

The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries on the Book of Prophet Daniel

Ivan I. Iliev

The work of Saint Hippolytus of Rome (c. 170–235) covers certain spheres of dogmatics, polemics, exegesis, homiletics and history, and his texts can be grouped in several thematic circles. Among the numerous works of Hippolytus, in spite of some scholarly discussions, the following texts are considered definitely to have come out under his hand:

Exegesis:

1. *Interpretatio cantici cantorum*, CPG 1871, translated into Armenian and Georgian, separate fragments of which have survived to this day in Byzantine Greek, Armenian, and Syriac manuscripts. In the Slavonic tradition, the work is known from three manuscripts. The first is a 16th-century manuscript kept at the Holy Trinity – St. Sergius Lavra (No. 730, *Palaea with additional texts*), the second – a 17th-century manuscript from the Moscow Synodal Library (No. 548), and the third, a codex containing parts of this *Commentary* of Hippolytus, is a manuscript from the second half of the 15th century at the Russian National Library – St. Petersburg, Pogodyn collection No. 81.¹ These texts are found in at least two catenae in South Slavonic tradition.

2. *De Christo et Antichristo*, CPG 1872, which is one of the well-known and famous work of Hippolytus, enjoyed widespread reception in the Middle Ages and a large area across in which it has been disseminated. It has been preserved in Georgian and Ethiopian versions, in Armenian and Syriac fragments, as well as in Old Bulgarian. Some parts overlap with *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* and are shared by the two works.

¹ Alekseev 2002: 40–122; Dimitrova 2012: 18. Fragments of the *Commentaries* are also contained in manuscript 4/14, of 1456, f. 195b–200a (See Hristova 1996: 16); the South Slavonic copies are not included in CPG.

3. *Commentarii in Daniele*, CPG 1873, which closely corresponds and refers to the *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, is also very popular and frequently translated into many languages at various periods. It is an interesting peculiarity of the text that the original Greek text² is frequently relayed in a fragmentary form and is controversial in places, although it also exists in full in the collection of Vatopedi Monastery on Mt. Athos (Vatopedi 290³), it has been preserved integrally in several copies of the Slavonic translation. In addition, translations into Armenian and Syriac have been also made.

4. *Benedictiones Isaac et Iacob*, CPG 1874, which were unknown in Eastern Europe but were translated among Caucasian peoples.

5. *Benedictiones Moysis*, CPG 1875, partially preserved in Greek alone.

6. *De David et Goliath*, CPG 1876, preserved only in Georgian translation.

7. Individual fragments of commentaries on the Octateuch have survived in Greek, but also in Arabic (*In Octateuchum*, CPG 1880).

8. Commentaries on the Book of Kings, preserved in Greek and Syriac (*Commentarii in Reges*, CPG 1881).

9. Fragments on the Psalms, known only in Greek (*In Psalmos*, CPG 1882).

10. Commentaries on the Proverbs in separate fragments (*Commentarii in Prouerbia*, CPG 1883).

11. Commentaries on Ecclesiastes, separate parts (*In Ecclesiasten*, CPG 1884).

12. A single fragment of a commentary on the beginning of Isaiah (*In initium Isaiae*, CPG 1885).

13. A Syriac fragment on Ezekiel (*In Ezechielen*, CPG 1886).

14. A commentary on the Gospel by Matthew preserved in separate parts in Coptic, Arabic and Greek (*In Mattheum*, CPG 1887 et 1888).

15. A commentary on John, fragments (*In Iohannem*, CPG 1889).

16. *De Apocalypsi*, CPG 1890 – there are separate fragments in Arabic and Syriac; a translation into Old Bulgarian is known in numerous copies.

17. *Capita contra Gaium (Apologia)*, CPG 1891).

Chronographic and polemic:

1. Comments on the calculation of Pascha, Greek and Syriac fragments (*Commentarium temporum Paschatis*, CPG 1892).

2. *Chronicle*, translated into Latin, Armenian and Georgian, but not translated into Old Bulgarian (*Chronicon*, CPG 1896).

3. *Against all Heresies*, a work written most probably at the time of Pope Zephyrinus about which there are references in *Φιλοσοφούμενα* (1. 20), Eusebius of

² Greek text after Richard 2000.

³ Richard 2000: 260. Richard 1970.

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

Caesarea (*Historia Ecclesiae*, VI, 22), Saint Jerome (*De viris illustribus*, 61) and Patriarch Photius (Βιβλιοθήκη, 121), preserved in separate fragments (*Syntagma contra omnes haereses*, CPG 1897).

4. *De universo*, CPG 1898, known from fragments.

5. Φιλοσοφούμενα – *Against all Heresies* (Ἐλεγχος or *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, CPG 1899) – the issue of the authenticity of Hippolytus's authorship is still open, although this work, ascribed to him by Eusebius and Jerome, is dated after 222.

6. *De resurrectione ad Mammaeam imperatricem*, CPG 1900, survived in Greek and Syriac fragments.

7. *De resurrectione et incorruptibilitate*, CPG 1901, known from a single fragment.

8. A polemic work known as *Contra Noetum*, CPG 1902.

The dubious works (*dubia*) include:

1. *Oratio de consumatione mundi*, CPG 1910 – a text which is controversial from the point of view of its authorship, but which is ascribed to Hippolytus and which is very popular in medieval Slavonic tradition, also existing in Armenian translation.

2. *Index apostolorum et discipulorum*, CPG 1911, a work popular among the orthodox Slavs, the first fragment of it is included in the *First Miscellany of Tsar Simeon* (*Izbornik* of 1073).

Several chronicles, erotapocritical works, homilies and other commentaries on the prophets are ascribed to Hippolytus along with these works.⁴

As mentioned above, the translation of *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* – the oldest and most comprehensive commentary on part of the Old Testament – is one of the important works from the early period of Old Bulgarian literature. The work became popular in the recently Christianized Bulgarian state probably because of the fear of heresies, on the one hand, and of cataclysmic events, on the other. In the years around the end of the 9th century thousands in Christian Europe expected the Apocalypse and saw any coincidence with the commented prophets, natural disaster or curious phenomenon in the heavens as an omen of the end of days. Book IV of the *Commentaries* contains a reference to the birth of Christ on December 25, about which all Christians were extremely concerned and Hippolytus is the first to give such information. Another important subject is the chronology of kingdoms in world history and their role in Christian eschatology. This popular subject is also contained in the excerpt from the work included in the *First Miscellany of Tsar Simeon* known from a Russian copy of 1073 (*Izbornik*) (f. 162c-d–163a-b) – the most representative and significant 10th century book dedicated to the faith, a symbol of the power of Christianized Slav rulers.

⁴ Bibliography on the life and works of Saint Hippolytus, see in: Richard 1976, more particularly about his work: col. 537–545.

The question about the translation of the Old Testament Book of Daniel as a text in its entirety and as excerpts has not been fully resolved in Palaeo-Slavonic studies. There is an opinion that parts of the Book of Daniel are the first to have been included in the prophetologion (προφητολόγιον, Old Testament readings for vespers) in the initial Cyrillo-Methodian translation.⁵ Ivan Evseev compares the translation in the prophetologion (which he ascribes to Constantine Cyril the Philosopher and terms it as „Cyril’s translation“) with the translation of the Book of Prophet Daniel included in the so-called *Arhivski Chronograph* (f. 181, No.3, 279/658, Central State Archive of Ancient Documents /РГАДА/, Moscow) (which he calls a „Methodian translation“) and the text of this biblical book in the so-called prophetic books with commentaries, which he calls a „Simeonic translation.“⁶ Next, the translation of the *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* by Hippolytus of Rome is mentioned in the work of Ivan Evseev:⁷ he quotes excerpts from it among the lexical variants (variant readings) in his publication of the Slavonic versions of the biblical Book of Daniel, but the content of the commentaries has not been analysed yet. The author comes up with the hypothesis that this translation formed the basis of the so-called Old Testament Books of Prophets with commentaries, translated in the 10th century. In the 20th century and onwards Evseev’s publication is criticized by Anatolij Alekseev, who underscores that his thesis about the dependence between the *Commentaries* and the Old Testament Books of Prophets with commentaries is unfounded.⁸ Francis Thomson also supports the same opinion.⁹

The oldest manuscript containing a fragment of Hippolytus’s *Commentaries* are the Pogodin Folia (also known as the Moscow Folia in Cyrillic-Glagolitic) from the 11th–12th century (hereinafter *P*), with preserved Glagolitic letters proving the early date of the Old Bulgarian translation.¹⁰ Today the two parchment folios are kept at the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg under No. 68. They are written on parchment with dimensions 20.8 x 16.4, each with 27 lines per folio. The handwriting is characterized as small uncial, with straight and compact inscription and a total of 15 Glagolitic letters. The most important linguistic peculiarities include: use of the two *yers* at their etymological locations, without vocalisation, ꙗе is written instead of ꙗѣ, contracted forms of imperfect tense endings are the rule. At one place the genitive form нѣѣсоже of the pronoun нѣѣѣтоже is used as a nominative. These folia contain a fragment of Book III of Hippolytus’s *Commentaries* on the fifth vision of the prophet Daniel (about the huge tree) first identified by Grigorij Il’inskij.¹¹

⁵ Karachorova 2003: 101-105.

