch as redeemer, see Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (SJS), 115; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 220ff. While Macaskill's study is important for providing critical insights in the issues of eschatology in the text and especially the role of Enoch as redeemer, his arguments against the possibility of the redeeming office of the seventh antediluvian hero in 2 *Enoch* appear to be weakened by his misunderstanding of the Slavonic terminology that stands behind the important title of Enoch as redeemer which is rendered in the text through the Slavonic words "otjatel'"/"otimitel'." These nouns, which can be translated literally as the "taker" of human sin(s), are conveyed in Andersen's English translation through the expression "the one who is taking out the human sin(s)." Andersen's English rendering of the term appears to be a source of confusion for Macaskill who interprets the Slavonic nouns "otjatel'"/"otimitel'" as "resultative participles." Cf. Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, 225. It shows that Macaskill does not clearly understand the original Slavonic form of this title of Enoch which serves as the starting point for his argument and in many ways constitutes the terminological nexus of his office as the redeemer of humanity. Still his general analysis of other aspects of the text's eschatology is useful, though it is quite strange that his book that deals with the eschatological dimensions of the text manages to completely ignore the account of the final age and Enoch's eschatological role in relation to this entity.

³⁸ The importance of Enoch's writings in the eschatological time is reaffirmed in 2 *Enoch* where the motif of the glorified righteous is invoked in the context of the eschatological time: "And I will leave a righteous man from your tribe, together with all his house, who will act according to my will. And from his seed another generation will rise, after many, but out of them many will be very gluttonous. Then at the conclusion of that generation the books in your handwriting will be revealed, and those of your fathers, and the earthly guardians (*stražie zemnye*) [of these books] will show them to the Men of Faith (*mužem' věrnym*), the ones who are loyal to me, who do not invoke my name invalidly. And they will be recounted to that generation, and they will be glorified in the end more than in the beginning." 2 *Enoch* 35:1–3 (the longer recension). Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 35. The shorter recension offers a similar description: "And I will leave a righteous man from your tribe, together with all his house, who will act according to my will. And from his seed another generation will arise, the last of many, and very gluttonous. Then at the conclusion of that generation the books in your handwriting will be revealed, and those of your fathers, and the earthly guardians (*stražie zemnye*) [of these books] will show them to the Men of Faith (*mužem' věrnym*). And they will

between the invisible and visible creation, Enoch holds knowledge of the plan not only in relation to the visible created order but also to its invisible counterpart.

Conclusion

The current study explored the roots of Enoch-Metatron's role as the foundation or pillar of the world prominent in later Jewish mysticism. Although in 2 *Enoch* the seventh antediluvian hero is never directly named as either the foundation or the pillar, his eschatological role and participation in the eschatological aeon depicts him as the counterpart of the primordial foundation, the luminous aeon Adoil. In view of the later offices of Enoch-Metatron in the Hekhalot materials where the translated hero is portrayed as the sustainer of the created order, it is possible that in the Slavonic apocalypse one can see the rudimentary theological unfolding toward understanding Enoch-Metatron as the eschatological foundation of the world. These intriguing traditions again point to the formative value of the conceptual developments found in the Slavonic apocalypse that in many ways serve as a bridge between Jewish apocalypticism and early Jewish mysticism.

be recounted to that generation, and they will be glorified in the end more than in the beginning." 2 *Enoch* 35:1–3 (the shorter recension). Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 93.

THE HEIR OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND THE KING OF
RIGHTEOUSNESS: THE PRIESTLY NOACHIC POLEMICS IN
2 ENOCH AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Introduction

It has been previously noted that the Epistle to the Hebrews engages in a consistent polemic against the figure of Moses and the Mosaic regulations about the sanctuary and the sacerdotal prescriptions depicting animal sacrifices as inferior, temporary offerings as compared with the eternal sacrifice of Jesus.¹ Notwithstanding the importance of the

¹ On Moses traditions in the Epistle to the Hebrews, see: E.L. Allen, "Jesus and Moses in the New Testament," *ExpTimes* 67 (1955–56) 104–6; C. Chavasse, "Jesus: Christ and Moses," *Theol* 54 (1951) 244–50; M.R. D'Angelo, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* (SBLDS, 42; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1979); É. Grässer, "Mose und Jesus: Zur Auslegung von Hebr 3:1–6," *ZNW* 75 (1984) 2–23; D.M. Hay, "Moses through New Testament Spectacles," *Int* 44 (1990) 240–252; P.R. Jones, "The Figure of Moses as a Heuristic Device for Understanding the Pastoral Intent of Hebrews," *RevExp* 76 (1979) 95–107. On Mosaic traditions, see also: R. Bloch, "Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique," in: *Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance* (ed. H. Cazelles; Tournai, New York: Desclée, 1955) 93–167; G.W. Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOTSup., 57; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1988); C. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*; *idem*, "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity," *DSD* 3 (1996) 236–252; *idem*, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 136ff.; J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 90–94; S.J. Hafemann, "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey," *JSP* 7 (1990) 79–104; C.R. Holladay, "The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian," *SBLSP* (1976) 447–52; P.W. van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34 (1983) 21–29; *idem*, "Some Notes on the Exagoge of Ezekiel," *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 364–5; L. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 58ff; H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); K. Kuiper, "Le poète juif Ezéchiël," *Revue des études juives* 46 (1903) 174ff; W.A. Meeks, "Moses as God and King," in: *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. J. Neusner; Studies in the History of Religions; Supplements to Numen, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968) 354–371; *idem*, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967); A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *SBLSP* 39 (2000) 130–147; A. Schalit, *Untersuchungen zur Assumptio Mosis* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, 17; Leiden: Brill, 1989); J.P. Schultz, "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law," *JQR* 61 (1970–71) 282–307; J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993); R. Van De Water, "Moses' Exaltation: Pre-Christian?" *JSP* 21 (2000) 59–69.

figure of Moses in the cultic debates in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the targets of the text's polemics may go beyond Mosaic sacrificial precepts and the priestly practices of the descendants of Levi and include other priestly traditions in the Jewish milieu of the late Second Temple period.

Recent scholarship has become increasingly aware of the complexity of the social, political, and theological climate of the late Second Temple period when the various sacerdotal groups and clans were competing for the primacy and authority of their priestly legacy. This contention-ridden sacerdotal environment created a whole gallery of ideal priestly figures that, along with traditional sacerdotal servants like Levi, Aaron, and Simon, also included other characters of primeval and Israelite history, such as Enoch, Methuselah, Noah, Shem, Melchisedek, Abraham, and others. The choice in depicting primeval heroes as ideal priests does not seem coincidental and provides further support for the intensity of the priestly rivalry in which the primacy of the sacerdotal hero was determined by, among other things, the antiquity of his cultic initiations and practices acquired long before the relevant competitors. In this respect the sacerdotal knowledge and initiations received by Enoch and Noah from God in ante- and post-diluvian time were more ancient than the disclosures about sacrificial rites and sanctuary received by Moses many centuries later on Mount Sinai.

One should note that ideal priestly figures were not the exclusive property of any one group but were often used by several rival traditions for legitimating distinctive priestly genealogies and claims. An illustration of this polemical feature will be shown later in the study through the ideal priestly figure of Melchisedek which was used by various, sometimes, rival traditions.²

² On Melchisedek traditions, see: I. Amusin, "Новый эсхатологический текст из Кумрана (11QMelchizedek)," *Вестник Древней Истории* 3 (1967) 45–62; *idem*, *Тексты Кумрана* (Памятники письменности Востока, 33/1; Moscow: Nauka, 1971); V. Aptowitz, "Malkizedek. Zu den Sagen der Agada," *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 70 (1926) 93–113; A. Aschim, "Melchizedek the Liberator: An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?" in: *Society of Biblical Literature 1996 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1996) 243–58; C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov," *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 445–70; A. Caquot, "La pérennité du sacerdoce," *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme* (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1978) 109–16; A.R. Carmona, "La figura de Melquisedec en la literatura targumica," *EstBib* 37 (1978) 79–102; G.L. Cockerill, *The Melchizedek Christology in Heb. 7:1–28* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979); J. Davila, "Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven," *SBLSP* 35 (1996) 259–72; *idem*, "Melchizedek: King, Priest, and God," in: *The Seductiveness of Jewish Myth: Challenge or Response?* (ed. S. Daniel Breslauer; Albany, N.Y.: SUNY, 1997) 217–234; *idem*, "Melchizedek, the

In view of this complexity of the priestly climate of the late Second Temple period, it appears that in his efforts to demonstrate the

'Youth,' and Jesus," in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ, 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 248–274; M. De Jonge and A.S. Van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1965–6) 301–26; M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 115–35; F. du Toit Laubscher, "God's Angel of Truth and Melchizedek. A note on 11 Q Melh 13b," *JSJ* (1972) 46–51; J. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBL SBS, 5; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974) 245–67; *idem*, "'Now This Melchizedek . . .'" (Heb. 7:1)," in: *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBL SBS, 5; Missoula MT: Scholars Press, 1974) 221–243; *idem*, "Melchizedek in the MT, LXX, and the NT," *Biblica* 81 (2000) 63–69; J. Gammie, "Loc of the Melchizedek Tradition of Gen 14:18–20," *JBL* 90 (1971) 385–96; F. García Martínez, "4Q Amram B 1:14; ¿Melkiresa o Melki-sedeq?" *RevQ* 12 (1985) 111–114, *idem*, "Las tradiciones sobre Melquisedec en los manuscritos de Qumrán," *Biblica* 81 (2000) 70–80; C. Gianotto, *Melchizedek e la sua tipologia: Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche (sec II a.C.-sec. III d.C)* (SrivB, 12; Brescia: Paideia, 1984); I. Gruenwald, "The Messianic Image of Melchizedek," *Mahanayim* 124 (1970) 88–98 (in Hebrew); F. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS, 30; Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University, 1976); P. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa* (CBQMS, 10; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); R.N. Longenecker, "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews: A Study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression of New Testament Thought," in: *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology* (ed. R. Guelich; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 161–185; J.L. Marshall, "Melchizedek in Hebrews, Philo, and Justin Martyr," *SE* 7 (1982) 339–342; M. McNamara, "Melchizedek: Gen 14, 17–20 in the Targums, in Rabbinic and Early Christian Literature," *Biblica* 81 (2000) 1–31; O. Michel, "Melchizedek," *TDNT* 4.568–71; A. Orlov, "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *JSJ* 31 (2000) 23–38; B. Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek in the First Tractate of the Unpublished Coptic-Gnostic Codex IX from Nag Hammadi," *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religion* (Supplements to Numen, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 200–8; *idem*, "The Figure Melchizedek in Gnostic Literature," in: *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 108–123; J. Petuchowski, "The Controversial Figure of Melchizedek," *HUCA* 28 (1957) 127–36; S.E. Robinson, "The Apocryphal Story of Melchizedek," *JSJ* 18 (1987) 26–39; D.W. Rooke, "Jesus as Royal Priest: Reflections on the Interpretation of the Melchizedek Tradition in Heb 7," *Biblica* 81 (2000) 81–94; H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)," *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. W. Baumgartner; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1950) 461–72; C. Schmidt and V. MacDermot, *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex* (NHS, XIII; Leiden: Brill, 1978); M. Simon, "Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 17 (1937) 58–93; R. Smith, "Abram and Melchizedek (Gen 14, 18–20)," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* LXXXVII (1965) 129–53; C. Spicq, "Melchisédech et l'Épître aux Hébreux," *ATH* 7 (1946) 69–82; H. Stork, *Die sogenannten Melchizedekianer mit Untersuchungen ihrer Quellen auf Gedankengehalt und dogmengeschichtliche Entwicklung* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur, 8/2; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1928); G. Vajda, "Melchisédech dans la mythologie ismaélienne," *Journal Asiatique* 234 (1943–1945) 173–83; G. Wuttke, *Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese* (BZNW, 5; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1927).

exclusivity of the priestly figure of Jesus and the superiority of his sacrifice, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was not able to ignore other contemporary Jewish priestly traditions by limiting his polemics solely to deconstructing the priestly significance of the Mosaic tradition. In fact, this study will argue that along with explicit polemics against Mosaic sacrificial precepts and practices, the Epistle to the Hebrews ventures into more subtle debates with the priestly Noachic tradition, which in the late Second Temple period often posited as an ideological counterpart to the official priestly office associated with the Jerusalem Temple. The study will also suggest that the figure of Melchisedek – which, as will be seen, by the first century CE was already adopted in the theological framework of the priestly Noachic tradition – is posited in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as in some Second Temple Jewish texts, as a polemical counterpart to Noah. It seems that by adopting the Melchisedek figure the Epistle to the Hebrews not only explicitly argues against Mosaic legacy but also implicitly polemicalizes with the Noachic tradition³ at the same time using its potential

³ On Noachic traditions, see: M. Bernstein, “Noah and the Flood at Qumran,” *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ, 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 199–231; D. Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T. A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 123–50; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 24–44; *idem*, “Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 86–108; N. Koltun-Fromm, “Aphrahat and the Rabbis on Noah’s Righteousness in Light of the Jewish-Christian Polemics,” in: *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation* (eds. J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay; TEG, 5; Louvain: Peeters, 1997) 57–71; H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 242–54; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); A. Orlov, “‘Noah’s Younger Brother’: Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch,” *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–73; *idem*, “Noah’s Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–87; *idem*, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 304–333; J. Reeves, “Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?” *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–15; J. M. Scott, “Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of Qumran,” *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPS, 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 368–81; R.C. Steiner, “The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a ‘Lost’ Work,” *DSD* 2 (1995) 66–71; M. Stone, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133–49; *idem*, “Noah, Books of,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 12.1198; J. VanderKam, “The Righteousness of Noah,”

for further enhancement of the priestly profile of the King of Salem who serves in the book as the ideal priestly prototype of Jesus.

I. *Why Melchisedek?*

Melchisedek in 2 Enoch

As was already noted, in the late Second Temple period the sacerdotal legacy of the Mosaic revelation came under fierce attack from some priestly groups. The Epistle to the Hebrews' authors were not the first to challenge the sacerdotal significance of the Mosaic legacy. There was another important priestly trajectory existing probably from the fourth or third century BCE, that was, as the later position of the Epistle to the Hebrews, rival to the Mosaic sacerdotal tradition. This trend which was associated with early Enochic and Noachic materials, attempted to offer a viable ideological alternative to the Mosaic tradition by means of speculating on the pre-Mosaic priestly traditions, depicting Enoch and Noah as custodians of the more ancient cultic revelation and practice that had existed long before Levi, Moses, and Aaron.⁴ In this rival paradigm Enoch and Noah were depicted as the priestly figures associated with the celestial and earthly sanctuaries and

Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms (eds. J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS, 12; Chico: Scholars, 1980) 13–32; *idem*, “The Birth of Noah,” *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6; Krakow: Enigma, 1992) 213–31; C. Werman, “Qumran and the Book of Noah,” *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 171–81.

⁴ On the priestly profile of Enoch, see: M. Himmelfarb, “The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira,” in: *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (eds. J. Scott and P. Simpson-Housley; New York: Greenwood Press, 1991) 63–78; *idem*, “Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple,” in: *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 26; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987) 210–217; J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); *idem*, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: South Carolina, 1995); H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 101–102. See also: J. Maier, “Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalypik und ‘Gnosis,’” *Kairos* 5(1) (1963) 18–40, esp. 23; *idem*, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis* (Kairos, 1; Salzburg: Müller, 1964), 127–8; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981) 575–600, esp. 576–82; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/

responsible for establishing the animal sacrificial cult by delivering the first sacrificial halakhot about the expiatory meaning of blood.⁵

The use of such protological figures as Enoch and Noah does not seem coincidental in view of their polemical anti-Mosaic thrust since these primeval heroes had held their priestly offices long before the son of Amram received his revelation and sacerdotal prescriptions on Mount Sinai. In its polemics against the Israelite prophet, late Enochic tradition adopted in its framework the portfolios of some other pre-Mosaic priestly figures, including the story of the enigmatic priest Melchisedek. An account found in the last chapters of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*, a Jewish text apparently written in the first century CE, gives one of the examples of such adaptation of the figure of Melchisedek. The account seeks to incorporate the enigmatic priest in the framework of the Enochic-Noachic cultic tradition by transferring to him the priestly features of Noah and, more specifically, the sacerdotal characteristics of his miraculous birth. It is well known that the birth of Noah occupies an important place in early Enochic and Noachic materials which portray the hero of the Flood as a wonder child. 1 *Enoch* 106,⁶ the *Genesis Apocryphon*,⁷ and possibly 1Q19⁸ depict him with a glorious face and eyes “like the rays of the sun.” 1 *Enoch* 106:2 relates that when the new-born Noah opened his eyes, the whole house lit up. The child then opened his mouth and blessed the Lord of heaven. Scholars have previously noted⁹ that the scene of the glorious visage of the young hero of the Flood delivering blessings upon his

Siebeck, 1988) 81; G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

⁵ See, for example, 2 *Enoch* 58–59.

⁶ 1 *Enoch* 106:5 “...his eyes (are) like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious...” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.244–5.

⁷ 1QapGen 5:12–13 “...his face has lifted to me and his eyes shine like [the] s[un...] (of) this boy is a flame and he...” F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.31.

⁸ A similar tradition is reflected in 1Q19. 1Q19 3: “...were aston[ished...] [...] (not like the children of men) the fir[st]-born is born, but the glorious ones [...] [...] his father, and when Lamech saw [...] [...] the chambers of the house like the beams of the sun [...] to frighten the [...]” 1Q19 13: “[...] because the glory of your splendour [...] for the glory of God in [...] [...] he will] be exalted in the splendour of the glory and the beauty [...] he will be honoured in the midst of [...]” García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.27.

⁹ C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 33ff.

rising up from the hands of the midwife has a sacerdotal significance and parallels the glorious appearance and actions of the high priest.¹⁰ The scene manifests the portentous beginning of the priestly Noachic tradition.¹¹ In *2 Enoch*, this prominent part of Noah's biography finds a new niche where the peculiar details of Noah's story are transferred to another character, Melchisedek.¹²

¹⁰ Crispin Fletcher-Louis notes parallels between this scene and the description of the ideal high priest from Sirach 50. He argues that "in Sirach 50 the liturgical procession through Simon's various ministrations climaxes with Aaron's blessings of the people (50:20, cf. Numbers 6) and a call for all the readers of Sirach's work 'to bless the God of all who everywhere works greater wonders, who fosters our growth from birth and deals with us according to his mercy' (50:22). So, too, in 1 Enoch 106:3 the infant Noah rises from the hands of the midwife and, already able to speak as an adult, 'he opened his mouth and blessed the Lord.'" Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 47.

¹¹ Fletcher-Louis argues that "the staging for [Noah's] birth and the behavior of the child have strongly priestly resonances." Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 46.

¹² Noachic polemics take place in the last chapters of the Slavonic apocalypse (chs 68–72). In this section of the pseudepigraphon we learn that, immediately after Enoch's instructions to his sons during his short visit to the earth and his ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, the sons of Enoch, constructed an altar at Akhuzan, the place where Enoch had been taken up. In *2 Enoch* 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him as priest before the people. Verses 11–16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. The text gives an elaborate description of the sacrificial ritual during which Methuselah slaughters with a knife, "in the required manner," sheep and oxen placed at the head of the altar. All these sheep and oxen are tied according to the sectarian instructions given by Enoch earlier in the book. Chapter 70 of *2 Enoch* recounts the last days of Methuselah on earth before his death. The Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of Lamech, the previously unknown Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass the priesthood to Nir instead of Noah (Lamech's firstborn son), even though Noah is also mentioned in the dream. Further, the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood before the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of the altar." The account of the sacerdotal practices of Enoch's relatives then continues with the Melchisedek story. The content of the story is connected with Nir's family. Sothonim, Nir's wife, gave birth to a child "in her old age," right "on the day of her death." She conceived the child, "being sterile" and "without having slept with her husband." The book narrated that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him in front of the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid herself during all the days of her pregnancy. Finally, when she was at the day of birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him and he saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from him, but she died at his feet. Melchisedek was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim, they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with "his clothing on him." According to the story, they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord. According to the story, the newborn child was marked with the sacerdotal sign, the glorious "badge of priesthood" on his chest. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the

Scholars have previously pointed out that Melchisedek's birth in the Slavonic apocalypse recalls some parallels with the birth of Noah in *1 Enoch* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.¹³ The details of Noah's natal account correspond at several points with the Melchisedek story:

1. Both Noah and Melchisedek belonged to the circle of Enoch's family.
2. Both characters are attested as survivors of the Flood.
3. Both characters have an important mission in the postdiluvian era.
4. Both characters are depicted as glorious wonder children.
5. Immediately after their birth, both characters spoke to the Lord. *1 Enoch* 106:3 relates that "...when he (Noah) arose from the hands of the midwife, he opened his mouth and spoke to the Lord with righteousness." A similar motif is attested in *2 Enoch* 71:19 where Melchisedek "...spoke with his lips, and he blessed the Lord."¹⁴
6. Both characters were suspected of divine/angelic lineage.

M. Delcor affirms that Lamech's phrase in the beginning of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, "Behold, then I thought in my heart that the conception was the work of the Watchers and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones..." can be compared with the words of Noah in *2 Enoch* uttered at the time of examining Melchisedek: "This is of the Lord, my brother."¹⁵

garments of priesthood and they fed him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded his archangel Gabriel to take the child and place him in "the paradise Eden" so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. The final passages of the story describe the ascent of Melchisedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

¹³ See M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 129; *idem*, "La naissance merveilleuse de Melchisédeq d'après l'Hénoch slave," *Kecharitomena. Mélanges René Laurentin* (ed. C. Augustin et al.; Paris: Desclée, 1990) 217–229; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 185; A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (4 vols.; ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984) 4.199; R. Stichel, *Die Namen Noes, seines Bruders und seiner Frau. Ein Beitrag zum Nachleben jüdischer Überlieferungen in der außerkanonischen und gnostischen Literatur und in Denkmälern der Kunst* (AAWG.PH 3. Folge 112; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 42–54.

¹⁴ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.207.

¹⁵ Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," 129.

7. The fathers of both infants were suspicious of the conception of their sons and the faithfulness of their wives.¹⁶ Thus, in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Lamech is worried and frightened about the birth of Noah, his son. Lamech suspects that his wife Bathenosh was unfaithful to him and that “the conception was (the work) of the Watchers, and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones, and it belonged to the Nephil[in].”¹⁷ The motif of Lamech’s suspicion about the unfaithfulness of Bathenosh found in the *Genesis Apocryphon* seems to correspond to Nir’s worry about the unfaithfulness of Sothonim. *2 Enoch* relates that when “...Nir saw her [Sothonim]...he became very ashamed about her. And he said to her, ‘What is this that you have done, O wife? And why have you disgraced me in front of the face of all the people? And now, depart from me, go where you conceived the disgrace of your womb.’”¹⁸

8. Mothers of both heroes were ashamed and tried to defend themselves against the accusation of their husbands. Thus, in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the wife of Lamech responds to the angry questions of her husband by reminding him of their intimacies: “Oh my brother and lord! Remember my sexual pleasure...[...] in the heat of intercourse, and the gasping of my breath in my breast.”¹⁹ She swears that the seed was indeed of Lamech: “I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of the hea[ven]s...[...] that this seed comes from you, [...] and not from any foreigner nor from any of the watchers or sons of heav[en].”²⁰ In *2 Enoch* Sothonim does not explain the circumstances of the conception. She answers Nir: “O my lord! Behold, it is the time of my old age, and there was not in me any (ardor of) youth and I do not know how the indecency of my womb has been conceived.”²¹

¹⁶ George Nickelsburg observes that the miraculous circumstances attending Melchisedek’s conception and birth are reminiscent of the Noah story in *1 Enoch*, although the suspicion of Nir is more closely paralleled in the version of the Noah story in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 188.

¹⁷ García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.29.

¹⁸ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.205.

¹⁹ García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.29.

²⁰ García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.29–31.

²¹ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.205.

9. Fathers of both sacerdotal infants were eventually comforted by the special revelation about the prominent future role of their sons in the postdiluvian era.²²

One cannot fail to notice the host of interesting overlaps between the birth of Noah in the Noachic materials and the birth of Melchisedek in *2 Enoch*. It appears that the author of *2 Enoch* wants to diminish the uniqueness of the priestly career of the hero of the Flood and to transfer his sacerdotal qualities to Melchisedek. The text can therefore be seen as a set of polemical improvisations on the original Noachic themes that attempts to adopt the figure of Melchisedek into the framework of the priestly Noachic tradition. It is clear that Noah's connection with the sacrifices and the commandments about the blood becomes one of the focal points of the polemical developments. The authors of the Slavonic apocalypse try to deconstruct the figure of Noah through the image of the heavenly Melchisedek, who according to their story, survives the Deluge, not in the ark of the Flood's hero, but through his translation to heaven on the back of the archangel Gabriel. Here the most significant point of the priestly Noachic tradition is challenged – the animal sacrifices at Noah's debarkation after the Flood lose their sacerdotal significance as the unique cult-establishing event, since the priest Melchisedek acquires a much loftier celestial appointment and now it is he who is promised by God to become the priest to all priests in the postdiluvian era.

Shem-Melchisedek in Targumic and Rabbinic Materials

Another example of incorporating Melchisedek's figure in the framework of the priestly Noachic tradition can be detected in the prominent typological portrayal of Melchisedek as Noah's oldest son, Shem. This feature may well be an original Noachic-Enochic development since Shem appears to play a very special role in the priestly Noachic tradition. According to *Jubilees*, Shem was Noah's choice in the transmission of his teaching. From *Jub.* 10:13–14 we learn that “Noah

²² *1 Enoch* 106:16–18 “And this son who has been born unto you shall be left upon the earth, and his three sons shall be saved when they who are upon the earth are dead.” *2 Enoch* 71:29–30 “And this child will not perish along with those who are perishing in this generation, as I have revealed it, so that Melkisedek will be... the head of the priests of the future.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.208. It is noteworthy that this information is given in both cases in the context of the revelation about the destruction of the earth by the Flood.

wrote down in a book everything... and he gave all the books that he had written to his oldest son Shem because he loved him much more than all his sons.”²³ Yet in targumic and rabbinic materials Shem-Melchisedek has been used for the legitimization and neutralization of the rival Noachic trend by placing this trajectory in the framework of traditional sacerdotal settings. In targumic and rabbinic materials Shem therefore serves as an important link that connects the priestly Noachic tradition with the figure of Abraham, by surrendering to him the priestly rights inherited from the hero of the Flood. This theological development has very early historical roots. Identification of Melchisedek as Shem can be found in the Targums,²⁴ Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible. *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 14:18 exhibits an exegetical development of this identification: “And Melchisedech, king of Jerusalem – he is Shem the Great – brought out bread and wine, for he was the priest who ministered in the high priesthood before the most High God.”²⁵ The *Tg. Ps.-J.* holds a similar exegetical position: “... the righteous king – that is Shem, the son of Noah – king of Jerusalem, went out to meet Abram, and brought him bread and wine; at that time he was ministering before God Most High.”²⁶

Theological deliberations about Shem-Melchisedek are also attested in talmudic and midrashic materials, including *Gen. Rab.* 43.1; 44.7, *Abot R. Nat.* 2, *Pirqe R. El.* 7; 27, and *b. Ned.* 32b. While the testimonies found in the targumim appear to be neutral, the evidence found in the midrashim and the talmudim tries to diminish the significance of the priestly Noachic tradition by surrendering its legacy to Abraham and his descendents. Thus, in *b. Ned.* 32b, the following passage is found:

R. Zechariah said on R. Ishmael’s authority: The Holy One, blessed be He, intended to bring forth the priesthood from Shem, as it is written, ‘And he [Melchizedek] was the priest of the most high God’ (Gen 14:18).

²³ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.60.

²⁴ Only the *Tg. Onq.* does not mention Shem in connection with Melchisedek. Interestingly *Tg. Onq.* is the only targum that also shows a negative attitude toward Enoch: “and Enoch walked in reverence of the Lord, then he was no more, for the Lord has caused him to die (Gen 5:24).” B. Grossfeld (tr.), *The Targum Onkelos to Genesis* (Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988) 52.

²⁵ M. McNamara (tr.), *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (AB, 1A; Colledgeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 92.

²⁶ M. Maher (tr.), *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (AB, 1B; Colledgeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 58.

But because he gave precedence in his blessing to Abraham over God, He brought it forth from Abraham; as it is written, ‘And he blessed him and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth, and blessed be the most high God’ (Gen 14:19). Said Abraham to him, ‘Is the blessing of a servant to be given precedence over that of his master?’ Straightway it [the priesthood] was given to Abraham, as it is written (Ps 110:1), ‘The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool;’ which is followed by, ‘The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek’ (Ps 110:4), meaning, ‘because of the word of Melchizedek.’ Hence it is written, And he was a priest of the most High God, [implying that] he was a priest, but not his seed (*b. Ned.* 32b).²⁷

As one can see, Melchisedek’s identification with Shem in rabbinic materials²⁸ exhibits a strong polemical flavor. Their basic message is the building up of the priestly antecedents of Melchisedek (Shem) in the context of transmission of this priestly line to Abraham. *b. Ned.* 32b underlines this polemical thrust by telling about Shem-Melchisedek that “he was a priest; but not his seed.”

Melchisedek in the Epistle to the Hebrews

It is now important to underline that in the two aforementioned theological developments attested in *2 Enoch* and the targumic materials, which appear to reflect traditions contemporaneous with deliberations found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the speculations about Melchisedek become associated with the figure of Noah. In *2 Enoch* he is depicted

²⁷ *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nedarim* (London: Soncino Press, 1936) 98–9.

²⁸ Two other important rabbinic attestations of Melchisedek as Shem include *Pirke R. El.* and *Gen. Rab.* *Pirke R. El.* has two references to Melchisedek-Shem. The first reference occurs in the passage on the handling of the tradition of intercalation among the Patriarchs. The text says that “Noah handed on the tradition to Shem, and he was initiated in the principle of intercalation; he intercalated the years and he was called a priest, as it is said, ‘And Melchizedek king of Salem . . . was a priest of God Most High’ (Gen 14:18). Was Shem the Son of Noah a priest? But because he was the first-born, and because he ministered to his God by day and by night, therefore was he called a priest.” *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (Tr. G. Friedländer; New York: Hermon, 1965) 53. The other reference to Melchisedek-Shem in *Pirke R. El.* occurs in chapter 28: “Rabbi Joshua said: Abraham was the first to begin to give a tithe. He took all the tithe of the kings and all the tithe of the wealth of Lot, the son of his brother, and gave (it) to Shem, the Son of Noah, as it is said, ‘And he gave him a tenth of all.’” *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (Tr. G. Friedländer; New York: Hermon, 1965) 195.

as the counterpart of Noah to whom the text transfers many priestly qualities of the hero of the Flood. In the targumic/rabbinic traditions, Melchisedek's portrayal as the elder son of Noah, Shem, also brings him into the framework of the priestly Noachic tradition. It is important that in both cases the priestly concerns are pronounced. Another common feature of these accounts is that both speculations about Melchisedek have an anti-Noachic flavor. In *2 Enoch*, Melchisedek replaces Noah as the ideal priest. In the targumic and rabbinic speculations, Shem-Melchisedek neutralizes and deconstructs the uniqueness and independence of the Noachic priestly tradition by surrendering its legacy to Abraham and his descendants, including Levi.

In view of these traditions, it is not entirely impossible that the author of Hebrews was cognizant of these developments that stemmed from the first century sacerdotal debates and can be ultimately traced to the Noachic motifs and themes reflected in such Second Temple sources as *1 Enoch*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and 1Q19. One must take note of scholars' previous suggestions of the possibility that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews may have been familiar with some extra-biblical Enochic and Noachic traditions.²⁹ It is therefore possible that by taking on the figure of Melchisedek, the author of Hebrews, similar to the authors of *2 Enoch* or the targumic materials, may have also tried to implicitly appropriate the prominent theological legacy of the priestly Noachic tradition.

Another possibility is that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews could have been cognizant of the developments found in *2 Enoch* or the Targums and therefore sought to argue against them. Some traditions found in Hebrews appear to point to this polemical intent.

Thus, both *2 Enoch* and the targumic passages express concern about the priestly lines and genealogies in connection with Melchisedek. *2 Enoch* attempts to incorporate Melchisedek in the priestly Enochic genealogy where Melchisedek becomes a climactic point of the honorable line of the protological priests.³⁰ The same tendency can be

²⁹ P. Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995) 148–149; B. Heinniger, "Hebr 11.7 und das Henochorakel an Ende der Welt," *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998) 115–132.

³⁰ *2 Enoch* 71:32–33 (longer recension): "Therefore honor him [Melchisedek] with your servants and great priests, with Sit, and Enos, and Rusi, and Amilam, and Prasadam, and Maleleil, and Serokh, and Arusan, and Aleem, and Enoch, and Methusalam, and me, your servant Nir." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.208.

seen in the targumic materials where Melchisedek in fact unifies two genealogies: the line of the non-Israelite Noachic sacerdotal tradition and the Israelite line traced to Abraham and Levi. Both targumic and Enochic developments also try to historically domesticate the figure of Melchisedek by assigning to him historical parents and placing him in the framework of Noah's (Targums) and Nir's (2 *Enoch*) families. Both developments seek to give this abstract and in some ways even ahistorical character of Genesis a certain historical location by placing him in the framework of primeval history. In the context of these developments, Hebrews' insistence on the fact that Melchisedek does not have parents or a priestly genealogy might constitute an attempt to disconnect the figure of Melchisedek from these contemporaneous theological developments, which tried to domesticate Melchisedek's figure by assigning him a specific historical locale or a particular priestly genealogy.

The identification of Melchisedek as the only being without a "genealogy" (ἀγενεαλόγητος) may indicate that the author of Hebrews was well aware of Melchisedek's genealogies, similar to those found in 2 *Enoch* or Melchisedek's treatise³¹ from the Nag Hammadi library where the name Melchisedek is incorporated into the sacerdotal lists of the priestly Noachic tradition.³²

II. *Why not Noah?*

The Epistle to the Hebrews is full of puzzles. One of the most intriguing puzzles for current research is this: why does the author never mention the name of Noah in his debates about animal sacrifices and

³¹ Pearson stresses the fact that Jewish apocalyptic elements are prominent in *Melch.* He argues that "it might be suggested that *Melch.* is a Jewish-Christian product containing an originally pre-Christian Melchizedek speculation overlaid with Christian Christological re-interpretation." B.A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X* (NHS, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 34.

³² "...of Adam [Abel], Enoch, [Noah] you, Melchizedek, [the Priest] of God [Most High] (12:7-11)." B.A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 63.

the expiatory meaning of human and animal³³ blood?³⁴ After all, it is not to Moses and Levi but to Noah that God has decided to reveal for the first time in human history his commandments about the importance of human and animal blood. Noah was also the first person to perform the animal sacrifices on the altar in the Bible.³⁵ He is thus depicted in the biblical and pseudepigraphical sources as the pioneer of expiatory practices involving animal blood, a sacrificial practice that many centuries after him was profoundly challenged by the sacrifice

³³ It is noteworthy that the motif of blood, both animal and human, represents one of the pivotal theological themes in the book. The word “blood” appears more often than in any other New Testament writing besides the Book of Revelation. The Greek term “αἷμα” occurs a total of twenty-one times in the pamphlet, of which no less than fourteen are found in the ninth and tenth chapters. William Johnsson’s research demonstrates that in the Epistle to the Hebrews the imagery of blood has a very strong cultic meaning and “...is set worth as the medium of power....specifically: blood provides access to God (9:7, 12, 25; 10:19); blood sanctifies, or consecrates (9:13); blood cleanses (9:14, 22); blood inaugurates covenant (9:20; 10:29); blood perfects (9:9, 14; 10:14); blood brings ἄφεσις (9:22).” Johnsson, *Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews* (Ph.D. diss.; Vanderbilt University, 1973) 229–230.

³⁴ Johnsson notes that in the book “the nature of blood as power comes to expression most clearly in terms of comparisons and contrasts as the blood of animals is juxtaposed to that of Jesus.” This contrast between animal blood and the blood of Jesus invokes the contrast earlier detected in Noah’s passage from Gen 9 where human and animal blood is contrasted with different theological outcomes. Another similarity is that in both accounts human blood has more power than animal blood. In Genesis 9 it has more power because shedding this blood brings more serious consequences – death. Johnsson observes that in the Epistle to the Hebrews “Jesus’s blood is the more powerful medium: this is the conclusion which the author wants to make. The comparison and contrast come into the sharpest focus at 9:13, 14 – if the blood of goats and bulls avail to the extent of the purgation concerning the σάρξ, how much more will Jesus’s blood bring purgation of conscience for true worship.” William G. Johnsson, *Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews* (Ph.D. diss.; Vanderbilt University, 1973) 229–230.

³⁵ Gen 8:20–9:6 “Then Noah built an altar to the Lord, and took of every clean animal and of every clean bird, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And when the Lord smelled the pleasing odor, the Lord said in his heart, “I will never again curse the ground because of humankind, for the inclination of the human heart is evil from youth; nor will I ever again destroy every living creature as I have done. As long as the earth endures, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease.” God blessed Noah and his sons, and said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth. The fear and dread of you shall rest on every animal of the earth, and on every bird of the air, on everything that creeps on the ground, and on all the fish of the sea; into your hand they are delivered. Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you; and just as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything. Only, you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood. For your own lifeblood I will surely require a reckoning: from every animal I will require it and from human beings, each one for the blood of another, I will require a reckoning for human life. Whoever sheds the blood of a human, by a human shall that person’s blood be shed; for in his own image God made humankind.”

of Jesus. Noah can in many ways be considered as the founder of the old expiatory practice in the same manner that Jesus is the ἀρχηγός of another expiatory paradigm. By depicting Jesus in this way the Epistle to the Hebrews stands in theological opposition to the long-lasting tradition of animal offerings inaugurated by the hero of the Flood in the postdiluvian world. This perspective, where Jesus is seen as the end of the tradition in which Noah constitutes the beginning, decisively demonstrates the role of Jesus as being not only the polemical counterpart of the intermediate figures of the animal sacrificial tradition, such as Moses or Levi, but also the polemical counterpart of the very founder of this tradition, the hero of the Flood.

Hebrews' theological attempt of renouncing animal sacrifices, depicting animal blood as an inferior expiatory medium in comparison with the human blood of Jesus, seems also to invoke for polemical purposes traces of the Noachic tradition. As we remember, the commandment to Noah about the blood in Gen 9 specifically warns against shedding human blood on the basis that a human being is fashioned after the image of God. Gen 9 may thus attest here to the implicit prohibition against human sacrifices, an expiatory practice involving human blood. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, in direct opposition to the commandment from Genesis, the expiation is made by the human blood of Jesus, which is proven there to be the more powerful expiatory medium than the blood of calves and goats.

Heir of Righteousness

This study has already noted that the Epistle to the Hebrews' author appears very reluctant – for reasons unknown to his readers – to invoke explicitly the significant connection of Noah with the blood commandments and his role as the pioneer of animal sacrificial practices. Despite this reluctance it is still possible that the author of Hebrews may have found more subtle ways to express his interest in these issues. Hebrews' attention to the issue of pre-Mosaic animal sacrificial practices appears to be implicitly reflected in chapter 11. What is important here is that the author's attitude to the ancient sacerdotal rites appears shrouded in a rather enigmatic vocabulary connected with the imagery of righteousness. As we remember, chapter 11, dealing with the issues of faith, provides a chain of important characters of primeval and Jewish history, briefly outlining their spiritual carriers. In the description of the heroes of the faith there, one can find several important

qualities of these figures, including references to righteousness. Noting to whom righteousness is assigned is important. In the distinguished cohort of the heroes of primeval and Israelite history, only two persons were privileged to be described with the terminology of righteousness. First is Abel who is designated as “righteous” (δίκαιος), and second is Noah who is named “the heir of righteousness” (δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος). It is important for our investigation of the usage of righteousness to note that the description of the Abel³⁶ story in Hebrews revolves around his sacrificial practices. Underlining the cultic emphasis of the passage, Pamela Eisenbaum observes that “the author does not begin with the murder of Abel by Cain. He begins with the enigmatic biblical fact that Abel’s sacrifice was accepted, while Cain’s was not.”³⁷ Oddly enough, the author also does not call attention to Abel’s violent death;³⁸ he mentions only that Abel “died,” and eschews portraying him as a victim here.³⁹ Eisenbaum notes that the author “does add to the biblical text when he says that Abel ‘was attested to be righteous’ (ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος).”⁴⁰ In tracing the roots of this tradition, she proposes that one of the earliest references to the righteousness of Abel can be found in *1 Enoch* 22:7, where he is said to be righteous.⁴¹ The possible Enochic-Noachic origin of this tradition is important for this study. Eisenbaum also points to another, possibly also “Enochic” passage from the *Testament of Abraham*, chapter 13 (Recension A)

³⁶ On Abel traditions, see: V. Aptowitzer, *Kain und Abel in der Agada, den Apokryphen, der hellenistischen, christlichen und muhamedanischen Literatur* (Vienna/Leipzig: Löwit, 1922) 37–55; J.M. Bassler, “Cain and Abel in the Palestinian Targums: A Brief Note on an Old Controversy,” *JJS* 17 (1986) 56–64; J.B. Bauer, “Kain und Abel,” *TPQ* 103 (1955) 126–133; S. Bénétreau, “La foi d’Abel: Hébreux 11/4,” *ETR* 54 (1979) 623–630; S. Brock, “A Syriac Life of Abel,” *Mus* 87 (1974) 467–492; P. Grelot, “Les Targums du Pentateuque,” *Sem* 9 (1959) 59–88; R. Le Déaut, “Traditions targumiques dans le corpus paulinien? (Hébr 11,4 et 12,24; Gal 4,29–30; II Cor 3,16),” *Biblica* 42 (1961) 24–48; G. Vermes, “The Targumic Versions of Genesis 4,3–16,” *ALUOS* 3 (1961–62) 81–114.

³⁷ P. Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995) 148.

³⁸ In Heb 12:24 the author of the Epistle compares the spilled blood of Jesus with Abel, in chapter 11, however, there is no typological relation between the blood of Abel and the blood of Jesus. See, Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, 149.

³⁹ Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, 149.

⁴⁰ Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, 148.

⁴¹ See also H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 316, footnote 136.

and chapter 11 (Recension B), where Abel, again connected with the motif of righteousness, is portrayed as a judge who distinguishes the righteous from the wicked.⁴² These references drawn from the Jewish pseudepigraphic writings might indicate that the author of Hebrews in his depiction of Abel was cognizant of Enochic/Noachic traditions and applied them in his portrayal of the primeval hero. The author uses the terminology of righteousness again in Heb 11:7 when speaking about Noah. The first part of the verse informs the reader that by faith Noah received an oracle concerning things not yet seen (Πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων). Some scholars suggest that here again the author exhibits familiarity with the traditions attested in the Enochic lore where Noah, depicted as a mantic practitioner, receives God's warnings about the impending Flood.⁴³ The second part of verse 7 is even more interesting since here the author invokes the tradition about Noah becoming the heir of righteousness (δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος). It is noteworthy that while Noah is designated as the righteous person in the Genesis account, the epithet "heir of righteousness" is not applied to him there.⁴⁴ The LXX translation of Gen 6:9 says that "Noah was a righteous man (δίκαιος)" but does not include the reference to Noah as the κληρονόμος.⁴⁵

What does the word "righteousness" mean in the context of the theological deliberations found in chapter 11 in particular and in the Epistle to the Hebrews in general? It is surprising that none of the other characters in chapter 11 is defined as righteous, despite the fact

⁴² Eisenbaum observes that "in *1 Enoch* 22:7ff and *T. Abr* 13, Abel resides in heaven and is portrayed as a judge who distinguishes the righteous from the wicked. Since Abel as the righteous one is connected to the image of Abel as judge, it is likely that our author knows the latter tradition as well as the former. In the Enoch passage the souls of the righteous are taken up while the wicked are left behind, buried in the earth – at Abel's discretion. The true home of the righteous is the divine realm, while that of the unrighteous is in the earth in its material sense. Abel therefore initiates the process of separating the righteous from the wicked, and at the same time becomes the first righteous one to reach the divine realm." Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, 149–150.

⁴³ The author's knowledge of Enochic/Noachic traditions, especially in connection with the motif of the warning of Noah in 11:7 and Noah's role as the mantic visionary, has been investigated by Bernard Heininger in his article "Hebr 11.7 und das Henochorakel an Ende der Welt," *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998) 115–132.

⁴⁴ See also Gen 7:1; Ezek 14:14, 20; Sir 44:17; Wis 10:4.

⁴⁵ Harold Attridge observes that "...the remark that Noah was an 'heir of righteousness' is not traditional." H.W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 320.

that many of them are designated with this epithet in the Second Temple Jewish lore. Thus, for example, in *1 Enoch*, the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch is defined as a righteous person and the scribe of righteousness. The Jewish pseudepigrapha, including the *Testament of Abraham* also refer to Abraham as a righteous person. The Epistle to the Hebrews, however, is surprisingly reluctant to apply this designation to Enoch and Abraham. Why were the authors of Hebrews, who were willing to adopt the traditions about Abel as a righteous person from pseudepigraphical literature, reluctant to proceed with this title in the case of Enoch and Abraham?

The author's choice in applying the important vocabulary of righteousness might indicate that in the context of the chapter and even the whole book this terminology might have a sacerdotal significance and maybe even a more peculiar meaning associated with sacrificial practices. It appears that the key for unlocking the mystery of the peculiar usage of the terminology of righteousness can be found in the already mentioned tradition from Heb 11:4. There the author tells his readers that "by faith Abel offered God a greater sacrifice than Cain, and through *this* he was commended as righteous, because God commended him for his offerings." (Πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἀβελ παρὰ Κάϊν προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ) The antecedent of the relative pronoun is not entirely clear here. Although the majority of translators prefer to translate "δι' ἧς" as "through his [Abel's] faith,"⁴⁶ it can be also translated "through his [Abel's] sacrifice." While the theme of faith is the dominant leitmotif of Chapter 11, in this particular verse the issue of Abel's offerings plays a paramount role. It is important therefore that the second part of the sentence puts additional emphasis on God's commendation of Abel for *his offerings* (τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ).

As we remember, the terminology of righteousness is invoked for the second time in chapter 11 verse 7 in connection with Noah. Although for some reason the author prefers not to speak openly about the animal sacrifices of Noah after his debarkation, instead focusing on his role in the construction of the ark and deliverance from the Flood, the

⁴⁶ Cf. C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (2 vols.; Paris: Gabalda, 1952–1953) 2.342; H.W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 316; W.L. Lane, *Hebrews 9–13* (WBC, 47B; Dallas: Word Books, 1991) 327.

reference to Noah as the heir of righteousness (δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος) might allude to Noah's connection with the sacrificial practice in the view that the depiction of Abel's sacrifices was conveyed earlier through a similar terminology.⁴⁷

It should be stressed again that only two primeval characters are described with the terminology of righteousness. What is even more interesting here is that both of them also represent two pivotal figures associated in the Bible with animal sacrificial practices. Moreover both of them can be seen as pioneers of these practices, Abel in the antediluvian time and Noah after the Flood in the covenantal setting by sacrificing on *the altar* for the first time in the Bible. Noah's role as the official pioneer of the animal sacrificial cult is further reinforced by God's commandments about blood dispatched to the hero of the Flood immediately after his offerings on the altar. Michael Stone observes that Noah can be seen as the bridge between the antediluvian and postdiluvian worlds, serving as an important transmitter of the sacrificial tradition through the cataclysm of the Flood.⁴⁸

If the terminology of righteousness is indeed somehow connected with the tradition of animal sacrifices in the mind of Hebrews' author, it is not coincidental that this imagery has not been applied to other characters found in chapter 11, who in fact did not belong to the distinctive cohort of the sacerdotal servants preoccupied with animal sacrificial rites.

Further, if we look into how the terminology of righteousness was used elsewhere in the book we can see that besides Jesus, who of course is regarded by the author as the sacerdotal servant *par excellence*, the terminology of righteousness is applied only to one other character, the priest Melchisedek. It is he whose name is translated by the author of Hebrews as the king of righteousness (βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης).⁴⁹ In the view of these cautious but precise attributions it is possible that through the terminology of righteousness, naming Noah as the heir

⁴⁷ In his classic study on the motif of Noah's righteousness, James VanderKam demonstrates that this motif was employed in the Second Temple materials for different literary ends. Thus, for example, the author of *Jubilees* "sketches a portrait of a priestly Noah whose righteousness consists in obedience to sacerdotal legislation...." VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," 20.

⁴⁸ He stresses that "the sudden clustering of works around Noah indicates that he was seen as a pivotal figure in the history of humanity, as both an end and a beginning." Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 141.

⁴⁹ Heb 7:2.

of righteousness and Melchisedek as the king of righteousness, the author may attempt to make an implicit connection between these two characters.

The question however remains: in what kind of connection does Noah as the heir of righteousness stand to Melchisedek as the king of righteousness and what does the author of the book try to accomplish through this terminological link? Does this link have a polemical significance? Does the author of Hebrews, like the author of *2 Enoch* try to depict Melchisedek as the sacerdotal counterpart of Noah? Are any qualities of Noah transferred to Melchisedek? All these questions will require another lengthy investigation.

THE WATCHERS OF SATANAIL:
THE FALLEN ANGELS TRADITIONS IN 2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH

... they became servants of Satan and led astray
those who dwell upon the dry ground.

1 *Enoch* 54:6

... These are the Watchers (*Grigori*), who turned
aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with
their prince Satanail.

2 *Enoch* 18:3

Introduction

The first part of 2 *Enoch*, a Jewish pseudepigraphon written in the first century C.E., deals with the heavenly ascent of the seventh antediluvian hero carried by his angelic psychopomps to the abode of the Deity. Slowly progressing through the heavens while receiving detailed explanations of their content from his angelic interpreters, in one of them, the patriarch encounters the group of the fallen angels whom the authors of the apocalypse designate as the *Grigori* (Watchers).¹ The detailed report of the group's transgression given in chapter 18 of the text which mentions the angelic descent on Mount Hermon, leading to subsequent corruption of humanity and procreation of the race of the Giants, invokes the memory of the peculiar features well known from the classic descriptions of the fall of the infamous celestial rebels given in the *Book of the Watchers*. This early Enochic booklet unveils the misdeeds of the two hundred Watchers led by their leaders Shemihazah and Asael. What is striking, however, in the description given in the Slavonic apocalypse, is that in contrast to the classic Enochic account, the leadership over the fallen Watchers is ascribed not to Shemihazah or Asael, but instead to Satanail.² This reference to the figure of the

¹ Slav. *Григори(ы)* (Gk. ἐγγήγοροι). Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 16.

² Slav. *Сатанаил*. Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 16.

negative protagonist of the Adamic story appears to be not coincidental. The careful examination of other details of the fallen angels traditions found in the Slavonic apocalypse unveils that the transference of the leadership over the Watchers from Shemihazah and Asael to Satanail represents not a coincidental slip of pen, or a sign of a lack of knowledge of the authentic tradition, but an intentional attempt of introducing the Adamic development into the framework of the Enochic story, a move executed by the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse with a certain theological purpose.

I previously explored the influence of the Adamic story on the Enochic account of the Slavonic apocalypse, especially in the materials of the longer recension, noticing an unusual readiness of its authors for the adoption of traditions and motifs from the Adamic trend, a tendency which appears to be quite surprising for a Second Temple Enochic text.³

Indeed, Adam's story occupies a strikingly prominent place in 2 *Enoch*. The traditions pertaining to the first human can be found in all the sections of the book.⁴ In these materials Adam is depicted as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. Although the bulk of Adamic materials belongs to the longer recension, which includes, for example, the lengthy Adamic narrative in chapters 30–32, the Adamic tradition is not confined solely to this recension. A number of important Adamic passages are also attested in the shorter recension. The extensive presence of Adamic materials in both recensions and their significance for the theology of the Slavonic apocalypse indicates that they are not later interpolations but are part of the original layer of the text.

It should be noted that such an extensive presence of Adamic materials in the intertestamental Enochic text is quite unusual. In the early Enochic circle reflected in 1 (*Ethiopic*) *Enoch*, Adam does not figure prominently. His presence in these materials is marginal and limited to a few insignificant remarks. Moreover, when the authors of the

³ Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 211–252; idem, “‘Without Measure and Without Analogy’: The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*,” in A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJSup., 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 149–174; idem, “On the Polemical Nature of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich,” in Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 239–268.

⁴ 2 *Enoch* 30:8–32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1–3; 71:28.

early Enochic booklets invoke the memory of Adam and Eve, they try to either ignore or “soften” the story of their transgression and fall in the garden. Scholars previously noticed this remarkable leniency of the Enochic writers towards the mishap of the protological couple in the texts “concerned with judgment and accountability.”⁵

This either modest or unusually positive profile which the Proto-plasts enjoy in the early Enochic circle can be explained by several factors. Scholars previously observed that early Enochic and Adamic traditions appear to be operating with different mythologies of evil.⁶ The early Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the Watchers’ story in which the fallen angels corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets.⁷ In contrast, the

⁵ Kelley Coblenz Bautch notes that “the portrayal of the [first] couple is softened in the Book of the Watchers; like ‘the holy ones’ mentioned in 1 En 32:3, they eat from the tree and are made wise (cf. Gen 3:6). No references are made to the serpent, deception, the reproach of God, and additional punishments that figure prominently in the Genesis account. In a text concerned with judgment and accountability, Adam and Eve do not appear as actors in the eschatological drama... the Animal Apocalypse from the Book of Dream Visions seems even more favorable in its depiction of the first couple. The Animal Apocalypse opts to recast exclusively events familiar from Gen 2 and 4... [it] does not offer a recitation of the fall in the garden. There is no tree, forbidden or otherwise, no illicit gain of knowledge, no expulsion from Eden, and no recapitulation of any part of Gen 3...” K. Coblenz Bautch, “Adamic traditions in the Parables? A Query on 1 Enoch 69:6,” in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 352–360 at 353–4.

⁶ In this respect Bautch observes that “...discussion of the Enochic corpus frequently takes up the literature’s distinctive view of evil. As is commonly asserted, Enochic texts posit that evil originates with the rebellious watchers who descend to earth: their prohibited union with women and teaching of forbidden arts lead to the contamination of the human sphere (for example, 1 En 6–11). This observation has led contemporary scholars to delineate two contrasting trends within Second Temple Judaism: one rooted in early Enochic texts like the Book of the Watchers where evil develops as a result of the angels’ sin, and the other that understands sin to be the consequence of human failings (e.g., Gen 3).” K. Coblenz Bautch, “Adamic traditions in the Parables? A Query on 1 Enoch 69:6,” in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 352–360 at 354–5. On the subject of two mythologies of evil see also J. Reeves, *Sefer ‘Uzza Wa-‘Aza(z)el: Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming); M. Stone, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133–49 at 144–49.

⁷ John Reeves in his forthcoming research on the early Jewish mythologies of evil provides a helpful description of the main tenets of the Enochic paradigm of the origin of evil (or what he calls the “Enochic Template”). According to this template: “evil first enters the created world through the voluntary descent and subsequent corruption of a group of angels known as the Watchers. Their sexual contact with human women

Adamic tradition traces the source of evil to Satan's transgression and the fall of Adam and Eve in Eden – the trend which is hinted at in Genesis 3 and then fully reflected in the Primary Adam Books which explain the reason for Satan's demotion by his rejection to obey God's command to venerate a newly created Protoplast.⁸

While in the early Enochic circle the presence of the Adamic traditions appears to be either marginalized or silenced – it looms large in *2 Enoch*. In my previous research I suggested that the extensive presence of the Adamic motifs in the Slavonic apocalypse has a profound conceptual significance for the overall theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse.⁹ It appears that the purpose of the extensive presence of Adamic themes in *2 Enoch* can be explained through the assessment of Enoch's image in the text who is portrayed in the Slavonic apocalypse as the Second Adam – the one who is predestined to regain the original condition of the Protoplast once lost by the first humans in Eden.¹⁰ In this context many features of the exalted prelapsarian Adam are transferred to the seventh antediluvian hero in an attempt to hint at his status as the new Protoplast, who restores humanity to its original state. This new protological profile of the elevated Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse thus can serve as an important

renders them odious to God and their former angelic colleagues in heaven; moreover, they also betray certain divine secrets to their lovers and families. The offspring of the Watchers and mortal women, an illegitimately conceived race of bloodthirsty 'giants,' wreak havoc on earth and force God to intervene forcefully with the universal Flood. The corrupt angels are captured and imprisoned, their monstrous children are slain, and humanity is renewed through the family of Noah. Noticeably absent from this particular scheme are references to Adam and Eve, the garden of Eden, or the serpent...." Reeves, *Sefer 'Uzza Wa-'Aza(z)el: Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).

⁸ Reeves provides the description of the main features of what he called the "Adamic Template," noticing the following crucial points: "(1) God resolves to create the first human being, Adam; (2) after Adam's creation, all the angels in heaven are bidden to worship him; (3) a small group of angels led by Satan refuse to do so; (4) as a result, this group is forcibly expelled from heaven to earth; and (5) in order to exact revenge, these angels plot to lead Adam and subsequent generations of humans astray...." Reeves, *Sefer 'Uzza Wa-'Aza(z)el: Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).

⁹ Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 211–214.

¹⁰ On the tradition of Enoch as the second Adam, see P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 102–104; M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240.

clue for understanding the necessity of the extensive presence of the Adamic traditions in *2 Enoch*.

Moreover, it appears that the appropriation of the Adamic lore in *2 Enoch* is not limited solely to the figure of the main positive protagonist – the seventh antediluvian patriarch, but also extended to the story of the negative angelic counterparts of the Enochic hero – the Watchers whose portrayals in the Slavonic apocalypse also become enhanced with novel features of the Adamic mythology of evil, and more specifically, with the peculiar traits of the account of its infamous heavenly rebel – Satan. Such interplay and osmosis of two early paradigmatic trends, which in John Reeves' terminology is designated as the mixed or transitional template, has long-lasting consequences for both "mythologies of evil" and their afterlife in rabbinic and patristic environments.¹¹ The purpose of this study is to explore the Adamic reworking of the Watchers traditions in the Slavonic apocalypse and its significance for subsequent Jewish mystical developments.

I. *2 Enoch 7: The Watchers in the Second Heaven*

There are two textual units pertaining to the Watchers traditions in *2 Enoch*. One of them is situated in chapter seven. The chapter describes the patriarch's arrival in the second heaven where he sees the group of the guarded angelic prisoners kept in darkness. Although chapter seven does not identify this group directly as the Watchers, the description of their transgressions hints to this fact. The second unit is situated in chapter eighteen which describes Enoch's encounter with another angelic gathering in the fifth heaven, the group which this time is directly identified as the Watchers (*Grigori*). Although our study of the traditions of the fallen angels in the Slavonic apocalypse will deal mainly with these two passages found in chapters seven and eighteen, some attention will be paid also to the Satanail traditions situated in chapters twenty nine and thirty one.

¹¹ Reeves detects the presence of the so-called "mixed template" that combines features of Adamic and Enochic "mythologies of evil" already in the *Book of Jubilees*. Reeves, *Sefer 'Uzza Wa-'Aza(z)el: Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).

Traces of the Enochic Template

In chapter 7 of the longer recension of 2 *Enoch* the following description is found:

... And those men picked me up and brought me up to the second heaven. And they showed me, and I saw a darkness greater than earthly darkness. And there I perceived prisoners under guard, hanging up, waiting for the measureless judgment. And those angels have the appearance of darkness itself, more than earthly darkness. And unceasingly they made weeping, all the day long. And I said to the men who were with me, "Why are these ones being tormented unceasingly?" Those men answered me, "These are those who turned away from the Lord, who did not obey the Lord's commandments, but of their own will plotted together and turned away with their prince and with those who are under restraint in the fifth heaven." And I felt very sorry for them; and those angels bowed down to me and said to me, "Man of God, pray for us to the Lord!" And I answered them and said, "Who am I, a mortal man, that I should pray for angels? Who knows where I am going and what will confront me? Or who indeed will pray for me?"¹²

Several scholars have previously recognized the connection of this passage about the incarcerated angels with the Watchers traditions.¹³ One of these scholars, John Reeves, argues that

...this particular text obviously refers to the angelic insurrection that took place in the days of Jared, the father of Enoch. The prisoners in this "second heaven" are in fact those Watchers who violated the divinely decreed barriers separating heaven and earth by taking human wives and fathering bastard offspring, the infamous Giants...¹⁴

¹² Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.112–114. The shorter recension of 2 *Enoch* 7 has the following form: "And those men took me up to the second heaven. And they set me down on the second heaven. And they showed me prisoners under guard, in measureless judgment. And there I saw the condemned angels, weeping. And I said to the men who were with me, 'Why are they tormented?' The men answered me, 'They are evil rebels against the Lord, who did not listen to the voice of the Lord, but they consulted their own will.' And I felt sorry for them. The angels bowed down to me. They said, 'Man of God, please pray for us to the Lord!' And I answered them and said, 'Who am I, a mortal man, that I should pray for angels? And who knows where I am going or what will confront me? Or who will pray for me?'" Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.113–115.

¹³ A. Rubinstein observes that "...there is evidence that the Slavonic Enoch is dependent on some features which are known only from the Ethiopic Enoch only. There can be little doubt that the Slavonic Enoch has a good deal in common with the Ethiopic Enoch, though the differences between the two are no less striking." A. Rubinstein, "Observation on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 13 (1962) 6.

¹⁴ J. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," in: *Tracing the Treads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.C. Reeves; EJL, 6; Atlanta: Scholars, 1994) 185.

Another scholar, James VanderKam expresses a similar conviction when he remarks that the angelic group depicted in chapter seven “remind us of the Watchers and their mutual oath to commit the deeds that led to their imprisonment in *1 Enoch* 6–11.”¹⁵

VanderKam’s suggestion that the theme of the angels “plotting together” found in *2 Enoch* 7 might allude to the Watchers’ council on Mount Hermon and their mutual oath is important. The Watchers tradition reflected later in the text in chapter 18 further strengthens the possibility that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse were familiar with the early Enochic tradition of the bounding oath taken by the Watchers on the infamous mountain.¹⁶

Another important detail that hints to the possibility of the presence of the Watchers tradition in the passage is that the angels choose to ask the patriarch about interceding with God. This request for intercession before God appears to allude to the unique role of the seventh antediluvian hero reflected already in the earliest Enochic booklets where he is depicted as the envoy bringing petitions of intercession to God on behalf of this rebellious angelic group. John Reeves suggests¹⁷ that the petition pressed upon the exalted patriarch by the imprisoned angels in *2 Enoch* 7 is reminiscent of the language found in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 13:4)¹⁸ where the Watchers ask the patriarch to write for them a prayer of intercession.¹⁹ From *1 Enoch* 13:6–7 we learn that this prayer was prepared by the seventh antediluvian hero and later was delivered by him in a vision to the Creator.²⁰

¹⁵ J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: South Carolina, 1995) 159.

¹⁶ The longer recension of *2 Enoch* 18:4 reads: “And they broke the promise on the shoulder of Mount Ermon.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.132.

¹⁷ “...identity [of the imprisoned angels] as rebellious Watchers is further underscored by the petition they press upon Enoch...” Reeves, “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library,” 185.

¹⁸ This connection was also mentioned by Robert Henry Charles who noticed that “the angels ask Enoch to intercede for them, as in 1 En. xiii.4,” *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols., ed. R.H. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913) 2.433, note 4.

¹⁹ “And they asked me to write out for them the record of a petition that they might receive forgiveness, and to take the record of their petition up to the Lord in heaven.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.93.

²⁰ “And then I wrote out the record of their petition and their supplication in regard to their spirits and the deeds of each one of them, and in regard to what they asked, (namely) that they should obtain absolution and forbearance. And I went and sat down by the waters of Dan in Dan which is south-west of Hermon and I read out

All these features demonstrate that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse appear to be well cognizant of some peculiar details of early versions of the Watchers story and were using these various characteristics of the early Enochic template in their depiction of the group of incarcerated angels in chapter seven, thus implicitly hinting to their audience at the angels' identity as the Watchers.

Finally there is another piece of evidence that further confirms the identity of the mysterious imprisoned group as the Watchers. Although the angelic group kept under guard in the second heaven is not directly identified in chapter seven as the Watchers, this chapter connects the unnamed angels with another celestial gathering which the patriarch will encounter later in the fifth heaven. *2 Enoch* 7 anticipates this encounter when it explains that the group in the second heaven "turned away with their prince and *with those who are under restraint in the fifth heaven.*" Later upon his arrival to the fifth heaven the patriarch sees there another angelic group which his celestial guides identify as *Grigori* (Slav. *Григори*)²¹ – the Watchers. During that identification a reference is also made to the group in the second heaven which puts this group also in the category of the Watchers: "These are the Grigori (Watchers), who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail. And *similar to them are those who went down as prisoners in their train, who are in the second heaven, imprisoned in great darkness.*" Later, in *2 Enoch* 18:7, when Enoch himself addresses the Watchers he tells them that he saw "their brothers" and "prayed for them." These details again appear to be alluding to the group in the second heaven who earlier asked the patriarch to pray for them.²² As we can see the two angelic groups in the second and fifth heavens are interconnected by the authors of the apocalypse through the set of cross-references situated in both chapters.

the record of their petition until I fell asleep." Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.93–94.

²¹ Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 16.

²² George Nickelsburg notices that the division of the fallen angels into two groups is also reminiscent of some early Enochic developments attested already in *1 Enoch*. He observes that "in his description of the rebel angels the seer distinguishes between two groups, as does *1 Enoch*: the *egregoroi* ('watchers'), who sinned with the women (*2 Enoch* 18); and their 'brethren' (18:7), called 'apostates' (chap. 7), who may correspond to the angels as revealers." G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005) 222.

Traces of the Adamic Template

We began our study by mentioning that the Watchers account situated in chapter 18 exhibits the clear features of Adamic tradition when it names Satanail as the leader of the fallen Watchers. In the light of this later reaffirmation, it is also possible that the subtle traces of the Adamic template may already be present even in the description found in chapter seven.

A close look at chapter 7 demonstrates that along with implicit traces of the Enochic traditions of the fallen Watchers the passage also exhibits some familiarities with the Adamic mythology of evil by recalling some features of the story of Satan's fall.

One of the pieces of evidence that catches the eye here is the peculiar title "prince" by which the passage describes the leader of the incarcerated angels. Already Robert Henry Charles noticed that although the passage found in chapter 7 does not directly name Satanail as the leader of the rebellious angels, the reference to the fact that they "turned away *with their prince*" (Slav. *с князем своим*)²³ invokes the similar terminology applied to Satanail later in chapter 18:3 which tells that the Watchers (*Grigori*) turned aside from the Lord together *with their prince* (Slav. *с князем своим*)²⁴ Satanail.²⁵ Charles' suggestion appears to be plausible, and in the light of the identical formulae attested in chapter 18 it is possible that the Satanail tradition is already present in *2 Enoch* 7. If it is so, here for the first time in the Slavonic apocalypse the chief negative protagonist of the Adamic lore becomes identified as the leader of the fallen Watchers.

Another possible piece of evidence that hints to the presence of the Adamic mythology of evil in *2 Enoch* 7 is connected with the motif of the imprisoned angels bowing down before Enoch. Both recensions of *2 Enoch* 7:4 portray the incarcerated angels in the second heaven as bowing down before the translated patriarch asking him to pray for them before the Lord.

I previously argued²⁶ that this tradition of angels bowing down before Enoch appears to stem from an Adamic mythology of evil²⁷

²³ Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 6.

²⁴ Sokolov, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе," 16.

²⁵ "their prince = Satanail, xviii, 3," R.H. Charles, *APOT*, 2.433, note 3.

²⁶ Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 221–222.

²⁷ The motif of the prostration of angelic beings, including the Watchers, before the seventh antediluvian hero is unknown in the early Enochic circle reflected in *1 Enoch*.

since it invokes the peculiar details of the Satan story attested in the Primary Adam Books²⁸ and some other Jewish, Christian and Muslim materials.²⁹ In order to clarify the Adamic background of the Watchers tradition found in *2 Enoch* 7 one should take a short excursus in the later Enochic developments reflected in the *Hekhalot* materials.

In the later Enochic composition, known to us as the *Sefer Hekhalot* or *3 Enoch*, the Adamic motif of the angelic veneration similar to *2 Enoch* also appears to be placed in the context of the Watchers tradition(s). Thus, *3 Enoch* 4 depicts the angelic leaders Uzza, Azza, and Azael, the characters whose names are reminiscent of the names of the leaders of the fallen Watchers,³⁰ as bowing down before Enoch-Metatron.

There are scholars who view this motif of angels bowing down before Enoch found in *Sefer Hekhalot* as a relatively late development which originated under the influence of the rabbinic accounts of the veneration of humanity.³¹ Yet, there are other researchers who argue

A possible reference to another tradition of prostration – the theme of the *giants* bowing down before the patriarch might be reflected in the *Book of Giants* [4Q203 *Frag.* 4:6]: “they bowed down and wept in front [of Enoch...].” F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.409. Although the passage is extant in a very fragmentary form and the name of Enoch is not mentioned, Józef Tadeusz Milik, Siegbert Uhlig, and Florentino García Martínez have suggested that the figure before whom the giants prostrate themselves is none other than Enoch himself. For the discussion of this tradition see L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSA), 63; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 75–76.

²⁸ The account of Adam’s elevation and his veneration by angels is found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13–15. These versions depict God’s creation of Adam in his image. The first man was then brought before God’s face by the archangel Michael to bow down to God. God commanded all the angels to bow down to Adam. All the angels agreed to venerate the protoplast, except Satan (and his angels) who refused to bow down before Adam, because the first human was “younger” (“posterior”) to Satan.

²⁹ The Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4; *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4, *Coptic Enthronement of Michael*, *Cave of Treasures* 2:10–24, and *Qur’an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18; 15:31–48; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85. The traces of the motif of veneration seem also present in the Temptation narrative of the Gospel of Matthew, where Satan asks Jesus to prostrate himself before Satan.

³⁰ Annette Reed suggested that the tradition about Uzza, Azza, and Azael is “reflecting direct knowledge of the account of the fall of the angels in *1 Enoch* 6–11.” A.Y. Reed, “From Asael and Šemihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: *3 Enoch* 5 (§§7–8) and Jewish Reception-History of *1 Enoch*,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 8 (2001) 110.

³¹ On the tradition of the veneration of humanity in rabbinic literature see A. Altmann, “The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends,” *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391; B. Barc, “La taille cosmique d’Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles apres J.-C.,” *RSR* 49 (1975) 173–85; J. Fossum, “The Adorable Adam

for early “pseudepigraphical” roots of this Hekhalot tradition of the angelic veneration of Enoch. One of these scholars, Gary Anderson, previously noticed the early pseudepigraphical matrix of this peculiar development present in *Sefer Hekhalot* and its connections with the primordial veneration of the Protoplast in the paradigmatic Adamic story where Satan and his angels refuse to bow down before the first human.³² Moreover, some conceptual developments detected in *2 Enoch* also point to early pseudepigraphical roots of the tradition of veneration of Enoch by angels. Scholars previously suggested that the Adamic motif of angelic veneration was transferred in the Enochic context not in the later Hekhalot or rabbinic materials but already in *2 Enoch* where the angels are depicted as bowing down several times before the seventh antediluvian hero. Besides the previously mentioned tradition of the imprisoned angels bowing down before Enoch found in chapter seven there is another, even more explicit appropriation of the motif of angelic veneration, found in *2 Enoch* 21–22 where God tests angels by asking them to venerate Enoch. These chapters depict Enoch’s arrival at the edge of the seventh heaven. There, God invites Enoch to stand before him forever. The Deity then tells his angels, sounding them out: “Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!” In response to this address, the angels do obeisance to Enoch saying, “Let Enoch yield in accordance with your word,

of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis,” *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (2 vols; eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1996) 1.529–39; G. Quispel, “Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition,” *Eranos Jahrbuch* 22 (1953) 195–234; idem, “Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis,” *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13; A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 108–115.

³² Commenting on *3 Enoch* 4, Gary Anderson suggests that if “we remove those layers of the tradition that are clearly secondary... we are left with a story that is almost identical to the analog we have traced in the Adam and Eve literature...” G. Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 107. He further notes that the acclamation of Enoch as the “Youth” in *Sefer Hekhalot* is pertinent since the reason *3 Enoch* supplies for this title is deceptively simple and straightforward: “Because I am young in their company and a mere youth among them in days and months and years – therefore they call me ‘Youth.’” Anderson proposes that the title might have Adamic origins since the explanation for the epithet “Youth” recalls the reason for the angelic refusal to worship Adam in the *Vita* on the basis of his inferiority to them by way of his age. Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” 108.

O Lord!”³³ Michael Stone previously noticed that the story found in 2 *Enoch* 21–22 is reminiscent of the account of Adam’s elevation and his veneration by angels found in the *Life of Adam and Eve*.³⁴ Stone notes that, along with the motifs of Adam’s elevation and his veneration by angels, the author of 2 *Enoch* appears also to be aware of the motif of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. Stone draws the reader’s attention to the phrase “sounding them out,” found in 2 *Enoch* 22:6, which another translation of the Slavonic text rendered as “making a trial of them.”³⁵ Stone notes that the expression “sounding them out” or “making a trial of them” implies here that it is the angels’ obedience that is being tested. Further comparing the similarities between Adamic and Enochic accounts, Stone observes that the order of events in 2 *Enoch* exactly duplicates the order found in the Primary Adam Books. Stone concludes that the author of 2 *Enoch* 21–22 was cognizant of the traditions resembling those found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. He also emphasizes that these traditions did not enter 2 *Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, because this form of the tradition does not occur in the Slavonic *Vita*.³⁶

Keeping in mind these remarkable parallels it is now time to return to the tradition of Enoch’s veneration by the incarcerated angels found in chapter seven of 2 *Enoch* in order to further explore its connection with the Adamic story of angelic veneration.

Several details of the story from 2 *Enoch* 7 seem also to be alluding to the Adamic template:

- a. In 2 *Enoch* 7, similar to the Adamic accounts, the sin of the imprisoned angels is disobedience to the Lord’s commandments.
- b. The agents of the rebellion are a group of angels with “their prince.” This recalls the information found in the Adamic accounts where not only Satan, but also other angels under him, refuse to venerate Adam. As we remember, the longer recension of 2 *Enoch* 18:3

³³ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.136, 1.138.

³⁴ M.E. Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*” in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 47–48.

³⁵ W. R. Morfill and R. H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1896) 28.

³⁶ Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve,” 47–48.

directly identifies the prisoners of the second heaven as the angels of Satanail.

- c. Finally, in the text the imprisoned angels bow down before a human being (Enoch). An additional important detail here is that the patriarch is addressed by the fallen angels as a “man” – “a man of God.” The combination of the motif of angelic bowing with a reference to the human nature of the object of veneration is intriguing and again might point to the protological Adamic account where some angels bow down before the human and others refuse to do so.

II. 2 Enoch 18: *The Watchers in the Fifth Heaven*

Traces of the Enochic Template

It is time now to proceed to the second textual unit dealing with the Watchers traditions situated in chapter 18 of the Slavonic apocalypse. In the longer recension of 2 Enoch 18 the following description can be found:

... And those men took me up on their wings and placed me on the fifth heaven. And I saw there many innumerable armies called Grigori. And their appearance was like the appearance of a human being, and their size was larger than that of large giants. And their faces were dejected, and the silence of their mouths was perpetual. And there was no liturgy in the fifth heaven. And I said to the men who were with me, “What is the explanation that these ones are so very dejected, and their faces miserable, and their mouths silent? And (why) is there no liturgy in this heaven?” And those men answered me, “These are the Grigori, who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail. And similar to them are those who went down as prisoners in their train, who are in the second heaven, imprisoned in great darkness. And three of them descended (*сойдошася три*) to the earth from the Lord’s Throne onto the place Ermon. And they broke the promise on the shoulder of Mount Ermon. And they saw the daughters of men, how beautiful they were; and they took wives for themselves, and the earth was defiled by their deeds. Who... in the entire time of this age acted lawlessly and practiced miscegenation and gave birth to giants and great monsters and great enmity. And that is why God has judged them with a great judgment; and they mourn their brothers, and they will be outraged on the great day of the Lord.” And I said to the Grigori, “I have seen your brothers and their deeds and their torments and their great prayers; and I have prayed for them. But the Lord has sentenced them under the earth until heaven and earth are ended forever.” And I said, “Why are

you waiting for your brothers? And why don't you perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord? Start up your liturgy, and perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord, so that you do not enrage your Lord God to the limit." And they responded to my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in this heaven. And behold, while I was standing with those men, 4 trumpets trumpeted in unison with a great sound, and the Grigori burst into singing in unison. And their voice rose in front of the face of the Lord, piteously and touchingly.³⁷

Already in the very beginning of this passage the angelic hosts situated in the fifth heaven are designated as *Grigori* (Slav. *Григору*),³⁸ the term which represents "a transcription of the Greek word for the Watchers."³⁹ Unlike in chapter 7, where the identity of the celestial gathering remains rather uncertain, here the authors of the text explicitly choose to name the angelic group. The text then provides some details of the angels' appearance. When the Slavonic apocalypse describes them, an intriguing comparison is made about the size of these angelic hosts, who are

³⁷ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.130–132. The shorter recension of 2 *Enoch* 18 has the following form: "And the men picked me up from there and carried me away to the fifth heaven. And I saw there many armies and Grigori. And their appearance was like the appearance of a human being, and their size was larger than that of large giants. And their faces were dejected, and the silence of their mouths. . . . And there was no liturgy taking place in the fifth heaven. And I said to the men who were with me, 'For what reason are they so dejected, and their faces miserable, and their mouths silent? And why is there no liturgy in this heaven?' And the men answered me, 'These are the Grigori, 200 princes of whom turned aside, 200 walking in their train, and they descended to the earth, and they broke the promise on the shoulder of Mount Hermon, to defile themselves with human wives. And, when they had defiled themselves, the Lord condemned them. And these ones mourn for their brothers and for the outrage which has happened.' But I, I said to the Grigori, 'I, I have seen your brothers and I have understood their accomplishments and I knew their prayers; and I have prayed for them. And now the Lord has sentenced them under the earth until heaven and earth are ended. But why are you waiting for your brothers? And why don't you perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord? Start up the former liturgy. Perform the liturgy in the name of fire, lest you annoy the Lord your God (so that) he throws you down from this place.' And they heeded the earnestness of my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in heaven. And behold, while I was standing, they sounded with 4 trumpets in unison, and the Grigori began to perform the liturgy as with one voice. And their voices rose up into the Lord's presence." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.131–133.

³⁸ Robert Henry Charles was the first scholar who clarified the terminological background of the Slavonic word "*Grigori*." He observed that "these are the Watchers, the ἑγρηγόροι, or עִירִים, of whom we have so full accounts in 1 En. vi–xvi, xix, lxxxvi." Charles, *APOT*, 2.439.

³⁹ J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: South Carolina, 1995) 159. It is intriguing that the authors of the Slavonic translation of 2 *Enoch* choose to keep this word in its Greek phonetical form, possibly envisioning it as a technical term.

depicted as beings “larger than the large giants” – a reference which might also invoke the Giants traditions – a conceptual trend which in early Enochic booklets is often intertwined with the Watchers story.

The text then describes the Watchers’ faces as being dejected, emphasizing also their perpetual silence. Enoch, who appears to be puzzled by the view of this silent and depressive angelic company, then asks his angelic guides about their strange dejected looks and their non-participation in the angelic liturgy. In response he hears the story that further provides the array of crucial motifs that invoke the memory of the account of the Watchers’ descent as it is described in the early Enochic circle. Two significant details here are the references to the number of the descended Watchers as two hundred (myriads)⁴⁰ and the designation of the place of their descent on earth as Mount Hermon (Slav. *Ермон/гора Ермонская*). It is well-known that the numeral two hundred in relation to the descended Watchers is attested already in the *Book of the Watchers* – one of the earliest Enochic booklets, whose text also locates the place of the Watchers’ descent at Mount Hermon.⁴¹

2 *Enoch* 18:4 then supplies another portentous detail by describing how the Watchers *broke the promise* on the shoulder of Mount Hermon. The reference to the “promise” (Slav. *обещание*)⁴² that the Watchers “broke” on the shoulder of the infamous mountain is intriguing and appears to hint to the early Enochic tradition of the binding oath taken by the Watchers. The passage found in chapter 6 of the *Book of the Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 6:3–6) unveils the motifs of mysterious promises and curses with which the rebellious angels decided to bind themselves, thus securing their ominous mission and fellowship.⁴³

⁴⁰ Some mss of 2 *Enoch* speak about 200 descended Watchers, others about 200 myriads of descended Watchers. Cf. the shorter recension of 2 *Enoch* 18:3 “These are the Grigori, 200 princes of whom turned aside, 200 walking in their train...” Andersen, “2 *Enoch*,” 1.131.

⁴¹ 1 *Enoch* 6:6 “And they were in all two hundred, and they came down on Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.68.

⁴² Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 16.

⁴³ 1 *Enoch* 6:3–5 “And Semyaza, who was their leader, said to them: ‘I fear that you may not wish this deed to be done, and (that) I alone will pay for this great sin.’ And they all answered him and said: ‘Let us all swear an oath, and bind one another with curses not to alter this plan, but to carry out this plan effectively.’ Then they all swore together and all bound one another with curses to it.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.67–68.

The descriptions of the Watchers' transgressions provided in 2 *Enoch* 18 are also noteworthy. The references to the Watchers' marriage to the human women, the procreation of the race of monstrous Giants, the enmity and evil that this infamous bastard offspring created on earth – all these features again betray the authors' familiarity with early Watchers and Giants traditions attested already in 1 *Enoch* 7.⁴⁴ It is also curious that 2 *Enoch* specifically emphasizes the sin of interbreeding (miscegenation) (Slav. *смешение*),⁴⁵ an important sacerdotal concern of intermarriage that looms large in the early Enochic circle.

Another typical “Enochic” detail of chapter 18 is the reference to God's sentencing the Watchers under the earth “until heaven and earth are ended forever.” This motif also appears to stem from the early Enochic lore where the fallen Watchers are depicted as imprisoned under the earth until the day of the final judgment.

All aforementioned details point to familiarity of the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse with the features of the original Enochic template.

Yet, despite the efforts of the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse to harmonize the plethora of early Enochic motifs into a coherent symbolic universe, the Watchers' account reflected in chapter 18 appears to be not entirely without contradictions. One of the puzzles here is a discrepancy about the location of the angelic group encountered by the patriarch earlier – the incarcerated rebels, whose memory is invoked again and again in chapter 18.

Thus, in 18:3 Enoch's angelic guides connect the Watchers in the fifth heaven with the angelic group in the second heaven depicted earlier in chapter 7:

⁴⁴ 1 *Enoch* 7:1–6 “And they took wives for themselves, and everyone chose for himself one each. And they began to go in to them and were promiscuous with them. . . . And they became pregnant and bore large giants, and their height (was) three thousand cubits. These devoured all the toil of men, until men were unable to sustain them. And the giants turned against them in order to devour men. And they began to sin against birds, and against animals, and against reptiles and against fish, and they devoured one another's flesh and drank the blood from it. Then the earth complained about the lawless ones.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.76–79.

⁴⁵ Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 16.

And similar to them are those who went down as prisoners in their train, who are *in the second heaven*, imprisoned in great darkness. (2 *Enoch* 18:3).

Later, in verse seven, Enoch himself reaffirms this connection between the two angelic groups when he unveils to the Watchers in the fifth heaven the sad destiny of their rebellious brothers in the lower realm:

And I said to the Grigori, "I have seen your brothers and their deeds and their torments and their great prayers; and I have prayed for them. But the Lord has sentenced them *under the earth* until heaven and earth are ended forever." (2 *Enoch* 18:7).

It is apparent that both passages about angelic rebellious groups in chapters 7 and 18 are interconnected by a series of allusions and familiar motifs intended to persuade the reader that both groups are interrelated and now are separated because of their previous deeds. Yet, 2 *Enoch* 18:7 exhibits a clear contradiction when Enoch reports to the Watchers in the fifth heaven that God has sentenced their brothers "*under the earth*."⁴⁶ Several scholars previously noticed this topological discrepancy about the exact location of the second group of Watchers.⁴⁷ Reflecting on the textual contradictions about the location of the imprisoned Watchers, one of these scholars, John Reeves, observes that

2 *Enoch* is peculiar in that it places the prison for the incarcerated Watchers in heaven itself. This transcendent location contradicts the explicit testimonies of other works where these rebellious Watchers are held; viz. beneath the earth (1 *Enoch* 10:4–7; 12–14; 88:3; *Jub.* 5:6, 10; 2 *Pet* 2:4). Moreover, a later passage in 2 *Enoch* is simultaneously cognizant of this latter tradition: "And I said to the Watchers, I have seen your brothers, and I have heard what they did; . . . and I prayed for them. And behold, the Lord has condemned them below the earth until the heavens and the earth pass away . . ." The reference in this text is surely to the imprisoned Watchers that Enoch had previously encountered in the second heaven.

⁴⁶ Francis Andersen points to the fact that even though the phrase "under the earth" is not found in some manuscripts of the shorter recension (V and N) its "genuineness cannot be doubted." He further acknowledges that the phrase "simply does not fit the cosmography of the rest of the book, and even contradicts this very ch. [18], which locates the other fallen angels in the second heaven. . . ." Andersen, "2 *Enoch*," 1.132.

⁴⁷ A. Rubinstein, "Observation on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 7–10; Andersen, "2 *Enoch*," 1.114; Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature," 185; VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 159.

But here, while touring the “fifth heaven,” the imprisoned Watchers are spoken as being “beneath the earth”!⁴⁸

It is possible that the discrepancy pertaining to the location of the imprisoned angels can be explained by the topological peculiarities of the Slavonic apocalypse whose main theological emphasis is centered on the ascension of the translated hero into the heavenly realm. Yet, possibly cognizant of the various early traditions of the patriarch’s tours into other (subterranean) realms, where Enoch observes the places of the punishment of the rebellious Watchers, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse try to reconcile (not always seamlessly) these earlier traditions with their ouranological scheme.⁴⁹ In this respect the phrase “I saw a darkness greater than *earthly darkness*,”⁵⁰ used in the description of the incarcerated angels in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* 7:1, deserves some additional attention. It appears that this phrase strives to underline the otherworldly, possibly even subterranean, nature of the darkness encountered by the patriarch in the second heaven. Clearly the text wants to emphasize that it is a darkness of *another realm* by comparing it with “earthly darkness.” Later, in verse 2 this comparison with the *earthly* darkness is repeated again, this time in the portrayal of the angels’ appearance: “And those angels have the appearance of darkness itself, *more than earthly darkness*.”⁵¹

Traces of the Adamic Template

Besides the references to the Enochic template, the passage from chapter 18 reveals also the authors’ familiarity with the Adamic mythology of evil and the peculiar details of its demonological settings. Moreover, it appears that the interaction between the two paradigmatic templates in *2 Enoch* can be seen not merely as an attempt at mechanical

⁴⁸ Reeves, “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library,” 185.

⁴⁹ Martha Himmelfarb suggests that “. . . in *2 Enoch* the ascent is clearly a reworking of the ascent in the *Book of the Watchers* in combination with the tour to the ends of the earth. . . .” M. Himmelfarb, “Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses,” in: *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (eds. J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth; JSPSS, 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 82. Cf. also G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005) 221–223.

⁵⁰ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.112.

⁵¹ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.112.

mixture of the elements of both trends but rather as the progressive movement toward their organic union when the mutual interaction is able to generate a qualitatively different tradition which is not equal anymore to their initial parts. Thus one can see here the consistent effort to “fuse” two mythological streams into a new coherent ideology – an enormously difficult creative task carried out masterfully by the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse. One of the crucial signs of such qualitative transition can be seen in the literary destiny of the main protological and eschatological opponent of the Adamic tradition – Satan(ail),⁵² who is now invited into the new unfamiliar entourage of the rival mythological trend, where he is being fashioned as the leader of the rebellious Watchers.

“These are the Grigori, who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together *with their prince* (с князом своим) Satanail...” (2 Enoch 18).

The fact that this identification represents not just an accidental slip of the pen or an interpolation, but a sign of the consistent and well-designed theological strategy of the text becomes evident if we compare the description found in chapter 18 with the Watchers tradition found in chapter 7. There again the group of the incarcerated Watchers is described by the authors as the rebellious group who turned away *with their prince*:

⁵² Rendering of the name of the chief negative protagonist of the Adamic tradition here not as Satan but as Satan-ail (el), with a theophoric angelic ending, appears to underline his original angelic status. In this context the change of the name to Satan (Slav. *Сотона*) and the removal of the theophoric ending signifies the expelling from the angelic rank, a tradition hinted in the longer recension of 2 Enoch 31: “Adam – Mother; earthly and life. And I created a garden in Edem, in the east, so that he might keep the agreement and preserve the commandment. And I created for him an open heaven, so that he might look upon the angels, singing the triumphal song. And the light which is never darkened was perpetually in paradise. And the devil understood how I wished to create another world, so that everything could be subjected to Adam on the earth, to rule and reign over it. The devil is of the lowest places. And he will become a demon, because he fled from heaven; Sotona, because his name was Satanail. In this way he became different from the angels. His nature did not change, but his thought did, since his consciousness of righteous and sinful things changed. And he became aware of his condemnation and of the sin which he sinned previously. And that is why he thought up the scheme against Adam. In such a form he entered paradise, and corrupted Eve. But Adam he did not contact. But on account of her nescience I cursed them. But those whom I had blessed previously, them I did not curse; and those whom I had not blessed previously, even them I did not curse – neither mankind I cursed, nor the earth, nor any other creature, but only mankind’s evil fruit-bearing. This is why the fruit of doing good is sweat and exertion.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.152–154.

