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Abstract

The term "apocryphal" has been applied to a broad range of medieval Slavonic texts. Many of them were composed in the Judeo-Hellenistic literary tradition and brought into the Slavic lands, forming a particular textual corpus abundant in a variety of contents and narrative styles. However, there is also a group of pieces regarded as Slavonic apocrypha but whose origin is unclear. The Dream of King Jehoash, a very short story written in Old Slavonic, is one of such texts, copies of which were mostly circulated from the 13th to the 18th century in Russia. This paper compares nine copies of the Dream, including the oldest one, analyzes linguistic and structural features of them, and presents the early transmission pattern of copies. Based on a particular expression reminiscent of the one found in The Song of Songs, the author concludes that the Dream was a Slavonic creation.
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The term “apocryphal” has been applied to a broad range of medieval Slavonic texts. Many of them were composed in the Judeo-Hellenistic literary tradition and brought into the Slavic lands, forming a particular textual corpus abundant in a variety of contents and narrative styles. However, there is also a group of pieces regarded as Slavonic “apocrypha” but whose origin is unclear. The Dream of King Jehoash [Сон царя Иоаса in Russian, Сънят на цар Йоас in Bulgarian] (further, the Dream), a very short story written in Old Slavonic, is typically seen as one such text, copies of which were mostly circulated from the 13th to the 18th century in Russia.
It has been suggested that the Dream was partly, or wholly, translated into Slavonic from Greek, but no equivalent in Greek, or any other language, has been found. As is not unusual with texts without the Vorlage, no attempt has been mounted either to look for its protograph or to detect the transmission pattern of the copies. Precise characterization of the Dream as a literary piece has not been provided yet, although an established understanding is that it is an apocryphon. Thus, this text indeed needs deeper observation in order to be properly placed in the tradition of medieval Slavonic writings, and this will be the task of this paper.

The paper is structured as follows: firstly, the storyline, manuscripts, and previous study concerning this text are overviewed; secondly, linguistic features of Russian and Bulgarian manuscripts are described for the purpose of looking for the language of protograph; thirdly, the content and textural structure of the story are analyzed, and fourthly, the early transmission pattern of the text is reconstructed in reference to other texts appearing adjacent to the Dream. The analysis concludes that the text was composed by way of combining the Slavonic tradition of apocryphal narrative and the style of exegetical writings popular in Byzantine-Orthodox literature.

1 Story, Copies, Previous Study

1.1 Story

A rumor that King Jehoash had a dream reached Amaziah, King of Judah, who then sent Jehoash his message to offer a meeting. Jehoash responded by relaying his dream through his messengers.

The narrative of dream after this introductory statement starts with an unclear yet impressive phrase: гръзнъ гълъмъ коупица иже на синаи сыи поустилъ ясть кедрови ливаньскомоу двѣ женѣ оунѣі възоръмь (“a grape" named "bush" has directed two pretty women to the Lebanon cedar standing on the Sinai mountain). This phrase, which might lead readers to anticipate the beginning of an unknown apocalyptic story, however, is followed by a narrative that runs not in a usual storytelling style but as a succession of fragmental phrases depicting different scenes without cohesive relationship between one another, for example: Two young pretty women, one of whom has a red face and the other – a white face; Abishag warms you; Big is the city, but small for me, and scarce are the people; a poor but wise man is in the city; it is him who saves the city besieged by a mighty king.

The narrative of the dream of Jehoash ends with the words addressed to Amaziah to explain all these. Amaziah, then taking the part of decipherer,
gives interpretation to each phrase of the dream: купина in the first phrase of the dream, for example, means Jesus; кедр ливански represents a righteous belief for new people; of the two women-heralds, the one with a red face is the Old Testament while the other with a white face is a holy, true faith. After the interpretations of Amaziah, phrases referring to the verses of the Psalms appear and the story ends.

1.2 Copies
Copies of the Dream are dated from the 13th century, disseminated in Russia with one exception of Bulgarian provenance included in the “Ivan Alexander's Miscellany.” The number of copies are estimated at several tens, but exact enumeration is supposedly difficult; not only because of the incomplete, fragmental copying of the text but also because of its interpolation into totally different texts.¹

The oldest extant copy, marked Q in this paper, is included in the collection Q.p.1.18, rnl (further, Qp18), fols. 1-3v, compiled in the first half of the 13th century in Russia.² The next oldest copy (O) is contained in the Codex F.205 (the o1dr collection), No.171, rsl (abbreviated as O171), dated the second half of the 13th century.³ The other copies consulted, or referred to, in this paper are the following:

• T11 – rsl, the Library Collection of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra, F. 304, I. No. 11 (abbreviated as ts11), fols. 57-58v,14th c.