⁶ Evseev 1905: IX–XXXVIII.

⁷ Evseev 1905: XXXVIII–XL

⁸ Alekseev 1999: 160.

⁹ Thomson 1998: 865–866.

¹⁰ Totomanova KME 2003: 177–178.

¹¹ Il’inskij 1929: 86–118.

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

The oldest dated Slavonic manuscript selectively containing a large part of Hippolytus's *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* is the famous Chudov 12 (State Historical Museum, Moscow), dated at the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century (hereinafter *C*), published, described and analysed by Kapiton Nevostruev, Izmail Sreznevskij and Ivan Evseev¹², which – the scholars are unanimous – is a copy of an original created in Preslav in the 10th century and contains the portrait of a ruler (perhaps Boris).¹³ It contains 127 folios (initially 138) on good quality parchment, written in large uncial in two columns. It contains the following two works: *Иполита епискоупа съказаниѣ о христосѣ и ѡ антихристѣ* from f. 2 to f. 68, from where the *Commentary* begins – *Тогоже отъ данила съказаниѣ о видѣнни. ѿ.*, and from f. 87: *видѣнниѣ четвѣртоѣ данила пророка. о ѡбразѣ и о трѣхъ отроцѣхъ*. There are traces of later interventions and marginal notes from the 14th – 15th century. The text features tangible Russifications, the use of the *jers* is not consistent and Russian continuants of the Proto-Slavic groups *tolt, *tort, *telt, *telt rarely appear but the Old Bulgarian original is seen distinctively.

Manuscript No. 92 from the Antonievo-Sijskij Monastery is a later one, today in the Arkhangelsk collection, Арханг. Д 171 at the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, from the end of the 15th – the beginning of the 16th century (hereinafter *A*), dated by the watermarks of the paper that was used.¹⁴ The manuscript is in quarto format, including I + 428 + I paper folios, inscribed in semi-uncial with elements of cursive. It contains *Dialogues* by Gregory the Great, *Vita* of the Seven Holy sleepers from Ephesus, the *Story* about the Holy fathers slain at Sinai and Raithu, Andreas of Caesarea's *Commentary on the Book of Revelation*, Hippolytus's *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist* and *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel*. The last two works are recorded in the short description of Aleksej Viktorov,¹⁵ but are not mentioned in the contemporary academic description.¹⁶ The copies have not been studied or published. The orthography is Russian; there are two letters for the nasals with the letter for the front nasal replacing ѡ; two *jers*, with *jers* in a weak position being omitted in some places.

The Petrozavodsk manuscript, No. 74 (71), previously from the library of the Petrozavodsk Archbishopric No. 11 is also created approximately at the same time. It is dated at the end of the 15th – the beginning of the 16th century according to the

¹² Nevostruev 1868: 2–4; Sreznevskij 1874: 4–35; Evseev 1905.

¹³ Uhanova 2012.

¹⁴ The watermarks (most of which are a bull's head in different variants, from the 1480s and the 1490s, or from the very beginning of the 16th century) were identified and placed at the disposal of this author by Alexej Sergeev (a researcher at the Manuscript Department of the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences), for which I am extremely grateful.

¹⁵ Viktorov 1890: 86.

¹⁶ Belova, Kukushkina 1989: 228.

watermarks (hereinafter *K*). The text is written in semi-uncial, on 179 f. 4°, with dimensions 20 x 14. Cinnabar is used for the titles and the initials. There are numerous marginal notes and separate glosses added in the margins by later Russian scribes.¹⁷ The beginning of the manuscript includes Hippolytus's work on the Antichrist, then from f. 43 – the fourth vision of *The fiery furnace*; from 63v – the fifth vision about *Nebuchadnezzar's madness*; from f. 78v – the sixth vision about *Belshazzar's feast*; from f. 81v – the seventh vision about *Daniel in the lions' den*; 91v – the eighth vision about *The beasts from the sea and the Son of Man*; f. 117 – the ninth vision about *The ram and the he-goat*; f. 121 – the tenth vision concerning the *Interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy weeks*; f. 128v – Daniel's last vision about *The angel's revelation: kings of the north and south*; f. 133 – twelfth vision; f. 151 – Daniel's first vision; f. 155 – commentary on the first chapter of the Book of Daniel about the *Captives in Babylon* and about the story of *Susanna and the Elders*; the manuscript ends on f. 179v with a late 18th century addition about Hieronymus Abbas.¹⁸ The spelling is Russian, one *jus*, ꙗ being replaced by оу, two *jers*.

Manuscript No. 486 from the Volokolamsk collection, former collection of the Moscow Theological Academy, today kept at the Russian State Library in Moscow¹⁹ (hereinafter *M*). It consists of 306 paper folios, in quarto format, written in large semi-uncial by a scribe with a firm and well-schooled hand, with small changes in the outline of letters. The *Commentaries* of Hippolytus are divided into chapters with large ornated titles in cinnabar. There are 15 lines per folio. There are numerous additions of the scribe in the margins, correcting his omissions, but there are also later corrections from another hand in places. This manuscript traditionally includes from f. 1r: КНИГА ДАНИЛА ПРРОКА ВИДѢНІЕ ИПОЛИТА. ЕПІПА ПАПЫ РИМСКѢ ПЛѢЗКОВАНІЕ. СКАЗАНІЕ Ѡ ХРИСТѢ И Ѡ АНТИХРІТѢ:, f. 79r: Ѡ трѣхъ ѡтроцѣхъ како в пещь ѡгньнѣхъ ввержени быша. ВИДѢНІЕ Д., e., f. 121v: того же Ѡ видѣніе. Ѣ. Ѡ сзвѣстїе еже Ѡ дѣлѣхъ и егда изгнанъ бысть навходоносоръ., f. 142r: Ѡ шестѣхъ видѣніи. и Ѡ запастіи рѣкы: слово. Д., f. 152r: Ѡ седмѣхъ видѣніи и Ѡ възмѣтанїи даниловѣхъ ѡже въ ѡмѣхъ къ львомъ. слово. Ѣ., f. 167v: того же слово Ѡ видѣніи Ѡ четырьѣхъ звѣрехъ :, f. 204r: Ѡ девѣтомъ видѣніи и Ѡ ѡбъхъ. и Ѡ къзлѣхъ. З. f. 210v: Ѡ десѣтѣхъ видѣніи. и Ѡ ѡ седмирицѣхъ, f. 221r: Ѡ первѣхъ ѡдесѣтѣхъ видѣніи и Ѡ црѣхъ оужьскыи. и северьскыи. Ѣ. f. 227r: Ѡ вторѣхъ ѡдесѣтѣхъ видѣніи. слово Ѡ трехъ(х) црѣхъ: д. f. 253v: сѣгаго иполита Ѡ данилѣхъ видѣніе пръвое: ꙗ f. 259r: Ѡ плѣхъ ѡдесѣтѣхъ црѣхъ и сѣговъ. и оуды. іерлѣхъ градъ: д. f. 268v: Ѡ сѣсанѣхъ и Ѡ ѡбоу старцѣхъ. видѣніе второе: в. Its content is identical to that of the Petrozavodsk manuscript (as the author of the description Alexander Pigin has noted), but after the works of Hippolytus there are several legal texts, including a Balsamon commentary on ecclesiastical canons

¹⁷ Pigin 2010: 199–200.