These are those who turned away from the Lord, who did not obey the Lord's commandments, but of their own will plotted together and turned away *with their prince* (с князем своим)...(2 Enoch 7).

Both passages are interconnected through identical Slavonic terminology since the leader of the rebellious angels in both cases is designated as *a prince* (Slav. князь).⁵³ It appears that in the theological tapestry of the Slavonic apocalypse, chapter 7 plays an important role by serving for its readers as a sort of a preliminary initiation into a new mythology of evil – the demonological setting where both the identities of the Watchers and their new leader Satanail are still concealed, thus anticipating their full conceptual disclosure in the later chapters.

But how really novel and original was this conceptual move for the Enochic trend? It should be noted that the leadership of Satan over the fallen Watchers is unknown in the earliest Enochic booklets. Yet, in the late Second Temple Enochic text, the *Book of the Similitudes*, one can see the extensive appropriation of the Satan terminology, both in the generic and in the titular sense.⁵⁴ One of the instances of the “generic” use of such terminology can be found in *1 Enoch* 40:7 where the term “satans” appears to designate one of the classes of angelic beings⁵⁵ whose function is to punish⁵⁶ or to put forward accusations against those who dwell on earth: “And the fourth voice I heard driving away the satans, and not allowing them to come before the Lord of Spirits to accuse those who dwell on the dry ground.”⁵⁷

⁵³ Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 16.

⁵⁴ Robert Henry Charles underlines the peculiarity of the Satan terminology in this section of *1 Enoch*. R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912) 66.

⁵⁵ Daniel Olson observes that “the author [of the *Similitudes*] could have deduced the existence of ‘satans’ as the class of malevolent angels from passages like Numbers 22, where the Angel of the Lord is twice described as coming, literally, ‘as a satan’ to block Balaam’s progress (vv 22, 32).” D. Olson, *Enoch: A New Translation* (North Richland Hills: Bibal, 2004) 80.

⁵⁶ Matthew Black argues that in this passage “the satans are a special class of angels” that “have been identified with the ‘angels of punishment.’” M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (SVTP, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 200.

⁵⁷ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.128. See also *1 Enoch* 41:9; 53:3; 65:6. The Satan tradition might also be indirectly present in *1 Enoch* 69:6, the passage which describes an angelic leader Gadre’el who is credited there with leading Eve astray. On this tradition see D. Olson, *Enoch: A New Translation* (North Richland Hills: Bibal, 2004) 126; K. Coblenz Bautch, “Adamic traditions in the Parables? A Query on *1 Enoch* 69:6,” in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 352–360.

The first possible steps towards the transitional template in which Satan becomes the leader of the fallen Watchers might be discernable in the *Similitudes* 54:4–6 where the “hosts of Azazel” are named as the “servants of Satan”:⁵⁸

And I asked the angel of peace who went with me, saying: “These chain-instruments – for whom are they being prepared?” And he said to me: “These are being prepared for the hosts of Azazel, that they may take them and throw them into the lowest part of Hell; and they will cover their jaws with rough stones, as the Lord of Spirits commanded. And Michael and Gabriel, Raphael and Phanuel – these will take hold of them on that great day, and throw them on that day into the furnace of burning fire, that the Lord of Spirits may take vengeance on them for their iniquity, in that they became servants of Satan and led astray those who dwell upon the dry ground.”⁵⁹

Scholars argued that the term “Satan” was used here not in the generic but in the “titular” sense.⁶⁰ If it is so this portentous conceptual development is relevant for our study of the Satanail tradition found in the Slavonic apocalypse, since it might provide additional proof that the extensive adoption of Adamic mythology of evil in *2 Enoch* was not a later Christian interpolation, but a genuine Enochic development possibly stemming from other late Second Temple Enochic booklets.

Yet, despite its promising nature, the origin of the Satan tradition found in the *Parables* remains clouded in mystery. It is really difficult to discern from this terse and enigmatic passage found in the *Similitudes* 54 if the authors of the book did really have the knowledge of the full-blown Adamic template, including the story of the angelic veneration, or if they were merely borrowing the titular usage of Satan from the biblical materials. Scholars previously noticed this peculiar tendency of the *Similitudes* for the extensive and open adaptations of some biblical titles in relation to Enoch – a novel development in comparison with the earliest Enochic booklets whose authors deliberately

⁵⁸ Matthew Black observes that “the idea that the watchers were the subjects of Satan is peculiar to the Parables, reflecting a later demonology....” M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (SVTP, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 219.

⁵⁹ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.138.

⁶⁰ Daniel Olson notes that “...Satan the individual is mentioned once in the ‘parables’ (54:6), so it would appear that both the generic and the titular use are employed in this book, but caution is in order because ‘satans’ in Ethiopic can simply mean ‘the hosts of Satan’ and need not imply a wholly distinct category of evil spirits.” D. Olson, *Enoch: A New Translation* (North Richland Hills: Bibal, 2004) 80.

tried to maintain distance from the “biblical” books.⁶¹ In the light of these developments it is possible that titular usage of the name “Satan” similar to many of Enoch’s titles found in the *Similitudes* might have here biblical roots. Nevertheless, it remains intriguing that the extensive appropriation of Satan terminology is found in such a transitional Enochic booklet as the *Parables*, a text which similar to the Slavonic apocalypse, tries to dramatically enhance the exalted profile of the seventh antediluvian patriarch leading this character into the entirely new, one might say “divine,” stage of his remarkable theological career by identifying him with the preexistent son of man.

Now it is time to return to the Slavonic apocalypse where the mutual interaction between two mythologies of evil appears to be exercising a lasting influence not only on the story of the Watchers but also on the account of the negative protagonist of the Adamic stream – Satan(ail) who is now acquiring some novel features from the Enochic tradition.

The longer recension of 2 *Enoch* 29 elaborates the story of Satanail’s fall by enhancing it with some new intriguing details. It describes that after his transgression (described there as the violation of the ranks of the angelic hierarchy in an attempt to exalt himself) Satanail was cast out from heaven with his angels.⁶² The text further unveils that after his

⁶¹ The *Book of the Similitudes* endows the seventh antediluvian patriarch with several roles and titles previously unknown in the early Enochic lore, such as “righteous one,” “anointed one,” “chosen one,” and “son of man.” One cannot fail to recognize that in contrast to other designations of Enoch found in the early Enochic materials, the titles from the *Book of the Similitudes* exhibit strong roots and connections with the motifs and themes found in the Bible, particularly in the Book of Isaiah, Psalm 2, and the Book of Daniel. Scholars have therefore proposed that these titles might be shaped by familiar biblical characters, such as the Servant of the Lord found in Deutero-Isaiah and the Son of Man found in Daniel 7. On the titles of Enoch in the *Book of the Similitudes* and their biblical roots see J. VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 169–70.

⁶² 2 *Enoch* 29:1–6: “And for all my own heavens I shaped a shape from the fiery substance. My eye looked at the solid and very hard rock. And from the flash of my eye I took the marvelous substance of lightning, both fire in water and water in fire; neither does this one extinguish that one, nor does that one dry out this one. That is why lightning is sharper and brighter than the shining of the sun, and softer than water, more solid than the hardest rock. And from the rock I cut off a great fire, and from the fire I created the ranks of the bodiless armies – ten myriad angels – and their weapons are fiery and their clothes are burning flames. And I gave orders that each should stand in his own rank. Here Satanail was hurled from the height, together

demotion “he [Satanail] was flying around in the air, ceaselessly above the Bottomless (Slav. *бездна*).”⁶³ This reference to the Slavonic word *бездна* (which more precisely can be translated as “pit” or “abyss”) as the place of punishment of the fallen angel, invokes the memory of the Asael/Azazel story from *1 Enoch* 10 where the leader of the fallen angels is thrown by the angel Raphael into the subterranean pit.⁶⁴

Here again one can see the profound dialogue between two formative traditions of the fallen angels that alters or enhances the features of the original templates, reshaping the stories of their infamous heroes.

III. *The Transitional Template and its Afterlife in the Shi'ur Qomah and Hekhalot accounts*

Our investigation of the mixed demonological template found in *2 Enoch* is important not only because it witnesses to the portentous dialogue between Enochic and Adamic mythologies of evil but also because it helps to illuminate another important theological transition taking place for the first time in the Slavonic apocalypse – that is the paradigm shift from the Jewish apocalypticism to early Jewish mysticism, thus in many ways anticipating future developments inside the Enochic lore and serving as a blueprint for the later Watchers traditions reflected in the *Shi'ur Qomah* and Hekhalot lore.⁶⁵

with his angels. But one from the order of the archangels deviated, together with the division that was under his authority. He thought up the impossible idea, that he might place his throne higher than the clouds which are above the earth, and that he might become equal to my power. And I hurled him out from the height, together with his angels. And he was flying around in the air, ceaselessly, above the Bottomless. And thus I created the entire heavens. And the third day came.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.148.

⁶³ Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 28.

⁶⁴ *1 Enoch* 10:4–6: “And further the Lord said to Raphael: ‘Bind Azazel by his hands and his feet, and throw him into the darkness. And split open the desert which is in Dudael, and throw him there. And throw on him jagged and sharp stones, and cover him with darkness; and let him stay there for ever, and cover his face, that he may not see light, and that on the great day of judgment he may be hurled into the fire.’” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.87–88.

⁶⁵ The similar development might be detected also in the *Book of the Similitudes*, an Enochic text already mentioned in this study which too exhibits some connections with the Merkabah tradition.

In this respect it is therefore useful to discuss some early signs and facets of this ideological transition taking place at the end of the Second Temple period through the exploration of several pioneering aspects of the Watchers traditions found in *2 Enoch* and the afterlife of these novel developments in later Jewish mysticism.

I have previously argued about the formative value of Enochic traditions reflected in the Slavonic apocalypse for late Jewish mysticism and particularly for the Enochic developments attested in *Sefer Hekhalot*.⁶⁶ My previous research was mainly concentrated on Enoch's figure. Yet, in the light of the current investigation it becomes clear that the lessons which *2 Enoch* provides for the later Hekhalot developments appear to be not limited solely to the transformation of the narrative involving the chief positive protagonist of the Enochic tradition – the seventh antediluvian hero, but also involve the peculiar reworking of the story of its anti-heroes – the fallen Watchers. In this section of my study I would like to concentrate on two motifs found in *2 Enoch* that appear to be anticipating future Jewish mystical developments: the motif of the three watchers and the theme of the liturgical duties of Enoch-Metatron.

Three Watchers

This study has already drawn attention to the intriguing fact that the Slavonic apocalypse operates with the tradition of the descent of the three Watchers. Several manuscripts of *2 Enoch* 18 tell that “three of them [the Watchers] descended to the earth from the Lord's Throne onto the place Ermon.” This passage invokes the memory of a peculiar tradition found in the later Enochic lore reflected in *Sefer Hekhalot* that mentions three ministering angels – Uzza, Azza, and Azael, enigmatic characters, whose names are reminiscent of the infamous leaders of the Watchers – Shemihazah and Asael.⁶⁷ *Sefer Hekhalot* contains two textual units which deal with Uzza, Azza, and Azael. One of them is situated in chapter four and another in chapter five.

⁶⁶ Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 148–208.

⁶⁷ For the background of the tradition about Uzza, Azza, and Azael, see A. Y. Reed, *What the Fallen Angels Taught: The Reception-History of the Book of the Watchers in Judaism and Christianity* (Ph. D. diss.; Princeton, 2002) 337ff; idem, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 252ff.

3 *Enoch* 4:1–10 reads:

R. Ishmael said: I said to Metatron: "... why, then, do they call you 'Youth' in the heavenly heights?" He answered: "Because I am Enoch, the son of Jared..." "... the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me (Enoch) in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of the ministering angels, Uzza, Azza, and Azael, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height. They said before the Holy One, blessed be he, 'Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, Do not create man!'... At once they all arose and went to meet me and prostrated themselves before me, saying, 'Happy are you, and happy your parents, because your Creator has favored you.' Because I am young in their company and a mere youth among them in days and months and years – therefore they call me 'Youth.'"⁶⁸

As has already been noticed in this study this specimen of the late "Enochic" lore found in *Sefer Hekhalot* is significant for our investigation because it attests to the conceptual matrix of the mythology of evil very similar to the one found in the Slavonic apocalypse, where the Enochic trend attempts to emulate the paradigmatic features of the Adamic story. It is possible that the influence of the Adamic template in the Hekhalot passage is even more decisive than it might appear at first glance since besides the theme of the angelic veneration of the seer it also invokes the motifs of the protological situation of the creation of humanity and the angelic opposition to this act of the Deity. Although the tradition of the veneration of Adam is not mentioned directly in this unit – it is indirectly (similarly to the Slavonic apocalypse) reaffirmed by the veneration that angels offer to Enoch. As has been mentioned already in this study, previous scholars have noticed the presence of the pseudepigraphical matrix of the Adamic tradition in this passage.⁶⁹

In *Sefer Hekhalot* 5 the tradition about three "Watchers" takes another, this time clearly "Enochic" turn, by connecting Uzza, Azza, and Azael with the familiar theme of the corruption of humankind through a reference to the angels' illicit pedagogy, a motif known already in the earliest Enochic mythology of evil:

What did the men of Enosh's generation do? They roamed the world from end to end.... They brought down the sun, the moon, the stars and the constellations.... How was it that they had the strength to bring

⁶⁸ Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.258–59.

⁶⁹ Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," 107.

them down? It was only because Uzza, Azza, and Azael taught them sorceries that they brought them down and employed them, for otherwise they would not have been able to bring them down.⁷⁰

It is noteworthy that both passages about three fallen angels from *Sefer Hekhalot* have distinctive features of the mixed template, very similar to the one found in the Slavonic apocalypse. Both texts are trying to bring the whole array of the Adamic motifs, including the account of the angelic veneration, into the framework of the Watchers story. Although the transmission history of the post-Second Temple Enochic traditions is clouded in mystery – it is possible that the developments detected in the Slavonic apocalypse exercised a formative influence on the later Enochic lore, including *Sefer Hekhalot*. In this respect it is noteworthy that despite the tradition of the fallen angels' opposition to God's creation of humans found in several places in rabbinic literature,⁷¹ the motif of the *three watchers* appears in Jewish milieu only in *Sefer Hekhalot*.⁷²

Enoch as the Celestial Choirmaster of the Watchers

Another portentous aspect of the Watchers traditions found in *2 Enoch* that appears to exercise a long-lasting influence on later Jewish mystical developments is its liturgical dimension. The repeated and persuasive invocation of the idea of angelic veneration in many ways hints (directly and indirectly) to this peculiar sacerdotal aspect, since this motif is often placed in the Second Temple and rabbinic materials in the context of celestial worship. In this respect one should not ignore the persistent liturgical concern that permeates the Watchers story in the Slavonic apocalypse.

Indeed, the authors of the Watchers narratives of *2 Enoch* do not shy away from expressing their interest in the theme of the heavenly liturgy. Thus, when Enoch sees the “dejected” Watchers in the fifth heaven, the passage immediately invokes the tradition of angelic wor-

⁷⁰ Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.260.

⁷¹ *b. Sanh.* 38B, *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael 2*, and *Zohar* III.207b–208a.

⁷² The motif of the three Watchers is also found in several Tafsirs on the Qur'an. For the original texts, translations and extensive discussion of these traditions see F.I. Abdullaeva *Персидская Кораническая экзегетика: Тексты, переводы, комментарии* (С.-Петербург: Петербургское Востоковедение, 2000).

ship by pointing to the Watchers' non-participation in the celestial liturgical praxis:

And their faces were dejected, and the silence of their mouths was perpetual. And there was no liturgy in the fifth heaven. "What is the explanation that these ones are so very dejected, and their faces miserable, and their mouths silent? And (why) is *there no liturgy in this heaven?*"

The liturgical dimension of the Watchers tradition in *2 Enoch* is intriguing and deserves further investigation. Yet, in order to apprehend the full meaning of this tradition for the later Enochic developments a short excursus in the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* materials is necessary.

The later Merkabah materials emphasize the crucial role that Enoch-Metatron occupies in celestial worship by serving as the leader of the angelic hosts.

3 Enoch 15B provides the following description of his spectacular liturgical office:

Metatron is Prince over all princes, and stands before him who is exalted above all gods. He goes beneath the throne of glory, where he has a great heavenly tabernacle of light, and brings out the deafening fire, and puts it in the ears of the holy creatures, so that they should not hear the sound of the utterance that issues from the mouth of the Almighty.⁷³

A similar description in another Hekhalot text (*Synopse* §390)⁷⁴ elaborates further Metatron's unique liturgical role:

One *hayyah* rises above the seraphim and descends upon the tabernacle of the youth whose name is Metatron, and says in a great voice, a voice of sheer silence: "The Throne of Glory is shining." Suddenly the angels fall silent. The watchers and the holy ones become quiet. They are silent, and are pushed into the river of fire. The *hayyot* put their faces on the ground, and this youth whose name is Metatron brings the fire of deafness and puts it into their ears so that they could not hear the sound of God's speech or the ineffable name. The youth whose name is Metatron then invokes, in seven voices, his living, pure, honored, awesome, holy, noble, strong, beloved, mighty, powerful name.⁷⁵

⁷³ Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.303.

⁷⁴ MS New York JTS 8128.

⁷⁵ P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) 164.

These enigmatic passages reveal that one of Metatron's duties in the heavenly realm involves his leadership over the angelic hosts delivering heavenly praise to the Deity. The testimonies that unfold Metatron's liturgical role are not confined solely to the Hekhalot corpus, but can also be detected in another prominent literary expression of early Jewish mysticism represented by the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. The passages found in the *Shi'ur Qomah* texts attest to a similar tradition in which Metatron is portrayed as a liturgical leader. Thus, *Sefer Haqqomah* 155–164 reads:

And (the) angels who are with him come and encircle the Throne of Glory. They are on one side and the (celestial) creatures are on the other side, and the Shekhinah is on the Throne of Glory in the center. And one creature goes up over the seraphim and descends on the tabernacle of the lad whose name is Metatron and says in a great voice, a thin voice of silence, "The Throne of Glory is glistening!" Immediately, the angels fall silent and the *'irin* and the *qadushin* are still. They hurry and hasten into the river of fire. And the celestial creatures turn their faces towards the earth, and this lad whose name is Metatron, brings the fire of deafness and puts (it) in the ears of the celestial creatures so that they do not hear the sound of the speech of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the explicit name that the lad, whose name is Metatron, utters at that time in seven voices, in seventy voices, in living, pure, honored, holy, awesome, worthy, brave, strong, and holy name.⁷⁶

In reference to these traditions Martin Cohen notes that in the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition Metatron's service in the heavenly tabernacle appears to be "entirely liturgical" and "is more the heavenly choirmaster and beadle than the celestial high priest."⁷⁷

It is evident that the tradition preserved in *Sefer Haqqomah* cannot be separated from the microforms found in *Synopse* §390 and 3 *Enoch* 15B since all these narratives are unified by a similar structure and terminology. All of them also emphasize Metatron's leading role in the course of the celestial service.

It is possible that this tradition of Enoch-Metatron as the one who encourages and prepares angels for their liturgical praxis in heaven might have its early roots already in 2 *Enoch*.

⁷⁶ M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (TSAJ, 9; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 162–4.

⁷⁷ M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983) 134.

As we remember in the beginning of chapter 18 the patriarch is depicted as the one who laments about the absence of angelic liturgy in the fifth heaven and the silence of the Watchers. In the light of the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* materials, his concern about the pause in the angelic liturgical routine appears to be not just a matter of curiosity. Further in the same unit Enoch encourages the celestial Watchers to start their liturgy before the face of God. The longer recension of *2 Enoch* 18:8–9 relates:

And I [Enoch] said, “Why are you waiting for your brothers? And why don’t you *perform the liturgy*”⁷⁸ before the face of the Lord? Start up *your liturgy*,⁷⁹ and perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord, so that you do not enrage your Lord to the limit.” And they responded to my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in this heaven. And behold, while I was standing with those men, 4 trumpets trumpeted in unison with a great sound, and the Grigori burst into singing in unison. And their voice rose in front of the face of the Lord, piteously and touchingly.⁸⁰

One can notice that the imagery of this account represents a rather vague sketch that only distantly alludes to the future prominent liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron. Yet here, for the first time in the Enochic tradition, the seventh antediluvian patriarch dares to assemble and direct the angelic creatures for their routine job of delivering praise to the Deity.

It is also significant that, despite the fact that in *2 Enoch* 18 the patriarch gives his advice to the angels situated in the fifth heaven, he repeatedly advises them to start the liturgy “before the Face of the Lord,” i.e., in front of the divine *Kavod*, the exact location where Youth-Metatron will later conduct the heavenly worship of the angelic hosts in the *Shi'ur Qomah* and Hekhalot accounts.

These later specimens of Jewish mystical lore provide an important interpretive framework that allows us to discern the traces of these later fully developed liturgical traditions already in *2 Enoch*. In this respect the Slavonic apocalypse can be seen as the crucial conceptual nexus loaded with several portentous transitions that become instrumental

⁷⁸ Slav. *служите*. Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 17.

⁷⁹ Slav. *служби ваше*. Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 17.

⁸⁰ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.132.

in shaping the angelological template prominent in the later *Shi'ur Qomah* and Hekhalot lore.

In light of the developments discernable in *2 Enoch* it is possible that the unique liturgical role that Enoch-Metatron occupies in the Merkabah tradition in relation to the celestial creatures is linked to the tradition of his veneration by the angels. Already in the Slavonic apocalypse the celestial citizens recognize the authority and the leadership of the seventh antediluvian hero by bowing down before him. This peculiar ritual of recognition of the celestial leader appears not to be forgotten in the later mystical lore. In this respect it is striking that in the aforementioned liturgical passages from the *Shi'ur Qomah* and Hekhalot accounts various classes of angels, including the class named עִירָן (the Watchers), are depicted with “their faces towards the earth” while Enoch-Metatron puts fire in their ears. It cannot be excluded that one can have here the liturgical afterlife of the familiar motif of the angelic bowing before the translated hero. It is noteworthy that already in early Adamic lore that constitutes the background of the developments found in *2 Enoch* – the theme of the angelic veneration of Adam is placed in the larger framework of divine worship – where the Protoplast appears to be understood not as the ultimate object of veneration but rather as a representation or an icon of the Deity through whom angels are able to worship God.⁸¹

Conclusion

In conclusion of our study of the intriguing relationships between the Enochic and Adamic templates of the fallen angels in the Slavonic apocalypse we should again draw attention to the broader theological concerns and circumstances for such striking metamorphoses of two previously relatively independent trends. As has been already pointed out in our study, one possible reason why many Adamic themes, including the motif of the angelic veneration, were brought for the first time in *2 Enoch* into the framework of the Enochic developments, was the changing status of the main hero of the Enochic tradition. It appears

⁸¹ See Georgian *LAE* 14:1: “Then Michael came; he summoned all the troops of angels and told them, ‘Bow down before the likeness and the image of the divinity.’” Latin *LAE* 14:1: “Having gone forth Michael called all the angels saying: ‘Worship the image of the Lord God, just as the Lord God has commanded.’”

that in the Slavonic apocalypse the story of the exalted protagonist of the Enochic lore seems to be stepping into the new era of its theological and anthropological development in which the patriarch undergoes a remarkable transition from an exemplar of the transformed angelomorphic humanity, as he appears in the early Enochic literature, to the new conceptual stage in which he is envisioned now as a specimen of the theomorphic humanity.

Scholars previously noted that many future roles of Enoch-Metatron as the lesser representation of the divine Name and the replica of the divine body, the offices that clearly intend to exalt the translated hero above the angelic world – are already hinted in the Slavonic apocalypse. In this respect it appears to be not coincidental that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse are repeatedly trying to emphasize the supra-angelic status of the translated patriarch and his unique position in relation to the Deity.⁸² The motif of the angelic veneration, a development borrowed by the Enochic authors from the rival Adamic trend, seems to help further affirm this new status of the elevated patriarch securing his unique place above the angels.

In light of these significant anthropological transitions leading Jewish mediatorial lore into the new era of its evolution, a brief look at another portentous theological account of the divine humanity, also written in the first century CE, might provide additional illuminating insights. Narrating Jesus' temptation in the wilderness the Gospel of Matthew unveils the following tradition:

Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and he said to him,

⁸² Thus, in *2 Enoch* 24 God invites the seer to the place next to him, closer than that of Gabriel, in order to share with him the information that remains hidden even from the angels. The shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 24 puts even greater emphasis on the unique nature of this offer; in this recension God places the patriarch “to the left of himself, closer than Gabriel (Slav. *Ближе Гаврила*).” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.143; Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 90 (Ms. B), 117 (Ms. U). Crispin Fletcher-Louis writes that the fact that in *2 Enoch* the seer is seated next to God “suggests some contact with the rabbinic Enoch/Metatron tradition.” C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, 2/94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 154. Michael Mach also suggests that this motif is closely connected with the Metatron imagery. He notes that “the exaltation to a rank higher than that of the angels as well as the seating at God’s side have their parallels and considerable development in Enoch’s/Metatron’s transformation and enthronement as depicted in *3 Enoch*.” M. Mach, “From Apocalypticism to Early Jewish Mysticism?” in: *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (3 vols.; ed. J.J. Collins; New York: Continuum, 1998) 1.229–264 at 251.

“All these I will give you, if you will fall down (πεσὼν) and worship me.” Then Jesus said to him, “Begone, Satan! for it is written, ‘You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.’” Then the devil left him, and behold, angels came and ministered (διηκόνουν) to him. (Matt 4:8–11. RSV).

It has been previously noticed that this passage where the Devil tempts Jesus by asking him to fall down (πεσὼν) and worship the demon appears to be alluding also to the Adamic account of the fall of Satan who once refused to venerate the Protoplast.⁸³ The ancient enemy of humankind appears to be trying to take revenge for his protological mishap involving the First Adam by asking now for the veneration and worship from the Last Adam – Christ. Yet, Jesus refuses to follow this demonic trap, and after he rejects Satan’s proposal – the motif of angelic worship is then invoked again, this time directly and unambiguously in the text. Matt 4:11 tells its readers that after the temptation was over, angels came to worship Jesus.⁸⁴

Here, similar to the possibly contemporaneous tradition found in the Slavonic apocalypse, the motif of angelic worship hints at the new divine status of a human character and helps to understand the anthropological paradigm shift which is leading the restored humankind back into the new, but once before lost, abode of its divine existence⁸⁵ – the dimension in which a long time ago humanity was exalted above the angels humbly venerated by them.

⁸³ On the Adamic background of the Temptation narrative in Matthew and Luke see J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (2 vols.; AB, 28, 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981) 1.512.

⁸⁴ A significant number of scholars believe that Matthew reflects the original order of the threefold temptation story, and that Luke represents the inversion of this original order.

⁸⁵ Cf. Armenian *LAE* 14:1: “Then Michael summoned all the angels and God said to them, ‘Come, bow down to god whom I made.’”

IN THE MIRROR OF THE DIVINE FACE:
THE ENOCHIC FEATURES OF THE *EXAGOGE* OF
EZEKIEL THE TRAGEDIAN

... The Lord of all the worlds warned Moses that he should beware of his face. So it is written, 'Beware of his face'.... This is the prince who is called... Metatron.

Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur §§396–397.

Introduction

One of the important compendiums of Jewish mystical lore, a composition known to scholars as *3 Enoch* or the *Book of the Heavenly Palaces* (*Sefer Hekhalot*) offers a striking re-interpretation of the canonical account of Moses' reception of Torah. In this text the supreme angel Metatron, also associated in *Sefer Hekhalot* with the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch, is depicted as the one who reveals Torah to the Israelite prophet by bringing it out of his heavenly storehouses.¹ The account portrays Moses passing the revelation received from Enoch-Metatron to Joshua and other characters of the Israelite history representing the honorable chain of transmissions of the oral law, known to us also from the mishnaic *Pirke Avot*, the *Sayings of the Fathers*. The Hekhalot writer, however, revises the traditional mishnaic arrangement of prophets, rabbis, and sages by placing at the beginning of the chain the figure of Enoch-Metatron, viewed as the initial revealer. This choice of the primordial mediator competing with the primacy of Moses is not coincidental and in many ways serves as an important landmark in the long-lasting theological tradition that began many centuries earlier when the Second Temple was still standing. This development points to the theological competition between two heroes, the son of Jared

¹ "Metatron brought it [Torah] out from my storehouses and committed it to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, Joshua to the Elders, the Elders to the Prophets, the Prophets to the Men of the Great Synagogue, the Men of the Great Synagogue to Ezra the Scribe, Ezra the Scribe to Hillel the Elder...." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.315; P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) §80.

and the son of Amram, which had ancient roots traced to the sacerdotal debates of the Second Temple era.

Recent scholarship has become increasingly cognizant of the complexity of the social, political, and theological climate of the late Second Temple period when the various sacerdotal groups and clans were competing for the primacy and authority of their priestly legacy. This competitive environment created a whole range of ideal mediatorial figures that, along with traditional mediators like Moses, also included other characters of primeval and Israelite history, such as Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Melchisedek, and Abraham. Scholars now are well aware that in the late Second Temple period the sacerdotal legacy of Mosaic revelation came under fierce attack from various mediatorial trends that sought to offer a viable ideological alternative to the Mosaic stream through speculation on the pre-Mosaic protological traditions. One such development, which has its roots in the early Enochic materials, tried to portray the seventh antediluvian patriarch as the custodian of the more ancient cultic revelation that had existed long before Moses. In this rival paradigm Enoch was depicted as an ancient mediator who received from God revelations superior to those received many centuries later by the son of Amram in the wilderness. The use of such a protological figure as Enoch does not seem coincidental since this primeval hero had been endowed with divine disclosures long before the Israelite prophet received his revelation and sacerdotal prescriptions on Mount Sinai. It is apparent that the circumstances surrounding the patriarch's reception of revelation described in the Second Temple Enochic booklets were much loftier than the circumstances of the Mosaic encounter in the biblical narrative. While Moses received Torah from the Lord on earth, the Enochic hero acquired his revelation in the celestial realm, instructed there by angels and God. In the biblical account the Lord descends to Moses' realm to convey his revelation to the seer, while Enoch is able to ascend to the divine abode and behold the Throne of Glory. The advantage here is clearly on the side of the Enochic hero.

Within the context of an ongoing competition, such a challenge could not remain unanswered by custodians of the Mosaic tradition. The non-biblical Mosaic lore demonstrates clear intentions of enhancing the exalted profile of its hero. This tendency detectable in the non-biblical Mosaic materials, of course, was not provoked solely by the rival Enochic developments, but rather was facilitated by the presence of a whole range of competitive exalted figures prominent in Second

Temple Judaism. Still, the challenge of the pseudepigraphic Enoch to the biblical Moses cannot be underestimated, since the patriarch was the possessor of an alternative esoteric revelation reflected in the body of extensive literature that claimed its supremacy over Mosaic Torah.²

The aforementioned set of initial disadvantages in the fierce rivalry might explain why the Mosaic tradition, in its dialogue with Enochic lore and other Second Temple mediatorial developments, could not rest on its laurels but had to develop further and adjust the story of its character, investing him with an angelic and even divine status comparable to the elevated status of the rivals.

One of the significant early testimonies of this polemical interaction between Mosaic and Enochic traditions has survived as a part of the drama *Exagoge*,³ a writing attributed to Ezekiel the Tragedian

² On the interaction between Enochic and Mosaic traditions, see: P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 102–111; idem, "Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," in: *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. C. Hempel et al., BETL, 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002) 223–243; G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 254–303; J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: South Carolina, 1995); idem, "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," in: *The Bible at Qumran* (eds. P.W. Flint and T.H. Kim; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 129–148.

³ On the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian, see S.N. Bunta, *Moses, Adam and the Glory of the Lord in Ezekiel the Tragedian: On the Roots of a Merkabah Text* (Ph.D. diss.; Marquette University, 2005); J.J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 224–225; M. Gaster, *The Samaritans. Their History, Doctrines and Literature* (London: Oxford University Press, 1925); I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980); Y. Gutman, *The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1958–1963) [in Hebrew]; C.R. Holladay, "The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian," *SBLSP* 10 (1976) 447–452; idem, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Vol. II, Poets* (SBLTT, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series 12; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 439–449; P.W. van der Horst, "De Joodse toneelschrijver Ezechiël," *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 36 (1982) 97–112; idem, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34 (1983) 21–29; idem, "Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel," *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 364–365; L. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 58ff; H. Jacobson, "Mysticism and Apocalyptic in Ezekiel's *Exagoge*," *ICS* 6 (1981) 273–293; idem, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); K. Kuiper, "De Ezechiele Poeta Iudaeo," *Mnemosyne* 28 (1900) 237–280; idem, "Le poète juif Ezéchiël," *Revue des études juives* 46 (1903) 48–73, 161–177; P. Lanfranchi, *L'Exagoge d'Ezéchiël le Tragique: Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (SVTP, 21; Leiden: Brill, 2006); idem, "Moses' Vision of the Divine Throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian," in: *The Book of Ezekiel and its Influence* (eds. H.J. De Jonge and J. Tromp; Aldershot,

that depicts the prophet's experience at Sinai as his celestial enthronement. The text seeks to enhance the features of the biblical Moses and attribute to him some familiar qualities of the exalted figure of the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch. Preserved in fragmentary form in Eusebius of Caesarea's⁴ *Praeparatio evangelica*,⁵ *Exagoge* 67–90 reads:

Moses: I had a vision of a great throne on the top of Mount Sinai and it reached till the folds of heaven. A noble man was sitting on it, with a crown and a large scepter in his left hand. He beckoned to me with his right hand, so I approached and stood before the throne. He gave me the scepter and instructed me to sit on the great throne. Then he gave me a royal crown and got up from the throne. I beheld the whole earth all around and saw beneath the earth and above the heavens. A multitude of stars fell before my knees and I counted them all. They paraded past me like a battalion of men. Then I awoke from my sleep in fear.

Raguel: My friend (ὦ ζέβε), this is a good sign from God. May I live to see the day when these things are fulfilled. You will establish a great throne, become a judge and leader of men. As for your vision of the whole earth, the world below and that above the heavens – this signifies that you will see what is, what has been and what shall be.⁶

England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007) 53–59; W.A. Meeks, “Moses as God and King,” in: *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968) 354–371; idem, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967); A. Orlov, “Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition,” *SBLSP* 39 (2000) 130–147; idem, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 262–268; R.G. Robertson, “Ezekiel the Tragedian,” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.803–819; K. Ruffatto, “Raguel as Interpreter of Moses' Throne Vision: The Transcendent Identity of Raguel in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian” (Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Philadelphia, 22 November 2005); idem, “Polemics with Enochic Traditions in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian,” *JSP* 15 (2006) 195–210; E. Starobinski-Safran, “Un poète judéo-hellénistique: Ezéchiel le Tragique,” *MH* 3 (1974) 216–224; E. Vogt, *Tragiker Ezechiel* (JSHRZ, 4.3; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1983); M. Wiencke, *Ezechielis Judaei poetae Alexandrini fabulae quae inscribitur Exagoge fragmenta* (Münster: Monasterii Westfalorum, 1931); R. Van De Water, “Moses' Exaltation: Pre-Christian?” *JSP* 21 (2000) 59–69.

⁴ Eusebius preserves the seventeen fragments containing 269 iambic trimeter verses. Unfortunately, the limited scope of our investigation does not allow us to reflect on the broader context of Moses' dream in the *Exagoge*.

⁵ The Greek text of the passage was published in several editions including: A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca* (PVTG, 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 210; B. Snell, *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 288–301; Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54; Holladay, *Fragments*, 362–366; Lanfranchi, *L'Exagoge d'Ezéchiel le Tragique: Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire*, 101–283.

⁶ Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54–55.

Wayne Meeks observes that, given its quotation by Alexander Polyhistor (ca. 80–40 B.C.E.), this Mosaic account can be taken as a witness to traditions of the second century B.C.E.⁷ Several characteristics of the narrative suggest that its author was familiar with Enochic traditions and tried to attribute some features of the story of the seventh antediluvian hero to Moses.⁸ This study will investigate the possible connections between the *Exagoge* and the Enochic tradition.

Oneiromantic Dreams

In the study of the Enochic features of the *Exagoge*, one must examine the literary form of this account. The first thing that catches the eye here is that the Sinai encounter is now fashioned not as a real life experience “in a body,” as it was originally presented in the biblical accounts, but as a dream-vision.⁹ This oneiromantic perspective of the narrative immediately brings to mind the Enochic dreams-visions,¹⁰

⁷ Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, 149. See also Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.308–12.

⁸ Alexander, Gutman, Holladay, Meeks, Robertson, Ruffatto, and van der Horst point to various Enochic parallels in the *Exagoge*. For a preliminary analysis of the “Enochic” features of the *Exagoge*, see also A. Orlov, “Ex 33 on God’s Face,” 142–43; idem, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 262–268.

⁹ The text unambiguously points to the fact that Moses acquired his vision in a dream. In the *Exagoge* 82 the seer testified that he awoke from his sleep in fear.

¹⁰ Scholars have previously noted that already in early Enochic materials the patriarch is depicted as an oneiromantic practitioner who receives his revelations in dreams. Thus, when in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 13:7–9a), Enoch describes one of his dream experiences, it vividly recalls the model often attested in similar cases of oneiromantic practices. The text reads: “And I went and sat down by the waters of Dan in Dan which is south-west of Hermon; and I read out the record of their petition until I fell asleep. And behold a dream came to me, and visions fell upon me, and I saw a vision of wrath...” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 1.45; 2.94. Other booklets of *1 Enoch* also attest to the patriarch’s visions as mantic dreams. Thus, when in *1 Enoch* 83 and 85, the seventh antediluvian patriarch describes his revelations, the text makes explicit that these visions are received in dreams. These passages also point to the fact that Enoch’s oneiromantic experiences occurred throughout his lifetime, possibly even from his early days, which the seer spent in the house of his grandfather Malalel. Later developments of this tradition reflected in the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Book of Giants* also highlight dreams as important media for the patriarch’s revelations. Thus, *Jub* 4:19 alludes to a vision that Enoch received in a sleep-dream in which he saw all the history of humankind until its eschatological consummation: “While he [Enoch] slept he saw in a vision what has happened and what will occur – how things will happen

particularly *1 Enoch* 14, in which the patriarch's vision of the *Kavod* is fashioned as an oneiromantic experience.¹¹

Additional proof that Moses' dream is oneiromantic in form and nature is Raguel's interpretation, which in the *Exagoge* follows immediately after Moses' dream-vision. The interpretation represents a standard feature of a mantic dream where the content of the received dream must be explained by an oneirocritic. Raguel serves here as such an oneirocritic – he discerns the message of the dream, telling the recipient (Moses) that his vision was positive.

It is also significant that the dream about the Sinai encounter in the *Exagoge* is fashioned as a vision of the forthcoming event, an anticipation of the future glorious status and deeds of Moses. This prophetic perspective is very common for Enochic accounts where the Sinai event is often depicted as a future event in order to maintain the antediluvian perspective of the narration. Thus, in the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85–90) Enoch receives a disclosure in his dream in which primeval and Israelite history is unfolded through distinctive symbolic descriptions involving zoomorphic imagery. In the course of the unfolding revelation Enoch beholds the vision of the sheep ascending on the lofty rock which, in the zoomorphic code of the *Animal Apocalypse*, symbolizes the future ascent of the Israelite prophet on Mount Sinai to receive Torah from God.

Heavenly Ascent

Another Enochic detail of the *Exagoge* is that Moses' ascension in a dream allows him not simply to travel to the top of the earthly mountain but, in imitation of the seventh antediluvian hero, to transcend the *orbis terrarum*, accessing the various extraterrestrial realms that include the regions "beneath the earth and above the heavens." The ascension vividly recalls the early Enochic journeys in dream-visions

for mankind during their history until the day of judgment." VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.26–27.

¹¹ Although dreams are not uncommon in classic Greek drama, the content of the dream-vision suggests a Jewish rather than Greek background. On the use of dreams in Greek drama in connection with the *Exagoge*, see Starobinski-Safran, "Un poète judéo-hellénistique: Ezéchiel le Tragique," 216–24; Jacobson, "Mysticism and Apocalyptic in Ezekiel's *Exagoge*," 273–93; Holladay, *Fragments*, 2.437; Lanfranchi, "Moses' Vision of the Divine Throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian," 56.

to the upper heavens, as well as the lower regions, learning about the upcoming judgment of the sinners.¹² This profile of Moses as a traveler above and beneath the earth is unknown in biblical accounts and most likely comes from the early Enochic conceptual developments.

It should be noted that the imagery of celestial travel to the great throne on the mountain recalls Enoch's journeys in the *Book of the Watchers* to the cosmic mountain, a site of the great throne of the divine *Kavod*.¹³ Scholars have previously noted terminological similarities in the throne language between the Enochic accounts and the *Exagoge*.¹⁴

Angelus Interpres

The visionary account of the prophet, which is now fashioned as a celestial journey, also seems to require the presence of another character appropriate in such settings, the *angelus interpres*, whose role is to assist the seer in understanding the upper reality. This new visionary dimension appears to be reflected in the figure of Raguel.¹⁵ His striking interpretive omniscience recalls the expertise of the angel Uriel of the Enochic accounts, who was able to help the seventh antediluvian patriarch overcome initial fear and discern the proper meaning of the revealed things.¹⁶ That Raguel might be understood as a supernatural

¹² See, for example, *1 Enoch* 17–18.

¹³ The imagery of the divine Throne situated on the mountain is widespread in the *Book of the Watchers* and can be found, for example, in *1 Enoch* 18:6–8 “And I went towards the south – and it was burning day and night – where (there were) seven mountains of precious stones. . . . And the middle one reached to heaven, like the throne of the Lord, of stibium, and the top of the throne (was) of sapphire;” *1 Enoch* 24:3 “And (there was) a seventh mountain in the middle of these, and in their height they were all like the seat of a throne, and fragrant trees surrounded it;” *1 Enoch* 25:3 “And he answered me, saying: “This high mountain which you saw, whose summit is like the throne of the Lord, is the throne where the Holy and Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King, will sit when he comes down to visit the earth for good.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.104; 2.113.

¹⁴ Holladay, *Fragments*, 2.440.

¹⁵ On the figure of Raguel as a possible angelic interpreter, see also Ruffatto, “Raguel as Interpreter of Moses’ Throne Vision: The Transcendent Identity of Raguel in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian.”

¹⁶ *Exagoge* 82: “Then I awoke from my sleep in fear.” The awaking of a seer from a dream-vision in fear is a common motif in the Enochic literature. See *1 Enoch* 83:6–7; 90:41–42; *2 Enoch* 1:6–7 (shorter recension).

helper in the *Exagoge* is shown in his role of a direct participant in the vision whose knowledge of the disclosed things, rather unexpectedly, surpasses that of the seer and allows him to initiate the visionary into the hidden meaning of the revealed reality.

Another fact suggesting that Raguel might be an angelic interpreter is that it is very unusual in Jewish traditions that a non-Jew interprets dreams of a Jew. Howard Jacobson observes that “in the Bible nowhere does a non-Jew interpret a symbolic dream for a Jew. . . . Such dreams when dreamt by Jews are usually assumed to be understood by the dreamer (e.g. Joseph’s dreams) or else are interpreted by some divine authority (e.g. Daniel 8).”¹⁷ It is however not uncommon for a heavenly being to discern the proper meaning of an Israelite’s visions. It is therefore possible that Raguel is envisioned here as a celestial, not a human, interpreter.

In light of these considerations, it is possible that Raguel’s address, which occupies the last part of the account, can be seen, at least structurally, as a continuation of the previous vision. One detail that might support such an arrangement is that in the beginning of his interpretation Raguel calls Moses ξένοϛ,¹⁸ a Greek term which can be rendered in English as “guest.”¹⁹ Such an address might well be interpreted here as an angel’s address to a human visitor attending the upper celestial realm which is normally alien to him.

Esoteric Knowledge

It has already been noted that the polemics between the Mosaic and the Enochic tradition revolved around the primacy and supremacy of revealed knowledge. The author of the *Exagoge* appears to challenge the prominent esoteric status of Enochic lore and the patriarch’s role as an expert in secrets by underlining the esoteric character of Mosaic revelation and the prophet’s superiority in the mysteries of heaven and earth. In *Exagoge* 85 Raguel tells the seer that his vision of the world

¹⁷ Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 92.

¹⁸ Jacobson and Robertson render the Greek word ξένοϛ as “friend.”

¹⁹ Robertson suggests this rendering as one of the possible options. He writes that “in addition to the more common meaning of the term, there are various levels of usage, among which is the meaning ‘guest.’” Robertson, “Ezekiel the Tragedian,” 812, note d2. See also Holladay, *Fragments*, 2.446.

below and above signifies that he will see what is, what has been, and what shall be.²⁰ Wayne Meeks notes the connection of this statement of Raguel with the famous expression “what is above and what is below; what is before and what is behind; what was and what will be,” which was a standard designation for knowledge belonging to the esoteric lore.²¹ Meeks draws attention²² to *m. Hag. 2:1* where the prohibition of discussing the esoteric lore,²³ including the Account of the Creation (מעשה בראשית) and the Account of the Chariot (מעשה מרכבה), is expressed through the following formula that closely resembles the description found in the *Exagoge*: “Whosoever gives his mind to four things it was better for him if he had not come into the world – what is above? what is beneath? what was beforetime? and what will be hereafter.”²⁴

It is possible that the formulae expressed in *m. Hag. 2:1* and the *Exagoge 85* might have their early roots in the Enochic lore where the patriarch’s mediation of esoteric knowledge encompasses the important spatial dimensions of the realms above and beneath the earth as well as the temporal boundaries of the antediluvian and eschatological times.²⁵ In the Enochic materials one can also find some designations of esoteric knowledge that might constitute the original background of the later mishnaic formulae. Thus, in the section of the *Book of the Similitudes* (1 *Enoch* 59–60) dealing with the secrets of the heavenly

²⁰ Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54–55.

²¹ *Sifre Zutta* 84. See also 3 *Enoch* 10:5; 11:3.

²² Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, 208. See also van der Horst, “Moses’ Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist,” 28; C. Fletcher-Louis, “4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology,” *DSD* 3 (1996) 236–252, esp. 246.

²³ G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1954) 74.

²⁴ H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) 213.

²⁵ The patriarch’s mediating duties comprise a whole range of spatial and chronological dimensions. His functions as mediator are not confined to a particular realm or a particular petitioner, since his clients include a range of divine, angelic, human, and composite creatures situated in the underworld as well as in heaven. In the *Book of the Watchers* faithful angels of heaven ask him to assist their brethren in the lower realm. In the same text he mediates on behalf of the rebellious group which includes the fallen Watchers and the Giants. Enoch’s mediating activities are also not limited by specific chronological boundaries. He mediates in the generation of the Flood, but he is also expected to be a mediator and a witness of divine judgment in the eschatological period. It appears that the patriarch is predestined to mediate judgment in two significant temporal loci. One of them is the historical locus associated with the generation of the Flood; in this locale Enoch acts as an intercessor and a writer of testimonies to the Watchers, Giants and humans. The second locus is eschatological and involves Enoch’s future role as witness of eschatological divine judgment.

phenomena, the *angelus interpretes* reveals to Enoch the secret that is “first and last in heaven, in the heights, and under the dry ground” (1 *Enoch* 60:11).²⁶ These enigmatic formulations pertaining to the patriarch’s role as a possessor of esoteric wisdom²⁷ would never be forgotten in the Enochic lore and could be found even in the later rabbinic compositions dealing with the afterlife of the seventh antediluvian hero, including the already mentioned *Sefer Hekhalot*,²⁸ which would depict Enoch-Metatron instructed by God in “the wisdom of those above and of those below, the wisdom of this world and of the world to come.”²⁹

In light of the passage found in the *Exagoge*, it is possible that its author, who shows familiarity with the earlier form of the Mishnaic formula, attempts to fashion the Mosaic revelation as an esoteric tradition, similar to the Enochic lore.³⁰

²⁶ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.144.

²⁷ On the role of the seventh antediluvian hero as an expert in the esoteric lore, see: Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 31–34; 48–50; 101–104; 188–200.

²⁸ Although many distinguished students of Jewish mystical traditions tried to demonstrate the conceptual links between the *Exagoge* and some *Hekhalot* materials, including 3 *Enoch*, Pierluigi Lanfranchi in his recent studies offered his criticism of these scholarly endeavours. He remarks that “...despite these attractive speculations on the *merkavah*, there are profound differences between the text of Ezekiel the Tragedian and the mystic literature. The most obvious is the length of the description of the throne. In 3 *Enoch*, based on the first chapter of the book of Ezekiel, it is rich in detail and extends over several chapters, while in the *Exagoge*, it is sober and concise and occupies only a few verses. The interests of the author composing his tragedy are obvious not the same as the preoccupations of the authors of the mystical texts of the *Hekhalot*. From a methodological point of view, it is risky to combine two texts that share the same subject (the vision of the divine Throne), but spring from a different tradition and are separated by at least six centuries.” Lanfranchi, “Moses’ Vision of the Divine Throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian,” 55. See also idem, *L’Exagoge d’Ezéchiel le Tragique: Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire*, 184–185. I hope that our study will help to answer some of Lanfranchi’s criticism by further demonstrating the common “Enochic” roots of traditions found in the *Exagoge* and 3 *Enoch*.

²⁹ Alexander, “3 *Enoch*,” 1.264.

³⁰ The insistence of some extra-biblical Mosaic accounts on the fact that the prophet ascended to heaven might be directed towards constructing the Mosaic disclosure as an esoteric tradition in order to secure the superiority of his revelation. Wayne Meeks observes that “the most common function of ascension stories in literature of the period and milieu we are considering is a guarantee of esoteric tradition. In the apocalyptic genre the ascension of the ‘prophet’ or of the ancient worthy in whose name the book is written is an almost invariable introduction to the description of the secrets which the ascendant one ‘saw.’ The secrets, therefore, whose content may vary from descriptions of the cosmic and political events anticipated at the end of days to cosmological details, are declared to be of heavenly origin, not mere earthly wisdom. This pattern is the clear sign of a community which regards its own esoteric lore as inacces-

Heavenly Counterpart

The placement of Moses on the great throne in the *Exagoge* account³¹ and his donning of the royal regalia have often been interpreted by scholars as the prophet's occupation of the seat of the Deity. Pieter van der Horst remarks that in the *Exagoge* Moses becomes "an anthropomorphic hypostasis of God himself."³² The uniqueness of the motif of God's vacating the throne and transferring occupancy to someone else has puzzled scholars for a long time.³³ An attempt to deal with this enigma by bringing in the imagery of the vice-regent does not, in my judgment, completely solve the problem. The vice-regents in Jewish traditions (for example, Metatron) do not normally occupy God's throne but instead have their own glorious chair, which sometimes serves as a replica of the divine Seat. It seems that the enigmatic identification of the prophet with the divine Form can be best explained not through the concept of a vice-regent but through the notion of a heavenly twin or counterpart. Before investigating this concept in the *Exagoge*, we need to provide some background for this tradition in Enochic materials.

sible to ordinary reason but belonging to a higher order of truth. It is clear beyond dispute that this is one function which the traditions of Moses' ascension serves." Meeks adds that in the later rabbinic accounts "the notion that Moses received cosmological secrets led to elaborate descriptions of his 'heavenly journeys,' very similar to those attributed elsewhere to Enoch." Meeks, "Moses as God and King," 367–8.

³¹ The imagery of Moses' enthronement is not confined solely to the *Exagoge* account but can be found also in other extra-biblical materials. Thus, Crispin Fletcher-Louis draws attention to a parallel in the Jewish *Orphica*: an exalted figure, apparently Moses, is also placed on the celestial throne. C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 137; M. Lafargue, "Orphica," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.796–7. *Orphica* 26–41 reads: "...a certain unique man, an offshoot from far back of the race of the Chaldeans.... yes he after this is established in the great heaven on a golden throne. He stands with his feet on the earth. He stretches out his right hand to the ends of the ocean. The foundation of the mountains trembles within at [his] anger, and the depths of the gray sparkling sea. They cannot endure the mighty power. He is entirely heavenly, and he brings everything to completion on earth, being 'the beginning, the middle, and the end,' as the saying of the ancients, as the one water-born has described it, the one who received [revelations] from God in aphorisms, in the form of a double law...." Lafargue, "Orphica," 2. 799–800.

³² van der Horst, "Some Notes on the *Exagoge*," 364.

³³ van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 25; Holladay, *Fragments*, 444.

Scholars have previously observed³⁴ that chapter 71 of the *Book of Similitudes* seems to entertain the idea of the heavenly twin of a visionary in identifying Enoch with the son of man, an enthroned messianic figure.³⁵ For a long time scholars have found it puzzling that the son of man, distinguished in the previous chapters of the *Similitudes* from Enoch, is suddenly identified with the patriarch in *1 Enoch* 71. James VanderKam suggests that this paradox can be explained by the Jewish notion, attested in several ancient Jewish texts, that a creature of flesh and blood could have a heavenly double or counterpart.³⁶ As an example, VanderKam points to Jacob's traditions in which the patriarch's "features are engraved on high."³⁷ He observes that the theme of the visionary's ignorance of his higher celestial identity is also detectable in the pseudepigraphic text the *Prayer of Joseph* where Jacob is identified with his heavenly counterpart, the angel Israel. VanderKam's reference to Jacob's lore is not coincidental. Conceptions of the heavenly image or counterpart of a seer take their most consistent form in Jacob's traditions.³⁸

³⁴ See J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71," in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 182–3; M. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995) 177–80; J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 144–5; Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 151. On a heavenly double see also W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (3d ed.; HNT, 21; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1966) 324; A. Orlov, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," in: *Of Scribes and Sages* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; London: T&T Clark, 2004) 2.59–76; idem, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 165–176.

³⁵ It is important to note that in the *Similitudes*, the son of man is depicted as the one seated on the Throne of Glory. See *1 Enoch* 62:5, *1 Enoch* 69:29. Jarl Fossum observes that "in the 'Similitudes' the 'Elect One' or 'Son of Man' who is identified as the patriarch Enoch, is enthroned upon the 'throne of glory.' If 'glory' does not qualify the throne but its occupant, Enoch is actually identified with the Glory of God". Fossum further suggests that "...the 'Similitudes of Enoch' present an early parallel to the targumic description of Jacob being seated upon the 'throne of glory.'" Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 145.

³⁶ VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71," 182–3.

³⁷ The metaphor of "engraving" on the *Kavod* might signify here that the seer's identity became reflected in the divine Face, as in a mirror.

³⁸ Besides the biblical account the traditions concerning Jacob's celestial double are also presented in the pseudepigraphical materials such as the *Prayer of Joseph* and the *Ladder of Jacob* and in several targumic texts, including *Tg. Ps.-J.*, *Tg. Neof.*, and *Frg. Tg.* In *Tg. Ps.-J.* to Gen 28:12 the following description can be found: "He

In view of the aforementioned traditions about the heavenly twins of Enoch and Jacob, it is possible that the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian also attests to the idea of a heavenly counterpart of the seer when it identifies Moses with the glorious anthropomorphic extent. We may recall that the text depicts Moses' vision of "a noble man" with a crown and a large scepter in the left hand installed on a great throne. In the course of the seer's initiation, the attributes of the "noble man," including the royal crown and the scepter, are transferred to Moses who is instructed to sit on the throne formerly occupied by the noble man. The visionary is clearly identified with his heavenly counterpart in the narrative, in the course of which the seer literally takes the place and the attributes of his upper identity. The account also underlines that Moses acquired his vision in a dream, by reporting that he awoke from his sleep in fear. Here, just as in the Jacob tradition, while the seer is sleeping on earth his counterpart in the upper realm is identified with the *Kavod*.³⁹

[Jacob] had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching toward the heavens. . . . and on that day they (angels) ascended to the heavens on high, and said, 'Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed (engraved) in the Throne of Glory, and whom you have desired to see.'" *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible, 1B; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 99–100. A distinctive feature of this description is that the heavenly counterpart of Jacob, his "image," is engraved on the Throne of Glory. Engraving on the Throne indicates here an association with the *Kavod* since the Throne is the central part of the *Kavod* imagery – the seat of the anthropomorphic Glory of the Lord. Besides the tradition of engraving on the Throne, some Jewish materials point to an even more radical identification of Jacob's image with the *Kavod*. Jarl Fossum's research demonstrates that in some traditions about Jacob, his image or likeness is depicted, not simply as engraved on the heavenly throne, but as seated upon the throne of glory. Fossum argues that this second tradition is original. See Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 139–142.

³⁹ It cannot be excluded though that the *Exagoge* authors might have known the traditions of the patriarch's enthronement in heaven, similar to those reflected in the *Similitudes*. Also it cannot be excluded that the Mesopotamian proto-Enochic traditions, in which the prototype of Enoch, the king Enmeduranki, was installed on a throne in the assembly of gods, might have influenced the imagery found in the *Exagoge*. Pieter van der Horst in his analysis of the *Exagoge* entertains the possibility that "... in pre-Christian times there were (probably rival) traditions about Enoch and Moses as *synthronoi theou*; and . . . these ideas were suppressed (for obvious reasons) by the rabbis." van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 27.

Stars and Fallen Angels

The *Exagoge* depicts Moses as a counter of the stars. The text also seems to put great emphasis on the prophet's interaction with the celestial bodies that fell before Moses' knees and even paraded past him like a battalion of men. Such "astronomical" encounters are unknown in the biblical Mosaic accounts. At the same time the preoccupation of the seventh antediluvian patriarch with astronomical and cosmological calculations and lore is well known and constitutes a major subject of his revelations in the earliest Enochic booklets, such as the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of the Watchers*, in which the patriarch is depicted as the counter of stars.⁴⁰ The later Enochic and Merkabah materials also demonstrate that the patriarch's expertise in counting and measuring celestial and earthly phenomena becomes a significant conceptual avenue for his future exaltation as an omniscient vice-regent of the Deity⁴¹ who knows and exercises authority over the "orders of creations."⁴²

The depiction of stars *falling* before Moses' knees also seems relevant for the subject of this investigation, especially in view of the symbolism found in some Enochic booklets where the fallen angels are often portrayed as stars. Thus, for example, the already mentioned *Animal Apocalypse* depicts the descent of the Watchers as the vision of stars falling down from heaven: "... I saw heaven above, and behold, a star fell from heaven.... and again I saw in the vision and looked at heaven, and behold, I saw many stars, how they came down...." (*1 Enoch* 86).⁴³

If we assume that in the *Exagoge* stars indeed signify angels and even more precisely *fallen* angels, the vision of the fallen angels genuflecting before Moses' feet might again invoke the memory of some Enochic developments since the motif of angelic veneration of a seer by the fallen angels plays a significant role in some Enochic materials.

⁴⁰ *1 Enoch* 33:2–4.

⁴¹ See *Synopse* §66 (*3 Enoch* 46:1–2).

⁴² See *2 Enoch* 40:2–3: "I know everything, and everything I have written down in books, the heavens and their boundaries and their contents. And all the armies and their movements I have measured. And I have recorded the stars and the multitude of multitudes innumerable. What human being can see their cycles and their phases? For not even the angels know their number. But I have written down all their names...." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.164.

⁴³ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.196–97.

The memory of this important motif is present even in the later “Enochic” compositions of the rabbinic period, for example in *Sefer Hekhalot* where the following tradition of Enoch’s veneration by the fallen angels can be found:

R. Ishmael said: I said to Metatron: “... You are greater than all the princes, more exalted than all the angels, more beloved than all the ministers... why, then, do they call you ‘Youth’ in the heavenly heights?” He answered, “Because I am Enoch, the son of Jared.... the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of the ministering angels, Uzza, Azza, and Azael, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height. They said before the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, Do not create man!’.... At once they all arose and went to meet me and prostrated themselves before me, saying, ‘Happy are you, and happy your parents, because your Creator has favored you.’ Because I am young in their company and mere youth among them in days and months and years – therefore they call me ‘Youth.’” *Synopse* §§5–6.⁴⁴

It is striking that in this passage Enoch-Metatron is venerated by angelic beings whose names (Uzza, Azza, and Azael) are reminiscent of the names of the notorious leaders of the fallen angels found in the early Enochic lore that are rendered by the zoomorphic code of the *Animal Apocalypse* as the stars. The tradition of angelic veneration has rather early roots in the Enochic lore and can be found in *2 Enoch* 22 where the patriarch’s transformation into the heavenly counterpart, like in the *Exagoge*, is accompanied by angelic veneration. In this account the Lord invites Enoch to stand forever before his Face. In the course of this initiation the Deity orders the angels of heaven to venerate the patriarch.⁴⁵

Another account of angelic veneration is found in *2 Enoch* 7 where the patriarch is venerated not simply by celestial angels but the *fallen* ones. *2 Enoch* 7:3 depicts Enoch carried by angels to the second heaven. There the patriarch sees the condemned angels kept as prisoners awaiting the “measureless judgment.” Enoch’s angelic guides explain to him that the prisoners are “those who turned away from the Lord, who did not obey the Lord’s commandments, but of their own will plotted together and turned away with their prince and with those who are

⁴⁴ Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.258–59.

⁴⁵ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.138.

under restraint in the fifth heaven.”⁴⁶ The story continues with angelic veneration. The condemned angels bow down to Enoch asking for his intercession: “Man of God, pray for us to the Lord!”⁴⁷

It should be noted that, although the motif of angelic veneration has its roots in the Adamic lore,⁴⁸ the theme of veneration by the fallen angels might be a peculiar Enochic development. Moreover, it seems that the initial traits of this theological development in which the fallen angels “fall before the knees” of the seventh antediluvian patriarch can be already found in the earliest Enochic booklets, including the *Book of the Watchers* where the fallen Watchers approach the patriarch begging him for help and intercession.

Transformation of the Seer’s Face

In the Second Temple Jewish materials the transformation of a seer into his heavenly counterpart often involves the change of his bodily appearance. It may happen even in a dream as, for example, in the *Similitudes’* account of the heavenly counterpart where, although Enoch’s journey was “in spirit,” his “body was melted” and, as a result, he acquired the identity of the son of man.⁴⁹ A similar change of the visionary’s identity might be also discernible in the *Exagoge* where the already mentioned designation of Moses as ξένοϛ occurs. Besides the meanings of “friend”

⁴⁶ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.114.

⁴⁷ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.114.

⁴⁸ On the Adamic background of the motif of angelic veneration, see M.E. Stone, “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*,” *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–156; G. Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan,” in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 83–110; A. Orlov, “On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich,” *JSJ* 34 (2003) 274–303. On the motif of angelic veneration in rabbinic literature see, also A. Altmann, “The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends,” *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391; B. Barc, “La taille cosmique d’Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles apres J.-C.,” *RSR* 49 (1975) 173–85; J. Fossum, “The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis,” *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (2 vols; eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1996) 1.529–39; G. Quispel, “Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition,” *Eranos Jahrbuch* 22 (1953) 195–234; idem, “Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis,” *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13; A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 108–115.

⁴⁹ 1 Enoch 71:11.

and “guest,” this Greek word also can be translated as “stranger.”⁵⁰ If the *Exagoge* authors indeed had in mind this meaning of ξένος, it might well be related to the fact that Moses’ face or his body underwent some sort of transformation that altered his previous physical appearance and made him appear as a stranger to Raguel. The motif of Moses’ altered identity after his encounter with the *Kavod* is reflected not only in Exod 34 but also in extra-biblical Mosaic accounts, including the tradition found in Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* 12:1. The passage tells that the Israelites failed to recognize Moses after his glorious metamorphosis on Mount Sinai:

Moses came down. (Having been bathed with light that could not be gazed upon, he had gone down to the place where the light of the sun and the moon are. The light of his face surpassed the splendor of the sun and the moon, but he was unaware of this). When he came down to the children of Israel, upon seeing him they did not recognize him. But when he had spoken, then they recognized him.⁵¹

The motif of the shining countenance of Moses is important for our ongoing discussion of the polemics between Enochic and Mosaic traditions that were striving to enhance the profiles of their main characters with features borrowed from the hero of the rival trend. This distinctive mark of the Israelite prophet’s identity, his glorious face, which served in Biblical accounts as the undeniable proof of his encounter with God, later became appropriated in the framework of Enochic⁵²

⁵⁰ Robertson points to this possibility. Robertson, “Ezekiel the Tragedian,” 812, note d2.

⁵¹ H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation* (AGAJU, 31; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 1.110.

⁵² In *2 Enoch* the motif of the luminous face of the seer was transferred for the first time to the seventh antediluvian patriarch. The text tells that the vision of the divine Face had dramatic consequences for Enoch’s appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. In Enoch’s radiant metamorphosis before the divine Countenance, an important detail can be found which links Enoch’s transformation with Moses’ account in the Book of Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 one learns about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch’s face at the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs us that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel was “terrifying and frightful,” and appeared frozen; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. With these cold hands he then chilled the patriarch’s face. Right after this chilling procedure, the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at him. This reference to the dangerous radiance of Enoch’s face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Exodus 34.

and Metatron⁵³ traditions as the chief distinguishing feature of the Enochic hero. In this new development Moses' shining face became nothing more than the later imitation of the glorious countenance of Enoch-Metatron. Thus, in *Sefer Hekhalot* 15B, Enoch-Metatron tells Moses about his shining visage: "Son of Amram, fear not! for already God favors you. Ask what you will with confidence and boldness, for light shines from the skin of your face from one end of the world to the other."⁵⁴

Here, as in the case of very few distinctive visionaries who were predestined to encounter their heavenly counterparts and to behold the divine Face like their own reflection in a mirror, Moses too finds out that his luminous face is a reflection of the glorious face of the Deity. Yet, there is one important difference: this divine Face is now represented by his long-lasting contender, Enoch-Metatron.⁵⁵

⁵³ *Synopse* §19 (3 *Enoch* 15:1) depicts the radiant metamorphosis of Enoch-Metatron's face: "When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all the needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.267.

⁵⁴ 3 *Enoch* 15B:5. Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.304.

⁵⁵ Scholars have observed that in the Merkabah tradition Metatron is explicitly identified as the hypostatic Face of God. On Metatron as the hypostatic Face of God, see A. De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJSup., 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 329; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 424–425.

MOSES' HEAVENLY COUNTERPART IN THE *BOOK OF JUBILEES* AND THE *EXAGOGE* OF EZEKIEL THE TRAGEDIAN

Introduction

One of the enigmatic characters in the *Book of Jubilees* is the angel of the presence who dictates to Moses heavenly revelation. The book provides neither the angel's name nor a clear picture of his celestial roles and offices. Complicating the picture is the angel's arrogation, in certain passages of the text, of what the Bible claims are God's words or deeds.¹ In *Jub.* 6:22, for example, the angel utters the following:

For I have written (this) in the book of the first law in which I wrote for you that you should celebrate it at each of its times one day in a year. I have told you about its sacrifice so that the Israelites may continue to remember and celebrate it throughout their generations during this month – one day each year.²

James VanderKam observes that according to these sentences “the angel of the presence wrote the first law, that is, the Pentateuch, including the section about the Festival of Weeks in the cultic calendars (Lev. 23:15–21 and Num. 28:26–31, where the sacrifices are specified).”³ VanderKam further notes that “these passages are represented as direct revelations by God to Moses in Leviticus and Numbers, not as statements from an angel.”⁴

Jub. 30:12, which retells and modifies Gen 34, repeats the angel's authorial claim again:

For this reason I have written for you in the words of the law everything that the Shechemites did to Dinah and how Jacob's sons said: “We will not give our daughter to a man who has a foreskin because for us that would be a disgraceful thing.”⁵

¹ J.C. VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7 (2000) 378–393 (here 390).

² VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.40.

³ VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” 391.

⁴ VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” 391.

⁵ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.195.

Even more puzzling is that in these passages the angel insists on personally *writing* the divine words, thus claiming the role of the celestial scribe in a fashion similar to Moses.⁶ Also striking is that this nameless angelic scribe posits himself as the writer of the Pentateuch (“For I have written (this) in the book of the first law”), the authorship of which the Tradition ascribes to the son of Amram. What are we to make of these authorial claims by the angel of the presence?

Is it possible that in this puzzling account about two protagonists, one human and the other angelic – both of whom are scribes and authors of the same “law” – we have an allusion to the idea of the heavenly counterpart of a seer in the form of the angel of the presence?⁷ In Jewish apocalyptic and early mystical literature such heavenly doubles in the form of angels of the presence are often presented as celestial scribes. The purpose of this study is to provide conceptual background for the idea of the angel of the presence as the heavenly counterpart of Moses in the *Book of Jubilees*.

I. *The Background: The Heavenly Counterpart of the Seer in the Jacob and the Enoch Traditions*

Before proceeding to a close analysis of the traditions about the heavenly counterpart of Moses and its possible identification with the angel of the presence, we will provide a short excursus on the background of the idea of the celestial double of a seer. One of the specimens of this tradition is found in the targumic elaborations of the story of the patriarch Jacob that depict his heavenly identity as his “image” engraved on the Throne of Glory.

⁶ The scribal office of Moses is reaffirmed throughout the text. Already in the beginning (*Jub.* 1:5; 7; 26) he receives a chain of commands to write down the revelation dictated by the angel.

⁷ On the angelology of the *Book of Jubilees* see R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Black, 1902) lvi–lviii; M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés* (Geneva: Droz, 1960) 75–92; K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ, II.3; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Nohn, 1981) 322–324; D. Dimant, “The Sons of Heaven: The Theory of the Angels in the Book of Jubilees in Light of the Writings of the Qumran Community,” in: *A Tribute to Sarah: Studies in Jewish Philosophy and Cabala Presented to Professor Sarah A. Heller-Wilensky* (eds. M. Idel, D. Dimant, S. Rosenberg; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994) 97–118 [in Hebrew]; VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” 378–393; H. Najman, “Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7 (2000) 313–333.

The Jacob Traditions

The traditions about the heavenly “image” of Jacob are present in several targumic⁸ texts,⁹ including *Targ. Ps.-J.*, *Targ. Neof.*,¹⁰ and *Frag. Targ.*¹¹

For example, in *Targ. Ps.-J.* for Gen 28:12 the following description can be found:

He [Jacob] had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching toward the heavens... and on that day they (angels) ascended to the heavens on high, and said, “Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed (engraved) in the Throne of Glory, and whom you have desired to see.”¹²

Besides the tradition of “engraving” on the Throne, some Jewish materials point to an even more radical identification of Jacob’s image with *Kavod*, an anthropomorphic extent of the Deity, often labeled there as the Face of God. Jarl Fossum’s research demonstrates that in some traditions about Jacob’s image, his celestial “image” or “likeness” is depicted not simply as engraved on the heavenly throne, but as seated upon the throne of glory.¹³ Fossum argues that this second tradition

⁸ The same tradition can be found in the rabbinic literature. *Gen. R.* 68:12 reads: “...thus it says, Israel in whom I will be glorified (Isa. xlix, 3); it is thou, [said the angels,] whose features are engraved on high; they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping.” *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961) 2.626. On Jacob’s image on the Throne of Glory see also: *Gen. R.* 78:3; 82:2; *Num. R.* 4:1; *b. Hul.* 91b; *Pirqe R. El.* 35.

⁹ On the traditions about Jacob’s image engraved on the Throne see: E.R. Wolfson, *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995) 1–62; 111–186.

¹⁰ “And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth and its head reached to the height of the heavens; and behold, the angels that had accompanied him from the house of his father ascended to bear good tidings to the angels on high, saying: ‘Come and see the pious man whose image is engraved in the throne of Glory, whom you desired to see.’ And behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him.” *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (tr. M. McNamara, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible, 1A; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 140.

¹¹ “...And he dreamt that there was a ladder set on the ground, whose top reached towards the heavens; and behold the angels that had accompanied him from his father’s house ascended to announce to the angels of the heights: ‘Come and see the pious man, whose image is fixed to the throne of glory...’” M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AB, 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980) 1.57 and 2.20.

¹² *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible, 1B; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 99–100.

¹³ J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 140–41.

is original. Christopher Rowland offers a similar view in proposing to see Jacob's image as "identical with the form of God on the throne of glory (Ezek. 1.26f.)."¹⁴

The Enoch Traditions

Scholars have previously noted that Enochic materials were also cognizant of the traditions about the heavenly double of a seer. Thus, the idea about the heavenly counterpart of the visionary appears to be present in one of the booklets of 1 (*Ethiopic*) *Enoch*. It has been previously observed¹⁵ that the *Similitudes* seems to entertain the idea of the heavenly twin of a visionary when it identifies Enoch with the Son of Man. Students of the Enochic traditions have been long puzzled by the idea that the son of man, who in the previous chapters of the *Similitudes* is distinguished from Enoch, suddenly becomes identified in 1 *Enoch* 71 with the patriarch. James VanderKam suggests that this puzzle can be explained by the Jewish notion, attested in several ancient Jewish texts, that a creature of flesh and blood could have a heavenly double or counterpart.¹⁶ To provide an example, VanderKam points to traditions about Jacob in which the patriarch's "features are engraved on high."¹⁷ He stresses that this theme of the visionary's ignorance of his higher angelic identity is observable, for example, in the *Prayer of Joseph*.

I have previously argued that the idea of the heavenly counterpart of the visionary is also present in another Second Temple Enochic text – 2 (*Slavonic*) *Apocalypse of Enoch*.¹⁸ 2 *Enoch* 39:3–6 depicts the

¹⁴ C. Rowland, "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition," *NTS* 30 (1984) 504.

¹⁵ See J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 *Enoch* 37–71," in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 182–3; M. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995) 177–80; Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 144–5; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, Reihe 2:94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 151.

¹⁶ VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 *Enoch* 37–71," 182–3.

¹⁷ VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 *Enoch* 37–71," 182–3.

¹⁸ Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 165–176; idem, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*," in: A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJS, 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 399–419.

patriarch who, during his short trip to the earth, retells to his children his earlier encounter with the Face. Enoch relates:

You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end.¹⁹

Enoch's description reveals a contrast between the two identities of the visionary: the earthly Enoch ("a human being created just like yourselves") and his heavenly counterpart ("the one who has seen the Face of God"). Enoch describes himself in two different modes of existence: as a human being who now stands before his children with a human face and body *and* as a celestial creature who has seen God's face in the heavenly realm. These descriptions of two conditions (earthly and celestial) occur repeatedly in tandem. It is possible that the purpose of Enoch's instruction to his children is not to stress the difference between his human body and the Lord's body, but to emphasize the distinction between *this* Enoch, a human being "created just like yourselves," and the *other* angelic Enoch who has stood before the Lord's face. Enoch's previous transformation into the glorious one and his initiation into the servant of the divine Presence in *2 Enoch* 22:7 support this suggestion. It is unlikely that Enoch has somehow "completely" abandoned his supra-angelic status and his unique place before the Face of the Lord granted to him in the previous chapters. An account of Enoch's permanent installation can be found in chapter 36 where the Lord tells Enoch, before his short visit to the earth, that a place has been prepared for him and that he will be in the front of Lord's face "from *now* and forever."²⁰ What is important here for our research is that the identification of the visionary with his heavenly double involves the installation of the seer into the office of the angel (or the prince) of the presence (*sar happanim*). The importance of this account for the idea of the heavenly counterpart in *2 Enoch* is

¹⁹ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.163.

²⁰ *2 Enoch* 36:3. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.161, emphasis mine.

apparent because it points to the simultaneous existence of Enoch's angelic double installed in heaven and its human counterpart, whom God sends periodically on missionary errands. Targumic and rabbinic accounts about Jacob also attest to this view of the heavenly counterpart when they depict angels beholding Jacob as one who at one and the same time is both installed in heaven and sleeping on earth. In relation to this paradoxical situation, in which the seer is able not only to be unified with his heavenly counterpart in the form of the angel of the presence but also to retain the ability to travel back into the earthly realm, Jonathan Smith observes that "the complete pattern is most apparent in the various texts that witness to the complex Enoch tradition, particularly *2 Enoch*. Here Enoch was originally a man (ch. 1) who ascended to heaven and became an angel (22:9, cf. 3En 10:3f. and 48C), returned to earth as a man (33:11), and finally returned again to heaven to resume his angelic station (67:18)."²¹

What is also important in *2 Enoch's* account for our ongoing investigation is that while the "heavenly version" of Enoch is installed in heaven his "earthly version" is dispatched by God to another lower realm with the mission to deliver the handwriting made by the translated hero in heaven. In *2 Enoch* 33:3–10, for example, the Lord endows Enoch with the mission of distributing the heavenly writings on earth:

And now, Enoch, whatever I have explained to you, and whatever you have seen in the heavens, and whatever you have seen on earth, and whatever *I have written in the books* – by my supreme wisdom I have contrived it all.... Apply your mind, Enoch, and acknowledge the One who is speaking to you. And you take *the books which I (!) have written*.... And you go down onto the earth and tell your sons all that I have told you.... And deliver to them the books in your handwriting, and they will read them and know their Creator.... And distribute the books in your handwriting to your children and (your) children to (their) children; and the parents will read (them) from generation to generation.²²

This account is striking in that while commanding the adept to travel to the lower realm with the heavenly books, God himself seems to assume the seer's upper scribal identity. The Deity tells Enoch, who is

²¹ J.Z. Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.699–714 at 705.

²² *2 Enoch* 33:3–9 (the shorter recension). Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.157, emphasis mine.

previously depicted as the scribe of the books,²³ that He wrote these books. This situation is reminiscent of some developments found in the *Jubilees* where the angel of the presence also seems to take on the celestial scribal identity of Moses. It is also noteworthy that in the *Jubilees*, like in *2 Enoch*, the boundaries between the upper scribal identity of the visionary who claims to be the writer of “the first law” and the Deity appear blurred.²⁴

In *2 Enoch* 33 where the divine scribal figure commands the seventh antediluvian hero to deliver the book in his [Enoch's] handwriting, one possibly witnesses the unique, paradoxical communication between the upper and the lower scribal identities.

The fact that in *2 Enoch* 33 the patriarch is dispatched to earth to deliver the books in “his handwriting,” the authorship of which the text assigns to the Deity, is also worthy of attention given that in the traditions attested in the *Jubilees*, where Moses appears as a heavenly counterpart, the angel of the presence claims authorship of the materials that the Tradition explicitly assigns to Moses. Here, just like in *2 Enoch*, book authorship can be seen as a process executed simultaneously by both earthly and heavenly authors, though it is the function of the earthly counterpart to deliver them to humans.

Angels of the Presence

It is significant that in both Enoch and Jacob traditions the theme of the heavenly counterpart is conflated with the imagery of the angels of the presence. For our study of the tradition in the *Jubilees*, where the angel of the presence might be serving as the heavenly counterpart of the son of Amram, it is important to note that both Jacob and Enoch traditions identify the heavenly counterparts of the seers as angelic servants of the presence.

Thus, in *2 Enoch* the seventh antediluvian hero is depicted as the angelic servant of the presence permanently installed in front of God's

²³ See *2 Enoch* 23:6 “I wrote everything accurately. And I wrote 366 books.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.140.

²⁴ Cf. *Jub.* 6:22 and 30:12. On the blurred boundaries between the angel of the presence and the Deity in the *Jubilees*, see VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” 390–392. It should be noted that the tendency to identify the seer's heavenly identity with the Deity or his anthropomorphic extent (known as his *Kavod* or the Face) is discernable in all accounts dealing with the heavenly counterpart.

face.²⁵ The Slavonic apocalypse repeats again and again that the seer is installed before the divine Face from “now and forever.” The later Merkabah developments reaffirm this prominent office of Enoch’s upper identity in the form of angel Metatron, portraying him as a special servant of the divine Presence, *sar happanim*.

In the Jacob traditions the heavenly counterpart of the son of Isaac is also depicted as the angel of the presence. Thus, in the *Prayer of Joseph*, the text which gives one of the most striking descriptions of the pre-existent heavenly double of Jacob, the heavenly version of the patriarch reveals his identity as the angel of the presence: “...I, Israel, the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God... *the first minister before the face of God...*”²⁶

The imagery of angels of the presence or the Face looms large in the traditions of the heavenly counterpart. What is striking here is not only that the heavenly double of the visionary is fashioned as the angel (or the prince) of the presence, but also that the angelic guides who acquaint the seer with his upper celestial identity and its offices are depicted as angels of the presence. In this respect the figure of the angelic servant of the divine Presence is especially important. Both Jacob and Enoch materials contain numerous references to the angel of the presence under the name Uriel, who is also known in various traditions under the names of Phanuel and Sariel.

In 2 *Enoch* 22–23, Uriel²⁷ plays an important role during Enoch’s initiations near the Throne of Glory.²⁸ He instructs Enoch about different subjects of esoteric knowledge in order to prepare him for various celestial offices, including the office of the heavenly scribe. 1 *Enoch* 71 also refers to the same angel but names him Phanuel. In the *Simili-*

²⁵ 2 *Enoch* 21:3: “And the Lord sent one of his glorious ones, the archangel Gabriel. And he said to me, ‘Be brave, Enoch! Don’t be frightened! Stand up, and come with me and stand in front of the face of the Lord forever.’”

2 *Enoch* 22:6: “And the Lord said to his servants, sounding them out, ‘Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!’”

2 *Enoch* 36:3: “Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever.” Andersen, “2 *Enoch*,” 1.136, 1.138, and 1.161.

²⁶ Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 2.713.

²⁷ Slav. *Vereveil*.

²⁸ The beginning of this tradition can be found in the *Book of Heavenly Luminaries* where Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2.173.

tudes, he occupies an important place among the four principal angels, namely, the place usually assigned to Uriel. In fact, the angelic name Phanuel might be a title which stresses the celestial status of Uriel/Sariel as one of the servants of the divine *Panim*.²⁹

The title "Phanuel" is reminiscent of the terminology found in various Jacob accounts. In Gen 32:31, Jacob names the place of his wrestling with God as Peniel – the Face of God. Scholars believe that the angelic name *Phanuel* and the place *Peniel* are etymologically connected.³⁰

This reference to Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel as the angel who instructs/wrestles with Jacob and announces to him his new angelic status and name is documented in several other sources, including *Targ. Neof.* and *Pr. Jos.* In the *Prayer of Joseph*, for example, Jacob-Israel reveals that "Uriel, the angel of God, came forth and said that 'I [Jacob-Israel] had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob.' He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me...."³¹

In the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*, another important text attesting to the idea of the heavenly counterpart, Jacob's identification with his heavenly counterpart, the angel Israel, again involves the initiatory encounter with the angel Sariel, the angel of the divine Presence or the Face. The same state of events is observable in Enochic materials where Uriel serves as a principal heavenly guide to another prominent visionary who has also acquired knowledge about his own heavenly counterpart, namely, Enoch/Metatron. The aforementioned traditions pertaining to the angels of the presence are important for our ongoing investigation of the angelic figure in the *Jubilees* in view of their role in accession to the upper identity of the seer.

²⁹ *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* §108) refers to the angel Suria/Suriel as the Prince of the Face. On the identification of Sariel with the Prince of the Presence see: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973) 99; Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," 2.709.

³⁰ G. Vermes suggests that the angelic name Phanuel "is depended on the Peniel/Penuel of Genesis 32." See, G. Vermes, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies," *JJS* 26 (1975) 13.

³¹ Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," 2.713.

II. *The Heavenly Counterpart of Moses**The Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian*

With this excursus into the background of the traditions about the heavenly counterpart found in the Enoch and the Jacob materials in place, we will now proceed to some Mosaic accounts that also attest to the idea of the celestial double of the son of Amram. One such early Mosaic testimony has survived as a part of the drama *Exagoge*, a writing attributed to Ezekiel the Tragedian, which depicts the prophet's experience at Sinai as his celestial enthronement. Preserved in fragmentary form in Eusebius of Caesarea's³² *Praeparatio evangelica*, the *Exagoge* 67–90 reads:

Moses: I had a vision of a great throne on the top of Mount Sinai and it reached till the folds of heaven. A noble man was sitting on it, with a crown and a large scepter in his left hand. He beckoned to me with his right hand, so I approached and stood before the throne. He gave me the scepter and instructed me to sit on the great throne. Then he gave me a royal crown and got up from the throne. I beheld the whole earth all around and saw beneath the earth and above the heavens. A multitude of stars fell before my knees and I counted them all. They paraded past me like a battalion of men. Then I awoke from my sleep in fear.

Raguel: My friend, this is a good sign from God. May I live to see the day when these things are fulfilled. You will establish a great throne, become a judge and leader of men. As for your vision of the whole earth, the world below and that above the heavens – this signifies that you will see what is, what has been and what shall be.³³

Scholars argue that, given its quotation by Alexander Polyhistor (ca. 80–40 B.C.E.), this Mosaic account is a witness to traditions of the second century B.C.E.³⁴ Such dating puts this account in close chronological proximity to the *Book of Jubilees*. It is also noteworthy that both texts (*Jubilees* and *Exagoge*) exhibit a common tendency to adapt some Enochic motifs and themes into the framework of the Mosaic tradition.

³² Eusebius preserves the seventeen fragments containing 269 iambic trimeter verses. Unfortunately, the limited scope of our investigation does not allow us to reflect on the broader context of Moses' dream in the *Exagoge*.

³³ H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 54–55.

³⁴ C.R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Vol. II, Poets* (SBLTT, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series, 12; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 308–12.

The *Exagoge* 67–90 depicts Moses' dream in which he sees an enthroned celestial figure who vacates his heavenly seat and hands over to the son of Amram his royal attributes. The placement of Moses on the great throne in the *Exagoge* account and his donning of the royal regalia have been often interpreted by scholars as the prophet's occupation of the seat of the Deity. Pieter van der Horst remarks that in the *Exagoge* Moses becomes "an anthropomorphic hypostasis of God himself."³⁵ The uniqueness of the motif of God's vacating the throne and transferring occupancy to someone else has long puzzled scholars. An attempt to deal with this enigma by bringing in the imagery of the vice-regent does not, in my judgment, completely solve the problem; the vice-regents in Jewish traditions (for example, Metatron) do not normally occupy God's throne but instead have their own glorious chair that sometimes serves as a replica of the divine Seat. It seems that the enigmatic identification of the prophet with the divine Form can best be explained, not through the concept of a vice-regent, but rather through the notion of the heavenly twin or counterpart.

In view of the aforementioned traditions about the heavenly twins of Enoch and Jacob, it is possible that the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian also attests to the idea of the heavenly counterpart of the seer when it identifies Moses with the glorious anthropomorphic extent. As we recall, the text depicts Moses' vision of "a noble man" with a crown and a large scepter in the left hand installed on the great throne. In the course of the seer's initiation, the attributes of this "noble man," including the royal crown and the scepter, are transferred to Moses who is instructed to sit on the throne formerly occupied by the noble man. The narrative thus clearly identifies the visionary with his heavenly counterpart, in the course of which the seer literally takes the place and the attributes of his upper identity. Moses' enthronement is reminiscent of Jacob's story, where Jacob's heavenly identity is depicted as being "engraved" or "enthroned" on the divine Seat. The account also underlines that Moses acquired his vision in a dream by reporting that he awoke from his sleep in fear. Here, just as in the Jacob tradition, while the seer is sleeping on earth his counterpart in the upper realm is identified with the *Kavod*.

³⁵ P.W. van der Horst, "Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel," *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 364–365 at 364.

The Idiom of Standing and the Angel of the Presence

Despite the draw of seeing the developments found in the *Exagoge* as the later adaptation of the Enochic and Jacobite traditions about the heavenly double, it appears that the influence may point in other direction and these accounts were shaped by the imagery found already in the biblical Mosaic accounts. It is possible that the conceptual roots of the identification of Moses with the angelic servant of the presence could be found already in the biblical materials where the son of Amram appears standing before the divine Presence. To clarify the Mosaic background of the traditions about the heavenly counterpart, we must now turn to the biblical Mosaic accounts dealing with the symbolism of the divine Presence or the Face.

One of the early identifications of the hero with the angel of the presence, important in the traditions about the heavenly double, can be found in *2 Enoch* where in the course of his celestial metamorphosis the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch was called by God to stand before his Face forever. What is important in this portrayal of the installation of a human being into the prominent angelic rank is the emphasis on the *standing* before the Face of God. Enoch's role as the angel of the presence is introduced through the formulae "stand before my face forever." *2 Enoch's* definition of the office of the servant of the divine Presence as standing before the Face of the Lord appears to be linked to the biblical Mosaic accounts in which Moses is described as the one who was standing before the Lord's Face on Mount Sinai. It is significant that, as in the Slavonic apocalypse where the Lord himself orders the patriarch to stand before his presence,³⁶ the biblical Mosaic accounts contain a familiar command. In the theophanic account from Exodus 33, the Lord commands Moses to stand near him: "There is a place by me where you shall stand (וַיַּצְבֵּת)³⁷ on the rock."

