

Ivan I. Iliev (Sofia, Bulgaria)

NEWLY DISCOVERED SLAVONIC MANUSCRIPTS, CONTAINING
DE CHRISTO ET ANTICHRISTO AND *COMMENTARII IN DANIELEM*
BY HIPPOLYTUS OF ROME*

Hippolytus of Rome (Hippolytus Romanus) was a significant early Christian theologian and writer, active around the late 2nd to early 3rd century. He is known for his exegetical works and contributions to Christian eschatology, which were thematically popular among Christian authors at the time. Both *De Christo et Antichristo* (also *De Antichristo*, or DA) (CPG 1872) and *Commentarii in Danielem* (also *In Daelem*, or CD) (CPG 1873) texts deal with apocalyptic themes, so the connection between them is in their shared focus on interpreting biblical prophecies, particularly concerning the end times, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and his antagonist, the Antichrist. In *De Christo et Antichristo*, Hippolytus discusses the essence and coming of the Antichrist, contrasting it with that of Jesus Christ. He draws from biblical sources such as the Prophet Isaiah, the Prophet Daniel, and the Revelation of St John the Theologian. His commentary on the Book of Daniel (*In Danielem*) would naturally be a detailed exegesis of the Book of Daniel, rich in apocalyptic imagery and prophecies about kingdoms and the end times. It is supposed that *De Christo et Antichristo* provides the exegetical foundation that Hippolytus then expands upon in *In Danielem*. Lastly, the visions in the Old Testament book (e.g., the four beasts and the statue with feet of clay) often foreshadow the coming of the Messiah and the Antichrist. Hippolytus might have used *De Christo et Antichristo*'s work (a homily) to establish the typological framework, which he then applied more specifically to the coming of the Antichrist in his detailed commentary, with a special focus on the Prophet Daniel.

* Acknowledgements. This study is financed by the European Union NextGenerationEU, through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria, project SUMMIT BG-RRP-2.004-0008-C01.

This article aims to introduce new witnesses that contain Slavonic translations or versions of both works or fragments/parts of them.

The Byzantine tradition of Hippolytus's homily on Christ and Antichrist and commentary on the *Book of Daniel* has been studied for several centuries¹. The works are preserved in a limited number of Greek copies (from the tenth to the sixteenth century). The main copy of *In Danielem*, the basis of the critical edition, is from the collection of Vatopedi Monastery (*A*) and dates from the tenth century. Actually, it is divided into parts and is currently located in various repositories. Researchers may have recourse to three other copies – in a codex from Meteora Monastery 573 (*E*), 10th century; a manuscript from the island of Chalki (Halki) No. 11 (*B*), 15th – 16th century, and the manuscript Chigi gr. 36 (R.VII.45) (*J*), 11th century, as well as the catenae (*C*), which have been preserved in several copies. The fact that all Greek copies have been preserved in monastic centres or archives originating from monastic libraries is significant. The copies, however, have their linguistic features and composition. They can be formally divided into two groups – a so-called 'Balkan' branch, to which copies *A* and *E* belong, and a second 'Asia Minor' branch, to which copy *B* belongs. It is essential to note that copy *E* from Meteora Monastery is the most similar to the Slavonic translation, and also that it contains the *De Christo et Antichristo*, which unequivocally draws together the Byzantine and Slavonic traditions of text transmission (Илиев 2017: 113–120; Iliev 2017: 257–262).

The Old Church Slavonic translation of the homily follows the Greek original. By volume and content, the translation reveals features similar to those of the so-called 'Balkan' branch. It undeniably indicates the translation's location and distinctive cultural ties to the Balkans. In addition, the literary centres from which models were taken for the translated literature were not associated so much with high-style libraries from Constantinople as with the monastic provincial scriptoria. The translation of *De Christo et Antichristo* and *In Danielem* was supposedly made in Bulgaria near the end of the 9th or the first decades of the 10th century. The following arguments of linguistic character can support it:

(1) The translation of the two texts was written initially in Glagolitic; it has been well-established and supported with arguments for quite some time. The use of Glagolitic indicates that the translation of the work can be associated with the early period of Old Bulgarian literature;

(2) The linguistic features of the texts reveal traces of the early Cyrillo-Methodian language and style, as well as some indications of the new translation models generated in Preslav. Its literary traditions are not limited to a single centre, and translation methods are formed incrementally, not limited by certain norms, making it impossible for them to be accurately dated. Specific linguistic prefe-

¹ The latest ones being: Norreli 1987; Richard 2000; Αθανάσοπουλος 2013; Schmidt 2017; Илиев 2017.

rences began to emerge and mature during the reign of Tsar Simeon (893–927). The translations preserve the original translator’s decisions, making them typical examples of Old Bulgarian translated literature. At the same time, the wealth and variety of their language serve as a bridge between the early translations found in the classical Cyrillo-Methodian works and the subsequent enrichment of literary genres with new content and models.