¹⁸ Pigin 2010: 201.

¹⁹ Iosif 1882: 90–91.

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

and a Justinian law. The list of Moscow metropolitans also includes Metropolitan Сурпrian and there is an important marginal note at the end of this manuscript: В лѣто 733 (1519) написана бысть книга сѣдъ въ обители пречистыя владычица наша Богородица, честнаго и славнаго ея Успенія въ устроении преподавнаго отца нашего Юсифа, повелѣниемъ пречестнѣишаго господина и отца моего игумена Данила, рукою грѣшнаго черныишка Лукы малаго. The marginal note clearly shows the year in which the manuscript was written which makes this the single precisely dated copy of the *Commentaries*. Here this copy is the main object of the current study.

The *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* were also copied in a manuscript from the collection of the Holy Trinity-Saint Sergius Lavra, No. 782, Russian State Library, Moscow, from the middle of the 16th century (hereinafter *T*).²⁰ It is a miscellany written in semi-uncial including 461 folios. It includes homiletic and hagiographical works. Among these, the *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist* begins from f. 79 starting with: Сѣго оца, ипполита, къ феофилѣ, полкованіе пррчествъ сѣго пррка, данила, ги блви ѿ. Помыслившиѣ ти по истовомѣ научити са предложенныя намъ ѿ тебе главы, брате мои любимыи Феодиле, after which *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* follow from f. 128v onward: Сѣго пр(о)рока Данила въ видѣнии четверто(м). и сѣдъ разрѣшеніе. The end of f. 209 and 210 is missing. The orthography is Russian, one *jus*, ж being replaced by ѡ, two *jers*.

In addition to the already mentioned codices in which the *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* follow Hippolytus's *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, the discussed text on the Old Testament book is contained in miscellanies including a translation of the *Story of the Destruction of Jerusalem*. Alexander Gorskij and Kapiton Nevostruev assumed that the Greek story of the Late Middle Ages compiled in Constantinople in 1398 was translated and copied in Novgorod in 1468, and was later divided into chapters in 1503.²¹ In this context, the *Commentaries* of Hippolytus are also found in several other copies, as for example No. 217, 16th century, Moscow Theological Academy collection (former Volokolamsk collection), Moscow, State Historical Museum; No. 9 (675), 16th century, Cyrillo-Belozher Monastery collection, St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia²² and others.

In terms of content, two of the surviving manuscripts from the Synodal collection, State Historical Museum, Moscow – No. 178 and No. 182 – in which we find copies of the Menaia for January and July.²³ Research of this version of the text is forthcoming.

In addition to these copies, there is also a short fragment kept at the National Archives of Romania in Bucharest under No. 741 (15th–16th c.) which has been de-

²⁰ Arsenij, Ilarij 1879: 203.

²¹ Gorskij, Nevostruev 1886: 114.

²² Viktorov 1890: 149.

²³ Sreznevskij 1874, Protas'eva 1970: 196–198, 203–205.

Table 1.

Chapters							
III	<p>1) St. Petersburg, Russian National Library No. 68, Cyrillic and Glagolitic writ, 12th c.</p> <p>2) Bucharest, No. 741, 15th–16th c.</p> <p>Fragments</p>	<p>Moscow, State Historical Museum, Chudov collection, No. 12, 11th–12th c.</p>	<p>St. Petersburg, Library of Russian Academy, Arkhangelsk collection, No. Д 171, the end of 15th c. (Antonievo-Sijskij Monastery)</p>	<p>Petrozavodsk, National archive of Karelia, No. 74 (71), (former Archbishopric No. 11), 15th–16th c. (Vygovskiy Monastery)</p>	<p>Moscow, Russian State Library, Volokolamsk collection, No. 486, 1519 r. (former Moscow Theological Academy)</p>	<p>Moscow, Russian State Library, Holy Trinity-Saint Sergius Lavra, No. 782, middle of 16th c.</p>	
IV		<p>F. 68v–87: Того же отъ данила съвѣзданиѣ дѣ видѣвниа въ лето ездурое цртва наеуходасора.</p>	<p>F. 383v: Сѣго прѣ(о)рса данила в видѣвнѣи четвергомы и снх разрѣшеніѣ.</p> <p>F. 383: Въ лето второе цртва наеухв(а)носорома.</p>	<p>F. 43: У тре(х) строехъ како в ле(ц)и мрчнѣхъ вержени вьша. видѣвнѣ. дѣ. слово осоме на деса(г)р). лѣ(г)р). наеухв(а)носороу црѣ . створи тѣло злато.</p>	<p>Л 79: У тре(х) строце(х) како в пецичъ мрчнѣхъ вержени вьша. видѣвнѣ. дѣ. слово бѣ.</p> <p>Въ вьсое на деса(г)р) лѣ(г)р) наеухв(а)носороу црѣ створи тѣло злато.</p>	<p>F. 128v: Сѣго прѣ(о)рса данила. О видѣвнѣи четверго(м) и снх разрѣшеніѣ.</p> <p>Въ лето второе цртва наеухв(а)носорома.</p>	
V	<p>Fragment of the Fifth vision for the huge trees, inc.: ... (пре)мудрѣсть и словеса побѣдаа тмнѣу Христовоу изъ оученинѣхъ дѣхъ и край — асы доуру вратѣ стурочи нѣдоу ѡрта вѣцѣ.</p>	<p>F. 87-127: Видѣвнѣи четвергоѣ данила пророка. о вьрѣзѣ и о трѣхъ строехъ.</p> <p>Въ лето осоме на деса(г)р) наеухв(а)носороу створи оура(з)ъ златѣ.</p>	<p>F. 390: Сѣго прѣ(о)рса данила. о видѣвнѣи платѣ(м), и в дѣбѣ. и како изыгнѣхъ бы наеухв(а)носороу црѣ, наеухв(а)носороу црѣ вьсѣхъ мѣдѣ(м), плѣченѣ(м) и азыкомъ(м).</p>	<p>F. 63v: Того же о видѣвнѣи ѣ с(а)во гѣ о снѣ с(ж) о дѣбѣ и егда изыгнѣхъ бы наеухв(а)носороу наеухв(а)носороу црѣ вьсѣхъ мѣдѣ(м), плѣченѣ(м) и азыкомъ(м).</p>	<p>F. 121v: Того же в видѣвнѣи. ѣ слово. г. в снѣгѣ ене в дѣбѣ и егда изыгнѣхъ вьсѣхъ наеухв(а)носороу. наеухв(а)носороу црѣ вьсѣхъ мѣдѣ(м), плѣченѣ(м) и азыкомъ(м).</p>	<p>F. 139v: Сѣго прѣ(о)рса данила О видѣвнѣи платѣ(м). и О дѣбѣ. И како изыгнѣхъ вьсѣхъ наеухв(а)носороу црѣ. из цртва егѣ. наеухв(а)носороу црѣ вьсѣхъ мѣдѣ(м), плѣченѣ(м) и азыкомъ(м).</p>	