---
¹ S. Ivanov, for example, noticed that the Dream was interpolated into one of Russian recensions of “the Story about the Twelve Fridays”: С.В. Иванов, "«Сказание о 12 пятницах» и «Сон царя Иоаса»: взаимодействие двух апокрифических текстов," in: Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология – xv. Материалы чтений, посвященных памяти профессора Носифа Моисеевича Тронского. 20-22 июня 2011 г. [S.V. Ivanov, “The Story about the Twelve Fridays” and «King Jehoash»: Interplay between two apocryphal texts,” in Indo-European Linguistics and Classic Philology – xv. Materials of readings, dedicated to the memory of professor Iosif Moiseevič Tronskij. Jun 20-22, 2011], Saint Petersburg, 2011, pp. 212-220; The Dream is also inserted into anthologies of texts ascribed to Ioannes Chrysostomos, ex.: "Въ среду цветныѧ нл҃и слово истоⷧковано ѿ єѵⷢаⷩлїѧ. Посла иѡвасъ црь ко амесию црю израильтескому. Толк. Амесии цр҃ъ рече, грезнъ есть х҃с." (А.В. Горский, К.И. Невоструев, Описание рукописей московской синодальной библиотеки, Отдел II, Ч. 3 [Description of Manuscripts in the Moscow Sinodal Library, Devison II, Part 3], Moscow. 1857, p. 96.)
² В.Н. Моцульский, “Сон царя Иоаса” [The Dream of King Jehoash], Русский филологический вестник, 37 (1897), pp. 97-113; Н. Ватрóбсka, The izbornik of the xii11th century: Cod. Leningrad, gpb, Qp. 1.18: Text in transcription (Полата кънигописьная, 19-20), Nijmengen, 1987.
³ А.А. Алексеев, “К истории русской переводческой школы ХII в.” [On the Russian Translational School of the 12th Century], ТОДП, 41 (1988), pp. 154-196, here p. 155.
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1.3 Previous Study

P.A. Lavrovskij (1858) was probably the first study to shed light on the Qp18, in which a copy of the Dream is contained. Although Lavrovskij mostly focused on the linguistic features of the collection, this surely generated scholarly interest in the Dream among researchers of subsequent generations, such as A.S. Uvarov (1896), V.N. Močul’skij (1897), V.M. Istrin (1898), and A.I. Sobolevskij (1911). Močul’skij’s contribution of the publication of Q should remain highly estimated today, but his conjecture that the narrative of Jehoash’s dream was composed by a Byzantine writer who was inspired by the Church art, whereas the interpretation part was later supplemented by a Slav, was severely criticized by Istrin as baseless. The latter remarked that the source text, which

4 Алексеев, "К истории русской переводческой школы," p. 157.
5 Д.В. Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника в XII-XIII вв.: люди, идеи, пути” [Rus’ and Thessalonica in the 12-13th Centuries: People, thoughts and roads], Византинский временник, 65. (2006), pp. 94-106, here p. 96.
6 E. Zashev, Lavrentiy’s Miscellany. Tsar Ivan Alexandăr’s Miscellany of 1348. Phototype edition, Sofia, 2015; see also: К. Куев, Иван Александровият сборниик от 1348 г. [Ivan Alexander’s Miscellany in 1348], Sofia, 1981.
7 П.А. Лавровский, “Описание семи рукописей императорской публичной библиотеки” [Description of the Seven Manuscripts in the Imperial Public Library], Чтения ОИДР (1858), No. 4, pp. 3-90; particularly pp. 17-24.
8 А.С. Уваров, “Рисунок символической школы XVII в.” [A Drawing of the 17th-century Symbolic School, Археологические известия и заметки (1896), No. 4, pp. 93-99.
9 See note 2.
10 В.М. Истрин, “К вопросу о ‘сне царя Иоаса’: По поводу статьи проф. Мочульского” [On the Question about ‘the Dream of King Jehoash’: In regard to the prof. Močul’skij’s article], Журнал Министерства народного просвещения (1898, February), pp. 300-308.
11 А.И. Соболевский, “Неизвестный русский паломник” [An Unknown Russian Pilgrim], ИОЯС, 16, 1 (1911), pp. 5-7.
should have been written in Greek, was not composed at one stroke but was gradually compiled over years by many writers. According to Istrin, this can explain the disorganized yet still unique textual structure of the *Dream*.

In recent years, M. Babitskaja (1995) examined the composition of Qp18 and concluded that this collection, as well as other collections of similar contents compiled in Russia, has an antecedent of East Slavonic provenance; however, no mention was made in reference to the *Dream*. In a series of works concerning the Slavonic translation of the biblical book of the Song of Songs, A.A. Alekseev more than once touched upon the *Dream* (Alekseev 1983, 1985, 1988, 2002) and suggested that the Slavonic version might have first been translated in the South Slavic region from a Greek text whereas the interpretation part could have been a creation in Kievan Rus. D.V. Kashtanov noticed this story in his study of fragmental texts extracted from the exegesis of Psalms appearing after the *Dream* in several copies, and guessed in relation to those fragmental texts that the *Dream* already existed by the end of the 12th century.

As for the South Slavonic copy, IA, K. Kuev (1981) gave a brief description of the *Dream* in his commentary to BA, whereas, in I. Zašev (2015), no particular mention was provided in regard to the *Dream*.

2 **Languages**

2.1 **Russian Copy Q**

This section will sketch linguistic features of Q, the oldest Russian copy, and the sole Bulgarian copy IA. The purpose of doing so is to search for clues to the language of protograph, since the possibility of the South Slavic origin of the *Dream* has been repeatedly suggested, while the copies were mostly circulated in Russia, including the oldest one dating from the 13th century.

---

12 М. Бабицкая, “Источники Изборника XIII века [Origins of a 13th-century Miscellany] (Cod. St. Petersburg, GPB Q.p.1.18),” *Byzantinoslavica*, 56 (1995), pp. 631-635.

13 Алексеев, “К истории русской переводческой школы,” p.18; A.A. Алексеев, “Цитаты из Песни песней в славянской письменности” [Citations from Song of Songs in the Slavonic literature]. Старобългарска литература, 18 (1985), pp. 74-92; idem, “К определению объема литературного наследия Мефодия (Четий перевод Песни песней)” [On the Definition of Range of Methodius’s Literary Legacy (‘Četij’ translation of Song of Songs)]. *ТОДРИ*, 37 (1983), pp. 239-255; idem, *Песнь песней в древней славяно-русской письменности [Song of Songs in Old Slavonic and Russian Literature]*, Saint Petersburg, 2002.