In Deuteronomy this language of standing continues to play a prominent role. In Deuteronomy 5:31 God again orders Moses to stand with him: "But you, stand (עֲמֹד)³⁸ here by me, and I will tell you all the commandments, the statutes and the ordinances, that you

³⁶ See *2 Enoch* 22:6: "And the Lord said to his servants, sounding them out, 'Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!'" *2 Enoch* 36:3: "Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.138 and 1.161.

³⁷ LXX: στήση.

³⁸ LXX: στήθι.

shall teach them. . . .” In Deuteronomy 5:4–5 the motif of standing, as in Exodus 33, is juxtaposed with the imagery of the divine *Panim*: “The Lord spoke with you face to face (פְּנִים בְּפָנִים) at the mountain, out of the fire. At that time I was standing (עָמַד)³⁹ between the Lord and you to declare to you the words of the Lord; for you were afraid because of the fire and did not go up the mountain.” Here Moses is depicted as standing before the Face of the Deity and mediating the divine Presence to the people.

These developments of the motif of standing are intriguing and might constitute the conceptual background of the later identifications of Moses with the office of the angel of the presence.

The idiom of standing also plays a significant part in the *Exagoge* account that has Moses approach and stand (ἐστᾶθην)⁴⁰ before the throne.⁴¹

In the extra-biblical Mosaic accounts one can also see a growing tendency to depict Moses' standing position as the posture of a celestial being. Crispin Fletcher-Louis observes that in various Mosaic traditions the motif of Moses' standing was often interpreted through the prism of God's own standing, indicating the prophet's participation in divine or angelic nature. He notes that in Samaritan and rabbinic literature a standing posture was generally indicative of the celestial being.⁴² Jarl Fossum points to the tradition preserved in *Memar Marqah* 4:12 where Moses is described as “the (immutable) Standing One.”⁴³

In 4Q377 2 vii–xii, the standing posture of Moses appears to be creatively conflated with his status as a celestial being:

... And like a man sees li[gh]t, he has appeared to us in a burning fire, from above, from heaven, and on earth he stood (עָמַד) on the mountain to teach us that there is no God apart from him, and no Rock like him. . . . But Moses, the man of God, was with God in the cloud, and the cloud covered him, because [...] when he sanctified him, and he spoke

³⁹ LXX: εἰστήκειν.

⁴⁰ Moses' standing here does not contradict his enthronement. The same situation is discernible in 2 *Enoch*, where the hero who was promised a place to stand in front of the Lord's Face for eternity is placed on the seat next to the Deity.

⁴¹ Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54.

⁴² Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 146–7; Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 121; J.A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (New York: KTAV, 1968) 215.

⁴³ Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 56–8.

as an angel through his mouth, for who was a messen[ger] like him, a man of the pious ones?⁴⁴

Scholars have previously observed that Moses here “plays the role of an angel, having received revelation from the mouth of God.”⁴⁵

In light of the aforementioned Mosaic developments it is possible that the idiom of standing so prominent in the depiction of the servants of the presence in the Enochic tradition of the heavenly double has Mosaic provenance. Already in Exodus and Deuteronomy the prophet is portrayed as the one who is able to stand before the Deity to mediate the divine Presence to human beings.⁴⁶ The extra-biblical Mosaic accounts try to further secure the prophet’s place in the front of the Deity by depicting him as a celestial creature. The testimony found in the *Exagoge*, where Moses is described as standing before the Throne, seems to represent an important step toward the rudimentary definitions of the office of the angelic servant of the Face.

The Idiom of the Hand and the Heavenly Counterpart

One of the constant features of the aforementioned transformational accounts in which a seer becomes identified with his heavenly identity is the motif of the divine hand that embraces the visionary and invites him into a new celestial dimension of his existence. This motif is found both in Mosaic and Enochic traditions where the hand of God embraces and protects the seer during his encounter with the Lord in the upper realm.⁴⁷

Thus, in *2 Enoch* 39 the patriarch relates to his children that during his vision of the divine *Kavod*, the Lord helped him with his right hand. The hand here is described as having a gigantic size and filling heaven: “But you, my children, see the right hand of one who helps you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, helping me and filling heaven.”⁴⁸ The theme of

⁴⁴ García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.745.

⁴⁵ Najman, “Angels at Sinai,” 319.

⁴⁶ This emphasis on mediation is important since mediating of the divine Presence is one of the pivotal functions of the Princes of the Face.

⁴⁷ The later Merkabah developments about Jacob also refer to the God’s embracement of Jacob-Israel.

⁴⁸ *2 Enoch* 39:5. Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.162; Sokolov, “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе,” 38.

the hand of God assisting the seer during his vision of the Face here is not an entirely new development, since it recalls the Mosaic account from Exodus 33:22–23. Here the Deity promises the prophet to protect him with his hand during the encounter with the divine *Panim*: “and while my glory passes by I will put you in a cleft of the rock, and I will cover you with my hand until I have passed by; then I will take away my hand, and you shall see my back; but my face shall not be seen.” There is also another early Mosaic account where the motif of the divine hand assisting the visionary is mentioned. The *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian relates that during the prophet’s vision of the *Kavod*, a noble man sitting on the throne beckoned him with his right hand (δεξιῶ δέ μοι ἔνευσε).⁴⁹

It is conceivable that *2 Enoch*’s description is closer to the form of the tradition preserved in Ezekiel the Tragedian than to the account found in Exodus since the *Exagoge* mentions the right hand of the Deity beckoning the seer. What is important here is that both Mosaic accounts seem to represent the formative conceptual roots for the later Enochic developments where the motif of the Lord’s hand is used in the depiction of the unification of the seventh antediluvian hero with his celestial counterpart in the form of angel Metatron. Thus, from the Merkabah materials one can learn that “the hand of God rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron.”⁵⁰ The motif of the divine hand assisting Enoch-Metatron during his celestial transformation is present in *Sefer Hekhalot*, where it appears in the form of a tradition very similar to the evidence found in the *Exagoge* and *2 Enoch*. In *Synopse* §12 Metatron tells R. Ishmael that during the transformation of his body into the gigantic cosmic extent, matching the world in length and breadth, God “laid his hand” on the translated hero.⁵¹ Here, just as in the Mosaic accounts, the hand of the Deity signifies the bond between the seer’s body and the divine corporeality, leading to the creation of a new celestial entity in the form of the angelic servant of the presence.

⁴⁹ Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, 54.

⁵⁰ *Synopse* §384.

⁵¹ “...the Holy One, blessed be he, laid his hand on me and blessed me with 1,365,000 blessings. I was enlarged and increased in size till I matched the world in length and breadth.” Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 1.263.

Conclusion

One of the important characteristics of the aforementioned visionary accounts in which adepts become identified with their heavenly doubles is the transference of prominent celestial offices to the new servants of the presence. Thus, for example, transference of the offices is discernable in the *Exagoge* where the “heavenly man” hands over to the seer his celestial regalia, scepter and crown, and then surrenders his heavenly seat, which the Enoch-Metatron tradition often identifies with the duty of the celestial scribe. Indeed, the scribal role may represent one of the most important offices that angels of the presence often surrender to the new servants of the Face. Thus, for example, *2 Enoch* describes the initiation of the seer by Vereveil (Uriel) in the course of which this angel of the presence, portrayed in *2 Enoch* as a “heavenly recorder,” conveys to the translated patriarch knowledge and skills pertaining to the scribal duties. What is important in this account is its emphasis on the act of transference of the scribal duties from Vereveil (Uriel) to Enoch, when the angel of the presence surrenders to the hero the celestial library and even the pen from his hand.⁵²

These developments are intriguing and may provide some insights into the puzzling tradition about the angel of the presence in the *Book of Jubilees*.⁵³ The *Jubilees*, like the Enochic account, has two scribal figures; one of them is the angel of the presence and the other, a human being. Yet, the exact relationship between these two figures is difficult to establish in view of the scarcity and ambiguity of the relevant depictions. Does the angel of the presence in the *Jubilees* pose, on the fashion of Uriel, as a celestial scribe who is responsible for initiation of the adept into the scribal duties? Or does he represent the heavenly counterpart of Moses who is clearly distinguished at this point from the seer? A clear distance between the seer and his celestial identity is

⁵² *2 Enoch* 22:10–11 (the shorter recension) “...the Lord summoned Vereveil, one of his archangels, who was wise, *who records all the Lord's deeds*. And the Lord said to Vereveil, ‘Bring out the books from storehouses, and give a pen to Enoch and read him the books.’ And Vereveil hurried and brought me the books mottled with myrrh. And he gave me the pen from his hand.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 1.139–141.

⁵³ When one looks closer into the angelic imagery reflected in the *Book of Jubilees* it is intriguing that Moses’ angelic guide is defined as an angel of the presence. As has already been demonstrated, the process of establishing twinship with the heavenly counterpart not only reflects the initiatory procedure of becoming a Servant of the Face, it also always presupposes the initiation performed by another angelic servant of the Face.

not unlikely in the context of the traditions about the heavenly counterpart. In fact, this distance between the two identities – one in the figure of the angel and the other in the figure of a hero – represents a standard feature of such accounts. Thus, for example, the already mentioned account from the *Book of the Similitudes* clearly distinguishes Enoch from his heavenly counterpart in the form of the angelic son of man throughout the whole narrative until the final unification in the last chapter of the book. The gap between the celestial and earthly identities of the seer is also discernable in the targumic accounts about Jacob's heavenly double where the distinction between the two identities is highlighted by a description of the angels who behold Jacob sleeping on earth and at the same time installed in heaven. A distance between the identity of the seer and his heavenly twin is also observable in the *Exagoge* where the heavenly man transfers to Moses his regalia and vacates for him his heavenly seat.

There is, moreover, another important point in the stories about the heavenly counterparts that could provide portentous insight into the nature of pseudepigraphical accounts where these stories are found. This aspect pertains to the issue of the so-called “emulation” of the biblical exemplars in these pseudepigraphical accounts that allows their authors to unveil new revelations in the name of some prominent authority of the past.⁵⁴ The identity of the celestial scribe in the form of the angel of the presence might further our understanding of the enigmatic process of mystical and literary emulation of the exemplary figure, the cryptic mechanics of which often remain beyond the grasp of our post/modern sensibilities.

Could the tradition of unification of the biblical hero with his angelic counterpart be part of this process of emulation of the exemplar by an adept? Could the intermediate authoritative position⁵⁵ of the angel of

⁵⁴ On the process of the emulation of the biblical exemplars in the Second Temple literature, see H. Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (SJSJ, 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003); idem, “Torah of Moses: Pseudonymous Attribution in Second Temple Writings,” in: *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (ed. C.A. Evans; JSPSS, 33; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 202–216; idem, *Authoritative Writing and Interpretation: A Study in the History of Scripture* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1998).

⁵⁵ This “intermediate” authoritative stand is often further reinforced by the authority of the Deity himself through the identification of the heavenly counterparts with the divine form. On this process, see our previous discussion about the blurring of the boundaries between the heavenly counterparts and the Deity.

the presence, predestined to stand “from now and forever” between the Deity himself and the biblical hero, serve here as the safe haven of the author’s identity, thus representing the important locus of mystical and literary emulation? Is it possible that in the *Jubilees*, like in some other pseudepigraphical accounts, the figure of the angel of the presence serves as a transformative and literary device that allows an adept to enter the assembly of immortal beings consisting of the heroes of both the celestial and the literary world?

Is it possible that in the traditions of heavenly counterparts where the two characters of the story, one of which is represented by a biblical exemplar, become eventually unified and acquire a single identity, we are able to draw nearer to the very heart of the pseudepigraphical enterprise? In this respect, it does not appear to be coincidental that these transformational accounts dealing with the heavenly doubles of their adepts are permeated with the aesthetics of penmanship and the imagery of the literary enterprise. In the course of these mystical and literary metamorphoses, the heavenly figure surrenders his scribal seat, the library of the celestial books and even personal writing tools to the other, earthly identity who now becomes the new guardian of the literary tradition.

PART III

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE TRANSMISSION OF THE
JEWISH PSEUDEPIGRAPHA IN THE SLAVIC MILIEUX

I. SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

1.1. COLLECTIONS OF THE SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS

- Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и Генов, М.) *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922).
- Franko, I. (Франко, И.) *Апокрифи и легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910).
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]).
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srb-skoga,” *Arkiv za Povjestnicu Jugoslavensku* IX (1868) 65–151.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67.3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [repr. Nendeln, 1966]).
- Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.1–413.
- Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) (Лихачев, Д.С., Дмитриева, Л.А.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (т. 1–12; Москва, 1978–1992).
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999).
- Novaković, S. (Новаковић, С.) *Примери књижевности и језика старога и српско-словенскога* (I. Ausgabe, Београд, 1877); (II. Ausgabe; Београд, 1889); (III. Ausgabe; Београд, 1904).
- Rorov, A. (Попов, А.) *Книга бытия небеси и земли (Палея историческая) с приложением сокращенной палеи русской редакции* (Москва, 1881).
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877).
- Rurip, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]).
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антић, В.) *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996).
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]).
- , *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII.4; С.-Петербург, 1894).

1.2. COLLECTIONS OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE SLAVONIC
PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS

- Angelov, V. and M. Genov (Ангелов, В. и Генов, М.) *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922).
- Dinekov, P. et al. eds. (Динеков, П., Куев, К. и Петканова, Д.) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961).
- Jovanović, T. (Јовановић, Т.) *Апокрифи. Старозаветни, према српским преписима* (Библиотека Стара српска књижевност, 23.1; Београд, 2005).
- Kaliganov, I., Polyujannju, D. (Калиганов, И., Полювянный, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990).
- Koneski, B., Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Конески, Б. и Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Тиквешки сборник* (Скопје, 1987).
- Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.1–413.
- Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992).
- Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков, В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997).
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981).
- Petkanova, D., Miltenova, A. (eds.) (Петканова, Д. и Милтенова, А.) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993).
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]).
- , *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008).
- Rubinkiewicz, R. (ed.) *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu* (Warszawa, 1999).
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) et al. *Страници од ренесансната књижевност* (Скопје, 1978) 141–162.

1.3. BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF THE SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA AND
RELATED LITERATURE

- Andersen, F.I. “Pseudepigrapha Studies in Bulgaria,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 1 (1987) 41–55.
- Апокрифно, Апокрифно християнство: Апокрифна и гадателна книжнина по балканските земи, запазена във фондовете на Нар. библ. “Св.св. Кирил и Методий” (София, 1999).
- Arsen'ev, A.V. (Арсеньев, А.В.) *Словарь писателей древнего периода русской литературы IX–XVIII веков (862–1700 гг.)* (С.-Петербург, 1882).
- Bel'chikov, N.F. et al. (Бельчиков, Н.Ф., Бегунов, Ю.К., Рождественский, Н.П.) *Справочник-указатель печатных описаний славяно-русских рукописей* (Москва-Ленинград, 1963).
- Bonwetsch, G.N. “Die christliche vornicänische Literatur in altslavischen

- Handschriften," in: A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1893 [Leipzig, 1958]) 1/2.886–917.
- Budovnic, I.U. (Будовниц, И.У.) *Словарь русской, украинской, белорусской письменности до XVIII века* (Москва, 1962).
- Charlesworth, J.H. *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 75; Atlanta, 1981).
- Charlesworth, J.H. with J.R. Mueller, *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excursuses on Apocalypses* (American Theological Library Association Bibliography Series; Metuchen, NJ/London, 1987).
- Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Ph.D. diss.; Vanderbilt, 1976) 87–91; 336–341.
- Delling, G. *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1965* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 106; Berlin, 1969 [2. Aufl., Berlin, 1975]).
- DiTommaso, L. *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850–1999* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature Supplement Series, 39; Sheffield, 2001).
- Dmitrieva, R.P. (Дмитриева, Р.П.) *Библиография русского летописания* (Москва-Ленинград, 1962).
- Droblenkova, N.F. (ed.) (Дробленкова, Н.Ф.) *Библиография советских русских работ по литературе XI–XVII вв. за 1917–1957 гг.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1961 [Leipzig, 1976]).
- , *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР 1958–1967 гг.* (части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1978–1979).
- , *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР 1968–1972 гг.* (С.-Петербург, 1996).
- D'jakov, V.A. ed., (Дьяков, В.А.) *Славяноведение в дореволюционной России: Библиографический словарь* (Москва, 1979).
- Guetcheva, K. (Гечева, К.) *Богомилството. Библиография* (София, 1997 [2007]).
- Haelewycck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout, 1998).
- Ivanova, T.G. et al. (eds.) (Иванова, Т.Г.) *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР 1973–1987* (части 1, 2 и 3; С.-Петербург, 1996).
- , *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР (России) 1988–1992* (С.-Петербург, 1998).
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск I. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921).
- Kaufman, I.M. (Кауфман, И.М.) *Русские биографические и библиографические словари* (Москва, 1955).
- Kolobanov, V.A., Konovalova, O.F., Salmina, M.A. (Колобанов, В.А., Коновалова, О.Ф., Салмина, М.А.) *Библиография советских работ по древнерусской литературе за 1945–1955 гг.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1956).

- Kotljarevskij, A. (Котляревский, А.) *Древняя русская письменность. Опыт библиологического изложения истории ее изучения* (Воронеж, 1881).
- Kozak, E. "Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158.
- Kuskov, V.V. (Кусков, В.В.) *Литература и культура Древней Руси. Словарь-справочник* (Москва, 1994).
- Lehnhardt, A. *Bibliographie zu den jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (Gütersloh, 1999).
- Leonid (Леонид, архимандрит) *Библиографические разыскания в области древнейшего периода славянской письменности IX-X вв. Памятники сих веков по сохранившимся спискам XI-XVII вв.* (Москва, 1890).
- Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987).
- , *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989).
- , *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XVII в.)* (Части 1–4; С.-Петербург, 1992–1998).
- Nazarevskij, A.A. (Назаревский, А.А.) *Библиография древнерусской повести* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955).
- Nikol'skij, N.K. (Никольский, Н.К.) *Материалы для повременного списка русских писателей и их сочинений X–XI вв.* (С.-Петербург, 1906).
- , *Рукописная книжность древнерусских библиотек (XI–XVII вв.). Материалы для словаря владельцев рукописей, писцов, переводчиков, справщиков и книгохранителей* (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1914).
- Novikov, V.I. (Новиков, В.И.) *Русский фольклор. Русская литература XI–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1998).
- Orlov, A.A. "Bibliography of the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature," in: A.A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 114; Leiden, 2007) 3–99.
- Peretc, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) *Новые труды по источниковедению древнерусской литературы и палеографии. Критико-библиографический обзор* (Киев, 1909–1913).
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (София, 1992 [2nd ed.; Велико Търново, 2003]).
- Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *История русской литературы* (т. 1; С.-Петербург, 1902) 471–484.
- Saharov, I.P. (Сахаров, И.П.) *Обозрение славяно-русской библиографии* (т. 1; С.-Петербург, 1849).
- Salmina, M.A., Tvorogov, O.V., Romodanovskaja, V.A. (Салмина, М.А., Творогов, О.В., Ромодановская, В.А.) *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе опубликованных в России 1998–2002 г.г.* (Москва, 2008).
- Salmina, M.A., Tvorogov, O.V., Novikova, O.L., Romodanovskaja, V.A. (Салмина, М.А., Творогов, О.В., Новикова, О.Л., Ромодановская, В.А.) *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе опубликованных в России 1993–1997 г.г.* (С.-Петербург, 2005).
- Santos Otero, A. de. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen*

- Apokryphen* (2 vols; Patristische Texte und Studien, 20 and 23; Berlin/New York, 1978 and 1981).
- Stegmüller, F. *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1950ff.).
- Stroev, P.M. (Строев, П.М.) *Библиологический словарь и черновые к нему материалы. Приведены в порядок и изданы под редакцией акад. А.Ф. Бычкова* (С.-Петербург, 1882).
- Svodnyj, *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1984).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996).
- Ukrainski Pis'menniki, *Українські Письменники: Био-бібліографічний словник* (5 томов; Киев, 1960) 1.619–962.
- Volkov, N.V. (Волков, Н.В.) *Статистические сведения о сохранившихся древнерусских книгах XI–XIV веков и их указатель* (С.-Петербург, 1897).

1.4. PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL WORKS AND FRAGMENTS

Fragment “Seventy Names of God” (Семьдесят Имен Богу)

a. *Texts*

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 2.339–344.

c. *Research*

Oris', *Опись рукописей, перенесенных из библиотеки Иосифова монастыря в библиотеку Московской духовной академии, иеромонаха Иосифа* (Москва, 1882) 210.

Salmina, M.A. (Салмина, М.А.) “Семьдесят имен Богу,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.318–319.

Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “Книги отреченные,” in: *Православная Богословская Энциклопедия* (12 томов; С.-Петербург, 1900–1911) 11.420.

Fragment “About All Creation” (О Всей Твари)

a. *Texts*

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 2.347–350.

c. *Research*

Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) “О всей твари,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.145–146.

*Slavonic Life of Adam and Eve*a. *Texts*

Dimnik, M. *The Apocrypha of Adam and Eve in Russia: A Historical and Literary Analysis* (M.A. Thesis; Toronto, 1970) 186–190.

Franko, I. (Франко, И.) “Слово о Адаме,” “Житие о Адаме и Еве и о согрешении их,” in: *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.19–23, 23–26.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) “Адам и Ева,” in: *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925 [1970]) 207–227.

Jagić, V. “Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches,” in: *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (Vienna, 1893) 1–104.

Novaković, S. *Примери књижевности и језика старогa и српско-словенскога* (Београд, 1877) 418–423; (Београд, 1889) 419–424; (Београд, 1904) 489–495.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) “Слово о Адаме и Исповедание Евы,” in: *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 34–46, 90–96, 208–216.

Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862) 1–7.

Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 66–74.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.298–304.

b. *Translations*

Anderson, G.A., Stone, M.E. *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and its Literature, 5; Atlanta, 1994 [1999]).

Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков, П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) “Слово за Адам и Ева,” in: *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 150–154.

Nachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) “Слово об Адаме и Еве, от начала и до конца,” in: *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (ed. В. Мильков; Москва, 1997) 148–153.

- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “Об Адаме и Еве,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.100–107.
- , “Об Адаме и Еве,” in: *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (ed. М.В. Рождественская; С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 20–27.
- , “Об Адаме и Еве,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 20–27.
- Kaliganov, I., Poluvjannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Польшвянный, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 81–87.
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) “Слово за Адам и Ева от началото до свършека,” in: *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.35–41; 348–349.

c. *Research*

- Anderson, G., Stone, M., Tromp, J. (eds.) *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 15; Leiden, 2000).
- Borozdin, A.K. (Бороздин, А.К.) *История русской литературы. Ч. 1. Русская народная словесность и древняя русская письменность* (2-е изд.; Киев, 1913) 115–116.
- Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Д.) “Към въпроса за историята на текста на апокрифа ‘Слово за Адам и Ева,’” *Старобългарска литература* 12 (1982) 70–81.
- , “Някои наблюдения върху литературните особености на апокрифа ‘Слово за Адам и Ева,’” *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982) 56–66.
- , “Космогоничната легенда за Тивериадското море и старобългарската апокрифна традиция,” *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 184–192.
- Eleonskaja, A.S. (Елеонская, А.С.) “Плач Адама в творчестве русских писателей XVII в.,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы XVIII-начала XVIII в.* (сб. 4; Москва, 1992) 5–27.
- Franko, I. (Франко, И.) “Критика і бібліографія. XVII. Апокріф о Адамі,” *Жите і Слово* 1 (1895) 474–479.
- Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) “Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентів-заочнику),” *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Адам и Ева,” in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 76–81.
- Jovanović, T. (Јовановић, Т.) “Краћа верзија апокрифа о Адаму и Еви у српском препису XVI века,” in: *CyrilloMethodiana 2005 ad honorem Zdenka Ribarova et Ludmila Pacnerová* (eds. E. Bláhová, E. Šlaufová; Slavica, 74.2–3; Prague, 2005) 367–377.
- Kabakova, G. (Кабакова, Г.) “Адам и Ева в легендах восточных славян,” *Живая Старина* 2 (1999) 2–35.
- Kagan, M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) “Апокриф о Адаме и Еве,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.)

- (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.47–51.
- Kaspina, M. (Каспина, М.) “Восприятие сюжета о грехопадении Адама и Евы в еврейской и славянской традиции,” in: *Концепт греха в славянской и еврейской культурной традиции. Сборник статей* (Москва, 2000) 116–129.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Текстологически наблюдения върху два апокрифа (апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво, приписван на Григорий Богослов, и апокрифа за Адам и Ева),” *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982) 35–55.
- , “Слово на Адам и Ева,” in: *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 417–418; (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 465–466.
- Porfir'ev, I.Я. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 172–179.
- Rurin, A. (Пыпин, А.) *История русской литературы* (4th ed.; С.-Петербург, 1911) 1.415–425, 427–429.
- Savel'eva, O.A. (Савельева, О.А.) “Структурные особенности краткой и пространной редакций Плача Адама,” in: *Исследования по истории общественного сознания эпохи феодализма в России* (Новосибирск, 1984) 152–165.
- , “Плач Адама: Круг источников и литературная семья памятника,” in: *Памятники литературы и общественной мысли эпохи феодализма* (ed. Е.К. Ромодановская; Новосибирск, 1985) 164–182.
- , “Плач Адама в составе литературных памятников,” in: *Источники по истории общественной мысли и культуры позднего феодализма* (ed. Н.Н. Покровская; Новосибирск, 1988) 5–13.
- Seregina, N.S. (Серегина, Н.С.) “Покаянный стих ‘Плач Адама о рае’ распева Кирила Гомулина,” in: *Памятники культуры. Новые открытия. 1983* (Москва, 1985) 258–262.
- Sergeev, V.N. (Сергеев, В.Н.) “Духовный стих ‘Плач Адама’ на иконе,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 26 (1971) 280–286.
- Stone, M. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 30–36.
- , “The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam,” in: *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 15; eds. G. Anderson, M. Stone, and J. Tromp, Leiden, 2000) 149–166.
- , *Adam's Contract with Satan: The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam* (Bloomington, 2001).
- Sumcov, N.F. (Сумцов, Н.Ф.) *Очерки истории южнославянских апокрифических сказаний и песен* (Киев, 1888) 32–37.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) “Отреченные книги древней России,” in: Тихонравов Н.С. *Сочинения* (Т. 1.; Москва, 1898) 152.
- Turdeanu, E. “La Vie d'Adam et d'Ève en slave et en roumain,” *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 75–144, 437–438.

The Story of God's Creation of Adam
(Сказание Как Сотворил Бог Адама)

a. *Texts*

- Brodskij, N.L. et al. (eds.) (Бродский, Н.Л.) *Историко-литературная хрестоматия. Ч. 2. Древняя русская письменность XI–XVII вв.* (Москва-Петроград, 1923) 43–44.
- Gromov, M.N. (Громов, М.Н.) “Апокрифическое Сказание о сотворении Адама в составе сборника середины XVII в. из Румянцевского собрания,” in: *Записки Отдела рукописей ГБЛ* 46 (1987) 76–81.
- Gudzij, N.K., ed. (Гудзий, Н.К.) *Хрестоматия по древней русской литературе XI–XVII вв.* (9th ed.; Москва, 1973) 91–92.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 421–427.
- , “Сказание о сотворении Богом Адама,” in: Gromov, M.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Громов, М.Н., Мильков, В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 741–747.
- Prokof'ev, N.I., ed. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древняя русская литература: Хрестоматия* (Москва, 1980) 54–55; (3rd ed.; Москва, 2005) 70–72.
- Rurin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 12–14.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси: XII век* (Москва, 1980) 2.148–153.
- , “Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.94–99.
- Zhovtis, A.L., ed. (Жовтис, А.Л.) *Древнерусская литература. Хрестоматия* (Москва, 1966) 91–92.

b. *Translations*

- Andersen, F.I. “On Reading Genesis 1–3,” in: *Interchange* 33 (1983) 11–36 at 29–30.
- Карпов, А.Ю. (Карпов, А.Ю.) “Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Kuz'min; Москва, 1990) 257–261.
- Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 19–30.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 428–431.
- , “Сказание о сотворении Богом Адама,” in: Gromov, M.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Громов, М.Н., Мильков, В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 748–751.

- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.148–153.
- , “Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.94–99.
- Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) “Сказание о том, как сотворил Бог Адама,” in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков, В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 202–205.
- c. *Research*
- Andersen, F.I. “On Reading Genesis 1–3,” *Interchange* 33 (1983) 11–36.
- , “On Reading Genesis 1–3,” in: *Backgrounds for the Bible* (eds. M.P. O'Connor and D.N. Freedman; Winona Lake, Ind., 1987) 137–150.
- Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) *Литература на изострени борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 87–88.
- Gromov, M.N. (Громов, М.Н.) “Античное учение о стихиях в Древней Руси,” *Вестник МГУ (Философия)* 7.2 (1981) 65–74.
- , “К истолкованию апокрифа о сотворении Адама,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 42 (1989) 255–261.
- Gudzij, N.K. (Гудзий, Н.К.) *История древнерусской литературы* (Москва, 1938) 42–43.
- Kirillin, V.M. (Кириллин, В.М.) *Символика чисел в литературе Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2000) 73.
- Kuskov, V.V. (Кусков, В.В.) *История древнерусской литературы* (3 изд.; Москва, 1977) 38.
- Kuzmin, A.G. (Кузьмин, А.Г.) “Апокрифическое сказание об Адаме,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1990) 256–257.
- Kuznesova, V.S. (Кузнецова, В.С.) *Дуалистические легенды о сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1995).
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) “Античное учение о четырёх стихиях в древнерусской письменности,” in: *Древняя Русь: пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 56–66.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 97–98.
- Rurin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) “Легенды и апокрифы в древней русской письменности,” *Вестник Европы* 3 (1894) 304–305.
- , *История Русской Литературы* (С.-Петербург, 1902) 1.425–426.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.649–650.
- Stone, M. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 116.
- Vostokov, A. (Востоков, А.) *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского музея* (С.-Петербург, 1842) 546.

Adam Octipartite

(От Скольких Частей Сотворил Бог Адама)

a. *Texts*

- Gupalo, Ju.M. (Гупало, Ю.М.) “Три фрагмента о сотворении человека,” in: *Повести Древней Руси* (Москва, 2002) 369–371.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “От Колика Части Сотвори Бог Адама,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.92.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 442–443, 445.

b. *Translations*

- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “От Колика Части Сотвори Бог Адама,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.93.
- , “О сотворении Адама,” in: *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (ed. М.В. Рождественская; С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 19–20.
- , “О сотворении Адама,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 19–20.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 444, 446.

c. *Research*

- Böttrich, C. *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Frankfurt am Main, 1995).
- Förster, M. “Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung: Ein lateinisches Fragment des s.g. slawischen Henoch,” *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1907–1908) 477–529.
- Jagić, V. “Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches,” in: *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (Vienna, 1893) 44–47.
- Kagan, M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) “От коих частей создан бысть Адам,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.153–155.
- Kagan, M.D. et al. (Каган, М.Д., Поньрко, Н.В., Рождественская, М.В.) “Описание сборников XV в. книгописца Ефросина,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 35 (1980) 172–196.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67.3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [Nendeln, 1966]) 119–120.

- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) "Античное учение о четырёх стихиях в древнерусской письменности," in: *Древняя Русь: пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 56–66.
- Stone, M.E. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 116.
- Turdeanu, É. "Dieu créa l'homme de huit éléments et tira son nom des quatre coins du monde," *Revue des études roumaines* 13–14 (1974) 163–194.
- , *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 404–435.

Adamic Fragments in the Apocryphal Circle about the Tree of the Cross
(Слово о Крестном Древе)

a. *Texts*

- Angelov, V. and M. Genov (Ангелов, В. и Генов, М.) *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922) 249–254.
- Franko, I. (Франко, I.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 2.242–245.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург, 1906) 109–110.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Слово о Крестном Древе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.284–290.
- Polivka, G. "Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu," *Starine* 21 (1889) 216–218.
- Porov, A. (Попов, А.) *Первое прибавление к описанию рукописей и каталогу книг церковной печати библиотеки А.И. Хлудова* (Москва, 1875) 31–44.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 47–50, 96–99, 101–103.
- Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 81–82.
- Stojanović, L. (Стојановић, Љ.) "Неколико рукописа из царске библиотеке у Бечу. 1. Један апокрифни зборник XVII столећа," *Гласник* 63 (1885) 53–59.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) "Слово о древе крестном," in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.305–313.

b. *Translations*

- Angelov, V. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и Генов, М.) *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922) 249–254.
- Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков, П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) “Апокриф за кръстното дърво,” in: *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 171–173.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “Слово о Крестном Древе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.285–291.
- , “Слово о Крестном Древе,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 121–128.
- , “Слово о Крестном Древе,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 161–169.
- Kaliganov, I., Polyujannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Поливянный, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 88–102.
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.274–288.
- Zachinjaev, A. (Зачиняев, А.) *Апокрифы. Духовные Стихи. Легенды* (С.-Петербург, 1909) 6–10.

c. *Research*

- Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 1.; С.-Петербург, 1861) 489.
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) *История сербо-хорватской литературы* (Казань, 1872) 100–102, 106–109.
- Kagan, M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) “Апокрифы о крестном древе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.60–66.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “Слово о Крестном Древе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.402–406.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Текстологически наблюдения върху два апокрифа (апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво, приписван на Григорий Богослов, и апокрифа за Адам и Ева),” *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982) 35–55.
- , “Апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 30–31.
- , “Апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 39–40.
- Mochul'skij, V.N. (Мочульский, В.Н.) *Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге* (Варшава, 1887) 65–76; 157–165.

- Panajotov, V. (Панайотов, В.) “Числовата системност в слово за Кръстното дърво на презвитер Йеремя,” in: *Преславска книж. школа* (т. 5; София, 2001) 257–266.
- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Повест за Кръстното дърво,” in: *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 334–335; (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 370.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 105–115, 132, 138–141, 165–166.
- , *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 47–52.
- Sokolov, M. I. (Соколов, М. И.) *Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск 1. Компиляция апокрифов болгарского попа Иеремии* (Москва, 1888) 72–211.
- Veselovskij, A. N. (Веселовский, А. Н.) “Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. 10. Западные легенды о древе креста и Слово Григория о трёх крестных древах,” *Записки Императорской Академии Наук* 45.1 (1883) 365–417.

*Adamic Fragments in the Discourse of the Three Hierarchs
(Беседа Трёх Святителей)*

a. *Texts*

- Karпов, A. (Карпов, А.) *Азбуковники или алфавиты иностранных речей (По спискам Соловецкой библиотеки)* (Казань, 1874) 124–132.
- Kolesov, V. V. (Колесов, В. В.) “Беседа трех святителей,” in: Kolesov, V. V. (Колесов, В. В.) *Мудрое слово Древней Руси (XI–XVII вв.)* (Москва, 1989) 69–74.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о новозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки* (С.-Петербург, 1890) 378–396.
- Purin, A. N. (Пыпин, А. Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970])* 168–178.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M. V. (Рождественская, М. В.) “Из беседы трех святителей,” in: *Памятники литературы Древней Руси: XII век* (Москва, 1980) 137–146.
- , “Из беседы трех святителей,” in: Lihachev, D. S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д. С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.350–358.
- Suschickij, F. P. (Сушицкий, Ф. П.) *Киевские списки “Беседы трех святителей” (Из филологического семинара В. П. Перетца)* (Киев, 1911).
- Tihonravov, N. S. (Тихонравов, Н. С.) *Памятники отреченной русской*

литературы (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 433–438.

Vjazemskij, P.P. (Вяземский, П.П.) “Беседа трех святителей,” in: *Памятники древней письменности* 1 (1880) 63–123.

b. *Translations*

Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 16–19.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.331–334.

Prokof 'ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 398–401.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Из беседы трех святителей,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси: XII век* (Москва, 1980) 138–147.

—, “Беседа трёх святителей,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Кузьмин; Москва, 1990) 266–275.

—, “Из беседы трех святителей,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.351–359.

—, “Из беседы трех святителей,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 142–148.

—, “Из беседы трех святителей,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 189–195.

Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) “Беседа трёх святителей,” in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 169–176.

c. *Research*

Vorison, A.Ja. (Борисов, А.Я.) “К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе,” *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.

Vuchilina, E.A. (Бучилина, Е.А.) *Апокриф “Беседа трех святителей” как памятник средневековой русской литературы* (Москва, 1994).

—, “Цикл вопросов об Адаме в апокрифической ‘Беседе Трёх Святителей,’” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (7.1; Москва, 1994) 107–141.

Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 2. С.-Петербург, 1861) 15–31.

Buchkov, V.V. (Бычков, В.В.) *Духовно-эстетические основы русской иконы* (Москва, 1995).

Kirillin, V.M. (Кириллин, В.М.) *Символика чисел в литературе Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2000) 73.

Krasnosel'skij, N.F. (Красносельский, Н.Ф.) *К вопросу о греческих источниках “Беседы трех святителей”* (Записки Новороссийского университета, 55; Одесса, 1890).

- Kuznesova, V.S. (Кузнецова, В.С.) *Дуалистические легенды о сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1995).
- Los', I.L. (Лось, И.Л.) "Беседа трех святителей," in: *Христианство. Энциклопедический словарь* (1; Москва, 1993) 374.
- Lur'e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) "Беседа трех святителей," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.89–93.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) "'Беседа на тримата светители' в южнославянската ръкописна традиция. Бележки върху класификацията на преписите," in: *Възрожденският текст. Прочити на литературата и културата на българското Възраждане. В чест на 70-годишнината на проф. Дочо Леков* (София, 1998) 336–344.
- , "Към въпроса гръцките прототипи на т. нар. 'Беседа на тримата светители,'" in: *ПОЛУХРОНИЯ. Сборник в чест на проф. Иван Божилов* (София, 2002) 212–229.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) "Античное учение о четырёх стихиях в древнерусской письменности," in: *Древняя Русь: пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 56–66.
- Mil'kov, V.V., Smol'nikova, L.N. (Мильков, В.В., Смольникова, Л.Н.) "Апокрифическая 'Беседа трех святителей' в Древней Руси и ее идейно-мировоззренческое содержание," in: *Общественная мысль: исследования и публикации* (Вып. III; Москва, 1993) 153–164.
- Mochul'skij, V.N. (Мочульский, В.Н.) *Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге* (Варшава, 1887) 24–53.
- , *Следы народной Библии в славянской и древнерусской письменности* (Одесса, 1893) 1–172.
- , *Греческие списки так называемой "Беседы трех святителей"* (Варшава, 1901).
- Nachtigall, R. "Ein Beitrag zu den Forschungen über die sogenannte 'Беседа трех святителей' (Gespräch dreier Heiligen)," *Archiv für Slavische Philologie* 23 (1901) 1–95; 24 (1902) 321–408; 26 (1904) 472–477.
- Obschestvennaja, *Общественная мысль: исследования и документы* (вып. 3; Москва, 1993) 165–182.
- Rurin, A. (Пыпин, А.) "Исследование для объяснения статьи о ложных книгах," *Летописи Занятий Археографической комиссии* (1861) (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1862) 41, 49.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Из беседы трех святителей," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.410–411.
- , "Об одном фрагменте вопросо-ответной апокрифической литературы ('Сказание о 12 пятницах' и 'Беседа трех святителей')," in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода "Переводной литературы" А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).

- Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) "Беседа трёх святителей," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков, В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 176–185.
- Vasil'ev, M.A. (Васильев, М.А.) "Хорс Жидовин': древнерусское языческое божество в контексте проблем Khazaro-Slavica," *Славяноведение* 2 (1995) 12–21.
- Zhdanov, I.N. (Жданов, И.Н.) "Беседа трех святителей и Iosa monachorum," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 1 (1892) 157–194.

Adamic Fragments in the Homily of Adam in Hades to Lazarus
(Слово Адама во Аду к Лазарю)

a. *Texts*

- Hitchcock, D.R. *The Appeal of Adam to Lazarus in Hell* (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 302; The Hague, 1979).
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) in: *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности* 52 (1891) 230–231.
- Rupin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 11–12.

b. *Translations*

- [Anonymous], "The Homily of Adam in Hades to Lazarus," *Slavonic and East European Review* 10 (1931) 244–252.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "В пятницу цветной недели слово святых апостолов от Адама в аду к Лазарю," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 103–105.
- , "В пятницу цветной недели слово святых апостолов от Адама в аду к Лазарю," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 143–149.

c. *Research*

- Haelewycck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout, 1998) 29.
- Savel'eva, O.A. (Савельева, О.А.) "Структурные особенности краткой и пространной редакций Плача Адама," in: *Исследования по истории общественного сознания эпохи феодализма в России* (Новосибирск, 1984).
- , "'Плач Адама': Круг источников и литературная семья памятника," in: *Памятники литературы и общественной мысли эпохи феодализма* (ed. Е.К. Ромодановская; Новосибирск, 1985) 164–182.
- , "Плач Адама в составе литературных памятников," in: *Источники по истории общественной мысли и культуры позднего феодализма* (ed. Н.Н. Покровская; Новосибирск, 1988) 5–13.

Seregina, N.S. (Серегина, Н.С.) “Покаянный стих ‘Плач Адама о рае’ распева Кирила Гомулина,” in: *Памятники культуры. Новые открытия*. 1983 (Москва, 1985) 258–262.

Sergeev, V.N. (Сергеев, В.Н.) “Духовный стих ‘Плач Адама’ на иконе,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 26 (1971) 280–286.

Satanael Text
(*Tentatio Adae et Evae a Satanael*)

a. *Texts*

Gaylord, H.E. “How Satanael Lost His ‘-el’,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982) 303–309.

b. *Translations*

Gaylord, H.E. “How Satanael Lost His ‘-el’,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982) 303–309.

c. *Research*

Gaylord, H.E. “How Satanael Lost His ‘-el’,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982) 303–309.

Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout, 1998) 29.
Stichel, R. “Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse,” in: *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien* (eds. R. Lauer and P. Schreiner; *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 177; Göttingen, 1989) 116–128.

Stone, M. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 116.

Turdeanu, É. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 17–31.

Adamic and Satanael Fragments in the Legend about the Tiberian Sea
(*Легенда о Тивериадском Море*)

a. *Texts*

Barsov, E. (Барсов, Е.) “О Тивериадском море по списку XVI века,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1886) 5–8.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, И.) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 290–303.

b. *Translations*

Jagić, V. “Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches,” *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (Vienna, 1893) 44–47.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) “За Тивериадското море,” in: *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 31–35.

c. *Research*

- Badalanova-Geller, F. "The Sea of Tiberias between Apocryphal Literature and Oral Tradition," in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Beljaev, M.V. (Беляев, М.В.) "Происхождение народных легенд о миротворении," *Изв. Азербайдж. ун-та. Сер. обществ. наук* 4/5 (1925) 70.
- Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Д.) "Космогоничната легенда за Тивериадското море и старобългарската апокрифна традиция," *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 184–192.
- , "Богомилская космогония в древнеславянской литературной традиции," in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (ed. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 38–58.
- Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антић, В.) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна грага* (Скопје, 1978) 33–34.
- Kuznesova, V.S. (Кузнецова, В.С.) "Сюжет о дуалистическом сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции и апокрифической книжности," in: *Международная конференция "Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции" (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 31–33.
- , *Дуалистические легенды о сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1995).
- , "Сюжет о дуалистическом миротворении в апокрифе о Тивериадском море (текстологические наблюдения, традиции бытования)," in: *Роль традиции в литературной жизни эпохи: сюжеты и мотивы* (Новосибирск, 1995) 24–39.
- , *Дуалистические легенды о сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции* (Новосибирск, 1998).
- , "Сотворение мира в восточно-славянских дуалистических легендах и апокрифической книжности," in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (ed. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 59–78.
- , "О море Тивериадском," in: *Традиция и литературный процесс* (ed. А.Б. Соколов; Новосибирск, 1999) 45–49.
- Markov, A. (Марков, А.) "Море Тивериадское в дуалистической легенде о сотворении мира," *Этнографическое Обзорение* 1/2 (кн. 96/97) (Москва, 1913) 64–75.
- Petruchin, V.Я. (Петрухин, В.Я.) "Антропогонические мифы," in: *Славянская мифология* (Москва, 1995) 34.
- Porfir'ev, I.Я. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872).

The Apocryphon about the Struggle of the Archangel Michael with Satanael
(Апокриф о Борбе Архангела Михаила с Сатанаилом)

a. *Texts*

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Апокрифът за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил в две редакции,” *Старобългарска литература* 9 (1981) 98–113.

—, “Неизвестна редакция на апокрифа за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил,” in: *Литературознание и фолклористика. Сборник в чест на acad. Петър Динев* (София, 1983) 121–127.

b. *Translations*

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 18–25.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Слово на Йоан Златоуст за това как Михаил победи Сатанаил,” in: *Vozhilov, I., et al., eds., (Божилов, И. и Кожухаров С.) Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987) 150–156.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) “Слово за лъжливия Антихрист, безбожен Сатанаил, как го плени Архангел Михаил,” in: *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 41–48; 349–350.

c. *Research*

Afinogenova, O. (Афиногенова, О.) “Греческий вариант апокрифа о борьбе архангела Михаила и Сатанаила,” *Scripta & E-scripta* 3/4 (2005/2006) 329–348.

Vukova, V.M. (Быкова, В.М.) *Сказание о чудесах архангела Михаила в древнерусской книжности* (Ph.D. diss.; Петрозаводск, 2006).

Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Д.) “Темата на произхода на злото в старобългарската апокрифна традиция,” in: *Литература, общество, идеи* (София, 1986) 25–47.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Апокрифът за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил в две редакции,” *Старобългарска литература* 9 (1981) 98–113.

—, “Неизвестна редакция на апокрифа за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил,” in: *Литературознание и фолклористика. Сборник в чест на acad. Петър Динев* (София, 1983) 121–127.

2 *Epoch*

a. *Texts*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и Генов, М.) *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922) 185–194.

- Arheografičeskaja Komissija (Археографическая Комиссия), *Великие Минеи Четии собранные Всероссийским Митрополитом Макарием. Декабрь дни 25–31* (Москва, 1912) 2496–2499.
- Franco, I. (Франко, I.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Nesnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.39–64.
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) “Енох,” in: J. Ivanov, *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 165–191.
- Ivšić, St. “Hrvatski glagoljski apokrif o Melhisedekovu rodjenju i spasenju zaorčega potopa,” *Nastavni vjesnik* 39 (1930–1931) 101–108.
- Jovanović, T. (Јовановић, Т.) “Апокриф о Еноху према српском препису из Народне библиотеке у Бечу,” *Археографски прилози* 25 (2003) 209–238.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “Сказание о Мелхиседеке,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.114–119.
- Kazakova, N.A. and Lur'e, Ja.S. (Казакова, Н.А. и Лурье, Я.С.) *Антифеодальные еретические движения на Руси XIV – начала XVI вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955) 215–220, 309–312, 388–391.
- Lur'e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) “Послание Геннадия Иосафу,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси: Вторая половина XV века* (Москва, 1978–1992) 540–553.
- Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) “Книга Еноха,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.204–240.
- Novaković, S. “Апокриф о Еноху,” *Starine* XVI (1884) 67–81.
- Роров, А. (Попов, А.) “Южнорусский сборник 1679 года,” in: *Библиографические материалы* (Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских, 3.9; Москва, 1880) 66–139.
- , *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Москва, 1896 [Onasbrück, 1986]) 154–169.
- Рурин, А.Н. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 15–16.
- Reinhart, J. “A Croatian Glagolitic excerpt of the Slavonic Enoch (2 Enoch),” *Fundamenta Europaea* 4 (2007) 31–46.
- Schneider, R. *Die moralisch-belehrenden Artikel im altrussischen Sammelband Merilo Pravednoe* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et Dissertationes, 23; Freiburg, 1986).
- Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха. II. Текст с латинским переводом,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1899) 1–112.
- , “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский

- перевод и исследование. Посмертный труд автора подготовил к изданию М. Сперанский,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1910) 1–167.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 75–80.
- Tihomirov, M. (Тихомиров, М.) *Мерило Праведное по рукописи XIV века* (Москва, 1961).
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.19–23, 26–31.
- Vaillant, A. *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Textes publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, 4; Paris, 1952 [1976]).
- b. *Translations*
- Agourides, S.C. “Enoch B' e To Biblio ton Mystikon tou Enoch (Slavonikos Enoch),” in S. Agourides (ed.), *Ta Apokrypha tes Palaias Diathekes B'* (Athens, 1984) 443–476.
- Andersen, F.I. “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York, 1985 [1983]) 1.91–221.
- Angelov, V. and M. Genov (Ангелов, В. и Генов, М.) *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922) 185–194.
- , “Enoch B' e To Biblio ton Mystikon tou Enoch (Slavonikos Enoch),” *Θεολογία* 56 (1985) 127–160.
- Averincev, S.S. (Аверинцев, С.С.) *От берегов Босфора до берегов Евфрата* (Москва, 1987).
- , “Книга Еноха Праведного. Славянский Енох,” in: *Книга Еноха. Тайны Земли и Неба* (ed. И. Лосиевский; Москва, 2003) 250–281.
- Barnstone, W. *The Other Bible: Jewish Pseudepigrapha, Christian Apocrypha, Gnostic Scriptures, Kabbalah, Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco, 1984) 3–9, 495–500.
- Bonsirven, J. “Les livres des secrets d'Hénoch,” in: *La Bible apocryphe en marge de l'Ancien Testament. Textes choisis et traduits par J. Bonsirven* (Paris, [1953] 1975) 227–247.
- Bonwetsch, G.N. *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. PH Neue Folge, 1.3; Berlin, 1896).
- , *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 44; Leipzig, 1922).
- Böttrich, C. *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenisch-römischer Zeit, 5.7; Gütersloh, 1995).
- Bugge, A. ‘Anden Enoksbog’, in E. Hammershaimb et al. (eds.), *De Gammelt-estamentlige Pseudepigrafer* (København, 1974) 2.791–826.
- Charles, R.H., W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford, 1896).
- Charles, R.H., N. Forbes, “The Book of the Secrets of Enoch,” in: *The Apoc-*

- rypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; ed. R.H. Charles; Oxford, 1913) 2. 425–469.
- Cousin, H. *Vies d'Adam et Eve, des patriarches et des prophètes. Textes juifs autour de l'ère chrétienne* (Suppléments au Cahier Évangile, 32; Paris, 1988) 35–40.
- Deißmann, A. “2 Enoch,” in: *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen, 1900 [1922]) 149–177.
- Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков, П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) “Апокрифът за праведния Енох,” in: *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 162–168.
- Enrietti, M. “Libro dei segreti di Enoc,” in: *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (ed. P. Sacchi; Turin, 1989) 2.477ff.
- Ginzberg, L. “The Ascension of Enoch,” in: *The Legends of the Jews* (6 vols.; Philadelphia, 1909–1925) 1.130–137 (text); 5.158–162.
- Nachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) “Книга Еноха,” in: *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (ed. В. Мильков; Москва, 1997) 47–54.
- , “Книга Святых тайн Еноха. Славянский Енох,” in: *Книга Еноха. Тайны Земли и Неба* (ed. И. Лосиевский; Москва, 2003) 282–316.
- Jack, A. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Albuquerque, 1972).
- Jovanovic, P., Vaillant A. *Le Livre des secrets d'Enoch* (Paris, 2005) 66–90; 105–137.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “Сказание о Мелхиседеке,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.114–119.
- Kahana, A. “Sefer Hanok B,” in: *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim le-Torah* (2 vols.; Tel-Aviv, 1937 [Ramat Gan, 1959]) 1.102–141.
- Kaliganov, I., Polyujannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Польшиванный, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 61–68.
- Karпов, A. Ju. (Карпов, А. Ю.) “Из потаённых книг Еноха Праведного,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Kuz'min; Москва, 1990) 266–275.
- Kuev, K. “Апокрифът за праведния Енох,” in: *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (eds. П. Динеков, et al.; София, 1978) 162–168.
- Moriyasu, T. “2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” in: *Seisho Gaiten Giten* (eds. M. Sekine and S. Arai; Tokio, 1975) 3.206–251; 363–378.
- Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) “Книга Еноха,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.204–241.
- , “Книга Еноха,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 33–66.
- Pennington, A. “2 Enoch,” in: *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford, 1984) 321–362.
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) “Книга за светите тайни Енохови,” in: *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 49–63.
- , “Из ‘Книга за светите тайни Енохови,’” in: Petkanova, D. and

- A. Miltenova (eds.) (Петканова, Д. и Милтенова, А.) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993) 7–10.
- Pincherle, M. “Il secondo libro di Enoch (“Enoch Slavo” o “Enoch II”),” in: Pincherle, *Il libro di Enoch* (Scienza e Ignoto, 9; Faenza, 1977) 12–13, 223–278.
- Rießler, P. “Henochbuch (slavisch) oder Zweiter Henoch,” in: *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg, 1928; [Heidelberg, 1966, 1984]).
- Rubinkiewicz, R. “Księga Henocha słowiańska,” in: *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu* (ed. R. Rubinkiewicz; Warszawa, 1999) 207–222.
- Sacchi, P. “Libro dei segreti di Enoc,” *Apocrifi dell’Antico Testamento* (5 vols.; eds. P. Sacchi et al.; Torino/Brescia, 1981–1997) 2.479–594.
- Santos Otero, A. de. “Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo),” in: *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (5 vols.; ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid, 1984–1987) 4.147–202.
- Schneider, R. *Die moralisch-belehrenden Artikel im altrussischen Sammelband Merilo Pravednoe* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et Dissertationes, 23; Freiburg/ i. Br., 1986) 93–99.
- Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха. II. Текст с латинским переводом,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1899) 1–80.
- , “Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский перевод и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изданию М. Сперанский,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1910) 1–167.
- Székely, St. “Liber Henoch Slavicus,” in: *Bibliotheca Apocrypha. Introductio Historico-Critica in Libros Apocryphos utriusque testamenti cum Explicatione Argumenti et Doctrinae* (Freiburg, 1913) 1.227–242.
- Tarkovskij, R.B. (Тарковский, Р.Б.) “Сказание о Мелхиседеке,” in: *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (ed. М.В. Рождественская; С-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 33–37.
- Vaillant, A. *Le livre des secrets d’Hénoch. Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris, 1952 [1976]).
- Vaillant, A. and M. Philonenko, “Livre des secrets d’Hénoch,” in: *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires* (eds. A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko; La Pléade; Paris, 1987) 1187–1223.
- Vladimirov, B. (Владимиров, Б.) *Книга Еноха. Етиопска и славянска версия* (София, 1994).
- Zvezda Volhfov (Звезда Волхвов) “Книга Еноха,” in: *Поэтические гностические тексты христианства* (Новочеркасск, 1994) 19–24.

c. Research

- Aalen, S. *Heilsverlangen und Heilsverwirklichung. Studien zur Erwartung des Heils in der apokalyptischen Literatur des antiken Judentums und im ältesten Christentum* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, 21; Leiden, 1990) 49–50.

- Alexander, P. "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 28 (1977) 173–180 at 160–161.
- , "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York, 1985 [1983]) 1.223–315 at 247–248.
- , "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, 1998) 87–122.
- Alon, G. "Par'irtin. On the History of the High Priesthood at the End of the Second Temple Period," in: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World. Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud* (Tr. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem, 1977) 48–88.
- Alonso, Días, J. "Sentido del 'juicio final' de Yahvé en la apocalíptica y en Mt 25," *Studium ovetense* 5 (1977) 77–98.
- Amusin, I.D. (Амусин, И.Д.) "Избранник Бога' в кумранских текстах," *Вестник Древней Истории* 1 (1966) 73–79.
- , "Новый эсхатологический текст из Кумрана (11Q Melchisedek)," *Вестник Древней Истории* 3 (1967) 45–62.
- , *Тексты Кумрана* (Вып.1; Памятники письменности Востока, 33/1; Москва, 1971).
- , *Кумранская Община* (Москва, 1983).
- Andersen, F.I. "On Reading Genesis 1–3," *Interchange* 33 (1983) 11–36.
- , "The Second Book of Enoch," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; Garden City, N.Y., 1992) 2.516–522.
- , "The Sun in 2 Enoch," *Христианский Востокъ* 4.10 (2006) 380–412.
- , "The Sun in 2 Enoch," in: *L'Église des deux Alliances. Méorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)* (eds. B. Lourié, A. Orlov, M. Petit; Piscataway, 2008) 1–38.
- , "The Sun in 2 Enoch: The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Anderson, G.A. "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997) 105–134.
- , "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson et al.; Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 15; Leiden, 2000) 83–110.
- Aptowitzer, V. "Les éléments juifs dans la légende du Golgotha," *Revue des études juives* 79 (1924) 145–162.
- , "Malkizedek. Zu den Sagen der Agada," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 70 (1926) 93–113.
- Arsenij, Hieromonk (Арсений, Иеромонах) "Описание славянских рукописей библиотеки Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры (I–III; Москва, 1878–1879)," in: *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1878) and *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1879).
- Bamberger, B.J. *Fallen Angels* (Philadelphia, 1952) 32–35, 289–290.

- Barth, C. *Diesseits und Jenseits im Glauben des späten Israel* (Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien, 72; Stuttgart, 1974) 37–39.
- Bauckham, R. “Early Jewish Visions of Hell,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990) 355–385.
- , *The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Schriften des Neuen Testaments, 93; Leiden, 1998).
- , “The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus,” in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 63; Leiden, 1999) 43–69.
- Baudry, G.-H. “Le péché originel dans les pseudépigraphes de l’Ancien Testament,” *Mélanges de science religieuse* 49 (1992) 163–192.
- Bauer, J.B. *Clavis apocryphorum supplementum. Complectens voces versionis germanicae libri Henoch slavici, libri Jubilaeorum, Odarum Solomonis* (Grazer theologische Studien 4; Graz, 1980) 121–170.
- Bietenhard, H. “Excurs: Die Schöpfungserzählung von 2 Hen 24–33,” in: *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2; Tübingen, 1951) 95–100.
- Böcklen, E. *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie* (Göttingen, 1902).
- Böttrich, C. *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Diss.; Leipzig, 1990).
- , “Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature* 9 (1991) 35–42.
- , *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, R.2, 50; Tübingen, 1992).
- , “Das ‘Sanctus’ in der Liturgie der hellenistischen Synagoge,” *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* (1994–1995) 10–36.
- , *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Frankfurt am Main, 1995).
- , “Die Vögel des Himmels haben ihn begraben,” in: *Überlieferungen zu Abels Bestattung und zur Ätiologie des Grabes* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, 3; Göttingen, 1995).
- , “Beobachtungen zum Midrasch vom ‘Leben Henochs,’” in: *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44–83.
- , “Astrologie in der Henochtradition,” *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 109 (1997) 222–245.
- , “The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32.4 (2001) 445–470.
- , “Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen im slavischen Henochbuch und in Qumran,” in: *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. von C. Hempel, A. Lange und H. Lichtenberger; Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium, 159; Leuven, 2002) 297–321.

- , “Die vergessene Geburtsgeschichte. Mt 1–2 / Lk 1–2 und die wunderbare Geburt des Melchisedek in sHen 71–72,” in: *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext* (eds. H. Lichtenberger and G. S. Oegema; JSHRZ-St 1; Gütersloh 2002) 222–249.
- , “Biblische Figuren im slavischen Henochbuch,” in: *The Reception and Function of Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Other Early Jewish Literature* (ed. H. Lichtenberger; Berlin-New York, 2009 (forthcoming)).
- Bousset, W. “Die Himmelsreise der Seele,” *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 4 (1901) 136–169.
- , *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (3rd ed.; Tübingen, 1966 [1903]).
- Bow, B.A. “Melchizedek’s Birth Narrative in 2 Enoch 68–73: Christian Correlations,” in: *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. G.W.E. Nickelsburg Festschrift (eds. R.A. Argall et al.; Harrisburg, 2000) 33–41.
- Brandenburger, E. *Adam und Christus. Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Röm. 5, 12–21 (1. Kor. 15)* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 7; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1962) 41–42.
- Burkitt, F.C. *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London, 1914) 75–76.
- , “Robert Henry Charles 1855–1931,” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 17 (1931) 437–445.
- Camponovo, O. *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften* (Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 58; Freiburg, 1984).
- Caquot, A. “La pérennité du sacerdoce,” in: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon* (Paris, 1978) 109–116.
- Cavallin, H.C. “Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I,” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.19.1 (Berlin/New York, 1979) 240–345.
- Cerbelaud, D. “Le nom d’Adam et les points cardinaux. Recherches sur un thème patristique,” *Vigiliae christianae* 38 (1984) 285–301.
- Cerutti, M.V. “Protologia e femminino in 1 Enoc, 2 Enoc, Apocalisse di Mosè, Vita di Adamo ed Eva,” *Ricerche storico bibliche* 6 (1994) 119–139.
- Charles, R.H. *A Critical History of the Doctrine of Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity; or Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology from Pre-Prophetic Time still the Close of the New Testament Canon. Being the Jewett Lectures for 1898–1899* (London, 1899) 261–266.
- , “The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1921) 161–163.
- , *Eschatology. The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity. A Critical History* (New York, 1963) 315–320.
- Charlesworth, J.H. “Jewish Astrology in the Talmud, Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Early Palestinian Synagogues,” *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977) 183–200.
- , “The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch,” *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978–1979) 315–323.
- , “The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel,” in: *Ideal Figures in Ancient*

- Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins et al.; Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 12; Chico, 1980) 135–151.
- , *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 75; Atlanta, 1981).
- , *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 54; Cambridge, 1985).
- Charlesworth, J.H. with J.R. Mueller, *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excursuses on Apocalypses* (American Theological Library Association Bibliography Series; Metuchen, NJ/London, 1987).
- Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Ph.D. diss.; Vanderbilt, 1976) 336–341.
- Collins J.J. “The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism,” in: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen, 1983) 531–548.
- , *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, 1998) 243–247.
- , “The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature,” in: *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in Judaisms of Antiquity* (eds. A.J. Avery-Peck et al.; Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1.49; Leiden, 2000) 119–139.
- Cortès, E. *Los discursos de adiós de Gn 49 a Jn 13–17. Pistas para la historia de un género literario en la antigua literatura judía* (Barcelona, 1976) 146–151.
- Culianu, I.P. “Les anges des peuples et la question des origines du dualisme gnostique,” in: *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique. Actes du Colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve (11–14 mars 1980)* (eds. J. Ries et al.; Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 27; Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982) 130–145.
- Daniélou, J. “Terre et paradis chez les pères de l’Église,” *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 22 (1953) 433–472.
- , “Trinité et angéologie dans la théologie judéo-chrétienne,” *Recherches de science religieuse* 45 (1957) 5–41.
- , *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Chicago, 1964). [*Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme. Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée* (Paris, 1958)]
- Danilova, V.M. (Данилова, В.М.) *Палеографическое и фонетическое описание рукописи Мерило Праведное (Троицкое собрание, № 15)* (Москва, 1969).
- Davila, J. “Melchizedek, the ‘Youth,’ and Jesus,” in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 46; Leiden, 2003) 248–274.
- De Conick, A. “Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First Century Christology in the Second Century,” in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 63; Leiden, 1999) 325–330 at 314.
- Dean-Otting, M. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Judentum und Umwelt, 8; Frankfurt am Main/New York, 1984) 225–238, 256–258.

- Delcor, M. "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 2 (1971) 126–130.
- , "Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocalyptique juive. Histoire et traditions," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 189 (1976) 3–53.
- , "La naissance merveilleuse de Melchisédeq d'après l'Hénoch slave," in: *Kecharitomene. Mélanges René Laurentin* (eds. C. Augustin et al.; Paris, 1990) 217–229.
- Demin, A.S. (Демин, А.С.) "Путешествие души по загробному миру (В древнерусской литературе)," in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (7.1; Москва, 1994) 51–74.
- , "Путешествие души по загробному миру," *Российский литературоведческий журнал* 5–6 (1994) 355–376.
- , "Загробный мир," in: *Древнерусская литература: Изображение природы и человека* (Москва, 1995) 182–207, 294–295, 312–314.
- Dennefeld, L. *Le messianisme* (Paris, 1929) 213–214.
- Diez Merino, L. "Los 'vigilantes' en la literatura intertestamentaria," in: *Simpósio bíblico español (Salamanca, 1982)* (eds. N. Fernández Marcos et al.; Madrid, 1984) 575–609.
- Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антић, В.) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна грага* (Скопје, 1978) 37–38.
- Dumke, J.A. *The Suffering of the Righteous in Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (Ph.D. diss.; Duke University, 1980) 154–157.
- Efron, J. "Holy War and Visions of Redemption in the Hasmonean Period," in: *Studies on the Hasmonean Period* (ed. J. Neusner; Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 39; Leiden, 1987) 33–65.
- Eiß, W. "Der Kalender des nachexilischen Judentums (mit Ausnahme des essenischen Kalenders)," *Die Welt des Orients* 3 (1964) 44–47.
- Eliseev, G.A. (Елисеев, Г.А.) "Антиеврейские православные сочинения конца XV – начала XVI века и влияние на них древнееврейских апокрифических книг," in: *Исследование по источниковедению истории России (до 1917 года). Сборник статей* (Москва, 1996) 75–97.
- Evans, J.M. "Microcosmic Adam," *Medium Aevum* 35 (1966) 38–42.
- Färber, P. *Wesen, Aufgabe und Hierarchie der Engel in den drei Henochbüchern* (Ph.D. diss.; Graz, 1983/84) 1–33.
- Fischer, U. *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 44; Berlin, 1978) 37–70.
- Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2.94; Tübingen, 1997) 140–141.
- , *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 42; Leiden, 2002).
- Förster, M. "Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung. Ein lateinisches Fragment des s. g. slavischen Henoch," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1908) 477–529.

- Forsyth, N. *The Old Enemy. Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton, 1987) 221–247.
- Fortheringham, J.K. “The Date and the Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1919) 252.
- , “The Easter Calendar of the Slavonic Enoch,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 23 (1922) 49–56.
- Fossum, J. “Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism,” *Vigiliae christianae* 37 (1983) 260–287.
- , *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Meditation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 36; Tübingen, 1985).
- , “Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism,” *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989) 183–201.
- , *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Freiburg/Göttingen, 1995).
- Frey, J.-B. “Apocryphes de l’Ancien Testament. 15. Le livre d’Hénoch slave ou livre des secrets d’Hénoch,” in: *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément* (eds. L. Pirot et al.; Paris, 1928) cols 353–460 at 448–454.
- García Santos, Á. “El pecado de los ángeles: los vigilantes,” *Estudios Biblicos* 51 (1993) 41–72.
- Geert Wouter, L. *The Antichrist Theme in the Intertestamental Period* (London/ New York, 2003) 142–148.
- Gieschen, C. “The Different Functions of a Similar Melchizedek Tradition in 2 Enoch and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” in: *Early Christian Interpretation of Scriptures of Israel* (eds. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 148; Sheffield, 1997) 364–379.
- , *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 42; Leiden, 1998) 158.
- Ginzberg, L. *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia, 1909–1925) 5.161–163
- Golitzin, A. “The Place of the Presence of God: Aphrahat of Persia’s Portrait of the Christian Holy Man,” in: *Essays in Honor of Archimandrite Aimilianos of the Monastery of Simonos Petras* (Athens, 2003) 391–447.
- Gorskij, A., Nevostruev, K. (Горский А., Невоструев, К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной Библиотеки* (Москва, 1859).
- Gowan, D.E. “The Fall and Redemption of the Material World in Apocalyptic Literature,” in: *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 7 (1995) 83–103.
- Grіcaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) “Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентів-заочнику),” *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
- Gruenwald, I. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 14; Leiden, 1980) 50–51.
- Gry, L. “La création en sept jours d’après les apocryphes de l’Ancien Testament,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 2 (1908) 277–293.

- , “Séjours et habitats divins d’après les apocryphes de l’Ancien Testament,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 4 (1910) 694–722.
- , “Quelques noms d’anges ou d’êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch,” *Revue biblique* 49 (1940) 195–203.
- Haag, H. “Die Dämonenlehre der Pseudepigraphen,” in: *Teufelsglaube* (Tübingen, 1974) 218–246.
- Hahne, H.A. *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation. An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:19–22 in Light of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Ph.D. diss.; Wycliffe College, 1997) 214–233.
- Hannah, D.D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2.109; Tübingen, 1999) 38–40.
- Harnack, A. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1896 [Leipzig, 1958]).
- Helyer, L.R. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period. A Guide for New Testament Students* (Downers Grove, 2002) 379–84.
- Hilhorst, A. “A Visit to Paradise: Apocalypse of Paul 45 and Its Background,” in: *Paradise Interpreted. Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; Themes in Biblical Narrative, 2; Leiden, 1999) 128–139.
- Himmelfarb, M. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford, 1993) 37–44, 83–87.
- Hughes, H.M. *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (Ph.D. diss.; London, 1909).
- Idel, M. “Enoch is Metatron,” *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Хронограф Академии Наук No. 45.13.4.,” in: *Летописи историко-филологического общества при Новороссийском университете* (XIII; Одесса, 1905) 313–341.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности* (Списки памятников) *Выпуск I. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 81–88.
- , “Описание южно-славянских и русских рукописей заграничных библиотек,” *Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности* 98 (1921) 225–229.
- Jenkinson, E.J. “Did Mohammed Know Slavonic Enoch?” *Muslim World* 21 (1931) 24–8.
- Jerome, F.J. *Das geschichtliche Melchisedech-Bild und seine Bedeutung im Hebräerbriefe* (Freiburg i.Br., 1920) 10–12.
- Jovanovic, P., Vaillant A. *Le Livre des secrets d’Enoch* (Paris, 2005).
- Kähler, C. *Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte der biblischen Makarismen* (Ph.D. diss.; Jena, 1974) 141–148.
- Kalachov, N.V. (Калачов, Н.В.) “Мерило Праведное,” in: *Архив историко-юридических сведений, относящихся до России, изд. Николаем Калачовым* (I(III); Москва, 1850) 28–40.
- Kallander, D.C. *The Defense of Jerusalem in the Roman Siege of 70 C.E.: A Study of First Century Apocalyptic Ideas* (Ph.D. diss.; Miami, 1980) 39–40.

- Kamlah, E. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 7; Tübingen, 1964).
- Klausner, J. "The Psalms of Solomon," in: *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (tr. W.F. Stinespring; New York, 1955).
- Kohler, K. *Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion, with Special Reference to Dante's Comedy* (New York, 1923) 67–70.
- Kreitzer, L.J. *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 19; Sheffield, 1987) 41–46, 51–52.
- Küchler, M. *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen. Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens* (Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 26; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1979) 62–87.
- Kuck, D.W. *Judgment and Community Conflict. Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5–4:5* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 66; Leiden, 1992) 89–93.
- Kutsch, E. *Das Herbstfest in Israel* (Diss. Mainz, 1955) 51–52.
- Lake, K. "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch," *Harvard Theological Review* 16 (1923) 397–398.
- Leonid, Arhimandrit [Kavelin] (Леонид, Архимандрит [Кавелин]) *Систематическое описание славяно-русских рукописей собрания Графа А.С. Уварова (со включением 750 ном. Собрания И.Н. Карского, описанных П.М. Строевым в алфавитном порядке)* (I–IV; Москва, 1893–1894).
—, "Сведение о славянских рукописях, поступивших из книгохранилища Св. Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры в библиотеки Троицкой Духовной Семинарии в 1747 (ныне находящихся в библиотеке Московской Духовной Академии)," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1884) 267–278.
- Levin, A.G. *The Tree of Life: Genesis 2:9/3:22–24 in Jewish, Gnostic and Early Christian Texts* (Ph.D.diss.; Harvard, 1996).
- Littman, E. "Enoch, Books of: II Slavonic Enoch," in: *The Jewish Encyclopedia* 5.181–182.
- Ljubimov, V.P. (Любимов, В.П.) *Правда Русская* (Москва-Ленинград, 1940) 89–103.
- Loisy, A. "Un nouveau livre d'Hénoch," *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse* 1 (1896) 29–57.
- Lourié, B. (Лурье, В.) "Метатрон и прометая: Вторая книга Еноха на перекрёстке проблем," in: *Scrinium II. Universum Hagiographicum. Mémoial R.P. Michel van Esbroeck, S.J. (1934–2003)* (ed. B. Lourié; С.-Петербург, 2006) 371–407.
- Lourié, B. and A. Orlov (eds.) *The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism* (Scrinium, III; С.-Петербург, 2007) 233–499.
- Lowther Clarke, W.K. "St. Luke and the Pseudepigrapha: Two Parallels," *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 (1913–1914) 597–599.
- Lukyn Williams, A. "The Cult of the Angels at Colossae," *Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1909) 413–438.
- Lupieri, E. "Apocalisse di Giovanni e tradizione enochica," in: *Apocalittica e Origini Cristiane* (Ricerche storico bibliche, 7; Bologna, 1995) 137–150.

- McKenna, M.M. "The Two Ways" in *Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period. A Study of the Form of Repentance Paranesis* (Ph.D. diss.; Pennsylvania, 1981) 205–226, 246–252.
- Mach, M. "From Apocalypticism to Early Jewish Mysticism?" in: *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (3 vols.; ed. J.J. Collins; New York, 1998) 229–264 at 251.
- Makushev, V. (Макушев, В.) "О некоторых рукописях народной библиотеки в Белграде. I: Рукописи болгарского письма," *Русский Филологический Вестник* 6 (1881) 309–324.
- Maunder, A.S.D. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316.
- Macaskill, G. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 115; Leiden, Boston, 2007) 142–148.
- De Merode, M. "Une aide qui lui correspond, L'exégèse de Gen. 2, 18–24 dans les écrits de l'Ancien Testament, du judaïsme et du Nouveau Testament," *Revue de théologie de Louvain* 8 (1977) 329–355.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) "Следы памятников Кумрана в старославянской и древнерусской литературе (К изучению славянских версий книги Еноха)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 130–147.
- , "К истории текста славянской книги Еноха (Следы памятников Кумрана в византийской и старославянской литературе)," *Византийский Временник* 24 (1964) 91–108.
- , "Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964) 198–206.
- , "К вопросу об источниках славянской Книги Еноха," *Краткие Сообщения Института Народов Азии* 86 (1965) 72–78.
- , "К вопросу о составе и источниках Академического Хронографа," in: *Летописи и хроники. Сборник статей* (Москва, 1973) 212–219.
- , "Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: Ветхозаветные апокрифы," in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, часть 1; Москва, 1976) 181–210.
- Milik, J.T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976) 107–124.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) "Книги за Енох," in: *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 228; (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 255–256.
- Muñoz León, D. *Palabra y Gloria. Excursus en la Biblia y en la literatura intertestamentaria* (Madrid, 1983) 197–199.
- Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) "Памятники славяно-русской переводной письменности и их роль в историко-лингвистических циклах," in: *Языковое и литературное образование в школе и вузе* (С.-Петербург, 1997) 248–250.
- , *Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000).

- , “‘Одеания ею пению раздаанию’ в славянском переводе книги Еноха,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003) 3–11.
- Nestle, E. “Eph. v. 14 and the Secrets of Enoch,” *The Expository Times* 9 (1897–1898) 376–377.
- Newman, C.C. *Paul’s Glory-Christology. Tradition and Rhetoric* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 69; Leiden, 1992) 85, 90–91.
- Nickelsburg, G. *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge, 1972).
- , *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis, 2005) 221–229.
- Niebuhr, K.W. *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2.28; Tübingen, 1987) 185–194.
- Nikolov, E. (Николов, Е.) *Апокрифна литература* (София, 1948) 17–20.
- Nordheim, E. von. *Die Lehre der Alten. I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, 13; Leiden, 1980) 221–225.
- Odeberg, H. *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York, 1973) 52–63.
- Oegema, G.S. *Für Israel und die Völker. Studien zum alttestamentlich-jüdischen Hintergrund der paulinischen Theologie* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 95; Leiden, 1999) 181–182.
- Orlov, A.A. (Орлов, А.А.) “Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998) 71–86.
- , “Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000) 23–38.
- , “Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Henoch* 22.1 (2000) 45–62.
- , “The Origin of the Name ‘Metatron’ and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000) 19–26.
- , “‘Noah’s Younger Brother’: Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch,” *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273.
- , “Ex 33 on God’s Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition,” in: *Seminar Papers* 39, *Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting 2000* (Atlanta, 2000) 130–147.
- , “On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003) 274–303.
- , “Noah’s Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–187.
- , “The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob,” in: *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; Sheffield, 2004) 2.59–76.
- , “Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and Merkabah Tradition,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14.1 (2004) 3–29.
- , “‘Without Measure and Without Analogy’: Shi’ur Qomah Traditions in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 56 (2005) 224–244.

- , “‘The Learned Savant Who Guards the Secrets of the Great Gods’: Evolution of the Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in Mesopotamian and Enochic Traditions: Part I: Mesopotamian Traditions,” in: *Scrinium I. Varia Aethiopica. In Memory of Sevir B. Chernetsov (1943–2005)* (eds. D. Nosnitsin et al.; C.-Πerepbypr, 2005) 248–264.
- , *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 107; Tübingen, 2005).
- , “‘The Learned Savant Who Guards the Secrets of the Great Gods’: Evolution of the Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in Mesopotamian and Enochic Traditions: Part II: Enochic Traditions,” in: *Scrinium II. Universum Hagiographicum. Mémorial R.P. Michel van Esbroeck, S.J. (1934–2003)* (ed. B. Lourié; C.-Πerepbypr, 2006) 165–213.
- , “Vested with Adam’s Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies,” *Christian Orient* 4.10 (2006) 498–513.
- , “God’s Face in the Enochic Tradition,” in: *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* (ed. A.D. De Conick; Symposium Series, 11; Atlanta/Leiden, 2006) 179–193.
- , “Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Book of the Similitudes: A Departure from the Traditional Pattern?” in: *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids, 2007) 110–136.
- , “The Heir of Righteousness and the King of Righteousness: The Priestly Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007) 45–65.
- , “Moses’ Heavenly Counterpart in the Book of Jubilees and the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian,” *Biblica* 88 (2007) 153–173.
- , “The Heirs of the Enochic Lore: ‘Men of Faith’ in 2 Enoch 35:2 and Sefer Hekhalot 48D:10,” in: *The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism* (Scrinium III; eds. B. Lourié and A. Orlov; C.-Πerepbypr, 2007) 451–463.
- , “Resurrection of Adam’s Body: The Redeeming Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” in: *The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism* (Scrinium III; eds. B. Lourié and A. Orlov; C.-Πerepbypr, 2007) 385–389.
- , *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 114; Leiden, 2007).
- , “In the Mirror of the Divine Face: The Enochic Features of the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian,” in: *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (eds. G. Brooks, H. Najman, L. Stuckenbruck; Themes in Biblical Narrative, 12; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 183–199.
- , “The Pillar of the World: The Eschatological Role of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Henoch* 30.1 (2008) 119–135.
- , “Воскресение тела Адама: искупительная роль Еноха-Метатрона во второй (Славянской) книге Еноха,” *Империя Духа* 2 (2009) 63–67.

- , “Slavonic Pseudepigrapha,” in: *The Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. J.J. Collins and D. Harlow; Grand Rapids, 2009) (forthcoming).
- , “2 Enoch,” in: *The Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. J.J. Collins and D. Harlow; Grand Rapids, 2009) (forthcoming).
- , “The Heirs of the Enochic Lore: ‘Men of Faith’ in 2 Enoch 35:2 and Sefer Hekhalot 48d:10,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- , “Сосуды света: предание о светоносном веке в славянской версии Второй книги Еноха,” *Памяти Сергея Аверинцева* (eds. L. Borodai et al.; Moscow, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Orton, D.E. *The Understanding Scribe. Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 25; Sheffield, 1989) 95–97.
- Otto, R. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. A Study in the History of Religion* (tr. F.V. Wilson and B.L. Woolf; London, 1938). [*Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch* (München, 1934)]
- Otzen, B. “The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic,” in: *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen* (ed. P. Bilde et al.; Aarhus, 1993) 140–154.
- , “Himmelrejser og Himmelvioner i jødisk Apokalyptic,” *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 58 (1995) 16–28.
- Palmer, D.W. “Origin, Form, and Purpose of Mark 16:4 in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1976) 113–122.
- Patella, M. *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolical Force and the Ministering Angel. Luke 23, 44–49* (Cahiers de la Revue biblique, 43; Paris, 1999) 143–144.
- Pearson, B.A. “Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism,” *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, PA, 1998) 176–202.
- Penna, R. *L’ambiente storico-culturale delle origini cristiane. Una documentazione ragionata* (La bibbia nella storia, 7; Bologna, 1984) 89–91.
- Philonenko, M. “La cosmogonie du ‘Livre des secrets d’Hénoch,’” in: *Religions en Égypte: hellénistique et romaine* (Paris, 1969) 109–116.
- Picard, J.-C. “Trajets du corps, trajets célestes: éléments d’une cosmologie juive,” in: *Moïse Géographe. Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l’espace* (eds. A. Desreumaux and F. Schmidt; Études de psychologie et philosophie, 24; Paris, 1988) 31–49.
- Pines, S. “Enoch, Slavonic Book of,” in: *Encyclopedia Judaica* 6.797–799.
- , “Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch,” in: *Types of Redemption* (eds. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky et al.; Studies in the History of Religions. Supplements to Numen, 18; Leiden, 1970).
- Piper, J. “Love Your Enemies.” *Jesus’ Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Early Christian Paraenesis. A History of the Tradition and Interpretation of Its Uses* (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series, 38; Cambridge, 1979) 36–37.
- Poljakov, F. “Beiträge zur Edition des ‘Merilo Pravednoe,’ *Die Welt der Slaven* 32.2 (1987) 313–333.

- Роров, А. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Москва, 1869).
 —, “Библиографические материалы,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3 (1880) 66–139.
- Роров, S. (Попов, С.) “Книгата на Енох’ и българският битов календар,” *Авитохол* 8 (1997) 16–23.
- Porter, F.C. “The yeçer hara. A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin,” in: *Biblical and Semitic Studies. Critical and Historical Essays by the Members of the Semitic and Biblical Faculty of Yale University* (New York/London, 1901) 91–156 at 154–156.
- Potter, C.F. *Did Jesus Write This Book?* (New York, 1965).
- Puech, É. *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (2 vols.; Ébib, 21–22; Paris, 1993) 1.176–182.
- Quelle, C. “El ‘más allá.’ Visión de la apocalíptica judía,” *Biblia y fe* 55 (1993) 51–70 at 66–68.
- Raphael, S.P. *Jewish Views of the Afterlife* (Northvale, NJ, 1994) 94–96, 106–107.
- Rau, E. *Kosmologie, Eschatologie und die Lehrautorität Henochs. Traditionen- und formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum äth. Henochbuch und zu verwandten Schriften* (Diss.; Hamburg, 1970) 203–209.
- Reed, A.Y. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity. The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge, 2005) 3, 4, 103, 110, 113, 119, 188, 198, 227, 246, 247, 277.
- Reeves, J. “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library,” in: *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Reeves; Atlanta, 1994) 173–203.
- Reichelt, G. *Das Buch mit sieben Siegeln in der Apokalypse des Johannes* (Diss.; Göttingen, 1975).
- Repp, F. “Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des cod. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek,” *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 58–68.
- Rohland, J.P. *Der Erzengel Michael. Arzt und Feldherr: Zwei Aspekte des vor- und frühbyzantinischen Michaelskultes* (BZRGG, 19; Leiden, 1977) 55–57.
- Romano, D. “Enok, Libro eslavo de,” in: *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* (6 vols.; ed. J.A. Gutiérrez-Larraya; Barselona, 1963) 3.36.
- Rosenkranz, S. “Vom Pardies zum Tempel,” *Tempelkult und Tempelzerstörung. Festschrift für Clemens Thoma zum 60. Geburtstag* (eds. S. Lauer and H. Ernst; Judaica et Christiana, 15; Bern, 1995) 27–131.
- Rossi, B. “La creazione della letteratura giudaica antica extrabiblica. Apocrifi e scritti giudaico-ellenistici,” *Vivens Homo* 4 (1993) 225–268.
- Rubinstein, A. “Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 15 (1962) 1–21.
- Russell, D.M. “The New Heavens and the New Earth.” *Hope for the Creation in Jewish Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (Philadelphia, 1996) 129–131.
- Sacchi, P. “Das Slavische Henochbuch (Artikel Henochgestalt/Henochliteratur),” in: *Theologica Evangelica* 15 (1986) 47–50.
- , *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature Supplement Series, 20; Sheffield, 1996).

- Schäfer, P. *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Studia Judaica. Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums, 8; Berlin, 1975).
- Schmidt, N. "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 41 (1921) 307–312.
- Scholem, G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1954) 67.
- , *Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (Studia Judaica. Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums, 3; Berlin, 1962) 62–65.
- , *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965) 17, 30.
- , *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York, 1991).
- Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes et al.; 4 vols.; Edinburgh, 1973–1987) 3.2.746–750.
- Scopello, M. "Un rituel idéal d'intronisation dans trois textes gnostiques de Nag Hammadi," in: *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis. Papers Read at the First International Congress of Coptology* (Cairo, December 1976) (ed. R.McL. Wilson; Nag Hammadi Studies, 14; Leiden, 1978) 91–95.
- , "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *Vigiliae christianae* 34 (1980) 367–385.
- Segal, A. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 25; Leiden, 1977).
- , "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity, and Their Environment," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II/23.2 (1980) 1333–1394 at 1378–1379.
- Seidel, H. "Lobgesänge im Himmel und auf Erden," *Gottesvolk. Beiträge zu einem Thema biblischer Theologie. Festschrift für S. Wagner* (Berlin, 1991) 114–124.
- Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) "Феникс в апокрифах об Енохе и Варухе," in: *Новый сборник статей по славяноведению, составленный и изданный учениками В.И. Ламанского* (С.-Петербург, 1905) 395–405.
- , "О фениксе по апокрифическим книгам Еноха и Варуха," *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4/1 (Москва, 1907) 9–11.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Описание рукописей Библиотеки Историко-Филологического Института Князя Безбородко в г. Нежине* (Москва, 1900).
- , "Русские памятники письменности в южнославянских литературах XIV–XVI вв.," in: M.N. Speranskij, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 55–103.
- Sreznevskij, V.I. (Срезневский, В.И.) "Отчёт о поездке в Олонецкую, Вологодскую и Пермскую губернии," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности* 8.4 (1903) 109–123.
- Sterling, G.E. "Recherché or Representative? What is the Relationship between Philo's Treatises and Greek-Speaking Judaism?" *Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999) 1–30 at 8–10.
- Stichel, R. *Die Namen Noes, seines Bruders und seiner Frau: Ein Beitrag zum Nachleben jüdischer Überlieferungen in der außerkanonischen und gnos-*

- tischen Literatur und in Denkmälern der Kunst* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 112; Göttingen, 1979) 42–54.
- Stojanović, L. *Katalog rukopisa i starih shtampanih knjiga* (Belgrad, 1901).
- , *Katalog Narodne Biblioteke u Beogradu. IV: Rukopisi i Stare Shtampane Knjige* (Belgrad, 1903).
- Stone, M. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, 2.2; Assen, 1984).
- , “The Fall of Satan and Adam’s Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1993) 143–157.
- , “Jewish Tradition, the Pseudepigrapha, and the Christian West,” in: *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in Their Historical Context* (eds. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara; Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 166; Sheffield, 1994) 431–449.
- Stroev, P.M. (Строев, П.М.) *Библиологический словарь* (С.-Петербург, 1882).
- Stroumsa, G. “Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ,” *Harvard Theological Review* 76 (1983) 269–288.
- , *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (Nag Hammadi Studies, 24; Leiden, 1984) 24.
- Stuhlmacher, P. *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (Göttingen, 1966) 169–170.
- Tantlevskij, I.R. (Тантлевский, И.Р.) *Книги Еноха* (Москва-Иерусалим, 2000).
- , *Мелхиседек и Метатрон в иудейской мистико-апокалиптической традиции* (С.-Петербург, 2007) 12.
- Tennant, F.R. *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge, 1903) 142–143, 204–211.
- Theophilus, P. *The Interpretation of Genesis 14:17–24. A Historical, Methodological, and Exegetical Study* (Ph.D. diss.; Southern Baptist Seminary, 1979) 87–91.
- Thompson, F.J. “‘Made in Russia.’ A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia,” in: *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 295–354 at 334.
- Tihomirov, M. (Тихомиров, М.) *Исследование о Русской Правде. Происхождение текстов* (Москва-Ленинград, 1941).
- Trafton, J.L. “Enoch, Second,” in: *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible* (eds. W.E. Mills, et al.; Macon, GA, 1990) 253.
- Turdeanu, E. “Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 138 (1950) 22–52; 176–218.
- , “Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs,” in: *Atti dello VIII congresso internazionale di studi bizantini. Palermo, 3–10 aprile 1951* (SRN, 8; Roma, 1953) 2.47–52.