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

VI				<p>F. 400: У шествоу видѣни, и ѿ запасти рѣсъ стго пророка данїиа. Балѣсаръ црѣ створи вечерю великѣъ боларомъ, в(ч)ерю великѣъ боларомъ, и тысячницю(и)</p>	<p>F. 78v: У шествоу видѣнии и о запасти рѣсъ балѣсаръ црѣ створи вечерю великѣъ боларомъ, свонизъ и мѣрениъ тысящни тысящни</p>	<p>F. 142: У шествоу видѣни, и ѿ запасти рѣсъ: слово. д. Балѣсаръ црѣ створи вечерю великѣъ боларомъ, свон(и) и мѣрениъ тысящни</p>	<p>F. 156v: У шествоу видѣни и о запасти рѣсъ стго пророка данїиа: Балѣсаръ црѣ створи вечерю великѣъ боларомъ, свон(и) и тысячницю(и)</p>	
VII					<p>F. 81v: О ѣ видѣни(и) ѿлетѣни данїиомъ ѿже в ѿмѣ. Прин(и)а ѡбо дарни нарѣкши са</p>	<p>F. 152: У седмѣмъ видѣни(и) ѿ ѿлетѣни данїиомъ ѿже вѣ ѿмѣкъ съ львомъ, слово. ѣ. Принизъ оубо дарни нарѣкши са</p>		
VIII	Fragment of the Eight vision in Bucharest No.741. F. 156r-161r и 168v- 169r.			<p>F. 404: Стго пророка данїиа, ѿ четыре(х) зсвѣре(х)ъ— видѣнїе. В лѣ(т) црѣта, балѣ(з)тарѣа црѣа халѣвисаго, данїиа, сонъ видѣ</p>	<p>F. 91v: Того же слово ѿ видѣни(и) ѿ и ѿ д. зсвѣре(х)ъ— В первое лѣто црѣта балѣсарѣа црѣа халѣвисаго, данїиа, сонъ видѣ</p>	<p>F. 167v: Того же слово ѿ видѣни ѿ четыре(х) зсвѣре(х)ъ. Въ первое лѣто црѣта балѣсарѣа халѣвисаго, данїиа, стѣ видѣ</p>	<p>F. 163v: Стго пророка, данїиа, ѿ четыре(х) зсвѣре(х)ъ видѣнїе. F. 164: В лѣто црѣта балѣ(з)тарѣа црѣа халѣвисаго, данїиа, сонъ видѣ</p>	
IX				<p>F. 421: (without title) Въ третѣе лѣто црѣта балѣсарѣа, видѣнїе са ѿвн мѣр данїиа</p>	<p>F. 204: У двѣагоу видѣни(и) и ѿвѣгѣ и ѿ ксѣлѣ, ѣ. Въ третѣе лѣто црѣто балѣсарѣа, видѣнїе са ѿвн мѣр данїиа</p>	<p>F. 194: (without title) Въ третѣе лѣто црѣта балѣ(з)тарѣа, видѣнїе са ѿвн мѣр данїиа</p>	<p>F. 194: (without title) Въ третѣе лѣто црѣта балѣ(з)тарѣа, видѣнїе са ѿвн мѣр данїиа</p>	
X				<p>F. 424: (without title) В первое лѣто дѣрѣа стѣа асорѣа, ѿже ѿ плѣмене мидѣисаго</p>	<p>F. 210: У двѣагоу видѣни(и) и ѿ ѿдѣмѣрицѣ(х) и ѿ ѿдѣ- ѣ. Въ первое лѣт(т) дѣрѣа стѣа (д) сорѣа, ѿже ѿ плѣмене мидѣисаго.</p>	<p>F. 199: (without title) В первое лѣто дѣрѣа стѣа асорѣа, ѿже ѿ плѣмене мидѣисаго</p>	<p>F. 199: (without title) В первое лѣто дѣрѣа стѣа асорѣа, ѿже ѿ плѣмене мидѣисаго</p>	

XI				<p>F. 128v: У ѿ видѣнии и о црѣхъ оужьскы(х) и северьскыѣ. В третѣ лето крста црѣ перьскаго.</p>	<p>F. 221: У первыиыиыаеиакъ видѣнии и в црѣи(х) оужьскыи(х) и северьскыи(х) . ѿ. Въ третѣ лето крста црѣ перьскаго.</p>	
XII			<p>F. 133: О бѣ видѣнии слово. Се еше три црѣ востанѣтъ въ перьскъ.</p>	<p>F. 227: У вторьвы(ѣ)надеиакъ видѣнии слово в тре(х) црѣхъ: ѿ. Се еше три црѣ востанѣтъ въ перьск(х)</p>		
I			<p>F. 151: Стѣо иполмга в даниаѣ видѣние первое: Иста лета въе(ѣ)шкѣго пѣвѣа снѣвъ избѣи(х) хотѣа сказати</p>	<p>F. 253v: Стѣо иполмга в даниаѣ видѣние прѣвое: ꙗ. Иста лѣта въишкѣго пѣвѣа снѣвъ избѣишкѣ хотѣа сказати</p>		
I			<p>F. 155: У пѣвѣиъ ииакыиѣа црѣа и снѣвъ ѿбѣды и ерѣву градѣ. Въ третѣе е лѣ(т) цесарь(с)тѣа ииакыиѣа црѣа</p>	<p>F. 259: У пѣвѣиъ ииакыиѣа црѣа и снѣвъ ииуѣды. перѣѣ градѣ: ꙗ. Въ третѣе лето црѣ(с)тѣа ииакыиѣа црѣа</p>		
II			<p>F. 161v: У ѿбѣаиѣ и в ѿвоѣ стѣрцо. видѣ(н)ѣ е. И бѣашѣ мужѣ. живѣи въ бѣаиѣиѣиѣ иивѣиѣиѣ ииакыиѣиѣ</p>	<p>F. 268v: У ѿбѣаиѣ и в ѿвоѣ стѣрцѣ. видѣние второе: бѣ. И бѣашѣ мужѣ живѣи въ бѣаиѣиѣиѣ иивѣиѣиѣ ииакыиѣиѣ</p>		

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

scribed and published.²⁴ Its contents also emulate the earlier Slavonic copies.

From the existing five copies with transmission of the Old Bulgarian translation, the part of Hippolytus's work known so far can be listed in the following manner by chapters:

- III. Nebuchadnezzar's dream of four kingdoms
- IV. The fiery furnace
- V. Nebuchadnezzar's madness
- VI. Belshazzar's feast
- VII. Daniel in the lions' den
- VIII. The beasts from the sea and the Son of Man
- IX. The ram and the he-goat
- X. Interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy weeks
- XI. The angel's revelation: kings of the north and south
- XII. The Last vision about three kingdoms
- I. Introduction. Captives in Babylon
- II. Susanna and the Elders

The content of all witnesses is presented in Table 1.

The question of the manuscript tradition and the contents of the initial Old Bulgarian translation of Hippolytus's *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* should be resolved by a review of the macrostructure of the individual copies and how they correspond to each other. Comparison of the copies reveals both differences on macrostructural level and variations at the rendition of the text.²⁵ These are most generally as follows:

- a) differences in the order of the chapters;
- b) lack of text;

c) common mistakes and reconsideration shared by the different copies. The results from the preliminary comparison of the five copies and the parallels with the Greek text can shortly be summed up as follows:

1. Omissions and additions.

- 1.1 Omissions: copies *K* and *M* lack the entire chapter three, as well as two identical passages from II.15.1 to II.15.4 and from III. 3.1. to III. 5.2; copies *A* and *T* lack chapters four and seven, and chapters nine and ten are without titles. In addition to these major differences, there are sporadic lacks of lexemes at many places, as for example: II.3.1. *ѣв* – *C* omitted, *A* *иѣвмъ* *T* *иѣвмъ*; II. 14.1. *ἐλθεῖν* – *C* omitted, *A* lacking, *K* and *M* *принти*; III.2.5. *μέγας προφήτης* – *P* *великъ*, *A* *пр(о)ръкъ*, *K* and *M* *пр(о)ръкъ великъ*, *T* *пр(о)ръкъ*.

²⁴ Iliev 2014; <http://www.slav.uni-sofia.bg/naum/lilijournal/2013/3-4/ilievi>.

²⁵ The content of the individual copies can be seen in Table 1 which shows the order and sequence of Hippolytus's *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel*.

- 1.2 Additions: rather rare: II. 14.1. ἀπέστειλεν συναγαγεῖν – C ποῦστι сзбърати, K повѣлѣ навχοδъносоръ цѣрь собра(т) M повелѣ новχοδъносоръ цѣрь сзбрати.
- 1.3 Specific features of individual groups: K and M completely coincide in structure and comprehensiveness and share common omissions, while in parallel A and T correspond in terms of comprehensiveness and shared lack of chapters.

