

“THESE BLASPHEMOUS RUSTIC SCRIPTURES”
(Indigenous Apocryphal Heritage of *Slavia Orthodoxa*)

Florentina Badalanova Geller (Berlin/London)

1. Framework of reference

In 1845, the assiduous Russian philologist Viktor Grigorovich discovered among the Slavonic manuscripts kept in the Slepche Monastery a text, which he believed to be a fragment from the apocryphal *Discussion between the Three Saints*; he identified it as a Bulgarian/Serbian redaction of the erotapocriseis. He copied it, and his notes were subsequently published by Ia. Shchapov [1863: 91].¹ The manuscript that Grigorovich discovered and described was lost, and his notes represent the only surviving evidence for the existence of what is now considered to be a unique South Slavonic redaction of an indigenous apocryphon designated as *The Sea of Tiberias*. Some years later Grigorovich — searching for other manuscripts scattered around in the vast lands of the Russian Empire — set off to the city of Cheboksary [Чебоксары], once part of the Kazan province (currently the capital of the Republic of Chuvashia). There he came across another manuscript containing a text similar to the Slepche account, but considerably larger with a more elaborate storyline. The text was published subsequently by Mochul'skii [1887 (18: 4): 173-177] and was thus included in a broader discussion about the phenomenon which some 19th century scholars labeled (following the terminology of the very Slavonic scribal tradition they were examining) as “proscribed literature” [отреченные книги].² Indeed, the thesaurus employed in medieval *Indices of Prohibited Books* to describe this type of writings habitually consisted of a vast range of negatively charged expressions, such as “blasphemous rustic scriptures and erroneous nomocanons” [льстивые сборники сельские и худыи номокануници];³ yarns “spun by foul mouthed dissemblers” [отъ лжесловесникъ сложена];⁴ tales “falsely copied” [лжею списано];⁵ “words fraudulently rendered” [слова криво складена];⁶ accounts reproducing “the lies of the Bulgarian priest Jeremiah” [еже Еремия поъ Болгарскіи изолгалъ];⁷ all copied by heretics [все то еретици списали].⁸ Thus in 1861, in his study of Bulgarian, Serbian and Russian apocryphal writings and their impact upon folk poetry, F. Buslaev refers to one of the 17th cent. Russian redactions of the *Indices of Proscribed Literature*

¹Note that in Miltenova's entry on *The Sea of Tiberias* in the *Encyclopaedia Lexicon of Old Bulgarian Literature* [1992: 463-64] the year of Shchapov's publication given (1963) should read 1863; the page number given (75) should also be amended to 91. Since Miltenova's entry contains many other erroneous details, it should be used with caution; see also footnote 11.

²Cf. Pypin [1862], Tikhonravov [1863].

³Cf. Buslaev [1861: 485].

⁴*Ibid.* 484.

⁵*Ibid.* 484.

⁶*Ibid.* 485.

⁷*Ibid.* 484.

⁸*Ibid.* 485.

from a miscellany from the manuscript collection of the Solovetsky Monastery and points out the following:

[С]татья эта ясно свидѣтельствуеѣтъ, что въ XVII в. между книгами истинными было насѣяно много ложныхъ писаній отъ еретиковъ, на пакость невѣждамъ, не только людямъ свѣтскимъ, но и попамъ и дьяконамъ, что ходили по рукамъ *льстивые сборники сельскіе и худые номоканонцы*, а въ молитвенникахъ — ложныя молитвы, то еѣтъ, заговоры и заклятія. Эти произведенія досужей фантазіи, столь противныя и страшныя для благочестивыхъ грамотниковъ древней Руси, в настоящее время, потерявъ свое прежнее религиозное значеніе, могутъ быть только матеріалами для исторіи народныхъ суевѣрій и поэзіи. Какъ народныя пѣсни и сказки переходили изъ устъ въ уста отъ одного поколѣнія къ другому, такъ и ложныя писанія, по свидѣтельству Соловецкой статьи, невѣжды *держатъ у себя отъ отцевъ и прадѣдовъ*. Это литература стоячая, лишенная самостоятельнаго развитія; это не болѣе, какъ та смутная среда народнаго баснословія, въ которой старое язычество приняло новыя формы, заимствованныя изъ чтенія книжнаго [Buslaev 1861: 487-488].

Almost half a century later, Iatsimirskii commented on the same problem, stating that the phenomenon of the so called “blasphemous rustic scriptures and erroneous nomocanons” remained virtually unstudied:

Вопросъ о «худыхъ номоканунцахъ», упоминаемыхъ въ индексахъ ложныхъ книгъ, иногда с прибавленіемъ «толстыя сборники сельскіе и худыя Манаканунцы при Молитвенникахъ (т. е. при Требникахъ) у сельскихъ поповъ», почти не разработанъ [1909: 39].

Indeed, *The Sea of Tiberias* — which one might consider to be an emblematic case of such type of “homespun” writings containing examples of folk homiletics and vernacular exegesis on themes ranging from Creation to the Resurrection of Jesus Christ — was not even mentioned in Iatsimirskii’s *Bibliographical Survey of South-Slavonic and Russian Apocryphal Literature* [1921], regardless of the fact that by that time various redactions of the text had been published by Barsov [1886: 5-8], Porfir’ev [1877: 87-89], Mochul’skii [1887 (18: 4): 173-7] and Sreznevskii [1904 (9: 3): 99-104]. Meanwhile the dualistic cosmogonic legend attested in *The Sea of Tiberias* was analysed in a series of important contributions by Veselovskii,⁹ Potebnia,¹⁰ Mochul’skii,¹¹ Dragomanov,¹²

⁹See his “Explorations in the realm of the Russian spiritual stanzas: dualistic beliefs about the creation of the Universe” [1889 (46: 6), 1-116, esp. 40-116], and his earlier study of Latin, Greek (Byzantine), and Slavonic recensions of *The Legend of the Holy Rood* and their correlation with the Slavonic versions of *The Life of Adam and Eve* and other apocrypha [1883 (32:4): 367-424].

¹⁰See chapter 75 of his “Survey of Poetic Motifs in Christmas Carols” [1886 (16: 4): 273-5 (738-40)] in which he explores mythopoeic imagery employed in the representation of the “Creation of the World” theme in Slavonic ritual songs. The interpretation of certain cosmogonic motifs in Ukrainian oral tradition was compared to their treatment in apocryphal literature, and in *The Sea of Tiberias* in particular. The folklore material presented by Potebnia was widely quoted by many of his contemporaries (including Veselovskii, Dragomanov, Mochul’skii, etc.) in a number of fundamental

Radchenko,¹³ Markov,¹⁴ Korobka,¹⁵ and others. Still, there was no trace of the existence of this apocryphon in Iatsimirskii's *Bibliographical Survey of South-Slavonic and Russian Apocryphal Literature* [1921]. More than seventy years later, the Russian folklorist Vera Kuznetsova [1998] returned to the subject of *The Sea of Tiberias* with eagerness and professional fervour; her diligent study presents a detailed examination of some surviving text-witnesses (along with folklore data), offering her own classification of sources. She divides them into three categories: the Barsovian redaction (with Barsov's publication as a paradigmatic model), the Cheboksary redaction (named after the city in which Grigirovich discovered one of the Mss.), and a third (mixed) redaction, to which she allocates the cosmogonic account from the Solovetsky Monastery Library from Ms. № 1138 (ff. 174r-77), published by Porfir'ev [Kuznetsova 1998:192-98].

In Bulgaria the apocryphon was thoroughly studied by Yordan Ivanov [1925], the results of whose brilliant research have influenced generations of scholars. *The Sea of Tiberias* was further explored by Donka Petkanova [1982], Dimitrinka Dimitrova-Marinova (who also discovered some new text-witnesses, e.g. the 18th cent. Russian redaction entitled *Сен списокъ ис книги Пале*, from Ms. № Д 566 from the Arkhangel'sk Collection of the Library of the Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg) [1985; 1998], and others. Dimitrova-Marinova divides the accounts into

publications on Creation sagas from the region of Eurasia and elsewhere.

¹¹Particularly significant is V. Mochul'skii's monograph "Vestiges of the Folk Bible in Slavonic and Old Russian Literature" [1894], as well as the series of articles (written by him eight years earlier) on the correlation between the Slavonic "apocryphal Bible" and some Russian spiritual folklore stanzas (i.e. *The Poem/Rhyme of the Book of the Dove*); see Mochul'skii [1886 (16:4): 197-219; 1887 (17: 1): 113-180; 1887 (17:2): 365-406; 1887 (18: 3): 41-142; 1887 (18: 4): 171-188]. In fact, it is in the final article of this series that he published one of the Russian redactions of *The Sea of Tiberias*; this account was edited and published by Ivanov 38 years later in his seminal *Book and Legends of the Bogomils* [1925: 294-99]. Unfortunately, Ivanov erroneously gives this text as belonging to volume 17 of *Русскій Филологическій Вѣстникъ* rather than volume 18. Regrettably, this slipup has been meticulously reproduced by others ever since; see Miltenova's entry on *The Sea of Tiberias* in the *Encyclopaedia Lexicon of Old Bulgarian Literature* [1992: 463-64].

¹²See Dragomanov [1894: 10-62]. In his study *Notes on Slavonic Religio-Ethical Legends* (written in Bulgarian and originally published in Sofia, in vols. 8 (1892), 257-314 and 10 (1894), 3-68 of *SbNU*) he drew upon the earlier contributions of Veselovskii and Mochul'skii, and took into consideration a wide range of folklore data (cosmogonic tales and songs rendering myths of origin from Eurasia and the Americas). This work was subsequently translated into English by Earl W. Count. Through this translation (published in 1961), Dragomanov became one of the most quoted Slavonic scholars in the West; he enjoyed tremendous popularity and had a significant impact upon the work of many renowned folklorists, anthropologists and ethnographers. Among the many influenced by him were Elli Kaija Kōngäs [1960: 151-80] and Alan Dundes [1962: 1032-51].

¹³His work "Treatises on Bogomilism" [1910: 73-131] influenced many scholars studying *The Sea of Tiberias*; it was published posthumously by his colleague and friend M. N. Speranskii.

¹⁴See his article "The Sea of Tiberias in the Dualistic Legend about the Creation of the World" [1913:64-75], which is based on extensive data from Slavonic folklore (oral) sources and apocryphal writings.

¹⁵See his two-part study on "The Image of the Bird Creating the World in Russian Folk Poetry and in Literature: the Legend of the Sea of Tiberias and Christmas Carols about the Two Doves Creating the World" [1909: 175-95; 1910: 105-47].

three categories: the long recension, the short recension and the concise recension [1998: 48-49, notes 17 and 19].

Recently the apocryphon became a subject of interdisciplinary examination in an excellent study by Ilona Nagy [2006] who takes into consideration the observations of Ivanov, Kuznetsova and Dimitrova-Marinova. References to their work are provided throughout my analysis of the text below.

As for the classification of the texts into separate categories, my position shares common ground with that of Yordan Ivanov [1925: 287-301], which I consider it to be more straightforward than the typologies suggested by Kuznetsova and Dimitrova-Marinova. The "first Russian version" in Ivanov's classification (represented by the text published by Barsov) corresponds to what Dimitrova-Marinova identifies as "the short recension," which Kuznetsova labels as "the Barsovian redaction". The "second Russian version" in Ivanov (represented by the text described in Cheboksary by Grigorovich and published by Mochul'skii) corresponds to the "long recension" in Dimitrova-Marinova and, to a certain extent, to what Kuznetsova calls the "Cheboksary redaction". Kuznetsova, however, argues that the Slepche version belongs to the same typological cluster of texts as the Cheboksary account. Her position differs from the opinions expressed by Ivanov and Dimitrova-Marinova, who consider the Slepche version to be a separate category; in fact, it was Ivanov who first called it "the Bulgarian version" of *The Sea of Tiberias*. As for the type described by Ivanov as "the third Russian version" (published by Porfir'ev), Dimitrova-Marinova designates it as "the concise recension," while in Kuznetsova's classification it as an independent type, which she lists separately from *The Sea of Tiberias* texts altogether. Elsewhere [Badalanova Geller 2011] I suggested the following taxonomy of sources:

Type A-1: represented by the Bulgarian version of *The Sea of Tiberias*;

Type A-2: comprising the type of Russian accounts analogous to the texts of *The Sea of Tiberias* published by Mochul'skii, Sreznevskii and Dimitrova-Marinova (i.e. "the second Russian version" in Ivanov, "the Cheboksary redaction" in Kuznetsova, "the long recension" in Dimitrova-Marinova);

Type B: comprising the type of Russian accounts parallel to Barsov's publication of *The Sea of Tiberias* (i.e. "the first Russian version" in Ivanov, "the Barsovian redaction" in Kuznetsova, "the short recension" in Dimitrova-Marinova);

Type C: represented by the fragment from *The Account of Sts. Andrew and Epiphanius About Questions and Answers*, which was published by Porfir'ev (i.e. "the third Russian redaction" in Ivanov, "the concise recension" in Dimitrova-Marinova, "the miscellaneous redaction" in Kuznetsova).

2. Towards an edition of *The Sea of Tiberias*

For the last several years I have been engaged in producing an edition of *The Sea of Tiberias*. This study reflects work in progress and displays preliminary results of my observations on two redactions of the apocryphon (that of Mochul'skii and Porfir'ev). They have been previously unavailable in English translation, which is now offered here in order to introduce these most interesting Slavonic apocryphal texts to western scholars. In my earlier publications [2008a, 2011] I provided

translations (with commentaries) of two other redactions: that of Barsov (**Type B**) and Sreznevskii (**Type A-2**); all form the basis for the current study.

2. 1. Mochul'skii's redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias* (Type A-2)

Presented below is a Russian redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias*, which — from the point of view of both historical and comparative linguistics — betrays palpable features of an earlier Bulgarian protograph. These include the systematic attestations of the lexeme *нощ*, which is etymologically related to the Proto-Slavonic **nakъ* (with **tj* being altered into *щ / ш*);¹⁶ significantly, it is rendered *only* in Old Church Slavonic/Bulgarian as *нощъ/нощгъ*,¹⁷ and in modern Bulgarian as *нощ*. The same form is reflected in Russian as *ночь*, in Belorussian as *ноч*, in Ukrainian as *ніч*, in Serbian as *ноћ*, in Croatian as *ноć*, in Slovenian as *noč*, in Polish as *noc*, etc.;¹⁸ hereby it may be argued that the thesaurus employed in this particular redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias* provides evidence elucidating its linguistic provenance, suggesting that Old Bulgarian was most probably the language of its protograph/antecedent (which, in turn, was subsequently transmitted/translated and copied in medieval Russia).

Mochul'skii designated this redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias*¹⁹ as a “prohibited Book of Genesis” [“Отреченная Книга Бытїя”] and indicated that the Ms. containing it was discovered in the city of Cheboksary [Чебоксары] by V. Grigorovich; it was part of a miscellany dating to the 18th century. Together with other Mss. and books belonging to Grigorovich, it was subsequently donated to the archival collection of the Imperial Novorossiiskii University of Odessa,²⁰ where it was registered as № 56.²¹ At present the Ms. is kept in *The Grigorovich's Collection* at the *M. Gorky Odessa State Scientific Library* [Одесская государственная научная библиотека им. М. Горького, Собр. Григоровича], and is catalogued as № 448 (56).²² Apart from the text of the “prohibited Book of Genesis” (given by the scribes the elaborate title of “Трудодѣвївыхъ мужей и бгѣодѣвївыхъ списано изъ божественныхъ книгъ Василиа Великаго, Григорїа Бгѣослова, Іоанна Дамаскина о преславныхъ пренїихъ невѣдомыхъ вещей о вѣначалнѣ Господѣ Бже нашѣ како бысть Гдѣ Савдофъ преже всея видимыя и невидимыя твари”), the miscellany also contains *The Discourse of the Three Saints* [“Бесѣда Трехъ Святителїей”]. In fact, its exact title is “Questions and Answers of Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian (= Gregory of Nazianzus) and John Chrysostom, [containing] revelations copied from the Bible, the Gospels and the Deeds of the Apostles” (Вопросы и ѡвѣты Свѣтыхъ Василиа Великаго, Григорїа Бгѣослова иоанна

¹⁶Cf. Georgiev and Duridanov [1995: 695-696].

¹⁷Cf. Mladenov [1979: 73, 78, 156, 159], Selishchev [1951: 212], Vaillant [2009: 78], Georgiev [1986:97-109], Ivanchev [1981: 27-47], Scatton [1978: 13-21], Velcheva (also spelled as Velčeva) [1979: 249-255; 1980: 59-66; 1988: 29-37].

¹⁸Cf. Vasmer, Vol. 3 [1987: 86-87].

¹⁹One of the earliest references to this text in Bulgarian academic context is that of M. Dragomanov [1894: 10, 15].

²⁰Currently known as “Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова”.

²¹Mochul'skii [1887 (18:4): 173] offers the following comments: “Изъ рукописнаго сборника XVIII вѣка, вывезеннаго В. И. Григоровичемъ изъ Чебоксаръ и хранящагося при Импер. Новор. Университетѣ (См. № 56 каталога книгъ и рукописей В. И. Григоровича)”.

²²Cf. Kuznetsova [1998: 195-196].

Златоустаго пророцества выписано от Библии от евангелиста и апостола); symptomatically, the text is copied immediately after the "proscribed Book of Genesis" (i.e. *The Sea of Tiberias*), which Mochul'skii considered to be "identical" with the Barsovian version²³ (= *The Account about the Begetting of Heaven and Earth*).²⁴

My edition of the text, as presented below, is based on Mochul'skii's publication of the Ms. (which once belonged to Grigorovich);²⁵ the framework of pericopes suggested by Ivanov [1925: 294-299] is also taken into consideration. Along with the original Slavonic text I make an attempt to provide — in a bricolage-like manner as footnotes — various parallels to the storyline from other apocryphal writings; these show the intense intertextual complexity of Slavonic para-scriptural traditions. Acknowledged are also some specific features of indigenous scribal idiosyncrasies (including errors which must have occurred during the process of copying of the manuscripts). The translation of the text into English is made by the author; the apocryphal storyline of *The Sea of Tiberias* is contextualised within the corpus of canonical biblical narrative.

**Трудолѣбивыхъ мужей и бѣлюбивыхъ списано изъ божественныхъ книгъ
Василиа Великаго, Григория Бѣгослова, Иоанна Дамаскина о преславныхъ
преніихъ невѣдомыхъ вещей о вѣначалнѣ Господѣ Бже нашѣмъ како бысть
Гдѣ Саваофъ преже всея видимыя и невидимыя твари**

І. Преже земли бысть Гдѣ Саваофъ в трехъ комарѣхъ на воздушехъ²⁶
ввелелѣпотѣ,²⁷ вѣначалный Царь невѣдомъ тайнъ присносущный, несозданный,
несказанный, нерожденный, незачатый, вмѣстный и невидимый и неосзаемый,
вѣсмертный и вѣслоотныи. И тогда бысть свѣтъ отъ лица Господня Саваофа седмерицею
свѣта сего свѣтаѣ. Ризы Его быша вѣлыи яко свѣтъ свѣтозарный отъ лица Господня. И
сидѣтъ Гдѣ Саваофъ в трехъ коморѣхъ на воздушехъ на престолѣ превыспренняя славы. И
помысли свѣтъ Гдѣ Саваофъ вѣначалныи Оцъ тако отргнухъ отъ сердца и родихъ

²³See in this connection Mochul'skii's notes: "Издаваемый текстъ, стоящій в сборникѣ Григоровича впереди предъ «Бесѣдой трехъ Святителей», тождественъ съ «Словомъ о зачатіи неба и земли» (Барсова) и «Свиткомъ божественныхъ книгъ» и названъ мною отреченной «книгой бытія»" [Mochul'skii 1887 (18:4): 173, footnote 1].

²⁴See Barsov [1886:5-8].

²⁵See Mochul'skii [1887 (18:4): 173-177].

²⁶The concept of three primordial chambers which preceded the Creation is presented in various erotapocritic writings; one such example comes from *The Discourse of the Three Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom, Queries with Interpretations: Copied from the Roman Patericon* [Бесѣда трехъ святителей Василиа Великаго, Григория Бѣгослова, Иоанна Златоустаго, вопрошеніе съ толкованіемъ. Списано съ Патерика Римскаго] (from a miscellany dated to the 17th-18th cent.): В[асилий] р[ече]: Гдѣ Богъ первѣя жилъ, иже не бысть свѣта? [Иоаннъ] р[ече]: Суть каморы три на воздушехъ, ту вѣше Господь въ трехъ каморехъ агнцемъ, а свѣту тогда не бысть. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 169]). Actually, Gregory the Theologian, or Gregory of Nazianzus (c. 329-389), lived two centuries before Pope Gregory the Great (c. 540 – 604), also known in Eastern orthodoxy as Gregory the Dialogist/Gregory Dialogus (*Gregorius Dialogus*); the latter is in fact credited with composing the celebrated *Dialogi de vita et miraculis patrum Italicorum et de aeternitate animarum*.

²⁷The form "ввелелѣпотѣ" should be emended to read "в велелѣпотѣ".

во³любленнагѡ Сына Божия Г^да нашегѡ Ии^са Хр^ста. Из вустъ²⁸ Свои^х Д^хъ Свои Святѣи изъпусти на Него видѣ ѡ голубяте образѣ, ст^бми трѣми комарами прообразова Г^дь троицѣни и безнач^лныи Сынъ и О^тцъ и Святѣи Д^хъ²⁹ на тѣ^х трѣхъ комарехъ безнач^лныи крестъ. И тотъ крестъ прообразова Г^дь Бгъ распятие Сна Своего Ииса Назаря^нина Иудейска. Почиваетъ в сер^лцѣ Д^хъ Ст^бни, ѡ О^тца исходитъ на всѣ^х вѣрующѣи^х во имя Его. О^тцъ оубо неза^чатыи и неро^жденъ, а Снъ оубо ро^жденъ, а не сотворенъ. Д^хъ Ст^бни несозданъ и неро^жденъ, но исходя^щ ѡ О^тца.

II. Не бысть то^да неба, ни земли, ни моря, ни аг^лъ, ни архангел^л, ни херувим^м, ни серафим^м, ни р^бкъ, ни езеръ, ни кладезен, не источникъ, ни челоу^ккъ, ни горъ, ни облак^к, ни в^бдъ, ни свѣт^л, ни верей, ни птицъ, ни вертепъ, ни зарей. Тогда была тма и бездны и темнота. Не бытъ тогда ни дни, ни ноци,³⁰ ни виковъ, ни часовъ. Тогда бысть себе в^смертныи ве^нач^лныи Снъ Божий Иисусъ Христосъ со^твори слово^м повеление^м О^тца Своего небснаго всю тварь небсн^ю видимую и невидимую и како рече Г^дь тако сотворило^с и со^ддало^с Д^хо^м Ст^бимъ о^т устъ его премудрыхъ. И рече Г^дь: буди небо хруста^лное³¹ на сто^лпѣхъ желѣзныхъ на седмидесяти тма^х тьянцъ³² и будите езера и облаки, и в^звзды, и свѣт^л. И вѣтръ д^ну^л из нѣдръ Свои^х; раи на востоцѣ насади; и востокъ и западъ и сѣверъ и югъ. Ангелъ сидитъ на востоцѣ в веле^лп^ноте превыспренняя славы своея. Семъ небесъ словомъ сотвори Г^дь.³³ Мра^с о^т лица Господня исхо^шъ; а гро^м гла^с Господень в колесницѣ огненной утвер^жденъ;³⁴ а мо^лния слово Господне изо устъ Божиихъ исходитъ; а со^лнце о^т нутрениа ризы Господни,³⁵ понеже Госпо^л по лицѣ

²⁸Устъ = labialized form (from устъ).