14 Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 101.

15 Кув, Иван Александровият сборник, pp. 383-385, 389-390.

16 Zašev, *Lavrentiy’s Miscellany*, pp. 11-64.
The reason for our selecting Q as an object of examination among Russian copies is not only because Q is the oldest extant text but also because it looks most reliable in reference to textual quality. Let us compare, for example, O (the second oldest copy) with Q. O lacks the first part of the story, and the following is the beginning of the extant part:

O) ...ч(с҃)тьнаѧ а ѥже възвѣстита горамъ и хълмомъ да сѧ ѡ(т)витають ...

... it (the belief) is honorable (?), and the two announce to mountains and hills that they themselves “otvitajut”\(^{17}\)

This is most likely a part of Amaziah’s interpretation of the dream, and the corresponding phrase in Q reads:

... Ӯтали Ӯтьнаѧ а ѥже възвѣстита горамъ и хълмомъ да сѧ Ӯвинвають

... it (the belief) is pure and honorable, and they two announce to mountains and hills that they themselves “otvivajut”

The obvious closeness of these two indicates that they are copied from a common source; however, the form of the relative pronoun in O, ѥже, obviously disagrees with the verb form възвѣстита, which is in the 3rd person dual present form. Moreover, the verb в(т)витают сѧ (‘dwell themselves?’) in O looks to be an error in comparison with Q’s втвивают сѧ (‘disclose themselves’) and the similar forms appearing in the corresponding position of other texts (T11: вѣнкаютъ, T408: венкаютъ, T122: вѣнкаютъ).

Defects and errors are found in different degrees in other younger manuscripts, too. T11, which is as complete a text as Q, for example, also shows errors in copying, as illustrated below:

(Q) обави же сѧ о томь амесии црⷭю июдиноу и послал амесиꙗ

(T11) обави же сѧ сонотъ амисию с҃ну июдииу исламесиꙗ

Here, о томь in Q is changed in T11 to сонот, which is evidently an error, and амесии црⷭю июдиноу in Q is miscopied to амисию с҃ну июдииу (to Amaziah, Son of Judah”).

---

\(^{17}\) Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI-XIII вв. [Repertory Catalogue of Slavonic-Russian Old Manuscripts from the 11th-13th centuries, kept in USSR], Moscow, 1984, p. 312.
These defects and errors in other copies give us good grounds to estimate Q as a copy that is closer than others to the Russian protograph and to take it as an objective of observation. Further, this manuscript will be used for the citation, too.

The language features that Lavrovskij remarked on in his observation of Qp1818 naturally hold true to Q. The jers in strong positions are retained in certain degree, whereas weak jers are mostly omitted: сънъ (‘dream,’ nom.sg.), but сна (gen.sg.); мне (dat.1sg, against the proper OR form мънe); съ (′сълъ ‘herald,’ acc.pl.). Thus, the way in which jers are used in Q matches the general tendency of treatment of jers in the writing tradition of Kievan Rus.19 Pleophonic forms are found as in под голову, истекающеѥ молоко, but ихь висоцѣ акы чернилъмь заволоченѣ.22 but their occurrence is not consistent; rather, it is accompanied with the South Slavonic alternatives: градъ оугазеную, оугазенная есть града. As for градъ, the pleophonic form града is not attested. Inter-consonantal diphthongs, originating from the Proto-Slavic *TьRT and *TъRT, are consistently written as <ъ+liquids>, which were usual in Old Russian: хълмоѢ (<*хълмъ, OCS:хмъ);23 первое (<*първъ, OCS:первъ).24 The big jus is not used, the etymological *ǫ being represented by о or е: гужкоу (сръжка, acc.sg.); сткъчующе (<[и]стеки, active participle present, n.nom.sg). The small jus is often replaced with и or я: рѣша (<рѣшъ, aor.3.pl.). It can be noted also that the preposition repetition, a feature typically observed in medieval Russian writings, is attested: къ Иоасоу къ сноу ахазова.25

Along with these Russian features, Q shows archaic features as well, such as the correct use of dual forms: речено же есть има, возвѣстита (<возвѣстити); съсо-ма надоить (<съсъ, instr.du.), and the dative absolute structure: истѣкающу мо-локоу по изобилу.26

On the basis of these observations, we can state that Q was definitely written in Russia, but several features, such as the use of South Slavonic forms

18 Лавровский, "Описание семи рукописей," p. 18.
19 В.И. Борковский, П.С. Кузнецов, Историческая грамматика русского языка [Historical Grammar of Russian Language], Moscow, 2006, pp. 99-100.
20 Тп. Т408: под голову.
21 Тп: истекающи мяоло; Т408: истекающи мяоло.
22 Тп: чернилъмь заволоченѣи; Т408: чернилъмъ заволоченѣи.
23 Т22, Т408: холмъ, Т1: хальмнуѫ.
24 Тп. Т408: первое, Т1: пръвѣе.
25 Тп: къ иоасоу къ сноу ахазову; Т1: къ иосиву къ сноу ахазову иро ирская.
26 For the use of dative absolute in OR, see Борковский, Кузнецов, Историческая грамматика русского языка, pp. 445-446.
without pleophony, along with the grammatical archaism, may hint at the South Slavic origin from which the Russian copy was composed.

2.2 IA

Let us turn our attention to IA.