2. Grammatical variation:

2.1 Variant readings indicative of time and place of translation or copying

2.1.1 In C there is prevalent use of the Dativus possessivus of the anaphoric pronoun, as is in K and M, while the genitive is preferred in A and T, but not consistently: II.1.1 πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ – C δ᾽ἔχ ἱεμοῦ, A and T δ᾽ἔχ ἐγο; but σύγκρισις αὐτοῦ C сзказаниа ἱεμοῦ, A and T сказаніе емѣ (емѣ). II.19.4 χειρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως – C ρδκοῦ цѣрю, K and M ρжкѣ цѣрю; II.27.5 εὐρος αὐτῆς – C широта ἱεμοῦ, K and M – широта емѣ.

2.1.2 The copies K and M feature only few uncontracted forms of the imperfect tense, while in C they are more consistently preserved – II.28.4 περικεῖσθαι – C лежадоху, K and M лежахѣ.

2.1.3 All copies feature very frequent use of the ending -ша instead of -ша – III.1.1 εἰσεπορεύοντο – A прїдоша, K and M придоша, T прїдоша.

2.2 Morphological variant readings

2.2.1 Changes of grammatical number – II.1.1 οἱ οἴκοι ὑμῶν διαρπαγῆσονται C домъ вашъ разграбленъ боудеть, A дома ваша ра(з)граблени бѣддѣтъ, T дома ваша разграблени бѣдоу(т).

2.2.2 Changes of person – III.1.1 οὐκ ἐγνώρισάν A не повѣдаста, K and M не повѣдаша, T не повѣдаста.

2.2.3 Change of verb form – II.1.1 ἐγένετο C вѣзъвноу, A and T вѣставъ; II.1.1 καλέσαι C призваати, A and T призовите.

2.2.4 Non-systematic variants – III.13.1. ἐπὶ τῷ κονιάματι – A на мазанѣ, K по мазанѣ, M на памазанѣ, T на мазанѣ. When not understanding the text the copyist tries to lend it come meaning and makes deviations from the original text.

3. Lexical variants

The lexical variants are the most numerous. There is a distinctive opposition between the copies of A and T, on the one hand, and K and M, on the other:

Greek	C	A	K	M	T
II.1.1. αὐτοῦ	ἱεμοῦ	ἐγο	–	–	ἐγο
II. 14.1. ἐν χώρᾳ	въ земли	–	во странѣ	къ странѣ	–
II. 14.1. ἀπέστειλεν	поῦστι	–	повѣлѣ	повелѣ	–
II. 14.1. συναγαγεῖν	сзбърати	–	собра(т)	сзбрати	–
II. 14.1. τοπάρχας	кѣназа мѣстомиѣ	–	и мьсѣтныа кѣна	мѣсѣтныа кназа	–

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

II. 14.1. ἡγουμένους	старѣшныи	–	мѣтѣла	мѣтѣла	–
III.2.5. εἶχεν	–	живаше	имѣаше	имѣаше	живаше
III.3.1. ἔφθασαν	–	досязаше	досеже	досеже	досязаше
III.13.1. ἐπὶ τῷ κονιάματι	–	на мазанѣ	помазанѣ	на памазанѣ	на мазанѣ
III.13.1. τοῦ τοίχου	–	стѣнѣ валомъ	стѣнѣ вармъ	стѣнѣ вармъ	стѣнѣ валомъ
III.13.1. συνεκροτοῦντο	–	сриваста са	сриваста са	сриваста са	сриваста са
III.14.5. ἐπὶ τῷ κονιάματι	–	на помазанѣ	на помазанѣ	на помазанѣ	на помазаннѣ
III.14.5. τοῦ τοίχου	–	стѣнѣ валомъ	стѣнѣ вармъ	стѣнѣ вармъ	стѣнѣ валомъ
III.15.5. ἐπαιδοῶν	–	бавилонанѣ	балнамъ	балтамъ	бавилонаномъ

Such a comparison makes it quite obvious that copies *A* and *T* are close, on the one hand, and that *K* and *M* are similar, on the other, and we can distinguish two traditions originating from two hyparchetypes, with certain redaction peculiarities which originated from a single translation.

The closeness of the two groups of texts can be discussed at comparison of some of their parts and the content of chapters three, four and particularly five, which exist in more than one manuscript and can be illustrated in the following manner and in a broader context:

A) Chapter III – Nebuchadnezzar's dream of four kingdoms

Greek text	<i>C</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>
II.1.1 ἐξέστη τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ ὕπνος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	69 оужасе са дѣхъ кемоу и вѣзвѣбноу отъ сѣна	384 ѡжасе са дѣхъ его и вѣставъ ѡ сна	128v оужасе са дѣхъ его. и вѣставъ ѡ сна
II.1.1 καλέσαι ἐπαιδοῦς καὶ τοὺς μάγους καὶ τοὺς φαρμακοὺς καὶ τοὺς Χαλδαίους	69 призвати обадньники и вѣвлзхвы и постацнихъ са. ѡродѣа, и звѣздоѡѣтъца	384 призовите ми ѡбав(з)нѣсы и влзхвы, и постацни(х) ѡродѣи и свѣздоѡѣт(з)ца	128v призовите ми ѡбавники и влзвы, и постацни(х) са ѡродѣи и свѣздоѡѣтца
II.1.1 ἐὰν οὖν μὴ γνωρίσητέ μοι τὸ ἐνύπνιον καὶ τὴν σύγκρισιν αὐτοῦ, εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἔσεσθε καὶ οἱ οἴκοι ὑμῶν διαρπαγήσονται	69d аще оубо не повѣсте ми сѣна. и сѣказаннѣ кемоу. погублю вы и домъ вашъ р(з)гравленъ боудеть	384 аще не повѣдите ми сна и сказаннѣ емѡ, погублю вы и дома ваша р(з)гравлени бѣдѡтъ.	129 аще не повѣдите ми сна и сказаннѣ емѡ, погублю вы и дома ваша р(з)гравлени бѡдоу(т)
II.2.4 ὑπὸ ετεροῶν μὴ νοούμενα	70c невѣдомоа инѣмѣ	384v инѣми не вѣдома	129v инѣми не вѣдомаа

Π.3.1 ἵνα οὖν μὴ ἐν τινὶ πρόπῳ	71v да не оубо нѣскимъ нрѣвомъ.	384v да љбо не инѣмъ нѣскимъ н(ъ)рѣвомъ,	129v да оубо не инѣмъ нѣскимъ нрѣвомъ,
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

It can be seen from the underscored examples that, although close to the other two, the text of *C* has differences in some grammatical characteristics of the translation. On the other hand, the *A* and *T* copies not only follow the general tradition, but are also closer to the Greek original, as illustrated by the possessive dative in the earlier copy *C*, later corrected in the other, more or less Russified copies. The text of copy *C* reveals a different condition of the translation, which has been subsequently reconsidered, additionally processed and edited by comparison with the relevant Greek text which does not differ essentially from the source of the initial Old Bulgarian translation.

It can be assumed that the objective of the editorial changes is to avoid archaic and unfamiliar words and to approximate to the Greek text. The differences between the two groups are distinct at the level of lexis, grammar and even word-order, and Chapter III of the Commentaries reveals interesting facts about the translation when comparing the text of *C* with the identical texts of *K* and manuscript *M*:

B) The fiery furnace

Greek text	<i>C</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>M</i>
Π. 14.1. ἐποίησεν εἰκόνα χρυσοῦν	87v сѣтвори овразъ златъ	43v сѣтвори тѣло злато	79 сѣтвори тѣло злато
Π. 14.1. ἐν χώρᾳ Βαβυλῶνος	87v въ земли вавулоньстѣви	43v во странѣ вавлон(ъ)стѣви	79 къ странѣ вавилонстѣви
Π. 14.1. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν συναγαγεῖν τοὺς ὑπάτους, στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοπάρχας, ἡγουμένους καὶ τυράννους καὶ τοὺς ἐπ' ἐξουσιῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν χωρῶν, ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνα τῆς εἰκόνας	87c и поустѣ сѣбрати ѱпаты. и воеводы и кѣзназа мѣстомъ и старѣшини и владѣущаѣ на осѣщение овразю.	43v и повѣлъ навходъносоръ црѣ собра(т) оупаты и воеводы и мѣстныѣ кѣза и мѣтла сѣщѣла надъ властѣми и всѣ кѣза странныѣ прити на ѡсѣщѣ тѣла	79 и повелѣ новходъносоръ црѣ сѣбрати оупаты и воеводы и мѣстныѣ 79v кѣназа. и мѣтѣла сѣщѣла надъ властѣми. и всѣ кѣназа страны и прити на ѡсѣщениѣ тѣла
Π. 14.1. καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ ἐβόα ἐν ἰσχύι	87d и проповѣдникъ въпиадше силою	43v и проповѣдни(ѣ) вопиаше крѣпко	80 и проповѣдникъ въпиадше крѣпко
Π. 14.1. ἦν ἄν ῶραν	88v въ нже ѡдъ	44a во нже годъ	80a во нже годъ