²⁹Compare the following fragment from the above quoted 17th-18th cent. *Discourse of the Three Saints* [Бесѣда трѣхъ святителей Василия Великаго, Григория Богослова, Иоанна Златоустаго, вопрошеніе съ толкованіемъ. Списано съ Патерика Римскаго]: Григорій рече: Протокуй ми Троицу въ трѣхъ каморехъ. [Иоаннъ] р[ече]: Отецъ, Сынъ и святѣи Духъ, единъ свѣтъ, а трое огнь. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 169]).

³⁰The form ноци betrays a Bulgarian protograph; see the discussion above.

³¹The idea that crystal was one of primordial substances from which the universe was constructed is also attested in other apocryphal cosmogonies. See the following fragment from the 16th-17th cent. Bulgarian redaction of *The Books of the Holy Secrets of Enoch* [Книги ст^н таянъ Енохо^с] (from MS № 321, once part of the Manuscript Collection of the National Library in Belgrade): И повелѣ^л да възмѣтса ѡ свѣта и ѡ тьми и рѣ^л: вѣди тлѣсто. и вѣито свѣто^м. И то прострѣ^л и вѣ вода. И прострѣ^л врѣхоу тьми, ниже свѣта. и тако воды утвер^жди^л си рѣ^л вѣз^нж. И основа^л свѣто^м окрѣгоу воды и сътвори^л .з. крѣ^л възноу^лтрь ждоу и възобрази^л како хрусталь, мокро и соухо си рѣ^л стъкло и ледъ вбхожденіа вода^м нинимъ стѣх^л. И оуказа^л кому^ждо свои пѣ^л .з. ми^м звѣздамъ кааждо ихъ на свои^м нбси, тако да градѣ^л. (Quoted after Sokolov [1899: 26]).

³²Perhaps “тысяч”?

³³For a survey of apocryphal sources in which the motif of seven heavens is registered, see Mochul'skii [1894: 66-67].

³⁴The emergence of thunder and lightning as primordial manifestations of the voice of the Creator is described in a similar way in the following fragment from *The Discourse of the Three Saints* [Бесѣда трѣхъ святителей Василия Великаго, Григория Богослова, Иоанна Златоустаго, вопрошеніе съ толкованіемъ. Списано съ Патерика Римскаго] (from a miscellany dated to the 17th-18th cent.): [Иоаннъ] р[ече]: Отъ чего громъ и молнія сотворена бысть? [Василій] р[ече]: Гласъ Господень въ колесницѣ огненной утвер^жденъ и ангела гр^мна приставлена. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 169]).

³⁵Compare the following fragment from the above quoted 17th-18th cent. *Discourse of the Three Saints* [Бесѣда трѣхъ святителей Василия Великаго, Григория Богослова, Иоанна Златоустаго, вопрошеніе съ толкованіемъ. Списано съ Патерика Римскаго]: [Василій] р[ече]: Отъ чего солнце сотворено бысть? [Иоаннъ] р[ече]: Отъ выспренняя ризы Господни. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 169]).

The cosmogonic motif of the creation of the Sun from God's garments is likewise featured in the 18th cent. erotapocriseis entitled *Questions and Answers of Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom*, [containing] revelations copied from the Bible, the Gospels and the

Своему утреся, а луна ѿ лица.³⁶ И рече Гѣдь: буди тма сто^аповъ на воздухѣхъ! И тако сотворило слово^м Господни^м. А столпы недвижымыя желѣзныя о^тначала вѣка сего. И буди на тѣхъ сто^апѣхъ камень недвижымыи, а на камени земля, а подъ землею адъз недвижымыи и весь мѣденъ; и верей желѣзныя и врата мѣсныя и желѣзныя,³⁷ а подъ адомъ тартаръ дна нѣтъ. И рече Гѣдь: буди надъ адомъ т^ма сто^аповъ мѣдныхъ и на сто^апахъ камень и на камени земля. Гѣдь слово^м камень и кремень со^твори.

III. И рече Гѣдь: буди на зе^мли море Тивирядское, вода соленая! Первая зе^мля на во^здухѣхъ со^творена и утврѣдена; вторая зе^мля на адѣ, а на той зе^мли море, а ѿ того моря Тивирядскаго брегъ нѣтъ. И с^ниде Гѣдь по во^здуху на море Тивирядское и узрѣ Госпѣдъ плавающа на то^м море Тивирядскомъ гололя и ста надъ нимъ Гѣдь и рече ему: Гололе, ты кто еси? И рече ему Сатана³⁸: а^з есмь бѣгъ. И рече ему Госпѣдъ: а азъ кто есмь? И рече ему Сатана: а ты бѣгъ бѣго^м и Црь црѣмъ. Аще бы ты не то реклъ Сатана, ино что противное Гѣду бѣгу, тд^а его Гѣдь бы сокруши^а на море Тивирядско^м. И рече Гѣдь Сатанѣ: поныри^еся в море и выне^с зе^мли и каме^ни! И преломи на двое; и^з лѣвыя руки даде Сатанѣ половину камени. и оудари Гѣдь же^ло^м по камению и рече Гѣдь: будите ангели по образу моему

Deeds of the Apostles (Вопросы и ѿвѣты Святыхъ василія великаго, григорія бѣгослова иоанна златоустаго пророчества выписано отъ библии отъ евангелиста и апостола). As briefly mentioned above, this erotapocritic text was copied in the same miscellany which contains the current version of *The Sea of Tiberias*; presently it is catalogued as № 448 (56) in *The Grigorovich's Collection* at the *M. Gorky Odessa State Scientific Library*. The fragment reads as follows:

В. Ѽ чего сотвори гдѣ бѣгъ солнце.

Ѽ. Ѽ свѣтлая своя ризы господни. (Quoted after Mochul'skii [1887 (18: 4): 178]).

According to some other erotapocritic writings (e.g. (P)азоумни^к в^се^м ѿпросе^м ѿ^е from the *Tikveshki Miscellany*), the Sun originated from God's tear, whereas the Moon was from his stole: Вьпрѣ. Ѽ ца сътвори бѣ слѣце и мѣць. Ѽвѣтъ. Игда сътвори бѣ нѣво и землею и игда помисли како да сътворитъ члѣвкѣ. и како да се родитъ ѿ него и како хоте распети(се) и смрти прѣдати(се). И игда в^с смрти помисли бѣ. тогда слъза испадѣ изъ вѣка гнѣа. то во слъзе нарче бѣ слѣце. мѣць ѿ петрахила гнѣа не^с. (Quoted after Nachov [1892: 402]).

³⁶In some erotapocritic writings it is suggested that God created the Moon from his "dark garments"; one such cosmogonic scheme is revealed in the 18th cent. *Questions and Answers of Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom, [containing] revelations copied from the Bible, the Gospels and the Deeds of the Apostles* [Вопросы и ѿвѣты Святыхъ василія великаго, григорія бѣгослова иоанна златоустаго пророчества выписано отъ библии отъ евангелиста и апостола] from Ms № 448 (56) of *The Grigorovich's Collection* at the *M. Gorky Odessa State Scientific Library*. The fragment reads as follows:

В. Ѽ чего сотвори гдѣ бѣгъ луну.

Ѽ. Ѽ темныя ризы своя господни (Quoted after Mochul'skii [1887 (18: 4): 178]).

For a brief examination of apocryphal writings in which the fashioning of either the Sun or the Moon is associated with God's garments, see Mochul'skii [1894: 67-68].

³⁷For a similar description of Hell's "врата меданаа, и верей желѣзныя", see Слово стгы^{хъ} ап^лъ и ѿ Адама во адѣ къ лазарю. гнѣ (from the *Zlatoust Miscellany* dated no later than the 16th century and published by Pypin [1862: 11-12], without any information about its provenance).

³⁸The idea that Satan "was begotten" on the waters of the Sea of Tiberias is briefly touched upon in the 18th cent. *Questions and Answers of Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom, [containing] revelations copied from the Bible, the Gospels and the Deeds of the Apostles* [Вопросы и ѿвѣты Святыхъ василія великаго, григорія бѣгослова иоанна златоустаго пророчества выписано отъ библии отъ евангелиста и апостола] from Ms. № 448 (56) of *The Grigorovich's Collection* at the *M. Gorky Odessa State Scientific Library*:

В. Отъ чего сатана зародился.

Ѽ. На море тивирядскомъ в девятѣмъ валу зародился. (Quoted after Mochul'skii [1887 (18:4): 178]).

си^ани, ве^зспло^тнии и ве^зсмертнии, совершдите хот^вние мое ввышн^х.³⁹ И сотвори бг^ъ о^т криле огне^нныхъ Михаила архангела, и Гаврила Іеурія, и Михаила Парафлама, Помогая, херувимы, серафимы, ангели, архангели; а же^злъ былъ ста^анои укладнои,⁴⁰ ч^бм оудари г^дь нашъ ии^съ хр^тосъ: и съ камени вылетели ангели⁴¹ слово^м повел^бнія г^дня: Михаилъ арх^аг^е и Гаври^а, Невеснаго Царя воеводи. Сатана же^ж наби^а изкамени⁴² бесовную ве^зчисленную силу бг^{ов}з плотныхъ. И рече г^дь: будите тридесятъ три кита на море тивирядско^м на водах^х! И буди на т^бхъ кит^бхъ зе^мля!⁴³ И ра^зсея г^дь зе^млю на н^и: буди зе^мля то^аста, широка и простра^нна! И прорасте древеси травы, и цв^бты, горы и

³⁹To read: в вышн^х.

⁴⁰For the meaning of “ста^анои укладнои”, see Dal[’], vol. IV [1882: 482].

⁴¹The motif of the creation of angels from fire ignited from stone is also featured in the 16th-17th cent. Bulgarian redaction of *The Books of the Holy Secrets of Enoch* [Книги ст^иг^амин^е Енох^ов^е] (from Ms. № 321 from the National Library in Belgrade): И ѿ камене^ж оу^свко^х вг^нь великы. и ѿ вг^нб^е сътвори^х ч^инии весплзтн^их^и вон^и .І. т^зм аг^лб^л. и вр^жж^а и^х вг^нна и вдеж^ае и^х плами палець и повел^х да сто^ж к^з до в^з свое^м ч^иноу. (Quoted after Sokolov [1899: 28]).

⁴²To read: из камени.

⁴³The motif of the 33 primordial whales on which the earth is positioned occurs also in *The Discourse of the Three Saints erotapocriseis*; see *Questions and Answers of Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom*, [containing] *revelations copied from the Bible, the Gospels and the Deeds of the Apostles* [Вопросы и ѿв^бты Св^атыхъ Василия великаго, григорія бг^ослова иоанна златоустаго пророцества выписано отъ библии отъ евангелиста и апостола]:

В. На ч^емъ земля основана бысть.

От. На тр^ехъ китахъ великихъ и на тридесяти малыхъ.

В. Отъ ч^его т^б киты с^уть бывають.

От. Находятъ он^б райское благоухание. вынимаютъ отъ того десят^у ч^асть на пропитание.

В. На ч^емъ земля стоитъ и ут^врдит^ся.

От. Слыши творца иоанна дамаскина глаголюща яко воздрузивыи бг^ъ на ничесомъ же землю повел^бниемъ своимъ и пов^бсивши не одержимую тяготу на водахъ. (Quoted after Mochul’skii [1887 (18:4): 179-180]).

In fact, the above quoted fragment is preceded by a separate, much more elaborate rendition of the *Hexameron*-type cosmogonic scenario, according to which the primordial whales (the number of which is not specified on this occasion) emerged on the third day: В. в которыхъ день ч^то сотвори всесил^нвишии бг^ъ. От. во первый день сотвори г^дь бг^ъ св^бтъ и т[’]м^у. на рече д^нь св^бтъ а т[’]м^у на рече ноць и бысть вечеръ и бысть ут^ро. день первый. во вторый день сотвори г^дь бг^ъ небеса небес огнь и воды яже превыше н^бс^з. в третий день сотвори г^дь бг^ъ землю моря и р^вки и в нихъ киты великия рыбы и всякия зв^бри. в чет^верты день сотвори г^дь бг^ъ два св^бтила великия солнце и луну и зв^бзды да св^бтитъ ч^лов^бкъ живущихъ на земли. в пятый день сотвори г^дь бг^ъ древесна на земли травы и злаки и п^тицы вся воздушная мшицы и комары. в шестый день сотвори г^дь бг^ъ всякия зв^бры, скоты, гады и ч^лов^бка а^дама. постави его ваддыку надъ все^м строениемъ своимъ и насади р^и на востоц^б и введе в него а^дама. в седмый день почи г^дь бг^ъ отъ все^бхъ д^ба своихъ такожде и намъ повел^х почити отъ д^ба земныхъ. исходити в церковъ на молитву. (Quoted after Mochul’skii [1887 (18:4): 177-178]).

However, in some other apocryphal writings the number of primordial whales may vary; one such example comes from the erotapocriseis Разумникъ from the (now lost) *Lovchanski Miscellany* (dated 1618), according to which the number of elemental whales is four:

В.: кажи ми ч^то д^ржи^т земля? – ѿ.: в^вда высока с^блав.

В.: да ч^то д^ржи^т в^вд^жт^ж? – ѿ.: камень п^лм^скъ велии.

В.: да ч^то д^ржи^т камень? – ѿ.: .д. к^втове златы.

В.: да ч^то д^ржитъ к^втове златыне? – ѿ.: р^вка вг^нна.

В.: да ч^то д^ржи^т т^б вг^н? – ѿ.: другы вг^н еже е^с по жеж^к ѿ того вг^нб^е. в.І. ч^асти.

В.: да ч^то д^ржи^т дно того вг^н? – ѿ.: д^вь жел^звень. еже е^с пр^бжде посажденъ ѿ всего, а к^врени^е ег^о на сил^б б^жи^и стон^т. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925: 260]).

A somewhat abridged version of this cosmological description is to be found in the erotapocriseis А се разумникъ въпроси юана и Василиа и Григорія from a 16th cent. miscellany kept in the Bulgarian National Library (Ms. № 68); the text was published by Arkhangel’skii [1899 (4):121-123]. Compare the following fragment: В. На ч^имъ земля стоитъ? О. На вод^б, а вода на огню. (Quoted after Arkhangel’skii [1899 (4): 122]).

хо⁴⁴мы, и источники, и езера, и рѣки. И сотвори Г⁴⁵дъ о⁴⁶т зѣ⁴⁷ли зверей, и скоты, и рыбы в водахъ, и пташицы, летящия по воздуху. И сотвори день и нощь, и гады пресмыкающияся по зѣ⁴⁸ли; а китомъ тѣмъ повелѣ пицу Г⁴⁹дъ ангело⁵⁰ о⁵¹т рая приносити; на нѣже утврѣдена зѣ⁵²ля и не подвизается ни в которую сторону.

IV. И рече Сатана противно Г⁵³ду Савлофу: у меня силы бо⁵⁴ши вышняго; подобенъ азъ вышнему. Причте Сатану во архангелы и вземъ его на небеса. Сатана же науд гордится и мыслию возносится в себѣ помышляя: сотворю себѣ престо⁵⁵лъ надъ зѣ⁵⁶дами на воздуху. Г⁵⁷дъ же проразумѣ мысль его лукавную и посла архангела Михаила, повелѣ Сатану свергнути с небеси. Михаилъ архангелъ удари Сатану же⁵⁸ло⁵⁹ и

⁴⁴ To read: в водахъ.

⁴⁵ The singular form of the noun is most probably птах (пятишь, пьтеньць), since the diminutive plural is пташицы (as in влах → власи, монах → монаси, etc.).

⁴⁶ Compare the following fragment from the erotapocriseis *Other Questions and Answers, Regarding What Day and Hour Has the Lord Created the First Adam and Other Related Issues* [Иные вопросы по отвѣтамъ, въ ки день и часъ сотвори господь перваго адама и протчая по сихъ]: В. Отъ чего звѣрие и скотин сотворены суть? – Т. Отъ земли, прежде Адама и по Адаму. (Quoted after Pypin 1862: 176).

⁴⁷ For the form нощь, see the discussion above.

⁴⁸ One of the earliest references to *Isaiah* [14:13] in *Slavia orthodoxa* is to be found in *The Discourse on the Holy Trinity* by Saint Clement of Ohrid (c. 840 – 916): *Ѡ те же въ единъ земному чинюу строитель поставленъ бгомъ иже горьдынюю своєю и оумомъ злымъ превознесъ са, рече; Поставлю прѣтолъ свои на облацѣхъ и воудю подобенъ вышнему. И того ради изверженъ е Ѡ сана своего и свѣтлости лишине, вы тмѣ начальникъ. И со ѡстоупными с нимъ аглы и своего блкы ѡстоупше, всми прмениша по своени нмъ зловѣ.* (Quoted after the publication of the work of Clement of Ohrid by Angelov *et al.* [1970:639]).

Then again, a similar reference to both *Isaiah* [14:13] and *Ezekiel* [28:13-19] is to be found in the narrative about the rebellion and the fall of Lucifer (свѣтоносецъ) — who has become an adversary of the Creator — in the *Slavonic Version of the Chronicle of (pseudo)Syncellus*, which was translated in medieval Bulgaria in the 9th-10th century. The narrative about the fall of the most senior among the angels is presented as an introduction to the creation of heaven and earth paralleling the first chapters of *Genesis*; see the discussion in Totomanova [2008: 31, 407-408].

On exegetical traditions grounded in *Ezekiel* [28: 13-19], see Anderson [2000c: 133-147].

⁴⁹ The motif of the revolt of God's angelic adversary is likewise featured in the 16th-17th cent. Bulgarian redaction of *The Books of the Holy Secrets of Enoch* [Книги стѣи таниъ Енохъ] (Ms. № 321 from the National Library in Belgrade): *Єдни же Ѡ чина архангелскаго ѡврацса съ чиномъ сѣдимъ под нимъ. възпрѣмъ мысль немощна, да постави прѣстоль свои выше облак на землѣ да вѣдѣт тже мои силѣ. И ѡврзго его съ выкости съ аглы его. И въ лѣта по въздохуу винъ врзхуу бе дни. И сътвори тако вѣт нѣса и вы днь, третїи.* (Quoted after Sokolov [1899: 28])

The motif of Satan's rebellion is rendered in a similar way in the 17th cent. Bosnian apocryphal legend *The World's Beginnings* [Почетие свѣта] (part of a miscellany currently kept in Plovdiv National Library, Ms. № 116, fols. 90-97): *Защо Г⁶⁰бъ сатвори сам свѣтъ? Утраи време биешѣ ѡ ангель ѡ Бога низаврани, кон би названъ Сатананъ. Онъ поче мислити како биш већи ѡ Г⁶¹а Б⁶², и тои мислеѣи, седе на престо⁶³лъ гнѣ. И доѣ к немъ Михаилъ архангелъ, ангелъ гнѣ верни и ре м⁶⁴: Устани, погани, ние ти тѣи сидети! И удри га ногомъ, и онъ паде подъ землѣ, и сви ангели, кои веровахъ негда, падоше с неба, єдни подъ землѣ, а дрѣзи на землѣ, а трети вѣташе под невомъ на ерѣ: како се гдѣ кон поменоваше Г⁶⁵а нашего, тако и онде вѣтаваше. И сви се сатворише дѣлави, кон мишлахъ онѣи зѣмисалъ и кои слѣжахъ лѣчипетра, и за то єсть ѡ вхоласти први гриехъ.* (Quoted after Ivanov [1925:322]).

Last but not least, a similar concept is expressed in the *Secret Book of the Bogomils*; below is a fragment from the 12th century Latin manuscript of *Codex Carcassoniensis* (i.e. *Liber Sancti Johannis*):

Et dixi: Domine, antequam Sathanas caderet, in qua gloria persistebat apud Patrem tuum? Et dixit mihi: in tali gloria erat, quod ordinabat virtutes coelorum; ego autem sedebam apud Patrem meum. Ipse erat ordinans omnem imitatoreм Patris, et descendebat de coelo in infimum et ascendebat ab infimis usque ad thronum invisibilis Patris. Et observabat gloriam, quae erat moventis coelos, et cogitavit sedem suam ponere super nubes coelorum et volebat Altissimo similis esse. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925: 73-4]).

попали огнь о^т Сатаны. Михаи^л архангел^ъ прииде ко Господ^у Савлаофу и рече: огне^м мя пали^т о^т Сатаны. И Госпо^д Михаил^а постро^и же^х в чернцы и положи на его схиму со кресты простыми знамение Христа Сна Божия. Михаи^л архангел^ъ иде и удари Сатану же^ло^м и сверже его снеже^м на зе^млю во ядову кромъшину со все^ми его бесовскими силами,⁵⁰ и паде в^съ с небеси,⁵¹ три дни и три ноци⁵² что капли до^ждевыя шло силы бесовския во адъ кромъшнии. И Г^дь рече: Ами^н. Ами^н. Аминь. Небеса затворишася и всяце в^си держими по во^духу повелѣни^м божи^м падают на зе^млю о^т искренней⁵³ дѣницы вышняго Б^жія промы^сла и сокрушаются на зе^мли.⁵⁴ И рече Сатана: сверже мя Г^дь на землю и я сяду в до^м Ияковля и буду славимъ о^т человекъ. !!

And I said: “Lord, before Satan fell, in what state of glory was he with Thy Father?” And He said to me: “He was in such glory that he was directing the heavenly forces. I, however, was sitting next to my Father. That one [i.e. Satan] was managing things completely in imitation of the Father, and he was descending from heaven to the depths, and ascending from the depths to the throne of the invisible Father. And he was observing the glory which pertained to the Mover of Heavens, and he got the idea of placing his throne above the clouds of heaven, and he wanted to be like the Most High”. (Quoted after Butler [1996: 191]).

⁵⁰ The tale about the contest between the two “cosmic warriors”, Satan and Archangel Michael, is likewise found in some other extra-canonical writings. See in this connection *The Account of John Chrysostom About How Archangel Michael Defeated Satan* [Слово Златоустаго Ивана како повѣде Михаилъ Сантаила Гдѣ благослови] (Ms. № 1161 from the Collection of the Holy Synod [ЦИАМ] in Sofia), *The Account of Our Holy Father John Chrysostom About How the Cunning Deceiving and Godless Antichrist Satan Was Confined by Archangel Michael the Commander of All Angels* [Словъ свѣтлгв Уца нашего, ѿвана златоустнаго ѿ дньдхриста лѣкаваго лѣживаго и безъбожнаго сантаила какво го, плени сти чинонаучалнѣкъ архангелъ Михаилъ воевода всемъ аггломъ] (Ms. № 232 from the same Collection), etc.; their designation indicates that the Old Church Slavonic (Bulgarian) *Vorlage* of this type of apocryphal writings must have originated from an earlier, heavily edited translation of a related Greek text, the protograph of which was purportedly attributed to John Chrysostom. Redactions of the text were published and/or analysed by Ivanov [1935: 18-25]; Miltenova [1981: 98:113; 1983: 121-128], Petkanova [1978: 171-177; 1982: 41-48, 349-350], Jovanović [1995: 33-55], Ivanova [2004: 397-404], Minczew [2010: 17-46; 2011: 23-54] and Badalanova Geller [2011: 70-71, 79]; see also Afinogenova [2006: 329-348]. For the contest between Michael and Satanael in vernacular Slavonic tradition, see Radchenko [1910: 74, 97, 107]; the also the discussion below (footnote 59).