Another argument for the dating of the translation of *De Christo et Antichristo* is the parallel in the historical context. Hippolytus lived during a time of persecution and theological controversy. His works might reflect concerns about the Roman Empire and its role in eschatological expectations. The Antichrist figure can be seen as a response to imperial cults or political powers that opposed Christianity. His interpretation of Daniel’s prophecies might link the beasts or kingdoms to Rome and Byzantium, setting the stage for the rise of the Antichrist as a political or religious adversary. These particular ideas found very fertile soil in the First Bulgarian Kingdom if we tried to enact them:

(a) Theological Expansion in *De Christo et Antichristo*

Christ vs. Antichrist: Building on Daniel’s imagery, Hippolytus contrasts Christ’s messianic reign with the Antichrist’s deceptive tyranny. The Antichrist emerges as a false imitator of Christ, usurping divine authority (e.g., claiming to be God, per 2 Thess. 2:4).

Eschatological Chronology: Both works offer a timeline of end-time events, with *De Christo et Antichristo* synthesising Daniel’s prophecies with New Testament references (e.g., the Beast of Revelation, Paul’s ‘man of lawlessness’ (2 Thess. 2:1–12) to construct a cohesive narrative of the *παρουσία* and the Antichrist’s defeat.

(b) Exegetical Foundation *In Danielelem*

Daniel as a Prophetic Blueprint: Hippolytus’ *In Danielelem* provides a detailed interpretation of Daniel’s apocalyptic visions (e.g., the four beasts, the ‘a stone was cut out without hands,’ and the seventy weeks (Dan. 2:34 and Dan. 9:2). These prophecies form the backbone of his eschatology, framing history as a divine drama culminating in Christ’s triumph. He interprets Daniel’s ‘little horn’ (Dan. 7–8) and the ‘the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate’ (Dan. 9:27) as prefiguring the Antichrist, establishing a typology earlier expanded in *De Christo et Antichristo*.

(c) Historical and Polemical Context

The Roman Empire as an Eschatological Stage: Hippolytus likely viewed Daniel’s fourth beast (Dan. 7:23–25) as symbolic of Rome, thereby framing the empire as the political backdrop for the Antichrist’s rise. This reflects broader early Christian anxieties about imperial persecution and idolatry.

Anti-Heretical Agenda: Both texts counter heterodox interpretations (e.g., chiliasm or overly literal eschatologies), advocating for a balanced typological approach that aligns Old Testament prophecy with apostolic teaching.

(d) Methodological Consistency

Allegory and Literalism: Hippolytus blends literal-historical readings of the *Book of Daniel* with allegorical insights, a method mirrored in *De Christo et Antichristo*. For instance, the ‘stone’ in Dan. 2:34 is both Christ and the kingdom of God, while the Antichrist’s reign literalizes Daniel’s visions of rebellion. Like Irenaeus, Hippolytus systematises apocalyptic themes, using Daniel to anchor the Antichrist’s role within the context of salvation history.

(e) Doctrinal Coherence

Incarnational Contrast: The works jointly emphasise Christ’s true divinity and humanity in contrast to the Antichrist’s false claims, thereby reinforcing early Christological orthodoxy. Both texts urge vigilance against deception, tying eschatological hope to ethical readiness – a pastoral concern for Hippolytus’ audience.

Keeping all the above in mind, we should point out the state of the Slavonic tradition and its reception in the following ages.

PREVIOUSLY KNOWN SLAVIC MANUSCRIPTS THAT CONTAIN THESE WORKS

A) First recorded manuscripts, known in Russia in the 19th–20th centuries:

1. The manuscript No. 12, dated to the end of the 11th to the beginning of the 12th century, from the Chudov collection (f. 80370), State Historical Museum, Moscow. The parchment MS contains 127 folia. It was introduced and studied by Kapiton Nevostruev (1815–1872) in his work „Слово святого Ипполита об антихристе: В славянском переводе по списку XII века, с исследованием о слове и о другой мнимой беседе Ипполита о том же, с примечаниями и приложениями“ (Невоструев 1868). He published only *De Antichristo*, using *Patrologia Graeca*’s Migne edition (1857) for comparison to the Greek text; the second part, containing *In Daniele*, was later published and commented on by Sreznevsky (Срезневский 1874), (hereinafter *Ch*);