Here, medieval Bulgarian innovative features are conspicuous, such as the use of juses in etymologically unrelated positions: ѧ for the etymological *ǫ in имѧщи (<<имѫщи, Q: имѫщи), лѫвѫѧ рѫкѫ (acc.sg.);  ж used in place of ѧ or лѫвѫѧ (<*ęзѫкъ, meaning 'people'); ῥμνοὶσѫя ῥα (aor.3.pl. < ῥμνοήσει τα). At the same time, old features are retained, for instance, сѫи (<<сѫтъ [бытъ]), in spite of the medieval Bulgarian tendency from the 12th century to replace ы with ж in the ending of the masculine nominative singular of the active participle present.

Amongst other features outside phonological ones we may notice:

– the dative absolute phrase, which correctly occurs in Q, is changed into стѧчаѫщѫ мѫлѫко. This could be read as a scribe’s reinterpretation of the dative absolute in the source text into the usual participial phrase with the nominative singular feminine form of the active participle of the verb стѧча (= 'shed') followed by мѫлѫко as the direct object, meaning ‘shedding milk’; otherwise it could be a simple error in copying.

– one of the two women appearing in Jehoash’s dream is depicted in Russian copies as “has a red face with black eyes” (Q:ѡчии смѫглѣ), but, in IA, the adjective смѣгла modifies the second woman who should be “white,” resulting in a formation of the contaminated phrase другѧ же смѣгла бѣло лице: “another black(?) woman (has) a white face.”

Another deviance which looks to be a result of a scribe’s miscopy is Аминдѧвѧ же дѧщи дѧвидѧвѧдѧвѧдѧвѧдѧвѧдѧвѧдѧвѧдѧвѧдѧ вѧдѧлѧ: “David’s(?) daughter.”

27 К. Мирчев, Историческа граматика на Български език [Historical Grammar of Bulgarian Language], Sofia, 1963, pp. 102, 104-105.
28 Q: лѫвѫѧ рѫкѫ.
29 Тит: языκъ.
30 Тит: ῥμνο(iconипса).a.
31 Мирчев, Историческа граматика, р. 214.9
32 The use of the verb стѧча as a transitive can be found in: ести α εβ ζεα χαλαρ. стѧчаѧща маля и мѧдѧ: J. Kurz, et al. Slovnik jazyka staroslovenského (Словарь старославянского языка. Репринтное издание) [Dictionary of Old Church Slavonic (Reprinted edition)], Saint Petersburg, 2006, vol. 1, p. 814.
Difference in lexical selection is scarcely observed between IA and Q, with one clear divergence: прѣльстити in IA and съблазнити in Q:

IA: Дїаволъ хотѧ люди прѣльстити и вѣвести въ мꙋкꙋ вѣчнꙋѩ
Q: то ѥсть диꙗволъ хотѧ люди съблазнити и вѣвести въ моукоу вѣчноую

This difference, however, does not provide us with any key to define the place or time of origin of these copies, as both verbs were used in Old Slavonic; i.e., in medieval Bulgarian as well as Russian writings.

Thus, our sketch of the linguistic features of Q as well as IA revealed that both Q and IA show orthographic features of medieval Russian and Bulgarian writings, respectively. To define the language of protograph of the Dream from comparison of these two copies is therefore hardly a promising endeavor. Nevertheless, some lexical features may indicate the South Slavic origin of the Dream, such as десница 'a right hand' and the use of книга to mean 'a book (of the Bible)': οучение стѫх книгѫ. It has been suggested in previous studies, as in Alekseev (1985), that the part of Jehoash’s dream may have first appeared in the South Slavic region, but the interpretation part could be a later addition in Kievan Rus. However, the linguistic features of Q look to contradict such a hypothesis, as pleophonic forms (голова, заволоченѣ) mostly appear in the dream part, while, in the interpretation part, the South Slavonic forms without pleophony are dominant. If the dream part were of South Slavic composition and the interpretation were a Russian addition, the appearance of pleophonic forms would be opposite. The possibility, as has been suggested by Močul’skij (1868) and Istrin (1898), that the Dream was composed gradually, firstly the dream part and later the interpretation part, cannot be denied; however, it is hardly conceivable that the first appearance of the Dream was in Kievan Rus and that the text was then introduced to the South Slavic region where the interpretation part was added before being brought back into Russia. The simplest way to understand the formation process of the Dream would be that the text as a whole was first composed in a South Slavic region, most likely Bulgaria, and then brought into Russia, where it underwent rewriting in compliance with scribes’ habits of Kievan Rus. The reason why the pleophonic forms are more favored in the dream part than in the interpretation part should be examined separately, which is outside the scope of this paper.

33 Алексеев, “К истории русской переводческой школы,” p. 181.
3 Composition and Content of the Text

The Dream is composed of the introductory segment, the main narrative as a core part, and a short coda. The main narrative is two-partite: the narrative of Jehoash’s dream, and interpretations given by Amaziah.

It has been already noted in the previous study that the Dream was a compilation of biblical books and drew particularly on The Song of Songs, The Kings, and the book of Ecclesiastes. Indeed, as we will see below, the author(s) of this short piece must have made the best use of these books; however, the strategy that the author(s) selected for referring to them is not simplex but ranges from plain quotation, though partial modification, to free adaptation. In addition, not only the biblical books but also the exegeses of the biblical books were used for composing this piece.

3.1 Introductory Segment

After the opening clauses of “in the time of the Prophet Isaiah, Jehoash, King of Israel, dreamed, and the rumor somehow reached King Amaziah of Judah,” the phrases telling of the reaction of Amaziah follow. Having heard about the vision that Jehoash experienced, Amaziah sent heralds to Jehoash:

This is obviously a direct quotation from the Bible; compare this part with 2 Kings 14:8-9:

Then Amaziah sent messengers to Jehoash, the son of Jehoahaz son of Jehu, king of Israel, saying, “Come, let us look one another in the face.” And Jehoash the king of Israel sent to Amaziah king of Judah, saying, ...