⁵¹ To read: с небеси.

⁵² For the form ноци, see the discussion above.

⁵³ The rich allegorical fluidity of this expression (i.e. искренней дѣницы вышняго Б^жія промы^сла), and especially the potential metaphorical equation of “искренней” (as a derivative from искра, meaning ‘fiery’ / ‘burning’) with “искренная” (as feminine form of the adjective искрьнь / искрьньмъ / искренній, meaning not only ‘truthful’ / ‘rightful’, but also ‘quick’, ‘living’, as well as ‘close’, ‘near’, ‘imminent’, ‘impending’, and ‘fierce’ / ‘furious’), may have provided the natural mythopoeic background for interpreting the current cosmogonic scenario within the framework of the Biblical narrative; see *Jeremiah* [23: 29]: *Is not my word like as fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?*

For the semantic coverage of the adjective “искренная” (as a derivative from искра) and its homonym/homograph “искренная” (as feminine form of the adjective искрьнь/искрьньмъ), along with the adverb искрь (‘imminently’, ‘soon’, ‘rapidly’, ‘quickly’, ‘momentarily’), see Sreznevskii, Vol. 1 [1893: 1118-1120], Bonchev [2002:215], Vasmer, Vol. 2 [1986: 140], Tseitlin [1999: 265].

⁵⁴ Quite significant in this respect is the fact that the motif of the defeated demonic forces falling from heaven to earth is systematically attested in a similar way in the *Palaea*; see Porfir’ev [1877: 21-31]. It is also featured in some Slavonic folk narratives concerned with vernacular demonology; see also the discussion below, footnote 148.

V. Вмѣсто ѿпадшихъ ликъъ наполняетъ Гѣдь челоуѣки, праведныхъ члѣкъъ созываетъ;⁵⁵ и вмѣсто самаго Сатаны сотвори Гѣдь плотна члѣвка, перевозда^наго Адама,⁵⁶ о^т перстныя зѣ^мли, кости о^т камени, кровь о^т Чер^мнаго моря, мысли о^т облакъъ, очи о^т со^нца, дыханіе о^т вѣтра.⁵⁷ И поиде Гѣдь по Дхъ Стѣи Свой на нѣса ко Оцоу и прииде Господь ко

⁵⁵The idea that mankind was created to replace the fallen angels is also highlighted in other apocryphal writings. This is how it is revealed in the following cosmogonic narrative of the Bosnian apocryphon *World's Beginnings* [Почетіе свіета], which is part of a 17th century miscellany (Plovdiv National Library, Ms. № 116, fols. 90-97): И Ѹзмили ГѢ БѢ како би мисливъ ѧ градъ када воискѣ изгубивъ, тако и ГѢ мислаше како би шпета напѣдно уни корь ангела, да бѣде на пѣно. И самисли и сатвори члѣвка на спасеніе негово, да се ѿ челова лѣди плоде ѿ чловека и ре^чи ѿ чѣмѣ на прво БѢ сатвори члѣвекѣ ѿ чѣмѣ живети, паки сатвори на приликѣ чѣдеса велика сатвори ГѢ БѢ. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925:322]).

⁵⁶For a similar description of Adam as "первозданны члѣкъ", see the following fragment from Слово стѣи^х аглѣз и ѿ Адама во адѣ къ Лазарю. гѣи (from the *Zlatoust Miscellany*, dated no later than the 16th century): И глѣз Ада^м соуцимъ въ адѣ приидете прѣрци и вси праведнии, послемъ вѣсть ко вл^аце Хоу съ слезами, на живыи вѣкъъ, хочеть ли на^с ѿ моу^кы сеа избавити; а Исана и Фремен, роугающіи^и адови и немощиои силъ его, рекоста Дѣдоу: а кто мо^уть ѿселе тамо ѿ на^с вѣсть донести? а врата меданна, и вера железная, а замкы каменныя, а твердо запечатено? Тогда Дѣ^въ к нимъ ясно р^че: а се заѣтра ѿ на^с поидеть Лазорь четверодневныи, друугъ Хѣвъ, тзи ѿ насъ к нему донести вѣсть. И се Ѹслышавъ Адамъ перевозданны члѣкъ, и нача битиса рѣкама своима на лицоу своему, тажко възпаше и глше: повѣданъ ѿ менѣ вл^аце, свѣтлыи дрѣ^въ Хѣвъ, Лазорю – а се ти възпнеть твои перевозданныи Адамъ: на се ли ма еси, Гѣи, сзз^аллъ, на короткыи вѣкъъ на земли сеи быти, а се и ма всѣ^а въ адѣ многа лѣта быти моу^читиса; того ли ра^а на^полни^и землю, ѿ вл^ако? а се нѣ тво^у възлюбленнии вноуци въ тмѣ седать, въ днѣ адовѣ моу^чимыи ѿ сотоны, и скорбию и тоу^гою ср^аце тешать и слезами своими вчи и зеницаи омывають, и памати жадающе велми Ѹныли соутъ. Се бо на земли сеи только в малѣ чѣ^с видихо^у добра, и се Ѹже в тоу^зе сеи многа лѣта въ швиде есе. Въ малѣ чѣ^с азъ црѣ быти вѣвмъ тваремъ бжнимъ, а нѣ въ многы дѣни рабъ бы^х адѣ, а вѣсомъ его полонаникъ. В мало время свѣтъ твои видѣхъ, а се оуже слнца твое (*sic*) пресвѣтлаго не вижу на многа лѣта, ни воура вѣтренаа не слышу. Гѣи, аще азъ сзгреш^ихъ, Гѣи, паче вѣ^с члѣкъ, то по дѣломъ моимъ сзз^алл ми сеи моу^коу сию; не жадоуюса, Гѣи, но сего ра^а жалъ ми, Гѣи, азъ по твоемоу вбразоу сзтворенъ есмъ, а нѣ дѣволъ роугаетьмиса, а по твоемоу вбразѣ сзтворена ма моу^чити злѣ ноу^да ма, Гѣи; азъ^т впорѣдѣ (*sic*) жива, а твою бж^твенноюу заповѣ^а престоупи^х. (Quoted after Pypin [1862:11-12]).

⁵⁷ This anthropogonic account resembles the narrative about the creation of Adam (out of seven substances), as revealed in the 16th -17th cent. Bulgarian redaction of *The Books of the Holy Secrets of Enoch* [Книги стѣи^х таинъ Енох^о] (Ms. № 321 from the National Library in Belgrade): И въ шести днѣ повелѣ^н моеи мѣдрости сзтворити члѣка ѿ .з. ми^х сзставъ: пль^т его ѿ земля, крз^ь его ѿ роси и слнца, вчи его ѿ без^ны морскыя, кости ѿ каменѣа, помысль его ѿ врззості агглѣскыя вбл^акѣ, жылы его и косми ѿ траве земнѣи, дшѣ^а его ѿ дхѣ моего и вѣтра, и да^х емоу .з. естество: слоу^к къ пль^ти, възрѣнїе вчи. вбонанїе дшѣвное, всазанїа жылы, възкоушенїе крзѣ, кости трзпѣнїе, помыслоу сладость. Се помысли^х хитрое слово сказати, ѿ невидѣмаго же и видѣмаго естѣва сззда^н члѣка ѿ обоего, сьмр^ь и живо^т, и вбразѣ вѣсть слово, ѣкы нѣкакоу тварь йнѣ въ велицѣ малѣ, и пакы въ малѣ великѣ. и на земли постави^х его агглѣа втораго чѣтна и велика и славна. и постави^х его црѣ земли. (Quoted after Sokolov [1899: 29-30]).

The Poltava version (copied in 1679) of *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, the Son of Jared, a Wise and God-loving Man* [Книга ѿ таинахъ еноховихъ сѣна Аредова моужа моудра и бѣлоубива], lists the components from which God creates Adam in a slightly different way: В шестій днѣ повелѣхъ мѣдрости моеи, сзтворити члѣка ѿ седми сзставѣ. а. плоть его ѿ земля. б. кровь его ѿ росы. в. очи его ѿ слнца. д. кости его ѿ каменѣа. е. помысль его ѿ въззості агглѣской. и ѿ вблѣака. ж. жылы его и влѣсы его ѿ травы земной. з. дшѣа его ѿ дхѣ моего и вѣтра, и да^х емоу .з. естество. сдѣхъ ко плоти. възрѣнїе вчи. вбонанїе дшѣвное. всазанїе жылы. възкѣшенїе кровзѣ. кости третѣнїе. помысль сладость. Помыслихъ хитрое слово сказати. ѿ невидѣмаго же и видѣмаго естѣва сзздахъ члѣка. ѿ вбою его смрть и животъ, и вбразѣ. вѣсть слово ѣко нѣкаа тварь. ноу велицѣ и малюу, и пакы вомалѣ великѣ, и на земли поставихъ его. агглѣа втораго чѣстна и велика и славна, и поставихъ его црѣа на земли царствовати, и ймѣти мою моудрость. и не бѣ елѣ подовенъ ѿ земли ѿ сѣцихъ тварїи моухъ. (Quoted after Popov 1880: 112).

The same anthropogonic scenario is revealed in some other erotapocritic writings (e.g. (P)азоумни^к ѿ все^а Ѹпросе ѿ^е from the *Tikveshki Miscellany*): Вьпро^ь. ѿ кого сьтвори бѣ а^дама. Ѹвѣт. Ѹ .з. чести .а. тело его ѿ зем^ле .б. кость его ѿ каменѣа .в. крѣвь его ѿ роси и ѿ слнца .д. дих(а)нне его ѿ вѣтра. дшѣоу его ѿ дхѣа вжнѣа .е. разоумъ его ѿ вблѣака .ж. вчи его ѿ моря .з. помисъ ѿ въззості его агглѣкии. (Quoted after Nachov [1892: 402]).

Ада^м на зе^млю; у^ръв Адама ранами обложена, о^т Сатаны персто^м истыкана;⁵⁸ и рече Г^дь Сатанъ: пошто, окаяние Дяволе, тако сотвори^а еси? А^з сотворилъ ч^лка чиста и непорочна и безболъзне^нна. И рече Сатана ко Господъ: забуде^т тя; аще кое м^бсто позволи^т и онъ помолитсѧ: Господи, помилуй! И Г^дь поворотивъ его внутрь подерши кожено и вложи в него Д^хъ С^тый и оживи Адама и рече Господъ Сатанъ: поклони^т ты Адаму! И рече Сатана: я Твое^му со^зданию непоклонюся!⁵⁹ И рече Г^дь Сатанъ: окая^нныи дяво^л, астивыи Сатана! И вопроси Г^дь Адама:

According to some other apocryphal writings, the body of Adam was composed of eight components. One such example comes from the erotapocriseis Разумникъ from the 16th cent. *Lovchanski Miscellany*: В.: ѿ колико ч^асти сътвори б^г Адама? – ѿ.: ѿ восемь ч^астеи. а. т^ло его ѿ земля. б. ѿ моръ кровь, г. кости ѿ каменѧ, д. дыханіе ѿ вѣтра и ѿ д^ха б^жїа, е. раз^дмъ его ѿ облака, з. очи ем^л ѿ слнца и ѿ росы, з. помыель его ѿ в^рзости аггелскыа, и ѿ см^рха и ѿ плача. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925: 260]). The template of “Adam octopartite” is likewise employed in the 15th-16th cent. erotapocriseis from the *Rumintsev’s Miscellany* (Ms. № 358, fol. 281): Григорій рече: отъ колѣкъ ч^асти Адамъ созданъ? Иванъ рече: отъ ѧ ч^астеи созданъ бысть Адамъ: сердце отъ каменѧ, т^ло отъ перети, кости отъ облакъ, жылы отъ м^глы, кровь отъ Черного моря, теплота отъ огня, очи отъ солнца, д^хъ отъ святого Д^ха. (Quoted after Rypin [1862: 11]).

For further information, see Mochul’skii [1894: 70-72], Nachov [1894: 129-130], Miltenova [2004: 200-236], Petkanova [2005: 24-28], Böttrich [1995a], Badalanova Geller [2011: 73-78]; see also the discussion below (footnote 108).

⁵⁸A similar motif (that the disease is placed in human body by the Devil) is attested in the 16th cent. Bulgarian redaction of *The Account of John Chrysostom About How Archangel Michael Defeated Satan* [Слово Злато^сѣтаго Ивна како повѣде Михаилъ Сантала Г^дь в^лгослови] (Ms. № 1161 from the Collection of the Holy Synod [ЦИАМ] in Sofia); see fols 42a-43a: Г^дь р^че: Имамъ вамъ прогавити слово на дьске, вамъ раз^дмени истини, ѿ мене д^минь. Г^лдъ вамъ: ег^да Сатанайлъ събл^зни се, ѿвѣже и болезни в прѣст на ч^лка положи, егоже азъ “твори^х” своимъ р^дками; нъ и т^ь хоцетъ ч^астн^ы бити въ второе мое пришаствіе. Тог^да ц^рьствовати хоцетъ см^рть на в^дкомъ д^нханіемъ по земли. На ч^лбнице^х и скотехъ, гаако то и в^се вьсеа Сатанайлъ своимъ прѣст^вплениемъ прѣсть; жело см^ртн^ое и владѣть Сатанайлово въ т^мл^к кромеши^нѣ. И потомъ сътвори др^в светъ без^лани, иже и бесм^ртн^ы и везьскочани; и т^лзи в^лвѣтъ рад^лсть и животь в^лвѣтъ; праведници съ мною въ ц^рьствоу н^бен^оумъ, а законопрѣст^впници испад^дтъ.

The motif of ailments implanted in the human body by the Devil is also featured in oral tradition; see the discussion in Petkanova [1978: 72, 158-159], Badalanova Geller [2011: 78-80]. See also footnote 110 below.

⁵⁹The refusal of Satan to worship Adam is rendered in a similar way in some Slavonic redactions of the apocryphal *Apocalypse of Baruch* (or, *3 Baruch*). According to one such Russian version coming from a 15th century miscellany (first published by Tikhonravov in 1984), the refusal of Satanael to bow before Adam is regarded as the main reason behind the subsequent withdrawal of the Devil’s host from the face of God, and their ultimate expulsion from the celestial realm:

и ре^ч Михаилоу в^зстроуви да съвероуть са ангѣли и да поклонатъ са т^вари роукою моею яже створи^х. И в^зстроуви Михаилъ ангѣлъ и собр^аша са вси ангѣли и поклонѣша са вси а^ддаму по чиноу. а сотонаилъ непоклони са и ре^ч азъ кал^оу и брениню не поклоню са нзи. и ре^ч поставлю прѣт^лз мои на облацѣхъ и воуд^оу подовенъ вышнему. да того ради б^г о^тверже и о^т лица своего и съ ангѣлъ своими якоже ре^ч пр^рокъ оудалиша са о^т лица его вси ненавидѣци б^га и славы б^жїя (Quoted after Gaylord [1982:304]).

And he said to Michael, “Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made.” And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Satanael did not bow down and said, “To mud and dirt I will never bow down.” (Quoted after Gaylord [1982: 305]).

The theme of Satan’s refusal to obey God’s command and venerate Adam is likewise woven into the storyline of the 1820 Bulgarian redaction of *The Account of Our Holy Father John Chrysostom About How the Cunning Deceiving and Godless Antichrist Satan Was Confined by Archangel Michael the Commander of All Angels* [Словъ ст^глг^вѠца нашего, ѿвана злато^сѣнаго Ѡ аньдихристѧ л^дкаваго л^зживаго и везьвозмога сантала какво го, плени е^ти чиноначланикъ арх^глъ миханлъ вонвода васемъ аг^ломъ] (Ms. № 232 from the Collection of the Holy Synod [ЦИАМ] in Sofia); see fol. 112: праведни людие които ходати по вола б^жїа а тогова ч^лбка виде л^дкави, и проклети

что видѣ^а еси во снѣ? И рече Ада^м: тя, Господи, видѣхъ во Иерусалимѣ на крестѣ распята; Петра в Риме стремиглавъ распята и Павла в Дамасцѣ!⁶⁰ И введе Гдѣ Адама в рай. Ада^м усну^а сно^м и Господь взе^м у Адама ребро лѣвое⁶¹ и сотвори ему жену Евву и вложи въ Евву Дхъ Стыи и рече Господь Ада^м: возбуди о^т сна. И рече Ада^м: что еси, Господи? И рече Гдѣ Ада^м: то тебѣ жена и живи с нею по заповедемъ Гднимъ! И повелѣ изо всѣхъ древе^с ясти ягоды Гдѣ Ада^м и Еввѣ. И заповѣда ѿ единаго винограднаго древа не ясти,⁶² занеже ѿ того древа самъ Гдѣ вкуси^а.

сангрияз па си тѣри ѿко сала мисалъ на паметъ и рече азъ сеги какво да учинимъ като направи, гдѣ одного члвекъ ѿ землю да е ѿ насъ по големъ и прослави го горни оцъ Оногова члвекъ и рече сви агли да мѣ се срамѣватъ и да мѣ се покланатъ тогива какво чл прелѣсави антихристъ тла дѣма ѿко се расрѣди и рече ѿ тогова члвекъ не шемъ ни да погледемъ а камо ли да мѣ се поклонимъ.

In fact, the motif of Satan's refusal to bow down before Adam is featured in all the extant versions of the apocryphal *Tale About the Combat Between Satan and Archangel Michael*; for a survey of its text-witnesses, see above (footnote 50). Furthermore the account of how Satan repudiated God's command to angels to worship Adam is also attested in some Greek and Slavonic apocryphal writings dealing with themes and characters from the New Testament; one such text is *The Debate between Christ and the Devil* [Ivanov 1925: 251]. See also the discussion below (footnote 111).

⁶⁰ See the following fragment from the erotapocriseis entitled *Other Questions and Answers, Regarding What Day and Hour Has the Lord Created the First Adam and Other Related Issues* [Иные вопросы по отвѣтамъ, въ кои день и часъ сотвори господь перваго адама и протчѣа по сихъ]: В. Что есть, пророчествова Адамъ? — О. Егда сотвори Господь Адама отъ земли, и дуну на него Богъ и оживе Адамъ, и посади его Господь Богъ на престолѣ и рече Богъ: благослови владыко, — и воста Адамъ отъ престола и рече: благословенно царство Отца и Сына и св. Духа, — и первое пророчество дала о святѣй Троицы; и егда заснувъ Адамъ въ рай, и воста отъ сна, и рече ему Господь: Адаме, что еси видѣлъ во снѣ? Адамъ же рече: видѣхъ, Господи, Петра идуща въ Римъ, а Павла въ Дамаскъ, а Юдина Богослова во Ефесъ, а тебѣ, Господи, видѣхъ распята на крестѣ во Иерусалимѣ, на Голгофѣ. То ест, пророчество Адамово. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 171-172]).

⁶¹ The (above mentioned) 17th century Bosnian cosmogonic account designated as *The World's Beginnings* [Почетне свиета] (Plovdiv National Library, Ms. № 116, fols. 90-97) also draws attention to the idea that the first woman originates from Adam's left rib: И таи дань, кои сатвори Гд Адама, Адамъ не може ни еданъ дань без дрѣга живети, и почѣ говорити: Гд, дай ми дрѣга. Гд рѣ: Адаме, лези на земли! Унъ леже и уснѣ. И зе мѣ Гд ѿ резаръ еврѣ, женѣ Адамовѣ, ис левѣ странѣ Адамовѣ едно ребро из резаръ Адамовиехъ, и ре^е емѣ: што ти дрѣгъ, Адаме. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925: 322]).

Further on Slavonic apocryphal and folklore narratives concerned with the creation of the first woman, see Badalanova Geller [2010: 17-48].

⁶² The same idea, that the grapevine was the Forbidden Tree, is also attested in *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (3 *Baruch*); see the following fragment from the 13th-14th cent. text entitled *Узѣтене стго Баруха*, негѣ посланъ въ к нему англь Пануиалъ оу стгоу гороу Сионию на рѣцѣ, негѣ плака се в плѣвени Иерусѣмьскѣмъ. Гд блосви from the *Dragolev Miscellany*: И пакы рѣхъ азъ Барохъ къ англоу: гд покажи ми дрѣво, иже прѣльсти змиа Ивоугоу и снѣсть е сама и да е Адамоу, и сего ради изгнана Бѣ из рая. И рече ми англь: слыши, Бароше, негѣ Бѣ съз^а Адама, то повелѣ арханглоу Михаилоу съврати двѣтѣ тисоуць и трѣе англы да насадеъ рай, и всади Михаилъ маслиноу, Гавриль же бабланъ, Рапаниль истоучно, Нопаниль врѣхъ, Саразаниль калиноу, Сатананиль же оусади лозоу, то во немѣ бѣ прьвое име, по испадени же на рече се такожѣ Сатананиль, и такожѣ вси англы насадише разлитчѣа дрѣвеса. И пакы рѣхъ азъ Барохъ къ англоу: гд покажи ми дрѣво неже прѣльсти змиа Ивоугоу и Адама. И рече ми англь: слыши, Бароше, прьвое дрѣво естъ лоза, вьторое же дрѣво похотѣ грѣховна неже излѣа Сатананиль на Ивоугоу и Адама; и сего ради проклеа бѣ Гд лозоу, занѣ бѣ ю Сатананиль оусади и тою прѣльсти прьвоз^аньнаго Адама и Ивоугоу. (Quoted after Иванов [1925: 196]).