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

Π. 14.1. τῆς φωνῆς τῆς σάλπιγγος, σύριγγος τη καὶ κιθάρας, σαμβύκης καὶ ψαλτηρίου καὶ παντὸς γένους μουσικῶν	90с гласъ трѹвъъ, и пиполы и гоусли и пиццаль и пѣснь. и вса хытрости мѣсикниекъѣѣ	44 глѣ трѹвныи сѹргинѣ и гѹсленѣ самѹкинѣ же и прегѹдници соглѣны(х) всакому родѹмѹ мѹсикинѹ	82 глѣ трѣбныи. соургини же и гѣсленѣ самѹкинѣ же и прегѣдници и согласныи(х) всакомѣ родѣ моу(си)киниѣ
Π. 14.1. εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην	88в въ печь огнѣ жегомалго	44 в печь огнемъ горациѹ	80в в печь:ъ огнемъ горациѹ

The hyperarchetype of copies *K* and *M* obviously lacked the beginning of the text and it was restored with a new translation from Greek, reflected in the content of the two copies. The lexemes τῆλο and ὄβρα:зъ are synonymous at quite distant levels, unlike the nouns ροδъ and γα:съ, which are much closer in meaning in the sense of „this hour“ or the determined time for worship and are synonymous only at the translation of ὥρα.²⁶ Consulting the Greek text is also given away by the translation of τυράννους as мѣжителѣ, also found in the *Codex Suprasliensis* and in other early witnesses,²⁷ while, on the contrary, a translation like владѣште is not found.²⁸ The examples quoted above show that the text of copies *M* and *K* has preserved some word-for-word translations and Greek elements, as well as an added part whose origin is yet to be determined, but this is valid solely for the beginning of the chapter alone which has been probably lost. **After this limited renovation in beginning the text, the two copies totally overlap with that of C:**

Greek text	<i>C</i>	<i>M</i>
Π. 15.5. προσεκύουν τῆ εἰκόνι	89в покланнадохѹ са ѡβразѹѹ	80в покланнахѣ са ѡβразѣ
Π. 16.1. ὡς ἂν ἀκούσητε τῆς φωνῆς τῆς σάλπιγγος, σύριγγος τε καὶ κιθάρας, σαμβύκης τε καὶ ψαλτηρίου καὶ παντὸς γένους μουσικῶν	90с да кѣде слышите гласъ трѹвъы. и пиполы и гоусли. пиццали. и пѣсни и вса хытрости мѹсикниинъѣѣ	82 да кдѣ слышите гласъ трѣбъѣи пиполыи гѣсли и пиццали и пѣсни, и вса хытрости мѣсикниинъѣѣ

²⁶ Dn 3:5; Petrov 2012: 14, 30–31.

²⁷ *Supr.* 79.12; 449.29; Mt 18:34 in *Codex Assemanius, Codex Zographensis, Codex Marianus, Savvina Kniga, and Ostromir Gospel.*

²⁸ The lexeme τυράννος in this manuscript is encountered in such a translation for the first time.

Π. 16.1. εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην	90d вѣ печь жегомоуоумоу	вѣ печь вѣgni 81v жегомаго
Π. 18.1. οὐδὲ τὸ πῦρ τῆς καμίνου καιόμενον εἰδότες ἔπτηξαν	91d ни огна печи жегомыа. не оутаиша са	83v ни вѣgni печи жѣгомымыа не оутаиша са
Π. 24.6. ἐν τῷ πυρὶ καιόμενοι	101 вѣ огни горациеи	92v вѣ вѣgni горацие
Π. 24.7. πιστοὶ μάρτυρες κληθῶσιν	101v вѣрънии послосуи нарекоутъ са	93 вѣрънїи посласлжси (!) нарекжт са
Π. 28.6. σὺν ἐσθήτι καὶ σαραβάροις διεσώθησαν	108с съ ризами и вичѣмогыи съхраниша са	101 съ ризами и вичѣмогыи съхраниша(с)
Π. 29.6. ἔπειθα μετῆλθον ἐπὶ τὰς τροπὰς τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ τὰ πνεύματα ἅτινα ἐστὶν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κτίσεως ὑπάρχοντα ἀνέμους ὄμβρος τε καὶ νιφετούς, ψῦχος καὶ καῦμα, φῶς καὶ σκότος, ἡμέρας τε καὶ νύκτος καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτοῖς	110v по томъ преидоша на премѣненїа въздоуха и доухы еже соутъ, средоу зѣданиа вѣтри дѣжда росы зимоу знои свѣтъ тьмоу дѣни и ноци и подобнаа симь	103 по томъ при(и)доша на премѣненїе въздѣха и дѣхы. еже сѣтъ зданїа вѣтры дѣжда рвсы, зимоу и знои свѣ[тъ] 103v тьмъ дѣнь и ноць и подобнаа симь
Π. 37. 2. δι' ἀφορμῆς τινος κατὰ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν ἀπολυθέντας	124 вѣжїемь строенїемь нѣвкотою виною гонезыша	117v вѣжїемъ строенїемъ нѣвкотою виною гонезыша

The translation from Greek ends on folio 80r, with which the lack was corrected, after which the text has not been corrected any longer, following the already existing tradition. There is a telling example with the translation of the verb *καίω*, which is translated as *жешти, жегж, жежши* eleven times and just twice as *горити, горжж, гориши*, and that is only in the beginning of the text of *M*. The most distinctive difference is found in the case of the musical instruments – the first listing contains the passage *τῆς φωνῆς τῆς σάλπιγγος, σύριγγος τε καὶ κιθάρας, σαμβύκης καὶ ψαλτηρίου καὶ παντὸς γένους*, which in manuscript *C* is initially rendered as *гласъ тровъзъ, и пиполы и гоусли и пицаль и пѣсень. и вса хытрости мжжикникскъзъа*, while in *M* it is *гѣдъ трѣбныи. соургии же и гжсленъ самбоукинъ же и прегждници и согласный всакомжъ родъж моу(си)кинъж*, however, there are no differences between them when

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

they are mentioned the second time. Another interesting point is the use of the archaic lexeme *посоуχъ*²⁹ in the two copies *C* and *M*, which is evidence of one and the same translation. The translation of the Greek verb ἀπολύω ('untie, release') is even more symptomatic with the use of the Old Bulgarian verb *ронежниати, ронежни, ронежнети*, which is found in *Codex Suprasliensis*³⁰ and some other early codices (*Izbornik* of 1073, *Uspenskij Codex*, Hippolytus's *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist* in manuscript *C* on another two occasions (*оуroneжеть* and *ронежноула*) and others), in the sense of „to save, free oneself”³¹, and in the text of manuscript *M* the word is encountered another six times with different meanings, rendering a broad spectrum of Greek equivalents. *Посоуχъ* and *ронежниати* are some of the typical Preslav usages. The other visible differences are mainly at phonetic or graphic level and do not reveal hesitation in the rendition of the text. However, individual changes in the manuscript tradition can be seen, for example, at comparison of Chapter Five of the *Commentaries*.