Once readers understand that it is a quotation from 2 Kings, the relationship between this introductory part and the successive, seemingly unclear, sentences can be easily found: γράψας γλώσσαν και λέγεις γάρ ἵνα μὴ ἴνα τὸ περιτόν κεδρῶν λίβαντος δέν τῇ ἑρῴῃ φύγῃ ..., as the corresponding part of 2 Kings

34 The Ostrog Bible.
35 Quoted from the King James Version.
continues as follows: "The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying ..."

What is peculiar in this introductory segment is that, in contrast to the usual way of beginning a story, according to which a narrator provides readers with initial background information on the development of the narrative or the theme of story, the opening phrases of this story function only to introduce the names of two biblical persons: Jehoash and Amaziah. Neither of these two persons plays a crucial role in the development of story, nor does the relationship of the two kings narrated in the Book of Kings have any relevance to the content of the *Dream*. Still, this peculiarity can be explained if we estimate that introducing the biblical persons at the onset of the story had significance in relating this story to OT and placing it in the tradition of medieval Orthodox-Christian writings formulated around the biblical, as well as other books related to them.

3.2 The Main Narrative

The dream part is made up of phrases associated with the biblical texts in various ways. While the beginning phrase of the dream “грьзъ глъмъ коупина иже на синаи сыи. поустилъ ѣсть кедрови ливаньскому” is a direct quotation of 2 Kings 14:9, “тернъ иже в ливанѣ посла къ кедрови сущему в ливанѣ,” the successive sentences depicting two women can be characterized as a free adaptation of the Song of Songs. A phrase starting with “ѥдина роумѧно лице имущи,” for example, is probably associated with the phrase in Song 1:4-5: “Чръна ѣсмъ и добра … азъ ѣсмъ ѡчрънѥна, ꙗко прѣзрѣ мѧ сл҃нце.” (“I am black, but comely [...] I am black, because the sun hath looked upon me.”). Relatedness to Song is more clearly seen in the phrases of “роумѧна та лѣвою роукоу подъложить ти подъ головоу а бѣлаꙗ десницею охопить тѧ,” as Song 2:6 reads: “Шоуица его под главою ми и десница его обьниметъ мѧ.”36 (“His left hand is under my head, and his right hand doth embrace me.”)

A curious phrase is Ависага же да сѣгрѣсть тѧ: the appearance of the name Ависага, which should mean *Abishag*, a young woman narrated in the Book of Kings,37 looks sudden here, as the narrative obviously drew on the Song. However, “Shunamite,” the epithet for Abishag, has been identified in various cultural traditions with “Shulamite,” mentioned in Song 6:13[7:1].38 Indeed, in the

---

36 The Ostrog Bible.
37 1 Kings 1:1-3.
38 LXX: ἡ Σουλαμῖτις, but in other Greek versions, “Soulamite” (ἡ Σουναμίτις) appears: Septuaginta, id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes, ed. A. Rahlfs, Stuttgart,
oldest Slavonic translation of the Song, RNL F.I. 461, the said part reads as “Соуламитѣини,” but the identification of “Shulamite” and “Shunamite” was surely known in the early literature of Slavia Orthodoxa, the proof of which is found, for example, in the Slavonic translation of Pandects, dated from the 12-13th century: in RSL F.304.12. we read, Рече въ пѣсныхъ соломонъ шестьдесѧтъ цесаріць и [...] да поищоуть цесарю дѣвица дѣвоѭ. и обрѣтоша суваламитѣнинъ да съгрѣть. Thus, it is quite possible that the author of the Dream was acquainted with such identification of “Shulamite” and “Shunamite,” and this association was reflected to the occurrence of the name Ависага in the narrative of this work.

We should note another interesting phrase: “Аминодава же дѣщи давидамлѧ. имоуши нозѣ въ сапогѣ.” The literary interpretation of “Аминодава же дѣщи давидамлѧ” would be ‘Aminodava, the daughter of Davidam(?)’; but the name Aminodava is not known in biblical books. Although a nearly identical expression in the OT, “the daughter of Aminadab,” might connect the said phrase to Esther, we prefer to offer a different interpretation in reference to another expression akin to the phrase in question, found in the old Slavonic translation of Song 7:2: Чьто оукрасишѧ сѧ стѫпаниꙗ твоꙗ въ сапогѣ дѣщи Амїнадамова. The closeness of the expressions of Аминодава же дѣщи and дѣщи Амїнадамова suggests that the latter was utilized as a model for the former.

After the sentences depicting the two women, we encounter again a plain quotation from the biblical book: “градъ же ти ѥсть паты великъ нъ мнѣ малъ. мало же въ немъ и моужи и приде црь великъ. и иобистоупи и твърдъ. и бѣ въ градѣ томь моужь нищь нъ моудръ и сеи сп҃се(ть) градъ.” Compare this part with the Book of Ecclesiastes, 9:14-15: “исію же мудрость видѣхъ послѣн҃цемъ и великъ есть комнѣ граⷣ малъ и мужіи в немъ мало. прїидетъ нанѧ цр҃ь великъ икорⷪтъ облѧже, и съдѣлаетъ о нем ограды велїѧ. и обрѣтеже в немъ мужа нища и мудра, и сеи систѣ градъ мудрѣстію своею.” (“There was a little city, and few men within it; and there came...
a great king against it, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it. Now there was in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city.