See also the reference to the same topic in the opening paragraph of the text entitled *About the grapevine and how it grew* [О виноградѣ и како ростише]; as indicated by Pypin, it was part of a 17th cent. miscellany (kept in Rumiantsov's Museum as № 380): Тако егда насади Господь виноградъ въ рай, не бысть ту тогда ни ангелъ, ни ктоже, токмо Господь и Сатананиль; и что повеле Господь садити, а Сатананиль крадя отъ всякого сада, отъ Господа прорекована среди рая. И рече Господь: тое будетъ тѣло мое, и я самъ ту буду; и будетъ тебѣ на прогнаніе. — Исшедъ вонъ и рече Сатананиль: Господи, благослови, елико насади. — Господь рече: ту есмь азъ посредеъ рая. Егда изыде Сатананиль видѣти древо свое, — древо же его изгна изъ рая, и почерилъ Сатананиль и бысть дѣволъ. (На поле заметка: еше Адамъ не бѣ.) Древо же израсте на три столбы: единъ столбъ — Адамъ, а другій столбъ — Евва, а третій столбъ посреди, самъ Господь. Да егда согрѣши Адамъ и Евва, тогда паде

VI. И в то время бысть сотворена земля вельми оукрашена и пространна прѣ^ж де Адама. И позавидѣ Сатана Адаму царствующу в раю в доворотѣ живущу и³верну^ася Сатана червемъ и прииде ко ѡвѣв⁶³ и рече еи: пожри мя в себя и внеси раи.⁶⁴ И вѣзвѣвса околѣ винограднаго древа и нача Сатана змиевѣ усты глаголати ко ѡвѣвѣ: пошто не вкушадете винограднаго сего древа и будите убо бози яко^{же} невесный Бгъ. ѡвѣва^{же} сказа Ада^м, прѣ^асти его глаголы змиевыми: будѣ^а убо бози яко^{же} невесныи Бгъ и научи^м вѣдати яко^{же} Хр^тосъ! И прелести^с Ада^м со ѡвѣвою: вкусили винограднаго древа запрещѣ^наго о^т Господа; и занеже искони лукавыи вра^г завидѣ^а роду чловѣк^ому, прелести Адама и ѡвѣву сог^вшити в раю; и спадоша с ни^х венцы и оде^жды свѣтлы; и нача Ада^м и ѡвѣва дресети крыти^с; и прииде Г^дь в раи и рече: Адаме, гдѣ еси? Ада^м рече: се азъ, Г^ди! Г^дь рече: Ада^м пошто, окаянный, тако сотвори^а еси преступление? Ада^м рече: жена мя прѣ^асти естъ! Укаяница, пошто тако сотворила еси? ѡвѣва рече: змия мя прѣ^асти! А ты, прелукавая змия, пошто тако сотворила еси? Змия^{же} рече: Сатана мнѣ повелѣ по^жрети себя и внести в раи! И рече ко Ада^м: зѣ^мля еси, в зѣ^млю поидеши. Азъ тя сотвори^х безсмертна в раю, а ты заповѣ^аб^б мою преступи^а еси запрещеннаго древа ясти

Адамова чѣсть въ рѣку Тигро, изнесе его (*Id.* на немже невѣрный разбойник); а ѡвѣва чѣсть паде въ рай, да егда потопъ бысть, на водѣ потопѣ, не възиде, да егда изиде (т. е., когда сошла вода потопа), древо же остана при Миретѣй рѣцѣ. [...] (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 7]).

The same concept — that the grapevine was the forbidden tree — is also featured, in a somewhat baffling way, in the 17th cent. Bosnian cosmogonic account *The World's Beginnings* [Почетие свѣта]: И Сатанамъ има злобѣ на Адама и на ѡвѣвѣ и васади лозѣ и похотѣ дресети да прелести Адама. И такы сташе Адамъ и ѡвѣва въ раи, и доше дѣволъ и сѣтвори се змиимъ. А тагда бнеше змия ѡ раю и хоѣаше на раи^х како и чловекъ на ногѣхъ и зваше се красна девица, тере се сѣтвори дѣвигномъ змиимъ и главоомъ дѣвигномъ, и доше напастонати ѡвѣвѣ, говорѣши: защо би неѣте ести виногаи воѣда? Уговори ѡвѣва и ре^с: ни е намъ га рекао Бгъ ести. И ре^с оны: каде би сте ели вѣои воѣе, све висте знали, цю Бгъ зна и тако е. ѡвѣва Увери дѣвалоу и Устриже вѣ вѣвѣице и заложилъ вна единомъ, а дрѣгомъ Адама заложилъ. Она прождри, Адамъ же заложивъ, споменѣ гнѣ и стиснѣ вѣвоуицу ѡ г^да. ѡ таи се чѣсъ оутледаше грѣшници и назилъ. И доше к нимъ Г^дь Бгъ, изгна ихъ изъ раи и тоу и змию прокае да вѣе не ходи па репѣ, а да е пѣна гада. И сѣтвори Г^дь иста чловекѣ глѣтъ его ѡ землѣ, кости ѡ мрамора, зѣм^ь ѡ врзине ангелске. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925: 323]).

As pointed out by Porfir'ev, in one of the narratives about the nature of the forbidden tree, entitled *Concerning the Tree of Knowledge* [О дрѣвѣ разумнѣмъ], which is included in the text of the 17th cent. *Palaea* (Ms. № 866 from the Solovetsky Monastery Library), it is mentioned that many individuals consider either the grapevine or the fig to be among the “plausible” appearances of the Tree of Life; yet, as the text further argues — which is typical for the *Palaea* type of discourse — neither of them is right, since the true Tree of Life is in fact Jesus Christ himself, along with the Holy Spirit: Мнѣзи оубѣо дрѣвѣ животнѣмъ во вѣвѣицихъ вѣвѣдишася нѣвѣвѣхъ. Вѣи убо являютъ видѣнне дрѣва паче же прорицаютъ. И видѣнне вѣвоуицѣхъ нѣвѣицѣхъ вѣи смюкѣхъ, дроузи же гроздѣ. ѡ обою то неправѣ глѣютъ. ... Древо во жизни ничтоже ино нѣвѣтъ токмо Хр^тосъ и Дхъ с^тиин (Quoted after Porfir'ev [1877: 205]).

For a brief survey of Slavonic sources in which the grapevine is identified as the forbidden tree, see Mochul'skii [1894: 98-99]; Petkavova further analyses the motif in relation to *The Sea of Tiberias* [1978: 110-111]; cf. also Badalanova Geller [2011: 87-95]. See the discussion below (footnote 114).

⁶³Here the Devil is speaking not to the serpent, but to Eve, which is an obvious scribal error.

⁶⁴The theme of the clandestine re-entering of sneaky Satan into the realm of the Garden of Eden was likewise attested in the 15th cent. Russian recension of *The Apocalypse of Baruch*. According to this text, after his having been cast out (on the account of his refusal to obey God's order to bow down to Adam), *Sotonail* returned to Paradise in the following way:

Тогда шедъ сотонаилъ обрѣте змию. И створи са червемъ и ре^с змии зини пожри ма въ оутробуоу свою. И бнѣде чресъ оградѣ въ раи хоци прельстити ѡвѣвоу. Тоа во ради изгнанаъ вѣ^х о^т славы Бжя. И пожре и змия и бнѣде в раи и обрѣте ѡвѣвоу. (Quoted after Gaylord [1982: 304]).

Then having gone, *Sotonail* [i.e. Satan] found the serpent and he made himself into a worm. And he said to the serpent, “Open [your mouth], consume me into your belly.” And he went through the fence into Paradise, wanting to deceive Eve. (Quoted after Gaylord [1982: 304]).

See also the discussion below (footnote 117).

винограднаго! И по^сла Господь арха^нгела Михаила и повелѣ ихъ и^гнати из рая свергнути на зе^млю. И рече Г^сдь Ада^м: паши землю!

VII. И ста с женою Ада^м нача плакати и рыдати что изгнали из рая. Г^сдь же хотя помиловати, видя его чисто покаяние о^т сер^дца и во^здыхание и слезы о^т лица: Вл^ако всецедры и ни^ке в^си су^абами спаси Адама прелестнаго! И услыша Сатана стенание Адамово, во^здыхание в грѣхъ, зане^же искони ненавистливый лукавы дияво^л прииде ко Ада^му и рече ему: скажу ти радость! Хоце^т тя Г^сдь помилова^ти, даи мнѣ р^укописание на себя и в ро^у свои; а ты, ѡва, клени^с мнѣ кля^твою!

VIII. И родиша^су Адама два с^на: Ав^ел и Ка^ин. Ав^ел принесе Г^сду Б^гу жертву агнецъ тученъ,⁶⁵ а Ка^ин^н принесе о^т зе^мли хлѣба пре^жде Г^сда са^м вкуси^л. Г^сдь Авелеву жертву прия^л, а Каина о^т рыгну^л. И завиде Ка^ин Авелю, уби его камене^м.⁶⁶ Г^сдь прииде и рече Каину: почто убилъ брата своего Авеля?⁶⁷ И заповѣда^л Г^сдь звѣрю три^жды на всякъ день снѣдаты и вымета^ти^с себе аки знамение три ста лѣтъ т^рясти по Авелю,⁶⁸ кро^вь о^т крови о^т ливатися. Ав^ел лежаше на зе^мли триста лѣтъ.⁶⁹ Ада^м же не^знаетъ что сотворити;

⁶⁵Compare the following fragment from the erotapocriseis Разумникъ from the 16th cent. *Lovchanski Miscellany*: В.: рыци ми, кто наи прьво сътвори оброкъ на земли? – ѿ.: Авель ягне закла. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925: 261]).

See also the discussion in Mochul'skii, who analyses apocryphal sources in connection with Talmudic renditions of the same motif [1894: 72-73].

⁶⁶Compare this to the following excerpt from the text of the *Rumiantsev's Palaia* (1494), once part of the archival collection of the Rumiantsev Museum (Ms. № 453): Аще хоцеша оубеда^т добре силоу книгъ, послушай да ѿ выгнана история и во^дхвннх^х пророкъ повесть скажемъ. Р^ее бо писание: потомъ^ж приложи пакы ро^ути Авела, и вы^г по д^не^х в^не^х, ре^е, принесе^т Каинъ Г^си ѿ пло^а земны^х жр^твоу, и Авель принесе ѿ пръвор^оны^х агнецъ. Авель оубо то твораше паствѣ млека ра^и и волны, ма^с ядение^ж еще возбранено вѣаше. И призрѣ Г^б на Авела и на дары его, баше и призрѣ Г^б на Авель пло^а смирення, и тѣмъ хоташе стр^ть свою изобразова^т, а Каина^ж видаше Г^б, яко моужъ крови е^с и пло^а пръваго безаконна, тѣмъ^ж не взна^т Г^б на жр^твѣ Каиновоу. Томъ р^ее блжннх^х дѣдъ: испытана ср^дца и оутробы Б^гъ пр^ве^т. Ускоревъ же, р^ее, Каинъ зѣло не в свое^м согрѣшени, но в братни блгодѣянии, и испаде лице^м, завидевъ во Авелю братѣ своему. И р^ее Каинъ ко Авелю: понде^м на поле^м и вы^г егда выгн^н на поли, и оумысли Каинъ оубити брата своего Авела, и не оуменаше, не ве бо кто кого оубилъ; но наоучи его сатана, р^ее: возми камень и оудари въ главоу, ви^ж взе^м камень и оуби брата своего Авела. Се оубо Авель пръвоу подобноу см^рть стр^ти хви восприатъ, иже завистию до ѿ брата своего Каина бес правды оубиен вы^г (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 9]).

Apart from the *Palaia*, the fratricide motif is also attested in some recensions of *The Discourse of the Three Saints* writings; Slavonic apocryphal renditions of the legend of the murder of Abel by his older brother Cain are analysed by Mochul'skii [1894: 81-82]. While surveying the literary sources featuring this motif, he refers to a 17th century miscellany from Vienna (Mss. № 76), containing a copy of *The Discourse of the Three Saints* (Serbian recension). According to this source (fol. 6, question № 6), the Devil appears to Cain in his dream and teaches him how to kill his brother with a stone: Кто показа Каиноу оубити брата своего не вѣди что есть сьмръть? О. Дѣволъ въ снѣ показа ямоу камень рекъ: оудары сь снмъ брата своего, и оубиеша него, теже и сътвори. (Quoted after Mochul'skii [1894: 81]).

⁶⁷The post-fratricide sequel is explained in a related way in the *Rumiantsev's Palaia* (1494): У оубити Авель Каина. Рече^ж Г^б к Каиноу: где е^с Авель, бра^т твои? — ѿвѣща Каинъ, и р^ее: егда стражъ братѣ моему есмь азъ? Рече^ж Г^б: что еси сотворилъ! Се кровъ брата твоего вопие^т ко мне? Тѣмъ оубо раздѣм^е, яко двое зло створи Каинъ: пръвое оубица вы^г и начални^с всакон кровини и жи, и оуби бо и солга: рекво егда стражъ братѣ моему есмь азъ. Г^б же р^ее к немъ: воу^а и стен^а и трасы^а, поне^ж приатъ кровъ брата своего..... И положи, р^ее, Г^б знамение на Каинѣ не оубити его всакому в^звретало^м его, Б^ги во оуста въ знаменн^а е^с возвращаемъ оубиенъ выгн^н, но и траснн^а оудовъ е^с вы^г. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 9]).

⁶⁸Cain's punishment is described in a similar way in some erotapocritic writings (e.g. (P)азоумни^к в все^м ѡпросе в^се from the *Tikveshki Miscellany*): Тако въ гнѣвѣ б^жи на каинѣ, свалѣксе хождаше. глава ямоу при ногу. (Quoted after Nachov [1892:403]).

⁶⁹According to the text of the *Rumiantsev's Palaia* (1494), the body of Adam was not buried for 30 years:

и по^бла Г^сдъ двѣ птицы горлицы и уби горлица горлицу; и разкопа^б зѣ^млю и погребивши сѣна своего Авеля в зѣ^млю.⁷⁰

IX. Ада^м поживе на зѣ^мли лѣтъ девять сотъ три^тцать и умре; и прииде смер^т сатанина и взѣ^м душу его и внесе во адъ; мучись 3000 лѣтъ внутри ада во огни горяще^м руки и ноги связаны на шесть цеплацѣи.⁷¹

X. И рече Бгъ Г^сдъ безнач^аныи Црь цр^твующи^м и Г^сдъ господствующимъ, самои^зволивши Оцъ нбный посла Сѣна своего единоро^анаго Г^сда нашего Ииса Хр^та на зѣ^млю вселитися в девицу и родити^с на погребление хл^бва адамова и разрушение цр^тва сатанина и на спасение род^у члвчско^{му}. И хотя Г^сдъ Адама и Евву помиловати, о^т первородныя кля^твы свободити. И седяще Г^сдъ нашъ Иисъ Хри^тосъ на небеси со Оцѣ^м Свои^м небесны^м на престолѣ сказана вѣка сего по^лпята тысящи;⁷² и ро^ждся на небеси о^т Оцѣ без матери, на зѣ^мли о^т матери безъ о^тца; воплотися о^т Дѣвы Марии Пресвятыя Бцы, родися въ Вифлеесѣ Иудействѣ^м и творяще на зѣ^мли многая чудеса и точию пострада яко члвкъ; распяцася волю на крестѣ восхотѣ^в ѿ иудеи вѣ^ззак^нныхъ во свято^м градѣ Иерусалиме и поло^женъ во гробъ, и воскресе в третии день воскресениемъ свои^м; и сниде во адъ, изведе изъ ада Адама первое достояние схо^ждения роду своего; а раи едемский на востоцѣ. На престолѣ свое^м бжественно^м смертъ сатанину^у умертви своєю смертию, а Сатану связа слово^м повелѣние^м О^тца своего. Аминь.

Плакше^са, р^е, Адамъ и свга на^а тѣло^м Авелевы^м л^л лѣт. И не согни тѣло его, и не оумеаста его погрести. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 9]).

However, according to some other apocryphal sources, Abel's body was not buried for 930 years; see in this connection the following fragment from the erotapocriseis Разумникъ from the 16th cent. *Lovchanski Miscellany*: В.: колико лежа Авель не погребенъ? — ѿ.: деветьсѣтъ лѣтъ и . л., доидеше погребошѣ и Адама оцѣ его. (Quoted after Ivanov [1925: 263]).

⁷⁰According to the text of the *Rumiantsev's Palaia* (1494), Adam and Eve learn how to bury the body of their son Abel from the doves which were sent by God to teach them funerary rituals: И повеление^м Бийимъ прилетесте горлице две, одина^ж оумре, другая^ж ископа тамоу и вложи в ню.....Адама и свга и погребоста Авела, и оустависта^ж са плачь. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 9]).

⁷¹See in this connection Russ. *цѣпла* ('кольцо с застежкой', 'металлическая повязка'), Bulg. *цѣпка* ('тривна') [Bonchev 2012: 327], meaning also 'халка', 'верига'. Perhaps the closest English semantic counterparts will be 'ring', 'hoop', 'fetter', 'shackle', 'handcuff', 'manacles', 'chains', 'restraints'. See also Gerov [1904: 533], who lists the following meanings of the noun *цѣпъ* (ж.р.): «вжже от желѣзо; верыга, веруга, зинджиръ, синджиръ; цѣпъ. *Обложихъ го съ цѣпю*».

⁷²A similar idea is revealed in the following excerpt from the *Rumiantsev's Palaia* (1494), in which it is maintained that Christ's coming on earth "as man among men" heralds the end of the period of 5500 years since Adam; hence the account of the birth of Jesus is integrated into the narrative of Adam's ultimate salvation: Аз-же, Сифъ, ег^а вѣ^х мола Г^д ѿ вратъ едемскы^х, зара ми гавимиса, архнглъ гнь Михаилъ, азъ есмь поставлен чресъ ес^тво чл^чко тебе ѿбо рекъ Сифъ не може ты троудитса, слезамим оласа масла ра^м милованіа, да помажеши вѣца своего Адама волезни..... коно^м не мо^жши ѿ него приати, развее в послѣднана дѣи, ег^а исполнена боудоу^т сѣ и ф^л лѣт. Тог^а прииде^т на землю возлюбленный Сѣз Бий Хс и створи^т ти възскр^сние тѣла Адамовѣ, и живити телеса мртвы^х, и тѣ прииде^т во Иерданстеи рѣце кр^титса и ег^а изыде^т ѿ воды, тог^а ѿ влѣа мл^тти его помаже^т вса вероующага, и вѣде^т влен милованіа и порожени боудоу^т водою и дх^ом в жизнь вечную; тог^а прииде^т возлюбленный Сѣз Бий Хс и введе^т вѣца твоего Адама в раи к древоу милованіа. (Quoted after Pypin [1862: 10]).

**Copied from the divine books of the diligent and God-loving men,
Basil the Great,⁷³ Gregory the Theologian,⁷⁴ and John Damascene,⁷⁵
[in which it is written] about the most glorious debates on mysterious issues
concerning the Eternal Lord, our God, [so that it might be elucidated]
how God Sabaoth preceded all visible and invisible creatures**

I. Before [the creation] of earth, the Lord Sabaoth — eternal, everlasting, uncreated, ineffable, unborn, un-conceived, omnipresent, invisible, intangible, immortal, and incorporeal King of mysterious secrets — was [reigning] in splendour in three⁷⁶ chambers in the ether. And then from the face of the Lord Sabaoth there was light, which was seven⁷⁷ times brighter than the present light. His garments were as white as the bright light of the face of the Lord. And the Lord Sabaoth was sitting in three chambers⁷⁸ in the ether, on the throne of his most high glory. And the Lord Sabaoth, the eternal Father, pondered within himself, and thus begot the beloved Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who emanated from his heart. From his lips he released his Holy Spirit on him [Jesus] in the image of a dove. These three chambers⁷⁹ heralded the triune⁸⁰ and eternal God — the Son, the Father, and the Holy Spirit. Upon these three chambers [was] the eternal Cross, and the Lord God made this Cross herald the crucifixion of his Son Jesus the Nazarene of Judea. The Holy Spirit, which issues from

⁷³Saint Basil the Great (c. 330-379), bishop of Caesarea; along with his brother Saint Gregory of Nyssa, he was one of the Cappadocian Fathers. Together with Saint Gregory the Theologian and Saint John Chrysostom, he is regarded as one of the “Three Holy Hierarchs” of Eastern Christianity. Saint Basil had a tremendous influence upon the theological tradition of the Byzantine Commonwealth; significantly, his heritage includes homilies on *Hexaemeron*, etc. (hence his direct or indirect impact upon various homiletic and exegetical writings concerned with Creation). The “imagined” authorship of the erotapocriseis *Discourse of the Three Saints*, which apocryphal tradition attributes to him and his associates, reflects not only his ultimate authority in the life of the Church, but also the respect which he was granted among “the simple folk” of *Slavia orthodoxa*.

⁷⁴Saint Gregory the Theologian (329-389), also known as Gregory Nazianzen (or Gregory of Nazianzus), was a friend of Saint Basil the Great and Saint Gregory of Nyssa; see also footnote 26.

⁷⁵Saint John Damascene (c. 657-749), also known as Saint John of Damascus; fragments of his most important theological work, *The Fountain of Knowledge* (or *The Fountain of Wisdom*), were included in Simeon’s *Florilegium*; see also the discussion in Thompson [1991; 1993] and Trendafilov [1998: 154-161]. As pointed out by Porfir’ev (and others), the composition of the *Palaeia* is occasionally attributed to either Saint John Damascene, or Saint John Chrysostom (c. 347–407), although the original authorship cannot be accredited either to the former or to the latter: Известно, что въ рукописяхъ Палея приписывается то Иоанну Златоусту, то Иоанну Дамаскину (смотри. Палею Румянц. Муз. № 361; въ спискѣ Палеи XVI века принадлежащей А. И. Хлудову № 182, приложено даже изображение I. Златоуста); но ни у того, ни у другого отца нѣтъ подобнаго сочиненія. [Porfir’ev 1877: 14].

⁷⁶ Cf. Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entry Z71.1. (Formulistic number: three).

⁷⁷ Cf. Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entry Z71.5 (Formulistic number: seven).

⁷⁸ For the metaphorical aspects of the description of the primordial *three-chambered habitat* within the cosmogonic scheme of *The Sea of Tiberias* (Types A-1 and A-2), see Badalanova Geller [2011: 25-30, 56]; see also in this connection footnotes 26, 29.

⁷⁹ Cf. *Isaiah* [40: 22]; similar cosmographic imagery is employed by Cosmas Indicopleustes in his *Christian Topography*. See also in this connection the discussion in Mil’kov and Polianskii [2009: 61-63, 78-79, notes 49-50, 60].

⁸⁰ For vernacular interpretations, see Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entry A109.1 (God as a triad).

the Father to all believers in his name, resides in their hearts, because the Father is unbegotten and unborn, while the Son is born but not created, and the Holy Spirit is not created and not born, but issues from the Father.

II. There was then no sky, no earth, no sea, no angels, no archangels, no cherubim, no seraphim, no rivers, no lakes, no wells, no springs, no men, no mountains, no clouds, no stars, no light, no beasts, no birds, no caves, no dawn. At that time there was darkness, the abyss, and murkiness; and then there were no days or nights, no eras, no hours. At that time there was the immortal and eternal Son of God, Jesus Christ,⁸¹ who created with a Word [=Logos], by the order of his heavenly Father, all the visible and invisible heavenly creations; and as the Lord uttered [the Word = Logos] from his most wise lips, so it was created and fashioned by the Holy Spirit. And the Lord said, “May there be a crystal sky on iron pillars, on seventy thousand of myriads⁸² of them, and may there be lakes and clouds and stars and light.” He exhaled⁸³ wind from his innards, and planted Paradise to the East,⁸⁴ [thus] East and West and North and South [were established]. An angel sits to the East in the splendour of his most high glory. The Lord created seven heavens with his Word [= Logos].⁸⁵ Frost issued from God’s face, while thunder is the Lord’s voice,⁸⁶ harnessed in a fiery chariot, and lightning is the Word of the Lord, issuing from God’s lips, and the Sun is from God’s innermost garments; on the account of God’s having wiped his face, the Moon [came] from [his] face. And the Lord said, “May there be a myriad of pillars in the ether!” And so it was created by the Lord’s Word [= Logos]. These immovable iron pillars are from the beginning of this era. “May there be on these pillars an immovable stone, and [may there be] on this stone earth, and [may there be] under the earth Hell, immovable and all made of bronze; and [may there be] iron beams and gates of bronze and iron! And under Hell [may there be] the bottomless Tartar.” And the Lord said, “May there be above Hell a myriad of bronze pillars, and [may there be] on the pillars a stone, and on the stone — the earth!” With a Word [= Logos] the Lord created stone and flint.