2. Manuscript No. 68, from the 11th to the beginning of the 12th century, the two parchment folia from the Pogodin collection (f. 583), National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg. Sreznevsky partly published them in 1861–1863, but it was Il’inskiĭ who conducted the full understanding of their contents and significance (Ильинский 1929) (hereinafter *Po*);

3. Manuscript No. 486, year 1519, Volokolamsk collection (f. 113), and former collection of the Moscow Theological Academy, today kept at the Russian State Library in Moscow (Иосиф 1882: № 131 (486), 90–91; Строев 1891: 110 (№ CCLXXVIII). This copy consists of both works, and it was known to Evseev, who used it only as footnotes in his edition of the *Book of Daniel* (Евсеев 1905, Илиев 2017) (hereinafter *Mo*).

B) Mentioned in the manuscript descriptions, but not studied and published are the following:

1. Copy in MS No. 92, the end of the 15th – the beginning of the 16th century, Siya Monastery of St. Antonius monastery, today in the Arkhangelsk collection (Arhang. Д 171), Library of the Russian Academy, Sankt Petersburg (Викторов 1890), (hereinafter *As*);

2. Copy in MS No. 74 (71), the end of the 15th – the beginning of the 16th century, previously from the library of the Petrozavodsk Archbishopric (old No.11), earlier in the Vygoleksinsky monastery (Викторов 1890: 288; Пигин 2010: 199–203), (hereinafter *Ka*);

3. Copy in MS No. 782 (1631), the middle of the 16th century, Trinity-Sergius Lavra (coll. 304. I), today kept at the Russian State Library in Moscow (Иларий, Арсений 1879: 203), (hereinafter *Ts*).

C) A specific case:

A fragment of *De Christo et Antichristo* in a manuscript kept at the National Library of Austria in Vienna, ÖNB Cod. slav. 9, 16th century, with South Russian language characteristics. It was described in Dorothea Müller's thesis in 1959 (unpublished), years before the official description by Birkfellner (1975) (hereinafter *Wi*). The fragment of *De Christo et Antichristo* in a manuscript kept at the National Library in Vienna, with South Russian language characteristics². This miscellany consists of 381+II f. on good-quality paper, measuring 325 × 200 mm. The watermarks are as follows: Crown (Briquet 1923: 4971: 1538); crown with a cross over it (Лихачев 1899: 1818, 1574); heraldic shield with an added crown (Briquet 1923: 1866, 1555–60); a boar with stripes of fur on the back (Briquet 1923: 13577, 1542–46). The texts in it are written in 27 lines in one column with a clear semi-uncial script, typical for South Russia. There are three handwritings – up to f. 300r, the script is small; then a second hand with larger letters appears, and the end is filled with a wider, cramped writing. The decoration is simple, with some initials being formed with cinnabar. The contents of the miscellany is heterogeneous: 1r–179r: *Palaia interpretata* (Explanatory palaea, known also as *Kovel's Palaia*), attributed to Pseudo-John Chrysostom; 179r–182r: Epiphanius (Epiphanius Constantiensis, Salamiensis vel Cypriota) *De XII gemmis* (CPG 3748); 182r–197r: Commentaries on the *Fourth Book of Moses* (or *Numeri*), part from *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* by Theodoret of Cyrus (Theodoretus episcopus Cyri) (CPG 6200); 197r–212r: 'On the honouring of icons', an excerpt from *Expositio fidei* by John of Damascus (Ioannes Damascenus) (CPG 8043); 212r–218r: *Commentary on Joshua*, from *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* by Theodoret of Cyrus; 218r–281r: Apocalypse with commentary by Andrew of Caesarea (Andreas Caesariensis) (CPG 7478); 281r–300r: *Nikodim's Gospel*; 300v–317r: *Vita Matris Dei* (apocryphal,

²Müller 1959: 3–4; Birkfellner 1975: 204–210, II/78.