- , “Une curiosité de l’Hénoch slave: Les phénix du sixième ciel,” *Revue des études slaves* 47 (1968) 53–54.
- , “Dieu créa l’homme de huit éléments et tira son nom des quatre coins du monde,” *Revue des études roumaines* 13–14 (1974) 163–194.
- , *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981).
- Tuval, M. “Doing without the Temple: Paradigms in the Judaic Literature of the Diaspora,” in: *Was 70 C. E. Really a Watershed? On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple* (eds. G. Aran et al.; Leiden, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Апокриф о Енохе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 40–41.
- Van den Broek, R. *The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’empire Romain, 24; Leiden, 1971).
- VanderKam, J.C. *Enoch. A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, SC, 1995) 158–161.
- Van Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. “The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature,” in: *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; Themes in Biblical Narrative, 3; Leiden, 2000) 34–62.
- Viktorov, A.E. (Викторов, А.Е.) *Очерк собрания рукописей В.М. Ундольского, в полном составе (Славяно-русские рукописи В.М. Ундольского описанные самим составителем и бывшим владельцем собрания с номера 1-го по 579-й. Издание Московского Публичного и Румянцевского Музеев)* (Москва, 1870).
- , *Каталог славяно-русских рукописей приобретённых Московским Публичным и Румянцевским Музеями в 1868 г. после Д.В. Пискарёва* (Москва, 1871).
- , *Описи рукописных собраний в книгохранилищах Северной России* (С.-Петербург, 1890).
- Vivian, A. “I movimenti che si oppongono al tempio: il problema del sacerdozio di Melchisedeq,” *Henoch* 14 (1992) 97–112.
- Volz, P. *Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1934 [Hildesheim, 1966]) 34–35.
- Vostokov, A. (Востоков, А.) *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского Музея* (С.-Петербург, 1842).
- V’lchanov, S. (Вълчанов, С.) “Кумрански текстове с апокрифно съдържание и старославянските старозаветни апокрифи,” *Годишник на Духовната Академия “Св. Климент Охридский”* 23 (1973/1974) (София: 1976) 234, 242–249, 282–291.
- Wedderburn, A.J.M. *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 44; Tübingen, 1987) 178–179.
- Wells, L.S.A. “The Historical Succession of the Books of Enoch: The Secrets of Enoch,” *International Journal of Apocrypha* 25 (1911) 30–34.

- Wewers, G.A. *Geheimnis und Geheimhaltung im rabbinischen Judentum* (Berlin and New York, 1975).
- Wicks, H.J. *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (Ph.D. diss. London, 1915 [New York, 1971]).
- Wuttke, G. *Melchisedech, der Priesterkönig von Salem. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 5; Gießen, 1927) 40–41.
- Yarbro Collins, A. “The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses,” in: *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 50; Leiden, 1996) 21–54.
- Zerbe, G.M. *Non-Retaliatio in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts. Ethical Themes in Social Contexts* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature Supplement Series, 13; Sheffield, 1993) 161–164.
- Zwiep, A.W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 87; Leiden, 1997) 49–51.

Enochic Fragment about the Two Tablets

a. *Texts*

- Роров, А. (Попов, А.) *Книга бытия небеси и земли (Палея историческая) с приложением сокращенной палеи русской редакции* (Москва, 1881) 14–17.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 221–222.
- Vassiliev, A. *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893) 196–198.

c. *Research*

- Orlov, A.A. (Орлов, А. А.) “Overshadowed by Enoch’s Greatness: ‘Two Tablets’ Traditions from the Book of Giants to Palaea Historica,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001) 137–158.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 51–52.

Fragment about the Flood (О Потопе)

a. *Texts*

- Franko, I. (Франко, И.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.65–73.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М. Д.) “О потопе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д. С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.108–112.

b. *Translations*

- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “О потопе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.109–113.
- , “О потопе,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 28–32.
- , “О потопе,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 28–32.

c. *Research*

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Сказание о потопе в древнерусской Палее,” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 5.
- Belova, O. (Белова, О.) “Легенда о Потопе в славянской и еврейской фольклорной традиции,” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 11–14.
- , “Легенда о Потопе в славянской и еврейской фольклорной традиции,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (ed. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 163–180.
- Dähnhardt, O. *Natursagen: Eine Sammlung naturdeutender Sagen, Märchen, Fabeln und Legenden* (Leipzig und Berlin, 1907) 1.257–266.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “Легенда о дьяволе в Ноевом ковчеге по древнерусским рукописным сборникам,” in: *Исследования по древней и новой литературе* (Ленинград, 1987) 106–110.
- , “О потопе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.373–374.
- Porfir’ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 52.
- Utley, F.L. *The Devil in the Ark* (Chillicothe, 1959).
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “Ефросиновская Палея: до и после (на материале Апокрифа о мыши в Ноевом ковчеге,” *Russica romana* 14 (2007) (forthcoming).

Noachic Fragments in the Revelation of Pseudo-Methodius
(Откровение Мефодия Патарского)

a. *Texts*

- Istrin, V. (Истрин, В.) *Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифические видения Даниила в византийской и славяно-русской литературах: Исслед. и тексты* (Москва, 1897) 84–131.

- Jacimirskij, A. (Яцимирский, А.) “Мелкие тексты и заметки по старинной славянской и русской литературе,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 2.2 (1906) 297–301.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67.4; С.-Петербург, 1901) 6–39.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 652–688.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863) 2.213–281.

b. *Translations*

- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 689–703.
- Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) “Откровение Мефодия Патарского,” in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 16–46.

c. *Studies*

- Dmitriev, L.A. (Дмитриев, Л.А.) “Откровение Мефодия Патарского,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 283–285.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и летопись,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 29 (1925) 380–382.
- Krivov, M.V. (Кривов, М.В.) “Откровение Псевдо-Мефодия Патарского как отражение народных взглядов на арабское нашествие,” *Византийский Временник* 44 (1983) 215–221.
- Litvinova, E.V. (Литвинова, Е.В.) “Списки ‘Откровения Мефодия Патарского’ в Древлехранилище ИРЛИ,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 382–390.
- Lourié, V. (Лурье, В.) “Около Солунской легенды. Из истории миссионерства в период монофелитской унии,” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (Вып. 6; Москва, 1996) 23–52.
- Petrovskij, N.M. (Петровский, Н.М.) *К истории “Откровения Мефодия Патарского” в западно-славянских литературах* (С.-Петербург, 1910).
- Rotarov, P. (Потапов, П.) “К вопросу о литературном составе летописи,” *Русский филологический вестник* 65.1 (1911) 81–110.
- Saharov, V. (Сахаров, В.) *Эсхатологические сказания и сочинения в древнерусской письменности* (Тула, 1879) 96–109, 120, 134–148.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Повесть временных лет’ и ее источники,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 4 (1940) 92–103.
- Suhomlinov, M.A. (Сухомлинов, М.А.) *О древней русской летописи как памятнике литературном* (С.-Петербург, 1856) 106–114;
- Veselovskij, A. (Веселовский, А.) “Опыты по истории развития христианской легенды,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* апрель (1875) 283–331; май (1875) 48–130.

Fragment about Lamech
(Апокриф о Ламехе)

a. *Texts*

- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863) 1.24–25.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 50–51, 104–105.
- Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1892) 57–57 об.
- Franco, I. (Франко, И.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.37–38.

c. *Studies*

- Salmina, M.A. (Салмина, М.А.) “Апокриф о Ламехе,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 52.

Apocalypse of Abraham

a. *Texts*

- Franco, I. (Франко, И.) “Книга о Аврааме праотци и патриарси,” in: *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.80–86.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Откровение Авраама,” in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск I. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 99–100.
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srb-skoga,” *Arkiv za Povjestnicu Jugoslavensku* IX (1868) 65–151 at 83–91.
- Novickij, P.P. (Новицкий, П.П.) “Откровение Авраама,” *Общество любителей древней письменности* 99 (С.-Петербург, 1891) (facsimile edition).
- Philonenko-Sayar, B., and Philonenko, M. *L'apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes* (Semitica, 31; Paris, 1981).
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 111–130.
- , “Палея Толковая по списку сделанному в г. Коломне в 1406 г.,” in: *Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова. Том I.* (Москва, 1892).
- Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом

- Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 24–36.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire* (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: Źródła i monografie, 129; Lublin, 1987). (Diss.; Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1977).
- Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский, Измаил Иванович) *Сказания о святых Борисе и Глебе. Сильвестровский список XIV века* (С.-Петербург, 1860).
—, “Книга Откровение Авраама,” *Известия Императорской академии наук по отделению русского языка и словестности*. Том 10. (С.-Петербург, 1861–1863) 648–645.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863) 1.32–77.
- b. *Translations*
- Bonwetsch, G.N. *Die Apokalypse Abrahams. Das Testament der vierzig Märtyrer* (Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, Bd.1, Heft 1; Leipzig, 1897).
- Vox, G.H., and Landsman, J.I. *The Apocalypse of Abraham. Edited, with a Translation from the Slavonic Text and Notes* (Translations of Early Documents, 1.10; London, New York, 1918).
- Enrietti, M. and Sacchi, P. “Apocalisse di Abramo,” in: *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (5 vols.; eds. P. Sacchi, et al.; Torino/Brescia, 1981–1997) 3.558–570.
- Gaster, M. “The Apocalypse of Abraham. From the Roumanian Text, discovered and translated,” in: M. Gaster, *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archeology* (London, 1925 [New York, 1971]) 1.92–123.
- Kulik, A. (Кулик, А.) “Откровение Авраама,” *Вестник Еврейского Университета* 5 (2002) 231–254.
—, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (Text-critical Studies, 3; Atlanta, 2004) 9–35.
- Pennington, A. “Apocalypse of Abraham,” in: *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford, 1984) 363–491.
- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Откровение на Авраам,” in: Petkanova, D. and A. Miltenova (eds.) (Петканова, Д. и Милтенова, А.) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993) 17–30.
- Philonenko-Sayar, B., and Philonenko, M. *L'apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes* (Semitica, 31; Paris, 1981) 37–105.
—, “Die Apokalypse Abrahams,” in: *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* 5.5. (Gütersloh, 1982) 413–460.
—, “Apocalypse d'Abraham,” in: *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires* (eds. A. Dupont-Sommer et al.; La Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris, 1987) 1691–1730.
- Rießler, P. “Apokalypse des Abraham,” in: *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Freiburg i.B., 1928 [Freiburg i.B., 1979]) 13–39; 1267–1269.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire* (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: Źródła i monografie, 129; Lublin, 1987) 99–218.

- , “The Apocalypse of Abraham,” in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983–1985) 1.681–705.
- , “Apokalypsa Abrahamana,” in: *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu* (ed. R. Rubinkiewicz; Warszawa, 1999) 460–481.

c. *Studies*

- Aalen, S. *Heilsverlangen und Heilsverwirklichung. Studien zur Erwartung des Heils in der apokalyptischen Literatur des antiken Judentums und im ältesten Christentum* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, 21; Leiden, New York/København/Köln, 1990) 50–51.
- Bamberger, B.J. “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” in: *Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* 1.21.
- Baudry, G.-H. “Le péché originel dans les pseudépigraphes de l’Ancien Testament,” *Mélanges de science religieuse* 49 (1992) 163–192 at 182–184.
- , “La théorie du ‘penchant mauvais’ et la doctrine du ‘péché originel,’” *Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique* 95 (1994) 271–301 at 282.
- , “La responsabilité d’Ève dans la chute. Analyse d’une tradition,” *Mélanges de science religieuse* 53 (1996) 293–320 at 300–301.
- Beer, B. *Leben Abrahams nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage* (Leipzig, 1859).
- Begg, C.T. “Rereadings of the ‘Animal Rite’ of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988) 36–46 at 43–45.
- Beyerle, S. *Die Gottesvorstellungen in der antik-jüdischen Apokalyptik* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 103; Leiden, 2005) 52, 103, 140, 203, 296, 323, 335, 345.
- Bhayro, S. *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament Veröffentlichungen zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients und des Alten Testaments, 322. Münster, 2005) 30.
- Boccaccini, G. “Testi apocalittici coevi all’Apocalisse di Giovanni,” *Ricerche storico bibliche* 7 (1995) 151–161 at 154–155.
- Bohak, G. “Apocalypse of Abraham,” *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, 55.
- Bowley, J.B. “The Compositions of Abraham,” in: *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.C. Reeves; Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature, 6; Atlanta, 1994) 215–238.
- Calvert-Koysis, N. *Paul, Monotheism and the People of God: The Significance of Abraham Traditions for Early Judaism and Christianity* (London; New York, 2004) 70–85.
- Calvert, N.L. *Abraham Traditions in Middle Jewish Literature: Implications for the Interpretation of Galatians and Romans* (Ph.D. diss.; Sheffield, 1993) 262–294.
- Cavallin, H.C. “Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I,” in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, 2.19.1 (Berlin/New York, 1979) 240–345 at 300–302.
- Charlesworth, J.H. “The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986) 19–41 at 33–37.

- , “Folk Traditions in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” in: *Mysteries and Revelations. Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Conference* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature Supplement Series, 9; Sheffield, 1991) 91–113.
- , “Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments,” *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 27.639–645 at 643.
- Christoffersson, O. *The Earnest Expectation of the Creature. The Flood-Tradition as Matrix of Romans 8:18–27* (Coniectanea biblica, New Testament, 23; Stockholm, 1990) 91–92.
- Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Ph.D. diss.; Vanderbilt, 1976) 49–51, 319–324.
- De Conick, A.D. “Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century,” in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 63; Leiden, 1999) 308–341 at 314–315.
- Dean-Otting, M. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Judentum und Umwelt, 8; Frankfurt am Main/Bern/New York, 1984) 248–255, 260–261.
- Delcor, M. “Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l’origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l’apocalyptique juive. Histoire et traditions,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 190 (1976) 3–53 at 49–50.
- Denis, A.-M. *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, 1; Leiden, 1970) 37–38.
- Flusser, D. “Abraham and the Upanishads,” *Immanuel* 20 (1986) 53–61 at 55.
- Fossum, J. “‘In the Beginning Was the Name.’ Onomanology as the Key to Johannine Christology,” in: “*The Image of the Invisible God.*” *Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christianity* (Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus, 30; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1995) 108–133 at 120–122.
- Frey, J.B. “Abraham (Apocalypse d’),” in: *Dictionnaire de la Bible* 1.28–38.
- Gaines, E.A. *The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in Biblical Literature* (Ph.D. diss.; Princeton Theological Seminary, 1987) 163–170.
- Géoltrain, P. *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham* (Diss.; Straßburg, 1960).
- Ginzberg, L. “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (1904) 1.91–92.
- Grabbe, L. “The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 18 (1987) 152–167 at 156–158.
- Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) “Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентів-заочнику),” *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
- Gutiérrez-Larraya, J.A. “Abraham, Apocalipses de,” in: *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* 1, col. 83.
- Hahn, F. *Frühjüdische und urchristliche Apokalyptik. Eine Einführung* (Biblich-theologische Studien, 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1998) 87.

- Hall, R.G. "The 'Christian Interpolation' in the Apocalypse of Abraham," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988) 107–112.
- , *Revealed Histories. Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature Supplement Series, 6; Sheffield, 1991) 21–32; 75–78.
- Halperin, D.J. "Ascension or Invasion: Implications of the Heavenly Journey in Ancient Judaism," *Religion* 18 (1988) 47–67 at 53–54.
- , *The Faces of the Chariot. Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 16; Tübingen, 1988) 103–113.
- Hannah, D.D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2.109; Tübingen, 1999) 53–54, 145–146.
- Harrisville, R.A. *The Figure of Abraham in the Epistles of St. Paul. In the Footsteps of Abraham* (San Francisco, 1992) 71–74.
- Helm, R.T. *The Development of the Azazel Tradition* (Ph.D. diss.; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1992).
- , "Azazel in Early Jewish Tradition," *Andrews University Seminary Papers* 32 (1994) 217–226 at 222–224.
- Helmbold, A.K. "Abraham, Apocalypse of," in: *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* 1.26–27.
- Henrichs, A. "'Thou Shalt Not Kill a Tree': Greek, Manichaean and Indian Tales," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 16 (1979) 85–108 at 105–106.
- Himmelfarb, M. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford, 1993) 61–66.
- Hughes, H.M. *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (Ph.D. diss.; London, 1909 [rep. London, 1928]) 18, 138–139, 210–212, 241, 308.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Палейное сказание об Аврааме," in: Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1897) 15–26.
- James, M.R. "Apocrypha," in: *Encyclopaedia Biblica. A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible* (4 vols.; eds. T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Black; London, 1899) 1.249–261 at 253–254.
- Jaubert, A. *La notion de l'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne* (Patristica Sorbonensia, 6; Paris, 1963) 284–285.
- Jenks, G.C. *The Origins and Development of the Antichrist Myth* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 59; Berlin/New York, 1991) 248–288.
- Kohler, K. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada. II. The Apocalypse of Abraham and Its Kindred," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 7 (1894/95) 581–606.
- Kozak, E. "Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158 at 134.
- Kulik, A. (Кулик, А.) "Об одном церковнославянском гапаксе," *Paleoslavica* 5 (1997) 339–345.
- , "К датировке 'Откровения Авраама,'" in: *In Memoriam: Памяти Я.С. Лурье* (С.-Петербург, 1997) 189–195.

- , “Откровение Авраама,” *Вестник Еврейского Университета* 5 (2002) 231–254.
- , “The Gods of Nahor: A Note on the Pantheon of the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 54.2 (2003) 228–232.
- , “Interpretation and Reconstruction: Retroverting the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Apocrypha* 13 (2002) 203–226.
- , *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (Text-critical Studies, 3; Atlanta, 2004).
- , “Textual Criticism and Retroversion,” *Jews and Slavs* 15 (2005) 313–323.
- , “Polysemantics vs. homography: On the CS ‘свете’ in ‘dark places’ of the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Quadrivium* (2006) 25–32.
- Lagrange, M.J. “Notes sur le messianisme au temps de Jésus,” *Revue biblique* 14 (1905) 481–514.
- Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский, Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 4–25.
- Licht, J. “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” in: *Encyclopedia Judaica* 2 (1972) 125–127.
- Lods, A., Caquot, A., Weil, G.E. *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive depuis les origines jusqu’à la ruine de l’état juif (135 après J.-C.)* (Paris, 1982) 944–946.
- Lohfink, G. “Der präexistente Heilsplan. Sinn und Hintergrund der dritten Vaterunserbitte,” *Neues Testament und Ethik* (Freiburg-i-Br., 1989) 110–133.
- Lourié, B. “Propitiatorium in the Apocalypse of Abraham,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Lunt, H.G. “The Transmission of the Apocalypse of Abraham,” in: R. Rubinkiewicz, “The Apocalypse of Abraham,” in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983–1985) 1.681–705 at 686–688.
- , “On the Language of the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 7 (1985) 55–62.
- Mach, M. “From Apocalypticism to Early Jewish Mysticism?” in: *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (3 vols.; ed. J.J. Collins; New York, 1998) 229–264 at 255–258.
- McGonigal, T.P. “Abraham Believed God”: *Genesis 15:6 and Its Use in the New Testament* (Ph.D. diss.; Fuller Theological Seminary, 1981) 167–171.
- Mell, U. *Neue Schöpfung. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 56; Berlin/New York, 1989) 169–170.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964) 180–231 at 191–203.
- , *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV веков* (Ленинград, 1978).
- Miltenova, A. “Апокрифи за Авраам,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 31–33.

- , “Апокрифи за Авраам,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 40–42.
- Miltenova, A., Badalanova F. (Милтенова, А., Бадаланова, Ф.) “Апокрифният цикъл за Авраам във фолклора и средновековните балкански литератури,” in: *Етнографски проблеми на народната духовна култура* (Т. 4, София, 1996) 203–250.
- Mueller, J.R. “The Apocalypse of Abraham and the Destruction of the Second Jewish Temple,” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 21 (1982) 341–349.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia, 1981) 294–299; (2nd ed.; Minneapolis, 2005) 285–288.
- , “Abraham the Convert: A Jewish Tradition and its Use by the Apostle Paul,” in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, 1998) 151–175 at 164–165.
- Niebuhr, K.-W. *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, II.29; Tübingen, 1987) 198–200.
- Oegema, G.S. *The Anointed and His People. Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha and Related Literature Supplement Series, 27; Sheffield, 1998) 212–215. [*Der Gesalbte und sein Volk. Untersuchungen zum Konzeptualisierungsprozess der messianischen Erwartungen von den Makkabäern bis Bar Koziba* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, 2; Göttingen, 1994)].
- , *Für Israel und die Völker. Studien zum alttestamentlich-jüdischen Hintergrund der paulinischen Theologie* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 95; Leiden/Boston/Köln, 1999) 151–152.
- Orlov, A.A. (Орлов, А.А.) “Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127.1 (2008) 53–70.
- , “‘The Gods of My Father Terah’: Abraham the Iconoclast and the Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18.1 (2008) 33–53.
- , “И Глась Бысть: Традиции Имени Божиего в ‘Откровении Авраама,’” *Волшебная Гора* (XV; ed. A. Medvedev; Moscow, 2008) 104–124.
- , “The Pteromorphic Angelology of the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (2009) (forthcoming).
- , “The Fallen Trees: Arboreal Metaphors and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *Harvard Theological Review* 2 (2009) (forthcoming).
- Otzen, B. “The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic,” in: *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen* (eds. P. Bilde et al.; Aarhus, 1993) 140–154 at 143–144.
- Paleja, Палея Толковая по списку сделанному в г. Коломне в 1406 г. Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова (Москва, 1892).

- Philonenko, M. "Le Poimandrès et la liturgie juive," in: *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité* (eds. F. Dunand et al.; Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire Romain 46; Leiden, 1975) 204–211.
- , "L'Anquipède alectorocéphale et le dieu Iaô," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1979) 297–304.
- , "Abraham. VI. Apokryphe Schriften," in: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 1, col. 65.
- Poirier, J. "The Ouranology of the Apocalypse of Abraham," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35 (2004) 391–408.
- Puech, É. *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Echter Bibel, 21; Paris, 1993) 1.145–149.
- Reed, A.Y. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity. The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge, 2005) 98.
- Rowland, C. "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 10 (1979) 137–154.
- , "The Parting of the Ways: The Evidence of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Mystical Material," in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135. The Second Durham – Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September, 1989)* (ed. J.D.G. Dunn; Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 66; Tübingen, 1992) 213–237 at 219–222.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Апокрифы об Аврааме в древнерусской письменности," in: *Академик Василий Михайлович Истрин. Тезисы докладов обл. научных чтений посвященных 125-летию со дня рождения ученого-филолога* (Одесса, 1990) 74–75.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. "Apokalipsa Abrahama," *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 27 (1974) 230–237.
- , "La vision de l'histoire dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, 2.19.1. (1979) 137–151.
- , "Apokalipsa Abrahama 1–6. Propozycja interpretacji symbolicznej," in: *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne. Annales de théologie et de droit canon – Annals of Theology and Canon Law* 29 (1982) 79–94.
- , *Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11 und das Neue Testament* (tr. H. Ulrich; Österreichische Biblische Studien, 6; Klosterneuberg, 1984).
- , "Les sémitismes dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham," *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1980) 141–148.
- , "Abraham, Apocalypse of," in: *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 1.41–43.
- Rubinstein, A. "Hebraisms in the Slavonic 'Apocalypse of Abraham,'" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (1953) 108–115.
- , "Hebraisms in the Slavonic 'Apocalypse of Abraham,'" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5 (1954) 132–135.
- , "A Problematic Passage in the Apocalypse of Abraham," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 8 (1957) 45–50.

- Santos Otero, A. de. "Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Apokalypse Abrahams," in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Saylor, G.B. *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 72; Chico, 1984) 134–139.
- Schein, B.E. *Abraham in the Non-Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period* (Ph.D. diss.; Yale University, 1972) 19–92.
- Scholem, G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1946).
- , *Die jüdische Mystik in ihren Hauptströmungen* (Frankfurt a. M., 1980) 74–75.
- Schüngel-Straumann, H. *Die Frau am Anfang. Eva und die Folgen* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1989) 70–72.
- Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175B.C.–A.D.135)* (eds. G. Vermes et al.; 4 vols; Edinburg, 1986) 3.1.288–687.
- Segal, A.F. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and Their Environment," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, 2.23.2 (Berlin/New York, 1981) 1334–1394 at 1362–1364.
- Slater, T.B. "One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism," *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 183–198 at 196–197.
- Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский, И.И.) "Дополнения к общему повременному обозрению древних памятников русского письма и языка," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 10 (1861–1863) 448–665.
- Steinmann, A.E. *The Shape of Things to Come. The Genre of the Historical Apocalypse in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature* (Ph.D. diss.; Michigan, 1990) 122–126.
- Stökl, D. "Yom Kippur in the Apocalyptic Imaginaire and the Roots of Jesus' High Priesthood. Yom Kippur in Zechariah 3, 1 Enoch 10, 11Q Melchizedek, Hebrews and the Apocalypse of Abraham 13," in: *Transformation of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (eds. J. Assmann and G. Stroumsa; Studies in the History of Religions. Supplements to Numen, 83; Leiden/Boston/Köln, 1999) 349–366 at 358–361.
- , *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from the Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 163; Tübingen, 2003) 92–94; 196–197.
- Stone, M. "Apocalyptic Literature," in: M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Philadelphia, 1984) 383–441; 415–418.
- Stroumsa, G.A. *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (Nag Hammadi Studies, 24; Leiden, 1984) 24–25.
- Thompson, F.J. "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," in: *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9.*

- Juli 1988 (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 295–354 at 333.
- Trafton, J.L. “Abraham, Apocalypse of,” in: *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible*, 7.
- Turdeanu, É. “L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en slave,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 3 (1972) 153–180.
- , “L’Apocalypse d’Abraham en slave,” in: É. Turdeanu, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 173–200, 439.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Древнерусские четвѣ сборники XII–XIV веков: (Статья третья: сказания и гомилии на сюжеты священной и церковной истории),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 47 (1993) 3–33.
- Van Stempvort, P.A. “Abrahams Apokalypse,” *Biblich-historisches Handwörterbuch* 1, col. 15.
- Vandergriff, K.L. *The Messianic Significance of the “Seed of Abraham” Concept in Pre-Christian Judaism* (Ph.D. diss.; Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988) 141–143.
- VanderKam, J.C. “Messianism and Apocalypticism,” *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, 193–228 at 212–213.
- Volz, P. *Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1934) 48–49.
- Weinel, H. “Die spätere christliche Apokalyptik,” in: *EΥΗΛΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag, dem 23. Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden* (ed. H. Schmidt; Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 36; Göttingen, 1923) 141–173 at 167–170.
- Weitzman, S. “The Song of Abraham,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 56 (1994) 21–33.
- Wernik, N.A. *A Critical Analysis of the Book of Abraham in the Light of Extracanonical Jewish Writings* (Ph.D. diss.; Brigham Young University, 1968).
- Whitney, K.W. Jr. *Two Strange Beasts. A Study of Traditions Concerning Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Ph.D. diss.; Harvard University, 1992) 88–105. [Whitney, K.W. Jr. *Two Strange Beasts. A Study of Traditions Concerning Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Winona Lake, 2006)].
- Wicks, R.H. *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (Diss.; London, 1915 [rep. New York, 1971]) 23–24, 107–109, 240–244, 331–332.
- Yarbo Collins, A. “The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses,” in: *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 50; Leiden/New York/Köln, 1996) 21–54 at 34–36.

*Testament of Abraham*a. *Texts*

- Angelov, V. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и Генов, М.) “Смъртта на Аврама,” in: *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922) 194–196.
- Franco, I. (Франко, I.) “Слово о святом Аврааме,” in: *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Nesnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 4.104–108.
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Prilozi k historiji knjizevnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga,” *Arhiv za Povjestnici Jugoslavenski* 9 (1868) 65–151 at 83–89.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) “Сказание об Аврааме,” in: *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [Nendeln, 1966]) 70–81.
- Polivka, I. “Die apokryphische Erzählung von Tode Abrahams,” *AfslPh* 18 (1896) 112–125.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) “Смерть Авраама,” in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.79–90.
- , “Смерть Авраама,” in: *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 58:4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 1–14.

b. *Translations*

- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 88–98.
- Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) “Смерть Авраама,” in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков, В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 98–106.

c. *Research*

- Badalanova, F. and Miltenova, A. (Бадаланова, Ф. и Милтенова, А.) “Апокрифният цикъл за Авраам във фолклора и в средновековните балкански литератури,” in: *Етнографски проблеми на народната култура* (4; София, 1996) 203–251.
- Cooper, D.S. and Weber, H.B. “The Church Slavonic Testament of Abraham,” in: *Studies in the Testament of Abraham* (ed. G.W.E. Nickelsburg; Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 6; Missoula, 1976) 301–326.
- Gaster, M. “The Apocalypse of Abraham. From the Roumanian Text, Discovered and Translated,” in: M. Gaster, *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archeology* (London, 1925 [New York, 1971]) 1.92–124.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Палейное сказание об Аврааме,” in: Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1897) 15–26.

- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Апокалиписис Авраама,” in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 95–99.
- Javorskij, Ju. (Яворский, Ю.) “Два замечательных карпато-русских сборника XVIII в., принадлежащих Университету св. Владимира,” *Киев. Унив. Изв.* 2 (1910) 67–68.
- Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский, Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 25–31.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Апокрифы за Авраам,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 31–33.
- , “Апокрифы за Авраам,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 40–42.
- Nachov, N.A. (Начов, Н.А.) “Тиквешки рукопись или сборник от апокрифни сказания, легенди, повести и пр.,” in: *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука, и книжнина* 8 (1898) 388–418 at 411–413.
- Panajotov, V. (Панайотов, В.) “‘Смъртта на Авраам’ в сборник от XVI век.,” in: *Глѣбина књижна* (Шумен, 2003) 284–291.
- Polívka, G. “Die apokryphische Erzählung vom Tode Abrahams,” *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 18 (1896) 112–125.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Апокрифы о Аврааме,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 47–49.
- , “Апокрифы об Аврааме в древнерусской письменности,” in: *Академик Василий Михайлович Истрин. Тезисы докладов обл. научных чтений посвященных 125-летию со дня рождения ученого-филолога* (Одесса, 1990) 74–75.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Средневековните текстови и фолклорот* (Скопје, 1978) 38–60.
- Strohal, R. *Stare hrvatske apokrifne priče i legende* (Bjelovar, 1917) 57–60.
- Turdeanu, É. “Notes sur la tradition littéraire du Testament d’Abraham,” in: *Silloge bizantina in onore di Silvio Giuseppe Mercati* (Studi bizantini e neoellenici, 11; Roma, 1957) 405–409.
- , “Le Testament d’Abraham en slave et en roumain,” *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 10 (1977) 1–38.
- , *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 201–239, 440.

Apocryphal Fragments about Melchizedek
(Апокрифы о Мелхиседеке)

a. *Texts*

- Franko, I. (Франко, І.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.92–101.

- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 53–55; 131–135; 222–225; 256–259.
- Purín, A. N. (Пыпин, А. Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 20–23.
- Tihonravov, N. S. (Тихонравов, Н. С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.26–31.
- b. *Translations*
- Tarkovskij, R. B. (Тарковский, Р. Б.) “Сказание о Мелхиседеке,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M. V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М. В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 33–36.
- c. *Research*
- Böttrich, C. “The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32.4 (2001) 445–470.
- , “Die vergessene Geburtsgeschichte. Mt 1–2 / Lk 1–2 und die wunderbare Geburt des Melchisedek in sHen 71–72,” in: *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext* (eds. H. Lichtenberger and G. S. Oegema; JSHRZ-St 1; Gütersloh 2002) 222–249.
- , “Die ‘Geschichte Melchisedeks’ (HistMelch) im slavischen Kulturkreis,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- , *Geschichte Melchisedeks* (JSHRZ.NF II/1; Gütersloh, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Bulanin, D. M. (Буланин, Д. М.) *Переводы и послания Максима Грека* (Ленинград, 1984) 142–143, 168–170.
- Gricaj, M. S. (Грицай, М. С.) “Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентів-заочнику),” *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
- Istrin, V. M. (Истрин, В. М.) *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славяно-русском переводе* (т. 1; Петроград, 1920) 86–88.
- Orlov, A. A. “Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000) 23–38.
- , “The Heir of Righteousness and the King of Righteousness: The Priestly Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007) 45–65.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 53–55.

Tvorogov, O. (Творогов, О.) “Апокрифы о Мелхиседеке,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 62–63.

The Ladder of Jacob

a. *Texts*

Franko, I. (Франко, I.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Nescnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.121–122.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 38–39.

Leicht, R. “Qedushah and Prayer to Helios: A New Hebrew Version of an Apocryphal Prayer of Jacob,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 6 (1999) 140–176.

Paleja, T. *Паляя Толковая по списку сделанному в г. Коломне в 1406 г. Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова* (Москва, 1892) 153–157.

Porfir'ev, I.Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) “Лествица Иакова,” in: *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 58–59; 138–149.

Rurin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 27–32.

Schäfer, P. and Shaked, S. *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 64; Tübingen, 1997) 27–78.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.91–95.

Tolkovaja, P. *Толковая Паляя 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1893) л. 100 об.–107 об.

Vtoryh, N.M. (Вторых, Н.М.) *Древности. Труды Славянской комиссии Московского археологического общества* 2 (1902) (Москва, 1902) протокол 1.

b. *Translations*

Bonwetsch, N. “Die Apokryphe ‘Leiter Jakobs,’” *Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-histor. Klasse* (Göttingen, 1900) 76–87.

Enrietti, M. and Sacchi, P. “Scala di Giacobbe,” in: *Apocrifi dell’Antico Testamento* (5 vols.; eds. P. Sacchi et al.; Torino/Brescia, 1981–1997) 3.558–570.

James, M.R. *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (Translations of Early Documents 1; Palestinian Jewish Texts, 14; London/New York, 1920) 96–103.

- Lunt, H.G. "Ladder of Jacob," in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983–1985) 2.401–411.
- Migne, J.-P. *Dictionnaire des apocryphes, ou Collection de tous les livres apocryphes relatifs à l'Ancien et au Nouveau Testament* (2 vols.; Paris, 1856–1858 [Turnhout, 1989]) 2.265.
- Pennington, A. "The Ladder of Jacob," in: *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford, 1984) 453–463.
- Vassiliev, A. *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Москва, 1893).

c. *Research*

- Bötttrich, C. "Das 'Sanctus' in der Liturgie der hellenistischen Synagoge," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik and Hymnologie* 35 (1994–1995) 10–36 at 31.
- Bratke, E. *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 4.3; Leipzig, 1899) 101–106.
- Charlesworth, J.H. "Jacob, Ladder of," in: *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3.609.
- , "Messianology in the Biblical Pseudepigrapha," *Qumran-Messianism. Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen, 1998) 21–52 at 49.
- Fossum, J. "The Son of Man's Alter Ego. John 1.51, Targumic Tradition and Jewish Mysticism," in: *"The Image of the Invisible God." Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christianity* (Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus, 30; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1995) 135–151 at 147–149.
- Kugel, J. *In Potiphar's House. The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (San Francisco, 1990) 117–119.
- , "The Ladder of Jacob," *Harvard Theological Review* 88 (1995) 209–227.
- Lourié, B. and A. Orlov (eds.) *The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism* (Scriinium, III; St. Petersburg, 2007) 303–322.
- Orlov, A.A. (Орлов А.А.) "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," in: *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; Sheffield, 2004) 2.59–76.
- , "Лицо как небесный двойник мистика в славянской 'Лестнице Иакова,'" in: *Волшебная Гора* (XIII; ed. A. Medvedev; Moscow, 2006) 56–77.
- , "Moses' Heavenly Counterpart in the Book of Jubilees and the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian," *Biblica* 88 (2007) 153–173.
- , "In the Mirror of the Divine Face: The Enochic Features of the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian," in: *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (eds. G. Brooks, H. Najman, L. Stuckenbruck; Themes in Biblical Narrative, 12; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 183–199.
- Porfir'ev, I.Я. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 284–285.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire* (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: Źródła i monografie, 129; Lublin, 1987) 73–74.

- Salmina, M.A. (Салмина, М.А.) “Лествица Иакова,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 230–231.
- Shchegolev, P.E. (Щеголев, П.Е.) “Очерки истории отреченной литературы: Сказание Афродитиана,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 4 (1899) 148–199; 1304–1344.
- Sheeley, S. “Jacob, Ladder of,” in: *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible*, 425.
- Svjatskij, D. (Святский, Д.) *Лестница Иакова или сон наяву* (С.-Петербург, 1911) 31–32.
- Weinel, H. “Die spätere christliche Apokalyptik,” in: *EΥΗΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag, dem 23. Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden* (ed. H. Schmidt; Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 36; Göttingen, 1923) 141–173 at 172–173.
- Whitney, K.W., Jr. *Two Strange Beasts. A Study of Traditions Concerning Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Ph.D. diss.; Harvard University, 1992). [Whitney, K.W. Jr. *Two Strange Beasts. A Study of Traditions Concerning Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Winona Lake, 2006)].

Joseph and Aseneth

a. *Texts*

- Burchard, C. *Joseph und Aseneth serbisch-kirchenslavisch: Text und Varianten* (Beihefte zur Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche, 2; Dielheim, 1980) 3–45 [= *Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 13; Leiden/New York/Köln, 1996) 53–92]
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Апокриф об Иосифе и Асенефе,” in: *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Императорского Московского Археологического Общества* 2 (1898) 146–199.
- Novaković, S. (Новаковић, С.) “Srpsko-slovenski zbornik iz vremena despota Stefana Lazarevića. 10. žitie Asenethi,” *Starine* 9 (1877) 27–42.

c. *Research*

- Bratulić, J. “Апокрифи о преkrасном Josipu u hrvatskoj knizhevности,” *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta* 7 (1972) 31–123.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Иосиф,” in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 118–141 at 119–120.
- Jovcheva, M., Taseva, L. (Йовчева, М., Тасева, Л.) “Езикови особености на Слово за силата на Йосиф,” *Paleobulgarica* 4 (1994) 64–74.
- Ostrovskij, A. (Островский, А.) “‘Иосиф прекрасный’: от сновидца к мученику,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в*

- славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 181–192.
- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) *Народно четиво през XVI-XVIII в.* (София, 1992) 178–183, 366–367.
- , “Слово за прекрасния Иосиф,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 466–467.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Средновековните текстови и фолклорот* (Скопје, 1978) 61–70.
- Volkova, T.F., Mihajlova, M.V. (Волкова, Т.Ф., Михайлова, М.В.) “Сказание об Иосифе прекрасном’ в редакции печорского книжника И.С. Мяндина,” in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода “Переводной литературы” А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

a. *Texts*

- Franko, I. (Франко, I.) “Заповіти дванацяти патріархів,” in: *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.174–224.
- Nikol’skij, N. (Никольский, Н.) *О литературных трудах митрополита Климента Смолятича, писателя XII в.* (С.-Петербург, 1892) 200–204.
- Paleja, Paleja *Толковая по списку, сделанному в Коломне в 1406 г.: Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова* (вып. 1–2; Москва, 1892–1896) 198–238.
- Porfir’ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) “Заветы 12-ти патриархов,” in: *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 59–67; 158–194.
- Rurin, A. N. (Пыпин, А. Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 33–38.
- Tihonravov, N. S. (Тихонравов, Н. С.) “Заветы двенадцати патриархов,” in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.96–232.
- Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1892) 146–189.

c. *Research*

- Charles, R.H. "Appendix IV: Christian Additions Made by the Slavonic Scribe in S1," in: *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Edited from Nine Mss together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments* (Oxford, 1908 [Hildesheim, 1966]) 257–262.
- Gaylord, H.E. and Korteweg, T. "The Slavic Versions," in: *Studies in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (ed. M. de Jonge; *Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha*, 3; Leiden, 1975) 140–143.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов* (Москва, 1893) 343–348.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) "Заветы патриархов," in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятникoв) Выпуск I. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 141–165.
- Јовановић, Т. "Завет патријарха Рувима у препису збирке манастира Никольца," *Старобългарска литература* 33–34 (2005) 394–404.
- Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский, Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 32–64.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) "Завети на дванадесетте патриарси," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 199–200.
- Morfill, W.R. "Appendix V: Retranslation of the Second Recension (S2) of the Slavonic Version," in: Charles, R.H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Edited from Nine Mss together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments* (Oxford, 1908 [Hildesheim, 1966]) 263–294.
- Panajotov, V.B. (Панайотов, В.Б.) *Апокриф "Заветы двенадцати патриархов" в контексте Толковой Палеи* (Москва, 1986).
- Panajotov, V., Nikolov, N. (Панайотов, В., Николов, Н.) "Архивски сборник – археографски бележки. (Апокрифът 'Завети на дванадесетте патриарси')," in: *Преславска книжовна школа. 2* (Шумен, 1997) 95–115.
- Porfir'ev, I.Я. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 256–284.
- Sergeev, V.N. (Сергеев, В.Н.) "Надписи на иконах праотеческого ряда иконостаса и апокрифические Заветы двенадцати патриархов," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 29 (1974) 306–320.
- Soldat, C. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in the Russian Tradition and the Contexts of Their Reception," in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum*; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) "Единъ югославянски превод отъ 'Заветите на дванадесетте патриарси,'" in: *Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* 18 (1901) 242–251.

- , *Заветы двенадцати патриархов в старинной чешской письменности* (С.-Петербург, 1905).
- Turdeanu, É. “Les Testaments des douze Patriarches en slave,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 1 (1970) 148–184.
- , *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 239–275, 440–441.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Заветы двенадцати патриархов,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 183–184.

Testament of Job

a. *Texts*

- Novaković, S. (Новаковић, С.) “Апокрифна прича о Јову,” *Starine* 10 (1878) 157–170.
- Polivka, G. “Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu.XIII. Апокрифна прича о Јову,” *Starine* 24 (1891) 113–160 at 135–155.

b. *Translations*

- Novaković, S. (Новаковић, С.) “Апокрифна прича о Јову,” *Starine* 10 (1878) 157–170.

c. *Research*

- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Иов,” in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 271–273.

Life of Moses

a. *Texts*

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57 at 56–57.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) “Сказания о Моисее,” in: *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877)* 67–68; 194–204; 259–260.
- Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) “Сказания о Моисее,” in: *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970])* 39–50 at 39–48.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Житие пророка Моисея,”

- in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.120–148.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) “Исход Моисеев,” in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.233–253.
- Tolkovaja, Paleja. *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1893).

b. *Translations*

- Bonwetsch, N. “Die Mosesage in der slawischen kirchlichen Literatur,” in: *Nachrichten von der Königlichten Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1909) 581–607.
- Meyer, A. *Légendes juives apocryphes sur la vie de Moïse; La Chronique de Moïse; L’Ascension de Moïse; La Mort de Moïse* (Paris, 1925).
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Житие пророка Моисея,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.121–149.
- , “Житие пророка Моисея,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 62–86.
- , “Житие пророка Моисея,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 66–92.

c. *Research*

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Русско-еврейские литературные связи до 15 века,” *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75.
- , “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57 at 44–47.
- Bauckham, R.J. “Excursus: The Background and Source of Jude 9,” in: *Jude. 2 Peter* (Word Biblical Commentaty, 50; Waco, 1993) 65–76 at 69–70.
- Bonwetsch, G.N. “Die christliche vornicänische Literatur in altslavischen Handschriften,” in: A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1893 [Leipzig, 1958]) 1/2. 886–917 at 915.
- Farrall, M.L. *A Jewish Translator in Kievan Rus’: A Critical Edition and Study of the Earliest Redaction of the Slavic “Life of Moses”* (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1981).
- Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) “Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентів-заочнику),” *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
- Haelewycck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout, 1998) No. 136. 105.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин В.М.) “Редакции Толковой палеи,” in: *Исслед. в области древнерусской литературы* (С.-Петербург, 1906) 94–98.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов*

- в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные (Петроград, 1921) 165–169.
- Kozak, E. “Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven,” *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158 at 137.
- Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский, Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 64–94.
- Lunt, H.G. and Taube, M. “Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?” *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988) 148–187 at 157–158.
- Mescherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: (Ветхозаветные апокрифы),” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, ч. 1; Москва, 1976) 192.
- Ogienko, I.I. (Огиенко, И.И.) “Легендарно-апокрифический элемент в ‘Небе новом’ Иоанника Голятовского,” *Чтения в Историческом обществе Нестора-летописца* 24.1 (1914) 89.
- Ponyrko, N.V. (Понырко, Н.В.) “Апокрифы о Моисее,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI–первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 63–67.
- Porfir’ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 55–68, 289–294.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Житие пророка Моисея,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.376–378.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Повесть временных лет и ее источники,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 4 (1940) 131–136.
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) *Материалы и исследования в области славянской филологии и археологии* (С.-Петербург, 1910) 174.
- Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) *Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе* (вып. 1; Москва, 1888) 72–211.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “Русские памятники письменности в югославянских литературах XIV–XV вв.,” in: *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, [1938] 1960) 55–103 at 67–77.
- Taube, M. “The Slavic Life of Moses and its Hebrew Sources,” *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 84–119.
- Thompson, F.J. “‘Made in Russia.’ A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia,” in: *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 327–387 at 334.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Летопись – хроника – паея (взаимоотношение памятников и методика их исследования),” in: *Армянская и русская средневековые литературы* (Ереван, 1985) 19–30.

- Turdeanu, É. “La Chronique de Moïse en russe,” *Revue des études slaves* 46 (1967) 35–64.
- , *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 276–305, 441.
- Zavadskaja, S.V. (Завадская, С.В.) “Наблюдения над терминологией ветхозаветного сюжета о Моисее (по поводу соотношения ранних летописных и палейных текстов),” in: *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье* (Москва, 1993) 28–31.

Apocryphal Fragments about David
(Апокрифы о Давиде)

a. *Texts*

- Franko, I. (Франко, I.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Nesnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.272–279.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург, 1906) 110–116.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) and R.B. Tarkovskij (Тарковский, Р.Б.) “Сказания о царе Давиде,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.160–170.
- Kuprijanov, I. (Куприянов, И.) “Описание замечательной Псалтири,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 88.2 (1855) 165–167.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Сказание за Сивила,” in: Trčkova-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Търкова-Заимова, В. и Милтенова, А.) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996) 264–271.
- Nachov, N.A. (Начов, Н.А.) “Тиквешки рукопись или сборник от апокрифни сказания, легенди, повести и пр.,” in: *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука, и книжнина* 8 (1898) 388–418.
- Perets, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) *Отчет об экскурсии семинария русской филологии в Москву 1–12 февраля 1912 года* (Киев, 1912) 25–26.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 237, 242–243.
- Undol'skij, V.M. (Ундольский, В.М.) *Славяно-русские рукописи В.М. Ундольского* (Москва, 1870) 16.

b. *Translations*

- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) and R.B. Tarkovskij (Тарковский, Р.Б.) “Сказания о царе Давиде,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.161–171.

- , “Сказания о царе Давиде,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 37–46.
- , “Сказания о царе Давиде,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 92–102.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Слово за Сивила,” in: Bozhilov, I. (Божиллов, И.) et al. *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987) 156–158.
- , “Сказание за Сивила,” in: Търкова-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Търкова-Заимова, В. и А. Милтенова) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996) 272–273.
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.99–106, 363–366.
- Prokof'ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 404.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) “Слово за пророкот Давид и цар како се зачна,” in: Koneski, B. and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Конески, Б. и Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Тиквешки сборник* (Скопје, 1987) 23–27.
- , “Слово како го исписа Давид псалтирот,” in: Koneski, B. and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Конески, Б. и Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Тиквешки сборник* (Скопје, 1987) 27–28.

c. Research

- Franko, I. (Франко, И.) “Из старых рукописей,” *Житие и слово* 3 (1895) 141–142.
- Istrin, V. (Истрин, В.) “Из области древнерусской литературы,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 8 (1903) 404–413.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников)* Выпуск 1. *Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 173–193.
- , “Из истории апокрифов и легенд в южнославянской письменности,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 14.2 (1909) 290–294.
- Jovanović, T. (Јовановић, Т.) “Српски преписи апокрифа ‘Како Давид написао Псалтир,’” *Археолошки прилози* 21 (1999) 299–314.
- Kagan, M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) “Апокрифы о Давиде,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.52–59.
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) and R.V. Tarkovskij (Тарковский, Р.В.) “Сказания о царе Давиде,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.380–385.
- Karskij, E.F. (Карский, Е.Ф.) *Западнорусские сказания о Сивилле пророчице по рукописи XVI в.* (Варшавские университетские известия, 2; Варшава, 1898).
- Loulié, V. (Лурье, В.) “Славянское ‘Сказание о Псалтири’ и его историко-литургическое значение,” *Byzantinoslavica* LXII (1996) 140–155.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “‘Сказание за Сивила’ (Археолошки

- бележки, текстологическо изследване, издание на текста),” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 8.4 (1984) 44–72.
- , “Problems of Old Bulgarian Translation of the *Skazanie za Sibyla*,” *Études balkaniques* 3–4 (1992) 72–76.
- , “Апокрифи за Давид и за Соломон,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 33–34.
- , “Сказание за Сивила,” in: Търкова-Займова, V. and A. Miltenova (Търкова-Займова, В. и А. Милтенова) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996) 251–276.
- , “Апокрифи за Давид и за Соломон,” in: *Старобългарска Литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 42–43.
- Nachov, N.A. (Начов, Н.А.) “Тиквешки рукопись или сборник от апокрифни сказания, легенди, повести и пр.,” in: *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука, и книжнина* 10 (1894) 106–112.
- Otchet, “Отчет командированного за границу приват-доцента Московского университета Василия Истрина за вторую половину 1894 года,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 6 (1896) 68–75.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И. Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 68–69, 93–94.
- Turilov, A.A. (Турилов, А. А.) “Отголосок легенды о царе Давиде в русской сфрагистике и книжности,” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (5; Москва, 1994) 107–114.

Apocryphal Fragments about Solomon
(Апокрифы о Соломоне)

a. *Texts*

- Franko, I. (Франко, И.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.280–295.
- Lurie, J. “Une légende inconnue de Salomon et Kitovras dans un manuscrit du XV siècle,” *Revue des études slaves* 43 (1964) 7–12.
- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г. М.) “Суды Соломона,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 4.67–87.
- , “Суды Соломона,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д. С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.172–190.
- Рурін, А. Н. (Пыпин, А. Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 51–71.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н. С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.254–272.
- Titova, L.V. (Титова, Л. В.) “Повесть о рождении и похождениях царя

Соломона,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси: XVII век. Книга первая* (Москва, 1988) 455–461.

b. *Translations*

Dinekov, P. et al. eds. (Динеков, П., Куев, К. и Петканова, Д.) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 207–209.

Gromov, M.N. (Громов, М.Н.) “О значении термина ‘философ’ на Руси,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (Москва, 1989) 447–480.

Nachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) “О Соломоне и Китоврасе,” in: Mil’kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 156–166.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 85–94.

Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 102–105.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.106–122, 366–368.

Prohorov, G.M., (Прохоров, Г.М.) “Суды Соломона,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 4.67–87.

—, “Суды Соломона,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.173–191.

—, “Суды Соломона,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 47–61.

—, “Суды Соломона,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 102–117.

Prokof’ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 404.

c. *Research*

Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Переводы с древнееврейских оригиналов в древней Руси,” *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987) 1–20.

—, “Русско-еврейские литературные связи до 15 века,” *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75.

—, “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57 at 47–53.

Anisimova, O.A. (Анисимова, О.А.) “Сказание о Соломоне и Китоврасе,” in: *Литература и культура Древней Руси: Словарь-справочник* (ed. V.V.Кусков; Москва, 1994) 152–153.

Arhangel’skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) “К истории южнославянской и древнерусской апокрифической литературы. Два любопытных сборника Софийской народной библиотеки в Болгарии,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4 (1899) 127–130.

Bagrij, A.V. (Багрий, А.В.) “К вопросу о путях распространения легенд о Мудром Соломоне,” *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Академии Наук* 101.3 (1928) 241–244.

- Bondar', K.V. (Бондарь, К.В.) "О Китоврасе от Палеи' и другие сюжеты книгописца Ефросина," in: *Материалы VII Ежегодной международной междисциплинарной конференции по иудаике* (ч. 2; Москва, 2000) 123–129.
- , "Соломонов цикл по ранним спискам," in: *IX Конференция молодых ученых "Вопросы славяно-русского рукописного наследия"* (к 75-летию Отдела древнерусской литературы) (С.-Петербург, 2008).
- Borisov, A.Ja. (Борисов, А.Я.) "К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе," *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.
- Chudinov, A.N. (Чудинов, А.Н.) *Древнерусские повести и романы* (С.-Петербург, 1895) 56–59.
- Dianova, T.V. (Дианова, Т.В.) *Повесть о рождении и похождениях царя Соломона* (Москва, 1991).
- Durnovo, N.N. (Дурново, Н.Н.) *Легенда о заключенном бесе в византийской и старинной русской литературе* (I–III; Москва, 1905).
- Eleonskij, S.F. (Елеонский, С.Ф.) "Повесть о царе Соломоне в фольклорной переработке XVIII в.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 14 (1958) 444–448.
- Grachotti, S. (Грачотти, С.) "Один из мотивов легенды о Соломоне и Китоврасе в мире греко-латинской классической древности," in: *Литература и искусство в системе культуры* (Москва, 1988) 162–165.
- Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) "О Соломоне и Китоврасе," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 167–168.
- Hudjakov, I.A. (Худяков, И.А.) *Великорусские сказки* (Москва, 1861) 2.133–138.
- Istoki. *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 321–322, 327–331.
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 270–272.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург 1906) 110–114.
- , *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 173–220.
- Jaroshenko-Titova, L.V. (Ярошенко-Титова, Л.В.) "Повесть об увозе Соломоновой жены' в русской рукописной традиции," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 29 (1974) 260–261.
- Karskij, E.F. (Карский, Е.Ф.) *Западнорусские сказания о Сивилле пророчице по рукописи XVI в.* (Варшавские университетские известия, 2; Варшава, 1898).
- Lourié, V. (Лурье, В.) "Чаша Соломона – Чаша Ездры. Элементы раннехристианского благочестия в Житии святого равноапостольного Кирилла, Учителя Словенского, и их значение для истории текста," in: *Славяне и их соседи* 5 (Москва, 1994) 9–25.

- Lur'e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) "Апокрифы о Соломоне," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.66–68.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) "Апокрифы за Давид и за Соломон," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 33–34.
- , "Апокрифы за Давид и за Соломон," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 42–43.
- Minc, S.I. (Минц, С.И.) "Черты индивидуального и традиционного творчества в сказках о царе Соломоне," in: *Художественный фольклор* (вып. IV–V; Москва, 1929).
- Novikov, V.I. (Новиков, В.И.) *Все шедевры мировой литературы в кратком изложении. Сюжеты и характеры. Русский фольклор. Русская литература XI–XVIII веков. Энциклопедический словарь* (Москва, 1998) 250–252.
- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) "От литературата към фолклора (Народни творби за Соломон и Давид)," *Български фолклор* 4 (1977) 39–48.
- Petrov, A.N. (Петров, А.Н.) "Апокрифическое пророчество царя Соломона о чаше," in: *Памятники древней письменности CIV* (С.-Петербург, 1894).
- , *Апокрифическое пророчество царя Соломона о Христе находящееся в пространном житии св. Константина Философа по списку XIII века* (С.-Петербург, 1894).
- Petruhin, V. (Петрухин, В.) "Владимир Святой и Соломон Премудрый. Грехи и добродетели в славянской и еврейской культурной традиции," in: *Концепт греха в славянской и еврейской культурной традиции. Сборник статей* (Москва, 2000) 72–86.
- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 4.541–542.
- , "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.385–386.
- Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) "Старинные сказки о царе Соломоне," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4 (1855) 237–284; *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 5 (1856) 61–64.
- Sbornik, *Сборник с лицевыми изображениями и крюковыми пометами "На реках Вавилонских"* (С.-Петербург, 1877).
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) "Заметки о рукописях Белградских и Софийских библиотек," *Известия Историко-филологического Института в Нежине* 16 (1898) 67–73.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Од средновековната книжевност* (Скопје, 1976) 100–117.
- , "Личноста на Соломон во средновековните текстови и во македонскиот фолклор," in: Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Меѓу книжевен текст и фолклор* (Скопје, 1987).
- Titova, L.V. (Титова, Л.В.) "Неизданная редакция 'Повести о рождении

- и похождениях царя Соломона,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1979) 343–363.
- , “Задачи изучения истории ‘Беседы отца с сыном о женской злобе,’” in: *Сибирская археография и источниковедение* (Новосибирск, 1979) 37–46.
- , “Беседа отца с сыном о женской злобе,” in: *Источниковедение литературы Древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1980) 164–173.
- , “К вопросу о жанре ‘Беседы отца с сыном о женской злобе,’” in: *Древнерусская рукописная книга и её бытование в Сибири* (Новосибирск, 1982) 62–72.
- , “Фольклорные обработки XVIII в. в Повести о рождении и похождениях царя Соломона,” in: *Источники по истории русского общественного сознания периода феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1986) 209–251.
- , *Беседа отца с сыном о женской злобе. Исследование и публикация текстов* (Новосибирск, 1987).
- , “Мотив похищения Соломоновой жены в древнерусской литературе,” in: *От сюжета к мотиву* (Новосибирск, 1996) 97–102.
- Ткачев, Ю.К. (Ткачев, Ю.К.) *Расширение национального образа мира в русской литературе веков. Часть 1. Евреи в древней русской словесности* (Черновцы, 2001) 109–118.
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) *Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китоврасе и западные легенды о Морольфе и Мерлине* (С.-Петербург, 1872).
- , “Талмудический источник одной Соломоновской легенды в русской Палее,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* Апрель (1880) 298–300.
- , “Новые данные к истории Соломоновых сказаний,” in: *Приложение к т. 40 Записок Академии Наук* (С.-Петербург, 1881).
- , *Шведская баллада об увозе Соломоновой жены* (С.-Петербург, 1896).
- , *Мерлин и Соломон: Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китоврасе и западные легенды о Морольфе и Мерлине* (Москва, 2001).
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “‘Пророчество Соломона’ из собрания Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря,” in: *Монастырская культура: Восток и Запад* (ed. Е.Г. Водолазкин; С.-Петербург, 1999) 59–67.
- , “Пророчество Соломона и Толковая Палея,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 52 (2001) 518–529.
- , “Историография и экзегеза (на материале Толковой Палеи и Пророчества Соломона),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003) 12–22.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 383–467.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) and Rudi, T.R. (Руди, Т.Р.) “Из истории древнерусской экзегезы (‘Пророчество Соломона’),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 54 (2003) 252–303.

Aporcraphal Fragments about Elijah
(Апокрифы о Илье Пророке)

a. *Texts*

- Kliment, Ohridski (Климент, Охридски) *Събрани съчинения* (eds. Ангелов, Б.С., Куев, К.М., Кодов, Х.; София, 1970) 1.673–706.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) “Похвала Илье пророку: Новое слово Климента Словенского,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 6.3 (1901) 236–280.

c. *Research*

- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск I. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 232–246.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) “Апокрифы о Илье Пророке,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 58–59.
- Saharov, V. (Сахаров, В.) *Эсхатологические сочинения и сказания в древней русской письменности и влияние их на народные духовные стихи* (Тула, 1879).
- Smirnova, Je.S. (Смирнова, Э.С.) *Живопись Великого Новгорода: сер. XIII – нач. XV в.* (Москва, 1976) 261–262.
- Torogov, V.N. (Топоров, В.Н.) *Исследования в области славянских древностей* (Москва, 1974) 164–170.
- Uspenskij, V.A. (Успенский, В.А.) *Филологические разыскания в области славянских древностей* (Москва, 1982) 40.

Fragments about Elijah in the Narration of Our Father Agapios
(Хождение Агапия в Рай)

a. *Texts*

- Arheograficheskaia, Arheograficheskaia komisija. *Великие Минеи Четии, собранные Всероссийским митрополитом Макарием*, апрель, дни 8–21 (С.-Петербург, 1912) 443–452.
- Knjazevskaja, O.A. (Князевская, О.А.) et al. *Успенский сборник XII–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1971) 446–473.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 627–640.
- Pope, R. “The Greek Text of The Narration of Our Pious Father Agapios the Syriac,” *Syriacmethodianum* 8–9 (1984) 233–260.
- Popov, A. (Попов, А.) “Библиографические материалы,” in: *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* (Кн. 1; С.-Петербург, 1879) 41–47.

- Рурин, А.Н. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862) 134.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Сказание отца нашего Агапия," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XII век* (Москва, 1978–1992) 154–165, 650–651.
- , "Сказание отца нашего Агапия," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.338–348.

b. *Translations*

- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 641–646.
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 252–258.
- Pope, R. "The Greek Text of The Narration of Our Pious Father Agapios the Syrian," *Cyrrilomethodianum* 8–9 (1984) 233–260.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Сказание отца нашего Агапия," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.339–349.
- , "Житие и подвиги преподобного отца нашего Агапия чудотворца," in: *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (ed. М.В. Рождественская; С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 173–178.
- , "Житие и подвиги преподобного отца нашего Агапия чудотворца," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 219–224.
- Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) "Хождение Агапия в рай," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков, В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 125–130.

c. *Research*

- Adrianova-Peretz, V.P. (Адрианова-Перетц, В.П.) "Апокрифы," in: *История русской литературы. Литература XI – нач. XIII в.* (1; Москва-Ленинград, 1941) 75–76, 82–83.
- Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) "Переводная беллетристика XI–XIII вв.," in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 151–154.
- Pope, R. "On the Fate of Utopian Apocryphal Apocalypses among the South and East Slavs: 'The Narration of Our Father Agapios.' Canadian Contributions to the IX International Congress of Slavists (Kiev 1983)," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 25.1 (1983) 1–12.
- , "The Greek Text of The Narration of Our Pious Father Agapios the Syrian," *Cyrrilomethodianum* 8–9 (1984) 233–260.
- Рурин, А.Н. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *История русской литературы* (С.-Петербург, 1902) 1.463.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Хождение Агапия в рай,"

- in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 462–463.
- Saharov, V. (Сахаров, В.) *Эсхатологические сочинения и сказания в древнерусской письменности и влияние их на народные духовные стихи* (Тула, 1879) 237–240.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) “Отреченные книги Древней России,” in: Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Собрание сочинений* (С.-Петербург, 1898) 1.200–201.

Ascension of Isaiah

a. *Texts*

- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) “Видение Исаево,” in: *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 134–149.
- Mil’kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) “Видение Исайи,” in: Mil’kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С.-Петербург, 1999) 504–516.
- Porov, A.N. (Попов, А.Н.) *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати А.И. Хлудова* (Москва, 1872) 414–419.
- , “Библиографические материалы,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 1.7 (1879) 1–48 at 13–20.
- Porfir’ev, I.Я. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) “Видение пророка Исайи,” in: *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 73–81.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) “Видение пророка Исайи,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.192–202.
- Shahmatov, A.S. and Lavrov, P. (Шахматов, А.С. и Лавров, П.) “Видение св. пророка Исайи,” in: “Сборник XII века Московского Успенского собора. Вып. 1.,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2.3 (1899) 129–136 [Aporhoreta Slavica, 1; ed. D. Chizhevskij; S-Gravenhage, 1957].
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII:4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 32–47.

b. *Translations*

- Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков, П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) “Видение Исаево,” in: *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 155–160.
- Nachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) “Видение Исайи,” in: Mil’kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков, В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 91–96.

- Kaliganov, I., Polyvjannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Польшвянний, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 69–75.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) "Видение Исаяи," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С.-Петербург, 1999) 517–523.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Видение пророка Исаяи," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.193–203.
- , "Видение пророка Исаяи," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 117–126.
- c. *Research*
- Demin, A.S. (Демин, А.С.) "Путешествие души по загробному миру (В древнерусской литературе)," in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (7.1; Москва, 1994) 51–74.
- , "Путешествие души по загробному миру," *Российский литературоведческий журнал* 5–6 (1994) 355–376.
- , "Загробный мир," in: *Древнерусская литература: Изображение природы и человека* (Москва, 1995) 182–207, 294–295, 312–314.
- Giambelluca Kossova, A. (Джамбелука Коссова, А.) "Наблюдения върху старобългарската традиция на Видение Исаяево – съответствия и различия с текстовете на Възнесение Исаяево," *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 7.2 (1983) 66–79.
- , "Osservazioni sulla tradizione paleoslava della Visione di Isaia: coincidenze e divergenze con la tradizione testuale dell'Ascensione di Isaia," in: *La cultura bulgara nel medioevo balcanico tra Oriente e Occidente europeo. Atti del 8 Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto, 3–6 novembre 1981* (Spoleto, 1983) 167–186.
- , "Един пренебрегнат ръкопис на 'Видение Исаяево': Яцимирски Препис 19," *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 12.4 (1988) 13–25.
- , "Una testimonianza inesplorata della versione paleoslava della Visione di Isaia: il codice N. 1448 della cattedrale di S. Sofia di Novgorod," in: *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujchev* (Studia Slavico-Byzantina et Mediaevalia Europensia, 1; eds. P. Dinekov, et al.; Sofia, 1988) 300–308.
- , "Visio Isaiae. Versione Paleobulgara," in: P. Bettliolo, A. Giambelluca Kossova, C. Leonardi, E. Norelli, and L. Perrone, *Ascensio Isaiae. Textus* (CCSA, 7; Turnhout, 1995) 235–319.
- Nachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатуриян, В.М.) "Видение Исаяи," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков, В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 96–97.
- Jacimírskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск I. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 247–250.
- Kagan, M.D., Ponyrko, N.V., Rozhdestvenskaja, M. (Каган, М.Д., Поньрко,

- Н.В., Рождественская, М.) “Описание сборников XV в. книгописца Ефросина,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 35 (1980) 64.
- Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 97–99.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Видение Исаево,” in: *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 91–92.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) “Видение Исаяи,” in: Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С-Петербург, 1999) 523–527.
- Porfir'ev, I.Я. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 294–305.
- Radchenko, K.F. (Радченко, К.Ф.) “Этюды по богомилству. Видение пророка Исаяи в пересказах катаров-богомиллов,” in: *Сборник статей по литературе и истории в честь Н.П. Дашкевича* (Киев, 1906) 229–234.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) “Видение пророка Исаяи,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.386–387.
- Rystenko, A.V. (Рыстенко, А.В.) *К литературной истории апокрифа “Восхождение Исаяи”* (Одесса, 1912).
- Schekin, A. “The Copy of the Isaiah Vision about the Last Times in the miscellany ‘Zlataja Matica,’ 15th c.,” *Scripta & e-Scripta* 3–4 (2006) 307–328.
- Stojanović, L. (Стояновић, Л.) “Стари српски хрисовуљи, акти, биографије, летописи, типичи, поменици, записи и др.,” *Споменик* (Београд, 1890) 190–193, 193–194.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 81–90.
- Tisserant, E. *Ascension d'Isaïe. Traduction de la version éthiopienne avec les principales variantes des versions grecque, latines et slave* (Paris, 1909).
- Turdeanu, É. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 145–172, 438–439.
- Vaillant, A. “Un apocryphe pseudo-bogomile: la Vision d'Isaïe,” *Revue des études slaves* 42 (1963) 109–121.

3 Baruch

a. Texts

- Gaylord, H.E. “How Satanael Lost His ‘-el’,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982) 303–309.
- , *The Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983).
- , “Славянский текст Третьей книги Варуха,” *Polata Knigopisnaja* 7 (1983) 49–56.
- , “Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch,” *Slovo* 37 (1987) 91–115.
- Hercigonja, E. “‘Videnje Varuhovo’ u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine,” *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7 (1964) 63–93.

- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 191–206.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) “Откровение Варуха,” in: *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [Nendeln, 1966]) 149–151.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 476–498.
- Novaković, S. “Otkrivene Varuhovo,” *Starine* 18 (1886) 203–209.
- Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) “Апокрифическое откровение Варуха,” *Древности Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4.1 (Москва, 1907) 201–258.
- Srećković, P.S. “Зборник попа Драгоља. Сadržина и пророштва,” *Споменик* 5 (1890) 3–20.
- Speranskij, M.M. (Сперанский, М.М.) “Рукописное собрание,” *Известия историко-филологического Института князя Безбородко в Нежине* 22 (1906) 27–28.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 91–99.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) “Откровение Варуха,” in: *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII.4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 48–54.
- b. *Translations*
- Bonwetsch, G.N. “Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch,” *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: philologisch-historische Klasse* (1896) 91–101.
- Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков, П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) “Откровение Варухово,” in: *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 160–161.
- Gaylord, H.E. “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York, 1985 [1983]) 1.653–655.
- Hage, W. *Die griechische Baruch-Apokalypse*. (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenisch-römischer Zeit 5.1; Gütersloh, 1974) 15–44.
- Kaliganov, I., Polyujannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Польшванний, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 75–81.
- Karrov, A.Ju. (Карпов, А.Ю.) “Откровение Варуха,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1990) 275–281.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 476–498.
- Morfill, W.R. “The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Slavic,” in: M.R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota II* (TS, 5.1; Cambridge, 1897 [rep. Nendeln, 1967]) 95–102.

- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) “Откровение на свети Варух,” *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 71–76; 353–354.
- , “Откровение на свети Варух,” in: Petkanova, D. and A. Miltenova (eds.) (Петканова, Д. и Милтенова, А.) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993) 11–16.
- c. *Research*
- Andersen, F.I. “The Sun in the Book of the Secrets of Enoch,” *Xristianskij Vostok* 4(10) (2006) 380–412.
- Bauckham, R. “Early Jewish Visions of Hell,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990) 355–385.
- , *The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Schriften des Neuen Testaments, 93; Leiden, Boston, Köln, 1998).
- Baudry, G.-H. “Le péché originel dans les pseudépigraphes de l’Ancien Testament,” *Mélanges de science religieuse* 49 (1992) 163–192 at 172–173.
- Bohak, G. “Greek-Hebrew Gematrias in 3 Baruch and in Revelation,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990) 119–121.
- Böcklen, E. *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie* (Göttingen, 1902) 33, 57, 65–66.
- Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Ph.D. diss.; Vanderbilt, 1976) 333–336.
- Collins, J.J. “The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism,” in: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen, 1983) 531–548 at 538–540.
- , “The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature,” in: *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in Judaism of Antiquity* (eds. A.J. Avery-Peck et al.; HOS, 1.49; Leiden, 2000) 119–139 at 134.
- Dean-Otting, M. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Judentum und Umwelt, 8; Frankfurt am Main/New York, 1984) 98–174.
- Demin, A.S. (Демин, А.С.) “Путешествие души по загробному миру (В древнерусской литературе),” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (7.1; Москва, 1994) 51–74.
- , “Путешествие души по загробному миру,” *Российский литературоведческий журнал* 5–6 (1994) 355–376.
- , “Загробный мир,” in: *Древнерусская литература: Изображение природы и человека* (Москва, 1995) 182–207, 294–295, 312–314.
- Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антић, В.) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна грага* (Скопје, 1978) 38.
- Fischer, U. *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 44; Berlin, 1978) 71–84.
- Frasson, M. “La struttura dei cieli in 3 Baruch. Uno studio filologico,” *Henoch* 14 (1992) 137–144.

- Gaylord, H.E. "How Satanael Lost His '-el'," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982) 303–309.
- , *The Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983).
- , "Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch," *Slovo* 37 (1987) 91–115.
- Gorskij, A., Nevostruev, K. (Горский, А., Невоструев, К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской синодальной библиотеки* (Москва, 1862) 2.3.752–753.
- Gry, L. "Séjours et habitats divins d'après les apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 4 (1910) 694–722 at 709.
- Hannah, D.D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2.109; Tübingen, 1999) 38–40, 44–45.
- Harlow, D. *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 12; Leiden, New York, Köln, 1996 [Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame, 1994]).
- Heil, C. *Die Ablehnung der Speisegebote durch Paulus* (Bonner biblische Beiträge, 96; Weinheim, 1994) 93–94.
- Himmelfarb, M. *Tours of Hell. An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia, 1983 [Ph.D. diss.; Pennsylvania, 1981]) 61–63.
- , *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford, 1993).
- Hubaux, J. and Leroy, M. *Le mythe du phénix dans les littératures grecque et latine* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 82; Liège/Paris, 1939).
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) "Варух," in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 227–232.
- Jacobson, H. "A Note on the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 7 (1976) 201–203.
- James, M.R. "Notes on the Apocrypha VI: Traces of the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch in Other Writings," *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1914–1915) 410–413.
- Jenks, G.C. *The Origins and Development of the Antichrist Myth* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 59; Berlin/New York, 1991) 293–297.
- Jovanović, T. (Јовановић, Т.) "Откровене Варухово у препису манастира Марче," in: *Србистички прилози. Зборник у част професора Славка Вукомановића. Филолошки факултет* (Београд, 2005) 115–122.
- Каргов, А.Ю. (Карпов, А.Ю.) "О календаре славянской книги 'Откровение Варуха,'" *Палестинский Сборник* 32 (1993) 81–83.
- Klausner, J. "The Greek Book of Baruch," *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (Tr. W.F. Stinespring; New York, 1955) 382.

- Kulik, A. *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) “Откровение Варуха,” *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 67/3 (1899) 149–151.
- , “Заметка об апокрифах в рукописи Публичной библиотеки греч. 70,” *Juzhnoslovenski Filolog* 2 (1921) 61–64.
- Lourié, B. and A. Orlov (eds.) *The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism* (Scrinium III; St. Petersburg: Byzantinorossica, 2007) 481–499.
- Lüdtke, W. “Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen: 2. Apokalypse des Baruch,” *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 31 (1911) 218–231 at 219–222.
- Maksimovich, K.A. (Максимович, К.А.) “Птица феникс в древнерусской литературе (К интерпретации образа),” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (5; Москва, 1992) 316–334.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Откровение Варухово,” in: *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 304–305; (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 336.
- Orlov, A.A. (Орлов, А.А.) “The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and the Book of Giants,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003) 184–201.
- Otzen, B. “The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic,” in: *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen* (eds. P. Bilde et al.; Aarhus, 1993) 140–154 at 144.
- Philonenko-Sayar, B. “La version slave de l’Apocalypse de Baruch,” in: *La littérature intertestamentaire. Colloque de Strasbourg 17–19 octobre 1983* (ed. A. Caquot; Paris, 1985) 89–97.
- Picard, J.-C. “Observations sur l’Apocalypse grecque de Baruch I. Cadre historique fictif et efficacité symbolique,” *Semitica* 20 (1970) 77–103.
- , “Trajets du corps, trajets célestes: éléments d’une cosmologie mystique juive,” in: *Moïse Géographe. Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l’espace* (eds. A. Desreumaux and F. Schmidt; Études de psychologie et philosophie, 24; Paris, 1988) 31–49 at 45–48.
- Riaud, J. “Quelques réflexions sur l’Apocalypse grecque de Baruch ou III Baruch à la lumière d’un ouvrage récent,” *Semitica* 48 (1998) 89–99.
- Rosenstiehl, J.-M. “La chute de l’Ange. Origines et développement d’une légende, ses attestations dans la littérature copte,” in: *Écritures et traditions dans la littérature copte. Journée d’études coptes, Strasbourg 28 mai 1982* (Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte, 1; Louvain, 1983) 37–60 at 48–49.
- Šagi, J. “Li sangue di Cristo nell’Apocalisse di Baruch greca,” in: *Li Sangue e antropologia biblica nella patristica* (Roma, 23–28 novembre 1981) (ed. F. Vattioni; Roma, 1982) 2.769–795.
- Schäfer, P. *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen. Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Studia Judaica. Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums, 8; Berlin, 1975).
- Schmid, H. “Baruch und die ihm zugeschriebene apokryphe und pseudepigraphische Literatur,” *Judaica* 30 (1974) 54–70 at 64–67.
- Schwemer, A.-M. “Gottes Hand und die Propheten. Zum Wandel der Metapher ‘Hand Gottes’ in frühjüdischer Zeit,” in: *Le Main de Dieu – Die Hand*

- Gottes (eds. R. Kieffer and J. Bergman; *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 94; Tübingen, 1997) 65–85 at 77–78.
- Segal, A.F. “Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and Their Environment,” in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, 2.23.2 (Berlin/New York, 1981) 1334–1394 at 1365–1366.
- Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) “Феникс в апокрифах об Енохе и Варухе,” in: *Новый сборник статей по славяноведению, составленный и изданный учениками В. И. Ламанского* (С.-Петербург, 1905) 395–405.
- , “О фениксе по апокрифическим книгам Еноха и Варуха,” *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4/1 (Москва, 1907) 9–10.
- , “Апокрифическое откровение Варуха,” *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4.1 (Москва, 1907) 201–258.
- Sterling, G.E. “Recherché or Representative? What is the Relationship between Philo’s Treatises and Greek-Speaking Judaism?” *Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999) 1–30 at 10.
- Stichel, R. “Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse,” in: *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien* (eds. R. Lauer and P. Schreiner; *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 177; Göttingen, 1989) 116–128.
- Turdeanu, É. “Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 69 (1950) 22–52, 176–218 at 177–181.
- , “Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs,” *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8 (1955) 47–52 at 50–52.
- , “L’Apocalypse de Baruch en slave,” *Revue des études slaves* 48 (1969) 23–48.
- , *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 1–74.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Откровение Варуха,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 282–283.
- Volkova, T.F. (Волкова, Т.Ф.) “Принципы и формы изображения природы в древнерусской литературе,” in: *Тема природы в художественной литературе. Материалы Всероссийской научной конференции 20 = 23 ноября 1995 г.* (ed. Л.В. Гурленкова; Сыктывкар, 1995) 3–9.
- Wright, J.E. *The Cosmography of the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch and Its Affinities* (Ph.D. diss.; Brandeis, 1992).
- , “Baruch. His Evolution from Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer,” in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, PA, 1998) 264–289.
- Zagrebin, V.M. (Загребин, В.М.) “О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая,” in: *Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний Отдела рукописей и редких книг ГПБ (Исследования, обзоры, публикации). Сборник научных трудов* (Ленинград, 1979) 61–80.

4 *Baruch*
(*Paraleipomena Jeremiou*)

a. *Texts*

Novaković, S. (Новаковић, С.) *Примери књижевности и језика старог и српско-словенскога* (I. Ausgabe, Београд, 1877) 424–431; (II. Ausgabe; Београд, 1889) 427–433; (III. Ausgabe; Београд, 1904) 495–502.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) “Повесть о пленении Иерусалима,” in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.273–284; 284–297.

—, “Повесть о пленении Иерусалима,” in: *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII.4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 15–24.

b. *Translations*

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) “Слово за пророк Йеремиа и за поробването на Йерусалим,” in: *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 77–84; 354–355.

c. *Research*

Delling, G. *Jüdische Lehre und Frömmigkeit in den Paralipomena Jeremiae* (Berlin, 1967).

Harris, J.R. *The Rest of the Words of Baruch* (Cambridge, 1889).

Istoki, *Истоки Русской Беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 145–147.

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Редакции Толковой Палеи,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/4 (1905) 179.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Иеремиа,” in: *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности* (Списки памятников) *Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 221–227.

Kohler, K. “The Pre-Talmudic Haggada. B. The Second Baruch or Rather the Jeremiah Apocalypse,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 5 (1893) 407–419.

Kraft, R.A. and Purinton, A.-E. *Paraleipomena Jeremiou* (T&T, 1; Pseudepigrapha Series, 1; Missoula, Mont., 1972).

Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский, Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 95–103.

Novaković, S. “Апокрифи jednoga srpskog ćirilovskog zbornika XIV v. I. Slovo propoka Jeremije o pljenjeni Jerusalima,” *Starine* 8 (1876) 36–48.

Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Повест за Йеремиа и за превземането на Йерусалим,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 369–370.

Polivka, G. “Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu. VI. Priča proroka Jeremije o plijenjenju Jerusalima,” *Starine* 21 (1889) 221–224.

Porov, A.N. (Попов, А.Н.) *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А.И. Хлудова* (Москва, 1872) 406–413.

- Рурин, А.Н. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 72.
- Robinson, S.E. "4 Baruch," in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]) 2.413–425.
- Shahmatov, A.S. and Lavrov, P. (Шахматов, А.С. и Лавров, П.) "Повесть пророка Иеремии," in: "Сборник XII века Московского Успенского собора. Вып. 1.," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2.3 (1899). [(Gravenhage, 1957)] 1–6.
- Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский, И.И.) *Древние славянские памятники юсового письма* (С.-Петербург, 1868) 185–188.
- Turdeanu, É. "Les Paralipomènes de Jérémie en slave," in: *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 348–363; 442.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Паралипомен Иеремии," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 295–296.
- , "Древнерусские четвы сборники XII–XIV веков: (Статья третья: сказания и гомилии на сюжеты священной и церковной истории)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 47 (1993) 3–33.
- Uspenskij, *Успенский сборник XII–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1971) 31–37.
- Zagrebin, V.M. (Загребин, В.М.) "О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая," *Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний Отдела рукописей и редких книг ГПБ (Исследования, обзоры, публикации).* Сборник научных трудов (Ленинград, 1979) 64–72.

Pseudo-Danielic Fragments

a. *Texts*

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифические видения Даниила* (Москва, 1897).
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург 1906) 133–136.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) "Видение Даниила," in: *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899 [Nendeln, 1966]) 1–5.
- Makushev, V. (Макушев, В.) "О некоторых рукописях библиотеки в Белграде. II. Рукописи сербского письма," *Русский Филологический Вестник* (1882) 1–29 at 23–26.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) "Библиографические материалы," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* (1889) 58–64, 95–98.

- Srećković, P.S. (Срећковић, П.С.) “Зборник попа Драгоља. Садржина и пророштва,” *Споменик* 5 (1890) 10–13.
- Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский, И.И.) “Памятники языка и словесности, их списки, чтения и объяснения,” *Ученые записки Императорской Академии Наук* 1 (С-Петербург, 1854) 135–136.
- Търкова-Займова, V. and A. Miltenova (Търкова-Займова, В. и Милтенова, А.) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996).

b. *Translations*

- Alexander, P.J. “Appendix: English Translation of Slavonic Daniel,” in: *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (ed. D. de F. Abrahamse; Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1985) 65–72.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “От светите книги видение на пророк Даниил,” in: Vozhilov, I., et al. eds. (Божилков, И. и Кожухаров, С.) *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987) 158–159.
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 400–401, 404–405.

c. *Research*

- Alexander, P.J. “Medieval Apocalypses as Historical Sources,” *American Historical Review* 73 (1968) 997–1018.
- , “Historical interpolations in the Zbornik popa Dragolia,” in: *Actes du XVe congrès international des études Byzantines* (București, 1976) 23–28.
- , *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (ed. D. de F. Abrahamse; Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1985) 62–64.
- Bonwetsch, G.N. “Die christliche vornicänische Literatur in altslavischen Handschriften,” in: A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1893 [Leipzig, 1958]) 1/2. 916–917.
- Bousset, W. *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche* (Göttingen, 1895) 41–45 at 43.
- , “Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 20 (1900) 262–281, 287–290.
- García Martínez, F. “4QPseudo Daniel Aramaic and the Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” in: *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 9; Leiden, 1992) 137–161 at 151–152.
- Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout, 1998) 210–211.
- Kajмакамова, М. (Каймакамова, М.) “Две старобългарски летописни съчинения от XI в.,” *Исторически преглед* 5 (1976) 86–96.
- Kozak, E. “Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven,” *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158 at 139.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Апокрифи за пророк Даниил,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 35–36.

- , “Апокрифи за пророк Даниил,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 44–45.
- Miltenova, A. and Trčkova-Zaimova, V. (Милтенова, А., Търčkова-Заимова, В.) “Виденията на пророк Данаил във Византия и в средновековна България,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 4 (1990) 39–46.
- Petrov, P. and Gjuzelev, V. (Петров, П. и Гюзелев, В.) *Христоматия по история на България* (София, 1978) 1.443–449.
- Stegmüller, F. *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1950ff.) No. 17.13–15.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Апокрифы и сказания о Данииле,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 44–47.
- Trčkova-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Търčkова-Заимова, В. и Милтенова, А.) “Виденията на пророк Даниил във Византия и в средновековна България,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 14.4 (1990) 39–46.

Apocalypse of Zosimus
(Хождение Зосимы к рахманам)

a. *Texts*

- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 2.78–92.

b. *Translations*

- Nachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) “Хождение Зосимы к рахманам,” in: *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (ed. В. Мильков; Москва, 1997) 107–115.

c. *Research*

- Charlesworth, J.H. “Greek, Persian, Roman, Syrian, and Egyptian Influences in Early Jewish Theology. A Study of the History of the Rechabites,” in: *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (eds. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, J. Riaud; Leuven – Paris, 1986) 219–243.
- Fonkitch, B.L. (Фонкич, Б.Л.) *Греческо-русские культурные связи в XV–XVII вв.* (Москва, 1977) 95, 101, 133, 136, 143.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 43.
- James, M. R. *Апосурѣна апесдота* (Cambridge, 1893) 96–108.
- Kaliganov, I., Poluyjannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Польшянный, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 130–131.
- Lourié, V. (Лурье, В.) *Призвание Авраама. Идея монашества и ее воплощение в Египте* (С.-Петербург, 2000).

- Picard, J.-C. “L’Histoire des Bienheureux du temps de Jérémie et la Narration de Zosime: arrière-plan historique et mythique,” in: *Pseudépigraphe de l’Ancien Testament et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (ed. M. Philonenko; Cahiers de la Recherche des sciences philosophiques et religieuses, 41; Paris, 1967) 27–73.
- Vaneeva, E.I. (Ванеева, Е.И.) “Хождение Зосимы к рахманам,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.489–491.
- Vassiliev A. *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Москва, 1893) xxxviii–xl, 166–179.
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) *Из истории романа и повести* (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1886) 280–329.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 276.

Ahiqar

(Повесть об Акире Премудром)

a. Texts

- Grigor’ev, A.D. (Григорьев, А.Д.) *Повесть об Акире Премудром. Исследование и тексты* (Москва, 1913).
- Tvorogov, O. (Творогов, О.) “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.246–281.
- , “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) *Мудрое слово Древней Руси (XI–XVII вв.)* (Москва, 1989) 176–177.
- , “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.28–56.

b. Translations

- Dinekov, P. et al. eds. (Динеков, П., Куев, К. и Петканова, Д.) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 203–207.
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 95–102.
- Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (ed. В.В. Колесов; Москва, 1989) 184–185.
- Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 53–71.
- Prokof’ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 123–127; 347–352; 402.
- Tvorogov, O. (Творогов, О.) “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.246–281.

—, “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.29–57.

c. *Research*

Barsov, E. (Барсов, Е.) “Акир премудрый во вновь открытом сербском списке XVI века,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3 (1886) 1–11.

Chtimia, I.C. “L’Histoire du sage Ahikar dans les littératures slaves,” *Romanoslavica* 9 (1963) 413–426.

Durnovo, N.N. (Дурново, Н.Н.) “О некоторых именах в славянском переводе повести об Акире,” *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 3 (1902) 11–12.

—, “К истории повести об Акире,” *Материалы и исследования по старинной литературе* (1; Москва, 1915).

—, *Дубровницкий список об Акире* (Дубровник, 1931).

Gladkova, O.V. (Гладкова, О.В.) “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: *Литература Московской и Домосковской Руси* (ed. А.С. Демин; Москва, 2008) 613–620.

Grigor’ev, A.D. (Григорьев, А.Д.) “Поучение в повести об Акире Премудром,” *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 5 (1911) 41.

—, “Повесть об Акире Премудром как художественное произведение,” *Варшавские Университетские Известия* 4 (1913) 1–60.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 237–245.

Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga,” *Arkiv za Povjestnicu Jugoslavenku* IX (1868) 65–151 at 137–151.

Jopova, M. (Йонова, М.) “Акир Премъдри,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 23–24.

Novikov, V.I. (Новиков, В.И.) *Все шедевры мировой литературы в кратком изложении. Сюжеты и характеры. Русский фольклор. Русская литература XI–XVIII веков. Энциклопедический словарь* (Москва, 1998) 174–178.

Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) *Переводные повести феодальной Руси и Московского государства XII–XVII вв.* (Ленинград, 1934) 56–63.

Peres, V.N. (Перец, В.Н.) “К истории текста ‘Повести об Акире Премудром,’” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии Наук* 21.1 (1916) 262–278.

Piotrovskaja, E.K. (Пиотровская, Е.К.) “Усть-Цилемская обработка ‘Повести об Акире Премудром,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 31 (1976) 378–383.

—, “О русской редакции Повести об Акире Премудром,” in: *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины* (Том 10; Ленинград, 1978) 323–327.

Polevoj, N. (Полевой, Н.) “Древнерусские повести,” *Русский Вестник* 1 (1842) 54–65.

- Silant'ev, V.V. (Силантьев, В.В.) “Романные сюжеты в литературе Древней Руси,” *Arbor mundi* 5 (1997) 125–143.
- Reznik, N.A. (Резник, Н.А.) “Мотив добра и зла в ранней лирике М.Ю. Лермонтова и древнерусской литературе,” in: *Взаимодействие творческих индивидуальностей русских писателей XIX – начала XX века. Межвузовский сборник научных трудов* (Москва, 1994) 70–82.
- Thompson, F.J. “‘Made in Russia.’ A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia,” in: *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 327–387 at 346.
- Turdeanu, É. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 93–94, 188, 192.
- Творогов, О. (Творогов, О.) “Беллетристические элементы в переводном историческом повествовании XI–XIII вв.,” in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 163–180.
- , “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.256–658.
- , “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 243–245.
- , “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 141–142.
- , “Повесть об Акире Премудром,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.362–364.