After the abovementioned quotation from Ecclesiastes, the dream part ends and the interpretation of the dream starts. In this part, the phrases in the previous part are repeated, and each is provided with an interpretation; for example: "И ре амси црь июдинъ грьзнъ ёсть хсъ. а кедръ правлъ втър новыхъ людий а посланы дтъ жнѣ руикаынъ ёсть законы кетхын."

It is obvious that the author employed the writing style of exegetical texts; particularly the biblical exegeses. Let us take for the sake of illustration a passage from a Slavonic translation of the exegesis on Song, originally composed by Philo of Carpasia (†410): "Шонъца его подъ главою ми и деница его обознаиетъ ма. жь. Шонъца къннить настояния втъс, деница же бдлъныи приносин- ци живять ..."). A word "толкъ," shown in this example, or the letter т, were often used by scribes of this genre of text to mark the phrases of interpretation, and, indeed, the scribe of Q employed this convention as well; ex.: "... главоу оуказену Т. оуказена усть глава бжтво; от Л Авикага. Т. Авикага усть заповѣдь ствла...."

Not only the style but also the content of the biblical exegeses was adopted. The phrase in the dream, “There was a little city, and few men within it... ,” which is in fact a quotation from the Ecclesiastes, is interpreted as “the city is a church, a poor wise man is Christ.” This was in fact a quotation from the Byzantine exegetical writing on Ecclesiastes.44

After the interpretation there appear the last phrases: “прѣкъ бо рече. правдникъ ико фіоникъ процвѣте и ико кедръ иже въ ливанѣ оумножится. хсъ процвѣ- те ико фіоникъ ствъ оумножиша ико кедри бу же наше.” This passage, which does not correspond to the content of Jehoash’s dream and thus looks to be added as a coda, is again a modification of the Bible; this time Psalms 91:13: Правдникъ ико фіоникъ процвѣтъ, ико кедръ иже въ ливанѣ оумножится.45

3.3 Summary of This Section
Our observation in this section enables us to state the following.

The first part of the Dream can be characterized indeed as apocryphal because of the appearance of biblical persons with starting phrases of ambiguous yet apocalyptic implication, although the two biblical figures, Jehoash of Israel and Amaziah of Judah, do not play any role in the story other than as ‘a

43 Алексеев, Песнь Песней, p. 76.
44 Алексеев, "К истории русской переводческой школы," p. 186.
45 The Ostroh Bible.
dreamer’ and an interpreter, and there are no apocryphal stories related to these two Kings.

Moreover, the textual structure made up of the dream accompanied by its interpretation is in accordance with other apocryphal stories disseminated in medieval Slavonic literature, such as the South Slavonic version of *the Story about Sibyl* and *the Story of the Twelve Dreams of Shaxinsha*. These features have probably led researchers of the previous study to place this text in the Slavonic apocryphal tradition. At the same time, the utilization of the style and contents of biblical exegeses makes this text appear closer to exegetical texts.

In sum, the *Dream* can be characterized as a unique composition created through the conjunction of apocryphal settings and the style of exegetical writings.

4 Textual Environment

Investigating the environment in which particular text occurs is important not only for characterizing the function of that text in broader intertextual relationships with other texts, but also for tracing its transmission pattern. This section focuses on this question.

The following table shows the textual environments of the *Dream*; i.e., texts appearing adjacent to the *Dream* in the miscellany and collections that fall under the scope of our examination.

| BA          | Qp18         | TSL11 “Golden Chain” | TSL408 “Stihirar” | TSL122 | O171                        |
|-------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------------|
| Questions and responses | On the Holy Friday and the Passion of Jesus | Wisdom of Sirah (Questions and responses) | Words from various books (containing 'Solomon’s chalice’) | On the Gospel and the Resurrection (fragments) |
| *the Dream* | *the Dream*  | *the Dream*          | *the Dream*       | *the Dream*          | *the Dream*         |
| Solomon’s chalice | Solomon’s chalice | Words on the Resurrection of Jesus | Solomon’s Chalice | Words of Gregory the Theologian, |
| Βζ στιν Σοφίν | Βζ στιν Σοφίν | Βζ στιν Σοφίν       | Βζ στιν Σοφίν       | Remarks on the Psalms 28.5, 36.35, 71.16 |
This table clearly shows that the *Dream* was circulated together with, or attached to, the biblical exegeses and other didactic, and explanatory, texts. In this environment of occurrence, we notice two patterns of adjacency that look to be important for detecting the transmission pattern of the *Dream*. One of them concerns the occurrence of textual unit consisting of exegetical remarks on three verses of the Psalters, and the other is the appearance of a short story broadly known as “the Story of Solomon’s Chalice.”

The first pattern was noticed by Kashtanov (2006), according to which short explanatory remarks on three verses of Psalms 28:5, 36:35, and 71:16 (“the three remarks on Lebanon”) appear immediately after O, V, and R, in O171, V113, and RGD, respectively. The occurrence of the same textual unit in the adjacent position would strongly suggest that O, V, and R were on one and the same line of textual transmission.