see below); 317r–330v: parts from ‘Ecclesiastic story’ *Historia ecclesiastica* by Eusebius Caesarensis (CPG 3495); 330v–334v: *On Muhammad, the lawgiver of the Saracens*, again from *Expositio fidei* by John of Damascus; 334v–339r: ‘*On penitence*’, an excerpt from *Catecheses* by Cyril of Jerusalem (Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus) (CPG 3585); 339r–349v: *Vita Sancti Stephani* on the 27 of December (BHG 1649d) and other extracts from the Synaxarion; 350r–359v: *De Christo et Antichristo* (excerpts from works by Cyril of Jerusalem and Hippolytus of Rome); 359v–362r: ‘*On penitence*’ by Anastasius Sinaita, excerpt from *Quaestiones et Responsiones* (CPG 7746); 362r–363v: Excerpt from the *Chronicle* by George Hamartolos (Georgius Hamartolus) (PG 110: col. 10–1327); 374v–376v: ‘*On the letters*’ by Chernorizets Hrabār; 376v–377r: excerpt from *Life of Saint Hilarion from Moglena*, written by Patriarch Euthymius of Tarnovo (Kałużniacki 1901: 27–58; Obolensky 1948: 223–226); 382r–383v: short information about the schism between the Eastern and Western churches. From 377r to the end of the miscellany, there are excerpts from commentaries by patristic authors on texts from the Old and New Testaments. Even though the copyists are undoubtedly Russian, the manuscript has preserved some Old Bulgarian traits – both yuses are in their etymological places. The fate of the book is not clear enough, but in a long marginal note in the form of dedication from folia 1 to 9, it is said that it was a gift for a monastery on Mount Athos (Hilandar) by Kozma Vasilevich, ‘a servant of the temple’ in Kovel (Ukraine), who on the 29th of May 1549 gave it to the clerks Maximus and Athanasius. In 1827, B. Koptitar retrieved the manuscript from the Hilandar monastery.

D) An attempt for description, text-critical analysis of new and unknown manuscripts, containing one or two of the works, was made (Илиев 2017; Iliev 2019: 197–203; Iliev 2021a: 283–301) on the following:

1. A codex from the Kirillo-Belozersk Monastery, now in the National Library of Russia (f. 76103) dated to 1492 (hereinafter *Kb*);
2. Manuscript No. 448 from the Rogozhskoe Cemetery, today at the Russian State Library, dates to the end of the 15th century (hereinafter *Ro*);
3. A fragment in MS No. 217 (f. 173.I), 15th century, Moscow Theological Academy, Russian State Library, Moscow (hereinafter *Ma*);
4. Copy in MS No. 741, dated to the late 15th or early 16th century, from the Romanian State Archives, Bucharest, Romania (hereinafter *Bu*);
5. Copy in MS Akc. 2743 (old no. 310), dated to the late 16th–17th centuries, also known as *Zbornik z Bunarówki*, National Library of Poland, Warsaw (hereinafter *Wa*);
6. Miscellany No. 138, dated from the first half of the 16th century, from the collection of A. S. Petrushevich, National Scientific Library ‘V. Stefanik’ – Lviv, Ukraine (hereinafter *Ga*).

Over the last couple of years, I have been working on the discovery of new witnesses to the Slavonic translation of two well-preserved works by Hippolytus of Rome: *In Daniel* and *De Christo et Antichristo*, which are closely connected and intertwined. This research is based on the information preserved in various manuscripts scattered among Slavia Orthodoxa and in different European depositories. Some of them are unknown or lack even elementary descriptions. The known ones are not joined in context and have not been compared and studied comprehensively so far. It is a significant fact that most manuscripts (9 out of 17³) contain two works or parts of them, indicating that they likely share a common manuscript tradition and were copied as a set, which challenges assumptions about their independent circulation.

1. Manuscript Q.I.622, f. 550 (ОСРК), The National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg. It is dated according to the watermarks to the mid-15th century. The volume of the book is II + 190 f., with the first folium and f. 93v being blank. Its format is 4^o, measuring 213 × 142 mm. The book is without miniatures or pictures; its decoration is limited to cinnabar for the beginnings and some of the initials. The watermarks are four kinds – a bull in two variants (a bull with a long tail – f. I, 1–7, type Лихачев 1899: 104, No. 2611 (middle of the 15th century); (small bull – f. 24, 25, 30, 31, type Лихачев 1899: 289, No. 1020 (year 1456); a circle under a cross (f. 8–23, 26–29, 32–93, type Piccard-online No 161429 (1440);⁴ a female figure (f. 94–190, II)⁵, (hereinafter *Pe*).