Adarian

(Повесть о царе Адариане)

a. Texts

- Franko, I. (Франко, I.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Nesnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.289.
- Ramjatniki, *Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко* (С.-Петербург, 1862) 2.343–344; 3.58.
- Schmidt, S.O. (Шмидт, С.О.) “‘Слово о Дариане-царе’ в рукописной книге XVI в.,” in: *Исследования по отечественному источниковедению: Сборник статей, посвященный 75-летию С.Н. Валка* (Москва-Ленинград, 1964) 414–418.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.268–269.

c. *Research*

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57 at 51.
- Borisov, A. Ja. (Борисов, А.Я.) “К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе,” *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167 at 163.
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) *Материалы и исследования в области славянской филологии и археологии* (С.-Петербург, 1910) 162, 175.
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) *Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китоврасе и западные легенды о Морольфе и Мерлине* (С.-Петербург, 1872) 92–93.
- Zajcev, A.I., Kagan, M.D. (Зайцев, А.И., Каган, М.Д.) “Повесть о царе Адариане,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 368–370.

The Word of the Blessed Zerubbabel
(Слово блаженного Зоровавеля)

a. *Texts*

- Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) “Слово блаженного Зоровавеля,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.150–158.

b. *Translations*

- Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) “Слово блаженного Зоровавеля,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.151–159.
- , “Слово блаженного Зоровавеля,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002 [2006]) 87–94.
- , “Слово блаженного Зоровавеля,” in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская, М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008) 127–134.

c. *Research*

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Русско-еврейские литературные связи до 15 века,” *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75 at 62–63.
- Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) “Слово блаженного Зоровавеля,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.378–380.
- , “Слово блаженного Зоровавеля” как пример непосредственного перевода с древнееврейского оригинала,” in: Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) *Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000) 148–155.

- , “The Slavonic Apocryphon of Zorobabel,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII вв.* (С.-Петербург, 1910) 400.

The Josippon
(*Slavonic Translation of Josephus' Wars*)

a. *Texts*

- Flusser, D. *The Josippon [Josephus Gorionides]* (2 vols.; Jerusalem, 1978–1980).
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) et al. *La Prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif* (2 vols; Paris, 1934–1938).
- Leeming, H. et al. *Josephus' Jewish War and Its Slavonic Version. A Synoptic Comparison* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 46; Leiden, 2003).
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “История Иудейской Войны” Иосифа Флавия в древнерусском переводе (Москва-Ленинград, 1958) 167–467.
- Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.) “Из ‘Истории Иудейской Войны’ Иосифа Флавия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.254–292.
- , “История Иудейской Войны” Иосифа Флавия. *Древнерусский Перевод* (2 vols.; Москва, 2004) 1.65–408.
- Zeitlin, S. “The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* LVIII (1968) 173–203.

b. *Translations*

- Berendts, A. and K. Grass, *Flavius Josephus: Vom Jüdischen Kriege, Buch I–IV* (Teil I; Dorpat, 1924–1926; Teil II; Dorpat, 1927).
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *La Prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif* (trs. P. Pascal and A. Vaillant; 2 vols; Paris, 1934–1938).
- Leeming, H. et al. *Josephus' Jewish War and Its Slavonic Version. A Synoptic Comparison* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 46; Leiden, 2003).
- Pascal, P. *La prise de Jérusalem* (Monaco, 1964).
- Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.) “Из ‘Истории Иудейской Войны’ Иосифа Флавия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.255–293.

c. *Research*

- dell'Agata, G. *Unità e varietà dello slavo ecclesiastico. A proposito di due mss. della Guerra giudaica* (Europa Orientalis, 7; Roma, 1988).
- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Интерполяции славянской версии ‘Иудейской войны,’” in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода “Переводной литературы” А. И. Соболевского.*

- Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).
- , “Интерполяции в славянской версии ‘Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 59 (2009) (forthcoming).
- Amusin, I.D. (Амусин, И.Д.) “К вопросу о зависимости сообщения о ессеях в древнерусском переводе Флавия от ‘Философумы,’” in: *Древний Восток и мировая культура* (Москва, 1981) 128–132.
- Angelov, B.S. (Ангелов, Б.С.) “Иосиф Флавий в южнославянских литературах,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 255–261.
- Anisimova, O.A. (Анисимова, О.А.) “История Иудейской Войны Иосифа Флавия,” in: *Литература и культура Древней Руси: Словарь-справочник* (ed. В.В. Кусков; Москва, 1994) 56–57.
- Barsov, E.V. (Барсов, Е.В.) “Слово о полку Игореве” как художественный памятник Киевской дружинной Руси (Москва, 1887) 1.213–259.
- Berendts, A. *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen “De Bello Judaico” des Josephus* (Leipzig, 1906).
- , “Analecta zum Slavischen Josephus,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der ältern Kirche* (1908) 40–70.
- Bickermann, E. “Sur la version vieux-russe de Flavius Josèphe,” *Annuaire de l’Institut de philologie et d’histoire orientales et slaves de Bruxelles* 4 (1936) 53–84
- , “Sur la version vieux-russe de Flavius Josèphe,” in: E. Bickermann, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 9; Leiden, 1986) 3.172–195.
- Couchoud, P.-L. “Les textes relatifs à Jésus dans la version slave de Josèphe,” *Revue de l’Histoire des Religion* 93 (1926) 44–64.
- Dujchev, I.S. (Дуйчев, И.С.) “Одно неясное место в древнерусском переводе Иосифа Флавия,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 16 (1958) 415–423.
- Eisler, R. “Jésus d’après la version slave de Flavius Josephus,” *Revue de l’Histoire des Religion* 93 (1926) 1–21.
- Fält, E. *Compounds in Contact. A Study in Compound Words with Special Reference the Old Slavonic Translation of Flavius Josephus* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Slavica Upsaliensia, 28; Uppsala, 1990).
- , *An Index to the Compound Words in Flavius Josephus “Peri tou Ioudaikou polemou” in its Greek and Old Slavonic Versions* (Uppsala Slavic Papers, 19; Uppsala, 1990).
- Gudzij, N.K. (Гудзий, Н.К.) “История Иудейской войны’ в древнерусском переводе,” in: *Старинная русская повесть. Статьи и исследования* (Москва-Ленинград, 1941) 38–47.
- Hansack, E. “N.A. Meščerski, Istorija iudejskoj vojny Iosifa Flavija v drevnerusskom perevode,” *Anzeiger für Slavische Philologie* 21 (1992) 183–185.
- , *Die altrussische Version des “Jüdischen Krieges.” Untersuchungen zur Integration der Namen* (Heidelberg, 1999).
- Hoecherl, A. *Zur Übersetzungstechnik des altrussischen “Jüdischen Krieges” des Josephus Flavius* (München, 1970).

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов: Исследования и текст* (Москва, 1893).
- , “К вопросу о взаимоотношениях Еллинских Летописцев и Архивского (Иудейского) Хронографа,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии Наук* 16.4 (1912) 125–143.
- , “‘Иудейская война’ Иосифа Флавия в древнем славяно-русском переводе,” *Ученые записки Высшей школы г. Одессы. Отдел гуманитарно-общественных наук. Том 2* (Одесса, 1926) 27–40.
- Kennard, J.S. “Cleanings from the Slavonic Josephus Controversy,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39 (1948) 161–170.
- , “Slavonic Josephus: A Retraction,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39 (1948–1949) 281–283.
- Kerschbaumer, G.W. *Die L-Periphrase in der altrussischen Version des “Jüdischen Krieges” von Josephus Flavius: Das echte und das fingierte Perfekt-präsens* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris, 33; Freiburg i Br., 1993).
- Makeeva, I.I. (Makeeva, И.И.) “Акцентная микросистема Архивского хронографа XV в. (На материале ‘Истории Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия),” *Русский язык в научном освещении* 1 (5) (2003) 141–169.
- Mansikka, V. (Мансикка, В.) *Житие Александра Невского* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 180; С.-Петербург, 1913) 27–32.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “Из наблюдений над древнерусским переводом ‘Истории Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия,” *Доклады Академии наук СССР. Серия В. Отделение общественных наук. Вып. 2* (Ленинград, 1930) 19–25.
- , “К вопросу об изучении переводной письменности Киевского периода,” *Ученые записки Карело-Финского педагогического института. Т. 2. Вып. 1* (Петрозаводск, 1956) 198–219.
- , “Отрывок из ‘Иосифона’ в ‘Повести Временных Лет,’” *Палестинский Сборник* 2/64–65 (1958) 58–68.
- , “Искусство перевода Киевской Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 15 (1958) 54–72.
- , “Значение древнеславянских переводов для восстановления их архетипов (на материале древнерусского перевода ‘Истории Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия),” in: *Исследования по славянскому литературоведению и фольклористике* (Москва, 1960) 61–94.
- , “Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964) 198–231.
- , *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1978) 96–100.
- Mulich, M.I. (Мулич, М.И.) “Отражение ‘Истории Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия в древней сербской литературе,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 24 (1969) 108–111.
- Nodet, É. *Flavius Josephus: baptême et résurrection* (Paris, 1999).
- , *The Historical Jesus? Necessity and Limits of an Inquiry* (tr. J.E. Crowley; Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies, 3; New York-London, 2008) 223–237.

- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) “К вопросу об Ипатьевской летописи,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 31 (1926) 118–123.
- Osinkina, L.V. (Осинкина, Л.В.) “Из наблюдений над сложными словами в языке русских переводных памятников XI–XII вв. (на материале ‘Истории Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия),” *Вестник Ленинградского университета* 8.2 (1981) 70–75.
- Реев, Д. (Пеев, Д.) “Глоса за българите в славянския текст на Юдейската война от Иосиф Флавий,” *Старобългарска литература* 33–34 (2005) 485–493.
- Perets, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) “К изучению ‘Слова о полку Игореве.’ 3. ‘Слово’ и ‘Повесть о разорении Иерусалима’ Иосифа Флавия,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 29 (1925) 43–55.
- Petruhin, V.Ja. (Петрухин, В.Я.) “‘Иосиппон’ и ‘Повесть Временных Лет.’ К вопросу об источниках русского летописания,” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (Москва, 1993) 55–56.
- Philonenko, M. “La notice du Josèphe slave sur les Esséniens,” *Semitica* 6 (1956) 69–73.
- Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.) “Древнерусский перевод ‘Истории Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия,” *Вестник РГНФ* 1 (1996) 227–234.
- , “Из ‘Истории Иудейской Войны’ Иосифа Флавия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.535–538.
- Rubinstein, A. “The Essenes According to the Slavonic Version of Josephus’ Wars,” *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956) 307–308.
- , “Observation on the Old Russian Version of Josephus’ Wars,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2 (1957) 329–348.
- Taube, M. “О генезисе одного рассказа в составе ‘Еллинского летописца’ второй редакции (‘О взятии Иерусалима Титом’),” in: *Russian Literature and History* (Jerusalem, 1989) 145–150.
- Thackeray, H.St.J. *Josèphe, l’homme et l’historien* (adapté de l’anglais par É. Nodet, avec un appendice sur la version slavone de la Guerre des Juifs; Paris, 2000).
- Thompson, F. “Славянский перевод ‘Иудейской войны’ Иосифа Флавия,” in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода “Переводной литературы” А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).
- Tkachev, Ju.K. (Ткачев, Ю.К.) *Расширение национального образа мира в русской литературе веков. Часть 1. Евреи в древней русской словесности* (Черновцы, 2001) 39–41.
- Trost, K. et al. *Die Lexik der altrussischen Version des “Jüdischen Krieges” des Flavius Josephus* (3 vols.; Regensburg, 1990–1991).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Беллетристические элементы в переводном историческом повествовании XI–XIII вв.,” in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 124–130.

- , “История Иудейской Войны Иосифа Флавия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 214–215.
- , “К ранним русско-еврейским литературно-текстовым связям (XI–XVI вв.),” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (Москва, 1993) 46–54.
- , *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001) 2.163–165.
- Vaillant, A. “Le Joseph slave et les Esséniens,” *Semitica* 8 (1958) 39–40.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеяного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 102, 191.
- Zeitlin, S. *Josephus on Jesus; with Particular Reference to the Slavonic Josephus and the Hebrew Josippon* (Philadelphia, 1931).
- , “The Hoax of the ‘Slavonic Josephus,’” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39 (1948) 171–180.
- , “The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* LVIII (1968) 173–203.

The Wisdom of Menander
(Мудрость Менандра)

a. *Texts*

- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Разум и философија из српских књижевних старина,” *Споменик* 13 (1892) iii–xix, 1–21.
- , “Die Menander-sentenzen in der altkirchenslavischen Übersetzung,” in: *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Bd 126, Abt. 7; Wien, 1892).
- Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Мудрость Менандра мудраго,” in: *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (ed. В.В. Колесов; Москва, 1989) 186–194.
- Semenov, V.A. (Семенов, В.А.) “Мудрость Менандра по русским спискам,” in: *Памятники Древней Письменности* (вып. 88; С.-Петербург, 1892) 5–33.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Переводные сборники изречений в славянской письменности* (Москва, 1905) 393–414.

b. *Translations*

- Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Мудрость мудрого Менандра,” in: *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (ed. В.В. Колесов; Москва, 1989) 195–204.
- Prokof'ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 297–304.

c. *Research*

- Adrianova-Peretc, V.P. (Адрианова-Перетц, В.П.) “Человек в учительной литературе древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 28 (1972) 3–39.

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57 at 42.
- Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) “Сербский пергаменный сборник П. С. Сречковича,” in: М.И. Соколов, *Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе* (Москва, 1888) 1–5; 11–12.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “Разумения единстрочные Григория Богослова и ‘Разуми мудраго Менандра’ в русском переводе,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Академии Наук* 2.2 (1898) 541–559.
- Suhomlinov, M.I. (Сухомлинов, М.И.) “О сборниках, известных под названием ‘Пчел,’” *Известия по Отделению Русского Языка и Словесности* 2 (1853) 222–231.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Мудрость Менандра,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 258–259.

The Twelve Dreams of Sehachi
(Сказание о двенадцати снах Шахаиши)

a. *Texts*

- Polivka, G. “Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu. 2. Dvanajest snova cara Šahinšaha,” *Starine* 21 (1889) 187–194; *Starine* 22 (1891) 157–160.
- Rotarov, P. (Потапов, П.) “К литературной истории Сказания о 12 снах царя Шахаиши,” in: *Сборник статей в честь акад. А. И. Соболевского* (Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности имп. Академии наук, 101.3; С.-Петербург, 1928) 120–129.
- Ryštenko, A.V. (Рыстенко, А.В.) “Сказание о двенадцати снах царя Мамера в славяно-русской литературе,” *Летопись Историко-филологического общества при Новороссийском университете* 13 (1904) 23–134.
- , “Addenda к статье о 12 снах царя Мамера,” *Летопись Историко-филологического общества при Новороссийском университете* 14 (1905) 135–164.
- , “Фроловский список ‘Снов Шахаиши,’” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* январь (1908) 114–117.
- Sbornik, “Сборник с лицевыми изображениями и с крюковыми пометами ‘На реках Вавилонских,’” *Изд. Общество Любителей Древней Письменности* 15 (1877) 355–357.
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) “Слово о двенадцати снах Шахаиши по рукописи XV в.,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 20.2 (1879) 4–10.

c. *Research*

- Bulgakov, F. (Булгаков, Ф.) “Энциклопедический сборник XVIII в. Библиографические сведения о сказаниях Соломоновых, о снах царя Шахаиши

- и повести о вине,” *Отчет о деятельности Общества Любителей Древней Письменности за 1877 г.* (С.-Петербург, 1877) 1–9.
- Gaster, M. *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archeology* (London, 1925 [New York, 1971]) 1.226–238.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифические видения Даниила в византийской и славяно-русской литературе* (Москва, 1897) 248–250.
- , *Исследования в области древнерусской литературы* (С.-Петербург, 1906) 224.
- Kuznesov, V.I. (Кузнецов, В.И.) “Слово о двенадцати снах Шахаиши и его связи с памятниками литературы Востока,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 30 (1976) 272–278.
- , “Сказание о двенадцати снах Шахаиши,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 408–410.
- Lougié, V. (Лурье, В.) “Славянское ‘Сказание о 12 снах Шахаиши.’ Сирийский оригинал, пехлевийский прототип (в связи с проблемой ранних сирийско-славянских контактов),” in: *Средневековое православие. От прихода до патриархата. Сб. научных статей* (ed. Н. Д. Барабанов; Волгоград, 1997) 5–45.
- Oľdenburg, S.F. (Ольденбург, С.Ф.) “К вопросу об источниках Слова о двенадцати снах Шахаиши,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* ноябрь (1892) 135–140.
- , “Сны Кейда, царя Канодожского и сны царя Шахаиши,” in: *Историко-литературный сборник, посвященный В. И. Срезневскому* (Ленинград, 1924) 47–54.
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) *Древняя русская литература XI–XVI вв.* (Ленинград, 1937) 194–198.
- Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Очерк литературной истории старинных повестей и сказок русских* (С.-Петербург, 1857) 123–124.
- Sbornik, *Сборник с лицевыми изображениями и крюковыми пометами “На реках Вавилонских”* (С.-Петербург, 1877).
- Shapira, D. “Irano-Slavono-Tibetica: Some Notes on Šaxaiša, Mithra, Lord Gshen-rab, Bon, and a Modern Myth,” *Христианский Восток* 3.9 (2002) 308–317.
- Suhomlinov, M. (Сухомлинов, М.) “О преданиях в древней русской летописи,” *Основа, южнорусский литературно-ученый вестник* июнь (1861) 54–57.

2. TRANSMISSION OF JEWISH PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL TEXTS AND TRADITIONS IN THE SLAVIC MILIEUX

2.1. PALAEAS

Palaea Historica (Историческая Палея)

a. *Texts*

- Роров, А. (Попов, А.) *Книга бытия небеси и земли (Палея историческая) с приложением сокращенной палеи русской редакции* (Москва, 1881).
Vassiliev, A., *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893).

c. *Research*

- Böttrich, C. "Palaea/Paleja. Ein byzantinisch-slavischer Beitrag zu den europäischen Historienbibeln," in: *Fragmentarisches Wörterbuch. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und christlichen Theologie. Horst Balz zum 70. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 2007) 304–313.
- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) "Палея," in: *Литературный энциклопедический словарь* (Москва, 1987) 265.
- Flusser, D. "Palaea Historica – An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends," in: *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (eds. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22; Jerusalem, 1971) 48–79.
- Jacobson, H. "Notes on the Palaea Historica," *ICS* 18 (1993) 329–30.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 104–147.
- , "Югославянские тексты Исторической палеи и русские её тексты," in: M.N. Speranskij, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 115–116.
- Stankov, R.A. (Станков, Р.А.) *Древнерусская и народная лексика в языке Исторической Палеи* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1985).
- , "Историческая Палея – памятник болгарской культуры," *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 4 (1986) 55–63.
- , "Локализация древнеболгарских переводных текстов в свете так называемой 'охридской' и 'преславской лексики' (На материале Исторической Палеи)," *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 4 (1991) 83–91.
- , *Лексика исторической Палеи* (Велико Търново, 1994).
- Sumnikova, T.A. (Сумникова, Т.А.) "К проблеме перевода Исторической Палеи," in: *Изучение русского языка и источниковедение* (Москва, 1969) 27–39.

- Turdeanu, É. “La Palaea Byzantine chez les slaves du Sud et chez les Roumains,” *Revue des études slaves* 40 (1964) 195–206.
- , *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981) 392–403.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Палея историческая,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.160–161.
- , “Летопись-Хроника-Палея: (взаимоотношения памятников и методика их исследования),” in: *Библия и возрождение культуры русского и других славянских народов: К 80-летию Русской Северо-Западной Библиейской Комиссии (1915–1995)* (С.-Петербург, 1995) 166–179.
- , “Палеи,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 124–125.

Palaea Interpretata
(Толковая Палея)

a. *Texts*

- Kamchatnov, A.M. (Камчатнов, А.М.) “Палея Толковая,” in: *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; С.-Петербург, 1999) 571–650.
- , “Палея Толковая,” in: *Философские и богословские идеи в памятниках древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; Москва, 2000) 114–147.
- , *Палея Толковая* (Москва, 2002).
- Paleja Tolkovalja, *Палея Толковая по списку, сделанному в Коломне в 1406 г. Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова* (Вып. 1–2; Москва, 1892–1896).
- Tolkovalja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1892).

b. *Translations*

- Kamchatnov, A.M. (Камчатнов, А.М.) “Палея Толковая,” in: *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; С.-Петербург, 1999) 651–677.
- , “Палея Толковая,” in: *Философские и богословские идеи в памятниках древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; Москва, 2000) 147–169.

c. *Research*

- Adrianova, V.P. (Адрианова, В.П.) *К литературной истории Толковой Палеи* (Киев, 1910).
- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Apocrypha translated from Hebrew within the East Slavic Explanatory Palaea,” *Jews and Slavs* 9 (2001) 147–154.

- , “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57.
- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) “О взаимоотношениях ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского и ‘Толковой палеи,’” in: *История русского языка: Исследования и тексты* (Москва, 1982) 262–277.
- Borцова, I.V. (Борцова, И.В.) “Легендарные экскурсии о разделении земли в древнерусской литературе,” in: *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР* (Москва, 1989) 178–185.
- Böttrich, C. “Palaea/Paleja. Ein byzantinisch-slavischer Beitrag zu den europäischen Historienbibeln,” in: *Fragmentarisches Wörterbuch. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und christlichen Theologie. Horst Balz zum 70. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 2007) 304–313.
- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) “Палея,” in: *Литературный энциклопедический словарь* (Москва, 1987) 265.
- Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) “Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентів-заочнику),” *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
- Istomin, K.K. (Истомин, К.К.) “К вопросу о редакциях Толковой Палеи,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10.1 (1905) 147–184.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1897).
- , “Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи, V. Златая Матица,” *Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности* 65.6 (1898) 96–135.
- , “Редакции Толковой Палеи,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/4 (1905) 150–151.
- Kamchatnov, A.M. (Камчатнов, А.М.) “Орфография и текстология: (Заметки на полях Толковой Палеи),” in: *Герменевтика Древнерусской Литературы* (12; ed. Д.С. Менделеев; Москва, 2005) 479–481.
- Karneev, A. (Карнеев, А.) “К вопросу о взаимных отношениях Толковой Палеи и Златой Матицы,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* февраль (1900) 344.
- Kozlova, A.Ju. (Козлова, А.Ю.) “Загадочные слова ‘клюще’ и ‘ключь’ Толковой Палеи,” *Русская Речь* 3 (1994) 75–80.
- , *Коломенский список Толковой Палеи 1406 г. как лингвистический источник* (Ph.D. diss.; Коломна, 2007).
- L’vov, A.S. (Львов, А.С.) “Чешско-моравская лексика в памятниках древнерусской письменности,” *Славянское языкознание* (Москва, 1968) 316–338.
- Maksimovich, K.A. (Максимович, К.А.) “Птица феникс в древнерусской литературе (К интерпретации образа),” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (Сб. 5; Москва, 1992) 316–334.
- Mihajlov, A.V. (Михайлов, А.В.) “Общий обзор состава, источников, редакций и литературных источников Толковой Палеи,” *Варшавские университетские известия* 7 (1895) 1–21.
- , “К вопросу о тексте Бытие пророка Моисея в Толковой Палеи,” *Варшавские университетские известия* 1 (1896) 1–23.

- , “К вопросу о происхождении и источниках Толковой Палеи,” *Известия по Русскому Языку и Словесности* 1 (1928) 49–80.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) “Религиозно-философское значение ‘Палеи Толковой,’” in: *Философские и богословские идеи в памятниках древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; Москва, 2000) 108–113.
- Panajotov, V.B. (Панайотов, В.Б.) *Апокриф “Заветы двенадцати патриархов” в контексте Толковой Палеи* (Москва, 1986).
- Piljavec, L.B. (Пилявец, Л.Б.) “‘Зерцало богословия’ Кирилла Транквиллиона-Старовецкого и ‘Палея Толковая,’” in: *Отечественная общественная мысль эпохи средневековья* (Киев, 1988) 245–250.
- Piotrovskaja, E.K. (Пиотровская, Е.К.) “Древнерусская версия ‘Христианской Топографии’ Козьмы Индикоплова и ‘Толковая Палея,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 48 (1993) 138–142.
- Porov, G.V. (Попов, Г.В.) “Миниатюры Псковской Палеи 1477 года (О некоторых аспектах развития рукописной иллюстрации Грозненского времени),” in: *Древнерусское искусство: исследования и атрибуции* (С.-Петербург, 1997) 325–341.
- Rarov, O. (Рапов, О.) “Кто создал русскую азбуку,” *Родина* 9 (1994) 26–33.
- Redin, E.K. (Редин, Е.К.) *Толковая лицевая палея XVI-го века собрания гр. А.С. Уварова* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 41; С.-Петербург, 1901).
- Rystenka, A.V. (Рыстенко, А.В.) *Материалы для литературной истории Толковой Палеи* (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1908).
- Santos-Otero, A. de. “Alttestamentliche Pseudepigrapha und die sogenannte ‘Tolkovaja Paleja,’” in: *Oecumenica et Patristica. FS W. Schneemelcher* (eds. D. Papandreou, W. A. Bienert, K. Schäferdieck, Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln, 1989) 107–122.
- Scheglov, A.P. (Щеглов, А.П.) “Религиозно-философское значение Толковой Палеи,” *Журнал историко-богословского общества* 2 (1991) 3–21.
- , *Философское содержание “Толковой Палеи” по материалам русских летописей* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1994).
- , “Комментарии к Толковой Палеи,” in: *Волишебная Гора: Философия, эзотеризм, культурология* (т. 7; Москва, 1998) 225–226.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Толковая Палея и русская летопись,” in: *Shahmatov, A.A. Статьи по славяноведению* (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1904) 199–272.
- Slavova, T. (Славова, Т.) “За протографа на Тълковната Палея,” *Старобългаристика/Palaebulgarica* 3 (1991) 64–66.
- , *Тълковната Палея в контекста на старобългарската книжнина* (София, 2002).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Летопись-Хроника-Палея: (взаимоотношения памятников и методика их исследования),” in: *Армянская и русская средневековые литературы* (Ереван, 1986) 19–30.

- , “Палея Толковая,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 285–288.
- , “К ранним русско-еврейским литературно-текстовым связям (XI–XVI вв.),” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (Москва, 1993) 46–54.
- , “Летопись-Хроника-Палея: (взаимоотношения памятников и методика их исследования),” in: *Библия и возрождение культуры русского и других славянских народов: К 80-летию Русской Северо-Западной Библиейской Комиссии (1915–1995)* (С.-Петербург, 1995) 166–179.
- , “Палеи,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 124–125.
- Uspenskij, V.M. (Успенский, В.М.) *Толковая Палея* (Казань, 1876).
- Vereshchagin, E.M. (Верещагин, Е.М.) *Христианская книжность Древней Руси* (Москва, 1996).
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “О Толковой Палее, Златой Матице и ‘естественно научных’ компиляциях,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 80–90.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000).
- , “Пророчество Соломона и Толковая Палея,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 52 (2001) 518–529.
- , “Историография и экзегеза (на материале Толковой Палеи и Пророчества Соломона),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003) 12–22.
- , “Новое о палеях (некоторые итоги и перспективы изучения палейных текстов),” *Русская литература* 1 (2007) 5.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 222–226; 384–388.
- Zavadskaja, S.V. (Завадская, С.В.) “Наблюдения над терминологией ветхозаветного сюжета о Моисее (по поводу соотношения ранний летописных и палейных текстов),” in: *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье* (Москва, 1993) 28–31.
- Zhdanov, I.N. (Жданов, И.Н.) “Палея,” *Университетские известия* 9 (1881) 255.

Palaea Chronographica
(Хронографическая Палея)

a. *Texts*

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Книги временныя и образныя Георгия Мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе* (3 vols.; Петроград, 1920–1930) 2.109–113.
- Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.*

- (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 204–208, 221–241.
- Rupin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [Paris, 1970]) 9–10, 20–21, 24–49, 51–58.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.17–18, 24–25, 254–258.
- Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1892).
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “Краткая Хронографическая Палея. Текст. Выпуск 1,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 57 (2006) 891–915.
- , “Краткая Хронографическая Палея (текст). Выпуск 2,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 534–556.

c. Research

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Палея в системе хронографического жанра,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 57 (2006) 25–32.
- , “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57.
- Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) “Этикетный мотив в древнерусской миниатюре XV в.,” in: *Исследования по древней и новой литературе* (Ленинград, 1987) 25–31.
- Borisov, A. Ja. (Борисов, А.Я.) “К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе,” *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.
- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) “Палея,” in: *Литературный энциклопедический словарь* (Москва, 1987) 265.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Редакции Толковой Палеи,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/4 (1905) 135–203; 11/1 (1906) 1–43.
- Karinskij, N. (Каринский, Н.) *Язык Пскова и его области в XV веке* (С.-Петербург, 1909) 1–62.
- Kloss, V.M. (Клосс, В.М.) “К вопросу о происхождении Еллинского летописца второго вида,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 370–379.
- Kotljар, N.F. (Котляр, Н.Ф.) “Грузинские сюжеты древнерусских летописей,” in: *Из истории украинско-грузинских связей* (Вып. 3; ed. Г.Г. Пайчадзе; Тбилиси, 1975) 7–19.
- Maslennikova, N.N. (Масленникова, Н.Н.) *Присоединение Пскова к Русскому централизованному государству* (Ленинград, 1955) 164–165.
- Porov, A.N. (Попов, А.Н.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 2; Москва, 1869).

- Protas'eva, T.N. (Протасьева, Т.Н.) "Псковская Палея 1477 года," *Древнерусское искусство: Художественная культура Пскова* (Москва, 1968) 97–108.
- Rybakov, V.A. (Рыбаков, В.А.) "Окна в исчезнувший мир," *Доклады и сообщения исторического факультета МГУ* (Вып. 4; Москва, 1946) 50–51.
- Shibaev, M.A. (Шибяев, М.А.) "Кодикологическое описание петербургских списков Краткой Хронографической Палеи," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 56 (2004) 146–163.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Повесть временных лет и Хронограф по великому изложению," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 28 (1974) 99–113.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975).
- , "Палея хронографическая," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.161–162.
- , "Летопись-Хроника-Палея: (взаимоотношения памятников и методика их исследования)," in: *Библия и возрождение культуры русского и других славянских народов: К 80-летию Русской Северо-Западной Библиейской Комиссии (1915–1995)* (С.-Петербург, 1995) 166–179.
- , "Палеи," in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 124–125.
- , *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001) 2.201–206.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) "Хронология русской хронографии, часть 1," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 49 (1996) 25–35.
- , "К вопросу об арабских наименованиях планет в древнерусской книжности," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 50 (1996) 677–683.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000).
- , "Редакции Краткой Хронографической Палеи," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 56 (2004) 164–180.
- , "Краткая Хронографическая Палея. Текст. Выпуск 1," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 57 (2006) 891–915.
- , "Краткая Хронографическая Палея: между историографией и богословием," *Вестник истории, литературы, искусства* (Т. 2. Москва, 2006) 233–243.
- , "Новое о палеях (некоторые итоги и перспективы изучения палейных текстов)," *Русская литература* 1 (2007) 3–23.
- , "Краткая Хронографическая Палея (текст). Выпуск 2," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 534–556.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 222–226; 337–353.

—, “Zu einer Rohfassung der Polnaja Chronograficeskaja Paleja und zum Verhältnis zwischen den verschiedenen Paleja-Redaktionen,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).

2.2. CHRONICLES

The Chronicle of George Syncellus (Хроника Георгия Синкелла)

c. Research

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Хроника Георгия Синкелла,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* август (1903) 381–414.
- , *Исследования в области древнерусской литературы* (С.-Петербург, 1906) 2–34.
- , *Очерк истории древнерусской литературы домосковского периода* (XI–XIII вв.) (Петроград, 1922) 85–88.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1978) 85–87.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Хроника Георгия Синкелла,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (XI – первая половина XIV в.) (Ленинград, 1987) 470–471.
- , “Хроника Георгия Синкелла в Древней Руси,” in: *Исследования по древней и новой литературе* (Ленинград, 1987) 215–219.
- , “Хроники,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический словарь* (Москва, 1996) 224–226.

The Chronicle of George the Monk (George Amartolos) (Хроника Георгия Амартола)

a. Texts

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Книги временныя и образныя Георгия Мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе* (3 vols.; Петроград, 1920–1930). [reprinted in: *Die Chronik des Georgios Hamartolos in altslavischer Übersetzung* (Slavische Propyläen, 135; München, 1972)].
- Matvienko, V.A., Shchegoleva L.I. (Матвиенко, В.А., Щеголева, Л.И.) “Временник Георгия Монаха (Хроника Георгия Амартола в славянском переводе XI в.). Кн. 1: Славянский текст. Русский перевод. Комментарий,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (Сб. 10; Москва, 2000) 644–717.
- , *Книги временныя и образныя Георгия Монаха* (2 vols.; Москва, 2006).

b. *Translations*

Matvienko, V.A., Shchegoleva, L.I. (Матвиенко, В.А., Щеголева, Л.И.) *Временник Георгия Монаха (Хроника Георгия Амартола): Русский текст, комментарий, указатели* (Москва, 2000).

c. *Research*

Afinogenov, D.E. (Афиногенов, Д.Е.) “Композиция Хроники Георгия Амартола,” *Византийский Временник* 52 (1991) 102–112.

—, “Представления Георгия Амартола об идеальном императоре,” in: *Византийские очерки* (Москва, 1991) 163–183.

—, “Об идейно-политической ориентации ‘Хроники’ Георгия Амартола,” *Византийские очерки* (Москва, 1996) 88–96.

Ajnalov, D.V. (Айналов, Д.В.) “Миниатюры древнейших рукописей в Музее Троице-Сергиевой лавры и на ее выставке,” in: *Краткий отчет о деятельности Общества древней письменности и искусства за 1917–1923 годы: С приложением статей проф. Д.В. Айналова и А.И. Лященко* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 190; Ленинград, 1925) 12–33.

—, “К истории древнерусской литературы. II. Иллюстрации к Хронике Георгия Амартола,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 3 (1936) 13–21.

Anisimova, T.V. (Анисимова, Т.В.) “Проблема датировки Троицкого списка Хроники Георгия Амартола,” in: *Румянцевские чтения: К 240-летию со дня рождения Н.П. Румянцева. Тезисы докладов и сообщений научно-практической конференции молодых специалистов (15 апреля 1994 г.)* (ч. 2; Москва, 1994) 46–49.

—, “К вопросу о датировке Троицкого списка Хроники Георгия Амартола,” in: *Россия в X–XVIII вв. Проблемы истории и источниковедения. Тезисы докладов и сообщений вторых чтений посвящённых памяти А.А. Зимины. Москва. 26–28 января 1995 г.* (Москва, 1995) 58–63.

—, “The Tver Manuscript of the Chronicle of Georgius the Monk: Inscriptions on the Frontispiece Illuminations and Marginalia,” in: *XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (Copenhagen, 1996) 8124.

—, “О трех малоизвестных списках Хроники Георгия Амартола из собрания Е.Е. Егорова (XV–XVI вв.),” in: *Опыты по источниковедению. Древнерусская книжность: Археография; Палеография; Кодикология* (С.-Петербург, 1999) 19–51.

—, “К вопросу о происхождении Эрмитажного списка Хроники Георгия Амартола,” in: *Букинистическая торговля и история книги. Межведомственный сборник научных трудов* (вып. 8; Москва, 2000) 26–40.

—, “О фрагментах Хроники Георгия Амартола в Успенском Сборнике рубежа XII–XIII вв. и в учительной части Пролога,” in: *Хризограф (Сборник статей к юбилею Г.З. Быковой)* (Москва, 2003) 44–56.

—, “Супрасльский список Хроники Георгия Амартола,” in: *Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка* (Москва, 2003) 192–227.

- , “Троицкий список Хроники Георгия Амартола (приписки на миниатюрах и на полях рукописи),” in: *Древнерусское искусство. Искусство рукописной книги. Византия. Древняя Русь* (С.-Петербург, 2004) 290–318.
- , “Об источнике Ефросиновского хронографа (по списку 70–80 гг. XV в. из собрания Г.Г. Юдина),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 98–110.
- , “Фрагмент Хроники Георгия Амартола хронографической редакции в двух списках: середины XV в. и рубежа XV–XVI в. ” in: *От аза до ижицы. Сборник научных статей в честь 70-летия доктора исторических наук И.В. Левочкина* (Москва, 2004) 62–70.
- , *Распространение и бытование древнерусских списков хроники Георгия Амартола в XIV–XVII веках* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2005).
- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) “Отрывок из Слова Григория Богослова в Изборнике Святослава 1073 года и Хронике Георгия Амартола,” in: *История русского языка и лингвистического источниковедения* (Москва, 1987).
- Durnovo, N. (Дурново, Н.) “К вопросу о национальности славянского переводчика Хроники Георгия Амартола,” *Slavia* 4.3 (1925) 801–815.
- Franklin, S. (Франклин, С.) “К вопросу о времени и месте перевода Хроники Георгия Амартола на русский язык,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 41 (1988) 324–330.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Греческий оригинал так называемого болгарского перевода Хроники Георгия Амартола,” *Византийский Временник* 13.1 (1906) 36–57.
- , “К изданию так называемого болгарского перевода Хроники Георгия Амартола,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 15.2 (1910) 222–240.
- , “Хроника Георгия Амартола в славянском переводе и связанные с нею памятники,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения май* (1917) 1–25.
- , “Толковая паляя и Хроника Георгия Амартола,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 29 (1924) 369–379.
- Kunik, A.A. (Куник, А.А.) “Разбор рукописного сочинения г. Ундольского под заглавием: Исследования о церковно-славянских хронографах, О современнике Георгия Амартола в отношении к Несторовой летописи,” in: *Двадцать пятое присуждение учрежденных П. Н. Демидовым наград* (т. 1; С.-Петербург, 1856) 71–84.
- Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) “Георгий Амартол в издании В. М. Истрина,” *Slavia* 4.3 (1925) 461–484; *Slavia* 5.4 (1926) 657–683.
- Mansvetov, I.D. (Мансветов, И.Д.) “Художественные и бытовые данные в славянской летописи Георгия Амартола из библиотеки Московской духовной академии,” *Труды V Археологического съезда в Тифлисе (1881)* (Москва, 1887) 161–169.
- Medvedev, I.P. (Медведев, И.П.) “Неизвестные страницы в ранней истории изучения славянорусской версии Хроники Георгия Амартола,”

- in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода "Переводной литературы" А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербурга 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).
- , "Неизвестный эпизод из ранней истории изучения славяно-русской версии Хроники Георгия Амартола," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 59 (2009) (forthcoming).
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1978) 70–79.
- Nikolova, S. (Николова, С.) "Хроника," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 547–548.
- , "Хроника на Георги Амартол," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 548–549.
- Obolenskij, M. (Оболенский, М.) "О греческом кодексе Георгия Амартола, хранящемся в Московской Синодальной библиотеке, и о сербском и болгарском переводах его Хроники," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4.4 (1846) 73–102.
- Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.) "О происхождении славянского перевода Хроники Георгия Амартола," in: *Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка* (Москва, 2002) 232–249.
- Podobedova, O.I. (Подобедова, О.И.) *Миниатюры русских исторических рукописей. К истории русского лицевого летописания* (Москва, 1963) 11–48.
- , *К истории создания Тверского списка хроники Георгия Амартола* (Москва, 1963).
- Rorov, A. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (вып. 1; Москва, 1866).
- Ranchin, A.M. (Ранчин, А.М.) *Вертоград Златословный. Древнерусская книжность в интерпретациях, разборах и комментариях* (Москва, 2007).
- Schegoleva, L.I. (Щеголева, Л.И.) "Примеры самовыражения переводчика в тексте славяно-русского перевода Хроники Георгия Амартола," in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (сб. 8; Москва, 1995) 204–228.
- , *Сюжетный рассказ в Хронике Георгия Амартола: проблема соотношений с источниками, древнерусская рецепция* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2003).
- , "Рассказ о происхождении порфиры-багряницы в Хронографии Иоанна Малалы и Хронике Георгия Амартола (сравнительный анализ)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 58–71.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) "Древнеболгарская энциклопедия X в.," *Византийский Временник* 7.1–2 (1900) 1–35.
- , "Повесть временных лет' и ее источники," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 4 (1940) 41–61.

- Snegirev, I. (Снегирев, И.) “Замечания о Георгии Амартоле,” *Труды и летописи Общества Истории и Древностей Российских* 5.1 (1830) 255–264.
- Stankov, R. (Станков, Р.) “Славянский перевод Хроники Георгия Амартола в издании В.М. Истрина,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 1 (1994) 74–88.
- Stroev, P. (Строев, П.) “О византийском источнике Нестора,” *Труды и летописи Общества Истории и Древностей Российских* 4.1 (1828) 167–183.
- Suhomlinov, M.I. (Сухомлинов, М.И.) *О древней русской летописи как памятнике литературном* (С.-Петербург, 1856) 85–106.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Беллетристические элементы в переводном историческом повествовании XI–XIII вв.,” in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 108–117.
- , “Повесть временных лет и Хронограф по великому изложению,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 28 (1974) 99–113.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 9–13, 98–110.
- , “Византийские хроники в Древней Руси,” in: *Русская и грузинская средневековые литературы* (Ленинград, 1979) 86–92.
- , “Материалы для истории русских хронографов. 2. Софийский хронограф и ‘Хроника Иоанна Малалы,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 188–221.
- , “Хроника Георгия Амартола,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 467–470.
- , “Хроники,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 224–226.
- , *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001) 2.141–146.
- Vasil’evskij, V. (Васильевский, В.) “Хроника Логофета на славянском и греческом,” *Византийский Временник* 2.1–2 (1895) 78–151.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Хроника Амартола в древнерусской литературе* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1990).
- , “Всемирная история в духовном мире древнерусского книжника. К вопросу литературного освоения хроники Амартола,” *Русская литература* 1 (1990) 144–148.
- , “Хроника Амартола в новонайденных списках,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 45 (1992) 322–332.
- , “К вопросу об источниках Русского Хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 47 (1993) 200–214.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000) 165–166.
- , “Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнерусской хронографии,” in: *Dem Freidenkenden: Zu Ehren von Dietrich Freydank* (Slavica Varia Halensia, 6; Münster, 2000) 307–323.

- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 211–212; 321–375.
- Vzdornov, G.I. (Вздорнов, Г.И.) “Иллюстрации к Хронике Георгия Амартола,” *Византийский Временник* 30 (1969) 205–225.
- , *Искусство книги в Древней Руси. Рукописная книга Северо-Восточной Руси XII—нач. XV в.* (Москва, 1980) 44–53.
- Weingart, M. *Byzantské kroniky v literaturě církevně-slovanské* (Bratislava, 1923).

The Chronicle of John Malalas
(Хроника Иоанна Малалы)

a. Texts

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Первая книга Хроники Иоанна Малалы,” *Записки императорской АН, Историко-филологическое отд.* 8.1.3 (1897) 1–29.
- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе: Книга вторая,” *Летопись Ист.-филол. о-ва при имп. Новорос. ун-те. Одесса. Визант.-славян. отд.* 7 (1902) 437–486.
- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе: Книга четвертая,” *Летопись Ист.-филол. о-ва при имп. Новорос. ун-те. Одесса. Визант.-славян. отд.* 8 (1905) 342–367.
- , “Пятая книга Хроники Иоанна Малалы,” *Летопись Ист.-филол. о-ва при имп. Новорос. ун-те. Одесса. Визант.-славян. отд.* 9.2 (1910) 1–51.
- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе: Книги шестая и седьмая,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 89.3 (1912).
- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе: Книги восьмая и девятая,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 89.7 (1912).
- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе: Книги одиннадцатая – четырнадцатая,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 90.2 (1914).
- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе: Книги пятнадцатая – восемнадцатая и Приложения,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 91.2 (1915).
- , *Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе* (reprinted edition; ed. М.И. Чернышева; Москва, 1994).
- Kalajdovich, K. (Калайдович, К.) *Иоанн екзарх Болгарский* (Москва, 1824) 178–188.

c. *Research*

- Abramovich, D.I. (Абрамович, Д.И.) “Отрывок Хроники Иоанна Малалы в Златоструе XII в.,” in: *Сб. статей в честь акад. А. И. Соболевского. Статьи по славян. филол. и рус. словесности* (Ленинград, 1928) 19–24.
- Andreev, I. (Андреев, И.) “Иоанн Малала,” in: *Православная Богословская Энциклопедия* (12 томов; С.-Петербург, 1905) 6.997–1000.
- Chernysheva, M.I. (Чернышева, М.И.) “Замечания о приемах перевода портретной лексики из ‘Хроники’ Иоанна Малалы,” in: *История русского языка: Памятники XI–XVIII вв.* (Москва, 1982) 57–66.
- , “О соотношениях славянского перевода ‘Хроники Иоанна Малалы’ и ее греческого текста: (На материале портретной лексики),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 222–228.
- , “К характеристике славянского перевода ‘Хроники Иоанна Малалы.’ (Роль иноязычных выражений),” *Византийский Временник* 44 (1983) 221–226.
- , “Греческие слова, способы их адаптации и функционирования в славянском переводе Хроники Иоанна Малалы,” in: Istrin, V.M. (Истрин В.М.) *Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе* (ed. М.И. Чернышева; Москва, 1994) 402–462.
- Derjugin, A.A. (Дерюгин, А.А.) “Вергилий в древнем славянском переводе Хроники Иоанна Малалы,” in: *Античность и Византия* (Москва, 1975) 351–362.
- Hripkov, V.F. (Хрипков, В.Ф.) “‘Хроника Иоанна Малалы’ в составе Тихонравовского хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 45 (1992) 333–350.
- Istrin, V.I. (Истрин, В.И.) “Хронограф Ипатского списка летописи под 1114 годом,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* ноябрь (1897) 83–91.
- Kajmakova, M. (Каймакамова, М.) *Българска средновековна историопис* (София, 1990) 164–168.
- Ljubarskij, Ja.N. (Любарский, Я.Н.) “Герои ‘Хронографии’ Иоанна Малалы,” *Кавказ и Византия* (Вып. 6; Ереван, 1988).
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “К вопросу о датировке Виленского хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 11 (1955) 380–386.
- , “Два неизданных отрывка древнеславянского перевода ‘Хроники’ Иоанна Малалы,” *Византийский Временник* 11 (1956) 279–284.
- , *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1978) 79–85.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Милюков, В.В.) “Сведения об античности и античной философии в древнерусской Хронике Иоанна Малалы,” in: *Древняя Русь: Пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 42–56.
- Nikolova, S. (Николова, С.) “Някои текстологически проблеми в панегиричното творчество на Климент Охридски,” *Кирило-Методиевски студии* 1 (1984) 115–117.

- , “Хроника,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 547–548.
- , “Хроника на Йоан Малала,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 550–551.
- Obolenskij, M.A. (Оболенский, М.А.) “Летописец Переяславля Суздальского,” *Временник Общества Истории и Древностей Российских* 9 (1851) VI–С.
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) “К вопросу об Ипатьевской летописи,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 31 (1926) 97–115.
- Роров, А. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (вып. 1; Москва, 1866) 1–95.
- Samutkina, L.A. (Самуткина, Л.А.) *Концепция истории в “Хронографии” Иоанна Малалы* (Иваново, 2001).
- Schegoleva, L.I. (Шеголева, Л.И.) “Рассказ о происхождении порфиры-багряницы в Хронографии Иоанна Малалы и Хронике Георгия Амартола (сравнительный анализ),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 58–71.
- Shestakov, S. (Шестаков, С.) “Иоанн Ритор,” *Ученые записки императорского Казанского университета* 5 (1890) 97–132.
- , “О значении славянского перевода Хроники Малалы для восстановления и исправления ее греческого текста,” *Византийский Временник* 1.3–4 (1894) 503–552.
- , “Прибавления к статье ‘О значении славянского перевода Малалы,’” *Византийский Временник* 2.3 (1895) 372–377.
- Shustorovich Ye.M. (Шусторович, Э.М.) “Древнеславянский перевод Хроники Иоанна Малалы: (История изучения),” *Византийский Временник* 30 (1966) 136–152.
- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы и античная традиция в древнерусской литературе,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 23 (1968) 62–70.
- , “Об одном отрывке из древнеславянского перевода Хроники Иоанна Малалы,” *Науч. докл. ВШ. Филол. Науки* 6 (1970) 105–110.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “Забелинский список Хронографа с Малалой,” in: *Сб. статей к 40-летию ученой деятельности акад. А. С. Орлова* (Ленинград, 1934) 75–81.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Беллетристические элементы в переводном историческом повествовании XI–XIII вв.,” in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 117–124.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975).
- , “Античные мифы в древнерусской литературе XI–XVI веков,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1977) 3–31.
- , “Материалы к истории русских хронографов. 2. Софийский хронограф и ‘Хроника Иоанна Малалы,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 188–221.

- , “Хроника Иоанна Малалы,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 471–474.
- , “Хроники,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Биобиблиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 224–226.
- , *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001) 2.146–152.
- Udal'cova, Z.V. (Удальцова, З.В.) “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в Киевской Руси,” in: *Археографический Ежегодник за 1965 г.* (Москва, 1966) 47–58.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 232–234.

The Chronicle of John Zonaras
(Хроника Иоанна Зонары)

a. *Texts*

- Vodjanskij, O. (Бодянский, О.) “Паралипомен Зонарин,” in: *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 1 (1847).
- Jacobs, A. *ΖΩΝΑΡΑΣ-Зонара: Die byzantinische Geschichte bei Joannes Zonaras in slavischer Übersetzung* (Slavische Propyläen, 98; München, 1970).
- Kačanovskij, V. “Iz srbsko-slovenskoga prievoda bizantinskoga ljetopisa Joanna Zonare,” *Starine* 14 (1882) 125–172.

c. *Research*

- Chernoglazov, D.A. (Черноглазов, Д.А.) “Хроника Иоанна Зонары и ее источники (IX–XI века),” *Византийский временник* 63 (2004) 137–155.
- , *Хроника Иоанна Зонары и ее источники. Методы работы Зонары-историографа* (Ph.D. diss.; Петербург, 2006)
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов* (Москва, 1893) 281–282.
- Kajmakamova, M. (Каймакамова, М.) *Българска средновековна историопис* (София, 1990) 173–178.
- Lavrov, P. (Лавров, П.) “Югославянская переделка Зонары,” *Византийский Временник* 4.3–4 (1897) 452–460.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1978) 87–89.
- Nikolova, S. (Николова, С.) “Хроника,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 547–548.
- , “Хроника на Йоан Зонара,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 549–550.

- Роров, А. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 1; Москва, 1866) 111–225; (Вып. 2; Москва, 1869) 9–15.
- Rotarov, P.I. (Потапов, П.И.) “Судьба хроники Зонары в славянорусской литературе,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 22.2 (1918) 141–186.
- Rozanov, S.P. (Розанов, С.П.) “Заметки по вопросу о русских хронографах,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* январь (1904) 104–106.
- , “Хронограф Западнорусской редакции: К вопросу о его издании,” *Летопись Занятий Археографической Комиссии за 1912 г.* (Вып. 25; С.-Петербург, 1913) 10, 16.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “К вопросу о происхождении хронографа,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 66.8 (1899) 15.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 44, 181–183, 197–198, 201.
- , “Хроника Иоанна Зонары,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.492–494.
- , “Хроники,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 224–226.
- Weingart, M. *Byzantské kroniky v literatuře cirkevňeslovanské* (Bratislava, 1922) 84–159.

The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses
(Хроника Константина Манассии)

a. *Texts*

- Dujchev, I.S. (Дуйчев, И.С.) et al. *Среднеболгарский перевод хроники Константина Манассии в славянских литературах* (София, 1988) 106–254.
- Salmina, M.A., Tvorogov, O.V. (Салмина, М.А., Творогов, О.В.) “Из Хроники Константина Манассии,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. Первая половина XVI в.* (Москва, 1984) 268–317, 693–700.
- , “Из Хроники Константина Манассии,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 9.114–159.
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) “Из истории романа и повести. Вып. II, Славяно-романский отдел,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 44.3 (1888) 101–118.

c. *Research*

- Vujukliev, I. (Буюклиев, И.) “Манасиевата Хроника и средновековното езиково и литературно съзнание,” *Старобългарска литература* 10 (1981) 52–58.

- Chertkov, A.D. (Чертков, А.Д.) “О переводе Манассиной летописи на словенский язык,” *Русский исторический сборник* 6.1–2 (1843) 1–183.
- Dujčev, I.S. (Дуйчев, И.С.) “Одна цитата из Манасиевой хроники в среднеболгарском переводе,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 16 (1960) 647–649.
- , *Летописца на Константин Манаси* (София, 1963).
- Dujčev, I.S. (Дуйчев, И.С.) et al. *Среднеболгарский перевод хроники Константина Манассии в славянских литературах* (София, 1988).
- Lazarevskij, A.M. (Лазаревский, А.М.) “Записка о Русском хронографе,” *Известия по Отделению Русского Языка и Словесности* 8.5 (1860) 384–390.
- , “К записке о Русском хронографе,” *Известия по Отделению Русского Языка и Словесности* 9.2 (1860) 115–127.
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Русские летописи и их культурно-историческое значение* (Москва-Ленинград, 1947) 337–346.
- , *Человек в литературе Древней Руси* (Москва-Ленинград, 1956) 92–99.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1978) 89–93.
- Mihăilă, Gh. “О некоторых произведениях византийской литературы в славяно-румынских сборниках,” *Syriomethodianum* 5 (1981) 90–112.
- Nikolova, S. (Николова, С.) “Хроника,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 547–548.
- , “Хроника на Константин Манасий,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 551–552.
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) “Хронограф и ‘Повесть о Казанском царстве,’” *Сборник статей в честь академика А. И. Соболевского* (Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук, 101.3; Ленинград, 1928) 188–193.
- Porov, A. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 1; Москва, 1866) 99–186; (Вып. 2; Москва, 1869) 4–7, 18–19.
- Salmîna, M.A. (Салмина, М.А.) “‘Ентинарий’ в ‘Повести о зачале Москвы,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 15 (1958) 362–363.
- , “Источники ‘Повести о зачале Москвы,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 16 (1960) 245–247.
- , *Повести о начале Москвы* (Москва-Ленинград, 1964) 44–46, 65–68.
- , “Новонайденные тексты Хроники Константина Манассии,” in: *Культурное наследие Древней Руси: Истоки. Становление. Традиции* (Москва-Ленинград, 1976) 355–359.
- , “Хроника Константина Манассии как источник Русского хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1977) 279–287.
- , “Хроника Константина Манассии и литературный стиль XVI в. на Руси,” in: *Русская и грузинская средневековая литература* (Ленинград, 1979) 99–104.

- , “Хроника Константина Манассии и стиль ‘второго монументализма’ на Руси,” in: *Българско Средновековие: Българско-съветски сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. Иван Дуйчев* (София, 1980) 260–262.
- , “Хроника Константина Манассии,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.494–496.
- Shambinago, S.K. (Шамбинаго, С.К.) “Повести о начале Москвы,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 3 (1936) 73–75.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “К истории жанра Хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 206–220.
- , *Троянские сказания: Средневековые рыцарские романы о Троянской войне по русским рукописям XVI–XVII вв.* (Лит. Памятники; Ленинград, 1972) 151–152, 162–166.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 180–181, 196–200.
- , “Античные мифы в древнерусской литературе XI–XVI вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1977) 16–22.
- , “Хроники,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 224–226.
- Vasenko, P.G. (Васенко, П.Г.) “Заметки к статьям о Смуте, включенным в хронограф редакции 1617 года,” in: *Сборник статей по русской истории, посвященных С.Ф. Платонову* (Петроград, 1922) 248–269.

The Chronicle of Simeon Logothetes
(Хроника Симеона Логофета)

a. *Texts*

- Sreznevskij, V.I. (Срезневский, В.И.) *Симеона Метафраста и Логофета Описание мира от бытия и летописи собран от различных летописцев; Славянский перевод Хроники Симеона Логофета с дополнениями* (С.-Петербург, 1905).

c. *Research*

- Dujchev, I. (Дуйчев, И.) *Из старата българска книжнина* (1; София, 1940) 118–140.
- Nikolova, S. (Николова, С.) “Хроника,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 547–548.
- , “Хроника на Симеон Логотет,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 552.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Хроника Симеона Логофета,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 474–475.
- , “Хроники,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 224–226.

- Vasil'evskij, V.G. (Васильевский, В.Г.) “Хроника Логофета на славянском и греческом,” *Византийский Временник* 2.1–2 (1895) 78–151.
- Zlatanova, R. (Златанова, Р.) “Хрониката на Симеон Логотет и отношението и към реформата на търновските книжовници,” *Търновска книжовна школа* 4 (1985) 204–222.
- Zlatarski, V. (Златарски, В.) “Известията за българите в хрониката на Симеона Метафраста и Логотета,” *Сборник на народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* 24 (1908) 3–161.

2.3. CHRONOGRAPHS

Chronograph po Velikomu Izlozheniju (Хронограф по Великому Изложению)

c. Research

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Редакции Толковой палеи* (С.-Петербург, 1907) 36, 111–175.
- , *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе* (Петроград, 1922) 2.380–392.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Повесть временных лет’ и ее источники,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 4 (1940) 72–80.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Повесть временных лет и Хронограф по великому изложению,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 28 (1974) 99–113.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 20–24, 46–73; 107–109, 141–144.
- , “Хронограф по великому изложению,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 476–477.
- , “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.
- , *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001) 2.152–159.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000) 166–172.
- , “Хронология русской хронографии. Часть 3,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 52 (2001) 79–97.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 212–220.

Russian Chronograph
(*Русский Хронограф*)

a. *Texts*

- Amfilohij (Амфилохий, епископ Угличский) *Летописец, списанный св. Дмитрием в Украине с готового 2-й редакции до 1617 г.* (Москва, 1892).
- Роров, А. (Попов, А.) *Изборник славянских и русских сочинений и статей, внесенных в хронографы русской редакции* (Москва, 1869).
- Russkij, "Русский хронограф: Хронограф редакции 1512 года," *Полное собрание русских летописей* (Т. 22, ч. 1; С.-Петербург, 1911).
- , "Русский хронограф: Хронограф Западнорусской редакции," *Полное собрание русских летописей* (Т. 22, ч. 2; С.-Петербург, 1914).
- Stat'i, "Статьи о Смуте, извлеченные из Хронографа 1617 года, и отповедь в защиты патриарха Гермогена," in: *Памятники древней русской письменности, относящиеся к Смутному времени* (2-е изд.; С.-Петербург, 1909) 1273–1322.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Из Хронографа 1512 года," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. Конец XV – первая половина XVI века* (Москва, 1984) 376–415, 716–723.
- , "Из хронографа редакции 1617 года," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. Конец XVI – начало XVII века* (Москва, 1987) 318–357.

c. *Research*

- Gorina, L.V. (Горина, Л.В.) "Антиеретические сочинения Евфимия Тырновского в Русском хронографе редакции 1512 г.: К истории болгаро-русских культурных связей конца XIV – нач. XVI в.," in: *Балканские исследования: Проблемы истории и культуры* (Москва, 1976) 265–274.
- , "О болгарских материалах в Русском хронографе редакции 1512 г.," in: *Българско средновековие: Българосъветски сборник в чест на 70-годишната на проф. Иван Дуйчев* (София, 1980) 265–269.
- , "История принятия христианства в Болгарии в Русском хронографе," in: *Вопросы истории славян* (вып. 14; ed. Н.П. Мананчикова; Воронеж, 1999) 117–125.
- , "Завоевание Болгарии Византией (конец X – начало XI в.) в Русском хронографе," in: *Македония: проблемы истории и культуры* (ed. Р.П. Гришина; Москва, 1999) 46–58.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов: Исследование и текст* (Москва, 1893) 252–316.
- Jagić, V. "Ein Beitrag zur serbischen Annalistik mit literaturgeschichtlicher Einleitung," *Archiv für slavische Philologie* (Bd 2; Berlin, 1877) 69–74.
- Kloss, V.M. (Клосс, В.М.) "О времени создания Русского хронографа," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 26 (1971) 244–255.

- , “Иосифо-Волоколамский монастырь и летописание конца XV – первой половины XVI в.,” in: *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины* (Т. 6; Ленинград, 1974) 115–126.
- , *Никоновский свод и русские летописи XVI–XVII веков* (Москва, 1980) 157–177.
- Lazarevskij, A.M. (Лазаревский, А.М.) “Записка о Русском хронографе,” *Известия по Отделению Русского Языка и Словесности* 8.5 (1860) 384–390.
- , “К записке о Русском хронографе,” *Известия по Отделению Русского Языка и Словесности* 9.2 (1860) 115–137.
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Русские летописи и их культурно-историческое значение* (Москва-Ленинград, 1947) 331–350.
- , *Человек в литературе Древней Руси* (Москва-Ленинград, 1958) 13–24, 90–99.
- Muĭnikov, A.S. (Мыльников, А.С.) “Отзвуки легенды о Палемоне в русском Хронографе: К вопросу о взаимосвязях литовской, западнославянской и русской этногенетических легенд,” in: *Курьер Петровской Кунсткамеры* (вып. 6–7; С.-Петербург, 1997) 34–40.
- Naumov, E.P. (Наумов, Е.П.) “Свидетельства Сербских летописей в составе Русского хронографа (К истории русско-сербских культурных связей XV в.),” *Советское славяноведение* 4 (1976) 44–56.
- , “Сербские главы и разделы Русского хронографа: (Итоги и задачи исследования сербских источников Хронографа редакции 1512 г.),” in: *Русско-балканские культурные связи в эпоху средневековья* (София, 1982) 102–122.
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) “Хронограф и ‘Повесть о Казанском царстве,’” in: *Сборник статей в честь акад. А. И. Соболевского: Статьи по славянской филологии и русской словесности* (Ленинград, 1928) 188–193.
- Platonov, S.F. (Платонов, С.Ф.) *Древнерусские сказания и повести о Смутном времени XVII века как исторический источник* (2-е изд. С.-Петербург, 1913) 80–103, 418–420.
- Pliguzov, A.I. (Плигузов, А.И.) “Противостояние митрополичьей и вассиановской кормчих накануне судебного заседания 1531 года,” in: *Исследования по источниковедению истории СССР дооктябрьского периода* (Москва, 1985) 40–43.
- Pokrovskaja, V.F. (Покровская, В.Ф.) “Об одном списке русского хронографа редакции 1512 г.,” in: *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины* (сб. 3; Ленинград, 1970) 252–268.
- Porov, A. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 1; Москва, 1866) 95–215.
- , “Библиографические материалы: Хронографы Московского Чудова монастыря,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* (Кн. 3; С.-Петербург, 1889).
- Rozanov, S.P. (Розанов, С.П.) “Заметки по вопросу о русских хронографах,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* январь (1904) 92–136.

- , “Житие сербского деспота Стефана Лазаревича и Русский хронограф,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 11.2 (1906) 62–97.
- , “Хронограф редакции 1512 г.: К вопросу об издании Хронографа,” *Летопись Занятий Археографической Комиссии* (Вып. 18; С.-Петербург, 1907) 1–16.
- , “Хронограф западнорусской редакции: К вопросу об его издании,” *Летопись Занятий Археографической Комиссии* (Вып. 25; С.-Петербург, 1913) 1–20.
- , “Время составления первоначальной редакции русского Хронографа,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 30 (1926) 311–322.
- Ruvargas, I. (Руварац, И.) “О Цароставнику или цароставним књигама, с погледом на важност њихову за српску повестницу,” *Летопис Матице Српке* (Т. 115; Нови-Сад, 1873) 38–43.
- , *Зборник Илариона Руварца* (Београд, 1934) 53–59.
- Rybin, V.A., Tvorogov, O.V. (Рыбин, В.А., Творогов, О.В.) “Материалы к классификации списков Русского хронографа,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (Вып. 2, ч. 1; Москва, 1976) 140–156.
- Salmina, M.A. (Салмина, М.А.) “Хроника Константина Манассии как источник Русского хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 32 (1977) 279–287.
- , “Античные мифы в Хронографе 1617 г.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 311–317.
- Sedel'nikov, A.D. (Седельников, А.Д.) “Досифей Топорков и Хронограф,” *Изв. АН СССР. VII сер. Отд. гуманитарных наук* 9 (1929) 755–773.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Пахомий Логофет и Хронограф,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* январь (1899) 200–207.
- , “Путешествие Г. М. Мисюря Мунехина на Восток и Хронограф редакции 1512 г.,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 4.1 (1899) 200–222.
- , “К вопросу о происхождении Хронографа,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности имп. Академии наук* 66.8 (1899).
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “Сербские хронографы и русский Первой редакции,” *Русский Филологический Вестник* 35.1 (1896) 1–18.
- Turilov, A.A. (Турилов, А.А.) “Был ли сербом составитель Русского хронографа?” in: *Вопросы источниковедения и историографии истории досоветского периода* (Москва, 1979) 55–62.
- , “К вопросу о болгарских источниках Русского хронографа,” in: *Летописи и хроники: Сб. статей* (Москва, 1984) 20–24.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “О Хронографе редакции 1617 г.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 25 (1970) 162–177.
- , “Русский хронограф и задачи его изучения,” in: *Пути изучения древнерусской литературы и письменности* (Ленинград, 1970) 48–55.

- , “К изучению древнерусских хронографических сводов (II. О происхождении Хронографа западнорусской редакции),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 393–404.
- , “К истории жанра хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 203–226.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 32–45, 160–234.
- , “Хронограф Русский,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.499–505.
- , “Хронограф Русский,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 226–227.
- , “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.
- Vasenko, P.G. (Васенко, П.Г.) “Заметки к статьям о Смуте, включенным в Хронограф редакции 1617 года,” in: *Сборник статей по русской истории, посвященных С. Ф. Платонову* (Петроград, 1922) 248–269.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “К вопросу об источниках Русского хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 47 (1993) 200–214.
- , “О людѣхъ дивиихъ древнерусских хронографов,” *Русская литература* 3 (1998) 131–147.
- Ziborov, V.K. (Зиборов, В.К.) “О выкладке лет в Русском хронографе,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 411–412.
- Zhurova, L.I. (Журова, Л.И.) “‘Повесть умильна о взятии Царьграда турками в 1453 г.’ в составе русского временника (К вопросу о связях Русского Хронографа и Русского Временника),” in: *Источники по истории общественного сознания и литературы периода феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1991) 5–12.

Troickij Chronograph
(Троицкий Хронограф)

c. Research

- Kloss, V.M. (Клосс, В.М.) “Книги, редактированные и писанные Иваном Черным,” *Зап. Отд. Рук. ГБЛ* 32 (1971) 60–72.
- Lihachev, N.P. (Лихачев, Н.П.) *Палеографическое значение бумажных водяных знаков* (т. 1; С.-Петербург, 1899) 293.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Древнеболгарская энциклопедия X в.,” *Византийский Временник* 7 (1900) 11–15.
- , “Начальный Киевский летописный свод и его источники,” in: *Юбилейный сборник в честь Всеволода Федоровича Миллера, изданный его учениками и почитателями* (Москва, 1900) 3–4.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 46–97.

- , “Материалы к истории русских хронографов. 1. Ефросиновский хронограф,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 32 (1977) 256–274.
- , “Хронограф Троицкий,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 478.
- , “Материалы к истории русских хронографов. 3. Троицкий хронограф,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 42 (1989) 287–343.
- , “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеиноного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000) 172–174.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеиноного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 221–225; 321–337.

Letopisec Ellinskij i Rimskij
(Летописец Еллинский и Римский)

a. *Texts*

- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001).

c. *Research*

- Bobrov, A.G. (Бобров, А.Г.) “К вопросу о времени и месте создания Летописца Еллинского и Римского второй редакции,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литератур* 55 (2004) 82–90.
- Davydova, S.A. (Давыдова, С.А.) “Сказание о св. Софии цареградской” в Летописце Еллинском и Римском,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литератур* 52 (1996) 561–566.
- Gorina, L.V. (Горина, Л.В.) “Именник болгарских ханов в составе еллинского летописца первой редакции,” *Bulgarian Historical Review* 3 (1991) 93–96.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Один только перевод Псевдокаллисфена, а древнеболгарская энциклопедия X века – мнимая,” *Византийский Временник* 10.1–2 (1903) 23, 26–30.
- , “К вопросу о взаимоотношении Еллинских летописцев и Архивного (Иудейского) хронографа,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 16.4 (1912) 125–142.
- Kloss, V.M. (Клосс, В.М.) “Книги, редактированные и писанные Иваном Черным,” *Записки Отдела рукописей ГБЛ* 32 (1971) 61–72.
- , “К вопросу о происхождении Еллинского летописца второго вида,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литератур* 27 (1972) 370–379.

- Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Заметки о языке летописца Еллинского и Римского Второй редакции,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 91–97.
- Kuchkin, V.A. (Кучкин, В.А.) “Один из источников Еллинского летописца второго вида,” *Византийский Временник* 27 (1967) 319–324.
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) “Еллинский летописец второго вида и правительственные круги Москвы конца XV в.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 6 (1948) 100–110.
- Porov, A (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 1; Москва, 1866) 1–95.
- , “Библиографические материалы. Хронографы Московского Чудова монастыря,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3 (1889) 1–72.
- Rukov, Ju.D. (Рыков, Ю.Д.) “Новонайденный фрагмент летописца Еллинского и Римского второй редакции,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 71–81.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Древнеболгарская энциклопедия X века,” *Византийский Временник* 7.1–2 (1900) 1–35.
- Taube, M. “О генезисе одного рассказа в составе ‘Еллинского летописца’ второй редакции (‘О взятии Иерусалима Титом’),” in: *Russian Literature and History* (Jerusalem, 1989) 145–150.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “К изучению древнерусских хронографических сводов. I. Редакции Еллинского летописца,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 380–393.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 24–32, 111–159, 274–304.
- , “Новонайденный список летописца Еллинского и Римского,” in: *Материалы и сообщения по фондам Отдела рукописной и редкой книги*. 1985 (Ленинград, 1987) 51–55.
- , “Летописец Еллинский и Римский,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.18–20.
- , “Летописец Еллинский и Римский,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 100–101.
- , “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.
- , “Летописец Еллинский и Римский: текстологические проблемы,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 52 (2001) 47–78.
- , *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001) 2.117–201.
- Vilinskij, S. (Вилинский, С.) “Сказание о Софии Цареградской в Еллинском летописце и в Хронографе,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 8.3 (1903) 1–43.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000) 177–181.

—, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 226–231; 353–367.

Arhivskij Chronograph
(Архивский Хронограф)

a. *Texts*

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов* (Москва, 1893) 124–138, 317–361 (fragments).

Kalajdovich, K.F. (Калайдович, К.Ф.) *Иоанн экзарх Болгарский* (Москва, 1824) 99–100, 178–188 (fragments).

c. *Research*

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “К вопросу о взаимоотношениях Еллинских Летописцев и Архивского (Иудейского) хронографа,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Академии наук* 16.4 (1912) 125–142.

—, *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе* (т. 2; Петроград, 1922) 75–96, 393–404.

Obolenskij, M. (Оболенский, М.) *Летописец Переяславля Суздальского, составленный в начале XIII века (между 1214 и 1219 гг.)* (Москва, 1851).

Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) “К вопросу об Ипатьевской летописи,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 31 (1926) 93–126.

—, “О Галицко-Волынском летописании,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 5 (1947) 24–35.

Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Древнеболгарская энциклопедия X века,” *Византийский Временник* 7.1–2 (1900) 15–18, 21, 30–35.

Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Хронограф Архивский,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 475–476.

—, “Заветы двенадцати патриархов,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 183–184.

—, “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.

Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000) 181–182.

—, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 232–233; 367–370.

Sofijskij Chronograph
(Софийский Хронограф)

a. *Texts*

Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Материалы к истории русских хронографов: 2. Софийский хронограф и ‘Хроника Иоанна Малалы,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 188–221.

c. *Research*

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Краткий хронограф с Хроникой Иоанна Малалы,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* Ноябрь (1903) 167–185.

—, *Исследования в области древнерусской литературы* (С.-Петербург, 1906) 52–70.

Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Хронограф Софийский,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.505–506.

—, “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.

Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеяного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000) 182–185.

—, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеяного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 233–236; 370–375.

Vilenskij Chronograph
(Виленский Хронограф)

c. *Research*

Dobrzanski, F. (Добрянский, Ф.) *Описание рукописей Виленской публичной библиотеки, церковнославянских и русских* (Вильно, 1882) 246–255.

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов* (Москва, 1893) 124–138, 317–347.

Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “К вопросу о датировке Виленского хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 11 (1953) 380–386.

—, “*История Иудейской войны*” Иосифа Флавия в древнерусском переводе (Москва-Ленинград, 1958) 21–30, 167–467.

Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Античные мифы в древнерусской литературе XI–XVI вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1977) 26–29.

—, “Хронограф Виленский,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 476.

- , “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеяного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 147; 233.

Akademicheskij Chronograph
(Академический Хронограф)

c. Research

- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “‘Хронограф’ Академии наук 45.13.4,” *Летопись Историко-филологического общества при Новороссийском университете. Т. 13. Византийско-славянский отдел* (Т. 8; Одесса, 1905) 313–341.
- , *Книги временныя и образныя Георгия Мниха: Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славяно-русском переводе* (Т. 2; Петроград, 1922) 404–408.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “‘Рыдание’ Иоанна Евгеника и его древнерусский перевод,” *Византийский Временник* 7 (1953) 78–79.
- , “К вопросу об изучении переводной письменности киевского периода,” *Ученые записки Карело-Финского педагогического института* (Т. 2, вып. 1; Петрозаводск, 1956) 204–206.
- , “*История Иудейской войны*” Иосифа Флавия в древнерусском переводе (Москва-Ленинград, 1958) 16, 141–142.
- , “К истории текста славянской книги Еноха,” *Византийский Временник* 24 (1964) 91–108.
- , “К вопросу о составе и источниках Академического хронографа,” *Летописи и хроники. 1973 г.* (Москва, 1974) 212–219.
- Sreznevskij, V.I. (Срезневский, В.И.) “Отчет о поездке в Олонецкую, Вологодскую и Пермскую губернии,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 8.4 (1903) 109–123.
- Tihomirov, M.N. (Тихомиров, М.Н.) *Краткие заметки о летописных произведениях в рукописных собраниях Москвы* (Москва, 1962) 69, 161–174.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 75–76.
- , “Хронограф Академический,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.498–499.
- , “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.

Tihonravovskij Chronograph
(Тихонравовский Хронограф)

a. *Texts*

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе. Книги пятнадцатая – восемнадцатая и приложения,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 91.2 (1915) 49–52.

c. *Research*

Hripkov, V.F. (Хрипков, В.Ф.) “‘Хроника Иоанна Малалы’ в составе Тихонравовского хронографа,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 45 (1992) 333–350.

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Особый вид Еллинского летописца из собрания Тихонравова,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 17.3 (1912) 1–30

Tvorigov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 65–94.

—, “Хронограф Тихонравовский,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.506.

—, “Хронографы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 227–229.

2.4. OTHER COMPILATIONS AND WORKS

Povest' Vremennyh Let
(Повесть Временных Лет)

a. *Texts*

Ipat'evskaja, *Ипатъевская летопись* (С.-Петербург, 1843).

Ipat'evskaja, *Ипатъевская летопись* (2-е изд.; С.-Петербург, 1908 [Москва, 1962]) 1–285.

Lavrent'evskaja, *Лаврентъевская и Троицкая летописи* (С.-Петербург, 1846) 1–123.

Lavrent'evskaja, *Лаврентъевская летопись: Повесть временных лет* (2-е изд.; Ленинград, 1926 [Москва, 1962, 1997]).

Letopis', *Летопись Нестерова по древнейшему списку мниха Лаврентия* (Москва, 1824).

Letopis', *Летопись по Лаврентъевскому списку* (С.-Петербург, 1872) 1–274.

Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Повесть временных лет. Ч. 1. Текст и перевод* (Литературные Памятники; Москва-Ленинград, 1950).

—, “Повесть временных лет,” in: *Повести Древней Руси* (Москва, 2002) 45–302.

Povest', *Повесть временных лет по Лаврентъевскому списку* (С.-Петербург, 1872).

- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) *Повесть временных лет, т. 1. Вводная часть. Текст. Примечания* (Петроград, 1916).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Повесть временных лет,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XI – 1-я пол. XII в.* (Москва, 1978) 22–277, 418–451.
- , “Повесть временных лет,” in: *Повести Древней Руси XI–XII вв.* (Ленинград, 1983) 23–227, 524–548.
- , “Повесть временных лет,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 1.62–315.

b. Translations

- Cross, S.H. et al. *The Russian Primary Chronicle* (Cambridge, 1953).
- Leger, L. *Chronique dite de Nestor* (Paris, 1884).
- Norrback, A. *Nestorkrönikan översättning från fornryskan av A. Norrback* (Stockholm, 1919).
- Pora-Lisseanu, G. *Cronica lui Nestor* (București, 1935).
- Prokof 'ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 106–119.
- Russkie, *Русские летописи XI–XVI веков. Избранное* (ed. А.Г. Бобров; С.-Петербург, 2006) 22–173.
- Trautmann, R. *Die altrussische Nestorchronik* (Leipzig, 1931).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Повесть временных лет,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XI – 1-я пол. XII в.* (Москва, 1978) 22–277, 418–451.
- , “Повесть временных лет,” in: *Повести Древней Руси XI–XII вв.* (Ленинград, 1983) 23–227, 524–548.
- , “Повесть временных лет,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 1.62–315.

c. Research

- Aleshkovskij, M.H. (Алешковский, М.Х.) “Первая редакция Повести временных лет,” *Археографический Ежегодник 1967 г.* (Москва, 1969) 13–40.
- , “К датировке первой редакции Повести временных лет,” *Археографический Ежегодник 1968 г.* (Москва, 1970) 71–72.
- , *Повесть временных лет: Судьба литературного произведения в древней Руси* (Москва, 1971).
- Aljutina, I.V. (Алютина, И.В.) *Поэтика сюжетов в “Повести временных лет” и скандинавских сагах* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2006).
- Anikin, D.V. (Аникин, Д.В.) *Исследование языковой личности составителя “Повести временных лет”* (Ph.D. diss.; Барнаул, 2004).
- Bestuzhev-Rjumin, K. (Бестужев-Рюмин, К.) “О составе русских летописей до конца XIV в.,” *Летопись Занятий Археографической Комиссии 4.1* (1868) 1–157.

- Boeva, L. (Боева, Л.) *Вопросы древнерусской литературы* (София, 1981) 9–37.
- , “‘Повесть временных лет’ – болгарские источники и параллели,” in: *Славянска филология. Т. 18. Литературознание и фолклор* (София, 1983) 27–36.
- Buganov, V.I. (Буганов, В.И.) *Отечественная историография русского летописания: Обзор советской литературы* (Москва, 1975) 15–20, 49–65, 130–132, 229–247.
- Bugoslavskij, S.A. (Бугославский, С.А.) “‘Повесть временных лет’: (Списки, редакции, первоначальный текст),” in: *Старинная русская повесть* (ed. Н.К. Гудзий; Москва-Ленинград, 1941) 7–37.
- , *Текстология Древней Руси. Повесть Временных Лет* (Москва, 2006).
- Cherernin, L.V. (Черепнин, Л.В.) “‘Повесть временных лет,’ ее редакции и предшествующие ей летописные своды,” *Исторические Записки* 25 (1948) 293–333.
- Danilevskij, I.N. (Данилевский, И.Н.) *Повесть временных лет : герменевтические основы изучения летописных текстов* (Москва, 2004).
- Demin, A.S. (Демин, А.С.) “Повесть временных лет,” in: *Древнерусская литература. Восприятие Запада в XI–XIV вв.* (Москва, 1996) 100–156.
- , “Повесть временных лет,” in: *Литература Московской и Домосковской Руси. Аналитическое пособие* (Москва, 2008) 24–44.
- Durnovo, N.N. (Дурново, Н.Н.) *Введение в историю русского языка* (Москва, 1969) 72, 255–257.
- Dushechkina, E.V. (Душечкина, Е.В.) “Художественная функция чужой речи в русском летописании,” *Ученые записки Тартуского университета. Труды по русской и славянской филологии* 21 (1973) 65–104.
- Elagin, V.S. (Елагин, В.С.) *Историко-биографический словарь “Повести временных лет”: Учебное пособие* (Новосибирск, 2002).
- Eliseev, G.A. (Елисеев, Г.А.) “Сведения из апокрифических текстов в ‘Повести Временных Лет,’” in: *Русское средневековье* (вып. 2; Москва, 1999) 25–33.
- Eremin, I.P. (Еремин, И.П.) *Литература Древней Руси: (Этюды и характеристики)* (Москва-Ленинград, 1966) 42–97.
- Florja, V.N. (Флоря, Б.Н.) “Сказание о преложении книг на славянский язык: Источники, время и место написания,” *Byzantinoslavica* 46.1 (1985) 121–130.
- Gromov, M.N. (Громов, М.Н.) “Древнерусская философия истории в ‘Повести временных лет,’” in: *Актуальные проблемы истории философии народов СССР* (вып. 2; Москва, 1975) 3–13.
- , “‘Речь философа’ из древнерусской летописи ‘Повесть временных лет,’” *Филологические Науки* 3 (1976) 97–107.
- Naburgaev, G.A. (Хабургаев, Г.А.) *Этнонимия “Повести временных лет”* (Москва, 1979).
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Замечания о начале русского летописания: По поводу исследований А. А. Шахматова в области древнерусской летописи,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 23 (1923) 45–102; 24 (1924) 207–251.

- Kizilov, Ju.A. (Кизилов, Ю.А.) “Историческое мировоззрение авторов ‘Повести временных лет,’” *Вопросы Истории* 10 (1978) 61–78.
- Kuz'min, A.G. (Кузьмин, А.Г.) *Русские летописи как источник по истории Древней Руси* (Рязань, 1969).
- , “Древнерусские исторические традиции и идейные течения XI в. (по материалам летописания XI–XII вв.),” *Вопросы Истории* 10 (1971) 55–76.
- , *Начальные этапы древнерусского летописания* (Москва, 1977).
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Русские летописи и их культурно-историческое значение* (Москва-Ленинград, 1947) 35–172.
- , “‘Софийский временник’ и новгородский политический переворот 1136 г.,” *Исторические Записки* 25 (1948) 240–265.
- , “Повесть временных лет,” in: Д.С. Лихачев, *Великое наследие: Классические произведения литературы древней Руси* (2-е изд.; Москва, 1979) 46–140.
- L'vov, A.S. (Львов, А.С.) *Лексика “Повести временных лет”* (Москва, 1975).
- Mustafina, Je.K. (Мустафина, Э.К.) *Способы выражения значения будущего времени в тексте “Повести временных лет”* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1984).
- Müller, L. “Die ‘Dritte Redaktion’ der sogenannten Nestorchronik,” in: *Festschrift für M. Woltner zum 70. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg, 1967) 171–186.
- , *Handbuch zur Nestorchronik* (Bd 1–3; München, 1977).
- , “Die Überschrift der ‘Povest’ vremennykh let,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 3–8.
- Nasonov, A.N. (Насонов, А.Н.) *История русского летописания X – нач. XVIII в.* (Москва, 1964) 12–79.
- Nekrasov, N.P. (Некрасов, Н.П.) “Заметки о языке ‘Повести временных лет’ по Лаврентьевскому списку летописи,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 1 (1896) 832–927; 2.1 (1897) 104–174.
- Nikolaeva, I.V. (Николаева, И.В.) *Семантика “своих” и “чужих” в Повести временных лет* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2003).
- Nikol'skij, N.K. (Никольский, Н.К.) “Повесть временных лет как источник для истории начального периода русской письменности и культуры,” in: *К вопросу о древнейшем русском летописании* (Ленинград, 1930).
- Odesskij, M. (Одесский, М.) “Начало славян и Пятикнижие: библейский контекст языческих преданий в Повести временных лет,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 253–262.
- Oragina, A.V. (Опарина, А.В.) *Специфика проявления авторской модальности в списках “Повести временных лет”: Лексико-грамматический аспект* (Ph.D. diss.; Тамбов, 2004).
- Rautkin, A.A. (Пауткин, А.А.) “Батальные описания ‘Повести временных лет’: (Своеобразие и разновидности),” *Вестн. МГУ. Сер. 9, Филология* 5 (1981) 13–21.

- , *Древнерусские летописи XI–XIII вв.: Вопросы поэтики* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2003).
- Poppe, A.V. (Поппэ, А.В.) “К вопросу об ультрамартовском стиле в Повести временных лет,” *История СССР* 4 (1974) 175–178.
- Povest', *Повесть временных лет: сборник произведений литературы Древней Руси* (eds. Л.А. Дмитриев и Д.С. Лихачев; Москва: 2008).
- Priselkov, M.D. (Приселков, М.Д.) *История русского летописания XI–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1940) 16–44.
- Ranchin, A.M. (Ранчин, А.М.) *Вертоград Златословный. Древнерусская книжность в интерпретациях, разборах и комментариях* (Москва, 2007).
- Rybakov, V.A. (Рыбаков, В.А.) *Древняя Русь: Сказания. Былины. Летописи* (Москва, 1963) 215–300.
- Senderovich, S. “Начало восточнославянской историографии с культурологической точки зрения: ‘Повесть Временных Лет’ и Священная история евреев,” *Jews and Slavs* 2 (1994) 23–58.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) “Древнейшие редакции Повести временных лет,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* октябрь (1897) 209–259.
- , “О начальном Киевском летописном своде,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3.3 (1897) 1–58.
- , “Начальный киевский летописный свод и его источники,” in: *Юбилейный сборник в честь Всеволода Федоровича Миллера* (Москва, 1900) 1–9.
- , “Предисловие к Начальному киевскому своду и Нестерова летопись,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 13.1 (1909) 213–270.
- , “‘Повесть временных лет’ и ее источники,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 4 (1940) 11–150.
- , “Киевский Начальный свод 1095 г.,” in: *А. А. Шахматов: 1864–1920* (ed. С. П. Обнорский; Москва-Ленинград, 1947) 117–160.
- Shajkin, A.A. (Шайкин, А.А.) “*Повесть временных лет*: изображение человека и проблема литературной целостности текста” (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1991).
- , “Реплика иудея в ‘Повести временных лет,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003) 456–458.
- , “‘Повесть временных лет’ о язычестве на Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 29–39.
- , “История и сказка в ‘Повести временных лет,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 57 (2006) 60–78.
- , “Олег и Игорь в Новгородской первой летописи и ‘Повести временных лет,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 607–626.
- Smirnova, L. (Смирнова, Л.) “Текстовая организация погодных записей воинской тематики в Повести временных лет,” in: *Русская лексика: Словообразование. Язык художественной литературы* (Москва, 1985) 2–26.

- , *Синтаксические структуры текстов воинской тематики в "Повести временных лет"* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1987).
- Sverdlov, M.V. (Свердлов, М.В.) "Отбор и интерпретация исторической информации в 'Повести временных лет,'" *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 57 (2006) 50–59.
- Suhomlinov, M.I. (Сухомлинов, М.И.) *О древней русской летописи как памятнике литературном* (С.-Петербург, 1856).
- Tolochko, P.P. (Толочко, П.П.) *Русские летописи и летописцы X–XIII вв.* (С.-Петербург, 2003).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Сюжетное повествование в летописях XI–XIII вв.," in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 31–66.
- , "Повесть временных лет и Хронограф по великому изложению," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 28 (1974) 99–113.
- , "Повесть временных лет и Начальный свод: (Текстологический комментарий)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 30 (1976) 3–26.
- , *Лексический состав "Повести временных лет": (Словоуказатели и частотный словарь)* (Киев, 1984).
- , "Повесть Временных Лет," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 337–343.
- Valeev, G.K. (Валеев, Г.К.) *Антропонимия "Повести временных лет"* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1982).