C) Nebuchadnezzar's madness:

Greek text	<i>P</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>T</i>
III.2.5. ὁς πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἅγιον εἶχεν ἐν αὐτῷ	f. 1 иже дъъ бѣиѣ живаше въ. немъ.	391 дъъъ во бѣиѣ живаше въ немъ	124v иже дъъъ сы бѣиѣ имѣаше въ собѣ	141 дъъъ въ бѣиѣ живаше въ немъ
III.2.5. ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ὑποταγμένων τῷ βασιλεῖ	f. 1. въ вѣтъхъ иже повиньни цѣрю бѣша	391v въ вѣтъ(х) повин(ъ)ни цѣрю бѣша	124v въ вѣтъхъ иже повиньни сѣтъ цѣрю	141v во вѣтъ(х) повин(ъ)ни цѣрю бѣша
III.2.5. μέγας προφήτης ὀνομασθῆ	f. 1 великъ наречетъ са	391v пр(о)ркъ нар(ъ)етъ са	124v пр(о)ркъ великъ наречетъ са	141v пр(о)ркъ наречетъ са
III.2.6. Μεννουθίμ τουτον ὀνόμασιν ὁ ἐστίν αἰγυπτιστὶ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ γὰρ μεννοῦ καλεῖται ἄνθρωπος, θίμ δὲ θεός	f. 1 менноудимъ сего нарекоша. еже есть ѱлѣкъъ бѣиѣ. менноуфъ во ѱлѣкъъ нарицаютьъ са егуптьскы · фимъ же гъ	391v менѳимъ сего нарѣкоша. е(ж) есть ѱл(о)къъ бѣиѣ. м(ъ)нѣ ѱл(о)ка зовѣ(т). егупетьскы(м) же бѣ	125 менѳимъ сего нарекоша еже есть ѱлѣкъъ бѣиѣ. менѣ во ѱлѣкъ нарицаетъ са егупетьскы фимъ же гъ	141v менѣфи(м) сего нарекоша, еже есть ѱлѣкъъ бѣиѣ. м'на ѱлѣка зовѣтъ. егупетьскым же бѣ

²⁹ Found in *Codex Suprasliensis* 241.23 and 216.26, *Euchologium Sinaiticum* 67v 23 and 83a 23 and in *Savvina Kniga* in Mt. 18.16; see Slavova 1989: 100.

³⁰ *Supr.* 238.16, 354.29, 401.6, 440.28.

³¹ Dobrev 2012: 75–100.

III.3.1. τὸ ὕψος αὐτοῦ ἔφθασαν ἕως τοῦ οὐράννου	f. 1 ВИСОТА ЕГО ДОСАЗАШЕ ДО НБСЕ	391v ВИСОТА ЕГО ДОСАЗАШЕ ДО НБСЕ	125v ВИСОТА ЕГО ДОСАЖЕ ДО НБСЕ	141v ВИСОТА ЕГО ДОСАЗАШЕ ДО НБСЕ
III.3.1. καὶ ἰδοὺ εἶδ' καὶ ἅγιος κατέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐφώνησεν ἐν ἰσχύϊ	f. 1v и [с]е доуга и свѣтъ съ нбсе съниде и възгласи вельми	391v и се доуга и свѣтъ нбсе съниде. и възгласи вельми	125v и се доуга и свѣтъ с нбсе (126a) сниде. и възгласи вельми рече	142 и се дѣга и свѣтъ съ нбсе сниде и возгласи вельми
III.3.1. πρὸς ἐπιτιμία	f. 1v на ѣпитимію	392 на ѡпитемію	missing	143 на опитемью
III.6.3. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖσαι δύναται βασιλεύς	missing	395 оудобъ гоньземь. что можетъ оусгвѣти црь	129v оудобъ гонезнемь. что можетъ оусгвѣти црь.	148 оудобъ гоньземь. что можетъ оусгвѣти црь

The above examples reveal the common hyparchetype of *A* and *T*, as well as the differences with copy *M* which, in turn, has parallels with *P*. The principal different readings are at grammatical level, but the lexical variants should not be overlooked either – *имѣаше* is not a synonym of *живаше*, and further, although synonyms the verbs *нарицаеть са* and *зовѣт* show a different interpretation of the Greek text. Another interesting item is the verb *досашти, досажѣ, досажеши*, which can be found in *Codex Suprasliensis*,³² and which has no analogue in other early codices. A shared mistake such as the lack of *ѣим* and the Russified spelling *опитеміа* in *A* and *T* prove the common genesis of these two copies. The variation at *гъ* and *бгъ* may be by chance, but at the same time it could be indicative of a different protograph. Once again we should pay attention to the verb *гонезнѣти*, because it is present in an analogous context in the three copies and without mistakes in rendition, lending an interesting nuance to the meaning of *ὠφελέω* ('to help') – helping oneself by liberating oneself. This is one of the earliest usages of this verb with such a meaning in Old Bulgarian literature. There is an important common mistake in the Old Bulgarian translation of the phrase *εἶδ' καὶ ἅγιος*, Latin *vigil*, Hebrew *שׁוּט(ִיר)* – with *доуга* и *свѣтъ* (*P*, *A*, *K*, *M*, *T*, in *C* the part about the huge tree is missing entirely). The translation in this place was made in this form because of a mistake in the Greek source with incorrect rendition and confusion with the word *ἱρις*³³ (rainbow or 'Iris', messenger of the gods³⁴). The translation of this verse into contemporary standard Bulgarian is the following: „...и,

³² Supr. 511.12.

³³ Alekseev 1999: 160; SJS, IV:555.

³⁴ LSJ: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0073%3Aentry%3Di%29%3Dris>

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

это, от небесата слезе Будният и Светият. Като извика високо...³⁵ („and there was a holy watcher, coming down from heaven. He cried aloud and said...“³⁶ In Russian: „и вот, нисшел с небес Бодрствующий и Святой. Воскликнув громко...“³⁷ What is meant is the angel *Ir Vekadish* – a watcher and a holy one. According to the Babylonians, there were two heavenly categories of gods and goddesses identified with the planets – supreme and secondary. Saint Hieronymus also included the advisory deities in the second group and the angels, always on watch and ready to serve the Lord himself, are such.³⁸ This is the only case of such specific usage of the lexeme *ДѢЛА*.³⁹ **The translation, found in all copies, is inherent to the common archetype of the *Commentaries* and unequivocally connects the content of the Pogodin Folia with the rest of the copies, thereby proving not only the archaic identity of the translation but also the stability of the tradition.**

D) The beasts from the sea and the Son of Man:

Greek text	<i>A</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>T</i>
IV.6.2. οὐδὲν γάρ ὄλωσ ψεύδεται ἢ γροαφή	408v ничтоже вѣіе л'жеѣ писаніе	96v ничесоже во взцііав(ь)шихъ (sic!) лж'еть 97гписаніе	176v ничсоже во взшію л'же(т) писаніе	171v ничтоже вѣіе лжеѣ писаніе.

This example clearly shows that copy *M* has not only preserved the text of Hippolytus's *Commentaries* most comprehensively (in terms of volume and order), but also preserves rare archaic readings typical of the 10th century literary tradition, such as the adverb *взшыѣ*, which can be found in *Codex Suprasliensis*.⁴⁰ This part was rendered incorrectly in the hyparchetype of *A* and *T*, where the word is replaced with *вожи*, and the copyist of *K* created a non-existent gloss because of misunderstanding, but as a result of his mistake the reading *взшыѣ* (not *вожи*) can be seen clearly preserved in the hyparchetype of *M* and *K*. The adverb is used once again in the same sense:

Greek text	<i>C</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>M</i>
II. 31.4. οὐχ ἦψατο αὐτῶν τὸ καθόλου τὸ πῦρ	115c не прикосноу са взшію огнь имъ	57v не прикоснѣ са взшыю огнь	не прико 109 снѣ са и(х) възшыю огнь

³⁵ Daniel 4:10-11 (Dn 4:10–11).

³⁶ The Holy Bible, 1990: 860 (Dn 4:13–14).

³⁷ Wordproject: <http://www.wordproject.org/bibles/ru/27/4.htm#0> (Dn 4:10–11).

³⁸ Valchanov 1975: 52–53.

³⁹ SJS, 4: 555.

⁴⁰ *Supr.* 30.1–2, 43.4–5, 338.13, 393.4.