⁸¹The image of the Son as the Creator of the Universe (i.e. the one who fashioned heavens and earth, plants and animals, Adam and Eve, etc.) is also attested in oral tradition, and in the religious art of *Slavia orthodoxa*; see the discussion in Badalanova Geller [2011: 57-60].

⁸² Cf. Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entry Z71.5.0.1 (Formulistic numbers: sevenfold).

⁸³ On the concept of “creation via exhaling”, see the discussion in Badalanova Geller [2011: 42-49].

⁸⁴Cf. *Genesis* [2: 8]: *And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.*

⁸⁵Consult Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entries A 651.1.4 (Seven heavens: a series of seven upper worlds) and Z71.5 (Formulistic number: seven). The image of the seven-folded sky can likewise be found in Bulgarian oral tradition. According to folklore data collected by D. Marinov, “the sky, which people can see now, is a solid thick crust of seven layers” (“небото, което виждаме, е твърда кора дебела и има седем дупли”), see *SbNU* 28 [1914: 7]. Further on Bulgarian vernacular cosmography, and in particular on the popular concept of the sky as a solid shell/coating of seven stratum, see S. Tolstaia [1998: 23]. For the extra-biblical traditions of seven heavens and earths, see Ginzberg [1909: 9-13; 1910: 260; 1911: 96; 1925: 9-11, 23, 30].

⁸⁶ On acoustic characteristics of God’s voice, see Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entry A 139.5.2 (*God’s voice causes thunder*).

III. And the Lord said, "May there be on earth the Sea of Tiberias, the salty water!" The first earth is created in the ether and made firm. The second earth [is] upon Hell, and on this earth [is] a sea and this Sea of Tiberias has no shores. And the Lord descended via the ether to the Sea of Tiberias, and on this Sea of Tiberias the Lord spotted a swimming duck, and God stood above it and said to it, "Duck, who are you?" And Satan said to him, "I am God!" And the Lord said to him, "And who am I then?" Satan said to him, "You are God of gods and King of kings." If Satan did not say that, but something which the Lord God did not approve,⁸⁷ then the Lord would have crushed him in the Sea of Tiberias. And God said to Satan, "Dive into the Sea and bring up earth and stone."⁸⁸ And he [God] broke it [i.e. the stone] into two, and half of the stone, [which was] from his left hand, he gave to Satan. And the Lord struck the stone with his sceptre and the Lord said, "Be you angels in my image — strong, incorporeal, and immortal — doing my will [in Heaven] above!"⁸⁹ And from the fiery⁹⁰ wings God created the archangels Michael, and Gabriel, Yeurya [Uriel],⁹¹ and Michael,⁹² Paraflam,⁹³ Pomogay,⁹⁴ cherubim, seraphim, angels, and archangels. As for the sceptre with which our God Jesus Christ hit [the stone], it was made of burnished steel. And by the will of the Word of God angels flew out from the stone —

⁸⁷Var.: "should he have said something against God".

⁸⁸For various attestations of this motif in vernacular oral traditions around the world, see Thompson's *Motif-Index*, entries A 811 (Earth brought up from bottom of primeval water) and A 812.1 (Devil as Earth Diver). In fact, this motif becomes one of the hallmarks of *The Sea of Tiberias*; it was attested in all the extant versions. At the same time, it is perhaps not only the best studied, but also the most controversial trait of this apocryphon; see the discussion in Potebnia [1886: 273 (738) -75(40)]; Veselovskii [1889: 19-24, 47-75, 82-7, 108-16]; Dragomanov [1892: 257-314; 1894:10-35, 45-52]; Korobka [1909: 175-95; 1910: 105-47]; Radchenko [1910: 74-6, 86-7, 91-3, 99-100, 109-15]; Markov [1913: 64-74]; Ivanov [1925: 287-90]; Köngäs [1960: 151-80]; Dundes [1962: 1032-51]; Tomicki [1976: 86-95; 1979:174-75; 1980:51-62, 70-117]; Petkanova [1978: 171-177]; Dimitrova [1985: 184-192; 1998: 376-84] and Dimitrova-Marinova [1998: 38-57]; Kuznetsova [1998: 59-79]; Šmitek 1998: 111-23]; Stoyanov (whose observations and arguments are rather close to those of Dragomanov) [2001: 19-33; 2004: 192-94]; Berezkin [2003a; 2003 b: 247]; Nagy [2006: 281-326]; Badalanova [2003: 6-7; 2008: 168, 219-21], Badalanova Geller [2011: 30-33, 64-68].

⁸⁹Consult Thompson's *Motif-Index*, entry A 52.0.1 (Angels created to execute God's will).

⁹⁰The concept of angels being created of fire is also featured in midrashic tradition [Ginzberg 1909:16]. It is likewise manifestly attested in the Qur'ān [Sūrah 7: 11; Sūrah 38: 77], and in some Islamic exegetical writings. Consult in this connection *The History of Prophets and Kings (Tarīkh al-rusul wa'l-mulūk)* by Al-Tabarī, vol. 1: *From the Creation to the Flood* [Rosenthal 1989: 252-53] and *The Stories of the Prophets (Qisas al-Anbiyā)* by Al-Rabghūzī [Boeschoten, O'Kane and M. Vandamme 1995: 11-13]; see also the discussion in Badalanova Geller [2008 b: 9, 92-94].

⁹¹The etymology of the angelonym "Uriel" is conventionally explained either in connection with the Hebrew lexeme denoting 'light', or with its Aramaic counterpart denoting 'fire' [Mach 1999: 885-886]. It is significant that in the current text, the archangel Uriel, along with Michael and Gabriel, emerges from certain 'fiery wings'.

⁹²It is not clear as to why the name of the archangel Michael is listed twice.

⁹³An obscure angelonym.

⁹⁴Yet another obscure angelonym; in other Mss. of *The Sea of Tiberias* the name of the angel Pomogay (the accusative form of which is Помогая) is spelled as either Pomailo [Помайло], or Pomail [Помайл]; see the discussion in Sreznevskii [1904: 100, note 3] and Badalanova Geller [2011: 126, note 450; 131].

archangels Michael and Gabriel, leaders of the [host of the] Heavenly King.⁹⁵ As for Satan, he beat out from the stone an innumerable host of fleshy demonic gods.⁹⁶ And the Lord said, “May there be 33 whales⁹⁷ in [the waters of] the Sea of Tiberias, and may earth rest on these whales!” And God seeded earth on them, [and said], “May there be a thick, wide and spacious earth!” And trees and herbs and flowers and forests and hills and springs and lakes and rivers [appeared]; and from the soil the Lord created beasts and animals and fish in the waters, and birds flying in the air;⁹⁸ and He created day and night, and reptiles crawling on the earth. As for the whales, the Lord ordered the angels to bring food for them from Paradise. On them the earth is fixed and does not move in any direction.

IV. And Satan said to the Lord Sabaoth, “My powers are stronger than those of the Most High, [since] I am like the Most High.” [God] accepted Satan as an archangel and took him up to the heavens. Satan began to be swollen with pride and elevated himself in his own thoughts, musing, “I will create for myself a throne above the stars, in the ether.”⁹⁹ The Lord divined his cunning thoughts and sent the archangel Michael, ordering him to evict Satan from the heavens. The archangel Michael hit Satan with a sceptre and fire sparked from Satanail. The archangel Michael came to the Lord Sabaoth and said, “Satan’s fire is burning me.” And the Lord ordained Michael¹⁰⁰ and put a *schema* (habit) on him with holy crosses, as a portent of Christ, Son of God. The archangel Michael went and hit Satan with a sceptre and evicted him from the heavens to earth, [and then pushed him] to Hell with all his demonic powers. And the Devil fell from the heavens;¹⁰¹ for three days and three nights, the demonic hosts were falling into Hell like drops of rain; and the Lord said, “Amen, amen, amen.” The heavens

⁹⁵ Cf. Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entry A 52 (Creation of angels); related also to A 52.0.8 (God created angels by striking one small stone with another. Lucifer created devils by imitation).

⁹⁶ Cf. Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entries A 51 (Creation of devil[s]), G302.1. (Origin of demons and their companions), G303.1 (The origin of the devil and his companions), G303.1.4 (The devil creates other devils); related also to G303.1.4.2 (Devils are created from sparks produced by Satan’s striking two stones together).

⁹⁷ The motif of the whales upon which the dry land rests has vernacular oral interpretations; see the discussion in Mochul’skii [1887 (18:3): 41-8], Ivanov [1925: 307-308], Dimitrova-Marinova [1998: 40-44, 48], Kuznetsova [1998:68], Badalanova Geller [2011: 33-42]. For further empirical data reflecting the renditions of this cosmological concept in Slavonic folklore tradition, see Gorodtsov [1909: 52-53 (text 1)]; Zavaritskii [1916: 68]; see also the discussion above.

⁹⁸ Cf. *Genesis* [2:19]: *And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air.*

⁹⁹ Cf. *Isaiah* [14:12-15]: *How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the farthest sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to Hell, to the sides of the pit.*

Consult also Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entries A106.2 (Revolt of evil angels against God), A106.2.1 (Revolting devil banished to hell), A106.2.2. (Satan’s fall from heaven).

¹⁰⁰ Lit.: “cut his hair”.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entries G303.8 (Devil’s expulsion from heaven and his present haunts), G303.8.1 (Devil driven from heaven), V236. (Fallen angels); included in the current narrative is also a slightly amended rendition of G303.8.1.2 (Archangels Michael and Gabriel drive Satan and other devils from heaven to earth).

closed, and the hanging demons, suspended in the ether according to God's will, started falling to earth, [pushed] by the righteous hand of the most high divine Wisdom, and they crashed onto earth. And Satan said, "God expelled me to earth and I will sit in Jacob's house and be glorified by men."¹⁰²

V. And the Lord substituted the fallen host with mankind. Righteous men were called for, and instead of Satan himself, God created a man of flesh — the primordial Adam — from the earth's soil,¹⁰³ with bones from stone,¹⁰⁴ blood from the Red Sea,¹⁰⁵ thoughts from clouds,¹⁰⁶ eyes from the sun,¹⁰⁷ and breath from the wind.¹⁰⁸ And the

¹⁰² Perhaps a tacit reference to *Luke* [1: 33] (*And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end*).

¹⁰³ On the homologies of earth and flesh in Indo-European cosmogonies and anthropogonies, see Gamkrelidze and Ivanov [1984: 821], Lincoln [1986: 4-16, 21-25].

¹⁰⁴ On the implementation of "bone" as a corporeal alloform for "stone" in Indo-European creation myths, see West [1971: 377] and Lincoln [1986: 7, 10-16, 21-25, 31, 109, 113].

¹⁰⁵ On the derivation of blood (i.e. the bodily fluids = the liquid elements of microcosm) from the sea/salty water (i.e. the liquid elements of macrocosm), as rendered in Indo-European anthropogonies (with a special emphasis on the "homologic causality" encoded in them), see Lincoln [1986: 13-15, 17, 21-27, 113].

¹⁰⁶ On the mythopoeic relationship between "thoughts" and "clouds", and their consubstantiality in Indo-European cosmologies and anthropogonies, see Lincoln [1986: 19-25].

¹⁰⁷ On the attestation of "Sun" as a macrocosmic alloform for "eye(s)" in Indo-European languages and mythologies, see Lincoln [1986: 17-18, 21-25].

¹⁰⁸ As indicated by Thompson in his *Motif-Index*, there are several numerical patterns inlaid in anthropogonic narratives. The motif of "seven substances employed in composition of human body" is classified by him as type A 1260.1.4; the anthropogonic paradigm of this redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias* (along with that of 2 *Enoch* and some erotapocritic writings) falls into this category; see also the discussion in Forbes and Charles [1913: 448-449] and West [1971: 377]. The same motif is likewise employed in some folk songs; it is found in some Russian oral poems, such as *The Rhyme of the Dove Book* (var. transl. *The Rhyme of the Unfathomable Book*) [*Стих о Голубиной Книзе*], and *The Jerusalem Scroll* [*Свиток Ерусалимский*]. According to one such text, the creation of man was described as follows:

Первая часть, кости — оть камня; | Вторая часть, тѣло — оть земли; | Третяя часть, руда — оть Чер[м]наго моря; | Четверая часть, дыханіе — оть вѣтру; | Пятяя часть, мысли, оть облыщевь; | Как оболаци ходють на небеси, вѣтромь и ненастьемь, | Такожда вь челоуѣкѣ ходють мысли худья и добрья; | Оть добраго разума душа воскресаеть, | Оть худаго разума душа погибаеть; | За добрымь пошеть, — добро и будеть, | За худымь пошеть, — пропасть во вѣки. | Очи — оть сонца, разумь — от Святаго Духа.

The bones — from stone, the first element; | the body — from earth, the second element; | the blood — from the Black/Red Sea, the third element; | the breath — from the wind, the fourth element; | the thoughts — from clouds, the fifth element; | as clouds wander along in the sky, [moved by] wind and storm, | so do good and bad thoughts in man; | from good reason [i.e. good sense] the soul resurrects, | from bad reason the soul perishes; | if you follow good, you will be well; | if you follow evil, you will be lost forever. | The eyes [are made from] sun, [the sixth element]; | the intellect [comes from] the Holy Spirit, [the seventh element].

The chant cited above (entitled *The Jerusalem Scroll*) was recorded in the first half of the 19th century in the Ryazan province of the Russian Empire, and published by P. Bezsonov [1864 (6:3): 68-74], text № 564, (quoted are lines 150-161). Among Russian peasants there existed many different versions of this spiritual poem; some of them were transmitted orally, others were copied by the indigenous scribes, thus becoming part of local vernacular writings [«народные рукописи»]. Their headings varied; titles such as: *The Jerusalem Verse* [*Стихъ Ерусалимскій*], *The Jerusalem Scrolls* [*Списки Ерусалимскіе*], *The Jerusalem Sheet* [*Листъ Ерусалимскій*], *The List Regarding the Jerusalem Portent* [*Списокъ Ерусалимского знаменія*], *The Legend of the Scroll* [*Сказаніе о Свиткѣ*], *The Scroll of the Jerusalem Portent* [*Свитокъ Ерусалимского знаменія*], *Parable* [*Притча*], *About Signs and Epistle of Our God Jesus Christ* [*О*

Lord went to his Father in heaven for the Holy Spirit, [to breath it into Adam];¹⁰⁹ and then the Lord went to Adam on earth, and he saw Adam, who was covered with wounds, having been pierced by [Satan's] finger.¹¹⁰ And the Lord said to Satan, "Why did you, O forlorn Devil, do that? I created man as pure and blameless, without blemish." And Satan said to the Lord, "He will forget you, but if some part [of his body] starts aching, he will pray [to you], 'Lord, have mercy upon me!'" And the Lord turned [man] inside out and fixed him with skin and inserted into him the Holy Spirit and vivified Adam. And the Lord said to Satan, "Bow before Adam." And Satan replied, "I am not going to bow to your creation." And the Lord said to Satan, "O forlorn Devil, cunning Satan."¹¹¹ And the Lord asked Adam, "What did you see in your

знамени и послании Господа Бога нашего I X], *The Epistle of the Lord God, Our Saviour Jesus Christ* [Послание Господа Бога и Спаса Нашего I X], *The Epistle of Our Lord Himself* [Послание отъ Самого Бога Нашего] were among the most popular ones [Bezsonov 1861: 68]. Parallels between the vernacular Slavonic anthropogonies (as formulated in *The Jerusalem Scroll*, *The Rhyme of the Dove Book*, etc.) and *The Sea of Tiberias* are analysed elsewhere [Badalanova Geller 2011: 74-79]. See also the discussion in Lincoln [1986: 4-40] who suggests that the anthropogonic narrative in 2 *Enoch* (along with other creation accounts from the 13th -14th cent. Irish sources, the 15th cent. Old Frisian *Code of Emsig*, etc.) and the Russian *Rhyme* (or *Poem*) of the *Dove Book* betray a common Indo-European mythological lineage; beware, however, of some erroneous translations of Russian material (e.g. *Стих о Голубиной Книге* being rendered by Lincoln as *The Poem on the Dove King* instead of *The Poem of the Dove Book / The Poem of the Unfathomable Book*). Further on the spiritual ballad/poem *The Rhyme of the Dove Book* and its links with Zoroastrian cosmology and Armenian heresiology, see Russell [2009: 141-208].

As for the parallel anthropogonic motif of *Adam octipartite* (i.e. man made of eight components: body — from earth, bones — from stones, veins — from roots, blood — from water, hair — from grass, thoughts — from winds, spirit — from clouds, warmth — from fire, cold — from air, dryness — from earth, instability — from water), it is classified by Stith Thompson in his *Motif-Index* as A 1260.1.3. The motif of *Adam octipartite* has differing attestations in Slavonic apocrypha; see Mochul'skii [1886 (17:1): 163-180], Böttrich [1995a: 73-82] and Orlov [2007: 11-12]. On the shifting numerical patterns in Slavonic anthropogonies, see Badalanova [2008: 223, 230-235].

¹⁰⁹This detail indicates that although the body of the first man was created by God the Son, the human soul/spirit ultimately came from the Father. The same is stated in the version published by Barsov: the Creator — God the Son — goes to His Father to obtain the soul/spirit, which He then blows/inserts into Adam's motionless body in order to vivify it.

¹¹⁰Consult Thompson, *Motif-Index*, entries A 1293 (Devil in God's absence puts sickness in Adam's body), A 1337 (Origins of disease) and A 1438 (Origin of medicine/healing). On the other hand, the motif of origin of disease is not confined to apocryphal writings only, but is widely attested in oral cosmogonic legends of *Slavia orthodoxa* as well. The indigenous storytellers further elaborated and developed this tale, making it part of their native ethnophilosophy, which provided the conceptual framework for ethnomedicine and ethnopharmacology; see also the discussion above (footnote 58).!

¹¹¹The picture is getting even more interesting when we take into consideration the fact that the motif of Satan's refusal to worship Adam is lacking in Greek and Slavonic redactions of *The Life of Adam and Eve*, but is present in Latin, Armenian and Georgian ones; see Anderson and Stone [1994: 10-13]; Stone [2000a: 44-48]; Anderson [2000b: 83-87]. It is also featured in Arabic and Ethiopic versions of *The Life of Adam and Eve* [Charles 1913: 121-131] and in the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*; see Gaylord [1982: 306], Anderson [2000b: 87-88]. References to the theme of Satan's refusal to venerate Adam are also found in some early Christian apocrypha (e.g. *The Gospel of Bartholomew*), and in some Greek and Slavonic apocryphal writings dealing with themes and characters from the New Testament. One such case is presented by the 14th cent. Bulgarian text entitled *An Account Concerning the Dispute Between the Devil and Our Lord Jesus Christ* (Слово въ прѣврѣни дѣволъ съ Гдѣмъ ѿшимъ Иѣ Хрѣ); see Radchenko [1903: 196-198]. Another Bulgarian version of the apocryphal *Dispute Between Christ and the Devil* (dated to the 16th century) comes from Ms. № 433 (fols. 101-105) from the National Library in Sofia. The Serbian redactions (compiled in

dream?" And Adam replied, "I saw You, Lord, in Jerusalem, being crucified on a cross and Peter crucified in Rome with his head lowered, and Paul in Damascus." And the Lord brought Adam into Paradise.¹¹² Adam fell asleep. Having taken the left rib from Adam, the Lord created a wife for him,¹¹³ Eve, and installed in Eve the Holy Spirit, and the Lord said to Adam, "Wake up from your slumbers!" And Adam replied, "What is happening, God?" And God said to Adam, "Here is a woman for you; live with her according to the Lord's commands." And the Lord God commanded Adam and Eve to eat fruit from each tree, but He ordered them not to eat from the grapevine, because the Lord Himself was tasting [the fruit] from this tree.¹¹⁴

the 15th-16th cent.) survived in MSS preserved in the Bulgarian National Library (Ms. № 326, fols. 41-44), the Prague National Museum (Ms. № 19, fols. 227-231), and the National Library in Belgrade (Ms. № 273). The Russian redactions (composed most probably in the 17th-18th cent.) represent the latest stages in the evolution of *The Account Concerning the Dispute Between the Devil and Our Lord Jesus Christ* within the socio-cultural environment of *Slavia orthodoxa*, and its (inevitable) interactions with other extra-canonical writings. The parallel attestations of some motifs (e.g., the refusal of Satan to worship Adam) in both *The Sea of Tiberias* and *The Account Concerning the Dispute Between the Devil and Our Lord Jesus Christ* further indicate that they relate to a certain meta-narrative in which the image of the First Adam is juxtaposed to the image of Jesus as the New Adam (cf. *1 Cor* 15:45). In the *Dispute*, as in the cosmogonic scenario of *The Sea of Tiberias*, the motif of how Satan refused to worship the First Adam is incorporated into a larger narrative describing the Devil's rebellion against Christ the New Adam. The end of this revolt, very much like in *The Sea of Tiberias*, is marked by the expulsion of Satan and his demonic forces from God's celestial abode, and their subsequent fall to Earth, into abysses, caves, and gorges, thus creating polluted landscapes. On the other hand, the encounter between Jesus and Satan, as described in the opening paragraph of the *Dispute*, is anchored by a dialogue, the form and structure of which resemble the dialogue between the anthropomorphic God and the ornithomorphic Satan prior to the creation of the dry land (as in the Porfiriev's version of *The Sea of Tiberias*; see the next text).

At the same time, the legend of the revolt of Satan is likewise attested in midrashic tradition (e.g. *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer*, *Bereshit Rabbah*); a survey of sources is offered by Ginzberg in his *Legends of the Jews* [1909: 62-64; 1925: 84-85 (note 35)]; see also in this connection the discussion in Anderson [2000b: 89-99; 108-110] and Stone [2000a: 45, note 4]. Finally, the motif of the refusal of Satan (Iblis) to make obeisance to Adam is also featured in the Quranic anthropogenesis [Surah 2:34-36, Surah 7:11-19, Surah 15:31-39, Surah 17:61-63, Surah 18:50, Surah 20:116-123, Surah 38:71-85]. See the discussion in Zwemer [1939: 135-148]; Badalanova Geller [2011: 80-84]. One final point; this type of interpretation of para-biblical legend of the angelic adoration of Adam is also attested in Christian, Jewish, and Muslim religious art; see Gutmann [1998: 137-138]. See also the discussion above (footnote 59).

¹¹²Cf. *Genesis* [2: 15]: *And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the Garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.*

¹¹³Cf. *Genesis* [2: 21-22]: *And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.*

For a concise survey of folklore interpretations of this motif, see Thompson's *Motif-Index*, entry A1275.1 (Creation of first woman from man's rib).