In this relation, we notice that Qp18 contains an exegesis of Psalters, and the phrases referring to the verses 28:5 and 36:35 in it are almost identical with those found in O171. Compare 28:5. in these two collections:

| Qp18                                      | O171                                      |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 28:5 И схроущить ḡдь кедри ливаньскыꙗ. | схроущῆ ḡ(оспод)ъ кедры ливаньскꙗя.     |
| Т. вѣсы ḡко гѣрды ḡко пріеюн         | тѣлѣсъ вѣсы ḡко гѣрды. пріеюн          |
| радуоющꙗ сѧ ливанꙗу. ливанꙗо вꙗ гѣра | радуоущꙗся ливанꙗу. ливанꙗо вꙗ гѣра     |
| жъртꙗ нарѧцꙗтꙗ сѧ. схроущꙗ же онꙗ | нарѧцꙗтꙗся жъртꙗ идольскꙗя.             |
| ḡѣпо принѣщꙗтꙗв. оутѣлꙗнь идольскꙗе    | схроущꙗ же ḡъ ристѣлꙗо същꙗтꙗв. и    |
| нѣстѣвꙗ.                               | утѣлꙗни идольскꙗе нѣстѣвꙗ.             |

This correspondence might seem to indicate that “the three remarks on Lebanon” in O were formed as an extraction from the exegesis of Psaltir included in Qp18. At the same time, however, divergence between these two collections is found in the explanation of 71:16:

Qp18: Т. възнесє во сѧ пѧнє долњскѫхѫ жъртꙗ жъртꙗ нѧкꙗ на крѣт. ливанꙗ во сказѧтꙗ сѧ жилиꙗ идольскꙗ.

---

46 Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 96.
47 Qp18: Wątróbska, *The izbornik*, p. 72; O171: Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 96.
48 Qp18: Wątróbska, *The izbornik*, p. 96; O171: Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника,” p. 96.
As the text in O171 is not a reduced but an extended version compared to the one in Qp18, we may opt to consider the possibility that “the remarks” on Lebanon in O171 were not directly formed from the exegesis of Psalter contained in Qp18 but were transmitted from another, intermediate, source between these two collections. Still, the close connection between Op18 and O171 is indisputable.

Another notable pattern in reference to the textual environment of the Dream is the neighboring appearance of “the Story of Solomon's Chalice.” The adjacency of “Solomon’s Chalice” to the Dream is found in BA, Qp18, and TSL408. In TSL11 the Chalice story appears, too; not after but before the Dream, being inserted among various short pieces.\(^{49}\) In RGD, which, like O171, contains the remarks on “Lebanon” after the Dream, the last sentence of “Solomon's Chalice” appears after the remarks on Lebanon: “and found (that) from the twelfth year of Solomon’s reign to the reign of Christ there (are) nine hundred and nine years.”\(^{50}\)

“The Story of Solomon’s Chalice” is a short text, well known in Slavic philology due to its inclusion as the chapter XIII of Vita Constantini (VC).\(^{51}\) Regarding the story appearing as chapter XIII of VC, much discussion has been done, mainly about whether the Chalice episode was an original part of the VC or a later interpolation.\(^{52}\)

The Chalice story had been considered a Slavonic creation, probably written by Constantine-Cyril himself, until the discovery by Shevchenko (1967) of a Greek fragment that corresponds to the Slavonic version of the Chalice. After

\(\text{---}
\)

\(^{49}\) “Словеса избранна от многих книг различных строк” [Words, selected from various books of different writers].

\(^{50}\) Каштанов, “Русь и Фессалоника.”

\(^{51}\) Vita Constantini-Cyriilli (Житие Константина).

\(^{52}\) I. Ševčenko, “The Greek Source of the Inscription on Solomon's Chalice in the Vita Constantini,” in: To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday in October 1966, vol. III, The Hague, 1967, pp. 1806-1817; R. Picchio, “Chapter 13 of Vita Constantinii: Its Text and Contextual Function,” Slavica Hierosolymitana, 7 (1985), pp. 133-152; M. Taube, “Solomon's Chalice, the Latin Scriptures and the Bogomils,” Slovo, 37 (1987), pp. 161-169; M. Capaldo, “Respect of the Textus Traditus or Venture into Conjecture? On a recent interpretation of the Vita Constantinii 13,” Палата книжописная, 25-26 (1994), pp. 4-92; P. Balcárek, “Some Remarks on Solomon's Chalice in Vita Constantinini,” Palaeobulgarianica, 351 (2011), pp. 34-51.
this discovery, it became an established understanding that the Slavonic version is a modification of the Greek antecedent. Outside VC, two recensions of the Chalice story are known. One is shorter, containing an interpretation added after the basic text of the Chalice, and the other is longer, showing a further textual transformation such that each verse of the basic text is accompanied by an interpretation and embedded into an exegetic writing of anti-Judaistic vein, traditionally referred to as the "Words of the Holy Prophets". The copies transmitted with the *Dream* belong to the shorter version (abbreviated here as SolChalT).

As Picchio (1985) notes, SolChalT was transmitted, occurring in various miscellanies of exegetic character, with the total number of copies amounting to around 30. It is notable that the four earliest copies of SolChalT, composed from the 13th to 15th centuries, were included in Qp18, BA, TSL408, and TSL122, emerging in a position neighboring, or close to, the *Dream*. Of them, those included in Qp18, BA, and TSL408, namely, the copies placed immediately after the *Dream*, are most likely derived from the same antigraph; this can be confirmed by comparing the starting part of these copies of SolChalT:

| BA          | Qp18          | TSL408         |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Въ ст҃ѣи софїи есть келꙗSION | Въ ст҃ѣи софꙋи есть келꙗSION | Въ сѣ Софыи есть келꙗSION |
| соломѡнѣ. ѿ камене МASON | соломѡна. отъ каменꙗ МASON | соломꙗна ѿ каменꙗ МASON |
| драгаго дѣлана. нанеи же ОН | драгага дѣлана. на ненꙗ ЕН | драгага дѣлана. на ненꙗ ЕН |
| написани сѫть стиси триꙗ. ЕВРЕИСКИ и самарѣискꙗ писꙗнꙗ. ЕВРЕИСКИ и самарѣискꙗ писꙗн始建 |

The closeness of these three copies is well illustrated by the word келꙗ, which commonly appears in them, in contrast to VC, where the word found in the equivalent place is потирь. On the basis of this evidence of adjacency, we can state that Q, IA, and T408 formed one line of transmission.