The Izbornik of 1073
(*Изборник 1073*)

a. *Texts*

- Isbornik, *Изборник великого князя Святослава Ярославича 1073 г.* (С.-Петербург, 1880) (facsimile edition).
- Isbornik, *Изборник великого князя Святослава Ярославича 1073 г. с греческим и латинским текстами* (Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских, 4; С.-Петербург, 1882).
- Isbornik, *Изборник Святослава 1073 г.* (2 vols.; ed. Л.П. Жуковская; Москва, 1983).
- Kalajdovich, K. (Калайдович, К.) *Иоанн экзарх Болгарский* (Москва, 1824) 102–104, 133–136.
- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) "Из Изборника 1073 года," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.136–167.
- Simeonov, *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.)* (2 vols.; София, 1991–1993).

b. *Translations*

- Jurchenko, A. (Юрченко, А.) “Изборник 1073 г.: интерпретация основных древнерусских философских терминов,” *Вопросы языкознания* 2 (1988) 87–90.
- , “Из Изборника 1073 года,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Kuz'min; Москва, 1990) 252–256.
- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) “Из Изборника 1073 года,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.136–167.

c. *Research*

- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) “Отрывок из сочинений Григория Богослова в Изборнике Святослава 1073 года,” *Старобългаристика/Palaebulgarica* 14.3 (1990) 49–56.
- , “Отрывок из Слова Григория Богослова в Изборнике Святослава 1073 года и Хронике Георгия Амартола,” in: *История русского языка и лингвистическое источниковедение* (Москва, 1987) 20–28.
- Bibikov, M.V. (Бибиков, М.В.) “Из истории культурных связей Византии и славян (Изборник Симеона-Изборник Святослава и его греческие прототипы),” in: *Международный конгресс по изучению стран Юго-Восточной Европы. Материалы к VI международному конгрессу по изучению стран Юго-Восточной Европы (история, этнография)* (Москва, 1989) 18–27.
- , “Сравнительный анализ состава Изборника Святослава 1073 г. и его византийских аналогов,” *Византийский Временник* 51 (1990) 92–102.
- , “Изборник Святослава 1073 г. и его византийские прототипы. Итоги и задачи изучения (историографический обзор),” in: *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР. Материалы и исследования. 1990 г.* (Москва, 1991) 204–218.
- , “Оxfordский список византийского прототипа ‘Изборника Святослава,’” *Византийский Временник* 52 (1991) 168–170.
- , *Византийский прототип древнейшей славянской книги (Изборник Святослава)* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1992).
- , “Рукописная традиция греческих списков прототипа Изборника Святослава 1073 г.,” *Византийский Временник* 53 (1992) 106–123.
- , “Рукописная традиция греческих списков прототипа Изборника Святослава 1073 г.,” *Византийский Временник* 54 (1993) 105–126.
- , “Библейские сюжеты в византийских, древнеславянских и других версиях флорилегия Анастасия Синаита,” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (5; Москва, 1994) 26–43.
- , *Византийский прототип древнейшей славянской книги: (Изборник Святослава 1073 г.)* (Москва, 1996).
- , “От ответов на вопросы Анастасия Синаита – к ‘Изборнику Святослава’ 1073 г.,” in: *Традиции и наследие Христианского Востока* (Москва, 1996) 127–158.
- , “Греческие списки прототипа Изборника Святослава 1073 г.,” in: *Рим, Константинополь, Москва: сравнительно-историческое исследо-*

- вание центров идеологии и культуры до XVII в. (Москва, 1997) 153–179.
- Bondar', S.V. (Бондарь, С.В.) “К пониманию проблемы ‘человек-история-время’ в ‘Изборнике 1073 г.’ (Опыт реконструкции на основе фрагмента ‘О шестом псалме’),” in: *Человек и история в средневековой философской мысли русского, украинского и белорусского народов* (Киев, 1987) 69–87.
- , “Античное учение об элементах и некоторые антропологические воззрения в Изборнике Святослава 1073 г.,” in: *Отечественная общественная мысль эпохи средневековья (историко-философские очерки)* (Киев, 1988) 125–133.
- , *Философско-мировоззренческое содержание “Изборников” 1073–1076* (Киев, 1990).
- Vozhilov, I. (Божиллов, И.) *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927)* (София, 1983).
- Danilov, V.V. (Данилов, В.В.) “Письма Исидора Пелусиота в Изборнике Святослава 1073 г.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 11 (1955) 335–341.
- Derzhavina, E.I. (Державина, Е.И.) “Культурные связи древнего Киева (Статья ‘О македонских месяцах’ в составе ‘Изборника Святослава’ 1073 г.,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы. XI–XIV вв.* (Сб. 5; Москва, 1992) 263–271.
- Elenski, I. (Еленски, И.) *Редуцированные гласные в Святославовом изборнике 1073 года* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1955).
- Filaret (Филарет, митр.) “О русской риторике XI века,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* февраль (1836) 233–235.
- Gavrjushin, E.K. (Гаврюшин, Е.К.) “‘Изборник Святослава’ 1073 г. и ‘Диалектика’ Иоанна Дамаскина,” *Советское славяноведение* 4 (1983) 94–96.
- Girshberg, V.V. (Гиршберг, В.В.) “‘Козльрогъ’ в Изборнике Святослава 1073 г.,” in: *Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга* (Москва, 1972) 81–89.
- Gorskij, A., Nevostruev, K. (Горский, А., Невоструев, К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки* (отд. 2, ч. 2; Москва, 1859) 365–405.
- Ivanova, K. (Иванова, К.) “За Хилендарския препис на първия Симеонов сборник,” in: *Старобългарска литература* (кн. 5, София, 1979) 57–96.
- , “Симеонов (Святославов) Сборник (Изборник) от 1073,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 450–451.
- Izbornik, *Изборник Святослава 1073 г. Сборник Статей* (ed. Б.А. Рыбаков; Москва, 1977).
- Juhimenko, E.M. (Юхименко, Е.М.) “Список Изборника Святослава 1073 г. в библиотеке Выговского монастыря,” in: *Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка* (ed. А.М. Молдован; Москва, 2000) 233–242.
- Kamchatnov, A.M. (Камчатнов, А.М.) “Философская терминология в Изборнике Святослава 1073 г.,” *Русская Речь* 4 (1982).

- , “Текстологический анализ списков Изборника Святослава 1073 г.,” in: *Древнерусская литература: Источниковедение* (Ленинград, 1984) 5–19.
- , “Философская терминология Изборника Святослава 1073 года и ее перевод,” in: *Древнерусский литературный язык в его отношении к старославянскому* (Москва, 1987) 67–73.
- Kashirina, V.V. (Каширина, В.В.) *Источниковедческий и лингвистический аспекты изучения библейских цитат в Изборнике Святослава 1073 г.* (Ph.D. diss; Москва, 1999).
- Kavrus, N.F. (Каврус, Н.Ф.) “Греческие списки протографа Изборника Святослава 1073 г. конца IX – первой половины X века (палеографический анализ),” *Византийский Временник* 51 (1990) 103–105.
- Korpreeva, T.N. (Копреева, Т.Н.) “Из истории болгаро-русских книжных связей: К истории взаимосвязей текстов Изборников 1073 и 1076 гг.,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 1 (1980) 39–47.
- Krutova, M.S. (Крутова, М.С.) “Изборник Святослава и Златая Цепь (сопоставительный анализ),” in: *Традиции древнейшей славянской письменности и языковой культуры славян* (Москва, 1991) 53–64.
- Kuev, K.M. (Кувев, К.М.) “Археографски бележки за распространението на Симеоновия (Святославовия) сборник в старите славянски литератури,” *Старобългарска литература* (кн. 5, София, 1979) 38–56.
- Kuskov, V.V. (Кусков, В.В.) “Святославов Сборник 1073 года,” *Древняя Русь* 1 (2000) 113–118.
- Levochkin, I.V. (Левочкин, И.В.) “Изборник Святослава и его славянский протограф,” *Старобългарска литература* (кн. 8, София, 1980) 46–49.
- , “Новый список Изборника 1073 г.,” in: *Памятники культуры: Новые открытия. 1980* (Москва, 1981) 7–11.
- , “Уваровский список Изборника 1073 г.,” *Советское славяноведение* 5 (1982) 91–94.
- , “Синодальный список Изборника Святослава,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 150–156.
- , “Византийский энциклопедический сборник в Болгарии и на Руси,” in: *У истоков общности философских культур русского, украинского и болгарского народов* (Киев, 1983) 35–41.
- , “О естественнонаучном и философском содержании Изборника Святослава 1073 г.,” in: *Памятники науки и техники: 1982–1983* (Москва, 1984) 119–130.
- , “Изборник Святослава и русские сборники XV–XVII вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 40 (1985) 373–378.
- , “‘Отечественные книги’ и Изборник Святослава 1073 г.,” *Советское славяноведение* 6 (1985) 75–80.
- , “Изборник 1073 г.: энциклопедия или хрестоматия?” *Советское славяноведение* 5 (1988) 70–74.
- , “К вопросу о составителях протографа Изборника 1073 г.,” in: *Проблемы происхождения и бытования древнерусской письменности и литературы* (Нижний Новгород, 1995) 23–28.

- , “Изборник Святослава (Симеона) в отечественной историографии 80-х годов XX века,” in: *Письменная культура: источниковедческие аспекты истории книги* (Москва, 1998) 56–63.
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) “К вопросу о судьбе рукописи Изборника 1073 г. в XIV в.,” in: *Русско-болгарские фольклорные и литературные связи* (т. 1; Ленинград, 1976) 42–44.
- , “Судьба рукописи Изборника 1073 г. в XIV в.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 49 (1996) 297–299.
- Lihacheva, V.D. (Лихачева, В.Д.) “Художественное оформление Изборника Святослава 1073 г.,” in: *Византия и Русь* (Москва, 1989) 291–312.
- Lunt, H. “On the Izbornik of 1073,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983) 359–376.
- L'vov, A.S. (Львов, А.С.) “Исследование Похвалы великому князю Святославу и царю Симеону,” in: *История русского языка: Исследования и тексты* (Москва, 1982) 162–197.
- Masing, L. *Studien zur Kenntniss des Izbornik Svjatoslava vom Jahre 1073 nebst Bemerkungen zu den jüngerem Handschriften* (Diss.; Schnakenburg, 1886).
- Mihăila, Gh. “Две копии Симеонова сборника в Библиотеке Румынской Академии,” in: *Slovansko jazikoslovie: Nahtigalov zbornik* (Ljubljana, 1977).
- Mironova, T.L. (Миронова, Т.Л.) “Изборник Святослава 1073 года: реконструкция старославянского протографа,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (сб. 12; ed. Д.С. Менделеев; Москва, 2005) 349–367.
- Nichik, V.M. (Ничик, В.М.) “Индексы запрещенных книг в Изборнике Святослава 1073 г. и ‘Кирилловой Книге’ (1664),” in: *Отечественная общественная мысль эпохи средневековья (историко-философские очерки)* (Киев, 1988) 281–289.
- Rejchev, B. (Пейчев, Б.) *Философският трактат в Симеоновия сборник* (София, 1977).
- , “Das Traktat von Presbyter Theodor von Raithu im ‘Изборник 1073 г.,” in: *Славянские культуры и Балканы* (София, 1978) 100–102.
- , *Философский трактат в Симеоновом сборнике* (Киев, 1983).
- Pentkovskij, A.M. (Пентковский, А.М.) “Календарные понятия в Изборнике 1073 года и их наименования,” in: *Древнерусский литературный язык и его отношение к старославянскому* (Москва, 1987) 37–77.
- Rozenfel'd, A. (Розенфельд, А.) “Язык Святославова Изборника 1073 г.,” *Русский Филологический Вестник* 51 (1899) 152–197.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Юбилей ‘Изборника 1073 года,’” *Византийский временник* 37 (1976) 295–297.
- Rozov, N.N. (Розов, Н.Н.) “Старейший болгарский ‘Изборник’ и его русская рукописная традиция,” *Известия Академии наук СССР. Отделение литературы и языка* 28.1 (1969) 75–78.
- , *Книга древней Руси* (Москва, 1977) 20–24, 31–33.
- , “О датировке и локализации Кирилло-Белозерского списка Изборника царя Симеона,” in: *Русско-болгарские связи в области книжного дела* (Москва, 1981) 22–35.
- Shahovskaja, T., Loosme, I. (Шаховская, Т., Лоосме, И.) “Материалы по изучению Изборника Святослава в фонде Л. Мазинга,” *Известия*

- Академии наук СССР. Отделение литературы и языка* 37.5 (1978) 462–465.
- Shevurev, S.P. (Шевырев, С.П.) *Поездка в Кирилло-Белозерский монастырь в 1847 г.* (ч. 2; Москва, 1850) 30–32.
- Sidorov, A.I. (Сидоров, А.И.) “Некоторые замечания по поводу изучения ‘Изборника Святослава 1073 г.’,” in: *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР: 1985* (Москва, 1986) 193–198.
- , “Творческое наследие Максима Исповедника в Древней Руси (на материале Изборника Святослава 1073 г.),” in: *Традиции древнейшей славянской письменности и языковая культура восточных славян* (Москва, 1991) 201–208.
- , “Федор Раифский и Федор Фаранский (По поводу одного из авторов Изборника Святослава 1073 г.),” in: *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР. Материалы и исследования. 1990 г.* (Москва, 1991) 135–167.
- Simonova, O.E. (Симонова, О.Е.) *Производные существительные со значением действия и лица в “Изборнике Святослава 1073 года”* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1988).
- Slavova, T. (Славова, Т.) “Зодиакальные изображения в Симеоновия сборник (по Святославовия препис от 1073 г.),” *Преславска книжовна школа* 2 (1997) 73–81.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Изборник 1073 г.,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 194–196.
- Vladimirova, L.A. (Владимирова, Л.А.) “О некоторых языковых особенностях в Изборнике Святослава 1073 года,” in: *Древнерусский литературный язык в его отношении к старославянскому* (Москва, 1987) 62–67.
- Zhukovskaja, L.P. (Жуковская, Л.П.) “Загадки записи Изборника Святослава 1073 года,” in: *Древнерусский литературный язык в его отношении к старославянскому* (Москва, 1987) 45–62.

The Izbornik of 1076
(Изборник 1076)

a. *Texts*

- Vobrov, V.A. (Бобров, В.А.) “К исправлению печатного текста Сборника 1076 г.,” *Русский Филологический Вестник* 47 (1902) 243–258; *Русский Филологический Вестник* 48 (1902) 469–476.
- Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) *Историческая хрестоматия церковнославянского и древнерусского языков* (Москва, 1861) 289–299 (fragments).
- Golyshenko, V.S. et al. (Гольщенко, В.С., Дубровина, В.Ф., Демьянов, В.Г., Нефедов, Г.Ф.) *Изборник 1076 г.* (Москва, 1965).
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) *Сборник Святослава 1076 г.* (Варшава, 1894).

- Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Из Изборника 1076 года,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.406–479.
- Shimanovskij, V. (Шимановский, В.) *К истории древнерусских говоров: Исследование с приложением полного текста Сборника Святослава 1076 г.* (Варшава, 1887).
- , *Сборник Святослава 1076 г.* (2nd ed.; Варшава, 1894).

b. *Translations*

- Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Из Изборника 1076 года,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.406–479.
- Veder, W.R. “The Izbornik of 1076,” in: W.R. Veder, *The Edificatory Prose of Kievan Rus’* (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. English Translations, 6; Harvard, 1994) 3–118.

c. *Research*

- Abramovich, D. (Абрамович, Д.) “До питання про джерела Изборника Святослава 1076 року,” *Науковий збірник Ленінградського товариства дослідників української історії письменства та мови* (т. 2; Київ, 1929) 65–74.
- , “Изборник Святослава 1076 року і патерики,” *Науковий збірник Ленінградського товариства дослідників української історії письменства та мови* (т. 3; Київ, 1931) 11–15.
- Adrianova-Peretc, V.P. (Адрианова-Перетц, В.П.) “Афоризмы Изборника 1076 г. и русские пословицы,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 25 (1970) 3–19.
- Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) *Творения отцов церкви в древнерусской письменности: Извлечения из рукописей и опыты историко-литературных изучений* (т. 1–2; Казань, 1889) 37–61; (т. 3; Казань, 1890) 81–83; (т. 4; Казань, 1890) 70–73, 195–198, 207–211, 227.
- Bobrov, V. (Бобров, В.) *История изучения Святославова сборника 1076 г.* (Казань, 1902).
- Bondar', S.V. (Бондарь, С.В.) “Древнерусский ‘Изборник 1076 года’ как источник изучения философской культуры Киевской Руси,” in: *Проблемы философии* (Вып. 56; Киев, 1982) 17–24.
- , *Философско-мировоззренческое содержание “Изборников” 1073–1076* (Киев, 1990).
- Budovnic, I.U. (Будовниц, И.У.) “‘Изборник’ Святослава 1076 г. и ‘Поучение’ Владимира Мономаха и их место в истории русской общественной мысли,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 10 (1954) 44–75.
- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) “Неизвестный источник Изборника 1076 г.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 44 (1990) 161–178.
- Dubrovina, V.F. (Дубровина, В.Ф.) “О греческих параллелях к Изборнику 1076 г.,” *Известия Академии наук СССР. Отделение литературы и языка* 22.2 (1963) 104–109.

- , “О привлечении греческих параллелей для прочтения переводных славяно-русских текстов,” *Исследования по лингвистическому источниковедению* (Москва, 1963) 36–44.
- Feder, U. (Федер, У.) “К изучению орфографии Изборника 1076 года и его автографа,” in: *Славянска палеография и дипломатика* (Sibal, 1985) 145–166.
- Freydank, D. “Interpretation einer griechisch-kirchenslawischen Übersetzung im Изборник von 1076,” *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 12.1 (1967) 38–48.
- Ivanova, K. (Иванова, К.) “Изборник от 1076,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 211–212.
- Jakovlev, V.A. (Яковлев, В.А.) *К литературной истории древнерусских сборников: Опыт исследования Измарагда* (Одесса, 1893) 10, 14, 20, 30–39.
- Kopreeva, T.N. (Копреева, Т.Н.) “Новые данные для изучения текста Изборника 1076 г.,” in: *Проблемы источниковедческого изучения рукописных и старопечатных фондов* (Ленинград, 1979) 92–112.
- , “Из истории болгаро-русских книжных связей: (К истории взаимосвязи текстов Изборника 1073 и 1076 гг.),” *Старобългаристика/Palaebulgarica* 1 (1980) 39–47.
- Krutova, M.S. (Крутова, М.С.) “Изборник Святослава и Златая Цепь (сопоставительный анализ),” in: *Традиции древнейшей славянской письменности и языковой культуры славян* (Москва, 1991) 53–64.
- Kuskov, V. (Кусков, В.) “Поэтическая фразеология ‘Изборника’ 1076 г.,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы XI–XVI века* (сб. 1; Москва, 1989) 52–75.
- Lépassier, J. “Une source de l’Izbornik de 1076,” *Revue des études slaves* 45 (1966) 39–47.
- , “Quelques passages de l’Izbornik de 1076 avec leur source grecque,” *Byzantinoslavica* 24.1 (1973) 28–32.
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) “Назначение Изборника 1076 г.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 44 (1990) 179–184.
- Lunt, H.E. “On the Izbornik of 1076,” in: *Unbegaun Festschrift* (New York, 1968) 69–77.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) “К вопросу об источниках ‘Изборника 1076 г.,”” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 321–328.
- , “К изучению лексики ‘Изборника 1076 г.,”” *Русская историческая лексикология и лексикография* (Ленинград, 1972) 3–12.
- , “К изучению источников ‘Изборника 1076 г.’ в связи с проблемой установления места древнеславянского перевода,” in: *Исследование языка художественных произведений* (Куйбышев, 1975) 152–155.
- , “О некоторых источниках ‘Изборника 1076 г.’ в связи с вопросом о происхождении их переводов,” in: *Культурное наследие Древней Руси: Истоки, становление, традиции* (Ленинград, 1976) 34–38.
- , “Взаимоотношения Изборника 1073 г. с Изборником 1076 г.,” in: *Изборник Святослава 1073 г.* (Москва, 1977) 90–99.

- , “Новое об источниках ‘Изборника 1076 г.’,” *Вестн. ЛГУ Ист., языкозн., лит.* 1 (1978) 60–69.
- , “‘Поучение’ Владимира Мономаха и ‘Изборник 1076 г.’,” *Вестн. ЛГУ Ист., языкозн., лит.* 4 (1980) 104–106.
- Mirochnik, E.Sh. (Мирочник, Е.Ш.) “Склонение имен существительных в ‘Изборнике 1076 года,’” *Научные труды Ташкентского университета* 317 (1967) 15–47.
- Moiseeva, G.N. (Моисеева, Г.Н.) “Из истории ‘Изборника 1076 г.’,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1977) 369–375.
- , “Изборник із зібрання М. М. Щербатова,” in: *Літературна спадщина Київської Русі і українська література XVI–XVIII ст.* (Київ, 1981) 36–43.
- Popov, N.P. “L’Izbornik de 1076, dit de Svjatoslav, comme monument littéraire,” *Revue des études slaves* 14.1–2 (1934) 5–25.
- , “Les auteurs de l’Izbornik de Svjatoslav de 1076,” *Revue des études slaves* 15.3–4 (1935) 210–223.
- Rozov, N.N. (Розов, Н.Н.) “Изборник 1076 года как памятник истории русской книги,” *Известия Академии наук СССР. Отделение литературы и языка* 35.6 (1976) 545–554.
- , “Старейшая русская книга для чтения,” *Вопросы истории* 12 (1976) 208–211.
- , “Как ‘сделана’ вступительная статья ‘Изборника 1076 г.’: (К 900-летию памятника),” in: *Культурное наследие Древней Руси. Истоки, становление, традиции* (Ленинград, 1976) 42–46.
- , *Книга Древней Руси XI–XIV вв.* (Москва, 1977) 23–34.
- Sazonova, L.I. (Сазонова, Л.И.) “Ритмико-синтаксические элементы в ‘Изборнике 1076 г.’,” in: *Культурное наследие Древней Руси. Истоки, становление, традиции* (Ленинград, 1976) 38–42.
- Seменов, V. (Семенов, В.) “Греческий источник изречений Исихия,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* июль (1893) 84–93.
- Schreketrova, T.V. (Шпектрова, Т.В.) “Научная конференция посвященная 900-летию Изборника 1076 г.,” in: *Археографический ежегодник за 1976 год* (Москва, 1977) 317.
- Shevchenko, I. “On some sources of Prince Svjatoslav’s Izbornik of the Year 1076,” in: *Orbis scriptus: D. Tschizewski zum 70. Geburtstag* (München, 1966) 723–728.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Переводные сборники изречений в славяно-русской письменности* (Москва, 1904).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Изборник 1076 г.,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 196–198.
- Veder, W. “Der bulgarische Ursprung des Izbornik von 1076,” *Кирило-Методиевски студии* 10 (1995) 82–87.
- Velcheva, V. (Велчева, В.) “Изборникът от 1076 г. като източник на данни за историята на българския език,” in: *Старобългарска литература* (кн. 5; София, 1979) 97–100.

- Vilkul, T. (Вилкул, Т.) “Христианское мироощущение древнерусского книжника: (Опыт исследования ‘Столбца Геннадия’ в Изборнике Святослава 1076 года),” in: *Mediaevalia Ucrainica* (т. 2; Киев, 1993) 5–29.
- Widnäs, M. “Der ‘Sbornik Svjatoslava’ von Jahre 1076,” *Geschichte der Ost- und Westkirche in ihren wechselseitige Beziehungen* (Wiesbaden, 1967) 84–86.
- Withman, R.H. “A textological Note on the Izbornik,” *Die Welt der Slaven* 12.1 (1967) 67–79.
- Zheкова, L. (Жекова, Л.) “За правописа на двама преписвачи в Изборника от 1076 г.,” in: *Старобългарска литература* (кн. 5; София, 1979) 107–109.

Alexandria Chronographica
(Александрия Хронографическая)

a. *Texts*

- Aleksandria, “Александрия,” in: *Изборник: (Сборник произведений литературы древней Руси)* (Москва, 1969) 236–279.
- Istrin, V. M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов: Исследования и текст* (Москва, 1893).
- Sofijska, *Софијска илустрирована Александрида. Фототипско издание* (Београд, 1987).

b. *Translations*

- Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 111–117.

c. *Research*

- Aleksandr, *Александр Великий в легендах и исследованиях Востока и Запада* (ed. E.B. Косолобова; Москва, 2000).
- Anisimova, O.A. (Анисимова, О.А.) “Александрия Хронографическая,” in: *Литература и культура Древней Руси: Словарь-справочник* (ed. V.B. Кусков; Москва, 1994) 9–10.
- Bertel’s, E. Je. (Бертельс, Е.Э.) *Роман об Александре и его главные версии на востоке* (Москва-Ленинград, 1948).
- Botvinnik, N.M. (Ботвинник, Н.М.) “‘Роман об Александре.’ Рукописная традиция и история изучения текста,” *Vizantinorossica* 2 (2003) 49–67.
- Gaevskij, S. (Гаевский, С.) *Александрія в давній українській літературі* (Київ, 1929).
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Один только перевод Псевдокаллисфена, а древнеболгарская энциклопедия X в. – мнимая,” *Византийский Временник* 10.1–2 (1903) 1–30.
- , *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе* (т. 2; Петроград, 1922) 399–404.

- Јонова, М. (Йонова, М.) "Александрия," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 25–26.
- Kinzhalov, R.V. (Кинжалов, Р.В.) *Политическая и социальная направленность повести "О жизни Александра Македонского" (Версия А)* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1955).
- Koryulenko, M.M. (Копыленко, М.М.) "Из исследований о языке славянских переводов памятников византийской литературы. (Гипотакт. конструкции славяно-русского перевода 'Александрии')," *Византийский Временник* 16 (1959) 82–91.
- Korolevich, S.A. (Королевич, С.А.) *Сравнительно-исторический анализ словарного состава "Александрии" старобелорусской и старорусской редакции* (Ph.D. diss.; Минск, 1988).
- Miletich, L. (Милетич, Л.) *Една българска Александрия от 1810 год* (Български старини, 13; София, 1936).
- Novikov, V.I. (Новиков, В.И.) *Все шедевры мировой литературы в кратком изложении. Сюжеты и характеры. Русский фольклор. Русская литература XI–XVIII веков. Энциклопедический словарь* (Москва, 1998) 179–186.
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) "К вопросу об Ипатьевской летописи," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 31.1 (1926) 106, 115–117.
- , *Переводные повести феодальной Руси и Московского государства XII–XVII вв.* (Ленинград, 1934) 9–25.
- Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) "Древнеболгарская энциклопедия X в.," *Византийский Временник* 7.1–2 (1900) 18–31.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Од средновековната книжевност* (Скопје, 1976) 157–161.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Беллетристические элементы в переводном историческом повествовании XI–XIII вв.," in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 130–141.
- , *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975) 85–88.
- , "Александрия Хронографическая," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 35–37.
- , "Александрия," in: Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.), *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 12–13.
- , *Летописец Еллинский и Римский* (2 vols.; С.-Петербург, 1999–2001) 2.160–162.
- Wesselofsky, A. "Zur bulgarischen Alexandersage," *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 1 (1875) 608–611.

Serbian Alexandria
(Александрия Сербская)

a. *Texts*

- Aleksandria, *Александрия* (Изд. Общество Любителей Древней Письменности, вып. 1 и 2; С.-Петербург, 1880, 1887).
- Aleksandria, “Александрия,” in: *Древнерусская литература. Хрестоматия* (ed. Н.И. Прохоров; Москва, 2005) 83–92.
- Bolotina, N.Ju. (Болотина, Н.Ю.) et al. *Александрия. Жизнеописание Александра Македонского* (Москва, 2005).
- Botvinnik, N.M., Luġ'e, Ja.S., Tvorogov, O.V. (Ботвинник, Н.М., Лурье, Я.С. и Творогов, О.В.) *Александрия: Роман об Александре Македонском по русской рукописи XV в.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1965).
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *История сербской Александрии в русской литературе* (Одесса, 1909).
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) *Život Aleksandra Velikoga* (Zagreb, 1871).
- Marinković, R., Jerković V. (Маринковић, Р., Јерковић, В.) *Српска Александрида* (Београд, 1985).
- Mitsakis, K. *Der byzantinische Alexanderroman nach dem Codex Vind. theol. gr. 244* (Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, 7; München, 1967).
- Novaković, S. (Новаковић, Ст.) *Приповетка о Александру Великом у старој српској књижевности* (Београд, 1878).
- Vaneeva, E.I. (Ванеева, Е.И.) “Александрия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. 2-я пол. XV в.* (Москва, 1982) 22–172.
- , “Александрия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 8.14–149.
- Wesselofsky, A. “Die Wunderepisode der mittelgriechischen Alexandreis,” *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 11 (1882) 327–343.

b. *Translations*

- Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 118–129.
- Vaneeva, E.I. (Ванеева, Е.И.) “Александрия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. 2-я пол. XV в.* (Москва, 1982) 22–173.
- , “Александрия,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 8.14–149.

c. *Research*

- Afanas'eva, E.V. (Афанасьева, Е.В.) “К вопросу о связях древнегреческой, среднегреческой и сербской редакций Романа об Александре Македонском,” in: *Древнерусская литература. Источниковедение* (Ленинград, 1984) 31–44.
- Botvinnik, N.M. (Ботвинник, Н.М.) “‘Роман об Александре.’ Рукописная традиция и история изучения текста,” *Byzantinorossica* 2 (2003) 49–67 at 63.

- Capaldo, M. "Recensioni," *Ricerche slavistiche* 20–21 (1973–1974) 359–369.
- Garkavi, A. Ja. (Гаркави, А.Я.) *Неизданная версия романа об Александре* (С.-Петербург, 1892).
- Gleixner, H. J. *Das Alexanderbild der Byzantiner* (München, 1961).
- Istoki, *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 320–359.
- Istrin, V. M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Иверский список среднегреческой Александрии," *Византийский Временник* 6.1–2 (1899) 96.
- , "К истории заимствованных слов и переводных повестей," *Летопись Историко-филологического общества при Новороссийском университете* 13 (1905) 175–186.
- Jacimirskij, A. I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) "Мелкие тексты и заметки по старинной южнославянской и русской литературе," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 22.1 (1917) 27–84.
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) *Historija kniževnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srpskoga* (Zagreb, 1867) 94–97.
- , "Ein Beitrag zur serbischen Annalistik mit literaturgeschichtlicher Einleitung," *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 2 (1877) 1–110.
- Jerković V. (Јерковић, В.) *Српска Александрида* (Београд, 1983).
- Jonova, M. (Йонова, М.) "Александрия," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 25–26.
- Kirillin, V. M. (Кириллин, В.М.) *Символика чисел в литературе Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2000) 89–99.
- Lur'e, Ja. S. (Лурье, Я.С.) "Мировые сюжеты средневековой беллетристики в русской и южнославянской литературах," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 23 (1968) 16–26.
- Marinković, R. (Маринковић, Р.) *Српска Александрида: Историја основног текста* (Београд, 1969).
- Orlov, A. S. (Орлов, А.С.) *Переводные повести феодальной Руси и Московского государства XII–XVII вв.* (Ленинград, 1934) 22–25.
- Pfister, F. "Alexander der Grosse in byzantinischen Literatur und in neugriechischen Volksbüchern," in: *Probleme der neugriechischen Literatur* (Bd 3; Berlin, 1960) 112–113.
- Pupin, A. N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) "Русские редакции средневековых сказаний об Александре," *Отечественные записки* 102.11 (1855) 1–44.
- Snegirev, I. (Снегирев, И.) *Отрывки чешской поэмы об Александре Македонском* (Казань, 1877).
- Sobolevskij, A. I. (Соболевский, А.И.) *Из истории заимствованных слов и переводных повестей* (Киев, 1904).
- , "К истории заимствованных слов и переводных повестей," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 10.2 (1905) 140–145.
- Tvorogov, O. V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Александрия," in: *Творогов, О.В. (Творогов, О.В.), Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 12–13.

- Vaneeva, E.I. (Ванеева, Е.И.) “К истории текста Сербской Александрии в России,” in: *Древнерусская книжность: Резюме докладов конференции молодых специалистов* (Ленинград, 1975) 6–7.
- , “К изучению истории текста Сербской Александрии: (На материале ленинградских списков XV–XVII вв.),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 30 (1976) 114–123.
- , “О едином происхождении русских списков Сербской Александрии,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 34 (1979) 152–161.
- , “Киевский список Александрии XVI в.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1979) 288–292.
- , *История Сербской Александрии в России* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1980).
- , “Селевк и Филон в Сербской Александрии,” in: *Источниковедение литературы Древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1980) 92–95.
- , “Русские списки Сербской Александрии XV–XIX вв.: (Из ленинградских и московских собраний),” in: *Русская и армянская средневековые литературы* (Ленинград, 1982) 57–69.
- , “Александрия Сербская,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.21–25.
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) *Из истории романа и повести* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1886).
- , *Новые данные для истории романа об Александре* (С.-Петербург, 1892).
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 275–277; 285–292.

Torzhestvennik
(Торжественник)

c. Research

- Antoshina, S.A. (Антошина, С.А.) “История минейных уставов на Руси и минейные торжественники,” in: *Из истории и культуры средневековья* (С.-Петербург, 1991) 5–13.
- Belous, A.A. (Белоус, А.А.) “Соотношение литературных и языковых особенностей в списках Минейного Торжественника XV в.,” in: *IX Конференция молодых ученых “Вопросы славяно-русского рукописного наследия” (к 75-летию Отдела древнерусской литературы)* (С.-Петербург, 2008).
- Chertorickaĭa, T.V. (Черторицкая, Т.В.) “Торжественник из собрания ИИФФ: (Опыт описания сборника постоянного состава),” in: *Источниковедение и археография Сибири* (Новосибирск, 1977) 162–198.

- , “Древнерусский литературный сборник ‘Торжественник’ (историко-типологическая характеристика),” *Вопросы сюжета и композиции* (Горький, 1978) 18–28.
- , “О составе минейных Торжественников XV–XVI вв.,” in: *Сибирская археография и источниковедение* (Новосибирск, 1979) 13–27.
- , *Торжественник – памятник русской литературы конца XIV–XVI в.: Литературная история сборника* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1979).
- , “О начальных этапах формирования древнерусских литературных сборников ‘Златоуст’ и ‘Торжественник’ (триодного типа),” in: *Источниковедение литературы древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1980) 96–114.
- , “Агиография русских минейных Торжественников конца XIV–XV вв.,” in: *Вопросы сюжета и композиции* (Горький, 1980) 5–18.
- , “К вопросу о литературной истории древнерусского минейного Торжественника,” in: *Древнерусская рукописная книга и ее бытование в Сибири* (Новосибирск, 1982) 5–27.
- , “Древнерусская агиография минейных торжественников XVI – нач. XVII вв.,” in: *Вопросы сюжета и композиции* (Горький, 1982) 21–29.
- , “Уставные чтения: Четыре сборники Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 39 (1985) 236–238.
- , “Об эволюции древнерусского минейного Торжественника в XVI – нач. XVII в.,” in: *Литература и классовая борьба эпохи позднего феодализма в России* (Новосибирск, 1987) 15–24.
- , “Торжественник,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.432–435.
- , “Торжественник и Златоуст в русской письменности XIV–XVII вв.,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописных книг* (Вып. 3, ч. 2; Москва, 1990) 329–381.
- Druzhinin, V. (Дружинин, В.) “Поморский торжественник,” in: *Сергею Федоровичу Платонову. Ученики, друзья и почитатели* (С.-Петербург, 1911) 34–55.
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) *Сборники Златоуст и Торжественник* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 158; С.-Петербург, 1905) 9–19.
- Panin, L.G. (Панин, Л.Г.) “К анализу содержательных различий в списках древнерусских сборников тождественного состава,” in: *Литература и классовая борьба эпохи позднего феодализма в России* (Новосибирск, 1987) 25–42.
- , *Лингвотекстологическое исследование минейного Торжественника рукописи XIV–XVI вв.* (Новосибирск, 1988).
- , “Предварительные сведения о составе списков минейного Торжественника (рукописи XIV–XVI вв.),” in: *Редкая книга в дореволюционной Сибири: Фонды редких книг и рукописей сибирских библиотек* (Новосибирск, 1988) 164–196.
- , “Похвальное слово Михаилу и Гавриилу Климента Охридского в списках Торжественника,” in: *Общественное сознание, книжность, литература периода феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1990) 150–155.

- , “Предварительные сведения о составе списков минейного Торжественника (рукописи XIV–XVI вв.) декабрь–февраль,” in: *Редкая книга в дореволюционной Сибири: Читательские интересы сибиряков* (Новосибирск, 1990) 169–196.
- , *Минейный торжественник в истории русского литературного языка: (Лингвотекстологическое исследование списков XIV–XVI вв.)* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1991).
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Сборники устойчивого состава,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 177–178.

Prologos
(Пролог)

a. *Texts*

- Davydova, S.A. (Давыдова, С.А.) “Из Пролога,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.388–405.
- Demin, A.S. (Демин, А.С.) *Литературный сборник XVII в. – Пролог* (Москва, 1978).
- Prolog, *Пролог* (Москва, 1641–1643).
- Prolog, *Пролог по рукописи Публичной библиотеки Погдинского древлехранилища № 58* (вып. 1, 2; С.-Петербург, 1916, 1917).
- Slavjano, “Славяно-русский Пролог,” in: *Памятники древнерусской церковно-учительной литературы* (вып. 2, 4; С.-Петербург, 1896, 1898).

b. *Translations*

- Prokof 'ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 53–67.

c. *Research*

- Abramovich, D.I. (Абрамович, Д.И.) “О Спасо-Прилуцком Прологе Санкт-Петербургской Духовной академии,” in: *Новый сборник статей по славяноведению* (С.-Петербург, 1905) 282–288.
- Begunov, Ju.K. (Бегунов, Ю.К.) *Козма Пресвитер в славянских литературах* (София, 1973) 41–50, 58–74.
- Bubnov, N.Ju. (Бубнов, Н.Ю.) “Славяно-русские Прологи,” in: *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 1; Москва, 1973) 274–296.
- Davydova, S.A. (Давыдова, С.А.) “Патериковые чтения в составе древнерусского Пролога,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 43 (1990) 263–281
- , “Пролог,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 170–172.

- , “Славяно-русский Пролог и церковный устав,” in: *Русь и южные славяне* (С.-Петербург, 1998) 204–212.
- Derzhavina, O.A. (Державина, О.А.) “Печатный пролог XVII в.,” in: *Средневековая Русь* (Москва, 1976) 125–130.
- Derzhavina, O.A. (Державина, О.А.) et al. “Циклы сюжетов в Прологе,” in: *Литературный сборник XVII в. – Пролог* (ed. А.С. Демин; Москва, 1978) 173–260.
- Dreval', D.N. (Древаль, Д.Н.) “Возможные источники русских памятней в составе первых изданий старопечатного Пролога,” in: *Книга и литература* (ed. В.Н. Алексеев; Новосибирск, 1997) 69–77.
- Gladkova, O.V. (Гладкова, О.В.) “Житие Евстафия Плакиды в составе Пролога: Исследования и тексты,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (сб. 7.1; Москва, 1994) 167–184.
- Fet, E.A. (Фет, Е.А.) “О Софийском Прологе кон. XII – нач. XIII в.,” in: *Источниковедение и археография Сибири* (Новосибирск, 1977) 78–92.
- , “Прологи в собрании Пушкинского Дома,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 34 (1979) 357–361.
- , “Новые факты к истории древнерусского Пролога,” in: *Источниковедение литературы Древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1980) 53–70.
- , “Пролог,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 376–381.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Мелкие тексты и заметки по старинной славянской и русской литературам,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 21.1 (1916) 79–85.
- Kalajdovich, K. (Калайдович, К.) *Известия о древностях славяно-русских и об Игнатии Ферадонтовиче Ферапонтове, первом собирателе оных* (Москва, 1811) 9–10, 14.
- , *Иоанн экзарх Болгарский* (Москва, 1824) 90–91.
- Kandaurova, T.N. (Кандаурова, Т.Н.) *Из истории древнерусского диалекта (о языке псковского Пролога 1383 г.)* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1951).
- Karica, F.I. (Капица, Ф.И.) “Персонажи печатного Пролога,” in: *Литературный сборник XVII в. – Пролог* (ed. А.С. Демин, Москва, 1978) 261–274.
- Kuchkin, V.A. (Кучкин, В.А.) “Первые издания русских Прологов и рукописные источники издания 1661–1662 гг.,” in: *Рукописная и печатная книга* (Москва, 1975) 138–156.
- Kurprijanov, I. (Курприянов, И.) *Обозрение пергаментных рукописей Новгородской Софийской библиотеки* (С.-Петербург, 1857) 25–26.
- Lebedeva, I.N. (Лебедева, И.Н.) “К истории древнерусского Пролога: Повесть о Варлааме и Иоасафе в составе Пролога,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 39–53.
- Loseva, O.V. (Лосева, О.В.) “К вопросу о переводе Пролога в Древней Руси,” in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода “Переводной литературы” А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).

- Momina, M.A. (Момина, М.А.) “О названии богослужебной книги ‘Пролог,’” in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода “Переводной литературы” А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).
- Moshin, V. (Мошин, В.) “Периодизация русско-южнославянских культурных связей X–XV вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 71–72.
- Mosin, V. “Slavenska redakcija Prologa Konstantina Mokisijskogo u svjetlosti visantijsko-slavenskih odnosa XII–XIII v.,” *Zbornik Historijskog Instituta Jugoslavenckih Akademije. Zagreb* 2 (1959) 17–68.
- Orlova, T.I. (Орлова, Т.И.) *Многоуровневый анализ вариантности в церковнославянском языке: на материале списков Пролога XII–XIV вв. мартовской половины года* (Ph.D. diss.; Барнаул, 1999).
- Perets, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) *К истории славяно-русского Пролога* (Петроград, 1914).
- Petkov, G. (Петков, Г.) *Стихиият Пролог в старата българска, сръбска и руска литература (XIV–XV век): Археография, текстология и издание на проложните стихове* (Пловдив, 2000).
- Petrov, N.I. (Петров, Н.И.) *О происхождении и составе славяно-русского печатного Пролога (Иноземные источники)* (Киев, 1876).
- , “Новые сочинения по агиологии в 1875 г.,” *Труды Киевской духовной академии* 1 (1876) 583–603.
- Sazonova, L.I. (Сазонова, Л.И.) “Проложное изложение как литературная форма,” in: *Литературный сборник XVII в. – Пролог* (ed. A.C. Демин, Москва, 1978) 26–53.
- Selivanov, Ju.V. (Селиванов, Ю.В.) “Житие преподобного Зосимы в составе древнерусского Пролога,” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (сб. 7.1; Москва, 1994) 142–166.
- Sergij (Сергий) *Полный месяцеслов Востока. Т. 1. Восточная агиология* (Москва, 1875) 216–289.
- , “Ответ по агиологии,” *Чтения в Обществе Любителей Духовного Просвещения* 5 (1876) 334–370.
- , *Святой Андрей Христа ради юродивый и праздник Покрова Просвятыя Богородицы* (С.-Петербург, 1898) 57–84.
- Shljarkin, I.A. (Шляпкин, И.А.) *Лекции по истории русской литературы* (3-е изд.; Петроград, 1915).
- Smirnov, I.M. (Смирнов, И.М.) *Синайский патерик* (Сергиев Посад, 1917) 260–272.
- Snegirev, I. (Снегирев, И.) “Новгородский древний Пролог,” *Русский исторический сборник* 3.3. (1839) 293–296.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “Сентябрьская книга четья домакарьевского состава,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 64.4 (1899) 1–9.
- , *История древнерусской литературы* (2-е изд.; Москва, 1914) 201–209.

- , “К истории взаимоотношений русской и югославской литератур,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 26 (1923) 143–206.
- , “К истории взаимоотношений русской и южнославянских литератур,” in: Сперанский, М.Н. *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 36–42.
- Syrku, P.A. (Сырку, П.А.) *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке* (т. 1; С.-Петербург, 1896) 457–467.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.), “Пролог как источник изучения древнерусской книжности XI–XIII вв.” in: *Исторические традиции духовной культуры народов СССР и современность* (Киев, 1987) 26–32.
- Turilov, A.A. (Турилов, А.А.) “Оригинальные южнославянские сочинения в русской книжности XV–XVI вв.,” in: *Теория и практика источниковедения и археографии отечественной истории* (Москва, 1978) 39–44.
- Vereschagin, E.M. (Верещагин, Е.М.) *Христианская книжность Древней Руси* (Москва, 1996) 84–90.
- Vladimirskij, N. (Владимирский, Н.) “Несколько слов о Прологе, памятнике древнерусской письменности, и несколько вопросов из древнейшей эпохи нашего просвещения,” *Ученые записки Казанского университета* 2 (1875) 51–883.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “Интерпретация древнерусского Пролога Н.С. Лесковым,” in: *Новгород в культуре Древней Руси* (Новгород, 1995) 157–162.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 113, 124.
- Vostokov, A.H. (Востоков, А.Х.) “Описание рукописных и печатных книг словенских, принадлежащих А. С. Норову,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* сентябрь (1836) 538–541.
- , *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского музея* (С.-Петербург, 1842) 447–462.
- Vzdornov, G.I. (Вздорнов, Г.И.) “Лобковский Пролог и другие памятники письменности и живописи Великого Новгорода,” in: *Древнерусское искусство* (Москва, 1972) 255–269.
- Widnäs, M. “Les synaxaires slavo-russes des ‘Fragments Finlandais,’” *Commentationes Humanorum Litterarum* 38.1 (1967) 1–214.
- Zhukovskaja, L.P. (Жуковская, Л.П.) “О якобы датированных списках Стишного пролога XV в.: (Троицкое собрание ГБЛ),” in: *История русского языка: Памятники XI–XVIII вв.* (Москва, 1982) 74–121.
- , “Текстологическое и лингвистическое исследование Пролога (избранные византийские, русские и инославянские статьи),” in: *Славян. языкозн. IX Международный съезд славистов. Доклады советской делегации* (Москва, 1983) 110–120.
- , “Возраст веры в Прологе,” in: *Проблемы изучения культурного наследия* (Москва, 1985) 149–150.

- Zlygost'eva, O.G. (Злыгостьева, О.Г.) “Стишной Пролог из собрания ГПНТБ СО РАН,” in: *Русская книга в дореволюционной Сибири* (Новосибирск, 1996) 51–88.
- , “Предварительные сведения о составе Стишного Пролога из собрания ГПНТБ СО РАН по рукописи XVI века. Март,” in: *Книга и литература* (ed. В.Н. Алексеев; Новосибирск, 1997) 91–105.

Great Menologia
(*Великие Минеи Четии*)

a. *Texts*

- Arheograficheskaia, Археографическая комиссия. *Великие Минеи Четии, собранные Всероссийским митрополитом Макарием*
Январь, дни 1–6 (Москва, 1910);
Январь, дни 6–11 (Москва, 1914);
Апрель, дни 1–8 (Москва, 1910);
Апрель, дни 8–21 (Москва, 1912);
Апрель, дни 22–30 (Москва, 1916);
Сентябрь, дни 1–13 (С.-Петербург, 1868);
Сентябрь, дни 14–24 (С.-Петербург, 1869);
Сентябрь, дни 25–30 (С.-Петербург, 1883);
Октябрь, дни 1–3 (С.-Петербург, 1870);
Октябрь, дни 4–18 (С.-Петербург, 1874);
Октябрь, дни 19–31 (С.-Петербург, 1880);
Ноябрь, дни 1–12 (С.-Петербург, 1897);
Ноябрь, дни 13–15 (С.-Петербург, 1899);
Ноябрь, день 16 (Москва, 1910);
Ноябрь, дни 16–17 (Москва, 1911);
Ноябрь, дни 16–22 (Москва, 1914);
Ноябрь, дни 23–25 (Москва, 1916–1917);
Декабрь, дни 1–5 (Москва, 1901);
Декабрь, дни 6–17 (Москва, 1904);
Декабрь, дни 18–23 (Москва, 1907);
Декабрь, день 24 (Москва, 1910);
Декабрь, дни 25–31 (Москва, 1912);
Декабрь, день 31 (Москва, 1914).
- Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) *Историческая хрестоматия церковно-славянского и древнерусского языков* (Москва, 1861) 771–784.
- Droblenkova, N.F., Prohorov, G.M. (Дробленкова, Н.Ф., Прохоров, Г.М.) “Из Великих Минеи Четых Макария,” Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. 2-я пол. XVI в.* (Москва, 1986) 478–549, 625–634.
- Droblenkova, N.F. (Дробленкова, Н.Ф.) et al. “Из Великих Минеи Четых Макария,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 12.8–321.

- Kniga, "Книга, глаголемая Козмы Индикоплова" из рук. Моск. главн. архива МИД. *Минея Четья митрополита Макария (новгородский список; XVI в. Месяц август, дни 23–31 (собр. кн. Оболенского № 159)* (Изд. Общество Любителей Древней Письменности, 86; С.-Петербург, 1886).
- Weiber, E. et al. *Die großen Lesemenäen des Metropoliten Makarij: uspenskijs spisok* (Monumenta linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris, 26; Freiburg, 1997-)

c. *Research*

- Abramovich, D.I. (Абрамович, Д.И.) *Описание рукописей С.-Петербургской духовной академии: Софийская библиотека. Вып. 2. Четьи Минеи; Пролози; Патерики* (С.-Петербург, 1907) 1–154.
- Adrianova, V.P. (Адрианова, В.П.) *Житие Алексея, человека божия, в древней русской литературе и народной словесности* (Петроград, 1917) 99–107.
- Alekseev, V.N. (Алексеев, В.Н.) "Троицкий книгописец Герман Тулупов," in: *Сибирское собрание М. Н. Тихомирова и проблемы археографии: Сб. научных трудов* (Новосибирск, 1981) 126–137.
- Bobrov, A.G. (Бобров, А.Г.) "О новосибирском списке Сказания Афродитиана (к вопросу о формировании Великих Минеи Четий митрополита Макария)," in: *Рукописная традиция XVI–XIX вв. на востоке России* (Москва, 1983) 117–119.
- Bugoslavskij, S.A. (Бугославский, С.А.) "Сокращенная редакция Великой Четьи Минеи за май месяц в рукописи Казанской духовной академии 1569 г. № 514 (533) (631)," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 18.4 (1913) 347–351.
- Chertorickaia, T.V. (Черторицкая, Т.В.) "Литературные четьи сборники древней Руси (к вопросу о структуре и классификации)," in: *Вопросы сюжета и композиции* (Горький, 1985) 16–26.
- , "Четьи сборники в составе Великих Минеи Четых митрополита Макария," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 46 (1993) 98–108.
- Dergacheva-Skor, E.I. (Дергачева-Скоп, Е.И.) et al. "Книжная культура старообрядцев и их четья литература: К проблеме типологии чтения," in: *Русская книга в дореволюционной Сибири* (Новосибирск, 1996) 9–39.
- Droblenkova, N.F. (Дробленкова, Н.Ф.) "Ранний вариант декабрьской Великой Минеи Четьи," *Культурное наследие Древней Руси: Истоки, становление, традиции* (Москва, 1976) 386–390.
- , "Великие Минеи Четии," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 39 (1985) 238–243.
- , "Из истории жанра Четиих Минеи в русской литературе," *Армянская и русская средневековые литературы* (Ереван, 1986) 139–181.
- , "Великие Минеи Четии," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.126–133.

- , “Великие Минеи Четии,” in: Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.), *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 28–32.
- Gavrushin, N.K. (Гаврюшин, Н.К.) “Первая русская энциклопедия,” in: *Памятники науки и техники. 1982–1983* (Москва, 1984) 119–130.
- Gergova, E. (Гергова, Е.) “Славянските службени минеи – методика на проучване,” in: *Медиевистични изследвания. В памет на П. Димитров* (Шумен, 1996) 201–212.
- Gladkova, O.V. (Гладкова, О.В.) “Житие Евстафия Плакиды в составе Великих Минеи Четых Митрополита Макария,” in: *Художественно-исторические памятники Можайска и русская культура XV–XVI веков* (Можайск, 1993) 171–184.
- Gorskij, A., Nevostuev, K. (Горский, А., Невоструев, К.) “Описание Великих Четых Минеи Макария, митрополита Всероссийского,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 1.2 (1884) 1–184.
- Grebenetskij, A. (Гребенетский, А.) “Слова и поучения в Великих Четых Минеях митрополита Макария: Извлечение из протоколов Совета Киевской Духовной академии за 1900 г.,” *Труды Киевской духовной академии* 5 (1901) 367–369.
- Gribov, Ju.A. (Грибов, Ю.А.) “Значение палеографических особенностей для определения состава и генеалогии четых сборников,” in: *История и палеография* (в. 1; Москва, 1993) 34–55.
- Iosif (Иосиф, архимандрит) *Подробное оглавление Великих Четых Минеи всероссийского митрополита Макария, хранящихся в Московской патриаршей, ныне Синодальной библиотеке* (Москва, 1892).
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Мелкие тексты и заметки по старинной южнославянской и русской литературам. LXXXIII–LXXXIV,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 22.1 (1917) 27–44.
- Kljuchevskij, V.O. (Ключевский, В.О.) *Отзывы и ответы. 3-й сборник статей* (Москва, 1914) 1–20.
- Kobjak, N.A. (Кобяк, Н.А.) et al. “Об издании Великих Минеи Четых митрополита Макария (Хроника заседаний во Фрайбурге),” in: *Археологический ежегодник* (Москва, 1996) 365–366.
- Kostjuhina, L.M. (Костюхина, Л.М.) “Писцовая школа митрополита Макария,” in: *Исторический музей-энциклопедия отечественной истории и культуры* (Москва, 1995) 126–131.
- Kozhuharov, S. (Кожухаров, С.) “Минеи,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 301–302.
- Kuchkin, V.A. (Кучкин, В.А.) “О формировании Великих Минеи Четых митрополита Макария,” in: *Книговедение и его задачи в свете актуальных проблем советского книжного дела: Тезисы докладов Второй Всесоюзной научной конференции по проблемам книговедения; Секция рукописной книги* (Москва, 1974) 22–26.
- , “О формировании Великих Минеи Четых митрополита Макария,” in: *Проблемы рукописной и печатной книги* (Москва, 1976) 86–101.

- Lebedev, V. (Лебедев, В.) “К истории кирилло-мефодиевского славянского перевода Библии на Руси: (Продолжение),” *Странник* 3 (1885) 407–411.
- Makarij (Макарий, епископ) “О новгородских Макарьевских Четых Минеях,” in: *Летописи Тихонова* (т. 1; Москва, 1859) 68–73.
- Mansikka, V. (Мансикка, В.) *Житие Александра Невского: Разбор редакций и текст* (С.-Петербург, 1913) 107–142.
- Miller, D.B. *The Velikie Minei Chetii and the Stepennaia Kniga of Metropolitan Makarii* (Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte, 26; Berlin, 1979) 262–382.
- Mulich, M. (Мулич, М.) “К вопросу о художественном мастерстве в древнейших славянских переводах служебных миней,” in: *Симпозиум 1100-годишнина од смертта Кирил Солунски* (т. 2; Скопје, 1970) 239–256.
- Murav'ev, N. (Муравьев, Н.) “Митрополит Макарий как составитель Великих Четых Миней: (К 400-летию составления Великих Четих Миней),” *Журнал Московской Патриархии* 5 (1953) 49–54.
- Mur'janov, M.F. (Мурьянов, М.Ф.) “Минья как тип средневековой книги,” *Советское славяноведение* 5 (1985) 64–78.
- Nechunaeva, N.A. (Нечунаева, Н.А.) *Минья как тип славяно-греческого средневекового текста* (Tallinn, 2000).
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) “Книга русского Средневековья и ее энциклопедические виды,” *Докл. АН СССР. Сер. В* 3 (1931) 37–51.
- Rak, N.I. (Пак, Н.И.) “Стилевое своеобразие повестей об убиенных князьях великих в составе Великих Миней Четых Митрополита Макария,” in: *Художественно-исторические памятники Можайска и русская культура XV–XVI веков* (Можайск, 1993) 155–170.
- Perets, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) “Исследования и материалы по истории старинной украинской литературы XVI–XVIII вв. IX. К изучению Четьи 1489 г.,” *Сборник по русскому языку и словесности* 1.1 (1928) 9–12, 19–21.
- Petrov, N. (Петров, Н.) “О происхождении и составе славянорусского печатного Пролога: Иноземные источники (Продолжение),” *Труды Киевской духовной академии* 5 (1875) 348–351.
- Popomarev, A.I. (Пономарев, А.И.) “Жизнь и подвижнические труды преподобного Сергия Радонежского по древнему славяно-русскому Прологу и по Четим Миньям митрополита Макария,” *Странник* 9 (1892) 3–19.
- Rorov, N.P. (Попов, Н.П.) *Автографы митрополита Макария, собирателя Великих Миней* (Летопись Занятий Археографической Комиссии, 25; С.-Петербург, 1913) 5.
- , “Иосифово Сказание о ереси жидовствующих по спискам Великих Миней,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 18.1 (1913) 173–197.
- , “О возникновении Московской Синодальной (Патриаршей) библиотеки,” *Сборник статей к 40-летию ученой деятельности академика А. С. Орлова* (Москва, 1934) 31, 33–36.

- Protas'eva, T.N. (Протасьева, Т.Н.) *Описание рукописей Синодального собрания, не вошедших в описание А.В. Горского и К. И. Невоструева (ч. 1, № 577–819)* (Москва, 1970) 170–208.
- Rogov, A.I. (Рогов, А.И.) “Минеи: (Справка),” in: *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 1; Москва, 1973) 297–305.
- Savva (Савва, архимандрит) *Указатель для обозрения Московской Патриаршей (ныне Синодальной) библиотеки* (Москва, 1858) 209–211.
- Serebrjakova, E.I. (Серебрякова, Е.И.) “О кодикологических особенностях ново найденного мартовского тома Софийского комплекта Великих Миней-четьих,” in: *Русская книжность: Вопросы источниковедения и палеографии* (Москва, 1998) 5–14.
- Sergij (Сергий, архимандрит) *Полный месяцеслов Востока* (т. 1; Москва, 1875) 203–215.
- Schul'gina, Je.V. (Шульгина, Э.В.) “Сравнительная характеристика состава мартовских миней-четьих XVII в. и Макарьевской минеи (предварительные итоги),” in: *Русская книжность. Вопросы источниковедения и палеографии* (Москва, 1998) 15–21.
- Shcheglova, S.A. (Щеглова, С.А.) *Богослужение: Историко-литературное исследование* (Киев, 1918) 208, 231–232, 292–294.
- Shestakov, D. (Шестаков, Д.) “Заметки о греческих текстах житий и Макарьевских Миней Четых,” *Богословский Вестник* 2 (1914) 369–382.
- Sirotkin, S.M. (Сироткин, С.М.) “Письмо по поводу издания и состава ВМЧ за декабрь месяц,” *Летопись Занятий Археографической Комиссии* 12 (1901) 126–130.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “Протокол 14 заседания Славянской комиссии Московского археологического общества: Реф. докл. о южнославянских Четых Миней и реформе Макария в минейх,” *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 1 (1895) 34–35.
- , “Сентябрьская Миней Четья домакарьевского состава,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 1.2 (1896) 235–257.
- , “Октябрьская Миней Четья домакарьевского состава,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 6.1 (1901) 57–87.
- , “Славянская метафрастовская Миней Четья,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 9.4 (1904) 176–189.
- Turilov, A. (Турилов, А.) “К уточнению объема и состава древнейшего славянского оригинального гимнографического корпуса в древнерусской рукописной традиции,” *Старобългарска литература* 35/36 (2006) 22–37.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Древнерусские четьи сборники XII–XIV вв. (Статья первая),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 41 (1988) 197–214.

- , “Древнерусские четьи сборники XII–XIV вв. (Статья вторая: Памятники агиографии),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 44 (1990) 196–225.
- , “Древнерусские четьи сборники XII–XIV веков. (Статья третья: Сказания и гомилии на сюжеты священной и церковной истории),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 47 (1993) 3–33.
- , “Древнерусские четьи сборники XII–XIV вв. (Статья четвертая: Дидактические гомилии),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 20–42.
- Undol'skij, V. (Ундольский, В.) “Библиографические разыскания по случаю выхода ‘Описания Библиотеки императорского Московского общества истории и древностей российских,’” *Москвитянин* 11–12 (1846) 209–210.
- , “Оглавление Четых Минеи всероссийского митрополита Макария, хранящихся в московском Успенском соборе, сост. справщиком, монахом Евфимием,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4.4 (1847) 1–78.
- Vajer, Je. (Вайер, Э.) “Великие Минеи Четьи в кругу политических, идеологических и культурных традиций,” in: *Археографический Ежегодник* (Москва, 1997) 96–102.
- Vereschagin, E.M. (Верецагин, Е.М.) “Необыкновенный образ апостола Петра, как он обрисован в Макарьевских Великих минеях-четьях,” *Русская Словесность* 1 (1995) 8–12.
- , “Апостол Павел в роли шутника как он представлен в Макарьевских Великих Минеях-Четьях,” *Русская Словесность* 2 (1995) 7–10.
- , *Христианская книжность Древней Руси* (Москва, 1996) 92–149.
- , “Наблюдения над перефразированием переводного текста в Великих Четьях Митрополита Макария,” *Филологические науки* 6 (1997) 33–53.
- Veselovskij, A. (Веселовский, А.) *Заметки по литературе и народной словесности. 3. К Сказанию о прении жидов с христианами* (Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук, 32.7; С.-Петербург, 1883) 26–28.
- Vladimirov, P.V. (Владимиров, П.В.) “Великое Зерцало: (Из истории русской переводной литературы XVII в.),” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2.4 (1883) 68–75.

Chudovskie Menologia
(Чудовские Минеи Четьи)

c. Research

- Alekseev, V.N. (Алексеев, В.Н.) “Троицкий книгописец Герман Тулупов,” in: *Сибирское собрание М.Н. Тихомирова и проблемы археографии* (Новосибирск, 1981) 127, 130–132.
- Droblenkova, N.F. (Дробленкова, Н.Ф.) “Минеи Четии Чудовские (Годуновские),” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и*

- книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.114–116.
- Gergova, E. (Гергова, Е.) “Славянските служебни минеи – методика на проучване,” in: *Медиевистични изследвания. В памет на П. Димитров* (Шумен, 1996) 201–212.
- Kostjuhina, L.M. (Костюхина, Л.М.) *Книжное письмо в России XVII в.* (Москва, 1974) 7–11, 26–35, 126.
- , “О некоторых принципах отождествления и типизации почерков в русских рукописях рубежа XVI–XVII веков,” in: *Древнерусское искусство: Рукописная книга* (Сб. 2; Москва, 1974) 18–27.
- , “К истории Чудовских миней-четьих 1600 г.,” in: *Археографический Ежегодник* (Москва, 1999) 196–198.
- Kozhuharov, S. (Кожухаров, С.) “Миней,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 301–302.
- Nechunaeva, N.A. (Нечунаева, Н.А.) *Миней как тип славяно-греческого средневекового текста* (Tallinn, 2000).
- O Chet'jah Minejah, “О Четъях Миней,” in: *Памятники Древней Письменности. Протокол годового собрания ОЛДП, 26 апреля 1879 г.* (Вып. 3; С.-Петербург, 1879) 39–95.
- Protas'eva, T.N. (Протасьева, Т.Н.) *Описание рукописей Чудовского собрания* (Новосибирск, 1980) 177–186.

Azbučkovniki
(Азбуковники)

a. *Texts*

- Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) “Дополнения и прибавления по второму тому Сказаний русского народа И. Сахарова,” in: *Арх. ист.-юр. св. сведений, относ. до России* (ed. Н. Калачев; кн. 1, отд. 4; Москва, 1850) 1–31.
- , *Историческая хрестоматия церковно-славянскаго и древнерусскаго языков* (Москва, 1861).
- Kovtun, L.S. (Ковтун, Л.С.) *Лексикография в Московской Руси XVI – начала XVII в.* (Ленинград, 1975) 268–312.
- , *Азбуковники XVI–XVII вв. Старшая разновидность* (Ленинград, 1989) 136–292.
- Saharov, I.P. (Сахаров, И.П.) *Сказания русского народа* (т. 2, кн. 5; С.-Петербург, 1849).

c. *Research*

- Alekseev, M.P. (Алексеев, М.П.) *Словари иностранных языков в русском азбуковнике XVII в.* (Ленинград, 1968).
- Batalin, N.I. (Баталин, Н.И.) *Древнерусские азбуковники* (Филол. зап., вып. 3–5; Воронеж, 1873).
- Djachok, M.T. (Дьячок, М.Т.) “Специфика словарных определений в древнерусских азбуковниках,” in: *Синтаксическая и лексическая*

- семантика (на материале языков разных систем)* (Новосибирск, 1986) 228–233.
- Janow, J. “Leksykografia wschodnio-słowiańska do konca XVII w. Cz. 1. Uwagi o ‘Azbukownikach’ i ‘Rozmowkach’ bizantynsko-rosyjskich,” *Spraw. czup. i pos. PAU* 52.2 (1951) 129–135.
- Karпов, A. (Карпов, А.) *Азбуковники или алфавиты иностранных речей по спискам Соловецкой библиотеки* (Казань, 1878).
- Kovtun, L.S. (Ковтун, Л.С.) *Русская лексикография эпохи средневековья* (Москва-Ленинград, 1963).
- , *Лексикография в Московской Руси XVI – начала XVII в.* (Ленинград, 1975) 206–258.
- , “Термины стихосложения в русском азбуковнике,” in: *Культурное наследие Древней Руси (в честь Д.С. Лихачева)* (ed. В.Г. Базанов; Москва, 1976) 269–274.
- , *Древние словари как источник русской исторической лексикологии* (Ленинград, 1977).
- , “Азбуковники среди других текстов древней лексикографии и проблемы их издания,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 36 (1981) 3–12.
- , “Символика в азбуковниках,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 38 (1985) 215–230.
- , “Азбуковники,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.10–20.
- , *Азбуковники XVI–XVII вв. Старшая разновидность* (Ленинград, 1989).
- Prussak, A.V. (Пруссак, А.В.) *Описание азбуковников, хранящихся в рукописном отделении императорской Публичной библиотеки* (С.-Петербург, 1915).
- Shirskij, K. (Ширский, К.) *Очерк древних славяно-русских словарей* (Филологические записки, вып. 1–3; Воронеж, 1869).
- Simoni, P.K. (Симони, П.К.) “Памятники старинной русской лексикографии по рукописям XV–XVII столетий,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 13.1 (1908) 175–212.
- Sorokaletov, F.P. (Сорокалетов, Ф.П.) *История русской лексикографии* (С.-Петербург, 1998) 23–49.

Hexaeterons
(*Шестодневы*)

a. *Texts*

- Aitzetmüller, R. *Das Hexaeteron des Exarchen Johannes* (7 vols.; Graz, 1958–1975).
- Varankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) “Шестоднев” *Иоанна экзарха Болгарского. Ранняя русская редакция* (Москва, 1998).

- , “Слово ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: Gromov, M.N., Mil’kov, V.V. (Громов, М.Н., Мильков, В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 424–468.
- Barankova, G.S., Mil’kov V.V. (Баранкова, Г.С., Мильков, В.В.) *Шестоднев Иоанна экзарха Болгарского* (С.-Петербург, 2001).
- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) et al. *Шестоднев Иоанна экзарха Болгарского. V Слово* (Москва, 1996).
- Koshev, N. (Кочев, Н.) *Йоан Екзарх. Шестоднев* (София, 1981 [2000]).
- Piljugina, N.B. (Пилюгина, Н.Б.) et al. *Шестоднев Иоанна Экзарха Болгарского как памятник средневекового философствования. I Слово* (Москва, 1991).
- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров Г.М.) “Из ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XII Век* (Москва, 1980) 184–195.
- , “Из ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Kuz’min; Москва, 1990) 246–252.
- , “Из ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.126–135.
- Shestodnev, *Шестоднев, составленный Иоанном Экзархом Болгарским, по харатейному списку Московской Синодальной библиотеки 1263 года* (Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских, 3; Москва, 1879).
- Shestodnev, *Шестоднев* (Москва, 1700).
- Shestodnev, *Шестодневец* (Москва, 1635).
- Shljarkin, I.A. (Шляпкин, И.А.) “Шестоднев” *Георгия Пизиды в славяно-русском переводе 1385 г.* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 32; С.-Петербург, 1882).
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) “Шестоднев Кирилла Философа,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 6.2 (1901) 177–202.

b. *Translations*

- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) “Слово ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: Gromov, M.N., Mil’kov, V.V. (Громов М.Н., Мильков В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 469–504.
- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) et al. *Шестоднев Иоанна экзарха Болгарского. V Слово* (Москва, 1996).
- Kaliganov, I., Polujannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Польшянный, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 44–53.
- Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 31–35.
- Piljugina, N.B. (Пилюгина, Н.Б.) et al. *Шестоднев Иоанна Экзарха Болгарского как памятник средневекового философствования. I Слово* (Москва, 1991).

- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) “Из ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XII Век* (Москва, 1980) 184–195.
- , “Из ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Kuz'min; Москва, 1990) 246–252.
- , “Из ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 2.126–135.

c. *Research*

- Abramov, A.I. (Абрамов, А.И.) “‘Шестоднев’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского – ‘Тексамерон’ славянской философской культуры,” in: *Философские и богословские идеи в памятниках древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; Москва, 2000) 366–375.
- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) “О ‘Шестодневе’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” *Русская речь* 5 (1972) 130–143.
- , “К текстологическому и лингвистическому изучению ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: *Восточнославянские языки: Источники для их изучения* (Москва, 1973) 172–215.
- , “К вопросу лингво-текстологического анализа списков ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского, хранящихся в ГБЛ,” *Записки Отд. рукописей ГБЛ* 35 (1974) 104–121.
- , “Шестодневы повествовательные,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, ч. I; Москва, 1976) 165–180.
- , “Об астрономических и географических знаниях,” in: *Естественнонаучные представления Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978) 48–62.
- , “Астрономическая и географическая терминология в ‘Шестодневе’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: *Памятники русского языка: Исследования и публикации* (Москва, 1979) 150–171.
- , “О взаимоотношениях Шестоднева Иоанна экзарха Болгарского и Толковой Палеи (текстолого-лингвистический аспект),” in: *История русского языка. Исследования и тексты* (Москва, 1982) 262–277.
- , “Лексикални особености в паментниците от Преславската книжовна школа: Изборник от 1073 г. и Шестоднев на Йоан Екзарх Български,” *Език и литература* 1 (1982) 40–49.
- , “Глоссирование как прием редактирования в списках поздней русской редакции ‘Шестоднева,’” in: *История русского языка. Памятники XI–XVII вв.* (Москва, 1982) 30–56.
- , “Ранняя русская редакция ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: *Древнерусский литературный язык в его отношении к старославянскому* (Москва, 1987) 77–90.
- , “Анатомические термины в русских списках переводных памятников,” *Источники по истории русского языка XI–XVII вв.* (Москва, 1991) 79–90.

- Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) et al. “Античная традиция в ‘Шестодневе’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: *Древняя Русь: Пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 13–41.
- Buchkov, V.V. (Бычков, В.В.) “Эстетические представления в Шестодневе Иоанна Экзарха,” *Старобългарска литература* 21 (1987) 50–66.
- B’chvarov, M., Rejchev, V. (Бъчваров, М., Пейчев, В.) “Иоан, екзарх Болгарський та давньоруська філософська культура,” *Філософська думка* 5 (1981) 78–81.
- , “‘Шестодневът’ на Йоан Екзарх Български (светоглед и етика),” in: *Йоан Екзарх, Шестоднев* (София, 1981) 5–37.
- Dujchev, I. (Дуйчев, И.) “Йоан Екзарх,” in: *История на българска литература* (София, 1962) 1.127–140.
- Esjukov, A.I. (Есюков, А.И.) “Мир и человек в ‘Шестодневе’ Афанасия Холмогорского,” in: *Проблемы культуры, языка, воспитания* (Архангельск, 2000) 111–119.
- Genov, M. (Генов, М.) “Иван Екзарх,” in: *Духовна култура* (кн. 3–4; София, 1920) 193–211.
- , “Философски идеи в писанията на Иван Екзарх,” in: *Философски преглед* (6.1; София, 1934) 24–32.
- Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) *Разцветът на българската литература в IX–X в.* (София 1962) 202–270.
- Georgij, *Георгий Писидийский и его поэма о миротворении в славяно-русском переводе 1385 г.* (С.-Петербург, 1890).
- Gladkova, O.V. (Гладкова, О.В.) “‘Шестоднев’ Иоана Экзарха,” in: *Литература Московской и Домосковской Руси* (ed. А.С. Демин; Москва, 2008) 749–757.
- Gorskij, A. Nevostruev, K. (Горский, А., Невоструев, К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки* (отд. 2, ч. 1; Москва, 1857) 1–44.
- Hristov, I.V. (Христов, И.В.) “Место исследования перевода терминов греческой философии в историко-философском изучении ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна Экзарха,” in: *Отечественная философская мысль XI–XVII вв. и греческая культура* (Киев, 1991) 181–193.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Мелкие тексты и заметки по старинной славянской и русской литературам. XXXI,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 7.1 (1902) 95–101.
- , “Шестодневы,” in: *Энциклопедический словарь Ф. А. Брокгауза и И. А. Эфрона* (С.-Петербург, 1907) 39.534–536.
- Jaksche, A. “Glagolistische Spuren im Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes,” *Welt der Slaven* 3.2 (1958) 138–142.
- Jopova, M. (Йонова, М.) “Шестоднев,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 564–565.
- Kalajdovich, K. (Калайдович, К.) *Иоанн экзарх Болгарский* (Москва, 1824).
- Karinskij, N.M. (Каринский, Н.М.) *Исследование языка Псковского Шестоднева 1374 г.* (С.-Петербург, 1916).

- Kochev, N. (Кочев, Н.) “Йоан Екзархото во виджано за красивото, отразено во неговиот Шестоднев,” *Проблеми за културата* 5 (1980) 101–117.
- Lägreid, A. *Der rhetorische Stil im Šestodnev des Exarchen Johannes* (Wiesbaden, 1965).
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) “‘Шестоднев’ Иоанна Экзарха и ‘Поучение’ Владимира Мономаха,” in: *Вопросы теории и истории языка* (Ленинград, 1963) 187–190.
- , “‘Слово о погибели Русской земли’ и ‘Шестоднев’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского,” in: *Русско-европейские литературные связи: Сб. статей к 70-летию со дня рождения академика М.П. Алексеева* (Москва-Ленинград, 1966) 92–96.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) “Слово ‘Шестоднева’ Иоанна экзарха Болгарского. Вводная часть,” in: Gromov, M.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Громов, М.Н., Мильков, В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 385–389.
- Musakova, E. (Мусакова, Е.) “Надписи и изображения Шестоднева в болгарских рукописях и церковной живописи XVII–XIX вв.,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 118–129.
- Panchenko, A.M. (Панченко, А.М.) “Некоторые эстетические постулаты в ‘Шестодневе’ Иоанна Экзарха,” in: *Русско-болгарские фольклорные и литературные связи* (т. 1; Москва, 1976) 32–41.
- Panich, T.V. (Панич, Т.В.) “Особенности Шестоднева Афанасия Холмогорского,” in: *Источники по истории русского общественного сознания периода феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1986) 5–24.
- , “Мироздание в представлении книжника XVII в. (на материале Шестоднева Афанасия Холмогорского),” in: *Научный атеизм, религия и современность* (Новосибирск, 1987) 305–321.
- , “Источники Шестоднева Афанасия Холмогорского,” in: *Источники по истории общественного сознания и литературы периода феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1991) 88–104.
- , “Шестоднев неизвестного автора из библиотеки Афанасия Холмогорского,” in: *Русское общество и литература позднего феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1996) 185–205.
- Poleshchuk, Ju.V. (Полещук, Ю.В.) *Рецепция Шестоднева Иоанна экзарха Болгарского в древнерусской литературе* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2006).
- Porfir'ev, I.Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Описание рукописей Соловецкого монастыря, находящихся в Казанской духовной академии* (ч. 1; Казань, 1881) 101–126.
- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) “Шестодневы,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 478–483.
- , “Шестодневы,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический словарь* (Москва, 1996) 229–231.
- Radoshević, N. (Радошевић, Н.) *Шестоднев Георгија Писиде и негов словенски превод* (Београд, 1979).

- Redin, E. (Редин, Е.) *О некоторых лицевых рукописях “Шестоднева” Иоанна экзарха Болгарского* (Москва, 1902).
- Rusek, J. (Русек Й.) “Из наблюденията върху лексиката на Йоан-Екзарховия ‘Шестоднев,’” *Старобългаристика/Palaebulgarica* 4 (1992) 27–33.
- Sarafanova-Demkova, N.S. (Сарафанова-Демкова, Н.С.) “Иоанн экзарх Болгарский в сочинениях Аввакума,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 367–372.
- Shestodnev, *Шестоднев Иоанна Экзарха Болгарского как памятник средневекового философствования* (Москва, 1991).
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) *Шестоднев Кирилла Философа* (С.-Петербург, 1901).
- Stefova, L. (Стефова, Л.) “Имена на народи в Шестоднева на Йоан Екзарх,” *Български език* 3 (1991) 437–445.
- Trendafilov, H. (Трендафилов, Х.) *Йоан Екзарх Български* (София, 2001) 47–82.
- Trifonov, Ju. (Трифонов, Ю.) “Сведения из старобългарския живот в ‘Шестоднева’ на Йоана Екзарх,” *Списание на Българската академия на науките* (35; София, 1926) 1–26.
- , “Йоан Екзарх Български и неговото описание на човешкото тяло,” *Български преглед* 1.2 (1929) 165–202.
- Turovcev, T.A. (Туровцев, Т.А.) *Экзегетика Шестоднева и представление о пространстве и времени в новоевропейской философии* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2006).
- Vatev, J. (Ватев, Й.) “Същност и произход на битието според Шестоднев на Йоан Екзарх,” *Философска мисъл* 8 (1980) 91–97.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 26–27; 256–257.
- Vorob'ev, S. (Воробьев, С.) “Антропоцентрическая направленность представлений русского средневековья о шестом дне творения,” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 20–23.

Costographies
(Космографии)

a. *Texts*

- Golyshenko, V.S., Dubrovina, V.F. (Гольшенко, В.С., Дубровина, В.Ф.) *Книга нарицаема Козьма Индикоплов* (Москва, 1997).
- Grigor'ev, A.V. (Григорьев, А.В.) “‘Христианская топография’ Козьмы Индикоплова (космологические и онтологические фрагменты),” in:

- Gromov, M.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Громов, М.Н., Мильков, В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 309–320.
- Kniga, “Книга глаголемая Козмография, сложена от древних философов, переведена с римского языка,” *Временник Общества истории и древностей российских* 16 (1853) 1–14.
- Kniga, *Книга глаголемая Козмы Индикоплова* (Общество любителей древней письменности, 86; С.-Петербург, 1886).
- Kosmografija, *Козмография 1670 г.* (Общество любителей древней письменности, 21, 57, 68; Петербург, 1878–1881).
- Kosta, P. *Eine russische Kosmographie aus dem 17. Jahrhundert* (München, 1982).
- Minaev, D.I. (Минаев, Д.И.) “Книга глаголемая Козмография, сложена от древних философов и переведена с римского языка на славенский,” *Сын Отечества* 3 (1851) 1–44.
- О geograficheskikh, “О географических сведениях древних россиян. Древняя русская Козмография,” *Московский Телеграф* 42.24 (1831) 456–485.
- Rorov, A.N. (Попов, А.Н.) *Изборник славянских и русских сочинений и статей, внесенных в хронографы русской редакции* (Москва, 1869) 459–507.
- Redin, E.K. (Редин, Е.К.) *Христианская Топография Козьмы Индикоплова по греческим и русским спискам* (ч. 1; Москва, 1916).

b. *Translations*

- Grigor'ev, A.V. (Григорьев, А.В.) “Христианская топография’ Козьмы Индикоплова (космологические и онтологические фрагменты),” in: Gromov, M.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Громов, М.Н., Мильков, В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 309–311.

c. *Research*

- Abramov, N. (Абрамов, Н.) “Козмография, относящаяся к началу второй половины XVII стол. Перевод с иностранного монаха Епифания Славинецкого,” *Известия императорского Географического общества* 2.3 (1866) 96–97.
- Alekseev, M.P. (Алексеев, М.П.) “Англия и англичане в памятниках Московской письменности XVI–XVII вв.,” *Ученые записки ЛГУ. Серия исторических наук* 15 (1946) 63–84.
- Arsen'ev, Ju.V. (Арсеньев, Ю.В.) “Описание Москвы и Московского государства. По неизданному списку Козмографии конца XVII в.,” *Записки Московского археологического института* 11 (1911) 1–17.
- Bahturina, R.V. (Бахтурина, Р.В.) “К вопросу о ранних восточнославянских переводах с польского,” in: *История русского языка: Исследования и тексты* (Москва, 1982) 76–77.
- , “Козмография’ русской редакции XVI в. и ‘Хроника всего света’ Мартина Бельского,” in: *Древняя Русь и Запад. Научная конференция* (Москва, 1996) 148–150.

- Barandeev, F.I. (Барандеев, Ф.И.) “Русские космографии XVI–XVII в.: история и перспективы изучения,” *Известия АН СССР. Сер. геогр.* 3 (1990) 111–121.
- , “Русские космографии XVI–XVII в.,” *Русская речь* 1 (1991) 103–109.
- , “Русские космографии XVI–XVII в. в аспекте топонимического источниковедения,” *Топонимия России* (Москва, 1993) 119–132.
- , “Космографии как памятники культуры и письменности Московской Руси,” in: *Язык и культура. Вторая международная конференция: тезисы* (часть 1; Киев, 1993) 177–178.
- , “Русские ‘Космографии:’ эволюция жанра,” in: *Древняя Русь и Запад. Научная конференция* (Москва, 1996) 144–147.
- , “Космография (материалы к ‘Русской энциклопедии’),” in: *Издательское дело и редактирование. Теория. Методика. Практика* (Вып. 4; Москва, 2000) 109–133.
- Beljaev, I.D. (Беляев, И.Д.) “О географических сведениях в древней Руси,” *Зап. РГО* 6 (1852) 1–264.
- Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) “География в виде колоды карт (Из переводческой деятельности в Москве Николая Спафария),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1977) 108–126.
- , “К истории библиотеки патриарха Адриана,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1977) 406–414.
- , “Географические сочинения в России XVII в.,” in: *Барокко в славянских культурах* (Москва, 1982) 316–325.
- , “Космография,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.493–494.
- , “Космографии,” in: Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.), *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 94–95.
- Borodin, O.R. (Бородин, О.Р.) “Космография Равеннского анонима (К вопросу о ее месте в истории географической науки),” *Византийский Временник* 43 (1982) 54–63.
- Gluskina, S.M. (Глускина, С.М.) *Космография Богдана Лыкова 1637 г.* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1949).
- , “Космография 1637 года как русская переработка текста ‘Атласа’ Меркатора,” *Географический сборник* (Кн. 3; Москва-Ленинград, 1954) 79–99.
- , “Общественная терминология в Космографии 1637 г.,” *Ученые записки Псковского педагогического института* 2 (1954) 186–243.
- Grigor’ev, A.V. (Григорьев, А.В.) “Космологические и онтологические идеи в ‘Христианской топографии’ Козьмы Индикоплова,” in: Gromov, M.N., Mil’kov, V.V. (Громов, М.Н., Мильков, В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 307–309.
- Gukova, S.N. (Гукова, С.Н.) “Карта мира Козьмы Индикоплова,” in: *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины* (Т. 17; Ленинград, 1985) 308–321.

- Pjushina, L.A. (Илюшина, Л.А.) "Христианская топография Козьмы Индикоплова," in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (Вып. 2. Ч. 1; Москва, 1976) 157–164.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 2.1 (1897) 178–184.
- Jacobs, A. "Kosmas Indicopleustes, Die Christliche Topographie in slavischen Übersetzung," *Byzantinoslavica* 40.2 (1979) 183–198.
- Kazakova, N.A. (Казакова, Н.А.) "Полные списки русского перевода 'Хроники всего света' Марциана Бельского," *Археографический ежегодник за 1980 г.* (Москва, 1981) 92–96.
- Lebedev, D.M. (Лебедев, Д.М.) *География в России XVII в.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1949) 208–219.
- Peckarskij, P.P. (Пекарский, П.П.) *Наука и литература при Петре Великом* (т. 1; Москва, 1862) 334–344.
- Pigulevskaja, N.V. (Пигулевская, Н.В.) *Византия на путях в Индию* (Москва-Ленинград, 1951) 129–156.
- Piotrovskaja, E.K. (Пиотровская, Е.К.) "On the Old Russian Version of 'Christian Topography' by Cosmas Indicopleustes," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* (XVI. Internationaler Byzantinischerkongress. Akten 11/4; Bd 32/4; Wien, 1982) 147–152.
- , "Христианская топография Козьмы Индикоплова," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 465–467.
- , "К изучению древнерусской версии 'Христианской топографии' Козьмы Индикоплова," *Византийский временник* 5 (1991) 105–111.
- , "Древнерусская версия 'Христианской Топографии' Козьмы Индикоплова и 'Толковая Палея,'" *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 48 (1993) 138–142.
- , "Христианская топография Козьмы Индикоплова," in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 223–224.
- Podosinov, A.V. (Подосинов, А.В.) "Традиции античной географии в 'Космографии' Равеннского анонима," in: *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР: Материалы и исследования 1987 г.* (Москва, 1989) 248–256.
- , "Франкская космография," in: *Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах* (т. 2; Москва, 1995) 398–400.
- , "'Космография' Равеннского Анонима," in: *Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах* (т. 2; Москва, 1995) 401–405.
- Rorov, A.N. (Попов, А.Н.) *Обзор Хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 2; Москва, 1869) 189–193.
- Rajkov, V.E. (Райков, В.Е.) *Очерки по истории гелиоцентрического мировоззрения в России* (Москва-Ленинград, 1947) 121–132.

- Rajnov, T. (Райнов, Т.) *Наука в России XI–XVII вв.: Очерки по истории донаучных и естественнонаучных воззрений на природу* (Москва-Ленинград, 1940) 372–431.
- Slovar', *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв. Указатель источников* (Москва, 1975) 58–59.
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) *История русского литературного языка* (Ленинград, 1980) 139.
- Superanskaja, A.V. (Суперанская, А.В.) “Географические представления по данным топонимии ‘Космографии’ XVII в.,” in: *Вопросы географии. Топонимика на службе географии* (110; Москва, 1979) 172–178.
- Uda'cova, Z.V. (Удальцова, З.В.) “Страничка из истории византийской культуры. Козьма Индикоплов и его ‘Христианская топография,’” in: *Византиноведческие этюды* (Тбилиси, 1978) 82–90.
- , “Косьма Индикоплов и его ‘Христианская топография,’” in: *Культура Византии* (т. 1; Москва, 1984) 467–477.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 243–247.
- Wolska, W. *La Topographie Chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustès. Théologie et science au VI siècle* (Paris, 1962).

Zlatostruj
(Златоструй)

a. *Texts*

- Arheograficheskaia, Археографическая комиссия, *Великие Минеи Четии, собранные Всероссийским митрополитом Макарием Ноябрь, дни 13–15* (С.-Петербург, 1899) 1180–1579.
- Malinin, V.N. (Малинин, В.Н.) *Десять слов Златоструя XII в.* (С.-Петербург, 1910).

c. *Research*

- Abramovich, D.I. (Абрамович, Д.И.) “Отрывок Хроники Иоанна Малалы в Златоструе XII в.,” in: *Сборник статей в честь академика А.И. Соболевского. Статьи по славянской филологии и русской словесности* (Ленинград, 1928) 19–24.
- Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) “Творения отцов церкви в древнерусской письменности,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* август (1888) 207–208.
- , *Творения отцов церкви в древнерусской письменности* (вып. 4; Казань, 1890) 103–228.
- Chagovec, V.A. (Чаговец, В.А.) *Преподобный Феодосий Печерский, его жизнь и сочинения: Историко-литературный очерк* (Киев, 1901) 84–126.
- Fomina, M.S. (Фомина, М.С.) “Об одном источнике Великих Четых Минеи митрополита Макария (‘Златоструй’),” in: *Проблемы литературных*

- жанров: *Материалы IV научной межвузовской конференции (28.09–1.10.1982 г.)* (Томск, 1983) 12–14.
- , “Жанровые и сюжетно-композиционные особенности древнерусского литературного сборника ‘Златоструй,’” in: *Вопросы сюжета и композиции* (Горький, 1984) 14–19.
- , “‘Златоструй’ (Исследовательские материалы для ‘Словаря книжников и книжности Древней Руси.’ Четыре сборники Древней Руси),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 39 (1985) 243–246.
- , “‘Златоструй,’” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 187–190.
- , “‘Златоструй’ в славянской письменности XII–XVI вв.,” *Методические рекомендации по описанию славянорусских рукописных книг* (Вып. 3, ч. 2; Москва, 1990) 297–328.
- , “Древнейшие списки сборника ‘Златоструй’ в ранней славянской письменности (XI–XIII вв.),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 47 (1993) 34–53.
- , “‘Златоструй’ как памятник литературы XII–XVI вв. (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2000).
- İl’inskiĭ, G. (Ильинский, Г.) *Златоструй А.Ф. Быкова XI века* (Българ. старини, 10; София, 1929).
- Ivanova K. (Иванова, К.) “Неизвестна редакция на Златоструя в сръбски извод от XIII в.,” *Стара српска књижевност* 10 (1976) 89–107.
- , “‘Златоструй,’” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 203–204.
- Izergin, V. (Изергин, В.) “Материалы для литературной истории древнерусских сборников. 1. Греческий источник одного слова в ‘Златоусте,’” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 80.1 (1905) 1–15.
- Kalajdovich, K. (Калайдович, К.) *Иоанн ектарх Болгарский* (Москва, 1824) 15, 100.
- Karaulova, F.V. (Караулова, Ф.В.) “Графика и орфография русского Златоструя XII века из публичной библиотеки,” *Ученые записки Мордовского университета* 86 (1971) 3–10.
- , *Палеографическое и фонетическое описание рукописи “Златоструй” XII в.* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1977).
- , “Жанровые и сюжетнокомпозиционные особенности древнерусского литературного сборника ‘Златоструй,’” in: *Вопросы сюжета и композиции* (Горький, 1984) 14–19.
- Malinin, V.N. (Малинин, В.Н.) *Исследование Златоструя по рукописи XII в. Императорской Публичной библиотеки* (Киев, 1878).
- , *Десять слов Златоструя XII века* (С.-Петербург, 1910).
- Malozemov, A. (Малоземов, А.) *Слово Иоанна Златоустаго на воскресение* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 169; С.-Петербург, 1908).