¹¹⁴Incidentally, some medieval Muslim commentators also maintain that the forbidden tree was the grapevine (hence the prohibition of drinking wine). The idea of the grape as the forbidden fruit is discussed in some eleventh-century Islamic exegetical writings, such as Al-Tha'labī's *Lives of the Prophets (Arā'is Al-Majālis Fī Quisās Al-Anbiyā)* [Brinner: 2002:49]. The similarities between these para-Scriptural (Judeo-Christian and Muslim) accounts indicate that some heterodox (apocryphal) Biblical and post-Qur'ānic sources obviously exploited common ideas in which peculiar (trans-cultural and trans-confessional) "fossil-concepts" from the theological proto-stratum of religions of the Book survived. See also the discussion above (footnote 62).

VI. At that time, [even] before Adam, the earth had been created, vast and embellished; and Satan envied Adam, who reigned in Paradise living in perfection.¹¹⁵ And Satan turned himself into a worm and came to Eve¹¹⁶ and said to her, “Swallow me and smuggle into Paradise.”¹¹⁷ And Satan curled himself around the grapevine and began to speak to Eve with the lips of a serpent: “Why don’t you taste of this grapevine? You will become gods like the Heavenly God.”¹¹⁸ Eve said to Adam, seducing him with the serpent’s words: “We will become gods like the Heavenly God, and we will obtain knowledge like Jesus.” And Adam together with Eve were seduced; they tasted the [fruit of the] grapevine, forbidden by God. And because the primordial cunning enemy envied mankind, he seduced Adam and Eve and induced them to transgress in Paradise. And the bright garments and wreaths fell off them¹¹⁹ and Adam and Eve began hiding among the trees.¹²⁰ And the Lord came to Paradise and said, “Adam, where are you?”¹²¹ Adam replied, “Here I am, Lord.”¹²² The Lord said to Adam, “Why, O forlorn one, did you commit this crime?” Adam said, “Woman seduced me.”¹²³ [God said to Eve:] “Why, O forlorn one, did you do this?”¹²⁴ Eve said, “The serpent seduced me.”¹²⁵ [God to the serpent]: “You, O most cunning serpent, why did you do that?” The serpent said, “Satan ordered me to ingest him and to smuggle him into Paradise.” And he [God] said to Adam, “You are earth and to earth you will

¹¹⁵ Consult Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entry A63.5.1 (Satan seduces Adam to sin because he is jealous of him).

¹¹⁶Perhaps a scribal error? It should be amended to read: “And Satan turned himself into a worm and came to the serpent”.

¹¹⁷This motif is also featured in vernacular (folklore) Christian and Islamic cosmogonies, and in parallel Muslim exegetical writings; one such example comes from the early 11th century *Lives of the Prophets (Arā'īs Al-Majālis Fī Quisas Al-Anbiyā)*, composed by the Islamic exegete Al-Tha’labī (see the text in Brinner [2002: 50]). The similar attestations of the motif of the Devil’s entrance into Paradise in apocryphal tradition of *Slavia orthodoxa* (i.e. the 15th cent. *Apocalypse of Baruch* and the 16th-18th cent. *Sea of Tiberias*) and in Muslim exegetical writings from the early 11th cent. are symptomatic. They indicate that the intellectual lineage of these para-Scriptural narratives must have been rooted in the fertile fabric of a common prototext, from which the extra-canonical (i.e. para-Biblical and para-Qur’ānic) cosmogonies eventually sprang. See also the discussion above (footnote 64).

¹¹⁸Cf. *Genesis* [3:4-5]: *And the serpent said unto the woman, “You shall not surely die, for God knows that in the day you eat thereof [the tree], then your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.”*

¹¹⁹Cf. *Genesis* [3:7]: *And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.*

¹²⁰Cf. *Genesis* [3:8]: *And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden.*

¹²¹Cf. *Genesis* [3:9]: *And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, “Where are you?”*

¹²²Cf. *Genesis* [3:10]: *And he said, “I heard your voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.”*

¹²³Cf. *Genesis* [3:12]: *And the man said, “The woman whom you gave to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.”*

¹²⁴Cf. *Genesis* [3:13]: *And the Lord God said unto the woman, “What is this that you have done?”*

¹²⁵Cf. *Genesis* [3: 13]: *And the woman said, “The serpent beguiled me and I did eat.”*

Compare also to the following section of *The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* [11:3]: *But I fear; lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.*

go.¹²⁶ I created you as immortal in Paradise, and you trespassed my command¹²⁷ and ate from the forbidden grapevine." And the Lord sent the archangel Michael and ordered them to be evicted from Paradise and to send them down to earth. And the Lord said to Adam, "Plough the earth!"¹²⁸

VII. And Adam, together with his wife, began mourning and weeping on account of being cast out of Paradise; the Lord wanted to pardon him, having seen his pure repentance from the heart and sighs and tears on his face [and prayers]: "Most merciful ruler, you who know all fates, save the fine Adam!" And Satan heard Adam's mourning and his lamenting on account of the sin, and because the Devil had been cunning and hateful from the very beginning, he came to Adam and said to him, "I will give you good tidings. The Lord is willing to pardon you. Give me a writ for yourself and your kin."¹²⁹ As for you, Eve, swear an oath to me."

VIII. And two sons were born to Adam, Abel and Cain.¹³⁰ Abel offered the Lord God a fat lamb for sacrifice,¹³¹ while Cain presented grain from the earth,¹³² but ate from it beforehand. The Lord accepted Abel's sacrifice but rejected Cain's.¹³³ And Cain envied Abel and killed him¹³⁴ with a stone. The Lord came and said to Cain, "Why did you kill your brother Abel?"¹³⁵ And the Lord ordered the

¹²⁶Cf. *Genesis* [3:19]: *In the sweat of your face shall you eat bread, till you return unto the ground; for out of it were you taken: for dust you are, and unto dust shall you return!*

¹²⁷Cf. *Genesis* [3:17]: *And unto Adam he said: "Because you have listened unto the voice of your wife and have eaten of the tree, of which I commanded you, saying, 'You shall not eat of it', cursed is the ground for thy sake! In sorrow shall you eat of it all the days of your life!"*

¹²⁸Cf. *Genesis* [3: 23-24]: *Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the Tree of Life.*

¹²⁹The motif of Adam's writ is also attested in Slavonic redactions of *The Life of Adam and Eve*, folklore narratives and iconography; see Ivanov [1925: 223-227, 309-310]; Petkanova [1978: 163-168]; for a more general discussion on the legend of the "Cheirograph of Adam", see Stone [2000b: 149-166; 2002], and Badalanova Geller [2011: 100-110].

¹³⁰Cf. *Genesis* [4: 1-2]: *And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord. And she again bare his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.*

¹³¹Cf. *Genesis* [4: 4]: *And Abel [...] brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof.* Compare also *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews* [11: 4]: *By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.*

Consult also Thompson's *Motif-Index*, entry V12.4.6 (Sheep [ram] as sacrifice).

¹³² Cf. *Genesis* [4: 3]: *And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.*

¹³³Cf. *Genesis* [4: 4-5]: *And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.*

¹³⁴Cf. *Genesis* [4: 8]: *And Cain talked with Abel his brother; and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother; and slew him.*

The canonical text, however, does not specify the nature of the murder weapon. On the other hand, some versions of the apocryphal *Life of Adam and Eve* fail to recount the fratricide altogether; see Tromp [2000: 293-295].

¹³⁵Cf. *Genesis* [4: 9-10]: *And the Lord said unto Cain, "Where is Abel your brother?" And he said, "I know not. Am I my brother's keeper?" And he said, "What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood cries unto me from the ground."*

beast [i.e. Cain] to eat three times a day and regurgitate [whatever he consumed], and as a sign, to tremble¹³⁶ for 300 years after Abel, for blood to run from blood. Abel lay on the earth for 300 years; Adam did not know what to do [with his corpse]. And the Lord sent two birds — doves — and one dove killed the other [and then dug the earth and buried the dead one; after his having seen that, Adam] dug the earth¹³⁷ and buried his son Abel in the earth [in the same way].¹³⁸

IX. Adam lived on earth for 930 years and died.¹³⁹ And Satanic death came and took his soul and brought it to Hell, [where] he suffered for 3000 years in Hell, in the burning fire. His hands and legs were bound with six shackles.

X. And the Lord God, the eternal King of kings and Lord of lords, our heavenly Father, by his own will, sent his only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, to earth to be incarnate in a Virgin, and to be born on account of the bread for Adam and the destruction of the Kingdom of Satan, and for the salvation of mankind. And the

¹³⁶ For vernacular attestations of this motif, see Bezsonov [1864 (6:3): 1-3], texts 525, 527.

¹³⁷ There is a cluster of supplementary details appearing in *The Sea of Tiberias* storyline which parallel some para-biblical sources (such as the *Palaea*). This narrative fragment represents one such case.

¹³⁸ The episode concerned with the origin of mortuary customs (first performed by Adam and Eve who learned how to bury their son from doves) is told in a similar manner not only within the narrative tradition of the *Palaea*, but also in folk legends; see the discussion in Petkanova [1978: 168-171; 2005: 107-115]; Badalanova Geller [2011: 111]. On the other hand, it is rather intriguing that some Jewish sources report a related version of the beginnings of funerary rites, except that the precedent is set not by Adam and Eve, but by Cain himself. Thus the *Tosefta Targum* on Genesis 4:8 (c. 4th century AD) reports the fratricide story in the following way: *Cain did not know where to strike him [Abel]. He looked about here and there until he saw two birds fighting; and one rose up against the other; and struck it on its mouth, and the blood spurted out, until it died; Cain took a lesson from it, and did the same to Abel [his] brother. Then seeing that he was dead, he feared that his father would demand [Abel] from him; and he did not know what to do. Looking up, he saw the bird that had killed its fellow putting its mouth to the ground; and it dug [a hole] and buried the other dead one, and covered it with earth. Cain did the same to Abel, so that [his father] might not find him.* (Quoted after Gutmann [1998: 138-139]).

According to Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer (c. 9th century), however, the execution of the first funeral is attributed yet again to Adam and Eve (with a raven coming to show them the mode of burial, not doves): *Adam and Eve, sitting by the corpse [of Abel], wept not knowing what to do, for they had as yet no knowledge of burial. A raven coming up, took the dead body of its fellow (mate), and having scratched up the earth, buried it thus before their eyes. Adam said, "Let us follow the example of the raven," and so taking up Abel's body buried it at once.* [Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer, Chapter 21]

A story similar to the one narrated by Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer (with the raven being 'the demiurge' of mortuary customs) is revealed in the Qur'ān; according to Sūrah [5:34-35], a raven is sent by Allah to teach the killer how to cover up his brother's body: *And God sent a raven which scratched upon the ground, to show him how he might hide his brother's wrong. He said, "O woe is me! Am I too weak to become like this raven, and to hide away my brother's wrong?" And he became one of the repentant.* The detail about the raven teaching Cain how to conceal the body of his brother is also attested in Al-Tabarī's *History of Prophets and Kings* [fol. 141]: *When Cain had killed Abel, he was perplexed as he did not know how to conceal him, for this supposedly was the first killing among the children of Adam* (quoted after Rosenthal [1989: 311]).

This type of interpretation of the legend of Abel's burial (with birds revealing to humans the knowledge of mortuary customs) is also attested in Christian, Jewish, and Muslim religious art; see Gutmann [1998: 137-140], Böttrich [1995b], Badalanova Geller [2008 b: 17, 113-114]. For the story of Cain and Abel in the *Qur'ān* and Islamic exegetical tradition, see Stillman [1974: 231-239]. See also the discussion above (footnotes 66, 67, 70, 137).

¹³⁹ Cf. Genesis [5:5]: *And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died.*

Lord wanted to pardon Adam and Eve, and to absolve them from the original curse. And our Lord, Jesus Christ, was sitting in heaven with his heavenly Father on a throne, for five and a half thousand [years] of the current age. And he was born in heaven from the Father without a mother, and on earth by a mother without a father. Being incarnated by the Virgin Mary, the most Holy Theotokos, he was born in Bethlehem in Judea, and performed¹⁴⁰ many miracles on earth, and suffered like a man. By his own will he was crucified on the cross by the lawless Jews in the holy city of Jerusalem, and was placed in a grave, and rose on the third day; having been resurrected he descended to Hell and took Adam out from Hell¹⁴¹ [and raised him] back to the original state of his kin, in the Paradise of Eden to the East. He conquered Satanic death with his own death, sitting on his divine throne, and he bound Satan with his Word [= Logos], by the will of his Father.

2. 2. Porfir'ev's redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias* (Type C)

Presented below is a 17th century Russian redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias* the linguistic features of which — very much like in the previous text — betray the Bulgarian protograph (e.g. the symptomatic attestation of the lexeme *ноиц*).¹⁴² The account was first published by I. Porfir'ev [1877: 87-89] who discovered it in a miscellany (at the time kept in the Manuscript Collection of the Library of the Solovetsky Monastery as № 1138, ff. 174r-177). M. Dragomanov was among the first to call attention to this redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias* [1894: 10-15]; the text was also published later by Ivanov [1925: 299-301].

My edition of the text is based on Porfir'ev's publication; additional parallels to other apocryphal writings are also supplemented in the footnotes. The translation of the text into English is made by the author.

Повесть свѣго Андрѣя со епифаниемъ о вопроствѣхъ и отвѣствѣхъ

І. ІВАННЪ РЕЧЕ: ОТЪ ЧЕВО ЗЕМЛЯ СОТВОРЕНА БЫСТЬ. ВАСИЛІЙ РЕЧЕ: ЕГДА СНИДЕ (БОГЪ) И НАЧЯ ХОДИТИ ПО ВОДѢ И УЗРѢ НА ВОДѢ ПТИЦУ, ПЛАВАЕТЬ ЯКО ГОГОЛЬ. И РЕЧЕ БОГЪ: ТЫ КТО ЕСИ. ПТИЦА ЖЕ РЕЧЕ: АЗЪ ЕСМЬ БОГЪ. А АЗЪ КТО ЕСМЬ? ПТИЦА ЖЕ РЕЧЕ: ТЫ БГОМЪ БОГЪ. БГЪ ЖЕ РЕЧЕ: ТЫ ОТКУДУ БѢ. ПТИЦА ЖЕ РЕЧЕ: АЗЪ ЕСМЪ ОТЪ НИЖНИХЪ. И РЕЧЕ БГЪ: А АЗЪ ОТКУДУ. ПТИЦА ЖЕ РЕЧЕ: ОТ ВЪШНИХЪ. И РЕЧЕ БГЪ: ДАЙ ЖЕ МИ ОТЪ НИЖНИХЪ. И ПОПРЕ ПТИЦА В МОРЕ И СОГНА ПБНУ ЯКО ИЛЪ¹⁴³ И ПРИНЕСЕ КЪ БГУ. И ВЗЯ БГЪ ИЛЪ В ГОРЬЕСТЬ И РАСПРОСТРАНИ СЮДУ И ОВОЮДУ И БЫСТЬ ЗЕМЛЯ. И ПОВЕЛЪ БГЪ ИЗСЯКНУТИ РЪКАМЪ І ИСТОЧНИКАМЪ. И ВЗЯ БГЪ ПТИЦУ І НАРЕЧЕ ИМЯ ЕМУ СОТОНДИЛЪ.¹⁴⁴ И БУДИ ТЫ У МЕНЕ ВОЕВОДА НЕБЕСНЫМЪ СИЛАМЪ, НАДО ВСѢМИ

¹⁴⁰ Lit. "created".

¹⁴¹ Consult also Thompson's *Motif-Index*, entries V211.7 (Christ's descent to Hell) and V211.7.1 (The harrowing of Hell).

¹⁴² See the discussion above, paragraph 2.1 (and especially footnotes 16, 17, 18).

¹⁴³ The same concept is featured in some erotapocritic writings; see Mochul'skii [1894: 68-69].

¹⁴⁴ A similar motif occurs in the 18th cent. Russian erotapocriseis; see the following fragment from *Questions and Answers of Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom, [containing] revelations copied from the Bible, the Gospels and the Deeds of the Apostles* (Вопросы и ѡвѣсты свѣатыхъ василіа великаго, григорія бгослова іоанна златоустаго пророцества выписано отъ вѣблани отъ евангелиста и апостола):

старѣйшина. и сотвори БГЪ потомъ небесныя силы. и бысть же всѣхъ вѣ чиновъ. и устрои въ коемуждо чину чинонадальника воеводу. и овии отъ нихъ постави во еже славити имя его престѣе. пѣсниже ихъ сицевы поюще: стѣ стѣ стѣ ГДЬ САВАОФЪ исполнѣ нѣбо и земля славы твоея. а инии же беспрестани славятъ днь и ноць.¹⁴⁵ инии же приставлени на службу и служатъ ему мыслию и еже что видѣ старѣйшинствомъ то повелѣваю(тъ). шествие же ихъ скорѣе молни. инии же на помощь посылаеми. и инии же на казнь согрѣшающимъ. зракъ же и красота ангельская невозможно есть усты челоувѣческими изрещи. ангели же самаго Бга не видятъ. славу же его по участию видѣтъ.

II. Бѣ же старѣйшина ангеломъ нареченный сотонаилъ первый воевода. и дастъ ему БГЪ вѣ-тый чинъ на службу. и помысли себѣ сотона яко сниду на землю и поставлю престолъ себѣ надъ звѣздами и подобенъ буду вышнему и да мя славитъ чинъ мой еже подо мною. БГЪ же видѣвъ и. яко сице помысли сотонаилъ. и предастъ старѣйшинство Михаилу на всѣхъ небесныхъ силахъ. I повелѣ БГЪ Михаилу соврещи противника своего долу и со отступными его силами. и тогда прииде Михаилъ и виде на немъ вѣство велико и не може къ нему приступить и возвратися ко ГДѣ и рече: ГДѣ вѣство твое велико на немъ. и рече БГЪ: поиди свергни. и снять съ него вѣство. и прииде Михаилъ и виде его яко проста члѣк и удари его скипетромъ в плеча. онъ же поиде и со отступными силами с высоты низу.¹⁴⁶ отъ шуму его хотяще нѣса пасти, и рече Михаилъ ГДѣ: хоцутъ нѣная твердь пагнися. и рече БГЪ: запрети словомъ. и рече Михаилъ: ГДѣ что есть глаголати. и рече БГЪ: молви воимемъ стѣя стѣимъ. и воспѣша нѣбныя силы: единъ стѣ единъ ГДЬ ИСЪ ХЪ во славу БГѣ отцу аминь.¹⁴⁷ Сотона же прошнѣ землю и ста на безднѣ подъ землею. и ина же его сила с нимъ. инаяже сила оста на земли и претворишася въ вѣсы и прелциютъ члѣки. иная же сила не допаде до земли и летаютъ по воздуху. и тѣ

V. Кого нарече БГЪ перее адама на земли.

VI. Когда сверженъ бысть сатана преже созданиа адамля за четыре дни тогда за гордость свою отпаде славы вѣния и нарече ся сатана диявол. (Quoted after Mochul'skii 1887 (18:4): 178).

¹⁴⁵ See footnotes 16, 17, 18.

¹⁴⁶The current narrative, about the eviction of Satan — once the leader of angelic host — from the celestial realms by the Archangel Michael, is rather close to the following fragment from the *Account about the Seven Planets* [Сказаніе о седми планитахъ], which was copied in the same 17th cent. miscellany № 1138 in the Solovetsky Monastery Library; in fact, the description of the concept “вѣство велико” in the *Account of Saint Andrew and Saint Epiphanius about Questions and Answers* is an almost verbatim rendition of that offered in the *Account about the Seven Planets*: Въ д-й днь сотвори БГЪ солнце и луну и звѣзды и втой же днь испаде отъ славы сатана. и видѣ сатанаилъ нѣбо и землю украшену и помысли себѣ: сотворю престолъ на облацѣхъ себѣ и буду подобенъ вышнему. да славить мя чинъ мой. I сотворилъ себѣ прѣтолъ на облацѣхъ свѣверныхъ и вознесся и бысть тогда воевода чину архгльскому. и видѣ БГЪ противника себѣ и посла БГЪ Михайла архггела и повелѣ сатанаила свержити долу. приде же Михаилъ к сатанаилу и видѣ на немъ вѣство велико и не смѣ на него и зрѣти. I прииде Михаилъ к БГѣ и рече. ГДѣ велико есть на немъ вѣство твое. ГДѣ же снять снего вѣство и рече: иди и свергни его долу. и прииде Михаилъ и видѣ сатанаила яко проста челоувѣка и удари его скипетромъ и спадеся престолъ его, и поиде сатана долу и со всѣми силами и о'нять о' него ГДѣ вѣство и снять отъ него илъ. и да ГДѣ илъ архгломъ и архггеломъ. и нарече имя Михе Михаилъ. и дастъ ему надо всѣми нѣбными силами старѣйшинство и нарече отступнику имя сатана дияволъ. и бысть помраченъ с своими силами. (Quoted after Porfir'ev [1877: 86]).

¹⁴⁷The cosmic cataclysms accompanying the Fall of Satan are described in a similar way in the (above mentioned 17th cent.) *Account about the Seven Planets* from the same miscellany: и поиде сатана наверху. I пошнѣвъ землю и хотѣша нѣса пагнися. и рече Михаилъ: ГДѣ хоцетъ нѣбо двинутися. и рече ему ГДѣ: запрети словомъ. и рече Михаилъ: ГДѣ что повелиши глѣти. и рече ГДѣ: изорцы воимемъ стѣя стѣимъ. скоро изглад тако. I тогда воспѣша вся силы нѣбныя: единъ стѣ. единъ ГДѣ ИСЪ ХЪ во славу БГѣ отцу. Аминь. I тогда утврдишася нѣса. (Quoted after Porfir'ev [1877: 86]).

In the above quoted fragment, however, the scribe paradoxically defines the Satan's expulsion from heaven as an upward movement, rather than as a fall to a lower habitat.

претворяются во ангелы и прелцаютъ люди. не тацы же сутьъ вѣси яко ихъ пишутъ черни огнеомраченнии суть.¹⁴⁸

III. И собра Михаилъ вся нѣбныя силы и рече имъ: внимаемъ себѣ да не будемъ тацыи і вонемъ добръ и станемъ предъ сотворшимъ ны создателемъ. и по сихъ слава единосущней трѣицы всегда и нѣвѣ и присно і во вѣки вѣкомъ аминъ.