Thus, from what has been observed, it is possible to restructure an early transmission pattern of the *Dream*, as below:

---

53 Capaldo, "Respect of the Textus Traditus," pp. 9-10.
54 Picchio, "Chapter 13 of Vita Constantini," p. 140.
55 Есть же въ свѧтѣи Софꙗи потꙗрꙗ, ѡтъ драгаго каменꙗ Соломнѧ дѣла. See P.A. Lavrov, Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности [Materials on the History of Emergence of the oldest Slavonic Literature], Leningrad, 1930.
Suppose that X is the protograph of the Slavonic version of the Dream; it should have been included in a collection in which SolChalT was also included, and there a transmission pattern of the Dream followed by SolChalT was formed. The formation of this pattern is not surprising, given a perceptible parallelism between the Dream and SolChalT: both contain apocryphal elements; the story is made up with a message that should be deciphered (a dream, and the verses never read) and its interpretation. This transmission pattern, most likely formed by the end of the 12th century, was further succeeded by Qp18, BL, TSL408. The adjacency of T122 and SolChalT in TSL122 also allows us to place T122 on the same transmission line as Q, IA, and T408. However, TSL122 differs from these three not only in the order of the Dream and SolChalT but also by the textual deviation of SolChalT, as the SolChalT in TSL122 starts: св. Софии есть комора Соломона сына Давида от камени другаго (sic.) сделана, contrary to Qp18 and other two copies, which include келия; not комора. Therefore, it can be assumed that a rewriting, or a modification, in transmission took place somewhere between the original pattern and the TSL122.

In the course of transmission of the Dream, at the same time, a particular set of remarks on Lebanon was extracted from the exegesis of Psalms to form a textual unit and inserted after the Dream. This happened probably when O, or its antigraph, was composed, and the pattern thus made was reflected to V113 and, later, RGD. That R was on the transmission line of Q – IA – R is indicated by the fact that the remarks on “Lebanon” appearing after the Dream in RGD are followed by the last phrase of the SolChalT, which is mostly identical to the equivalent part of the SolChalT in Qp18:
In the later transmission, however, the connectedness of the Dream and Sol-ChalT was lost, and the Dream was mostly included in exegetical and didactic writings.

5 Conclusion – The Authorship

As was observed in 3.2, a phrase in the narrative of Jehoash’s dream depicting a woman, अमिनादव जेदीमी दवियादपला, निमोयिन हेत्ते क्ष सापेश्च, is certainly a modification of Song 7:2., and we read an equivalent expression in the Old Slavonic translation of Song.

However, the name appearing in the corresponding part in the Greek version, such as in LXX, is not “Aminadav” or “Aminodav” but “Nadab”: διαβήματα σου εν υποδήμασιν θύγατερ ναδαβ (your footsteps in sandals, O daughter of Nadab). In fact, ναδαβ is a literary copy, or a transliteration from Hebrew נדיב (nadib),58 and, therefore, in Latin translation (the Vulgate) this part reads fida principis.

Here, questions arise: where did the expression “दृष्टि अमिनादवाका” in the old Slavonic translation of Song come from? Also, how could the phrase “अमिनादव जेदीमी दवियादपला” in the Dream be so close to the Slavonic version of Song? Possible answers may be either that (1) the Slavonic translation of Song was based on a Greek version in which αμιναδαβ appeared instead of ναδαβ,59 while the Dream was also composed by relying on a Greek version in which the word αμιναδαβ appeared, and, as a result, it turned out that the two expressions in question in the Slavonic versions of Song and the Dream conform, or (2) अमिनादवा in the Dream was directly composed on the basis of the Slavonic translation of the Song, in which the original ναδαβ or possibly अमिनादव in Greek was translated into अमिनादवा.
Although there is no proof to support either option, we may opt to consider that the second option was what actually happened on account of its simplicity and higher probability than the first option. If so, an assumption would arise that the whole story of the Dream was not a translation but a creation by a Slav; most likely by one who was working in the South Slavic writing tradition. Judging from the varied utilization of biblical books, such as the Song, Ecclesiastes, and Kings, and of exegetical texts related to them, the composer of the Dream was most likely a scribe, or a compiler, of such religious and didactical books and pieces. Inspired by these texts, he composed this small piece taking advantage of his own experience and knowledge.

The Dream has been regarded as apocryphal, but, as our observation revealed, this piece is not in fact an apocryphon but a composition created by way of combining an apocryphal narrative and the exegetical style that was quite popular in Byzantine-Orthodox literature. The connectedness of the Dream with the SolChalT in their early transmission may be explained by the similarity of their textual characteristics. Because of this structural resemblance, these two stories were probably perceived as being very close by scribes and compilers of medieval Slavonic texts.

Needless to say, there might have been a Greek text that could serve as a source of the Dream, as was the case with the Story of Solomon’s Chalice. Brought into the Slavic world, the original text could have been transformed so as to become a Slavonic version of the Dream.

In any case, this short piece serves us with good material to observe the process of the early development and perception of the biblical and exegetical writings in Slavia Orthodoxa.

Abbreviations

| Abbreviation | Description |
|--------------|-------------|
| RGADA        | Russian State archive of old documents [Российский государственный архив древних актов] |
| RNL          | Russian National Library (Petersburg) |
| RSL          | Russian State Library (Moscow) |