- Palauzov, S.N. (Палаузов, С.Н.) *Век Симеона Болгарского* (С.-Петербург, 1852) 84.
- Shafarik, P.I. (Шафарик, П.И.) “Расцвет славянской письменности в Болгарии,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 7.3 (1848) 54.
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) “Из области древней церковнославянской проповеди,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 2.1 (1906) 45, 50–52.
- Stroev, P. (Строев, П.) *Рукописи славянские и российские, принадлежащие Ивану Никитичу Царскому* (Москва, 1848) 109–122.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Сборники устойчивого состава,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 177–178.
- Ziborov, V.K. (Зиборов, В.К.) “Златоструй – источник Нестора агиографа и летописца,” in: *Мавродинские чтения* (С.-Петербург, 1994) 44–48.

Zlatoust
(Златоуст)

c. Research

- Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) “Творения отцов церкви в древнерусской письменности,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* август (1888) 213–214.
- Chertoricckaja, T.V. (Черторицкая, Т.В.) “О начальных этапах формирования древнерусских литературных сборников Златоуст и Торжественник (триодного типа),” in: *Источниковедение литературы древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1980) 96–114.
- , “Об архитектонике дидактических сочинений древнерусских златоустов,” in: *Вопросы сюжета и композиции* (Горький, 1987) 19–28.
- , “Торжественник и Златоуст в русской письменности XIV–XVII вв.,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописных книг* (Вып. 3, ч. 2; Москва, 1990) 329–381.
- Gorskij, A.V. (Горский, А.В.) “О древних словах на святую четвердедесятницу,” in: *Прибавл. к изданию творений святых отцов в русском переводе* (ч. 17; Москва, 1858) 34–64.
- Granstrom, E.Je. (Гранстрем, Е.Э.) “Иоанн Златоуст в древней русской и южнославянской письменности (XI–XIV вв.),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 35 (1980) 345–375.
- Ioann, *Иоанн Златоуст в древнеславянской и южнославянской письменности XI–XVI веков: Каталог гомилий* (Е.Э. Гранстрем et al.; С.-Петербург, 1998).
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) *Сборники Златоуст и Торжественник* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 158; С.-Петербург, 1905) 3–9.
- Petuhov, E. (Петухов, Е.) “Древние поучения на воскресные дни великого поста,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 40.3 (1886) I–XIX, 1–30.

- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Златоуст. Рукопись XVI века Тверского музея* (Москва, 1889).
- Strokovskaja, T.E. (Строковская, Т.Е.) “Сочинения болгарского писателя Климента Охридского ‘Слово о Троице, о твари и о суде’ в составе рукописных ‘Златоустов’ XV–XVI вв.,” in: *Зарубежные славяне в прошлом и настоящем* (Москва, 1999) 56–72.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Описание и классификация списков сборника ‘Златоуст,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 39 (1985) 278–284.
- , “Сборники устойчивого состава,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 177–178.
- Tvorogov, O.V., Chertorickaja, T.V. (Творогов, О.В., Черторицкая, Т.В.) “Златоуст,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.358–363.
- Vasil'ev, L.L. (Васильев, Л.Л.) *Богдановский Златоуст XVI в.* (С.-Петербург, 1905).
- Zabelin, I.E. (Забелин, И.Е.) “Из книги Златоуст,” in: Забелин И. Е. *Опыты изучения русских древностей и истории* (ч. 1; Москва, 1872) 179–188.

Izmaragd
(Измарагд)

a. *Texts*

- Izmaragd*, *Измарагд* (Москва, 1912).
- Kolesov, V.V., Rozhdestvenskaja, V.V. (Колесов, В.В., Рождественская, В.В.) “Из Измарагда,” in: *Домострой* (2nd ed.; eds. В.В. Колесов, В.В. Рождественская, С.-Петербург, 2005) 271–285.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Из ‘Измарагда,’” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. Середина XVI века* (Москва, 1985) 54–69.
- , “Из ‘Измарагда,’” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 10.100–115.

b. *Translations*

- Kolesov, V.V., Rozhdestvenskaja, V.V. (Колесов, В.В., Рождественская, В.В.) “Из Измарагда,” in: *Домострой* (2nd ed.; eds. В.В. Колесов, В.В., Рождественская, С.-Петербург, 2005) 286–300.
- Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 171–172.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Из ‘Измарагда,’” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. Середина XVI века* (Москва, 1985) 54–69.
- , “Из ‘Измарагда,’” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 10.100–115.

c. *Research*

- Adrianova-Perets, V.P. (Адрианова-Перетц, В.П.) “К вопросу о круге чтения древнерусского писателя,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 3–29.
- Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) *Творения отцов церкви и древнерусской письменности* (вып. 1–2; Казань, 1889) 46–27, 61–74; (вып. 3; Казань, 1890) 88–116.
- Horvat, G. (Хорват, Г.) “Об ‘Измарагде’ из собрания Румянцева Гос. Библиотеки СССР им. В.И. Ленина,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 37 (1983) 415–417.
- Istorija, *История русской литературы* (т. 2, ч. 1; Москва-Ленинград, 1946) 155–162.
- Izvergin, V. (Извергин, В.) “Материалы для литературной истории древнерусских сборников,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 81.1 (1905) 16–78.
- Jakovlev, V.A. (Яковлев, В.А.) *К литературной истории древнерусских сборников: Опыт исследования “Измарагда”* (Одесса, 1893).
- Javorskij, Ju.A. (Яворский, Ю.А.) *Малорусский отрывок Измарагда XVII в.* (Berlin, 1908).
- Karneev, A. (Карнеев, А.) “Вероятный источник ‘Слова о среде и пятке,’” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* сентябрь (1891) 160–175.
- Klibanov, A.I. (Клибанов, А.И.) *Реформационные движения в России в XIV – первой половине XVI в.* (Москва, 1960) 385–388.
- Labunsev, Ju.A. (Лабынцев, Ю.А.) “О некоторых поздних старообрядческих изданиях памятников древнерусской литературы,” in: *Федоровские чтения* (Москва, 1987) 194–202.
- Luk'janov, P. (Лукьянов, П.) “Отчет о занятиях в столичных библиотеках,” *Протоколы заседаний совета императорского Харьковского университета и приложения к ним* 6 (1967) 557–595; 7 (1967) 628–643.
- Nekrasov, I.S. (Некрасов, И.С.) *Опыт историко-литературного исследования о происхождении древнерусского Домостроя* (Москва, 1873) 107–116, 121–123.
- Perets, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) *Исследования и материалы по истории старинной украинской литературы XVI–XVIII вв.* (т. 3; Ленинград, 1929) 1–19.
- Petrov, N. (Петров, Н.) *О происхождении и составе славяно-русского печатного Пролога: (Иноземные источники)* (Киев, 1875) 297–300.
- Petuhov, E. (Петухов, Е.) *Серапион Владимирский, русский проповедник XIII в.* (С.-Петербург, 1888) 202–205.
- Rorov, N.P. (Попов, Н.П.) “Памятники литературы стригольников,” *Исторические Записки* 7 (1940) 34–45.
- Pudalov, V.M. (Пудалов, В.М.) “К вопросу о литературной истории Измарагда,” *Материалы XXII Всесоюзной научной студенческой конференции. Филология* (Новосибирск, 1984) 42–47.

- , “Версия о нижегородском происхождении сборника ‘Измарагд,’” in: *В памяти Отечества. (Сборник докладов Чтений ИРЛИ)* (Горький, 1989) 65–74.
- , “‘Румянцевский Измарагд’ – рукописный памятник древнерусской духовной культуры (К вопросу о бытовании рукописи в Гагинской округе),” in: *Памятники истории и культуры Горьковской области. Информационные материалы* (Горький, 1989) 31–34.
- , “Сборник ‘Измарагд’ в русской письменности XIV–XVIII вв.,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописных книг* (Вып. 3; Москва, 1990) 382–405.
- , “Сборник ‘Измарагд’ в русской письменности XIV–XVIII вв.,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописных книг* (Вып. 3, ч. 2; Москва, 1990) 382–405.
- , “Нижегородский ‘Измарагд’ конца XVIII века (К вопросу о завершении литературной истории сборника),” in: *Тезисы докладов VI научной конференции “Проблемы исследования памятников истории, культуры и природы Европейской России”* (Нижний Новгород, 1995) 53–54.
- , *Сборник “Измарагд” в древнерусской литературе* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 1996).
- , “Литературная история 1-й (древнейшей) редакции Измарагда,” *Древняя Русь: Вопросы медиевистики* 2 (2000) 76–95.
- , “К литературной истории сборника ‘Измарагд’ формирование 2-й (‘Основной’) редакции,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 330–342.
- Sedel'nikov, A.D. (Седельников, А.Д.) “Следы стригольнической книжности,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 1 (1934) 128–130.
- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “‘Измарагд’ особого состава из собрания Ундольского,” in: *Проблемы культурного наследия* (Москва, 1985) 151–154.
- , “Измарагд: Четгы сборники Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 39 (1985) 449–453.
- , “Измарагд,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.397–401.
- , “Сборники устойчивого состава,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 177–178.
- Vladimirov, P.V. (Владимиров, П.В.) “Из истории древнерусской письменности: (Переводные творения отцов церкви. Вопросы и ответы. Измарагды),” *Чтения в историческом обществе Нестора летописца* 9.4 (1895) 28–44.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 240.

Margarit
(Маргарит)

a. *Texts*

Arheograficheskaia, *Археографическая комиссия. Великие Минеи Четии, собранные Всероссийским митрополитом Макарием. Сентябрь, дни 14–24* (С.-Петербург, 1869) 773–1193.

Margarit, *Маргарит* (Москва, 1764).

c. *Research*

Angelov, V. (Ангелов, Б.) “Търновският книжовник Дионисий Дивний,” *Старобългарска литература* 7 (1980) 54–62.

Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) “Творения отцов церкви в древнерусской письменности,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* август (1888) 212.

Chertorickaia, T.V. (Черторицкая, Т.В.) “Маргарит,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.100–102.

Gorskij, A., Nevostrujev K. (Горский, А., Невоструев, К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки* (Отд. 2. ч. 2; Москва, 1859) 119–131.

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 3.2 (1898) 478–491, 509–511.

Kazenina, E.T. (Казенина, Е.Т.) “‘Маргарит’ и историко-культурная ситуация на Руси XV–XVI в.,” *Древняя Русь* 10 (2002) 57–66.

Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Из грецко-българските книжовни отношения през XVII–XVIII в.,” *Годишник на Софийския университет* 62 (1968) 139–144.

Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) “Иоанн Златоуст в русской письменности,” in: *Православная Богословская Энциклопедия* (12 томов; С.-Петербург, 1905) 6.943.

Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Сборники устойчивого состава,” in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 177–178.

Velkovska, E. (Велковска, Е.) “Маргарит,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 293–294.

Romanova, A.A., Sergeev, A.G. (Романова, А.А., Сергеев, А.Г.) “Каталогкус albo реестр всех книг божественаго Иоана Златоустаго’ из ‘Нового Маргарита,’” in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода “Переводной литературы” А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).

Physiologus
(Физиолог)

a. *Texts*

- Aleksandrov, A. (Александров, А.) *Физиолог* (Казань, 1893).
 —, “Физиолог,” *Ученые Записки Казанского Университета* 60.3 (39–74) 81–112.
 Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) “Физиолог,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XIII Век* (Москва, 1981) 474–485, 613–614.
 —, “Физиолог,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 5.402–413.
 Karneev, A. (Карнеев, А.) *Материалы и заметки по литературной истории Физиолога* (С.-Петербург, 1890).
 Vaneeva, E.I. (Ванеева, Е.И.) *Физиолог* (С.-Петербург, 1996).

b. *Translations*

- Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) “Физиолог,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XIII Век* (Москва, 1981) 474–485, 613–614.
 —, “Из ‘Физиолога,’” in: *Златоструй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Kuz'min; Москва, 1990) 291–296.
 —, “Физиолог,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 5.402–413.
 Prokof'ev, N.I. et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 128–134.

c. *Research*

- Arhangel'skaja, A.V. (Архангельская, А.В.) “Физиолог,” in: *Литература Московской и Домосковской Руси* (ed. А.С. Демин; Москва, 2008) 758–762.
 Bagrij, A. (Багрий, А.) “Древнерусское сказание о птицах,” *Русский Филологический Вестник* 67.1–2 (1912) 289–322.
 Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) “Физиолог,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 461–462.
 Belova, O.V. (Белова, О.В.) “О чудесной птице Алконост,” *Русская Речь* 1 (1993) 113–117.
 —, “К вопросу об изучении славянского ‘Физиолога,’” *Славяноведение* 2 (1995) 38–45.
 —, *Названия и символика животных в памятниках восточно- и южно-славянской книжности XII–XVII вв.* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1996).
 —, “Баснословный зверинец,” *Живая Старина* 2 (1996) 47–50.
 —, “Легенда о дятле и разрыв-траве в книжной и устной традиции,” *Живая Старина* 1 (1997) 34.
 —, “Славянский ‘Физиолог.’ Полные тексты и фрагменты в книжности восточных и южных славян,” in: *Древнерусская культура в мировом*

- контексте: археология и междисциплинарные исследования (ed. А.В. Чернецов; Москва, 1999) 196–204.
- , “Списки древнерусского ‘Физиолога’ в монастырских собраниях,” in: *Рукописные собрания церковного происхождения в библиотеках и музеях России* (ed. В. Даниленко; Москва, 1999) 157–164.
- , *Славянский Бестиарий* (Москва, 2000).
- Durnovo, N.N. (Дурново, Н.Н.) “К истории сказаний о животных в старинной русской литературе,” *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 3 (1902) 45–113.
- Gura, A.V. (Гура, А.В.) *Символика животных в славянской народной традиции* (Москва, 1997).
- Gudzij, N.K. (Гудзий, Н.К.) “Естественно-научные сочинения,” in: *История русской литературы. т. 1. Литература XI – нач. XIII в.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1941) 195–199.
- Jurchenko, A.G. (Юрченко, А.Г.) *Александрийский Физиолог: Зоологическая Мистерия* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 5–48.
- Karneev, A. (Карнеев, А.) “Новейшие исследования о Физиологе,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 267 (1890) 172–208.
- , *Материалы и заметки по литературной истории Физиолога* (С.-Петербург, 1890).
- Lur’e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) “Два миниатюриста XV в.: (К проблеме так называемого художественного мышления Древней Руси),” in: *Культурное наследие Древней Руси: Истоки; Становление; Традиции* (Москва, 1976) 105–111.
- Maksimovich, K.A. (Максимович, К.А.) “Птица феникс в древнерусской литературе (к интерпретации образа),” *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы XI–XIV вв.* (сб. 5; Москва, 1992) 316–334.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Физиолог,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 533–534.
- Mochul’skij, V. (Мочульский, В.) *Происхождение “Физиолога” и его начальные судьбы в литературах Востока и Запада* (Варшава, 1889).
- Novaković, S. (Новаковић, С.) “Physiologus,” *Starine* 11 (1879) 191–203.
- Oltjanu, P. (Олтяну, П.) “К истории ‘Физиолога’ в славянских и румынской литературах (Неизвестная среднеболгарская версия из Трансильвании),” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 8 (1984) 38–58.
- Ozhehovska, H. “Български ‘Физиолог’ от сбирката на В. Копитар в Народната и университетска библиотека в Любляна (Cod. Кор. 29),” *Старобългарска литература* 13 (1983) 91–143.
- Polivka, G. “Zur Geschichte des Physiologus in den slavischen Literaturen,” *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 14 (1892) 3–4; *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 15 (1892) 1–2.
- Rajkov, B.E. (Райков, Б.Е.) “Натуралистическое просвещение в Древней Руси,” *Ученые записки ЛГПИ им. А. И. Герцена. Кафедра метод. естествознания* 57 (1947) 5–24.

- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “К истории ‘Физиолога’ в старой болгарской письменности,” in: Сперанский М.Н. *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 148–159.
- Stojkova, A. (Стойкова, А.) “‘Физиолог’ (комментарии к тексту),” in: *Стара българска литература. Т.5. Естествознание* (ed. А. Милтенова; София, 1992) 242–255.
- , *Физиологът в южнославянските литератури* (София, 1994).
- Svane, G. “Славянский ‘Физиолог’ (Александрийская редакция): По рукописи Королевской библиотеки в Копенгагене,” *Arbejdsrapporter Slavisk Institut Århus Universitet* 6–7 (1986).
- Vaneeva, E. (Ванеева, Е.) “Комментарий к главе Физиолога об Ибисе, или цапле,” in: *In Memoriam: Памяти Я.С. Лурье* (С.-Петербург, 1997) 196–202.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 156–157; 251–252.

Trepetnik
(Трепетник)

a. *Texts*

- Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) “К истории южнославянской и древнерусской апокрифической литературы,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4.1 (1899) 131.
- Speranskij, M. (Сперанский, М.) *Из истории отреченных книг. II. Трепетники* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 131; С.-Петербург, 1899).

b. *Translations*

- Kaliganov, I., Polyujannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Польшванний, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 434–435.
- Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 324.

c. *Research*

- Angusheva-Tihanova, A. (Ангушева-Тиханова, А.) *Гадателните книги в старобългарската литература* (София, 1996) 78–79, 155–156.
- Копонов, N.N. (Кононов, Н.Н.) “Из области астрологии. Обзор статей: Планетника, Звездочетца, Колядника, Громника, Лунника, Трепетника, Тайная тайных, Лечебника и пр. рук. XVIII в. А.Г. Первухина,” *Древности. Труды Славянской комиссии императорского Московского археологического общества* 4.1 (1907) 45–47.
- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Трепетник,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 516.

Speranskij, M. (Сперанский, М.) *Из истории отреченных книг. II. Трехлетники* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 131; С.-Петербург, 1899).

Melissa
(Пчела)

a. *Texts*

Bessonov, P. (Бессонов, П.) “Книга Пчела: Памятник древней русской словесности, переведенный с греческого,” *Временник Общества Истории и Древностей Российских* 25 (1857).

Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Пчела,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси: XIII век* (Москва, 1981) 486–519, 614–616.

—, “Книги Бчела,” in: *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (ed. В.В. Колесов; Москва, 1989) 205–271.

Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.); Makeeva, I.I. (Макеева, И.И.) *Пчела. Древнерусский Перевод* (2 vols.; Памятники славяно-русской письменности. Новая серия; Москва, 2008) 1.1–444; 1.581–885.

Scheglova, S.A. (Щеглова, С.А.) “Пчела” *по рукописям Киевских библиотек: Опыт изучения и тексты* (С.-Петербург, 1910).

Semenov, V. (Семенов, В.) “Древняя русская Пчела по пергаменному списку,” in: *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности имп. Академии наук* 54.1 (1893) [репринт: *Melissa. Ein byzantinischen Florilegium, griechisch und altrussisch* (Slavische Propyläen, Bd 7; München, 1968)].

—, “Материалы к литературной истории русских Пчел,” in: *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1895).

Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Переводные сборники изречений в славянорусской письменности. Исследование и тексты* (Москва, 1904) 155–392.

b. *Translations*

Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Пчела,” in: *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (ed. В.В. Колесов; Москва, 1989) 272–340.

Prokof'ev, N.I., ed. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древняя русская литература: Хрестоматия* (Москва, 2005) 107–108.

Prokof'ev, N.I., et al. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древнерусская Притча* (Москва, 1991) 331–342.

c. *Research*

Adrianova-Perets, V.P. (Адрианова-Перетц, В.П.) “Человек в учительной литературе Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 3–68.

Budde, E. (Будде, Е.) “О слове Давиила Заточника в его отношении к древнерусской Пчеле,” in: *Под знаменем науки* (Москва, 1902) 74–94.

- Chizhevskij, D. *Melissa. Ein byzantinisches Florilegium* (München, 1968).
- Egunov, A.N. (Егунов, А.Н.) “Erotici scriptores в древнерусской ‘Пчеле,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 24 (1969) 101–104.
- Gorskij, A. (Горский, А.), Nevostruev, K. (Невоструев, К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки* (отд. 2. ч. 3; Москва, 1862) 530–569.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Был ли Даниил Заточник действительно заточен?* (Летопись Историко-филологического общества при Новороссийском университете, 10, Одесса, 1902) 20–32.
- Mihajlov, A.V. (Михайлов, А.В.) “К вопросу о греко-византийских и славянских сборниках изречений,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* январь (1893) 15–59.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Пчела,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 418–419.
- Mindalev P. (Миндалев, П.) *Моление Даниила Заточника и связанные с ним памятники* (Казань, 1914) 244–279.
- Modestov, I. (Модестов, И.) “О послании Даниила Заточника,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* ноябрь (1880) 165–195.
- Obolenskij, M.A. (Оболенский, М.А.) “Летописец Переяславля Суздальского,” *Временник Общества Истории и Древностей Российских* 9 (1851) 82–84.
- Perets, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) “Сведения об античном мире в Древней Руси XI–XIV в.,” *Гермес* 20 (1917) 261–262.
- Rozanov, S.P. (Розанов, С.П.) *Материалы по истории русских Пчел* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 154; С.-Петербург, 1904).
- Saharov, I.P. (Сахаров, И.П.) “О слове Даниила Заточника,” *Москвитянин* 5 (1843) 149–155.
- Scheglova, S.A. (Щеглова, С.А.) “Пчела” по рукописям киевских библиотек. *Опыт изучения и тексты* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 175; С.-Петербург, 1910).
- Shevurev, S.P. (Шевырев, С.П.) *История русской словесности, преимущественно древней* (т. 1, ч. 2; Москва, 1846) 248.
- Snegirev, I.M. (Снегирев, И.М.) *Русские в своих пословицах* (кн. 1; Москва, 1831) 71.
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) “Особенности русских переводов домонгольского периода,” in: Соболевский, А.И. *История русского литературного языка* (Ленинград, 1980) 141.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *К истории взаимоотношений русской и южнославянских литератур* (Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности, 26; Петроград, 1923) 190–192.
- Suhomlinov, M.I. (Сухомлинов, М.И.) “Замечания о сборниках известных под названием ‘Пчел,’” *Известия по Отделению Русского Языка и Словесности* 2 (1853) 222–234.

- Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) “Пчела,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 382–387.
- Zilitinkevich, V.S. (Зилитинкевич, В.С.) “Переводы из Феогнида в древнерусской Пчеле,” in: *Источниковедение литературы Древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1980) 33–37.

Just Balance
(Мерило Праведное)

a. *Texts*

- Schneider, R. *Die moralisch-belehrenden Artikel im altrussischen Sammelband Merilo Pravednoe* (MLSDV, 23; Freiburg, 1986).
- Tihomirov, M.N. (Тихомиров, М.Н.) *Мерило Праведное по рукописи XIV века* (Москва, 1961).

b. *Translations*

- Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) “Из Мерила Праведного,” in: *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (ed. В.В. Колесов; Москва, 1989) 338–340.

c. *Research*

- Begunov, Ju.K. (Бегунов, Ю.К.) “Кормчая Ивана Волка Курицына,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 12 (1956) 141–159.
- Beljakova, E.V. (Белякова, Е.В.) “Источники Кормчей Ивана Волка Курицына,” in: *Древнерусская литература: Источниковедение* (Ленинград, 1984) 75–83.
- Beneshevich, V.N. (Бенешевич, В.Н.) *Древнеславянская кормчая. 14 титулов без толкований* (Т. 1; Вып. 1–3; С.-Петербург, 1906–1907).
- Danilova, V.M. (Данилова, В.М.) *Палеографическое и фонетическое описание рукописи «Мерило Праведное» (Троицкое собрание, № 15)* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1969).
- Janakieva, S. (Янакиева, Ц.) “Теоретические и методические проблемы русского языка как иностранного в начале XXI века. К вопросу о диалекте писца сборника второй половины XIV века Мерило Праведное,” in: *Сборник доклады. Руски език. Юбилейна научна сесия, посветена на 1300 – годишнината на българската държава* (Шумен, 1982) 27–35.
- Jushkov, V.S. (Юшков, В.С.) *К истории древнерусских юридических сборников (XIII в.)* (Саратов, 1921).
- Kalachev, N.V. (Калачев, Н.В.) *Исследование о Русской Правде. Ч. 1. Предварительные юридические сведения для полного объяснения Русской Правды* (Москва, 1846).
- , *Мерило Праведное* (Архив историко-юридических сведений, относящихся до России, 1; С.-Петербург, 1876).

- Kazakova, N.A., Lur'e, Ja.S. (Казакова, Н.А. и Лурье, Я.С.) *Антифеодальные еретические движения на Руси XIV – начала XVI вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955).
- Ljubimov, V.P. (Любимов, В.П.) “Списки Правды Русской,” in: *Правда Русская* (Т. 1; Москва-Ленинград, 1940) 99–100.
- Lur'e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) *Идеологическая борьба в русской публицистике конца XV – начала XVI в.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1960) 93–95, 171, 200–201, 284, 420.
- , “Курицын Иван-Волк,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.503–504.
- Nikolaev, G.A. (Николаев, Г.А.) *Формы именного словообразования в языке Мерила Праведного XIV века* (Ph.D. diss.; Казань, 1966).
- Pavlov, A.S. (Павлов, А.С.) *Первоначальный славяно-русский Номоканон* (Казань, 1969).
- , “Книги законныя,” содержащие в себе в древнерусском переводе византийские законы земледельческие, уголовные, брачные и судебные (С.-Петербург, 1885).
- Rozenkampff, G.A. (Розенкамф, Г.А.) *Обозрение Кормчей книги в историческом виде* (С.-Петербург, 1839).
- Shcharov, Ja.N. (Щапов, Я.Н.) *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследство на Руси в XI–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1978) 154.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Переводные сборники изречений в славяно-русской письменности* (Москва, 1904).
- Tihomirov, M.N. (Тихомиров, М.Н.) *Исследование о Русской Правде. Происхождение текстов* (Москва-Ленинград, 1941).
- , *Закон судный людем краткой редакци в русских рукописях. Вступительная статья к изданию Закона судного людем в краткой редакци* (Москва, 1961).
- Vostokov, A.H. (Востоков, А.Х.) *Описание русских и славянских рукописей Румянцевского музея* (Москва, 1841).
- Zalijnjak, A.A. (Зализняк, А.А.) “Мерило праведное” XIV века как акцентологический источник (München, 1990).

Golden Chain
(Златая Цепь)

a. *Texts*

- Krutova, M.S. (Крутова, М.С.) “Книга глаголемая Златая Чепь,” in: *Златая Цепь: Тексты, исследования, комментарии* (ed. М.С. Крутова, Москва, 2002) 19–186.

c. *Research*

- Alekseeva, T.A. (Алексеева, Т.А.) “Сборники постоянного и варьирующегося состава со словами Кирилла Туровского,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного*

- каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, ч. 1; Москва, 1976) 244–245.
- Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) *Творения отцов церкви в древнерусской письменности* (Казань, 1889) 2.143–146.
- Budovnic, I.U. (Будовниц, И.У.) “Изборник’ Святослава 1076 г. и ‘Поучение’ Мономаха и их место в истории русской общественной мысли,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 10 (1954) 61, 72–73.
- Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) “Русские пословицы и поговорки,” in: *Архив историко-юридических сведений, относящихся до России, издаваемый И. Калачовым* (кн. 2, 2-я пол., отд. 1; Москва, 1855) 69–70.
- Filaret (Филарет, епископ рижский) “Содержание рукописи Златая чепь принадлежащей к началу XIV века и хранящейся в библиотеке Сергиевой лавры,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1846) 45–48.
- Golubinskij, E. (Голубинский, Е.) *История Русской Церкви* (Москва, 1880) 1.726.
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Замечания о составе Толковой палеи,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 65.6 (1898) 136, 416.
- Jakovlev, V.A. (Яковлев, В.А.) *К литературной истории древнерусских сборников: Опыт исследования “Измарагда”* (Одесса, 1893) 30–41, 168.
- Klibanov, A.I. (Клибанов, А.И.) *Реформационные движения в России в XIV – 1-й пол. XVI в.* (Москва, 1960) 385–387.
- Kolobanov, V.A. (Колобанов, В.А.) *Общественно-литературная деятельность Сератиона Владимирского* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1962).
- Krutova, M.S. (Крутова, М.С.) “Златая чепь’ как тип сборника,” in: *Литература Древней Руси. Источниковедение* (Ленинград, 1987) 39–62.
- , “Текстологическая характеристика сборников ‘Золотая Цепь,’” in: *III Уральские Археографические Чтения: Археография и изучение духовной культуры. Тезисы докладов* (Свердловск, 1987) 5–6.
- , *Лексическая вариантность в русских списках “Златой Цепи” XIV–XVII вв.* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1989).
- , “Сборник ‘Златая цепь’ в русской письменности,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (Вып. 5, ч. 1–2; Новосибирск, 1990).
- , “О книжной коллекции И.П. Лаптева и Златой Цепи в ее составе,” in: *Общественное сознание, книжность, литература периода феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1990) 133–138.
- , “Лингвотекстологическое сопоставление ‘Златой Цепи’ с другими сборниками,” *Старобългаристика/Palaebulgarica* 3 (1990) 43–48.
- , “Изборник Святослава и Златая Цепь (сопоставительный анализ),” in: *Традиции древнейшей славянской письменности и языковой культуры славян* (Москва, 1991) 53–64.

- , “Семантика варьирующей лексики в рукописных сборниках непостоянного состава ‘Золотая Цепь’ и ‘Цветник’ XIV–XVII вв.,” in: *Семантика языковых единиц* (Москва, 1994) 4.53–56.
- , “‘Златая цепь’ по Троицкому списку,” in: *Культура: От информации к знанию* (Москва, 2003) 127–129.
- Krutova, M.S., Nevzorova, N.N. (Крутова, М.С., Невзорова, Н.Н.) “Златая Чепь,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 184–187.
- Nekrasov, I.S. (Некрасов, И.С.) “Опыт историко-литературного исследования о происхождении древнерусского Домостроя,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3 (1872) 105, 116–126.
- Nevzorova, N.N. (Невзорова, Н.Н.) *Кодикологическое и текстологическое описание пергаментной рукописи XIV в.: К вопросу о “Златой Чепи” как типе сборника* (М.А. thesis; Ленинград, 1979).
- Nikol’skij, N.K. (Никольский, Н.К.) “Отзыв о трудах профессора А. И. Пономарева,” in: *Журн. заседаний совета СПб. Духовн. акад. за 1899–1900 учебные годы* (С.-Петербург, 1902) 111–117.
- Orlov, A.S. (Орлов, А.С.) “Сборник Златоуст и Торжественник,” *Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства* 158 (1905) 4–5.
- , “Книга русского средневековья и ее энциклопедические виды,” *Доклады АН СССР. Сер. В* 3 (1931) 41–43.
- Petrov, N.I. (Петров, Н.И.) *О происхождении и составе славяно-русского печатного пролога: (Иноземные источники)* (Киев, 1875) 284–331.
- Petuhov, V.V. (Петухов, Б.В.) *Серапион Владимирский – великий русский проповедник XIII в.* (С.-Петербург, 1888) 189–213.
- , *Материалы и заметки из истории древней русской письменности. вып. 2. К вопросу о Златых Цепях* (Киев, 1894) 33–68.
- Popomarev, A.I. (Пономарев, А.И.) “Поучения о разных истинах веры, благочестия и христианской жизни,” in: *Памятники древнерусской церковно-учительной литературы* (вып. 3; С.-Петербург, 1897) IX–XIV.
- , “К литературной истории древнерусских сборников ‘Златая цепь,’” *Ученые записки Казанского университета* 8 (1916) 1–32.
- Rorov, N.P. (Попов, Н.П.) “Памятники литературы стригольников,” *Исторические Записки* 7 (1940) 45–48.
- Rybakov, V.A. (Рыбаков, Б.А.) “Смоленская надпись XIII в. о ‘врагах игуменах,’” *Советская Археология* 2 (1964) 185–187.
- Smirnov, S. (Смирнов, С.) *Древнерусский духовник* (Москва, 1914) 157–158.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Сочинения* (Москва, 1898) 1.25–26, 43.
- Vinogradov, V.P. (Виноградов, В.П.) *Уставные чтения: Очерки по истории греко-славянской церковно-учительной литературы* (Сергиев Посад, 1915) 183–187.
- Vladimirov, P.V. (Владимиров, П.В.) *Из истории древнерусской письменности* (Киев, 1895) 23, 32–44.

Zlataja Matica
(Златая Матица)

a. *Texts*

Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) *Историческая хрестоматия церковнославянского и русского языков* (Москва, 1861) 683–692.

c. *Research*

Bobrov, A.G. (Бобров, А. Г.) “Псковский сборник XV в. ‘Златая Матица,’” in: *Археология и история Пскова и Псковской земли. Краткие тезисы докладов к предстоящей научно-практической конференции* (Псков, 1988) 40–41.

—, *Апокрифическое “Сказание Афродитиана” в литературе и книжности Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 1994) 47–54.

Bobrov, A.G., Chertorickaja, T.V. (Бобров, А.Г., Черторицкая, Т.В.) “К проблеме Златой Матицы,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 43 (1990) 341–358.

Chertorickaja, T.V. (Черторицкая, Т.В.) “Литературные четьи сборники Древней Руси. К вопросу о структуре и классификации,” in: *Вопросы сюжета и композиции. Сборник статей* (Горький, 1985) 22.

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи, V. Златая Матица,” *Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности* 65.6 (1898) 96–135.

Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Slovenski tekstovi kanona o knjigami staroga i novoga zavjeta pod jedno s indeksom lažnih knjiga,” *Starine* 9 (1877) 99–107.

Karneev, A. (Карнеев, А.) “К вопросу о взаимных отношениях Толковой Палеи и Златой Матицы,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* февраль (1900) 344–345.

Porfir'ev, I.Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *История русской словесности* (ч. 1; Казань, 1886) 210–211.

Rystenka, A.V. (Рыстенко, А.В.) *Материалы для литературной истории Толковой Палеи* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1908) 14–17.

Schekin, A. “The Copy of the Isaiah Vision about the Last Times in the miscellany ‘Zlataja Matica,’ 15th c.,” *Scripta & e-Scripta* 3–4 (2006) 307–328.

Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “О Толковой Палее, Златой Матице и ‘естественно научных’ компиляциях,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 80–90.

—, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)* (2nd ed.; Библиотека Пушкинского Дома; С.-Петербург, 2008) 251–255; 257–263.

The Book of the Dove
(Голубиная Книга)

a. *Texts*

- Bessonov, P. (Бессонов, П.) *Калики перехожие. Сборник стихов XI–XVI вв.* (6 выпусков; С.-Петербург, 1861–1874) 1.269–378.
- Evgen'eva, A.P. (Евгеньева, А.П.) et al. *Древние русские стихотворения собранные Кириеем Даниловым* (2nd ed.; Москва, 1977) 208–213.
- Kulagina, A.V. (Кулагина, А.В.) *Русское устное народное творчество. Хрестоматия* (Москва, 1996) 522–528.
- Oksenov, A.V. (Оксенов, А.В.) *Народная поэзия. Былины, песни, сказки, поговорки, духовные стихи, повести. С очерками главнейших отделов русской народной поэзии, объяснительным словарем и образцами напевов народных песен* (4 ed.; С.-Петербург, 1908) 304–311.
- Selivanov, F.M. (Селиванов, Ф.М.) *Стихи духовные* (Москва, 1991) №2.
- Soloschenko, L.F. (Солощенко, Л.Ф.) *Голубиная книга: Русские народные духовные стихи XI–XIX вв.* (Москва, 1991) 34–48.
- Varencov, V.G. (Варенцов, В.Г.) *Сборник русских духовных стихов* (С.-Петербург, 1880) 11–40.

c. *Research*

- Adrianova, V.P. (Адрианова, В.П.) *Житие “Алексея, человека божия” в древней русской литературе и народной словесности* (Петроград, 1917).
- Arhipov, A.A. (Архипов, А.А.) “Голубиная книга Wort und Sache,” in: *Механизмы культуры* (Москва, 1990) 76.
- Markov, A.V. (Марков, А.В.) *Повесть о Володе и ее отношение к повести о св. граде Китеже и к стиху о Голубиной книге* (С.-Петербург, 1913).
- Mochul'skij, V.N. (Мочульский, В.Н.) *Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге* (Русский Филологический Вестник, 4; Варшава, 1887).
- , *О мнимом дуализме в мифологии славян* (Варшава, 1889).
- , *Следы народной Библии в славянской и древнерусской письменности* (Одесса, 1893).
- , *Апокрифическое сказание о создании мира* (Одесса, 1896).
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) “Отреченные книги Древней Руси,” in: *Сочинения* (т. 1; Москва, 1898) 127–255.
- Torogov, V.N. (Топоров, В.Н.) “Русская ‘Голубиная книга’ и иранский BUNDAHIŠN,” in: *Этимология 1976* (Москва, 1978) 152–153.
- , “‘Голубиная книга’ и ‘К плоти’: состав мира и его распад,” in: *Этнолингвистика текста. Семиотика малых форм фольклора* (1; Москва, 1987) 169–174.
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) “Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. III. Алатырь в местных преданиях Палестины и легенды о Граде. IV. Сон о дереве в Повести града Иерусалима и стихе о Голубиной Книге,” *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 11.4 (1881) 1–72.

Secretum Secretorum
(Тайная Тайных)

a. *Texts*

- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) “Тайная Тайных” и “Сказание об Аристотеле,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. Конец XV – первая половина XVI века* (Москва, 1984) 534–595, 750–755.
- , “Тайная Тайных” и “Сказание об Аристотеле,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 9.372–427.
- Istoricheskaja Hristomatija, *Историческая христоматия церковно-славянского и древнерусского языков* (ed. Ф. Буслаев; Москва, 1861) 1397–1404 (fragments).
- Speranskij, M. (Сперанский, М.) *Из истории отреченных книг. IV. Аристотелевы врата, или Тайная Тайных* (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 171; С.-Петербург, 1908).

b. *Translations*

- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) “Тайная Тайных” и “Сказание об Аристотеле,” in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники Литературы Древней Руси. Конец XV – первая половина XVI века* (Москва, 1984) 534–595, 750–755.
- , “Тайная Тайных” и “Сказание об Аристотеле,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 9.372–427.
- Medvedev, Ju.M. (Медведев, Ю.М.) *Сказания о чудесах* (т. 1; Москва, 1990) 154–157.

c. *Research*

- Adrianova, V.P. (Адрианова, В.П.) “К истории текста ‘Аристотелевых врат,’” *Русский Филологический Вестник* 66.3–4 (1911) 1–14.
- Bagno, V.E. (Багно, В.Е.) “За Аристотелевыми вратами (древнерусская и кастильская версии краткой редакции ‘Тайная Тайных’),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 54 (2003) 184–191.
- Bogojavlenskij, N.A. (Богоявленский, Н.А.) “Древнерусское врачевание в XI–XVII вв.,” in: *Источники для изучения истории русской медицины* (Москва, 1960) 34–38.
- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) “Тайная Тайных,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина XIV–XVI в.)* (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.427–430.
- Gaster, M. “The Hebrew Version of the ‘Secretum Secretorum,’” *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* January (1907) 111–162; October (1907) 879–912.

- Horoshkevich, A.L. (Хорошкевич, А.Л.) "Русско-славянские связи конца XV – начала XVI в. и их роль в становлении национального самосознания России," in: *История, культура, этнография и фольклор славянских народов. VII Международный съезд славистов. Доклады советской делегации* (Москва, 1973) 411–412.
- Jordan, W.C. "The 'Aristotelevy vrata:' Problems in Reconstructing an Ideology," *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 28.3 (1980) 398–401.
- Karskij, E.F. (Карский, Е.Ф.) *Белорусы* (Т. 3, ч. 2; Петроград, 1921) 52–55.
- Kononov, N.N. (Кононов, Н.Н.) "Из области астрологии. Обзор статей: Планетника, Звездочетца, Колядника, Громника, Лунника, Трепетника, Тайная тайных, Лечбника и пр. рук. XVIII в. А.Г. Первухина," *Древности. Труды Славянской комиссии императорского Московского археологического общества* 4.1 (1907) 45–47.
- Luria, J.S. "Unresolved Issues in the History of the Ideological Movements of the Late Fifteenth Century," in: *Medieval Russian Culture* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London, 1984) 152–153.
- Rorov, N.P. (Попов, Н.П.) "Иосифово Сказание о ереси жидовствующих по спискам Великих Миней," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 18.1 (1913) 173–197.
- Ryan, W.F. "A Russian Version of the *Secreta Secretorum* in the Bodleian Library," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 12 (1965) 40–48.
- , "Aristotle in Old Russian Literature," *The Modern Language Review* 63.3 (1968) 650–658.
- , "Древнерусский перевод жизнеописания Аристотеля Диогена Лаэртского," *Slavia* 37.2 (1968) 349–355.
- , "The Onomantic Table in the Old Russian *Secreta Secretorum*," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 49 (1971) 603–606.
- , "The Old Russian Version of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Secreta Secretorum*," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 56 (1978) 242–260.
- , "The *Secretum Secretorum* and the Muscovite Autocracy," in: *Pseudo-Aristotle: The Secret of Secrets. Sources and Influences* (Eds. by W.F. Ryan and Ch. B. Schmitt; Warburg Institute Surveys, 9; London, 1983) 114–123.
- , "The Passion of St Demetrius and the Secret of Secrets. An Onomantic Interpolation," *Cyrillomethodianum* 8/9 (1984/1985) 59–65.
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) "Логика" жидовствующих и "Тайная Тайных" (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 133; С.-Петербург, 1899) 5–13.
- , *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII вв.* (С.-Петербург, 1910) 419–423.
- Speranskij, M. (Сперанский, М.) "'Аристотелевы врата' и 'Тайная тайных,'" *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности императорской Академии наук* 101.3 (1928) 15–18.
- Turilov, A.A., Chernecov, A.V. (Турилов, А.А., Чернецов, А.В.) "Отреченная книга Рафли," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 40 (1985) 260–261; 282–283.
- Val'denberg, V. (Вальденберг, В.) *Древнерусские учения о пределах царской власти* (С.-Петербург, 1916) 319–321.

Zguta, R. “The ‘Aristotelevy vrata’ as a Reflection of Judaizer Political Ideology,” *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 26.1 (1978) 1–10.

Zimin, A.A. (Зимин, А.А.) *И.С. Пересветов и его современники* (Москва, 1958) 351–352.

3. RELATED STUDIES

3.1. JEWISH PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL WORKS AND TRADITIONS IN THE SLAVIC MILIEUX

- Adamczyk, M. *Biblijno-apokryficzne narracje w literaturze staropolskiej do końca XVI wieku* (Filologia Polska, 19; Poznan, 1980).
- Adrianova-Peretc, V.P. (Адрианова-Перетц, В.П.) “Апокрифы,” in: *История русской литературы* (Т. 1. Москва- Ленинград, 1941) 71–86.
- , *Древнерусская литература и фольклор* (Ленинград, 1974).
- Afanas'ev, A.N. (Афанасьев, А.Н.) *Народные русские легенды* (Москва, 1859).
- , *Поэтические воззрения славян на природу* (Т. 3; Москва, 1869).
- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) *Песнь песней в древней славяно-русской письменности* (Часть 1 и 2; Москва, 1980).
- , “Песнь песней по русскому списку 16 века в переводе с древнееврейского оригинала,” *Палестинский Сборник* 27 (1981) 63–79.
- , “О греческой основе славянских библейских переводов,” *Starobulgaristica* 8 (1984) 3–22.
- , “Цитаты из Песни песней в славянской письменности (цитаты и текстология),” *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 74–92.
- , “Der Stellenwert der Textologie bei der Erforschung altkirchenslavischer Übersetzungstexte,” *Die Welt der Slaven* 31.2 (1986) 415–438.
- , “Переводы с древнееврейских оригиналов в Древней Руси,” *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987) 1–20.
- , “Пути стабилизации языковой нормы в России 11–16 вв.,” *Вопросы Языкознания* 2 (1987) 34–46.
- , “К истории русской переводческой школы XII в.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 41 (1988) 154–196.
- , “Цели и методы текстологического исследования лингвистических источников 11–17 вв.,” in: *Русистика Сегодня. Язык: Система и её функционирование* (Москва, 1988) 188–209.
- , “Русско-еврейские литературные связи до XV века,” *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75.
- , “Св. Писание как памятник древнерусской письменности,” *Русская Литература* 4 (1993) 202–213.
- , “Молитва Иуды,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 48 (1993) 238–241.
- , “The Song of Songs in the Slavonic Bible,” *The Bible Translator* 47 (1996) 119–125.

- , “Кое-что о переводах в Древней Руси (по поводу статьи Фр. Дж. Томсона ‘Made in Russia’),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 49 (1996) 278–295.
- , “По поводу статьи Г.Г. Ланта ‘Ещё раз о мнимых переводах в Древней Руси,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 442–445.
- , *Текстология славянской Библии* (С.-Петербург, 1999).
- , “К вопросу об изучении переводной письменности Киевского периода,” in: *Русская историческая филология: Проблемы и перспективы* (Петрозаводск, 2001) 34–42.
- , “Ветхий Иерусалим древнерусской хронографии,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003) 446–455.
- , “Библия в церковнославянской традиции,” *Церковный вестник* 5 (2003) 55–57.
- , “Издания греческих и славянских библейских текстов: сравнительный обзор эдиционных проблем,” in: *Критическото издание на най-стария славянски текст на библейските книги и неговите алтернативи. XIII международен конгрес на славистите. Люблина, 15–21 август 2003 г.* (София, 2003) 20–45.
- , “Перспективы текстологии: От реконструкции архетипа к истории текста,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 54 (2003) 50–57.
- , “Византийско-славянский профитологий (формирование состава),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 56 (2004) 46–77.
- Altbauer, M. *The “Vilnius” Version of the Oldest Russian Translation of the Book of Esther (Vilnius Codex 52)* (Jerusalem, 1988).
- Altbauer, M. and M. Taube, “The Slavonic Book of Esther: When, Where and from What Language Was It Translated?” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (1984) 304–320.
- Alvarado, S. and B.I. Sazdova-Alvarado, “Un apócrifo eslavo de contenido escatológico y su relación con la tradición islámica. Cuestiones y perspectivas,” *Al-Qantara* 15:1 (1994) 75–98.
- Angelov, B. (Ангелов, Б.) “Есхатологическите представи на средновековния българин, отразени в официалната и апокрифната литература,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 3 (1982) 73–97.
- Angusheva-Tihanova, A. (Ангушева-Тиханова, А.) *Гадателните книги в старобългарската литература* (София, 1996).
- Арсѣйна Khizhnina, “Апокрифна книжнина,” in: Dinekov, P. et al. eds., (Динеков, П., Куев, К. и Д. Петканова) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 110–144.
- Arhangel’skij, A.S. (Архангельский, А.С.) “К истории южнославянской и древнерусской апокрифической литературы,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4.1 (1899) 112–118.
- Arhipov, A.A. (Архипов, А.А.) *Из истории гебраизмов в русском книжном языке XV–XVI веков* (Ph.D. diss., Москва, 1982).
- , “On the Jewish Dimension of Old Russian Culture,” *Jews and Slavs* 6 (1999) 217–250.

- Astahova, A.M. (Астахова, А.М.) “Проблема взаимовлияния устной и книжной традиций у славянских народов,” in: *Сборник ответов на вопросы по литературоведению. IV Международный съезд славистов* (Москва, 1959) 288–291.
- Badalanova, F. (Бадаланова, Ф.) “Каин и Авель в болгарском фольклоре,” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 5–11.
- , “Каин и Авель в болгарском фольклоре,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 154–162.
- Baras, G.M. (Барац, Г.М.) *Собрание трудов по вопросу о еврейском элементе в памятниках древнерусской письменности* (1–2; Париж, 1927).
- Barsov, E. (Барсов, Е.) “О воздействии апокрифов на обряд и иконопись,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 12 (1885) 100–110.
- Batjushkov, F. (Батюшков, Ф.) *Спор души с телом в памятниках средневековой литературы* (Вып. 1–2; Харьков, 1890–1892).
- Beljaev, L. (Беляев, Л.) “Мотив ‘Древа Жизни’ в изобразительном фольклоре Руси XIV–XVI веков,” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 15–18.
- , “Мотив ‘Древа Жизни’ в изобразительном фольклоре Руси XIV–XVI веков,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 130–137.
- Beljaev, M.V. (Беляев, М.В.) “Происхождение народных легенд о миротворении,” *Известия Азербайджанского государственного университета. Общественные науки* 4–5 (1925) 66–74.
- , “Из литературной истории русских народно-поэтических представлений,” *Известия Азербайджанского государственного университета. Общественные науки* 6–7 (1926) 49–61.
- Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) “Переводная беллетристика XI–XIII вв.,” in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 143–154.
- Belova, O.V. (Белова, О.В.) “Народная Библия.” *Восточнославянские этимологические легенды* (Москва, 2004).
- Benovska-S'bkova, M. (Беновска-Събкова, М.) “Апокрифни мотиви и народно вярване (Распускането на мъртвите души),” *Българска етнология* 3 (1996) 80–89.
- Bobrik, M.A. (Бобрик, М.А.) “‘Закон Моисеев’ из Новгородского кодекса: Материалы к комментарию,” *Russian Linguistics* 28 (2004) 43–71.
- Vobrov, A.G. (Бобров, А.Г.) *Апокрифическое Сказание Афродитиана в литературе и книжности Древней Руси. Исследования и тексты* (С.-Петербург, 1994).

- Bogdanović, D. (Богдановић, Д.) *Историја старе српске књижевности* (Београд, 1980).
- Bogolubov, A.N. (Боголюбов, А.Н.) *Естественнонаучные представления Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978).
- Borisov, A. Ja. (Борисов, А.Я.) “К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе,” *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.
- Børtnes, J. *Visions of Glory: Studies in Early Russian Hagiography* (Oslo, 1988).
- Bozhilov, I. et al., eds. (Божилов, И., Кожухаров, С.) *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987).
- Brojer, G. (Бройер, Г.) “Значение синтаксических наблюдений для определения оригиналов древнерусской переводной письменности,” in: *IV Международный съезд славистов. Материалы дискуссии* (Москва, 1962) 2.248–250.
- Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) *Античные традиции в древнерусской литературе XI–XVI вв.* (München, 1991 [Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1989]).
- Bulashev, G.F. (Булашев, Г.Ф.) *Украинский народ в своих легендах, религиозных воззрениях и верованиях. Вып. 1. Космогонические украинские народные воззрения и верования* (Киев, 1909). [Repr.: Булашев Г. *Український народ у своїх легендах, релігійних поглядах та віруваннях. Космогонічні українські народні погляди та вірування* (Киев, 1993)].
- Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) “Мифические предания о человеке и природе,” in: Ф.И. Буслаев, *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 1 и 2; С.-Петербург, 1861) 1.137–151.
- , “Изображение страшного суда по русским подлинникам,” in: Ф.И. Буслаев, *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 1 и 2; С.-Петербург, 1861) 2.133–154.
- Charlesworth, J.H. “The Uniqueness and Importance of the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum*; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Chekin, L.S. (Чекин, Л.С.) “The Role of Jews in Early Russian Civilization in the Light of a New Discovery and New Controversies,” *Russian History* 17.4 (1990) 379–394.
- , “К анализу упоминаний о евреях в древнерусской литературе XI–XIII вв.,” *Славяноведение* 3 (1994) 34–42.
- Chistov, K.V. (Чистов, К.В.) *Русские народные социально-утопические легенды XVII–XIX вв.* (Москва, 1967).
- Curkan, R.K. (Цуркан, Р.К.) *Славянский перевод Библии* (С.-Петербург, 2001).
- Danilevskij, I. (Данилевский, И.) “Потоп и Русская Земля (к вопросу об исторических взглядах древнерусского летописца),” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской*

- народной культуре. Сборник статей (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 263–268.
- Demin, A.S. (Демин, А.С.) *Древнерусская литература: Изображение природы и человека* (Москва, 1996).
- Demkova, N.S. and Semjakina, Z.P. (Демкова, Н.С., Семякина, З.П.) “Повесть об ангеле послушавшемся Бога’ (Из истории русской повести конца XVII начала XVIII в.),” in: *Русская литература на рубеже двух эпох (XVII – начало XVIII в.)* (Москва, 1971) 128–159.
- Dergacheva, I.V. (Дергачева, И.В.) *Посмертная судьба и иной мир в древнерусской книжности* (Москва, 2004).
- , *Эсхатологические представления в русской литературе XI–XIX веков (на материале житий и синодиков)* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 2004).
- Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Д.) “Темата на произхода на злото в старобългарската апокрифна традиция,” in: *Литература, общество, идеи* (София, 1986) 25–47.
- , “Медиаторът в старобългарската апокрифна традиция и българския фолклор,” in: *Медиевистика и културна антропология* (София, 1988) 376–384.
- , “Старобългарските апокрифи в изследванията на Йордан Иванов,” *Известия на Историческия музей в Кюстендил* 4 (1992) 65–69.
- , “Тайната книга на богомилите в старобългарската апокрифна литература,” in: *1100 години Велики Преслав* (Шумен, 1995) 118–130.
- , “Апокрифическая письменная традиция средневековой Болгарии-социокультурные аспекты,” *Scripta&e-Scripta* 2 (2004) 219–241.
- Dinekov, P. (Динеков, П.) “Българская апокрифическая летопись (из истории жанров в старобългарской литературе),” *Проблемы изучения культурного наследия* (Москва, 1985) 121–126.
- DiTommaso, L., Böttrich, C. “The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha in the Slavonic Tradition,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Dragomanov, M. (Драгоманов, М.) “Забележки върху славянските религиозно-етически легенди,” in: *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* 8 (София, 1892) 276–281.
- Dujchev, I. (Дуйчев, И.) “Апокрифа Bysantino-Slavica,” *Zbornik Filosovskog fakulteta (Beograd)* 9/1 (1967) 247–250.
- Eliseev, G.A. (Елисеев, Г.А.) “К вопросу о роли апокрифических текстов в формировании единой концепции христианской истории,” in: *40 лет научному студенческому кружку источниковедения истории СССР* (Москва, 1990) 86–92.
- , “Апокрифические книги Древней Руси и творчество Максима Грека,” in: *Исследования по источниковедению истории России (до 1917 г.)* (Москва, 1993) 29–43.
- , *Апокрифы и их влияние на русскую публицистику XV – начала XVII в.* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1994).

- , “Антиеврейские православные сочинения конца XV – начала XVI века и влияние на них древнееврейских апокрифических книг,” in: *Исследование по источниковедению истории России (до 1917 года). Сборник статей* (Москва, 1996) 75–97.
- , “О влиянии апокрифов на взгляды и творчество книжника Кирило-Белозерского монастыря Ефросина (XV в.),” in: *Исследования по источниковедению истории России (до 1917 г.)* (Москва, 1998) 8–29.
- , “Две системы взглядов в общественном сознании средневековой Руси и эволюция апокрифов в XIII–XV вв.,” in: *Русское Средневековье. Книжная Культура* (вып. 1; Москва, 1998) 26–58.
- , “Апокрифические тексты: проблемы подлинности и достоверности,” in: *Чтения по истории русской культуры (4–5 января 1993)* (Москва, 2000) 96–103.
- Elizarova, M.M. (Елизарова, М.М.) “Ветхозаветная апокрифическая литература и кумранские находки,” *Палестинский Сборник* 28.91 (1986) 62–68.
- Eremin, I.P. (Еремин, И.П.) “Исследование формы древнерусских произведений,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 12 (1956) 284–291.
- , “О византийском влиянии в болгарской и древнерусской литературах IX–XII вв.,” in: *Славянские литературы: V Международный съезд славистов* (Москва, 1963) 5–13.
- Evseev, I.E. (Евсеев, И.Е.) *Заметки по древнеславянскому переводу Священного Писания: Толкования на книгу пророка Даниила в древнеславянской и старорусской письменности* (Москва, 1901).
- , *Книга пророка Даниила в древне-славянском переводе* (С.-Петербург, 1905).
- , “Словеса святых пророк – противоиудейский памятник по рукописи XV века,” in: *Древности: Труды Славянской комиссии Императорского московского археологического общества, том 4.1* (Москва, 1907).
- Fasmer, M.G. (Фасмер, М.Г.) *Греко-славянские этюды. III. Греческие заимствования в русском языке* (С.-Петербург, 1909).
- Franklin, S. “Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Russian Historiography,” *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 15 (1982) 1–27.
- Garzaniti, M. “Le citazioni bibliche nella letteratura slavo-ecclesiastica,” *Studi slavistici* 1 (2004) 330–335.
- Gaster, M. *Ilchester Lectures on Greco-Slavonic Literature (and its Relation to the Folklore of Europe during the Middle Ages)* (London, 1887).
- Gavrjuschin, N.K. (Гаврюшин, Н.К.) “Поновление стихий” в древнерусской книжности,” in: *Отечественная общественная мысль эпохи средневековья (историко-философские очерки). Сборник Научных Трудов* (ed. В.С. Горский; Киев, 1988) 206–214.
- Genegozov, Ja. (Генерозов, Я.) *Русские народные представления о загробной жизни на основании закличек, причитаний, духовных стихов и т. п.* (Саратов, 1883).
- Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) *Литература на изострени борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 76–161.

- Georgieva, I. (Георгиева, И.) *Българска народна митология* (София, 1983).
- Gorodcov, P.A. (Городцов, П.А.) “Западносибирские народные легенды о творении мира и борьбе духов,” *Этнографическое Обозрение* 80.1 (1909) 52.
- Grabar, B. “Apokrifna djela apostolska u hrvatskaglagoljskoj literature,” *Radovi staroslavenskog institute (Zagreb)* 6 (1967) 109–208.
- , “Apokrifi u hrvatskoj srednjovekovnoj književnosti,” *Croatica* 1 (1970) 15–28.
- Gromov, M.N. (Громов, М.Н.) “‘Элементы мироздания’ в апокрифической литературе,” *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 1999) 63–67.
- Gudzij, N.K. (Гудзий, Н.К.) “Апокрифы,” in: *История древней русской литературы* (7 изд.; Москва, 1966) 28–35.
- Nachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) *Русские редакции эсхатологических апокрифов (конец XV–XVII вв.)* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1982).
- , “Русская редакция апокрифа ‘Хождение Агапия в рай,’” *Научные доклады высшей школы. Филологические науки* 4 (1983) 79–82.
- , “Утопические представления в эсхатологических апокрифах (XVI – первая половина XVII вв.),” in: *Философская мысль на Руси в поздние средневековье* (Москва, 1985) 76–86.
- Hercigonja, E. *Srednjovjekovna književnost* (Zagreb, 1975) 41–57; 102–114.
- Hromov, O. (Хромов, О.) “К вопросу об иконографических и литературных источниках ‘Сотворения мира’ в русских лубочных изданиях,” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 68–71.
- Hubanchev, A. (Хубанчев, А.) “Религиозно-философски космогонически възгледи в апокрифната книжнина на средновековна България,” *Духовна Култура* 5–6 (1967) 40–49.
- Iglói, E. *История древней русской литературы XI–XVII вв.* (Budapest, 1981) 20–29.
- Illarion, I.O. “Die Hebraismen in der altkirchenslavischen biblischen Sprache,” *Münchener Beiträge zur Slavenkunde* 41 (1953) 163–178.
- Istoki, *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970).
- Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) “Новый сборник ветхозаветных апокрифов,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 1 (1848) 114–129.
- , *Александрия русских хронографов* (Москва, 1893).
- , *Первая книга хроники Иоана Малалы* (С.-Петербург, 1897).
- , *Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифические видения Даниила в византийской и славяно-русской литературах: Исследования и тексты* (Москва, 1897).
- , “Из области древне-русской литературы,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* февраль (1904) 257–294.

- , *Книги временныя и образныя Георгия Мниха. Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славяно-русском переводе* (3 vols.; Петроград, 1920–1930).
- , “Апокрифы,” in: Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Очерк истории древнерусской литературы домосковского периода (11–13 вв.)* (Петроград, 1922) 112–117.
- , “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и летопись,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 20 (1925) 380–382.
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]).
- , *Български старини из Македония* (София, 1931[1970]).
- , *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935).
- Ivanov, S.A. (Иванов, С.А.) “Болгарская апокрифическая летопись как памятник этнического самосознания болгар,” in: *Развитие этнического самосознания славянских народов в эпоху зрелого феодализма* (Москва, 1989) 70–77.
- , “К вопросу об элементах этнополитического сознания в Болгарской апокрифической летописи,” in: *Раннефеодальные славянские государства и народности. (Проблемы идеологии и культуры)* (София, 1991) 131–136.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) *Из славянских рукописей. Тексты и заметки* (Учёные записки Императорского Московского университета, отд. ист.-филол., 24; Москва, 1899).
- , *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (С-Петербург, 1906).
- , “Из истории апокрифов и легенд в южнославянской письменности,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 14.2 (1909) 267–322; 14.3 (1909) 103–159; 15.1 (1910) 1–62; 18.3 (1913) 1–102; 18.4 (1913) 16–126.
- , *История южных славян* (Варшава, 1913).
- , *Апокрифы и легенды. К истории апокрифов, легенд и ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности* (Вып. 1; Петроград, 1915). [Review: Е.К. Карский, “А. Я. Яцимирский, *Апокрифы и легенды. К истории апокрифов, легенд и ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности* (Вып. 1; Петроград, 1915),” *Русский Филологический Вестник* 73.1–2 (1915) 444–445.]
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Novi prilozi za literaturnu biblijskih apokrifa,” *Starine* 5 (1873) 69–108.
- , “Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko južnoslovenskih rukopisa,” *Starine* 6 (1874) 60–156.
- , *Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen. 1. Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches* (Wien, 1893).
- Janchuk, N. (Янчук, Н.) “К вопросу об отражении апокрифов в народном творчестве,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 12.1 (1907) 125–143.
- Jovanović, T. (Јовановић, Т.) “Траг апокрифа о борби са ђаволом у српској народној књижевности,” *Књижевност и језик* XLIII.3–4 (1995) 33–55.

- , *Стара српска књижевност. Избор из средњовековне књижевности: поезија, похвале, апокрифи* (Београд, 1997).
- , “L'étude des apocryphes dans la tradition manuscrite serbe médiévale,” *Études balkaniques* 4 (1997) 105–132.
- , *Стара српска књижевност. Хрестоматија* (Београд, 2000).
- , “Old Testament Apocrypha in the Serbian Manuscript Tradition,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swo-boda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forth-coming).
- Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) “Энциклопедические сборники XV в. и круг интересов книгописца Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря Ефросина,” in: *Русская и грузинская средневековые литературы* (Ленинград, 1979) 192–199.
- Kajmakamova, M. (Каймакамова, М.) *Българска средновековна историопис* (София, 1990) 124–163.
- Kalitovskij, O. (Калитовский, О.) *Материалы до русской литературы апокрифичной* (Львов, 1884).
- Karskij, E.F. (Карский, Е.Ф.) *Русская Правда по древнейшему списку* (Ленинград, 1930).
- Kashanin, M. (Кашанин, М.) *Српска књижевност у средњем веку* (Београд, 1975).
- Kazakova, N.A., Lur'e, Ja. S. (Казакова, Н.А. и Лурье, Я.С.) *Антифеодалные еретические движения на Руси XIV – начала XVI вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955).
- Kerenskij, F. (Керенский, Ф.) “Древнерусские отреченные верования и календарь Брюса,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 3 (1874) 52–79; 4 (1874) 276–342.
- Klejn, I. “Слово о полку Игореве' и апокалиптическая литература (К постановке вопроса о топике древнерусской литературы,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 31 (1976) 104–105.
- Kniga, *Книга хожений. Записки путешественников XI–XV веков* (Москва, 1984).
- Knizhnye, *Книжные центры Древней Руси. Кирилло-Белозерский монастырь* (ed. С. А. Семячко; С.-Петербург, 2008).
- Konjavskaja E.L. (Конявская, Е.Л.) *Авторское самосознание древнерусского книжника (XI – середины XV вв.)* (Москва, 2000).
- Korobka, N. (Коробка, Н.) “Образ птицы, творящей мир, в русской народной поэзии и письменности,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 14.4 (1909) 191–192.
- Krasnosel'sev, N.F. (Красносельцев, Н.Ф.) “Прение Панагиота с Азимитом' по новым греческим спискам,” *Летопись историко-филологического общества* 6 (1896) 293–364.
- Kristanov, S. and Dujchev, I. (Кристанов, С. и Дуйчев, И.) *Естествознанието в средновековна България* (София, 1954) 204–211.
- Kulik, A. (Кулик, А.) “О еврейском присутствии на Волыни в XII–XIII вв.,” *Jews and Slavs* 11 (2003) 194–201.

- , “Judeo-Greek Legacy in Medieval Rus,” *Viator* 39.1 (2008) 51–64.
- , “Slavonic Apocrypha and Slavic Linguistics,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Kuzidova, I. “A Glance at Medieval South Slavonic Anthologies of Wise Sentences (Genre Peculiarities, Terminology and Text Headings),” *Scripta & e-Scripta* 1 (2003) 175–186.
- Kuznecova, V.S. (Кузнецова, В.С.) *Дуалистические легенды о сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1995).
- Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский, Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864).
- Lebedeva, I.N. (Лебедева, И.Н.) *Повесть о Варлааме и Иоасафе: Памятник древнерусской переводной литературы XI–XII вв.* (Ленинград, 1985).
- Lekov, D. (Леков, Д.) *Българската литература и народното творчество* (София, 1977).
- Leeming, H. “Early Slavonic Translation Technique: A Contrast with Latin and Gothic,” *Кирилло-Методиевски студии* 4 (1987) 180–191.
- Levshun, L.V. (Левшун, Л.В.) “Апокрифы,” in: *Очерки истории восточнославянской средневековой книжности: Эволюция творческих методов* (Минск, 2000) 68–72.
- Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев, Д.С.) *Текстология на материале русской литературы X–XVII вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1962).
- , *Развитие русской литературы X–XVII веков. Эпохи и стили* (Ленинград, 1973).
- , *Поэтика древнерусской литературы* (3 изд.; Москва, 1979).
- , *Литература – Реальность – Литература* (Ленинград, 1984).
- , “Священная история в познавательных произведениях литературы Древней Руси,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 3.5–8.
- Lipschic, E. Je. “Какое значение имели старославянские переводы с греческого в формулировании древнеславянских литератур?” in: *Сборник ответов на вопросы по литературоведению* (Москва, 1958).
- Lourié, V. (Лурье, В.) “Славянское ‘Сказание о Псалтири’ и его историко-литургическое значение,” *Byzantinoslavica* 57 (1996) 140–155.
- Lüdke, W. “Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 31 (1911) 218–235.
- Lunt, H.G. “The Old Church Slavonic Song of Songs: One Translation or Two?” *Die Welt der Slaven* 302 (1985) 297–304.
- , “On interpreting the Russian Primary Chronicle: The Entry for 1037,” *The Slavic and East European Journal* 32 (1988) 251–264.
- , “Did Jaroslav the Wise Sponsor Translations into Slavonic?” in: *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujcev* (Studia Slavico-Byzantina et Mediaevalia Europensia, 1; Sofia, 1988).

- , “Еще раз о мнимых переводах в Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 435–441.
- Lunt, H.G. and M. Taube, “Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?” *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988) 147–187.
- , “The Slavonic Book of Esther: Translation from Hebrew or Evidence for a Lost Greek Text?” *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994) 347–362.
- , *The Slavonic Book of Esther* (Massachusetts, 1998).
- Lur'e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) *Общерусские летописи XIV–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1976) 204–209.
- Majkov, L. (Майков, Л.) *Великорусские заклинания* (С-Петербург, 1869).
- Maljek, Je. (Малэк, Э.) “Сказание о римском попе Аврааме – неизвестная повесть о сношениях человека с дьяволом,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 50 (1996) 526–530.
- , “Образы ангелов в древнерусской письменности (ангелы грозные, тихие и милостивые),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 54 (2003) 201–210.
- Markovski, I. (Марковский, И.), “Ветхозаветни апокрифи и псевдоэпиграфи,” *Годишник Соф. Унив. Богословский фак.* 15 (1937/1938) 51–53.
- Meshcherskaja, E.N. (Мещерская, Е.Н.) et al. “Апокрифы,” in: *Православная энциклопедия* (Москва, 2001) 3.46–58.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) *Древнерусский перевод еврейской книги “Есфирь” и проблема переводов с еврейского в древнерусской письменности Киевского периода* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1946).
- , “К вопросу изучения переводной письменности Киевского периода,” *Ученые записки Карельского педагогического института* 2.1 (1956) 198–219.
- , “Отрывок из ‘Иосиппон’ в Повести Временных Лет,” *Палестинский Сборник* 2/64–65 (1956) 58–68.
- , “К вопросу об источниках Повести Временных Лет,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 13 (1957) 57–65.
- , “Искусство перевода Киевской Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 15 (1958) 54–72.
- , “К вопросу о заимствованиях из греческого в словарном составе древнерусского литературного языка (По материалам переводных произведений Киевского периода),” *Византийский Временник* 13 (1958) 246–266.
- , “О синтаксисе древних славяно-русских переводных произведений,” in: *Теория и практика перевода* (Ленинград, 1962) 83–103.
- , “Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964) 198–231.
- , “К изучению ранней московской письменности,” in: *Изучение русского языка. Источниковедение* (Москва, 1969) 93–103.
- , “К вопросу об источниках Изборника 1076 г.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 321–328.
- , “К изучению исторической лексики ‘Изборника 1076 г.’,” in: *Русская историческая лексикология и лексикография* (Ленинград, 1972) 3–12.

- , “Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: Ветхозаветные апокрифы,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, часть 1; Москва, 1976) 181–210.
- , *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV веков* (Ленинград, 1978).
- , “Текст древнерусского перевода книги Есфирь,” *Dissertationes slavicae* 13 (1978) 131–164.
- , “О лингвистическом разграничении памятников древнеславянского языка русского извода и древнерусского литературного языка XI–XIV веков (к постановке проблемы),” *Проблемы развития языка* (Саратов, 1981) 3–11.
- , *Избранные статьи* (С.-Петербург, 1995).
- Mezier, A.V. *Русская словесность с XI по XIX столетия включительно* (С.-Петербург, 1899) 1.74–80.
- Mihajlov, A.V. (Михайлов, А.В.) *Опыт изучения текста Книги Бытия пророка Моисея в древнеславянском переводе* (Варшава, 1912).
- Mihajlov, N. (Михайлов, Н.) “К реконструкции отдельных космогонических/ космологических и “антропологических” фрагментов славянской модели мира на материале русских заговоров,” in: *Исследования по славянскому фольклору и народной культуре. Studies in Slavic Folklore and Folk Culture* (eds. А. Архипов и И. Полинская; Вып. 2; Oakland, 1997) 57–76.
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) *Към характеристиката на българската литература XV–XVII век (сборници със смесено съдържание)* (Ph.D. diss.; София, 1982).
- , “Неофициалната книжнина през XIII век в контекста на идейните и литературните тенденции на епохата,” in: *Търновска книжовна школа. 4. Културно развитие на българската държава края на XII–XIV век* (София, 1985) 102–114.
- , “Апокрифни произведения в манастирските сборници. (Постановка на въпроса),” *Кирило-Методиевски студии* 3 (1986) 262–275.
- , “Сказание о происхождении русалок. (К истории книжной деятельности книгописца XV в. Ефросина),” in: *Исследования по древней и новой литературе. Сборник, посвященный 80-летия Д.С. Лихачева* (Ленинград, 1987) 147–154.
- , “Апокрифни пророчества в средновековната българска литература (XI–XIII в.),” in: *Втори международен конгрес по българистика. Стара българска литература. Литература на българското Възраждане. Доклади* (София, 1987) 265–284.
- , “Новооткрит ‘близнак’ на Беляковския апокрифен сборник,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 8.3 (1989) 61–74.
- , “Цикълът от историко-апокалиптични творби в Драголювия сборник – произход, източници, композиция,” *Старобългарска литература* 25/26 (1991) 135–144.
- , “‘Видение на пророк Исая за последните времена’ – историко-апокалиптично съчинение от XIII век,” *Palaeobulgarica* 16.2 (1992) 77–81.

- , *Старобългарска литература. Т. 5. Естествознание* (София, 1992).
- , “Слово за Антихриста’ – един малко познат български апокриф,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 17.4 (1993) 59–71.
- , “Беседа на тримата светители’ в южнославянската ръкописна традиция. Бележки върху класификацията на преписите,” in: *Възрожденският текст. Прочити на литературата и културата на българското Възраждане. В чест на 70-годишнината на проф. Дочо Леков* (София, 1998) 336–344.
- , “Medieval Apocalyptic Texts in the Context of Bulgarian Cultural Anthropology,” *Balkanistica* 13 (2000) 105–112.
- , “Към въпроса гръцките прототипи на т. нар. ‘Беседа на тримата светители,’” in: ПОЛУХРОНИЯ. *Сборник в чест на проф. Иван Божилов* (София, 2002) 212–229.
- , *Erotapokriseis. Съчиненията от кратки въпроси и отговори в старобългарската литература* (София, 2004).
- , “Slavonic Erotapokriseis: Sources, Transmission, Morphology of the Genre,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Miltenova, A. and M. Kajmakamova (Милтенова, А., Каймакамова, М.) “Неизвестно старобългарско летописно съчинение от XI век (Сказание Исаево),” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 7.4 (1983) 52–73.
- Miltenova, A. and Kirilova, A. (Милтенова, А. и Кирилова, А.) *Средновековни лековници и амулети* (София, 1994).
- Miltenova, A. and Petkanova, L. (Милтенова, А. и Петканова, Д.) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология.* (София, 1993).
- Miltenova, A. and T’rkova-Zaimova, V. (Милтенова, А. и Тъпкова-Займова, В.) “‘Пророчествата’ във византийската и в старобългарската книжнина,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 8.3 (1984) 23–32.
- , “The Problem of Prophecies in Byzantine and Bulgarian literature,” *Balkan Studies* 25 (1984) 499–510.
- , *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и в средновековна България* (София, 1996).
- Mil’kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) “Античное учение о четырех стихиях в древнерусской письменности,” in: *Древняя Русь: Пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 57–66.
- , “Канонический, апокрифический и традиционный подходы к осмыслению истории в Древней Руси,” in: *Древняя Русь: Пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 136–190.
- , “Церковные, народные и античные представления об ином мире в их отношении к апокрифическому образу рая,” in: *Древняя Русь: Пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 250–280.
- , *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С.-Петербург, 1999).
- Mochul’skij, V.N. (Мочульский, В.Н.) *Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге* (Русский Филологический Вестник, 4; Варшава, 1887).

- , *О мнимом дуализме в мифологии славян* (Варшава, 1889).
- , *Следы народной Библии в славянской и древне-русской письменности* (Одесса, 1893).
- , *Апокрифическое сказание о создании мира* (Одесса, 1896).
- , *Апокрифический элемент в вопросах и ответах св. Афанасия к кн. Антиоху* (Одесса, 1900).
- Moldovan, A.M. (Молдован, А.М.) “Критерии локализации древнерусских переводов,” *Славяноведение* 2 (1994) 69–80.
- , *Лексика древнеславянского перевода в региональном аспекте* (Москва, 1994).
- Naumov, A.E. *Apokryfy w systemie literatury cerkiewnosłowianskiej* (Prace Komisji Słowianoznawstwa PAN w Krakowie, 36; Wrocław, 1976).
- , “Апокрифите в системата на старите славянски литератури,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 4.2 (1980) 71–78.
- , *Biblia w strukturze artystycznej utworów cerkiewnosłowianskich* (Kraków, 1983).
- Nikolov, E. (Николов, Е.) *Апокрифна литература* (София, 1948).
- Ovcharov, N. (Овчаров, Н.) “Няколко слабо известни апокрифни мотиви от 1497–1498г (в ръкопис N22 на библиотеката на Православната патриаршия в Йерусалим),” *Българска етнография* 3–4 (1998) 81–88.
- Palauzov, S.N. (Палаузов, С.Н.) *Век болгарского царя Симеона* (Москва, 1877).
- Panajotov, V.B. (Панайотов, В.Б.) *Апокриф “Заветы двенадцати патриархов” в контексте Толковой Палеи* (Москва, 1986).
- , “За Енох и Илия – Тълкования върху апокалипсиса,” in: *Глѣбина књижна* (Шумен, 2003) 279–283.
- Patlagean, E. “Remarques sur la production et la diffusion des apocryphes dans le monde byzantin,” *Апоскрыфа* 2 (1991) 155–164.
- Peleschenko, Ju. (Пелешенко, Ю.) “Апокрифи та легенди богомилського похождения в українській словесності: здобутки і перспективи дослідження,” in: *Біблія і культура: Зб. наук. статей* (Вип. 1; Чернівці, 2000) 45–47.
- Perets, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) *Материалы по истории апокрифа и легенды. К истории Громника и Лунника* (2 тома; С.-Петербург, 1899–1901).
- , “К вопросу о еврейско-русском литературном общении,” *Slavia* 5 (1926) 267–276.
- Pesenson, M. “The Sibylline Tradition in Medieval and Early Modern Slavic Culture,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Апоскрыphen 4. Die Apokryphen in der byzantinisch-slavische Welt,” in: *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (Berlin, 1976) 1.662–666.
- , “Фолклорът в апокрифните молитви,” *Български фолклор* 2 (1976) 28–40.

- , “Близости между апокрифи и фолклор,” in: *Българската литература и народното творчество* (ed. Д. Леков; София, 1977).
- , *Апокрифна литература и фолклор. Апокрифната художествена проза и фолклорът* (София, 1978).
- , “Апокрифна художествена проза. Видова класификация и характеристика,” *Старобългарска литература* 3 (1978) 13–33.
- , “Folklore und Literatur während des Mittelalters in der byzantinischslavischen Welt,” *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 15 (1979) 89–97.
- , “Апокрифната литература и личното творчество на старобългарските писатели,” *Starobulgaristica* 5/3 (1981) 3–9.
- , “Апокрифната литература в България,” in: Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова, Д.) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 5–27.
- , “Красивото в апокрифите,” in: П. Динеков, *Литературознание и фолклористика* (София, 1983) 48–52.
- , “Гадателные книги и фолклорът,” *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 47–57.
- , *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (София, 1992).
- , *Приемственост и развитие* (София, 1992).
- , “Апокрифна литература,” in: Д. Петканова, *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (София, 1992) 36–39.
- , “Отново по въпроса апокрифи и фолклор,” *Език и литература* 4 (1992) 124–138.
- , *Старобългарска литература IX–XVIII век* (3 ed., София, 1997) 231–275.
- , *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003).
- , “Апокрифна литература,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 44–45.
- Petruhin, V. (Петрухин, В.) “Библия, апокрифи и становление славянских раннеисторических традиций (к постановке проблем),” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 51–54.
- , “Библия, апокрифи и становление славянских раннеисторических традиций (к постановке проблем),” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 269–286.
- Picchio, R. “The Fuction of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of ‘Slavia Orthodoxa,’” *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 1 (1977) 1–31.
- Pigin, A.V. (Пигин, А.В.) “Видения потустороннего мира в рукописной традиции XVIII–XX вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 50 (1996) 551–557.

- G. Podskalsky, *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus'* (988–1237) (München 1982).
- Polivka, G. “К славянским повериям о мироздании,” *Этнографическое Обозрение* 1.8 (1891) 252.
- Poljakova, Ja. (Полякова, Я.) “Материалы о развитии дуалистических народных сказок у славян,” *Slavia* 34.3 (1965) 456–468.
- Pop, R. (Поп, Р.) “К вопросу о судьбе апокрифических апокалипсисов о земном рае у южных и восточных славян,” in: *IX Международный съезд славистов. Резюме докладов и письменных сообщений* (Москва, 1983) 244–245.
- Pormarginov, D. (Попмаринов, Д.) “Месиански и апокалиптични идеи в българската старозаветна апокрифна литература,” in: *Търновска книжовна школа 7* (Велико Търново, 2000) 685–698.
- Porov, A.N. (Попов, А.Н.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 2; Москва, 1869) 162–169.
- , *Историко-литературный обзор древне-русских полемических сочинений против латинян (XI–XV в.)* (Москва, 1875 [London, 1972]).
- , *Книга бытия неба и земли (Палея историческая)* (Москва, 1881).
- , *Влияние церковного учения и древнерусской духовной письменности на мирозерцание русского народа, и в частности на народную словесность в древний допетровский период* (Казань, 1883).
- Porfir'ev, I.Ja. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) “Народные духовные стихи и легенды,” *Православный Собеседник* 3 (1869) 54–92.
- , *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872).
- , *История русской словесности* (Казань, 1876).
- , *Апокрифические молитвы по рукописям Соловецкой библиотеки* (Казань, 1878).
- , *Разбор сочинения В. Мочульского “Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге”* (Варшава, 1887) (С.-Петербург, 1890).
- Prohorov, G. (Прохоров, Г.) “Мотив еврейского греха в духовных стихах богородичного цикла,” in: *Концепт греха в славянской и еврейской культурной традиции. Сборник статей* (Москва, 2000) 154–162.
- Purin, A.N. (Пыпин, А.Н.) “Легенды и апокрифы в древней русской письменности,” *Вестник Европы* 3 (1894) 291–339.
- Rizhskij, M. (Рижский, М.) *История переводов Библии в России* (Новосибирск, 1978).
- Rjazanovskij, F. (Рязановский, Ф.) *Демонология в древнерусской литературе* (Москва, 1916).
- Roddy, N. “Slavonic Apocryphal Traditions in the Romanian Lands: Diffusion and Diffraction,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Romodanovskaja, E.K. (Ромодановская, Е.К.) *Повести о гордом царе в рукописной традиции XVII–XIX веков* (Новосибирск, 1985).

- , “Римские Деяния и историческое повествование Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 645–654.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) “Апокрифы,” in: Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.), *Литература Древней Руси. Библиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 15–17.
- , “Апокрифические памятники в литературе Древней Руси (эсхатологические видения об аде и рае): Основные результаты и перспективы исследования,” in: *Гуманитарная наука в России: Соросовские лауреаты* (Москва, 1996) 54–61.
- , “Апокрифы; Апокрифы библейские,” in: *Российский гуманитарный энциклопедический словарь* (3 тома; С.-Петербург-Москва, 2002) 1.100.
- , “Роль библейских апокрифов в культуре Древней Руси: апокрифы как литературный текст,” in: *Литература, культура и фольклор славянских народов. Материалы конференции* (Москва, 2002) 3–12.
- , “Рай ‘мнимый’ и рай ‘реальный’: древнерусская литературная традиция,” in: *Образ рая: от мифа к утопии* (Symposium, 31; С.-Петербург, 2003) 31–46.
- , “Новгородская грамота № 10 – ‘апокрифическая загадка?’” in: *Берестяные грамоты: 50 лет открытия и изучения* (Москва, 2003) 310–320.
- , “Путь к святости: древнерусские описания рая и Святой Земли,” *Jews and Slavs* 10 (2003) 27–32.
- , “Древнеславянский книжник в работе над апокрифическим источником (Воскрешение Лазаря и Сошествие во ад),” in: *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Автор и его текст (XV Чтения памяти члена-корр. АН СССР Владимира Терентьевича Паушото. Москва, 15–17 апреля 2003 г.). Материалы конференции* (Москва, 2003) 210–213.
- , “Время апокрифа: Когда возрадовался весь мир?” in: *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Время источника и время в источнике* (Москва, 2004) 167–170.
- , “Апокрифы в сборнике XVI в. из Стокгольмской Королевской библиотеки (А 797),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 387–393.
- , *Библейские апокрифы в литературе и книжности Древней Руси: Историко-литературное исследование* (Диссертация доктора наук; С.-Петербург, 2004).
- , “О ‘преобразовании’ пространства в апокрифической литературе средневековой Руси,” in: *Иеротопия. Исследование сакральных пространств. Материалы международного симпозиума* (Москва, 2004) 82–84.
- , “Реальное и мнимое (О ‘райско-палестинском тексте’ в древнерусской литературе),” in: *Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы. Мнимые реальности в античных и средневековых текстах* (Москва, 2005) 209–231.

- , “Священная история в познавательных произведениях литературы Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 57 (2006) 18–24.
- Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V., Turilov, A.A. (Рождественская, М.В., Турилов, А.А.) “Апокрифы в славянской и русской письменности,” in: *Православная Энциклопедия* (Москва, 2001) 3.55–57.
- Rudi, T.R. (Руди, Т.Р.) “‘Imitatio angeli’ (проблемы типологии агиографии),” *Русская литература* 2 (2003) 48–59.
- Rzhiga, V.F. (Ржига, В.Ф.) “Новая версия о земном рае,” *Byzantinoslavica* 2 (1930) 374–383.
- Saharov, V. (Сахаров, В.) *Эсхатологические сочинения и сказания в древней русской письменности и влияние их на народные духовные стихи* (Тула, 1879).
- Santos-Otero, A. de. “Das Problem der kirchenslawischen Apokryphen,” *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 1 (1962) 123–132.
- , *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1978–1981).
- , “Alttestamentliche Pseudepigrapha und die sogenannte ‘Tolkovaja Paleja,’” in: *Oecumenica et Patristica. FS W. Schneemelcher* (eds. D. Papan-dreou, W. A. Bienert, K. Schäferdieck, Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln, 1989) 107–122.
- Sedakova, O.A. (Седакова, О.А.) “О принципе подхода к изучению древнерусских апокрифов,” in: *Культура и общество Древней Руси (X–XVII вв.) (Зарубежная историография)* (часть 2; Москва, 1988).
- Sedel’nikov, A.D. (Седельников, А.Д.) “Мотив о рае в русском средневековом прении,” *Byzantinoslavica* 7 (1937–1938) 164–173.
- Shcharov, A.P. (Щапов, А.П.) “Смесь христианства с язычеством и ересями в древнерусских народных сказаниях о мире,” *Православный собеседник* 1 (1861) 249–283.
- , “Исторические очерки народного мирозерцания и суеверия,” in: А.П. Щапов, *Сочинения* (Т. 1.; С.-Петербург, 1906) 47–172.
- Shchegolev, P.E. (Щеголев, П.Е.) “Очерки истории отреченной литературы: Сказание Афродитиана,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4.1 (1899) 148–199; 4.3 (1899) 1304–1344.
- Shishkina, E.V. (Шишкина, Е.В.) “Демонологические мотивы в древнерусской литературе,” in: *Фольклор народов России* (22; Уфа, 1997) 134–144.
- Shuvalov, S.V. (Шувалов, С.В.) “Дуалистические апокрифы в древней русской литературе: Апокриф о споре и борьбе дьявола с Иисусом,” *Ученые записки Московского педагогического дефектологического института* (Т. 1; Москва, 1941) 179–221.
- Simonov, R.A. (Симонов, Р.А.) “‘Сотворение мира’ как начало отсчета времени на Руси в свете библейской экзегетики,” in: *Международная конференция ‘Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции’ (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 54–57.

- , *Русская астрологическая книжность (XI – первая четверть XVIII века)* (Москва, 1998).
- , “Рука законодателя Моисея – христианская версия еврейской пасхи в славяно-русской традиции,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 193–207.
- Sircova, O. (Сирцова, О.) *Апокрифична апокалиптика, философска екзегеза и текстология* (Киев, 2000).
- Smol'nikova, L.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Смольникова, Л.Н., Мильков, В.В.) “Апокрифы в религиозной и идейной жизни Руси периода её христианизации,” in: *Переводные памятники философской мысли в Древней Руси* (Москва, 1992) 44–77.
- Smorgunova, E. (Сморгунова, Е.) “Библейский исход и рассеяние русских староверов,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 208–219.
- , “Создание Геннадиевской Библии – первого русского Библейского свода и иудейские источники на Руси в XV веке,” in: *Материалы VII Ежегодной международной междисциплинарной конференции по иудаике* (ч. 2; Москва, 2000) 7–40.
- Sobolev, A.N. (Соболев, А.Н.) *Загробный мир по древнерусским представлениям (Литературно-исторический опыт исследования древнерусского народного мирозерцания)* (Сергиев Посад, 1913).
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) “Логика” жидовствующих и “Тайная Тайных” (С.-Петербург, 1899).
- , *Молитва на дьявола* (С.-Петербург, 1899).
- , *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII вв.* (С.-Петербург, 1903).
- , *Древняя церковно-славянская литература и её значение* (Харьков, 1908).
- , *Материалы и исследования в области славянской филологии и археологии* (С.-Петербург, 1910).
- , “Особенности русских переводов домонгольского периода,” *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 88.3 (1910) 162–177.
- , *История русского литературного языка* (Ленинград, 1980).
- Sokolov, V. (Соколов, В.) “О житийных и апокрифических мотивах в былинах,” *Русский филологический вестник* (том 74; Москва, 1916).
- Solov'ev, S.V. (Соловьев, С.В.) *К легендам об Иуде предателе* (Харьков, 1895).
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) “К истории ‘Прения Панагиота с Азимитом,’” *Византийский Временник* 2 (1895) 521–530.
- , “Гадания по псалтыри. Тексты гадательной псалтыри и родственных ей памятников и материал для их объяснения,” in: *Памятники древней письменности и искусства* (С.-Петербург, 1898).
- , *Переводные сборники изречений в славяно-русской письменности* (Москва, 1902).