An Account of Saint Andrew and Saint Epiphanius About Questions and Answers

I. [Saint] John said, "From what was the earth created?" [Saint] Basil replied, "When [God] descended and began walking on water, he saw a bird on the water swimming like a duck. And God said, 'Who are you?' The bird replied, 'I am God.' [And God said,] 'And who am I then?' The bird said, 'You are God of gods.' And God said, 'Where are you from?' The bird replied, 'I am from the lower [world]'. And God said, 'Where am I from then?' The bird replied, 'From the upper [world].'¹⁴⁹ And God said, 'Give me [a substance] from the lower [world]!' And the duck dove into the sea and fetched some foam-like silt and brought it to God.¹⁵⁰ And God took the silt in his palm and scattered it here and there, and there was earth. And God ordered rivers and springs to issue forth. And God took the bird and gave it the name *Sotonail* [and said to him]: 'May you be the Commander of my heavenly host, and to be an Elder¹⁵¹ above all.' And God then created the heavenly host, of which were twelve ranks;¹⁵² and having appointed a commander from each rank, he assigned them to glorify his holy name. Their songs chanted: 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord Sabaoth who fills heaven and earth with his glory!'¹⁵³ And some glorify [him] day and night without cease; others are appointed for

¹⁴⁸The current narrative about the emergence of various classes of demonic forces is similar to the following fragment from the *Account about the Seven Planets* from the same 17th cent. miscellany (№ 1138 in the Solovetsky Monastery Library): сатана же тогда пронде землю і услыша гласъ Михаиловъ и ста во адѣ на безднѣ подъ землею, а подъ нимъ вода, а подъ водою огонь негасимъ. и кои ближїи быша тѣ снмъ проразнша землю до пренеподняго ада и никако же неисходни, и не могутъ ничево дѣйствовать и ходѣть во тмѣ и до вѣка не узрятъ свѣта. друзїи же падоша на землю и слышаша гласъ Михаиловъ и остахся на земли и ходятъ по полнѣней і все злое творятъ роду члѣческому и претворишася в вѣсы. инни же не дойдоша до земли и слышася гласъ Михаиловъ остахся на воздухѣ. начальникъ же ихъ диволъ лютосердъ есть ратоходецъ. і все то имѣють себѣ величество крѣпко несытное хотѣние на зло поучаютъ на зло безъ вины лютии живыи и проказливїи мощнїи безсоннїи безплотнїи невидимїи. лицемѣрїя ради видимїи бывають. і преобразуютъ себѣ во ангела и в члѣвѣка. І животину во всякую і в гадину смущая члѣки. (Quoted after Porfir'ev [1877: 86]).

The subject of the emergence of various classes of Satanic forces is analysed at length by Tolstoy [1995 b: 245-249; 1995c: 250-269]; consult also the related data presented by Badalanova Geller [2011: 68-73].

¹⁴⁹Perhaps an allusion to John [8:23]: *And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world.*

¹⁵⁰See Thompson's *Motif-Index*, entries A811 (Earth brought up from bottom of primeval water) and A812.1 (Devil as Earth Diver).

¹⁵¹Cognate to the form 'Hegemon' below.

¹⁵²According to the Barsovian redaction of *The Sea of Tiberias* (Type B), the number of angelic ranks is nine [Badalanova Geller 2011: 114], as in *The Celestial Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite.

¹⁵³Compare to *Isaiah* [6:1-3]: [...] *I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he*

service and serve him with their thoughts; and whatever the inclinations of the Hegemon,¹⁵⁴ so they command; their striding is faster than lightning. Some are sent to assist [the righteous] and others [are sent] to punish those transgressing. It is impossible to articulate with human lips their angelic appearance and splendour. Angels, though they do not see God himself, perceive his glory by participating in it.

II. Yet, the Elder of the angels, the one who was called *Sotonail*, was the Chief Commander, and God appointed him to the twelfth rank for service. And this is what *Sotona* [i.e. Satan] thought to himself: ‘I will descend¹⁵⁵ to earth and put my throne above the stars and I will be like the Most High,¹⁵⁶ so that all the ranks below me will glorify me.’ God realised what *Sotonail* was thinking, so he gave hegemony to Michael over all the heavenly ranks. And God ordered Michael to thrust this very Adversary down [to earth] with all his apostate host.¹⁵⁷ And then Michael came [close to *Sotonail*], and he saw the great divine [nature]¹⁵⁸ in him and could not get near; and he returned to the Lord and said, ‘Lord, your august divinity is [still] with him.’¹⁵⁹ And God said, ‘Go and overthrow him.’ He removed the divine attributes from him.¹⁶⁰ And Michael approached him [again] and [now he] saw him as an ordinary man, and struck him in the shoulder with a sceptre. He [i.e. Satan, whose name is now transformed from *Sotonail* to *Sotona*] went with all his apostate-powers from the heights to the depths, and the heavens almost collapsed from his roaring. Michael said to the Lord, ‘The heavenly firmament is about to collapse.’ And God said, ‘Forbid this with a command!’ And Michael said, ‘Lord, what do I say?’ And God said, ‘Utter [the following]: *In the name of the Holy of Holies!*’ And the Heavenly Host began singing, ‘One holy, one Lord Jesus Christ, in the glory of God the Father, amen!’

Sotona pierced the earth and stood upon the subterranean abyss, with some of his host being with him, while some remained on earth and became demons to seduce

covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.

¹⁵⁴The suggested reading is based on LXX Num. [1: 52].

¹⁵⁵However, according to the canonical text (*Isaiah* [14: 12]) Lucifer ponders ascending to heaven, while in *The Sea of Tiberias* he descends to earth. What the current apocryphal narrative implies is that the divine domain (in which *Sotonail* was residing before his expulsion) is imagined as belonging to the ‘high heavens’ and not to ‘the low earth’. In other words, before losing the divine *-il* ending of his name, *Sotonail* was an angel and as such dwelled in heavens, enjoying a celestial but not terrestrial habitat.

¹⁵⁶Cf. *Ezekiel* [28: 13-19] and *Isaiah* [14: 12-15]; see also the discussion above (footnotes 48, 49, 146, 155).

¹⁵⁷Consult Thompson’s *Motif-Index*, entries G303.8 (Devil’s expulsion from heaven and his present haunts), G303.8.1 (Devil driven from heaven); the storyline includes a somewhat altered version of motif G303.8.1.2 (Archangels Michael and Gabriel drive Satan and other devils from heaven to earth).

¹⁵⁸Apparently, God’s antagonist still has an angelic status and divine standing; it is clearly indicated by the ending *-il* of his designation as *Sotonail* [СѦТѦНННЛЪ]. The *-il* [-НЛЪ] component in *Sotonail*’s name [СѦТѦНННЛЪ] refers to the Hebrew *-el* (immanent in ‘God’).

¹⁵⁹The meaning of the statement “Lord, your august divinity is [still] with him” perhaps should be (re)constructed in a following way: “As long as his name contains the ending *-il*, he continues to be a manifestation of the divine hypostasis”.

¹⁶⁰God does this by taking the divine ending *-il* [-НЛЪ] from the name of *Sotonail* [СѦТѦНННЛЪ] thus changing it into *Sotona* [СѦТѦНН].

mankind. Other [satanic] hosts did not reach the earth [while falling], but [were hanging about and] flying in the air; and these, disguised as angels, seduce mankind. However, the demons are not appearing as usually rendered as black, but they are dark fire.¹⁶¹

III. Michael gathered all his heavenly host and said to them, 'Beware not to become like them [i.e. fallen angels] and mind well that we may stand before the Creator who made us.'

May the glory of the consubstantial Trinity follow, now, forever and ever, and for all ages, Amen."

3. Concluding remarks

Since being introduced to modern scholarship in the 19th century, *The Sea of Tiberias* was considered to be a somewhat idiosyncratic apocryphal composition, with the strong flavour of vernacular Slavonic mythopoesis. The text has no Greek protograph and survived in relatively late recensions. It was hitherto completely unknown to western scholarship nor was it ever included within general anthologies of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha (cf. Charles [1913], Sparks [1984], Charlesworth [1983-1985]). The present author was the first to translate the text of *The Sea of Tiberias* into English, in order to make the apocryphon more widely accessible. Since the two accounts of *The Sea of Tiberias* presented in the current study (i.e. that of Mochilu'skii and Porfir'ev) differ in many details from each other and from the two previously published redactions [Badalanova 2008; Badalanova Geller 2011], they are outlined here as synoptic editions of the texts, with translation and explanatory commentary. The many cross-references noted to Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* indicate that the *Sea of Tiberias* certainly reflects rich oral heritage; thus the dualistic motif of the diving demiurge who descends to the bottom of the primordial sea in order to fetch the *material prima* (from which the universe is to be formed by God), is undoubtedly the hallmark of this highly unusual text. Apart from folklore themes, within the narrative of the *Sea of Tiberias* one notes intertextual links to other Slavonic apocrypha, e.g. *The Tale About the Contest between Satanil and Michael* (attributed to Saint John Chrysostom), *The Apocalypse of Enoch (2 Enoch)*, which, incidentally, also lacks a Greek protograph but was originally composed in a non-Slavonic environment), *The Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch)*, *The Life of Adam and Eve*, *The Discourse of the Three Saints* eratoptic writings, to mention just a few. *The Sea of Tiberias* has numerous counterparts in folklore narratives and songs (e.g. *The Rhyme of the Book of the Dove*, as well as dualistic etiological legends about Creation), and the versatile texture of the resulting literary composition reveals the richness of the cultural memory retained in indigenous Slavonic apocrypha of *Slavia orthodoxa*.

¹⁶¹ In the versions of *The Sea of Tiberias* published by Mochul'skii, Sreznevskii and Dimitrova-Marinova (all representative of Type A-2), and by Barsov (which is the paradigmatic Type B), the narrative of the fall of Satan precedes the tale about the creation of Adam, while in Porfir'ev's account (Type C) it functions as its final, closing segment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Afinogenova 2006.** О. Афиногенова, “Греческий вариант апокрифа о борьбе Архангела Михаила и Сатанаила” [“The Greek Version of the Apocryphal Account About the Struggle Between the Archangel Michael and Satanael”]. — *Scripta&e-Scripta*, 3-4, 2006, с. 329-348
- Anderson and Stone 1994.** Gary A. Anderson and Michael Stone (eds.), *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. (Second Revised Edition). Society of Biblical Literature. Early Judaism and Its Literature, № 17. Atlanta, Georgia, 1994
- Anderson, Stone and Tromp 2000.** Gary A. Anderson, Michael Stone and Johannes Tromp (eds.), *Literature on Adam and Eve*. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000
- Anderson 1998.** Gary A. Anderson, “Adam and Eve in the *Life of Adam and Eve*”. — In: M. Stone and T. Bergen (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1998, pp. 7-32
- Anderson 2000a.** Gary A. Anderson, “The Penitence narrative in the *Life of Adam and Eve*”. — In: Gary A. Anderson et al. (eds.), *Literature on Adam and Eve*, Leiden, Boston, Köln, pp. 3-42
- Anderson 2000b.** Gary A. Anderson, “The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan”. — In: Gary A. Anderson et al. (eds.), *Literature on Adam and Eve*, Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000, pp. 83-110
- Anderson 2000c.** Gary A. Anderson, “Ezekiel 28, the Fall of Satan, and the Adam Books”. — In: Gary A. Anderson et al. (eds.), *Literature on Adam and Eve*, Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000, pp. 133-147
- Angelov, Kuev, Kodov 1970.** Климент Охридски: Събрани съчинения, Т. 1. Обработили Б. Ст. Ангелов, К. М. Кувев, Хр. Кодов. София, 1970
- Arkhangel'skii 1899.** А. С. Архангельский, “Къ исторіи южнославянской и древнерусской апокрифической литературы. Два любопытныхъ сборника Софійской народной библиотеки, въ Болгарии: описание рукописей и тексты.” [“On the history of South-Slavonic and Old Russian apocryphal literature”]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наукъ*, 4:1, Санктпетербургъ, 1899, с. 101-147
- Badalanova 2003.** F. Badalanova, “The Word of God, by Word of Mouth: Byelorussian Folklore Versions of the Book of Genesis” — *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* (2003), [Festchrift A. McMillin], 2003, pp. 1-22
- Badalanova 2008 a.** F. Badalanova, “The Bible in the Making: Slavonic Creation stories.” — In: Markham Geller et al. (eds.), *Imagining Creation*. Leiden and Boston, 2008, pp. 161-365
- Badalanova Geller 2008 b,** Florentina Badalanova Geller, *Qur'ān in vernacular: Folk Islam in the Balkans*. Max Planck Institute for the History of Science. PREPRINT 357. Berlin, 2008
- Badalanova Geller 2010.** F. Badalanova Geller, “Gynesis in Genesis”. — In: S. Bergolissi and R. Salvatore (eds.), *Forma Formans. Studi in onore di Boris Uspenskij*. Vol. 1 Università degli Studi di Napoli “L'Orientale”, Dipartimento di Studi dell'Europa Orientale, 2010, pp. 17-48
- Badalanova Geller 2011.** F. Badalanova Geller, “*The Sea of Tiberias: Between Apocryphal Literature and Oral Tradition*”. - In: L. Di Tommaso and Ch. Böttrich (eds.), *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity*. Tübingen, 2011, pp. 13-157
- Barsov 1886.** Е. В. Барсовъ.“О Тивериадскомъ морѣ (по списку 16 в.)”. — *Чтенія въ Императорскомъ Обществѣ исторіи и древностей російскихъ при Московскомъ Университетѣ*, 1886 (Апрѣль-Іюнь), Книга вторая. Москва, 1886, с. 3-8
- Berezkin 2003 a.** Іu. Berezkin, “Southern Siberian—North American links in mythology”. — *Archaeology, ethnology and anthropology of Eurasia*, 14, 2003, p. 94-106
- Berezkin 2003 b.** Ю. Березкин, “О путях заселения Нового Света: некоторые результаты сравнительного изучения американских и сибирских мифологий.” [“Peopling of the New World: some results of comparative studies of American and Siberian mythologies”] — *Археологическіе вѣсти*, 10, 2003, с. 228-89
- Bezsonov 1861.** *Калѣки перехожіе. Сборникъ стиховъ и изслѣдование П. Безсонова* [*Wandering Crippled Singers of Tales: Collection of Chants*]. Москва, 1861
- Bezsonov 1864.** *Калѣки перехожіе. Сборникъ стиховъ и изслѣдование П. Безсонова. Стихи былевые: библейскіе, старшіе и младшіе.* [*Wandering Crippled Singers of Tales: Collection of Chants*, 6/3: Historical Rhymes: Biblical, Old and New]. Москва, 1864
- Boeschoten et al. 1995.** Н. Е. Boeschoten, М. Vandamme, and S. Tezcan (eds.), *The Stories of the Prophets (Qisas al-Anbiyā) by Al-Rabghūzī*. Vols 1-2, Leiden, 1995

- Bonchev 1942.** Нешо Бончев. *Съчинения*. София, 1942
- Bonchev 2002-2012.** Архимандрит Атанасий Бончев. *Речник на църковнославянския език*, Т. 1-2 [Dictionary of Church Slavonic Language, Vols. 1-2]. София, 2002-2012
- Böttrich 1995a.** Christfried Böttrich. *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch*. Frankfurt, 1995
- Böttrich 1995b.** Christfried Böttrich. "Die Vögel des Himmels haben ihn begraben": Überlieferungsgeschichte zu *Abels Bestattung und zur Ätiologie des Grabes*, Göttingen, 1995
- Böttrich 1996.** C. Böttrich. *Das slavische Henochbuch*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Bd 5, Apokalypsen, Lfg. 7. Gütersloh, 1996
- Brinner 2002.** W. Brinner (ed. and transl.), *Lives of the Prophets (Arā'is Al-Majālis Fī Quisas Al-Anbiyā) by Al-Tha'labi*. Leiden, 2002
- Buslaev 1861.** Ф. Буслаевъ. *Историческіе очерки русской народной словесности и искусства. Русская народная поэзія. Сочинение Ф. Буслаева* [Writings on History of Russian Folk Literature and Art. Russian Folk Poetry]. Санктпетербургъ, 1861
- Butler 1996.** Thomas Butler, *Monumenta Bulgarica: A Bilingual Anthology of Bulgarian Texts from the 9th to the 19th Centuries*. Ann Arbor, MI, 1996
- Charles 1913.** R. H. Charles, (ed.) *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vols 1-2. Oxford, 1913
- Charlesworth 1983-1985.** James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vols 1-2. Garden City, N.Y., 1983-1985
- Dal' 1882.** *Толковый словарь живаго великорусскаго языка Владимира Даля*. Т. 4 (Р - V). [Interpretative Thesaurus of the Living Russian Language, Vol 4]. Санктпетербургъ & Москва, 1882
- Dimitrova 1985.** Димитринка Димитрова, "Космогоничната легенда за Тивериадското море и старобългарската апокрифна литература" ["The Cosmogonic Legend about the Sea of Tiberias and Old Bulgarian Apocryphal Tradition"]. — *Старобългарска литература*, 18, 1985, с. 184-192
- Dimitrova 1998.** Димитринка Димитрова, "Медиаторът в старобългарската апокрифна традиция и в българския фолклор: въпроси на типологията" ["The mediator in medieval Bulgarian apocryphal literature and folklore: problems of typology"]. — In: А. Ангушева-Тиханова et al. (съст.), *Медиевистика и културна антропология. Сборник в чест на 40-годишната творческа дейност на проф. Донка Петканова*. [Medieval Studies and Cultural Anthropology: Festschrift Petkanova]. София, 1998, с. 376-384
- Dimitrova-Marinova 1998.** Димитринка Димитрова-Маринова, "Богомилската космогония в древнеславянската литературна традиция" ["Bogomilistic cosmogony in Old Slavonic literary tradition"]. — In: В. Я. Петрухин, (отв. ред.), *От Бытия к Исходу. Отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей [From Genesis to Exodus: the Reflection of Biblical Plots in Slavonic and Jewish Popular Cultures. Collection of Articles]*. Москва, 1998, с. 38-57
- Dragomanov 1892, 1894.** Михаил Драгоманов, "Забълъжки върху славянскитѣ религиозно-етически легенди (2): Дуалистическото миротворение (1-4). — *Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина*, 8, 1892, с. 257-314; 10, 1894, с. 3-68
- Dragomanov 1961,** M. Dragomanov. *Notes on Slavic Religio-Ethical Legends: The Dualistic Creation of the World*; trans. E. W. Count, Bloomington, Indiana University Publications. Russian and East European Series Vol. 23. The Hague, 1961
- Dundes 1962.** Alan Dundes, "Earth-Diver: creation of mythopoeic male." — *American Anthropologist*, 64:5/ 1, October, 1962, pp. 1032-1951
- Forbes and Charles 1913,** N. Forbes and R. H. Charles, "2 Enoch, or the Book of the Secrets of Enoch" — In: R. Charles, (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2: Pseudepigrapha. Oxford, pp. 425-69
- Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984.** Т. В. Гамкrelidze, Вяч. Вс. Иванов, *Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Реконструкция и историко-типологический анализ праязыка и протокультуры*, Т. 1-2. (С предисловием Р. О. Якобсона) [Indo-European Language and Indo-Europeans. A Reconstruction and Historical Typological Analysis of Proto-Language and Proto-Culture, Vols 1-2. (With a preface by R. Jacobson)]. Тбилиси, 1984

- Gaylord 1982.** Harry E. Gaylord, "How Satanael lost his -el". — *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 33: 1-2, 1982, pp. 303-309
- Georgiev 1986.** Владимир Георгиев, "Звуковата стойност на глаголическата буква Ѻ и произходът на старобългар. *шт, жд*". — *Български език*, 36:2, 1986, с. 97-109
- Georgiev and Duridanov 1995.** Владимир Георгиев, Иван Дуриданов (ред.), *Български етимологичен речник*. Том 4. [*Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. 4]. София, 1995
- Gerov 1904.** Найден Геров, *Рѣчникъ на Българскій языкъ съ тлъкувание рѣчи-ты на българскы и на русскы. Събралъ и изтъкувалъ Найдень Геровъ. Часть пята: Р — ѡА*. Издадена подъ редакциѣ-тѣ на Теодоръ Панчевъ [*A Lexicon of the Bulgarian Language with Explanations of Words in Bulgarian and Russian. Collected, classified and published by Naiden Gerov and edited by Teodor Panchev*, Vol. 5]. Пловдив, 1904
- Ginzberg 1909-1913, 1928, 1925, 1938.** Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*. Vols. 1-7. Philadelphia, PA, 1909-1913, 1928, 1925, 1938
- Gorodtsov 1909.** П. А. Городцовъ, "Западно-сибирскія народныя легенды о творении мира и борьбѣ духовъ". ["Folk legends from Western Siberia about the creation of the world and the combat between spirits"] — *Этнографическое обозрѣние*, 80, 1, 1909, с. 50-63
- Gutmann 1998.** Joseph Gutmann, "On Biblical Legends in Medieval Art". — *Artibus et Historiae*, 19: 38, 1998, pp. 137-142
- Iatsimirskii 1899, 1916.** А. И. Яцимирскій. "Мелкие тексты и заметки по старинной славянской и русской литературе". ["Brief notes and comments on Old South Slavonic and Russian literatures"]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣлення Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии наук*, 4: 2, 1899, с. 423-475; 21: 1, 1916, с. 192-261
- Iatsimirskii 1909, 1910, 1913.** А. И. Яцимирскій, "Къ исторіи апокрифовъ и легендъ въ южнославянской письменности". ["On the history of apocryphal writings and legends in South Slavonic Literature"]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣлення Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии наук*, 14: 2, 1909, с. 267-322; 14: 3, 1909, с. 118-174; 15: 1, 1910, с. 1-62; 18: 3, 1913, с. 1-102
- Iatsimirskii 1913 (1914).** А. И. Яцимирскій, "Къ исторіи ложныхъ молитвъ въ южнославянской письменности". ["To the history of False Prayers in South Slavonic Literature"]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣлення Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии наук*, 18: 4, 1913 (published 1914), с. 16-126
- Iatsimirskii 1921.** А. И. Яцимирскій, *Библиографическій обзоръ апокрифовъ въ южнославянской и русской письменности. Списки памятниковъ. Вып. 1. Апокрифы Ветхозавѣтныя*. (Издание Отдѣлення Русскаго языка и словесности Россійской Академіи наукъ). [*Bibliographical Survey of South-Slavonic and Russian Apocryphal Literature. Catalogue of Monuments. Old Testament Apocrypha*. Vol. 1], Петроградъ, 1921
- Ivanchev 1981.** Светомир Иванчев, "Развоят на *tj, dj* в *шт* и *жд* и етногенетичният процес на Балканите". — *Palaeobulgarica*, 5:1, 1981, с. 27-47
- Ivanov 1925.** Йордан Иванов, *Богомилски книги и легенди*. [*Books and Legends of the Bogomils*]. София, 1925
- Ivanov 1935.** Йордан Иванов, *Старобългарски разкази: текстове, новобългарски превод и бележки* [*Old Bulgarian Tales: Original Texts and Translations in Modern Bulgarian, with Commentaries*]. София, 1935
- Ivanova 2004.** Климентина Иванова, "Един литургичен паралел към апокрифа «Как Михаил победи Сатанаил»" ["One liturgical parallel to the apocryphal narrative *How Michael Defeated Satanael*"]. — In: Ц. Степанов & В. Вачкова, (ред.), *Civitas Divino-Humana. In honorem annorum LX Georgii Bakalov*. София, 2004, с. 397-404
- Jovanović 1995.** Томислав Јовановић, "Траг апокрифа о борби са ђаволом у српској народној књижевности". ["On the apocryphal text about the struggle with the Devil in Serbian popular literature"] — *Књижевност и језик*, 43: 3-4, 1995, с. 33-55
- Köngäs 1960.** Elli Kaija Köngäs, "The Earth-Diver (Th. A 812)" — *Ethnohistory*, 7, 1960, pp. 151-180
- Korobka 1909.** Н. И. Коробка. "Образъ птицы, творящей міръ, в русской народной поэзии и письменности. 1. Сказаніе о Тиверіадскомъ морѣ и колядки о двухъ голубяхъ, творящихъ