The existence of *бъшыж* in the oldest known copy *C* (dated at the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century) undoubtedly proves its presence in the initial translation. Its value as a lexical marker⁴¹ not only proves the archaic origin of the translation but also indicates its connection with the Preslav literary circle. Other linguistic peculiarities including, as mentioned above, the distinctive verb *гонежнѣти*, can serve as additional arguments for the localization of the translation.

Two principal structural models of distribution of the work of Hippolytus emerged in a Slavonic environment – one, in which the first chapter is the one about the golden statue and the fiery furnace, as recorded in copies *C*, *A* and *T*, and another, in which the story about the three companions becomes first – *K* and *M*. The two traditions differ mainly in the order of the visions, partly in content and in relation to their linguistic characteristics. Thus, because of the different parts of Hippolytus's work which were copied in the manuscripts examined, the comparison at macrostructural level provides grounds to conclude that *K* and *M* are very close, on the one hand, and that *A* and *T* – on the other, share many common readings and that their basis being was formed by two archetypes originating from one and the same translation. In a sense, the text of *C* is separate and does not coincide completely with any one of the two groups in terms of content, but it preserves archaic linguistic characteristics and provides important evidence of the initial translation. It seems at first glance that there is also a separate fragment, preserved in the Pogodin Folia (*P*), which does not provide enough information for comparison, but has also undoubtedly preserved the missing part of the text of the hyperarchetype of copies *K* and *M* which does not exist in them but has been recorded in the rest of the *A* and *T* copies. This means that there has been a stable tradition of long standing in at least two branches, leading right back to the initial Old Bulgarian translation from the Greek original which provides grounds for its comprehensive research. The initial translation of part of the *Commentaries on the Book of Daniel* was most probably made even in the last decades of the 9th century in an East Bulgarian literary centre, supposedly complemented, revised and expanded in the 10th century, which version has been subsequently disseminated with insignificant changes. On Russian soil, a process of revision of the text has begun in the Late Middle Ages, but it was neither consistent nor persistent, and the changes are occasional in character and largely relied on the earlier version. Copy *M* has best preserved the initial translation and most probably in its fullest version, as well as the stages of its complementing, but this is the subject of a future comprehensive analysis.

⁴¹ Miltenov 2006:104–117.

*The Slavonic Versions of Hippolytus of Rome's Commentaries
on the Book of Prophet Daniel*

REFERENCES

- Alekseev 1999: Алексеев, А.А. *Текстология славянской библии*. Санкт Петербург, 1999.
- Alekseev 2002: Алексеев, А.А. *Песнь песней в древней славяно-русской письменности*. Санкт-Петербург, 2002.
- Belova, Kukushkina 1989: *Описание рукописного отдела Библиотеки Академии наук СССР*. Т. 8, вып. 1. Сост. А.А. Амосов, Л. Б. Белова, М. В. Кукушкина, Москва, Ленинград, 1989.
- Viktorov 1890: Викторов, А. Е. *Описи рукописных собраний в книгохранилищах Северной России*. Санкт Петербург, 1890.
- Välchanov 1975: Вълчанов, С. *Тълкуване на книгата на пророк Даниил*. София, 1975.
- Dimitrova 2012: Димитрова, М. *Тълкувания на Песен на песните в ръкопис 2/24 от Рилската света обител*. София, 2012.
- Dobrev 2012: Добрев, И. “За двете готски лексикални гнезда в Супрасълския сборник и за липсата на една източногерманска лексема в сборника.” – В: *Преоткриване: Супрасълски сборник, старобългарски паметник от X век*. Съст. А. Милтенова. София, 2012, 75–100.
- Evseev 1905: Евсеев, И. Е. *Книга пророка Даниила в древнеславянском переводе*. Москва, 1905.
- Hristova 1996: Христова, Б. *Опис на ръкописите на Владислав Граматик*. Велико Търново, 1996.
- Iliev 2014: Илиев, И. И. “Иполитовото тълкувание на Книга на пророк Даниил в ръкопис 741 от Букурещкия държавен архив.” – *Bulgaria Mediaevalis IV*, 2014 (in print).
- Il'inskij 1929: Ильинский, Г. А. “Погодинские кирилловско-глаголические листки.” – *Byzantinoslavica* 1, 1929, 86–118.
- Iosif 1882: Иосиф, иеромонах. *Опись рукописей перенесенных из библиотеки Иосифова монастыря в библиотеку Московской духовной академии*. Издание Общества истории и древностей российских при Московском университете, Москва, 1882.
- Karachorova 2003: Карачорова, И. “Паримейник.” – В: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия*. Гл. ред. Л. Грашева. Т. 3. София, 2003, 101–105.
- LSJ: Liddell, K.G., R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised ed. by H. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie. Oxford: Calderon Press, 1940. E-version in Perseus Digital Library Project. Ed. by G.R. Crane. Tufts University, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/search?redirect=true>
- Miltenov 2006: Милтенов, Я. “Стб. *въхъ*, *въхъма*, *въшъж* ‘съвсем, напълно’, *въшънъ* ‘окончателен’ – наблюдения върху етимологията, разпространението и употребата им.” – *Български език* 53, 2006, № 2, 104–117.
- Novostruev 1868: Невоструев, К. И. *Слово святого Ипполита об антихристе в славянском переводе по списку XII века*. Москва, 1868.
- Petrov 2012: Петров, И. *Названията за време в старогръцки и старобългарски*. Магистърска теза: Софийски университет “Св. Климент Охридски”. София, 2012.
- Pigin 2010: Пигин, А. В. *Памятники книжной старины Русского Севера: коллекции рукописей XV–XX веков в государственных хранилищах Республики Карелия*. Санкт Петербург, 2010.

- Protas'eva 1970: Протасьева, Т. Н. *Описание рукописей Синодального собрания (невошедших в описание А.В. Горского и К.И. Невоструева)*. Москва, 1970.
- Richard 1970: Richard, M. *Pour une nouvelle edition du commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur Daniel*. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1970.
- Richard 1976: Richard, M. "Hippolyte de Rome." – In: *Opera Minora*. Vol. 3. Brepols, 1976, n. 10, col. 537–545.
- Richard 2000: Richard, M. *Kommentar zu Daniel*. Walter de Gruyter, 2000.
- Slavova 1989: Славова, Т. "Преславска редакция на Кирило-Методиевия старобългарски евангелски превод." – *Кирило-Методиевски студии*. Кн. 6. София, 1989, 15–129.
- Sreznevskij 1874: Срезневский, И. И. *Сказания об Антихристе в славянских переводах*. Москва, 1874.
- SJS: *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. Hlav. red. J. Kurz, Z. Hauptova. Praha, 1958-1997.
- The Holy Bible 1990: *The Holy Bible. The New King James Version*. American Bible Society, New York, 1990.
- Thomson 1998: Thomson, F. "The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament." – In: *Interpretation of the Bible*. Ed. by Jože Krašovec. Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, Ljubljana, Sheffield, 1998, 605–920.
- Totomanova 2003: Тотоманова, А.-М. Погодински кирилско-глаголически листове. – В: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия*. Гл. ред. Л. Грашева. Т. 3. София, 2003, 177–179.
- Uhanova 2012: Уханова, Е. "Палеографические и кодикологические особенности древнейшего Учительного Евангелия Константина Преславского (ГИМ, Син. 262) и история его создания." – In: Тихова, М. *Старобългарското Учително евангелие на Константин Преславски. С детайлното описание от Елена Уханова на най-стария препис (ГИМ Син. 262)*. (= Monumenta linguae Slavicae, LVIII), Weiher Verlag, Freiburg i. Br., 2012.
- Wordproject®. International Biblical Association: <http://www.wordproject.org/index.htm>

About the author...

Ivan I. Iliev is a doctoral student at the Institute for Literature at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. He graduated Classical philology and has a Master degree in Old Church Slavonic at Sofia University. He has been a visiting lecturer in Latin there since 2010. His interests include manuscript studies, Russian literature, eschatology and apocalypticism, Slavic studies, Classical Latin, Medieval history and literature, textual criticism, and etymology.