- , *Предисловие к Псалтыри жидовствующих в переводе Федора-еврея* (Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских, 2; Москва, 1907).
- , “Аристотелевы врата, или Тайная тайных,” in: *Памятники древней письменности и искусства* (Вып. 171; С.-Петербург, 1908).
- , *История древней русской литературы. Пособие к лекциям в университете. Том 1. Киевский период* (Москва, 1920).
- , *История древней русской литературы. Пособие к лекциям в университете. Том 2. Московский период* (Москва, 1921).
- , *Славянская письменность XI–XIV вв.* (Петроград, 1927).
- , “‘Аристотелевы врата’ и ‘Тайная Тайных,’” in: *Сборник статей в честь А.И. Соболевского* (Ленинград, 1928).
- , *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960).
- Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский, И.И.) *Сведения и заметки о малоизвестных и неизвестных памятниках* (С.-Петербург, 1866).
- , *Древние славянские памятники юсового письма* (С.-Петербург, 1868).
- , *Сказание об антихристе в славянских переводах с замечаниями о славянских переводах творений св. Ипполита: Разбор книги о них К.И. Невоструева* (С.-Петербург, 1874).
- , “Сказание об антихристе в славянских переводах творений св. Ипполита,” in: *Отчет о пятнадцатом присуждении наград графа Уварова* (С.-Петербург, 1874) 44–362.
- , *Древние памятники русского письма и языка* (2 изд.; С.-Петербург, 1898).
- Stanchev, K. (Станчев, К.) *Поетика на старобългарската литература (Основни принципи и проблеми)* (София, 1982).
- , *Стилистика и жанрове на старобългарската литература* (София, 1984).
- Stojčevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) “Кон средновековната книжевност,” *Разгледи* 18.8 (1976) 1005–1015.
- , *Од средновековната книжевност* (Скопје, 1976).
- , *Низ страниците од јужнословенските книжевности* (Скопје, 1977).
- , *Средновековните текстови и фолклорот* (Скопје, 1978) 37–103.
- , “Првиот анонимен антологичар од Македонија,” *Современост* 29.1–2 (1979) 67–72.
- , *Навраќања кон библијата* (Скопје, 1981).
- , “Апокрифите во Македонија [XI–XIV в.],” *Спектар* 3.5 (1985) 5–22.
- , *Меѓу книжевен текст и фолклор* (Скопје, 1987).
- Stoyanov, Y. “Problems in the Study of the Interrelations between Medieval Christian Heterodoxies and Heterodox Islam in the Early Ottoman Balkan-Anatolian Region,” *Scripta & e-Scripta* 2 (2004) 171–218.
- Sumcov, N.F. (Сумцов, Н.Ф.) *Очерки истории южнославянских апокрифических сказаний и песен* (Киев, 1888).

- Swoboda, M. "The Old Testament 'Apocrypha' in Early Russian Drama," in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Syrsov, I. (Сырцов, И.) *Мировоззрение наших предков русских славян-язычников до крещения Руси* (Кострома, 1897).
- Tarasova, I.V. (Тарасова, И.В.) "Апокрифы по спискам веков из собрания ГМИРиА," in: *Православие в Древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1989) 67–73.
- Taube, M. "On Two Related Slavic Translations of the Song of Songs," *Slavica hierosolymitana* 7 (1985) 203–209.
- Thompson, F.J. "The Nature of the Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implication for Russian Culture," *Slavica Gandensia* 5 (1978) 117.
- , "A Guide to Slavonic Translations from Greek Down to the End of the Fourteenth Century," in: *Славянска палеография и дипломатия* (София, 1980) 27–36.
- , "Apocrypha Slavica," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 58.2 (1980) 256–268; 63.1 (1985) 91–96.
- , "The Bulgarian Contribution to the Reception of Byzantine Culture in Kievan Rus': The Myth and the Enigma," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988/89).
- , "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," in: *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 295–354.
- , "The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament," in: *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia* (Sheffield, 1998) 605–920.
- Titov, V.V. (Титов, В.В.) *Ложные и отреченные книги славянской и русской старины: Тексты-первоисточники XV–XVIII вв. с примечаниями, комментариями и частичным переводом* (Москва, 1999).
- Tkachev, Ju.K. (Ткачев, Ю.К.) *Дидактическая традиция в средневековой русской литературе (XIV–XVII вв.)* (Черновцы, 1999).
- , "Евреи в русской народной словесности средних веков," *Запорожские Еврейские Чтения* 4 (2000) 179–185.
- , "Евреи в средневековой русской литературе," in: *Материалы Седьмой Ежегодной Международной Междисциплинарной конференции по иудаике* (ч. 2; Москва, 2000) 101–115.
- , "К вопросу об отражении библейской концепции человека в литературе русского средневековья," in: *Литературоведческий сборник* (Вып. 3; Донецк, 2000) 39–47.
- , "Эсхатологические мотивы в средневековых русских духовных стихах," in: *Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету* (Вип. 83; Чернівці, 2000) 25–31.

- Tolstaja, S. (Толстая, С.) “Апокрифы,” *История русской литературы X–XVII веков* (Москва, 1980) 46–49.
- , “О некоторых ветхозаветных мотивах в славянской народной традиции,” in: *Международная конференция “Сотворение мира и начало истории в апокрифической и фольклорной традиции” (на материале славянских и еврейских текстов) 5–7 декабря 1995 г. Москва. Тезисы докладов* (Москва, 1995) 66–68.
- , “О некоторых ветхозаветных мотивах в славянской народной традиции,” in: *От Бытия к Исходу: Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей* (eds. В.Я. Петрухин et al.; Москва, 1998) 21–37.
- , “Рассказы о посещении того света в славянской фольклорной традиции в их отношении к книжному жанру видений,” *Jews and Slavs* 10 (2003) 48.
- Tolstoj, N.I. (Толстой, Н.И.) *Славянские древности: Этнолингвистический словарь* (Т. 1; Москва, 1995) 113–115.
- Turdeanu, E. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 5; Leiden, 1981).
- Turilov, A.A. (Турилов, А.А.) “Библейские книги в народной культуре восточных славян (Псалтырь как гадательная книга),” *Jews and Slavs* 2 (1994) 76–86.
- , “Кичевский сборник с ‘Болгарской апокрифической летописью’ (Датировка, состав и история рукописи),” *Palaebulgarica* 4 (1995) 2–39.
- , “‘Поучение Моисея’ и сборник игумена Спиридона (Новгородский памятник XII в. В контексте русско-южнославянских литературных связей),” *Русистика. Славистика. Индоевропеистика: К 60-летию А.А. Зализняка* (Москва, 1996) 83–103.
- , “Южнославянские переводы XIV–XV вв. и корпус переводных текстов на Руси,” in: *Переводная литература в Древней Руси: К столетию выхода “Переводной литературы” А. И. Соболевского. Международная научная конференция Санкт-Петербург 5–8 октября 2004 г.* (С.-Петербург, 2004).
- Turilov, A.A., Chernecov, A.V. (Турилов, А.А., Чернецов, А.В.) “Отреченная книга Рафли,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 40 (1985) 324–331.
- Tvogofov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975).
- , “Обойденная вниманием (О Распространенной редакции хронографа 1617 года),” in: *Неисчерпаемость источника. К 70-летию В. А. Кучкина* (Москва, 2005) 307–313.
- , “К изучению октябрьской четвѣй минеи XV в.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 282–289.
- , *Переводные жития в русской книжности XI–XV веков. Каталог* (Москва-С.-Петербург, 2008).
- Uvarov, A.S. (Уваров, А.С.) “Образ ангела-хранителя с похождениями (отрывок из русской символики),” *Русский архив* 1 (1864) 13–25.

- Vagner, G.K. (Вагнер, Г.К.) "Литература, апокрифы и фольклор в творчестве мастеров Всеволода III," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 24 (1969) 75–79.
- Varencov, V.G. (Варенцов, В.Г.) *Сборник русских духовных стихов* (С.-Петербург, 1860).
- Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) *Из истории литературного общения Востока и Запада. Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китоврасе* (С.-Петербург, 1872).
- , "Опыты по истории развития христианской легенды," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 4 (1875) 283–331; *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 5 (1875) 48–130.
- , "Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. Вып. 5. XI. Дуалистические поверия о мироздании," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 46.6 (1889) 4.
- , "К вопросу о дуалистических космогониях," *Этнографическое обозрение* 2.5 (1890) 42.
- , "Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. Вып. 6. Гл. XX. Еще к вопросу о дуалистических космогониях," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 53.6 (1891) 123.
- , "Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. XIX. Эпизод о рае и аде в послании новгородского архиепископа Василия," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 53.6 (1892) 91–104.
- , "О книге В. Мочульского 'Следы народной Библии в славянской и древнерусской письменности' (Одесса, 1893)," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 2 (1894) 414–418.
- Voznesenskij, A.V. (Вознесенский, А.В.) *Древнерусская литература у старообрядцев: На материале старообрядческий изданий – XVIII начала XIX в.* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 1996).
- Vjazemskij, P.P. (Вяземский, П.П.) "Прение Панагиота с Азимитом," *Памятники древней письменности* 4 (1879) 37–59.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) "Хронология русской хронографии. Часть 1," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 49 (1996) 22–35.
- , "Особенности времяисчисления русской хронографии: (На материале хронографов XI–XV веков)," in: *Славянские литературы. Культура и фольклор славянских народов* (Москва, 1998) 56–70.
- , "Хронология русской хронографии. Часть 2," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 9–19.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000).
- , "Монстры русской хронографии," in: *Древний мир и мы* (Вып. 2; С.-Петербург, 2000) 245–251.
- , "От тождества к единству: (К вопросу о взаимоотношениях хронографии и летописания)," *Die Welt der Slaven* XLV (2000) 133–152.

- , “О некоторых особенностях ранней русской хронографии,” *Русская литература* 3 (2000) 3–18.
- , “Хронология русской хронографии. Часть 3,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 52 (2001) 79–97.
- , “О жанровых особенностях ранней русской хронографии,” in: *Литература, культура и фольклор славянских народов. XIII Международный съезд славистов (Любляна, 2003). Доклады российской делегации* (Москва, 2002) 56–73.
- , “Историография и экзегеза,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003) 12–22.
- , “Из истории древнерусской экзегезы (Пророчество Соломона),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 54 (2003) 252–303.
- , “Хронографическая компиляция XVII века (Соловецкий хронограф),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 116–120.
- , “Из истории поздней русской хронографии. Соловецкий хронограф,” in: *Международная научная конференция “Книжное наследие Соловецкого монастыря XV–XVII вв.” 5–10 сентября 2005 г. Тезисы докладов* (Соловки, 2005) 80–81.
- , *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV вв.)* (2nd ed.; С.-Петербург, 2008).
- Vorotnikov, Ju. (Воротников, Ю.) “Флорилегии: О переводных сборниках изречений в древнерусской литературе,” *Русская Речь* 3 (1991) 84–88.
- Vlchanov, S. (Вълчанов, С.), *Кумрански текстове с апокрифно съдържание и старославянските старозаветни апокрифи* (Ph.D. diss.; София, 1972).
- , *Тълкуване на книгата на пророк Даниил* (София, 1975).
- , “Апокрифът в старозаветното богословие,” *Духовна култура* 56.9 (1976) 22–30.
- , “Кумрански текстове с апокрифно съдържание и старославянските старозаветни апокрифи,” *Годишник на Духовната Академия “Св. Климент Охридский”* 23 (1973/1974) 171–302 (София, 1976).
- , *Отражения на старозаветната апокрифна традиция в средновековната българска култура* (ГДА, 28; София, 1986) 133–183.
- , “Към въпроса за апокрифното начало в средновековната българска литература. (Специфика и аспекти),” in: *II Международен конгрес по българистика. София, 1986* (София, 1987) 253–264.
- , “Следи от апокрифни елементи в Кирило-Методиевската традиция в средновековна България,” in: *Медиевистика и културна антропология* (София, 1998) 195–210.
- Zachinjaev, A. (Зачиняев, А.) *Апокрифи. Духовные Стихи. Легенды* (С.-Петербург, 1909).
- Zamaleev, A.F. (Замалеев, А.Ф.) *Философская мысль в средневековой Руси (XI–XVI вв.)* (Ленинград, 1987).

- Zhivov, V.M. (Живов, В.М.) “Особенности рецепции византийской культуры в Древней Руси,” in: *Из истории русской культуры* (Москва, 2000) 1.552–585.
- Zhukovskaja, L.P. (Жуковская, Л.П.) *Текстология и язык древнейших славянских памятников* (Москва, 1976).
- Zhuravel', O.D. (Журавель, О.Д.) *Сюжет о договоре человека с дьяволом в русских повестях конца XVII – начала XVIII в.* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 1994).
- , *Сюжет о договоре человека с дьяволом в древнерусской литературе* (Новосибирск, 1996).
- Zozulja, L. (Зозуля, Л.) “Изображение ада и рая в некоторых древнерусских текстах. (На материалах апокрифических и ранних еретических текстов),” in: *Русская философия: Сборник научных студенческих работ. Тартуский государственный университет. Т. 3* (Тарту, 1971) 14–25.

3.2. “PROHIBITED BOOKS”

- Angelov, B. (Ангелов, Б.) “Списъкът на забранените книги в старобългарската литература,” *Известия на Института за българска литература* 1 (1952) 107–159.
- Beneshevich, V.N. (Бенешевич, В.Н.) *Древнеславянская кормчая XIV титулов без толкований* (Том 1; Вып. 1–3; С.-Петербург, 1906).
- Breyer, M. *O starim i rijetkim jugoslovenskim knjigama* (Zagreb, 1952).
- Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф. И.) *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (С.-Петербург, 1861) 1.484–486.
- , *Историческая хрестоматия церковнославянского и древнерусского языков* (Москва, 1861) 533–544.
- Chernecov, A.V. (Чернецов, А.В.) “Иллюстрация к Шестокрылу и вопрос об отреченных изображениях в Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 38 (1985) 231–240.
- Demkova, N.S., Jakunina, S.A. (Демкова, Н.С., Якунина, С.А.) “Кормчая XV века из собрания Пермского педагогического института,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 43 (1990) 330–337.
- Dujchev, I. (Дуйчев, И.) “Най-старият славянски списък на забранените книги,” *Годишник на Българския библиографски институт “Елин Пелин”* 3 (1955) 50–60.
- Franko, I. (Франко, І.) *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Nescnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.1–6.
- Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) *Литература на изострени борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 234–244.
- Gorskij, A., Nevostrujev, K. (Горский, А., Невоструев, К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской синодальной библиотеки* (Москва, 1862) 2.3.640–641, 742–744.

- Gricevskaĵa, I.M. (Грицевская, И.М.) “Индекс истинных книг в составе ‘Кирилловой книги,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 46 (1993) 125–133.
- , *Индексы истинных книг* (С.-Петербург, 2003).
- , “Индексы истинных и ложных книг в Волоколамском монастыре,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 494–504.
- , “Book Inquisition in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Russia,” in: *Scrinium 4: Patrologia Pacifica. Selected papers presented to the Western Pacific Rim Patristics Society 3rd Annual Conference (Nagoya, Japan, September 29–October 1, 2006)* (eds. V. Baranov and B. Lourié; С.-Петербург, 2008) 136–146.
- , “Some Problems of Textology of Indexes of Prohibited Books,” in: *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, with the assist. of M. Swoboda; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum; Tübingen, 2009) (forthcoming).
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 52–53.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) “Мелкие тексты и заметки по старинной славянской и русской литературам,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 7.1 (1902) 134–136.
- , “К истории апокрифов и легенд в южнославянской письменности,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 14.2 (1909) 282–287.
- , *Апокрифы и легенды. К истории апокрифов, легенд и ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности* (Вып. 1; Петроград, 1915) 15–21.
- , *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 1–75.
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Slovenski tekstovi kanona o knjigami Staroga i Novoga Zavjeta pod jedno s indeksom lažnih knjiga,” *Starine* 9 (1877) 91–116.
- Jugović, V. “Gonjene knjige kros vekove. O cenzuri i zabranjenim knjigama,” *Bibliotekar* 8 (1956) 3–4.
- Kagan, M.D., Pomyrko, N.V., Rozhdestvenskaja, M. (Каган, М.Д., Понырко, Н.В., Рождественская, М.) “Описание сборников XV в. Книгописца Ефросина,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 35 (1980) 20–21, 213–214.
- Kalajdovich, K.F. (Калайдович, К.Ф.) *Иоанн экзарх Болгарский* (Москва, 1824) 208–212.
- Kerenskij, F. (Керенский, Ф.) “Древнерусские отреченные верования и календарь Брюса,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 3 (1874) 52–79; 4 (1874) 276–342.
- Kirillova, *Кириллова Книга* (Москва, 1644).
- Kobjak, N.A. (Кобяк, Н.А.) “Индексы ‘ложных’ и ‘запрещённых’ книг и славянские апокрифические евангелия,” in: *Из истории культуры и общественной мысли народов СССР* (Москва, 1984) 19–30.

- , “Индексы отреченных и запрещённых книг в русской письменности,” in: *Древнерусская литература: Источниковедение* (Ленинград, 1984) 45–54.
- , “Списки отреченных книг,” in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 441–447.
- , “Индекс ложных книг, приписываемый митрополитам Киприану и Зосиме,” in: *Русский феодальный архив XIV- первой трети XVI в.* (Москва, 1988) 4.697–716.
- , “Индекс ложных книг и древнерусский читатель,” in: *Христианство и церковь в России феодального периода* (Новосибирск, 1989) 352–363.
- , “Оксфордская редакция индекса ложных книг: археография и тексты,” in: *Из фонда редких книг и рукописей Научной библиотеки МГУ* (Москва, 1993) 175–187.
- , “Чудовская и Охфордская редакции индекса ложных книг приписываемого митрополитам Киприану и Зосиме,” *Palaebulgarica* 4 (1997) 88–103.
- Kozhuharov, S. (Кожухаров, С.) “Индекс на забранените книги,” in: *Кирило-Методиевата енциклопедия* (София, 1995) 2.114–115.
- Lileev, M.I. (Лилеев, М.И.) *Описание рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеке Черниговской духовной семинарии* (С.-Петербург, 1880) 212–213.
- Lur'e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) “Литературная и культурно-просветительная деятельность Ефросина в конце XV в.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 17 (1961) 143–145.
- Makarij (Макарий [Булгаков]) “Материалы для истории русской церкви,” *Духовный вестник* 2 (1862) 36–41.
- Maljek, Je. (Малэк, Э.) “Неполезное чтение” в России XVII–XVIII веков (Warszawa, 1992).
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Индекси,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 219–220.
- Milov, L.V. (Милов, Л.В.) “О древнейшей истории кормчих книг на Руси,” *История СССР* 5 (1980) 105–123.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Милюков, В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 33–37.
- Nichik, V.M. (Ничик, В.М.) “Индексы запрещенных книг в Изборнике Святослава 1073 г. и ‘Кирилловой Книге’ (1664),” in: *Отечественная общественная мысль эпохи средневековья (историко-философские очерки)* (Киев, 1988) 281–289.
- Otrechennye, *Отреченные чтения в России XV–XVIII веков* (Москва, 2002).
- Pavlov, A.S. (Павлов, А.С.) *Первоначальный славяно-русский номоканон* (Приложение к ученым запискам имп. Казанского университета, 1869; том 5; Казань, 1869).

- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Из гръцко-българските книжовни отношения през XVII–XVIII в.” *Годишник на Софийския университет. Факултет по славянски филологии* 62 (1968) 128–129.
- , *Апокрифна литература и фолклор. Апокрифната художествена проза и фолклорът* (София, 1978) 19–28.
- Pihoja, R.G. (Пихоя, Р.Г.) “Пермская Кормчая,” in: *Общественное сознание, книжность и литература периода феодализма* (Новосибирск, 1990) 171–175.
- , “Пермская Кормчая,” *Исторический Архив* 1 (2001) 187–210.
- Porfir'ev, I.Я. (Порфирьев, И.Я.) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 142–168.
- Purin, A. (Пыпин, А.) “Исследование для объяснения статьи о ложных книгах,” *Летопись Занятий Археографической комиссии (1861)* (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1862) 1–55.
- , “Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины,” *Русское Слово* 1.2 (1862) 48–130.
- , “Для объяснения ложных книг и преданий: Неделя и ‘Епистолия о Неделе,’” *Летопись Занятий Археографической комиссии* (Вып. 2; С.-Петербург, 1864) 1–15.
- , *Обзор истории славянских литератур* (С.-Петербург, 1864) 62–80.
- Rosenkampf, G.A. (Розенкамф, Г.А.) *Обозрение Кормчей книги в историческом виде* (С.-Петербург, 1839) 186–190.
- Sapunov, V.V. (Сапунов, В.В.) “‘Богословца от словес’ в Изборнике 1073 г. и проблема читателя на Руси в XI в,” in: *Изборник Святослава 1037 г.* (Москва, 1977) 234–246.
- Semenovker, V.A. (Семеновкер, В.А.) “Греческие списки истинных и ложных книг и их рецепция на Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 40 (1985) 206–228.
- , *Библиографические памятники Византии* (Москва, 1995) 129–154.
- Shcharov, A. (Щапов, А.) *Русский раскол старообрядчества* (Казань, 1859) 449–452.
- Shcharov, Ja.N. (Щапов, Я.Н.) “Новые списки Кормчих книг содержащие Русскую Правду,” *История СССР* 2 (1964) 100–103.
- , *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследие на Руси (кормчие книги) в XI–XIV вв.* (Ph.D. diss.; Москва, 1975).
- , *Восточнославянские и южнославянские рукописные книги в собраниях Польской Народной Республики* (т. 2; Москва, 1976) 135–137.
- , “Византийские хронографические сочинения в древнеславянской кормчей Ефремовской редакции,” in: *Летописи и хроники* (Москва, 1976) 230–263.
- , *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследие на Руси в XI–XIII в.* (Москва, 1978).
- , “Памятники церковного права IX–XII вв. Древней Руси и славянских стран. Опыт сравнительно-исторического изучения,” *Исторические Записки* 107 (1982) 303–331.

- , “Номоканон Мефодия в Великой Моравии и на Руси,” in: *Великая Моравия, ее историческое и культурное значение* (Москва, 1985) 238–253.
- Shljapkin, I.A. (Шляпкин, И.А.) “Описание рукописей суздальского Спасо-Евфимиева монастыря,” in: *Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства* (вып. 4; С.-Петербург, 1881) 53–56.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Из истории отреченных книг. Вып. 1: Гадания по Псалтыри* (С.-Петербург, 1899).
- , *Из истории отреченных книг. Вып. 4: Аристотелевы врата или Тайная Тайных* (С.-Петербург, 1908).
- , “Сербские списки книг истинных и ложных,” *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3 (1908) 41–45.
- , “Книги отреченные,” *Православная Богословская Энциклопедия* (12 томов; С.-Петербург, 1900–1911) 11.406–434.
- Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский, И.И.) *Обозрение древних русских списков кормчей книги* (С.-Петербург, 1897).
- Syrku, P.A. (Сырку, П.А.) “Заметки о славянских и русских рукописях в Bodleian Library в Оксфорде,” *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 12.4 (1907) 136–140.
- Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов, Н.С.) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.1–11.
- , “История статьи о книгах истинных и ложных. Краткое изложение,” *Труды III Археологического съезда (в Киеве)* (Киев, 1878) 1.8–9.
- , “Отреченные книги древней России,” in: Тихонравов Н.С. *Сочинения* (Т. 1.; Москва, 1898) 127–255.
- Tkachev, Ju.K. (Ткачев, Ю.К.) *Расширение национального образа мира в русской литературе веков. Часть 1. Евреи в древней русской словесности* (Черновцы, 2001).
- Turilov, A.A., Chernecov, A.V. (Турилов, А.А., Чернецов, А.В.) “К изучению ‘отреченных книг,’” in: *Естественно-научные представления Древней Руси* (ed. P.A. Симонов; Москва, 1988) 111–140.
- , “Отреченные верования в русской рукописной традиции,” in: *Отреченные чтения в России XV–XVIII веков* (Москва, 2002) 8–72.
- Vinogradov, V.P. (Виноградов, В.П.) *Уставные чтения* (вып. 1; Сергиев Посад, 1914); (вып. 2; Сергиев Посад, 1915).
- Vladimirov, P.V. (Владимиров, П.В.) *Научное изучение апокрифов – отреченных книг в русской литературе во второй половине XIX столетия* (Киев, 1900).

3.3. BOGOMILISM AND THE SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

- Angelov, D. (Ангелов, Д.) *Богомилството в България* (София, 1969).
- , *Презвитер Козма и беседата му против богомилите* (София, 1974).

- , “Богомилска книжнина,” in: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия* (София, 1985) 1.209–212.
- , “Българското богомилство и руското стриголничество,” in: *Руско-български връзки през вековете* (София, 1986) 23–38.
- Angelov, D., Batakliiev, G., Primov, V. (Ангелов, Д., Батаклиев, Г., Примов, Б.) *Богомилството в България, Византия и Западна Европа в извори* (София, 1976).
- Apichkov, E. (Аничков, Е.) “Манихеји и богомили,” *Гласник Скопского Научного друштва* 5 (1929) 137–155.
- Begunov, Ju.K. (Бегунов, Ю.К.) *Козма Пресвитер в славянских литературах* (София, 1973).
- , “Болгарские богомилы и русские стригольники,” *Byzantinobulgaria* 6 (1980) 63–72.
- Beyer, H. “Affinitäten zwischen Messalianern und Bogomilen,” in: *Университетски изследване и преподавания на българска история у нас и в чужбина* (София, 1982) 357–373.
- Vlagoev, N.P. (Благоев, Н.П.) *Правни и социални възгледи на богомилите* (София, 1912).
- Bogomilska Knizhnina, “Богомилска книжнина. [Тайната книга, Адамов запис, Тайнити на Еноха, Детството на Исуса, Разумник],” in: *Старобългарска литература* (София, 1947) 89–109.
- Bogomilska Knizhnina, “Богомилска книжнина,” in: Dinekov, P. et al. eds., (Динеков, П., К. Куев и Д. Петканова) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 144–155.
- Bogomilska Knizhnina, “Богомилска книжнина,” *Енциклопедия България* (София, 1978) 1.321.
- Cibranska, M. (Цибранска, М.) “Катарският требник и богомилската книжнина,” *Старобългаристика/Palaeobulgarica* 1 (2004) 42–67.
- Dimitrov, P. (Димитров, П.) *Презвитер Йереимия* (Ph.D. diss.; София, 1990).
- Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Д.) “Старобългарските апокрифи в изследванията на Йордан Иванов,” *Известия на Исторически музей Кюстендил* 4 (1992) 65–69.
- , “Тайната книга на богомилите в старобългарската апокрифна литература,” in: *1100 години Велики Преслав* (Шумен, 1995) 118–130.
- , “Богомилская космогония в древнеславянской литературной традиции,” *От бытия к исходу* (Москва, 1998).
- Dimitrova-Marinova, D. (Димитрова-Маринова, Д.) “Богомилството и богомилската литература в културната традиция на X век,” in: *Преславска книж. школа* (Т. 7; София, 2004) 316–328.
- Dinekov, P. (Динеков, П.) “Апокрифи; Богомилство; Богомилска книжнина; Противобогомилска книжнина,” in: П. Динеков, *Стара българска литература* (София, 1950) 1.113–144; 167–214.
- Dosev, H. (Досев, Х.) “Богомили. История и учение,” *Възраждане* 1.4–5 (1907) 76–106.
- Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) “Богомилство и орфичка традиција,” *Зборник Философског факултета* 10.1 (Београд, 1968) 193–210.

- , “Богомилски апокрифни реликти од Македонија,” *Македонски фолклор* 3 (1970) 22–23.
- , *Богомилството на Балкану и у Малој Азји. Т. 1. Богомиљски родоначалници* (Београд, 1974).
- , “Манихејска тајна књига у јжнословенској књижевности,” *Књижевна историја* 23 (1974) 509–516.
- , “Богомилскиот дуализам како одраз на класните судири во средниот век,” *Погледи* 6–7 (1975) 105–112.
- , “Манихејска формула проклињања у словенском преводу,” *Balkanica* 6 (1975) 51–61.
- , “Исихазм и богомилство,” *Balkanica* 11 (1980) 19–28.
- , *Богомилството на Балкану и у Малој Азји. Т. 2. Богомилство на православном истоку* (Београд, 1982).
- , “Почеци богомилства на Балкану,” in: *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања* (Скопје, 1982) 19–29.
- Dragoјlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна грага* (Скопје, 1978).
- , *Митилогумена на средновековната кирилска писменост* (Скопје, 1990).
- George, J.M. *The Dualistic-Gnostic Tradition in the Byzantine Commonwealth with Special Reference to the Paulician and Bogomil Movement* (Ph.D. diss.; Wayne State University, 1979).
- Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) “Прокълнатиот старобългарски писател поп Йеремија,” *Език и литература* 1 (1964) 11–30.
- , “Богомилска литература,” in: Е. Георгиев, *Литература на изострени борби в средновековна Българија* (София, 1966) 202–231.
- , “В борба са апокрифната литература и богомилството,” in: Е. Георгиев, *Литература на изострени борби в средновековна Българија* (София, 1966) 233–304.
- Gjuzelev, V. (Гюзелев, В.) “Българската версия на апокалиписа ‘Тайната книга’ на богомилите или Йоановото евангелие,” in: Енев, М. *Апокалиписът на св. Йоан Богослов в стенописите, иконите и миниатюрите от християнските храмове* (София, 1996) 14–18.
- , “‘Тайната книга’ на богомилите или ‘Откровение Йоаново’ (XIV),” in: *Извори за средновековната история на Българија (VII–XV в.) в австрийските ръкописни сбирки и архиви. Т. 2. Италиански, латински и немски извори* (София, 2000) 74–83.
- Grasheva, L. (Грашева, Л.) “Йеремија, поп,” in: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия* (Т. 2; София, 1995) 146–149.
- Hamilton, B., Hamilton, J. *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650–c. 1450* (Manchester, 1998).
- Ilinskiј, F. (Илинскиј, Ф.) “Русские богомилы XV века (жидовствующие),” *Богословский Вестник* 7–8 (1905) 436–459.
- Istomin, K. (Истомин, К.) *Историческое исследование о богомилах* (Харьков, 1876).
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]).

- , *Livres et legends bogomiles (Aux sources du Catharisme)* (tr. M. Ribeyrol; Paris, 1976).
- Jagić, V. (Ягич, В.) “Богомилы; ложные книги и народные сказания,” in: В. Ягич, *История сербско-хорватской литературы* (Казань, 1879) 95–143.
- Kaliganov, I., Polyvjannuj, D. (Калиганов, И., Поливянный, Д.) *Родник Златоструйный. Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990) 240–273.
- Kazachkova, D.A. (Казачкова, Д.А.) “Зарождение и развитие антицерковной идеологии в Древней Руси XI в.,” *Вопросы истории религии и атеизма* 5 (1958) 283–314.
- , “Към въпроса за богомилската ерес в древна Русия през XI в.,” in: *Исторически преглед* 13.4 (1957) 47–78.
- Kazhdan, A.P. (Каждан, А.П.) “Новые материалы о богомилах в Византии XII в.,” *Византийский Временник* 2 (1966) 275–277.
- Кенанов, Д. (Кенанов, Д.) “Йордан Иванов и ‘Тайната книга’ на богомилите,” *Известия на историческия музей в Кюстендил* 4 (1992) 89–92.
- Kiselkov, V. (Киселков, В.) *Презвитер Козма. Беседа против богомилите* (София, 1942).
- Klibanov, A.I. (Клибанов, А.И.) “Свободомыслие в Твери,” *Вопросы истории религии и атеизма* 6 (1958) 246.
- , *Реформационные движения в России в XIV – первой половине XVI в.* (Москва, 1960) 118–136, 167–173.
- , “Идея свободы человека в учениях русских еретиков конца XV – первой половины XVI в.,” *Средние Века* 25 (1964) 216–227.
- , *Народная социальная утопия в России: Период феодализма* (Москва, 1977).
- Klincharov, I. (Клинчаров, И.) *Поп Богомил и неговото време* (София, 1927).
- Koshev, N. (Кочев, Н.) “Към въпроса за космогоничните възгледи на представителите на гностико-дуализма във Византия и на Балканите през IX–XII в. и античната философия (павликяни и богомили),” *Studia balcanica* 14 (1979) 49–67.
- , “Още по въпроса за богомилството – Беседата на презвитер Козма и т.нар. богомилски книги-апокрифи,” *Духовна култура* 10 (1995) 19–29.
- Коев, Т. (Коев, Т.) “Павликянски и масалиански религиозни елементи в богомилството,” *Известия. Българската патриаршия. Църковно-исторически и архивен институт* 2 (1984) 76–82.
- Kondakov, N.P. (Кондаков, Н.П.) “О манихействе и богомилах,” in: *Сборник статей по археологии и византиноведению* (1; Прага, 1927) 289–301.
- Lambert, M. *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (New York, 1976) 12–23.

- Lapteva, L. (Лаптева, Л.) “Изучение источников по истории богомилства в Болгарии русской историографией XIX – начала XX веков (1 часть),” *Starobulgaristica* 10/1 (1986) 81–96.
- , “Изучение источников по истории богомилства в Болгарии в русской историографии XIX – начала XX веков,” in: *Историография и источниковедение стран Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы* (Москва, 1986) 140–165.
- Ljubarskij, Ja.N. (Любарский, Я.Н.) “Расправа императора Алексея Комина с богомилами,” *Вопросы истории религии и атеизма* 12 (1964) 310–316.
- Loos, M. “Le prétendu témoignage d’un traité de Jean Exarque intitulé ‘Sestodnev’ et relatif aux Bogomiles,” *Byzantinoslavica* 13 (1952) 59–67.
- , “Satan als Erstgeborener Gottes (Ein Beitrag zur Analyse des bogomilischen Mythos),” *Byzantino-Bulgarica* 3 (1969) 23–35.
- , *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Prague, 1974).
- Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, А.) “Богомилска книжнина,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 60–62.
- , “Богомилство,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 62–63.
- , “Разобличението на дявола-граматик. (Към историята на старобългарската легенда за произхода на павликяните),” in: *Човек и време. Сборник с научни изследвания в памет на Сабина Беляева* (София, 1997) 287–294.
- , “Littérature apocryphe bogomile et pseudo-bogomile dans la Bulgarie médiévale,” *Slavica Occitania* 16 (2003) 37–53.
- , “Богомилска книжнина,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 72–74.
- , “Богомилство,” in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 74–75.
- Minissi, N. “La tradizione apocrifa e le origini del Bogomilismo,” *Ricerche Slavistiche* 3 (1954) 97–113.
- Mutafchiev, P. (Мутафчиев, П.) “Поп Богомил и св. Иван Рилски,” *Философски преглед* 2 (1934) 97–112.
- Naumov, E.P. (Наумов, Е.П.) “Сербские средневековые источники о богомилстве к оценке их свидетельств в историографии,” in: *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања* (Скопје, 1982) 89–95.
- Obolensky, D. *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism* (Cambridge, 1948).
- Panajotov V. (Панайотов, В.) “‘Слово на ползу души.’ Новооткрит богомилски паметник,” *Старобългаристика/Palaebulgarica* 3 (1988) 113–119.
- , “Богомилски вариант на притчата за Еднорога,” in: *Медиевистични изслед. в памет на П. Димитров* (Шумен, 1996) 25–36.

- , “Посланието на Панко’ и богомилството,” *Любословие* 1 (1996) 26–42.
- , “Системността в славянските богомилски текстове,” in: *Преславска книжовна школа* (Т. 7; София, 2004) 308–315.
- Rejchev, V. (Пейчев, Б.) “Тайната книга на богомилите във вариант от 1455 г.,” *Проблеми на културата* 1 (1982) 3–16.
- Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Д.) “Към въпроса за връзките на фолклора с богомилството,” *Известия на института за българска литература* 6 (1956) 81–101.
- , *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 274–294.
- , “Богомилството и апокрифната литература,” *Старобългаристика/Palaebulgarica* 6/3 (1982) 143–153.
- , “Das Bogomilentum und die apokryphen Literatur,” in: *Beiträge zur Bulgaristik* (София, 1984) 43–48.
- , “Йеремяя, поп,” in: *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 201–202; (2nd ed.; ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 226–227.
- Poruzhenko, M. (Попруженко, М.Г.) *Козма Пресвитер* (София, 1911).
- , “Козма пресвитер и новгородские еретики XV в.,” in: *Сб. Л. Милетич* (София, 1933) 321–332.
- , *Козма Пресвитер, болгарский писатель X века* (София, 1936).
- Primov, V. (Примов, Б.) *Бугрите. Книга за поп Богомил и неговите последователи* (София, 1970).
- Puech H.C. and A. Vaillant, *Le Traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre* (Paris, 1945).
- Rachki, F. (Рачки, Ф.) *Богомили и патарени* (Београд, 1931).
- Radchenko, K.F. (Радченко, К.Ф.) “Этюды по богомилству. К вопросу об отношении апокрифов к богомилству,” in: *Изборник Киевский* (Киев, 1904) 29–38.
- , “Этюды по богомилству. Народные космогонические легенды славян в их отношении к богомилству,” *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 15.4 (1910) 73–131.
- , “Этюды по богомилству. Видение пророка Исаи в пересказах катаров-богомиллов,” *Сборник статей по литературе и истории в честь Н.П. Дашкевича* (Киев, 1906) 229–234 [*Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 15.4 (1910) 34–56].
- Rigo, A. *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalinismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmato e bogomilismo* (Firenze, 1989 [Cambridge, 1991]).
- Sajjar, D. (Сайяр, Д.) “Богомилството и иранските дуалистически учения,” *Философска мисъл* 6 (1974) 82–88.
- Sanjek, F. “Le phénomène dualiste vu par les historiens balkaniques,” *Cahier de Fanjeaux* 14 (1979) 249–270.
- Schmaus, A. “Der Neumanichäismus auf dem Balkan,” *Saeculum* 2 (1951) 271–299.
- Sokolov, I. (Соколов, И.) “Богомилство,” in: *Православная Богословская Энциклопедия* (12 томов; С.-Петербург, 1903) 2.751–767.

- Stearns, J.F. *Bogomilism – the Great Bulgarian Heresy* (Chicago, 1929).
- Stefanov, P. (Стефанов, П.) “Неизвестно произведение на поп Йеремия,” *Духовна култура* 5 (1996) 13–18.
- Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) “Богомилскиот дуализм и фолклорот,” *Современост* 26.7–8 (1976) 58–84.
- , “Неколку книжевни извори за богомилството од XIII и XIV век,” *Литературен зборник* 26.3 (1979) 89–102.
- , “Од церковното богомилско и псеудобогомилско наследство,” *Годишен зборник. Филозофски факултет на Универзитетот-Скопје* 30 (1979) 575–582.
- , “Дуалистически елементи во македонскиот фолклор,” in: *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања* (Скопје, 1982) 113–126.
- Stoyanov, Y. *The Hidden Tradition in Europe* (London, 1994).
- Turdeanu, É. “Aposcryphes bogomiles et aposcryphes pseudobogomiles,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 138/139 (1950) 22–52.
- Vasilev, G. (Василев, Г.) “Влияние на зороастризма върху богомилството,” *Култура* 3 (1990) 56–68.
- , “Елементи на орфизма в богомилството (По повод непубликуваните статии на Йордан Иванов ‘Богомилството,’ ‘Прераждането на душите’ и ‘Никодимовото евангелие’),” *Известия на историческия музей Кюстендил* 2 (1998) 61–70.
- , *Български богомилски и апокрифни представи в английската средновековна култура* (София, 2001).
- Volman, F. (Вольман, Ф.) “В чем значение богомилства для славянских литератур средневековья?” in: *Сборник ответов на вопросы по литературоведению, IV Международный съезд славистов* (Москва, 1958) 22–24.
- Werner, E. “Die Bogomilen in Bulgarien Forschungen und Fortschritte,” *Studi Medievali* 3 (1962) 249–278.

3.4. “HERESY OF THE JUDAIZERS”

- Adrianova, V.P. (Адрианова, В.П.) “К истории текста ‘Аристотелевых врат,’” *Русский Филологический Вестник* 66.3–4 (1911) 1–14.
- Alov, V. (Алов, В.) *Русские “еретики” XIV–XVI веков* (С.-Петербург: 1908).
- Bagno, V.E. (Багно, В.Е.) “За Аристотелевыми вратами (древнерусская и кастильская версии краткой редакции ‘Тайная Тайных’),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 54 (2003) 184–191.
- Bogojavlenskij, N.A. (Богоявленский, Н.А.) “Древнерусское врачевание в XI–XVII вв.,” in: *Источники для изучения истории русской медицины* (Москва, 1960) 34–38.
- De Michelis, C.G. *La valdesia di Novgorod: “Giudaizzanti” e prima riforma* (Torino, 1993).

- Ettinger, S. "Jewish Influence on the Religions Ferment in Eastern Europe at the End of the 15th Century," in: *Jitshak F. Baer Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1960) 228–247.
- Evseev, I.E. (Евсеев, И.Е.) "Словеса святых пророк – противоиудейский памятник по рукописи XV века," in: *Древности: Труды Славянской комиссии Императорского московского археологического общества, том 4.1* (Москва, 1907).
- Fine, J.V. "Fedor Kuritsyn's 'Laodikijskoe poslanie' and the Heresy of the Judaizers," *Spekulum* 41.3 (1966) 500–504.
- Garsoian, N. *The Paulician Heresy. A Study in the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire* (Hague, 1967).
- Grigorenko, A. (Григоренко, А.) "'Лаодикийское послание' и его литературное окружение," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 43 (1990) 324–329.
- Horoshkevich, A.L. (Хорошкевич, А.Л.) "Русско-славянские связи конца XV – начала XVI в. и их роль в становлении национального самосознания России," in: *История, культура, этнография и фольклор славянских народов. VII Международный съезд славистов. Доклады советской делегации* (Москва, 1973) 411–412.
- Hösch, E. *Orthodoxie und Häresie im alten Rußland* (Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa, 7; Wiesbaden, 1975) 43–50.
- Howlett, J.R. "Свидетельство архиепископа Геннадия о ереси новгородских еретиков жидовская мудрствующих," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 46 (1993) 53–73.
- Plinskij, F. (Илинский, Ф.) "Русские богомилы XV века (жидовствующие)," *Богословский Вестник* 7–8 (1905) 436–459.
- Iosif (Иосиф, игумен Волоцкий) *Просветитель или обличение ереси жидовствующих, творение... Иосифа игумена Волоцкого* (Казань, 1903).
- Jordan, W.C. "The 'Aristotelevy vrata': Problems in Reconstructing an Ideology," *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 28.3 (1980) 398–401.
- Kämpfer, F. "Zur Interpretation des 'Laodicenschen Sendschreibens,'" *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 16 (1968) 53–69.
- Karskij, E.F. (Карский, Е.Ф.) *Белорусы* (Т. 3, ч. 2; Петроград, 1921) 52–55.
- Kazachkova, D.A. (Казачкова, Д.А.) "Зарождение и развитие антицерковной идеологии в Древней Руси XI в.," *Вопросы истории религии и атеизма* 5 (1958) 283–314.
- Kazakova, N.A., Lur'e, Ja.S. (Казакова, Н.А. и Лурье, Я.С.) *Антифеодалные еретические движения на Руси XIV – начала XVI вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955).
- Klivanov, A.I. (Клибанов, А.И.) *Реформационные движения в России в XIV первой половине XVI в.* (Москва, 1960).
- , "Идея свободы человека в учениях русских еретиков конца XV – первой половины XVI в.," *Средние Века* 25 (1964) 216–227.

- Klier, J.D. "Judaizing Without Jews? Moscow, Novgorod 1470–1504," in: *Culture and Identity in Muscovy* (UCLA Slavic Studies, NS, 3; eds. A.M. Kleimola and G. D. Lenhoff; Москва, 1997) 336–349.
- Копонов, N.N. (Кононов, Н.Н.) "Из области астрологии. Обзор статей: Планетника, Звездочетца, Колядника, Громника, Лунника, Трепетника, Тайная тайных, Лечбника и пр. рук. XVIII в. А. Г. Первухина," *Древности. Труды Славянской комиссии имп. Московского археологического общества* 4.1 (1907) 45–47.
- Kuznecov-Krasnojarskij, I.P. (Кузнецов-Красноярский, И.П.) *Рафли. Памятники старинной русской письменности в Сибири* (Томск, 1905).
- Lilienfeld, F. von. "Das 'Laodikijское poslanie' des grossfürstliches D'jaken Fedor Kuricyn," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 24 (1976) 64–77.
- Lur'e, Ja.S. (Лурье, Я.С.) *Идеологическая борьба в русской публицистике конца XV – начала XVI века* (Ленинград, 1960).
- , "Лаодикийское послание' Федора Курицына," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси: Вторая половина XV века* (Москва, 1982) 538–539.
- , "Послание Геннадия Иоасафу," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al. (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси: Вторая половина XV века* (Москва, 1982) 540–553.
- , "Unresolved Issues in the History of the Ideological Movements of the Late Fifteenth Century," in: *Medieval Russian Culture* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London, 1984) 152–153.
- , *Русские современники Возрождения: Книгописец Ефросин, дьяк Федор Курицын* (Ленинград, 1988).
- , "Источники по истории 'новоявившейся новгородской ереси' ('жидовствующих')," *Jews and Slavs* 3 (1995) 199–223.
- , "Когда была написана 'Книга на новгородских еретиков'?" *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 49 (1996) 78–88.
- , "Лаодикийское послание' Федора Курицына," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 7.444–445.
- , "Послание Геннадия Иоасафу," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев, Д.С.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1997) 7.446–459.
- Majer, J. "Zum jüdischen Hintergrund des sogenannten 'Laodicensischen Sendschreibens,'" *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 17 (1969) 1–12.
- Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) "Отвергнутая традиция: учение еретиков- 'жидовствующих,'" in: *Древняя Русь: пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 420–448.
- Pliguzov, A. (Плигузов, А.) "Полемика о новгородских еретиках и 'ответ кириловских старцев,'" *Jews and Slavs* 3 (1995) 135–155.
- Роров, N.P. (Попов, Н.П.) "Иосифово Сказание о ереси жидовствующих по спискам Великих Миней," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 18.1 (1913) 173–197.

- Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) “Прение Григория Паламы с ‘хионы и турки’ и проблема ‘жидовская мудрствующих,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 329–369.
- Rudnev, N. (Руднев, Н.) *Рассуждение о ересях и расколах, бывших в русской церкви от Владимира Великого до Иоанна Грозного* (Москва, 1838) 4–21.
- Ryan, W.F. “A Russian Version of the *Secreta Secretorum* in the Bodleian Library,” *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 12 (1965) 40–48.
- , “Aristotle in Old Russian Literature,” *The Modern Language Review* 63.3 (1968) 650–658.
- , “Древнерусский перевод жизнеописания Аристотеля Диогена Лаэртского,” *Slavia* 37.2 (1968) 349–355.
- , “The Onomantic Table in the Old Russian *Secreta Secretorum*,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 49 (1971) 603–606.
- , “The Old Russian Version of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Secreta Secretorum*,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 56 (1978) 242–260.
- , “The *Secretum Secretorum* and the Muscovite Autocracy,” in: *Pseudo-Aristotle: The Secret of Secrets. Sources and Influences* (Eds. by W.F. Ryan and Ch.B. Schmitt; Warburg Institute Surveys, 9; London, 1983) 114–123.
- , “The Passion of St Demetrius and the Secret of Secrets. An Onomantic Interpolation,” *Cyrrilomethodianum* 8–9 (1984–1985) 59–65.
- Simonov, R.A., Turilov, A.A., Chernecov, A.V. (Симонов, Р.А., Турилов, А.А., Чернецов, А.В.) *Древнерусская книжность (Естественнонаучные и сокровенные знания в России XVI в. связанные с Иваном Рыковим)* (Москва, 1994).
- Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский, А.И.) “Логика” жидовствующих и “Тайная Тайных” (Памятники Древней Письменности и Искусства, 133; С.-Петербург, 1899) 5–13.
- , *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII вв.* (С.-Петербург, 1903) 396–428.
- Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Псалтырь жидовствующих в переводе Федора еврея* (Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских, 2; Москва, 1907).
- , “Ересь жидовствующих,” in: *История древней русской литературы* (Москва, 1921) 53–81.
- , “‘Аристотелевы врата’ и ‘Тайная тайных,’” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук* 101.3 (1928) 15–18.
- Taube, M. “The ‘Poem on the Soul’ in the Laodicean Epistle and the Literature of the Judaizers,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 19 (1995) 671–685.
- , “Послесловие к ‘Логическим терминам Маймонида’ и ересь жидовствующих,” in: *In Memoriam: Памяти Я. С. Лурье* (С.-Петербург, 1997) 239–246.
- Tkachev, Ju.K. (Ткачев, Ю.К.) *Расширение национального образа мира в русской литературе веков. Часть 1. Евреи в древней русской словесности* (Черновцы, 2001).
- Toropov, V.N. (Топоров, В.Н.) “К ранним русско-еврейским литературно-текстовым связям,” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (Москва, 1993) 46–54.

- Turilov, A.A. (Турилов, А.А.) “О датировке и месте создания календарно-математических текстов – ‘семи тысячников,’” in: *Естественнонаучные представления Древней Руси* (Москва, 1988).
- Turilov, A.A., Chernecov, A.V. (Турилов, А.А., Чернецов, А.В.) “Отреченная книга Рафли,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 40 (1985) 260–261; 282–283.
- , “‘Рафли’ – ‘языческие святцы’ Ивана Рыкова,” in: *Памятники Культуры. Новые Открытия. Ежегодник. 1984* (Ленинград, 1986).
- , “К культурно-исторической характеристике ереси ‘жидовствующих,’” in: *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы. Сб. 1: XI–XVI века* (Москва, 1989) 407–429.
- Val’denberg, V. (Вальденберг, В.) *Древнерусские учения о пределах царской власти* (С.-Петербург, 1916) 319–321.
- Veselovskij, A. (Веселовский, А.) *Заметки по литературе и народной словесности. 3. К Сказанию о прении жидов с христианами* (Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности имп. Академии наук, 32.7; С.-Петербург, 1883) 26–28.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) “‘Пророчество Соломона’ из собрания Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря,” in: *Монастырская культура: Восток и Запад* (ed. Е.Г. Водолазкин; С.-Петербург, 1999) 59–67.
- Zguta, R. “The ‘Aristotelevy vrata’ as a Reflection of Judaizer Political Ideology,” *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 26.1 (1978) 1–10.
- Zimin, A.A. (Зимин, А.А.) *И. С. Пересветов и его современники* (Москва, 1958) 351–352.

3.5. KHAZARS AND SLAVS

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57 at 53.
- Arhipov, A. (Архипов, А.) *По ту сторону Самбатииона. Этюды о русско-еврейских культурных, языковых и литературных контактах в X–XI вв.* (Berkeley, 1995).
- Artamonov, M.I. (Артамонов, М.И.) *Очерки древнейшей истории хазар* (Ленинград, 1936).
- , *История хазар* (Ленинград, 1962).
- Babenko, V.A. (Бабенко, В.А.) “Памятники хазарской культуры на юге России,” *Труды XV археологического съезда в Новгороде 1911 г.* (Т. 1; Москва, 1914) 464–473.
- Baras, G.M. (Барац, Г.М.) *Библейско-агадические параллели к летописным сказаниям о Владимире Святом* (Киев, 1908).
- , *Собрание трудов по вопросу о еврейском элементе в памятниках древнерусской письменности* (т. 1–2; Берлин, 1924–1926).
- Bartol’d, V.V. (Бартольд, В.В.) “О письменности у хазар,” in: *Культура и письменность Востока* (Вып. 4; Баку, 1929).

- Brook, K.A. "Khazar-Byzantine Relations," in: *The Turks* (eds. H. Celâl Güzel, C. Cem Oguz, and O. Karatay; Ankara, 2002) 1.509–515.
- Bruckus, Ju.D. (Бруцкус, Ю.Д.) "Письмо хазарского еврея от X в.," *Еврейская мысль* 1 (1922) 31–71.
- , "Die Chazaren und das Kiewer Russland," in: *VII Congres Internationale des Sciences Historiques* (1; Warszawa, 1933) 108–113.
- , "The Khazar Origin of Ancient Kiev," *Slavonic and East European Review* 22 (1944) 108–124.
- Chekin, L.S. (Чекин, Л.С.) "Christian of Slavelot and the Conversion of Gog and Magog. A Study of Ninth Century Reference to Judaism among Khazars," *Russia Medievalis* 9.1 (1996) 13–43.
- Cukerman, K. (Цукерман, К.) "On the Date of Khazars' Conversion to Judaism and the Chronology of the Kings of the Rus Oleg and Igor," *Revue des études Byzantines* 53 (1995) 237–270.
- , "Русь, Византия и Хазария в середине X в.: проблемы хронологии," in: *Славяне и их соседи. Греческий и славянский мир в Средние века и раннее Новое время* (Москва, 1996) 68–80.
- , "О происхождении двоевластия у хазар и обстоятельствах их обращения в иудаизм," *Материалы по археологии, истории и этнографии Таврии* 9 (2002) 521–534.
- , "The Khazars and Byzantium – The First Encounter," in: *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives – Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium* (eds. P.B. Golden et al.; Leiden, 2007) 399–432.
- Dunlop, D.M. "Aspects of the Khazar Problem," *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* 12 (1951) 33–44.
- , *The History of the Jewish Khazars* (Princeton, NJ, 1954).
- , "The Khazars," in: *The Dark Ages: Jews in Christian Europe, 711–1096* (eds. C. Roth and I. H. Levine; New Brunswick, NJ, 1966) 325–356.
- , "Khazars," in: *Encyclopedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971–1972) 10.945–954.
- , "H.M. Baratz and his views of Khazar Influence on the Earliest Russian Literature, Juridicial and Historical," in: *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1975) 345–367.
- Dvornik, F. *Les legends de Constantin et de Methode* (Prague, 1933).
- Garkavi, A.Ja. (Гаркави, А.Я.) "Заметка о Сангари," in: В.А. Бильбасов, *Кирилл и Мефодий* (ч. II; С.-Петербург, 1871) 376–383.
- , "Сказания еврейских писателей о хазарах и Хазарском царстве," *Труды Восточного Отделения Археологического Общества* 17 (1874) 259–422.
- , "Сообщения о хазарах. А. Хазарские письма," *Еврейская библиотека* (Вып. 7; С.-Петербург, 1879) 144–153.
- , "Сообщения о хазарах. В. Судьбы хазарских писем в европейском ученом мире в продолжение трех столетий," *Еврейская библиотека* (Вып. 8; С.-Петербург, 1880).
- Golb, N., Pritsak O. *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century* (Ithaca, NY, 1982).

- Golden, P.B. *Khazar Studies* (Vol. 1; Budapest, 1980).
- , “The Question of the Rus’ Qaganate,” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 2 (1982) 77–97.
- , “Khazaria and Judaism,” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 3 (1983) 127–156.
- , “A New Discovery: Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8.3–4 (1984) 474–486.
- , “Государство и государственность у хазар. Власть хазарских каганов,” in: *Феномен восточного деспотизма. Структура управления и власти* (Москва, 1993) 211–233.
- Golubovskij, P.V. (Голубовский, П.В.) *Болгары и хазары – восточные соседи Руси при Владимире Святом (историко-этнографический очерк)* (Киевская старина, 22.7; Киев, 1888).
- Gourand, J.-L. “Quelques propos cavaliers sur les Khazars,” in: *L’Empire khazar VII^e–XI^e siècle: L’enigme d’un peuple cavalier* (eds. J. Piatigorsky and J. Sapir; Paris, 2005) 117–142.
- Hazary, *Хазары* (eds. V. Petruhin et al.; Jews and Slavs, 16; Jerusalem-Moscow, 2005).
- Huxley, G. “Byzantinokhazarika,” *Hermathena* 148 (1990) 69–87.
- Jakubovskij, A.Ju. (Якубовский, А.Ю.) “О русско-хазарских и русско-кавказских отношениях в IX–X вв.,” *Известия Академии наук СССР. Серия истории и философии* 3.5 (1946).
- Jean-Baptiste, P. “Une nouvelle histoire des Khazars: Le royaume juif de la Volga,” *Sciences et Avenir* 650 (2001) 123.
- Knjazkij, I.O. (Князкий, И.О.) “Русь, Хазария, иудаизм,” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (Москва, 1993) 26–28.
- Kokovcov, P.K. (Коковцов, П.К.) “Новый еврейский документ о хазарах и хазаро-русско-византийских отношениях в X в.,” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* ноябрь (1913) 150–172.
- , *Еврейско-хазарская переписка в X в.* (Ленинград, 1932).
- Lavrovskij, L.Ja. (Лавровский, Л.Я.) “Колі хазари перейшли на жидівство,” *Богословіє* 12 (1934) 66–69, 193–206, 295–299; *Богословіє* 13 (1935) 1935 47–49.
- Ligeti, L. “The Khazarian Letter from Kiev and its Attestation in Runiform Script,” *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31 (1981) 5–18.
- Magomedov, M.G. (Магомедов, М.Г.) *Образование Хазарского каганата* (Москва, 1983).
- Malyshevskij, I. (Малышевский, И.) *Евреи в Южной Руси и Киеве в X–XII вв.* (Киев, 1878).
- Marchenko, V.T. (Марченко, В.Т.) *Хазары, монголы и Русь: Очерк истории Евразии* (Москва, 1993).
- Mason, R.A.E. “The Religious Beliefs of the Khazars,” *Ukrainian Quarterly* LX (1995) 383–415.
- Moin, V.A. “Les Khazares et les Byzantins d’après l’Anonyme de Cambridge,” *Byzantion* 6 (1931) 309–325.

- Moshin, V.A. (Мошин, В.А.) “Еще о ‘новооткрытом’ хазарском документе,” in: *Сборник Русского Археологического общества в королевстве Югославия* (1; Белград, 1927) 41–60.
- , “(Готская епархия) в Хазарии в VIII в.,” *Труды IV съезда русских академических организаций за границей* (1; Белград, 1929).
- , “Русь и Хазария при Святославе,” *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 6 (1933) 187–208.
- , “Хельгу хазарского документа,” *Slavia* 15 (1938) 191–200.
- Noonan, T.S. “Khazaria as an Intermediary between Islam and Eastern Europe in the Second Half of the Ninth Century: the Numismatic Perspective,” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 5 (1987) 179–204.
- , “Byzantium and the Khazars: a special relationship?” in: *Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990* (eds. J. Shepard and S. Franklin; Aldershot, 1992) 109–132.
- , “The Khazar Qaghanate and its Impact on the Early Rus’ State: The Translation Imperii from Itil to Kiev,” in: *Nomads in the Sedentary World* (eds. A.M. Khazanov and A. Wink; Richmond, 2001) 76–102.
- Novosel’cev, A.P. (Новосельцев, А.П.) *Хазарское государство и его роль в истории Восточной Европы и Кавказа* (Москва, 1990).
- Parhomenko, V.A. (Пархоменко, В.А.) “Киевская Русь и Хазария,” *Slavia* 6 (1927–1928) 380–387.
- Petruhin, V.Ja. (Петрухин, В.Я.) “The Normans and the Khazars in the South of Rus’ (The Formation of the ‘Russian Land’ in the Middle Dnepr Area),” *Russian History* 19 (1992) 393–400.
- , “Хазария и Русь: источник и историография,” in: *Скифы, Хазары, Славяне, Древняя Русь: Международная конференция посвящённая 100-летию со дня рождения профессора Михаила Илларионовича Артамонова. Санкт-Петербург, 9–12 декабря 1998 г.* (С.-Петербург, 1998) 106–108.
- , “Хазария и Русь в современной историографии: традиционные проблемы и новые решения,” *Jews and Slavs* 5 (2000) 365–375.
- , “О ‘Русском Каганате,’ начальном летописании, поисках и недоразумениях в новейшей историографии,” *Славяноведение* 4 (2001) 78–82.
- , “К вопросу о сакральном статусе хазарского кагана: традиция и реальность,” *Славяне и их соседи* (вып. 10; Москва, 2001) 73–78.
- , “Khazaria and Rus’: An Examination of their Historical Relations,” in: *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives – Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium* (eds. P.B. Golden, et al.; Leiden, 2007) 245–268.
- Pletneva, S.A. (Плетнева, С.А.) *Die Chasaren: Mittelalterliches Reich an Don und Wolga* (Leipzig, 1978).
- , *Хазары* (2 изд.; Москва, 1986).
- , *Очерки хазарской археологии* (Москва, 2000).

- Polovoj, N. Ja. (Половой, Н. Я.) "О русско-хазарских отношениях в 40-е гг. X в.," *Записки Одесского археологического общества* 1.34 (1960) 343–353.
- Pritsak, O. "The Chazar Kingdom's Conversion," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2 (1978) 278–280.
- Schechter, S. "An Unknown Khazar Document," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 3 (1912) 181–219.
- Shapira, D. "Two Names of the First Khazar Jewish Beg," *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 10 (1998–1999) 231–240.
- , "Bulgar-Khazar Rivalry: Notes on Ethnical Historio-Psychology," in: *Хазарский Альманах Vol. I (Proceedings of the Third International Khazar Colloquium)* (Харьков, 2002) 214–224.
- , "Judaization of Central Asian Traditions as Reflected in the so-called Jewish-Khazar Correspondence, with Two Excurses: A. Judah Halevy's Quotations; B. Eldad Ha-Dani (Judaeo-Turkica VI), and an Appendix," in: *Хазары* (eds. V. Petruhin et al.; Jews and Slavs, 16; Jerusalem-Moscow, 2005) 503–521.
- , "Armenian and Georgian Sources on the Khazars: A Re-Evaluation," in: *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium* (eds. P. B. Golden et al.; Leiden, 2007) 307–352.
- , "Iranian Sources on the Khazars," in: *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium* (eds. P. B. Golden et al.; Leiden, 2007) 291–306.
- , "Iconoclasts and Khazars, a Note," in: *Scrinium 4: Patrologia Pacifica. Selected papers presented to the Western Pacific Rim Patristics Society 3rd Annual Conference (Nagoya, Japan, September 29–October 1, 2006)* (eds. V. Baranov and B. Lourie; С.-Петербург, 2008) 341–347.
- Shepard, J. "The Khazars's Formal Adoption of Judaism and Byzantium's Northern Policy," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 31 (1998) 11–34.
- Skify, Скифы, Хазары, Славяне, Древняя Русь: Международная конференция посвящённая 100-летию со дня рождения профессора Михаила Илларионовича Артамонова. С.-Петербург, 9–12 декабря 1998 г. (С.-Петербург, 1998).
- Sorlin, I. "Le problème des Khazares et les historiens soviétiques dans les vingt dernières années." *Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation byzantine* 3.51 (1968) 423–455.
- Степанов, С. (Степанов Ц.) *Българи и хазари през ранното средновековие* (София, 2003).
- Szyszman, S. "Les Khazars. Problèmes et controverses," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 152:2 (1957) 174–221.
- , "Découverte de la Khazarie," in: *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations* 25:3 (1970) 818–821.
- Tereshchenko, A. "Que sait-on des Khazars ou état des lieux historique d'un peuple oublié," in: *L'Empire khazar VII^e–XI^e siècle: L'enigme d'un peuple cavalier* (eds. J. Piatigorsky and J. Sapir; Paris, 2005) 35–78.

- Торогов, V.N. (Топоров, В.Н.) “Еврейский элемент в Киевской Руси,” in: *Славяне и их соседи* (Москва, 1993) 28–43.
- Torpusman, A.M. “Slavic Names in a Kiev Manuscript from the First Half of the 10th Century,” in: *These Are the Names: Studies in Jewish Onomastics* (vol. 2, ed. A. Demsky; Ramat-Gan, 1999) 171–175.
- Trendafilov, H. (Трендафилов, Х.) *Хазарската полемика на Константин-Кирил* (София, 1999).
- Vachkova, V. “Danube Bulgaria and Khazaria as part of the Byzantine oikoumene,” in: *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages: Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans* (ed. F. Curta; Leiden, 2007).
- Vasil’ev, M.A. (Васильев, М.А.) “Хорс Жидовин’: древнерусское языческое божество в контексте проблем Khazaro-Slavica,” *Славяноведение* 2 (1995) 12–21.
- Vinnikov, A.Z. (Винников, А.З.) “Донские славяне и хазарский каганат,” in: *Скифы, Хазары, Славяне, Древняя Русь: Международная конференция посвящённая 100-летию со дня рождения профессора Михаила Илларионовича Артамонова. Санкт-Петербург, 9–12 декабря 1998 г.* (С.-Петербург, 1998) 108–110.
- Weinryb, B.D. “The Khazars, an annotated bibliography,” *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 6 (1963) 111–129; *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 11 (1976) 57–74.
- Yarmolinsky, A. et al. *The Khazars; A Bibliography Compiled by the Slavonic Division* (New York, 1939).
- , *The Khazars: A Bibliography: 1940–1958* (New York, 1959).
- Zifelyp-Simumjagi, A.R. (Зифельп-Симумяги, А.Р.) “К вопросу о языке хазар,” *Известия Азербайджанского филиала АН СССР* 2 (1937) 47–53.

3.6. TRANSLATIONS FROM HEBREW IN THE SLAVIC MILIEUX

- Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, А.А.) “Переводы с древнееврейских оригиналов в Древней Руси,” *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987) 1–20.
- , “К истории русской переводческой школы XII в.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 41 (1988) 154–196.
- , “Русско-еврейские литературные связи до XV века,” *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75.
- , “Кое-что о переводах в Древней Руси (по поводу статьи Фр. Дж. Томсона ‘Made in Russia’),” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 49 (1996) 278–295.
- , “По поводу статьи Г.Г. Ланта ‘Ещё раз о мнимых переводах в Древней Руси,’” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 442–445.
- , “К вопросу об изучении переводной письменности Киевского периода,” in: *Русская историческая филология: Проблемы и перспективы* (Петрозаводск, 2001) 34–42.

- , “Еще раз о книге Есфирь,” *Русский язык в научном освещении* 1.5 (2003) 185–214.
- , “Апокрифы Толковой палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 58 (2008) 41–57.
- Amusin, I.A. (Амусин, И.А.) “Новый эсхатологический текст из Кумрана (11Q Melchisedek),” *Вестник древней истории* 3 (1967) 45–62.
- Lunt, H.G. “The Old Church Slavonic Song of Songs: One Translation or Two?” *Die Welt der Slaven* 302 (1985) 297–304.
- , “On Interpreting the Russian Primary Chronicle: The Entry for 1037,” *The Slavic and East European Journal* 32 (1988) 251–264.
- , “Did Jaroslav the Wise Sponsor Translations into Slavonic?” in: *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujcev* (Studia Slavico-Byzantina et Mediaevalia Europensia, 1; Sofia, 1988).
- , “Еще раз о мнимых переводах в Древней Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 435–441.
- Lunt, H.G. and M. Taube, “Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?” *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988) 147–187.
- , “The Slavonic Book of Esther: Translation from Hebrew or Evidence for a Lost Greek Text?” *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994) 347–362.
- , *The Slavonic Book of Esther* (Massachusetts, 1998).
- Lysen, I. *Книга Эсфирь. К истории первого славянского перевода* (AUU, 41; Uppsala, 2001) 19–23.
- Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский, Н.А.) *Древнерусский перевод еврейской книги “Есфирь” и проблема переводов с еврейского в древнерусской письменности Киевского периода* (Ph.D. diss.; Ленинград, 1946).
- , “К вопросу изучения переводной письменности Киевского периода,” *Ученые записки Карельского педагогического института* 2.1 (1956) 198–219.
- , “Искусство перевода Киевской Руси,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 15 (1958) 54–72.
- , “К вопросу о заимствованиях из греческого в словарном составе древнерусского литературного языка (По материалам переводных произведений Киевского периода),” *Византийский Временник* 13 (1958) 246–266.
- , “О синтаксисе древних славяно-русских переводных произведений,” in: *Теория и практика перевода* (Ленинград, 1962) 83–103.
- , “Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964) 198–231.
- , “К изучению ранней московской письменности,” in: *Изучение русского языка. Источниковедение* (Москва, 1969) 93–103.
- , “К вопросу об источниках Изборника 1076 г.,” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 321–328.
- , “К изучению исторической лексики ‘Изборника 1076 г.’,” in: *Русская историческая лексикология и лексикография* (Ленинград, 1972) 3–12.

- , “Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: Ветхозаветные апокрифы,” in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, часть 1; Москва, 1976) 181–210.
- , *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV веков* (Ленинград, 1978).
- , “Текст древнерусского перевода книги Есфирь,” *Dissertationes slavicae* 13 (1978) 131–164.
- , “О лингвистическом разграничении памятников древнеславянского языка русского извода и древнерусского литературного языка XI–XIV веков (к постановке проблемы),” in: *Проблемы развития языка* (Саратов, 1981) 3–11.
- , *Избранные статьи* (С.-Петербург, 1995).
- Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) *Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000).
- , “Слово блаженного Зоровавеля’ как пример непосредственного перевода с древнееврейского оригинала,” in: Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) *Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000) 148–155.
- Taube, M. “On Two Related Slavic Translations of the Song of Songs,” *Slavica hierosolymitana* 7 (1985) 203–209.

MODERN AUTHOR INDEX

- Abdullaeva, F.I., 158
Alexander, P., 17, 65, 104, 136, 157, 158,
159, 165, 167, 169, 174, 179, 182, 197
Allen, E.L., 111
Altmann, A., 142, 180
Amusin, I., 112
Andersen, F.I., 5, 8, 9, 88, 95, 96, 98,
101, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 118, 119,
120, 123, 138, 139, 144, 146, 147, 149,
150, 151, 155, 157, 161, 163, 178, 179,
180, 187, 188, 189, 190, 194, 196, 198
Anderson, G.A., 86, 143, 144, 180
Aptowitz, V., 112, 127
Arbel, D., 82, 85
Aschim, A., 112
Attridge, H.W., 127, 128, 129
Augustin, C., 118
Avanesov, R.I., 43
- Barc, B., 142, 180
Barr, J., 86
Bassler, J.M., 127
Bauer, J.B., 127
Baumgartner, W., 113
Bénétreau, S., 127
Berger, K., 184
Bergren, T.A., 17, 114, 136, 167
Bernstein, M., 114
Black, M., 152, 153
Bloch, R., 111
Boccaccini, G., 116, 135, 152, 167
Böttrich, C., 8, 10, 11, 17, 112, 134, 180
Bousset, W., 176
Box, G.H., 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 46, 52,
89
Breslauer, S.D., 112
Brock, S., 127
Bunta, S.N., 62, 82, 83, 167
- Cagni, L., 83
Cancik, H., 84, 143, 180
Caquot, A., 112
Carmona, A.R., 112
Caroll, R.P., 86
Cazelles, H., 111
Charles, R.H., 9, 11, 139, 141, 144, 146,
152, 184
- Charlesworth, J.H., 8, 15, 17, 24, 78, 150,
154, 168, 175, 176, 186, 188
Chavasse, C., 111
Chazon, E., 114, 115, 135
Coats, G.W., 111
Coblentz Bautch, K., 135, 152
Cockerill, G.L., 112
Cohen, M., 160
Collins, J.J., 17, 22, 25, 39, 46, 55, 107,
115, 150, 163, 167
- Danby, H., 173
D'Angelo, M.R., 111
Davies, P.R., 86
Davila, J.R., 112, 113, 182
Dean-Otting, M., 21
De Conick, A.D., 17, 182
De Jonge, H.J., 167
De Jonge, M., 113
Delcor, M., 113, 118
Denis, A.-M., 168
De Roo, J., 47
de Santos Otero, A., 118
Diez Macho, A., 81, 118
Dimant, D., 114, 184
du Toit Laubscher, F., 113
- Eisenbaum, P., 123, 127, 128
Elior, R., 72
Evans, C.A., 114, 176, 199
- Feinberg, E.L., 47
Fitzmyer, J.A., 113, 164
Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T., 82, 111, 116,
117, 163, 173, 175, 176, 186, 195
Flint, P.W., 167
Fossum, J., 18, 32, 41, 42, 44, 45, 62, 84,
111, 142, 176, 177, 180, 185, 186, 195
Franko, I., 14
Friedländer, G., 122
Frishman, J., 114
- Gammie, J., 113
García Martínez, F., 113, 114, 116, 119,
142, 196
Gaster, M., 167
Gianotto, C., 113

- Gieschen, C.A., 42, 76
 Ginzberg, L., 13, 15, 17, 61
 Goodenough, E.R., 111
 Grabbe, L.L., 47
 Grässer, E., 111
 Grelot, P., 127
 Grether, O., 42, 76
 Grossfeld, B., 82, 121
 Gruenwald, I., 17, 21, 55, 113, 167
 Guelich, R., 113
 Gutman, Y., 167, 169
- Habel, N.C., 86
 Hafemann, S.J., 111
 Halperin, D.J., 21, 23, 29, 34, 36, 115, 182
 Harrelson, W., 86
 Hay, D.M., 111
 Heinninger, B., 123, 128
 Heller-Wilensky, S.A., 184
 Hempel, C., 167
 Himmelfarb, M., 17, 115, 150
 Holladay, C.R., 111, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 175, 192
 Horton, F., 113
 Hurtado, L., 111, 167
- Idel, M., 18, 93, 99, 100, 101, 103, 136, 184
 Ivanov, J., 5
- Jacimirskij, A.I., 5, 8, 14
 Jacobson, H., 111, 167, 168, 170, 172, 173, 181, 192, 195, 197
 Janowski, B., 47
 Jeppesen, K., 86
 Johnsson, W.G., 125
 Jones, P.R., 111
 Jurgens, B., 47
- Kapera, Z.J., 115
 Kim, T.H., 167
 Klein, M.L., 82, 185
 Knibb, M.A., 48, 102, 116, 139, 140, 147, 148, 152, 153, 155, 169, 171, 174, 176, 178, 186, 190
 Kobelski, P., 113
 Köhler, L., 26
 Koltun-Fromm, N., 114
 Kugel, J., 18
 Kuiper, K., 111, 167
 Kulik, A., 4, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 71, 75, 77, 78, 79, 85, 87, 89
- Kvanvig, H.S., 106, 114, 115
- Lafargue, M., 175
 Landsman, J.I., 15, 16, 21, 23, 25, 46, 52, 89
 Lane, W.L., 129
 Lanfranchi, P., 167, 168, 170, 174
 Launderville, D., 86, 87
 Le Déaut, R., 127
 Levy, R.D., 47
 Lewis, G.S., 114, 182
 Lichtenberger, H., 84, 143, 180
 Lihachev, D.S., 18
 Longenecker, R.N., 113
 Loretz, O., 47, 86
 Lourié, B., 44, 82, 83
 Lunt, H.G., 9, 14, 15
 Luttkhuizen, G.P., 114
- Macaskill, G., 109
 MacDermot, V., 113
 Mach, M., 163
 Maher, M., 81, 121, 177, 185
 Maier, J., 115
 Marcus, R., 81
 Marshall, J.L., 113
 Maunder, A.S.D., 5, 10
 May, H.G., 86
 McNamara, M., 81, 113, 121, 185
 Meeks, W.A., 111, 168, 169, 173, 174, 175
 Meshcherskij, N., 9
 Mettinger, T.N.D., 26, 28, 31, 32, 42, 43, 76
 Michel, O., 113
 Milgrom, J., 47
 Milik, J.T., 10, 102, 108, 142
 Miller, J.E., 86
 Montgomery, J.A., 195
 Morfill, W.R., 9, 11, 144
 Munoa, P., 53, 56
- Najman, H., 184, 196, 199
 Neusner, J., 111, 168
 Newman, C.C., 182
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E., 24, 102, 115, 118, 119, 140, 150
- Odeberg, H., 12, 18, 191
 Oesterley, W.O.E., 18
 Olson, D., 152, 153

- Orlov, A., 12, 24, 33, 39, 41, 44, 55, 57,
67, 73, 76, 78, 82, 83, 95, 103, 111,
112, 113, 114, 134, 136, 141, 156, 167,
168, 169, 174, 176, 180, 186
- Parry, D.W., 114
- Pearson, B.A., 113, 124
- Petuchowski, J., 113
- Philonenko, M., 14, 15, 18, 21, 23, 29,
30, 34, 37, 38, 41, 46, 48, 51, 60, 62,
72, 78, 89
- Philonenko-Sayar, B., 14, 15, 21, 23, 29,
30, 34, 37, 38, 41, 46, 48, 51, 60, 62,
72, 78, 89
- Porfir'ev, I.Ja., 14
- Porter, S.E., 114
- Pypin, A.N., 14
- Quispel, G., 62, 143, 180
- Reed, A.Y., 142, 156
- Reeves, J.C., 49, 114, 135, 136, 137, 138,
139, 149, 150
- Riefler, P., 16
- Robertson, R.G., 168, 169, 172, 181
- Robinson, S.E., 113
- Rooke, D.W., 113
- Rosenberg, S., 184
- Rowland, C., 21, 22, 24, 41, 42, 52, 53,
55, 76, 80, 186
- Rowley, H., 113
- Rubinkiewicz, R., 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23,
30, 52, 68, 69, 70, 80, 88, 89
- Rubinstein, A., 15, 138, 149
- Ruffatto, K., 168, 169, 171
- Schalit, A., 111
- Schäfer, P., 33, 84, 103, 143, 159, 165, 180
- Schlüter, M., 159, 165
- Schmidt, C., 113
- Scholem, G., 18, 21, 31, 39, 93, 173
- Schultz, J.P., 111
- Scott, J.M., 114, 115
- Segal, A., 143, 180
- Seow, C.L., 64, 65
- Simon, M., 113
- Simpson-Housley, P., 115
- Singer, I., 13
- Smith, J.Z., 188, 190, 191
- Smith, R., 113
- Snell, B., 168
- Sokolov, M.I., 8, 88, 96, 109, 110, 133,
140, 141, 147, 148, 152, 155, 161
- Sperber, A., 82
- Spicq, C., 113, 129
- Sreznevskij, I.I., 14, 37, 43
- Starobinski-Safran, E., 168, 170
- Steiner, R.C., 114
- Stichel, R., 118
- Stone, M.E., 17, 21, 114, 115, 130, 135,
136, 143, 144, 167, 180
- Stork, H., 113
- Stuckenbruck, L.T., 142
- Tantlevskij, I.R., 103
- Taube, M., 9
- Tawil, H., 47
- Testuz, M., 184
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C., 116, 119, 142, 196
- Tihonravov, N.S., 6, 14
- Tishby, I., 101
- Tromp, J., 111, 143, 144, 167, 180
- Turdeanu, É., 5
- Uhlig, S., 142
- Ulrich, E., 86, 114
- Vaillant, A., 8, 10
- Vajda, G., 113
- VanderKam, J.C., 58, 66, 103, 114, 115,
121, 130, 139, 146, 149, 154, 167, 170,
176, 183, 184, 186, 189
- van der Horst, P.W., 111, 167, 169, 173,
175, 177, 193
- Van De Water, R., 111, 168
- Van den Broek, R., 11
- Van der Woude, A.S., 113
- Van Rompay, L., 114
- Vermes, G., 127, 191
- Vogt, E., 168
- von Mutius, H.G., 159, 165
- von Rad, G., 26
- Weinfeld, M., 25, 26, 27, 28, 42, 47, 69,
76
- Werman, C., 115
- Whitney, K.W., 33
- Wiencke, M., 168
- Williams, A.J., 86
- Wilson, I., 42, 76
- Wolfson, E.R., 185
- Wright, J.W., 86
- Wright, D.P., 47
- Wuttke, G., 113
- Yaron, K., 86

SUBJECT INDEX

- Aaron 112, 115
Abednego 64, 66
Abel 4, 53, 124, 127–130, 166
– as enthroned judge 53
– sacrifices of 127–130
Abraham 3, 13, 23–24, 29, 37, 47, 52, 57, 88, 112, 121–122, 124, 129, 166
– as fighter against idols 13, 57
abyss 49, 155
Adam 3–6, 11, 81–82, 108, 134–136, 144, 157, 166
– creation of 108, 134–136, 166
– gigantic body of 81, 84
– garments of 81–82
– as king of the earth 11
– name of 11
– two natures of 88
– veneration of 144, 157
Adoil 93–107, 109–110
– belly of 96
– as foundation 93–94, 96, 99, 104
– luminosity of 95, 99
– as revealer 96, 107
– as starting point of creation 95
Aeon of the Righteous 93–94
Aher (Elisha ben Abuyah) 31, 86
Akhuzan 10, 107–108, 117
Alexander the Great 44
Alexandria 10, 11
Amram 64, 116, 166, 182, 184, 189, 192–194
Angel of the Lord 31, 42–43, 64, 152
angels of the Presence 189–191, 198–200
angelus interpres 23, 41, 171–172
Anointed Cherub 84–87
– as model of perfection 85
Anthropos 62, 95
Ark 120, 129
Assyria 79
Azazel (Asael) 133–134, 142, 153, 156–158, 179
– as composite creature 48
– as impure bird 47–50
– *Kavod* of 70
– punishment of 48, 155
– as scapegoat 48–49, 155
Azza 142, 156–158, 179
Balkans 5
Bar-Eshath 24, 52, 59–60, 64–65, 69, 77, 78
Bathenosh 119
Bogomils 5, 16
Byzantium 3
Cain 4, 127, 129
chalkydras 11
Chariot, Account of 173
cheirograph 5
Cherubim 33
Creation, Account of 173
Dan 139, 169
David 6
Deuteronomic school 26–28, 42, 67, 76
Diaspora 10
Egypt 11, 79
Elijah 6, 28–29
Enmeduranki 106–107, 177
Enoch 3, 7, 12, 53, 65, 72, 93–94, 97, 101–104, 110, 112, 143–145, 158–162, 166, 169–170, 179, 186–189, 195
– as choirmaster/liturgical director 158–162
– as cosmic dam 102
– as expert in secrets 106–107
– as foundation 104
– as governor of the world 103
– heavenly counterpart of 175–177, 186–189
– incorruptibility of 105–106
– luminosity of 93, 104–105
– as mantic practitioner 169–170
– as mediator 102, 139
– metamorphosis of 65, 104, 106
– as pillar 102
– as priest 7, 72
– as prince of the Presence 65, 195
– as redeemer 108–109
– as revealer 106–107

- righteousness of 101–103
- as sacerdotal foundation 94, 107–108
- as scribe of righteousness 102
- as second Adam 136
- veneration of 143–145
- as Youth 143, 179
- Essenes 16
- Eve 4–6, 48, 81, 135–136, 152
- Extent, Divine 35, 63
- Ezra 165

- Face, Divine 27, 87–89, 161, 165, 182
- fiery test 63–67, 87
- Flood 7, 102–103, 121, 130, 173
- “frozen” angel 181

- Gabriel 45, 118, 120, 153, 163, 190
- Garden of Eden 48, 79, 81, 85, 89, 103, 118, 135–136
- garments of light 81–82
- garments of skin 81–82
- Giants 49–50, 133, 136, 138, 142, 145–148, 173
- Glory, Divine 27, 35, 38, 44–45, 69, 72

- Haluq* (Deity’s attire) 34–35
- Hand of God 196–197
- Haran 58, 66
- Hayyot* (Living Creatures) 33, 35, 58, 159
- Hell 6
- Hermon, Mount 133, 139, 146–147, 169
- Horeb, Mount 28–29

- idolatry 57–58, 66, 71, 75, 86–87
- idols 37–38, 56–57, 59, 68–69, 71
- Isaac 4, 190

- Jacob 3, 176, 185–186, 188, 190–191, 193, 199
 - heavenly counterpart of 176, 185–186, 190
 - image of 176, 185
- Jared 138, 157, 165, 179
- Jerusalem 9–10, 44, 108, 151
- Jesus 32, 111, 114, 125–127, 130, 142, 163–164
- Joshua 165

- Kavod* traditions 17, 21–22, 27, 34, 37, 60, 69, 76, 161

- Lamech 116–117, 119
- Lazarus 6
- Lebanon 79
- “Lesser YHWH” 39
- Levi 72, 112, 115, 123–126

- Mar-Umath 59, 68–70
- Mashach 64, 66
- Melchisedek 72, 112, 114, 115, 117–124, 130–131
 - geneology of 123–124
 - as king of righteousness 130–131
 - miraculous birth of 7, 118–119
 - as Shem 120–122
- Men of Faith 109
- Mêsu-Tree 83
- Metatron 12, 31, 39, 64–65, 85–86, 94, 101, 103–104, 110, 158–162, 179, 182
 - as choirmaster 39, 156, 158–162
 - as foundation of the world 94, 103
 - as glory of highest heaven 65
 - as idol 86
 - as “Lesser YHWH” 39
 - as priest 160
 - as prince of the Presence 12, 65
 - as prince over all princes 159
 - as prince of the world 103
 - as replica of the Deity 65, 104
 - shining face of 182
 - as Youth 179
- Methuselah 105, 107, 112, 117
- Michael 6, 39, 72, 142, 153, 162, 164
- Moses 3, 27, 65, 67, 111–112, 115, 125, 165–200
 - as angel of the Presence 194–196
 - heavenly counterpart of 175–177, 189, 193
 - as immutable Standing One 195
 - shining face of 65, 180–182
- mythologies of evil 135–137, 141

- Name of God 17, 26–28
- Nebuchadnezzar 64
- Nimrod 66
- Nir 117, 119, 123
- Noah 3–4, 6, 112, 114–119, 121, 123, 126–131, 166
 - as heir of righteousness 126–129
 - luminosity of 116
 - as mantic practitioner 128
 - miraculous birth of 116, 118–119
 - as priest 114, 117, 121, 123, 130–131
 - as wonder child 116

- oath 139, 147
 oneirocritic 170
Ophannim 9, 35
- paradise of righteousness 102
 Peniel/Penuel 191
 Phanuel 153, 190–191
 phoenixes 11
 Priestly source 25–28, 38, 80
 Prince of Tyre 82, 84
 Protoplast 5–6, 62, 81–82, 84, 86–88,
 105, 136, 142–143, 162, 164
 psychopomps 44–47, 50, 97, 133
- Qedushah* 34–36
- Raguel 168, 170–173, 181, 192
 Raphael 48, 153, 155
 Righteous, The 93, 98–101, 104–106
 – as cosmic entity 93, 98–100
 – as foundation 99–101
 – as pillar 100
- sacrifices 10, 45, 47, 125–126
 Sariel 190–191
 Satan 5–6, 133, 136–137, 151–154, 164
 Satanail/Satanael 5, 6, 133–164
 – as prince 141, 152
 satans 152
 secrets of creation 7, 93–94, 97, 106,
 173–174
 Seraphim 33, 159–160
 serpent 6, 48, 81, 135–136
 Shadrach 64, 66
Shekhinah 34, 65, 160
 Shem 112, 120–122, 166
Shem traditions 17, 26–32, 34, 37–38,
 72
 Shemihazah 133–134, 147, 156
Shi'ur Qomah tradition 17, 31–33, 41,
 45, 51, 155–162
 Sinai, Mount 27–29, 32, 65, 67, 112,
 116, 166, 168–170, 181, 192, 194
- slavonic pseudepigrapha 3–7, 14
 Solomon 6
 Son of Man 61, 63, 154, 176, 180, 199
 Sothonim 117, 119
- Temple 9–10, 12, 15, 71–72, 75, 114,
 165
 Terah 23, 29, 55–58, 63, 66, 75
 – as “creator” 63, 68–69, 71, 84
 three watchers 156–158
 Throne, Divine 7, 22, 35, 55, 76, 96,
 99, 193
 Torah 165–167, 170
 “two powers” controversy 31, 86
- Uriel 171, 190–191, 198
 Uzza 142, 156–158, 179
- veneration, angelic 30, 141–144,
 163–164
 Vereveil 97, 190, 198
 Voice, Divine 24–25, 29, 55, 67, 78
- Watchers 50, 102, 133, 135, 137–162,
 173, 178–180
 – descent of 147
 – oath of 147
 – petition of 139
 – as stars 50, 178–179
 – silence of 147
 – transgression of 50
- Yahoel 13, 29–32, 39, 41–45, 50–51, 72
 – as angel of the Name 30–31, 42
 – as *angelus interpres* 23, 41, 43
 – as bird of heaven 32, 41–44
 – body of 41
 – as choirmaster 32–33
 – as composite creature 44–45
 – invisibility of 50–51
 – as likeness of the Divine Glory 45
 – as mediation of God’s Name
 30–31, 42