- миръ. А). Образъ птицы, творящей миръ, в *Сказаниі о Тиверіадскомъ морѣ*”. [“The image of the bird creating the world in Russian folk poetry and in literature. Part One: *The Legend of the Sea of Tiberias* and Christmas carols about two doves creating the world. A) The image of the bird creating the world in the *Legend of the Sea of Tiberias*”]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наук*, 14: 4, 1909, с. 175-195
- Korobka 1910**. Н. И. Коробка. “Образъ птицы, творящей миръ, в русской народной поэзіи и письменности. 1. *Сказаніе о Тиверіадскомъ морѣ* и колядки о двухъ голубяхъ, творящихъ миръ. Б) Колядки о голубяхъ, творящихъ миръ”. [“The image of the bird creating the world in Russian folk poetry and in literature. Part One: *The Legend of the Sea of Tiberias* and Christmas carols about two doves creating the world. B) The Christmas carols about the doves creating the world”] — *Извѣстія Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наук*, 15: 1, 1910, с. 105-147
- Kulik 2010**. А. Kulik, *3 Baruch: Greek Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*. Berlin, 2010
- Kuznetsova 1998**. Вера С. Кузнецова. *Дуалистические легенды о сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции*. [Dualistic legends about the Creation of the World in East Slavonic Folklore Tradition]. Новосибирск, 1998
- Lincoln 1986**. Bruce Lincoln, *Myth, Cosmos, Society. Indo-European Themes of Creation and Destruction*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1986
- Mach 1999**. М. Mach, “Uriel”. — In: Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, Pieter W. Van der Horst, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 1999, p. 885-886
- Marinov 1914**. Димитър Маринов, “Жива старина: народна вяра и религиозни народни обичаи”. [“Living Antiquities: Folk Beliefs and Religious Folk Customs”] — *Сборник за народни умотворения и народопис*, 28, 1914, с. 1-574 (a monograph issue)
- Markov 1913**. А. Марков, “*Море Тиверіадское* в дуалистический легендѣ о сотворении мира”. [“*The Sea of Tiberias* in the dualistic legend about the Creation of the World”]. — *Этнографическое обозрѣніе*, 96-97: 1-2, 1913, с. 64-75
- Mianecki 2002**. Adrian Mianecki, “Ludowe Kosmogonie a Problem Religii Słowian Zachodnich” [“Folk cosmogonies and the problem of religion of the Western Slavs”]. — *Literatura ludowa*, 46:4/5, 2002, pp. 21-29
- Miltenova 1981**. Анисава Милтенова, “Апокрифът за борбата на Архангел Михаил със Сатанаил в две редакции” [“Two redactions of the apocryphal text about the contest between Archangel Michael and Satanael”]. — *Старобългарска литература*, 9, 1981, с. 98-113
- Miltenova 1983**. Анисава Милтенова, “Неизвестна редакция на апокрифа за борбата на Архангел Михаил със Сатанаил” [“One unknown redaction of the apocryphal text about the contest between Archangel Michael and Satanael”]. — In: Л. Грашева *et al.* (ред.), *Литературознание и фолклористика (В чест на 70-годишнината на академик Петър Динев)* [Studies in literature and folklore: Festschrift P. Dinev]. София, 1983, с. 121-128
- Miltenova 1992**. Анисава Милтенова, “Тивериадското море” [“The Sea of Tiberias”]. — In: Д. Петканова (ред.), *Стара българска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* [Encyclopaedia Lexicon of Old Bulgarian Literature], София, 1992, с. 463-464
- Miltenova 2004**. Анисава Милтенова, *Erotapokriseis: Съчиненията от кратки въпроси и отговори в старобългарската литература* [The Erotapokriseis Writings: Texts Consisting of Short Questions and Answers in Old Bulgarian Literature]. София, 2004
- Mil'kov and Polianskii 2008-2009**. В. В. Мильков и С. М. Полянский. *Космологические произведения в книжности Древней Руси*. Часть 1: Тексты геоцентрической традиции; Часть 2: Тексты плоскостно-комарной и других космологических традиций. Санкт-Петербург, 2009.
- Minczew 2010**. Георги Минчев, “Един богомилски текст? Слово на Св. Йоан Златоуст за това, как Михаил победи Сатанаил”. [“The Homily of John Chrysostom how Michael vanquished Satanael — a Bogomil text?”] — *Palaebulgarica*, 34: 4, 2010, с. 17-46
- Minczew 2011**. Georgi Minczew, “John Chrysostom’s tale on how Michael vanquished Satanael: a Bogomil text?” — *Studia Ceranea*, 1, 2011, pp. 23-54

- Mladenov 1979.** Стефан Младенов. *История на българския език*. (Превод и редакция на проф. Иван Дуриданов от немското издание през 1929 год.). [*Geschihte der Bulgarian Sprache* von Stefan Mladenov (Berlin-Leipzig: Walterde Gruyter, 1929)]. София, 1979
- Mochul'skii 1886, 1887.** В. Мочульский, "Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книгѣ". ["Historical and Literary Analysis of the *Book of the Dove Stanzas*"]. — *Русскій Филологическій Вѣстникъ* [*Russian Philological Journal*]. 16: 4, 1886, с. 197-219; 17:1, 1887, с. 113-180; 17:2, 1887, с. 365-406; 18:3, 1887, с. 41-142; 18:4, 1887, с. 171-188
- Mochul'skii 1894.** "Слѣды Народной Библии в славянской и древне-русской письменности". ["Vestiges of the Folk Bible in Slavonic and Old Russian Literature"] — *Записки Императорскаго Новороссійскаго Университета*, 61, Одесса, 1894, с. 1-282
- Morfill and Charles 1896.** W. R. Morfill and R. H. Charles. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Translated from the Slavonic by W. R. Morfill and edited, with introduction, notes and indices by R. H. Charles. Oxford, 1896
- Nachov 1892, 1894.** Н. А. Начов, "Тиквешки ръкопис" — *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина*, 8, 1892, с. 389-418; 10, 1894, с. 69-193
- Nachtigall 1902.** Rajko Nachtigall, "Ein Beitrag zu den Forschungen über die sogenannte 'Беседа трехъ святителей' (Gespräch dreier Heiligen)" — *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*, 24, 1902, pp. 321-408
- Nagy 2006.** Ilona Nagy, "The earth-diver myth (Mot. 812) and the apocryphal legend of the Tiberian Sea." — *Acta ethnographica Hungarica*, 51:3-4, 2006, pp. 281-326
- Orlov 2007.** Andrei A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. Leiden, Boston, 2007
- Petkanova 1978.** Донка Петканова, *Апокрифна литература и фолклор: апокрифната художествена проза и фолклорът*. [*Apocryphal Literature and Folklore*]. София, 1978
- Petkanova 1982.** Донка Петканова (ред.). *Стара българска литература*. Том 1: *Апокрифи*. [*Old Bulgarian Literature*. Vol. 1: *Apocrypha*]. София, 1982
- Petkanova 1992.** Донка Петканова (съставител), *Старобългарска литература: енциклопедичен речник*. [*Encyclopaedia Lexicon of Old Bulgarian Literature*]. София, 1992
- Petkanova 2005.** Донка Петканова, *По книжовния път на миналото*. [*Walking Along the Bygone Path of Literature*]. София, 2005
- Popov 1880.** А. Н. Поповъ, "Библиографическіе материалы, собранные Андреемъ Поповымъ (4). Южнорусскій сборникъ 1679 года." ["Bibliographical Data Collected by A. Popov (4): South-Russian Miscellany dated 1679"]. — *Чтенія в Императорскомъ Обществѣ Исторіи и Древностей Россійскихъ при Московскомъ университетѣ* (Юль-Сентябрь), Кн. 3, 1880, с. 66-139
- Porfir'ev 1877.** И. Порфирьевъ, "Апокрифическія сказанія о ветхозавѣтныхъ лицахъ и событіяхъ по рукописямъ Соловецкой библиотеки" ["Apocryphal Legends About Old Testament Characters and Events from the Manuscripts of the Solovetsky Monastery Library"]. — *Сборникъ Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наукъ*, 17: 1, 1877, с. 1-276, Санктпетербургъ, 1877 (a monograph issue)
- Potebnia 1886.** А. Потебня, "Обзоръ поэтическихъ мотивовъ колядокъ и щедривокъ" ["Survey of Poetic Motifs in Christmas Carols. Part 75: The Beginning of the world"]. — *Русскій Филологическій Вѣстникъ*. 16: 4, 1886, с. 273 (738)-275(740)
- Pypin 1862.** Александръ Пыпинъ, *Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графомъ Григориемъ Кушелевымъ-Безбородко. Выпуск третій. Ложныя и отреченныя книги русской старины, собранныя А. Н. Пыпинымъ*. [*Monuments of Old Russian Literature, Published by Count Kushlev-Berzborodko. (3): False and Proscribed Books of Russian Antiquities, Collected by A. N. Pypin*]. Санкт Петербург, 1862
- Radchenko 1903.** К. Радченко, "Заметки о пергаментномъ сборнике 14 века Венской Придворной Библиотеки" ["Notes on a 14th century parchment miscellany from the Vienna Imperial Library"]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наукъ*, 8:4, 1903, с. 175-211

- Radchenko 1910.** К. Радченко, "Этюды по богомилству" ["Treatises on Bogomilism"]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наук*, 15: 4, 1910, с. 73-131
- Rosenthal 1989.** F. Rosenthal (ed. and transl.) *The History of Prophets and Kings (Tarīkh al-rusul wa'l-mulūk) by Al-Tabarī. From the Creation to the Flood*. Vol. 1 (Albany, NY, 1989)
- Russell 2009.** James Russell, "The Rhyme of the Book of the Dove (Stikh o Golubinoi Knige): From Zoroastrian Cosmology and Armenian Heresiology to the Russian Novel". — In: Ch. Allison et al. (eds), *From Daena to Dîn. Religion, Kultur und Sprache in der iranischen Welt. Festschrift für Philip Kreyenbroek zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden, 2009
- SbNU 1889-2002** (Vols 1-62). *Сборник за народни умотворения [Miscellany of Folk Lore, Scholarship and Literature]*. From Vol. 1 to Vol. 27 it is designated as *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина*. As from Vol. 28, the heading is changed to *Сборник за народни умотворения и народотис*.
- Scatton 1978.** Ernest A. Scatton, "Old Church Slavonic t̃j/dj → št/žd". — *Linguistics*, 16 (208), 1978, pp. 13-21.
- Selishchev 1951.** А. М. Селищев, *Старославянский язык (Часть 1) [Old Slavonic Language (1)]*. Москва, 1951
- Shchapov 1863.** Я. Н. Щаповъ, "Историческіе очерки народнаго міросозерцанія и суевѣрія (Православнаго и Старообрядческаго)" ["Historical treatises on vernacular worldview and superstition (Among Orthodox Christians and Old Believers)"] — *Журналь Министерства Народнаго Просвѣщенія*, 117, Мартъ, 1863, с. 75-92
- Šmitek 1998.** Zmago Šmitek, "Slovensle ljudske predstave o stvaranju sveta" ["Slovene folk notions about the creation of the world"]. — *Traditiones: acta Instituti Ethnographiae Slovenorum*, 27, 1998, p. 111-123
- Sokolov 1888.** Матвѣй Соколовъ. *Матеріалы и замѣтки по старинной славянской литературѣ Матвѣя Соколова*. Выпускъ 1. [*Materials and Notes on Old Slavonic Literature*. Vol. 1]. Москва, 1888
- Sokolov 1899.** Матвѣй Соколовъ. "Матеріалы и замѣтки по старинной славянской литературѣ Матвѣя Соколова. Выпускъ 3 (VII). Славянская книга Эноха (II). Текстъ с латинскимъ переводомъ." — *Чтенія въ Императорскомъ Обществѣ исторіи и древностей російскихъ при Московскомъ Университетѣ*, 1899, Кн. 4. Москва, 1899
- Sokolov 1910.** Матвѣй И. Соколовъ. *Славянская книга Еноха Праведнаго. Тексты, латинскій перевод и изслѣдованіе. Посмертный трудъ автора, приготовилъ к изданію М. Сперанскій*. Изданіе Императорскаго Общества Исторіи и Древностей Російскихъ при Московскомъ Университетѣ. [*The Slavonic Book of Enoch the Just*]. (Posthumous publication of the unfinished manuscript, edited by M. N. Speranskii). Москва, 1910
- Sparks 1984.** H. F. D. Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Oxford, 1984
- Sreznevskii 1893-1903.** И. И. Срезневскій. *Матеріалы для словаря древне-русского языка по письменнымъ памятникам*. Изданіе Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наук, Т. 1-3. [*Materials for the Dictionary of the Old Russian Language According to the Written Sources*, Vols 1-3]. Санктпетербургъ, 1893-1903
- Sreznevskii 1904.** В. И. Срезневскій, "Отчетъ Отдѣленію русскаго языка и словесности Императорской Академіи Наук о поѣздкѣ въ Олонецкую, Вологодскую и Пермскую губерніи (Іюнь 1902). Перечень приобрѣтенныхъ рукописей." ["Report to the Department of Russian Language and Literature at the Imperial Academy of Sciences regarding the expedition to the Olonets, Vologda and Perm Gubernias (carried out in June 1902). List of acquired manuscripts"]. — *Извѣстія Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи наук*, 9: 1, 1904, с. 183-214; 9: 2, 1904, с. 96-161; 9: 3, 1904, с. 41-104
- Stillman 1974.** Norman A. Stillman. "The Story of Cain and Abel in the Qur'an and the Muslim commentators: some observations" — *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 19, 1974, pp. 231-239
- Stone and Bergen 1998.** Michael Stone and Theodore A. Bergen (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1998
- Stone 2000a.** Michael Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance". — In: Gary A. Anderson et al. (eds.), *Literature on Adam and Eve*. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000, pp. 43-56

- Stone 2000b.** Michael Stone, "The legend of the cheirograph of Adam". — In: Gary A. Anderson *et al.* (eds.), *Literature on Adam and Eve*. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000, pp. 149-166.
- Stone 2002.** Michael Stone, *Adam's Contract with Satan: The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam*. Bloomington, 2002
- Stoyanov 2001.** Yuri Stoyanov, "Islamic and Christian heterodox water cosmogonies from the Ottoman period — parallels and contrasts." — *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London*, 64:1, 2001, pp. 19-33
- Stoyanov 2004.** Yuri Stoyanov, "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, pp. 171-217
- Thompson 1991.** Francis Thompson. "John the Exarch's theological education and proficiency in Greek as revealed by his abridged translation of John of Damascus' *De Fide Orthodoxa*". — *Palaeobulgarica*, 15:1, pp. 35-58
- Thompson 1993.** Francis Thompson. "The Symeonian Florilegium: problems of its origin, content, textology and edition, together with an English translation of the Eulogy of Tzar Symeon". — *Palaeobulgarica*, 17:1, pp. 37-53
- Thompson 1955-1958.** Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk Literature. A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Medieval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books and Local Legends*, Vols 1-6, Copenhagen, 1955-1958
- Tikhonravov 1863.** Николай Тихонравовъ. *Памятники отреченной русской литературы, собранные и изданы Николаемъ Тихонравовымъ*, Т. 1-2 [*Monuments of Proscribed Russian Literature*], Vols 1-2. Санктпетербургъ, 1863
- Tolstaia 1988.** Светлана Михайловна Толстая, "О нескольких ветхозаветных мотивах в славянской народной традиции" ["On Some Old Testament Motifs in Slavonic Folk Tradition"]. — In: В. Петрухин (отв. ред.), *От Бытия к Исходу: отражение библейских сюжетов в славянской и еврейской народной культуре. Сборник статей [From Genesis to Exodus: the Reflection of Biblical Plots in Slavonic and Jewish Popular Cultures. Collection of Articles]*. Москва, 1998, с. 21-37
- Tolstoy 1995 a.** Никита Ильич Толстой, "Бинарные противопоставления *правый-левый, мужской-женский*" ["The binary oppositions *left-right* and *male-female*"]. — In: *Язык и народная культура [Language and Popular Culture]*. Москва, 1995, с. 151-166
- Tolstoy 1995 b.** Никита Ильич Толстой, "Откуда дьяволы разные? (Заметки по славянской демонологии)" ["From where did different devils come? (Notes on Slavonic demonology)"]. — In: *Язык и народная культура. [Language and Popular Culture]*. Москва, 1995, с. 245-249
- Tolstoy 1995 c.** Никита Ильич Толстой, "Каков облик дьявольский" (Заметки по славянской демонологии)" ["What is the Devil's appearance? (Notes on Slavonic demonology)"]. — In: *Язык и народная культура. [Language and Popular Culture]*. Москва, 1995, с. 250-269
- Tomicki 1976.** Ryszard Tomicki, "Słowiański mit kosmogoniczny". ["Slavonic cosmogonic myth"]. — *Etnografia polska*, 20:1, 1976, pp. 47-97
- Tomicki 1979.** Ryszard Tomicki, "Ludowa kosmogonia dualistyczna Słowiań w świetle Samojedzkich mitów stworzenia". ["Dualistic Folk Cosmogony of Slavonic People in the Light of Samoyedic Myths of Creation"]. — *Etnografia Polska*, 23: 2, 1979, pp. 169-184
- Tomicki 1980.** Ryszard Tomicki, "Ludowe mity o stworzeniu człowieka. Z badań nad synkretyzmem mitologicznym w Europie Wschodniej i Południowej oraz w Azji Północnej" ["Folk myths about the creation of man: research on mythological syncretism in Eastern and Southern Europe and in Northern Asia"]. — *Etnografia polska*, 24:2, 1980, pp. 49-119
- Totomanova 2008.** Анна-Мария Тотоманова, *Славянската версия на хрониката на Георги Синкел*. София, 2008
- Trendafilov 1998.** Христо Трендафилов, "Иоанн Экзарх и становление славянского теологического монологизма" ["John the Exarch and the Establishment of Slavonic Theological Monologism"]. — In: А. Ангушева-Тиханова *et al.* (съст.), *Медиевистика и културна антропология. Сборник в чест на 40-годишната творческа дейност на*

- проф. Донка Петканова. [*Medieval Studies and Cultural Anthropology: Festschrift Petkanova*]. София, 1998, с. 154-161
- Tromp 2000.** Johannes Tromp, "Cain and Abel in the Greek and Armenian/Georgian Recensions of *The Life of Adam and Eve*." — In: Gary A. Anderson et al. (eds.), *Literature on Adam and Eve*. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000, p. 277-296
- Tseitlin 1999.** Раля Михайловна Цейтлин et al. (ред.), *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X-XI веков)* [*Old Slavonic Dictionary: Based on Data from 10th-11th century Manuscripts*]. Москва, 1999
- Vaillant 2009.** А. Вайан, *Руководство по старославянскому языку* [*Manuel du Vieux Slave*]. Москва, 2009
- Vasmer 1986-1987.** Макс Фасмер, *Этимологический словарь русского языка* (В четырех томах). Перевод с немецкого и дополнения члена-корреспондента АН СССР О. Н. Трубачева. Издание второе, стереотипное. Т. 2 (Е — Муж), Т. 3 (Муза—Сят) [*Etymological Dictionary of Russian Language*, Vols. 2-3]. Москва, 1986, 1987
- Velčeva 1979.** Боряна Велчева, "Protoslavlic dental palatalization and Bulgarian št" — *Folia Slavica*, 3:1-2 (*Studies in Honour of Horace G. Lunt*, Part 2). Columbus, Ohio, pp. 249-255
- Velcheva 1980.** Боряна Велчева, *Праславянски и старобългарски фонологически изменения*. София, 1980
- Velcheva 1988.** Боряна Велчева, "Старобългарски шт и жд и буквата џ в глаголицата". — *Palaeobulgarica*, 12:1, 1988, с. 29-37
- Veselovskii 1883, 1889.** Александръ Николаевичъ Веселовский, "Разысканія въ области русскаго духовнаго стиха" ["Explorations in the realm of Russian Spiritual Stanzas]. — *Сборникъ Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи Наукъ*, 32: 4, 1883, с. 1-461; 46:6, 1889, с. 1-367 (with an appendix, 1-106)
- West 1971.** M. West, "The Cosmology of 'Hippocrates', De Hebdomadibus" — *The Classical Quarterly*. (New Series) 21 (2) [Nov. 1971], p. 365-388
- Zavaritskii 1916.** Гавриль Кирилловичъ Заварицкий, "О томъ свѣтъ и объ этомъ: рассказы Саратовскаго Поволжья". ["About this world and the beyond: tales from the region of Saratovskoe Povolzhie"] — *Этнографическое обозрѣніе*, 109-110: 1-2, 1916, с. 67-83
- Zwemer 1939.** S. M. Zwemer, *Studies in Popular Islam*. London & New York, 1939

**ПИСАНИЯ СЕЛСКИ ИЗМАМНИ:
ИЛИ ЗА САМОРАСЛЕЦИТЕ В АПОКРИФНАТА КНИЖНИНА НА
SLAVIA ORTHODOXA**

Флорентина Бадаланова Гелер

Апокрифното "Сказание за Тивериадското море" е уникална творба със скромно наглед родословие. То е самобитен книжовен продукт с интригуващо потекло, което не възхожда към литературния елит на *Slavia orthodoxa*, а към глъбинните пластове на нейната витална културна традиция. Протографът му ще да е възникнал в средновековна България като плод на усилията на доморасли книжовници, които най-вероятно ще да са били и даровити певци и разказвачи на народни приказки, легенди и предания. Що за хора са били тези самоуки интелектуалци и какво е било естеството на създадения от тях културен продукт? Трябва ли той да бъде смятан за литературна творба *sensu*

stricto, или е представлявал устен наротив, съдържанието на който впоследствие е било прилежно записано — вероятно от същите тези хора, които са го разказвали или разпявали като устен текст — на страниците на толкова сурово осъжданите и презирани от праволинейните духовни пастири “*писания селски измамни*”? Ако е така, някои съвременни теоретични възгледи, основани на презумцията за ниското равнище на грамотността в *Slavia orthodoxa*, трябва да бъдат сериозно преосмислени. Нещо повече: анализът на апокрифното “Сказание за Тивериадското море” показва, че самобитните носители на фолклорната ни словесност определено са познавали много от творбите, възхождащи към богатото апокрифно наследство на византийската културна традиция; в сюжетната линия на “Сказанието за Тивериадското море” прозират наротивни фрагменти от “Книга за светите тайни Енохови”, “Откровение Варухово”, “Слово за лъжливия Антихрист, безбожния Сатанаил, как го плени архангел Михаил, войвода на всички ангели”, “Слово за Адам и Ева”, “Слово за Честния кръст”, “Прение на Антихриста с Господа наш Исус Христос”, както и редица откъслечи от еротапокритични текстове (“Разумник”, “Беседа на тримата светители”). Богатството на тази палитра от книжовни източници е впечатляващо. То показва, че авторите на “Сказанието за Тивериадското море” са били добре запознати със съдържанието на “класическото” византийско апокрифно наследство. В същото време обаче те са останали верни на своите *устни* самобитни космогонии, инкорпорирайки ги в тъканта на *книжното* апокрифно повествование и създавайки по този начин една друга, “*доморасла Палея*”. И накрая — но не и на последно място! — този творчески процес е сериозно повлиян от богомилската традиция, следи от която остават живи в недрата на фолклорната ни култура до най-ново време.