It is a miscellany with the following content: f. 1–93r: *Vita sancti Theodori ex Edessa* (BHG 1744) (9th of July) by Basil from Emesa⁶; 94r–188v: Hippolytus, Roman pope, *In Danielelem*, but the text begins with *De Christo et Antichristo*, after which there are excerpts from the Commentary from f. 134v (The beginning of Logos B (Nebuchadnezzar's dream of four kingdoms) up to f. 142v; the

³ The manuscripts are actually 18, with one manuscript from the National Library of Russia in Saint Petersburg, Pogodin 1917, 16th century, 27 f., containing excerpts solely from *In Danielelem*, that is not described or published, marked as *X*. Sadly, we could not get more information on it, but we noticed that it somewhat corresponds to the branch of *As* and *Ts*. The others described and studied, abbreviated *Po*, *Kb*, *Ma*, *Bu*, *Ga* and *Wa*, contain only fragments from *In Danielelem* (Илиев 2017: 200–213; 268–282).

⁴ Piccard 1987: <https://www.piccard-online.de/detailansicht.php?klassi=023.001.003.003&ordnr=161429&sprache>.

⁵ Шибаев 2013: 409. Paper with such watermarks is also used in a manuscript from the Kirillo-Beozersk Monastery 1/1240 (1452). I sincerely thank Zhana L. Levshina for the identification of the watermarks and the help with the description.

⁶ The Byzantine original, dated to the 9th century is brought to Moscow by Arsenii Sukhanov in the 17th century (Белокуров 1891). It contains also 'Virtuous chapters' (κεφάλαια πρακτικά), 100 in number. It has been claimed that there are two different Slavonic translations – South Slavonic and Russian. Recent research: Вершинин 2021: 473–484.

beginning of Logos Γ (Nebuchadnezzar's madness) from 143r to 154v, where begins Belshazzar's feast, from f. 159v is the beginning of Logos Δ (Vision of the beasts from sea) in the form of excerpts (Илиев 2017: 22–23; 49). A vision of the two kings of North and South, as well as the last visions, together with Susanna and the elders, is missing. The end of the text is as follows: СЛАВА СВЕРШЕНТЕЛЮ КСҮ. ВСАКОМОУ ДѢЛѢ БЛГОУ НАУАЛО И КОНЕЦЬ ХС. After it, there is a marginal note with cinnabar: ИСТОУНИКѢ СЪЦѢ НА МѢСТѢ. И БОГАТѢ ВОДѢ ТЕКѢЩОУ. КТО ЖАЖЕЮ ИСТАѢ. ЯВѢ Ё ЯКО НЕ ПРИХОДАН К НЕМѢ. СИЩЕ И СІА КНИГА. ИСТОУНИКѢ ЕСТЬ ПѢВНА. АЩЕ КТО ОУСЕРДІЕМЪ РАЗГНѢВѢ ПРОУТѢ. НАПОИТ ДШѢ СВОЮ ЖИВНОСНА ВѢУНЫЯ ВОДЫ. И НЕ ЪЖАЖЕТЪ ВО ВѢКЫ ЯКОЖЕ. ГЪ КЪ САМАРАНЫИИ ГЛА. АМННЬ.

On the blank folia 189r–190v there are later written commentaries on the Second Advent (excerpts), bearing the name of Solomon (Ecclesiastes 12: 3–6) and John Chrysostom, with which the manuscript finishes⁷. These texts are in Middle Bulgarian writing, with two yuses (Ѡ and ѡ) and two jers (ѣ and ѥ), inconsistently used.

In the miscellany, there are some later additions and interventions: f. 1r with different scripts: „Феодора Едесскаго“, „Святаго славнаго“, „Книга сия“, on f. 1v in semi-uncial: „Некто ся роди, на лицѣ поля, в ношь тмою, пеленами не повит, водою не омыт, солнце на небѣ сияеть, върасту же его мир радуеться“ (Ezekiel 16:4) ; in the lower margins of f. 1–3 in a script from 15–16th centuries it is written: „Ферапонтова монастыря“. The book is written in one column in semi-uncial script by four different hands. What is remarkable is that on f. 35v–93r, the script is heavily influenced by Greek orthography; however, in the grammar and specifics of all of them, there are features connected with the Second South Slavonic influence. The book entered the Emperor's library in 1859. The miscellany lacks an analytical description, and its nature is unknown⁸.

2. Manuscript from the collection of E. V. Barsov, signature 214, dated to the 16th century, State Historic Museum, Moscow. The book is printed on high-quality paper; however, no information is provided about the watermarks. The hard-cover binding was added after the book arrived at the Museum, and it consists of wooden boards, covered with leather and metal hasps. The manuscript, measuring 255 × 80 mm, is written in smooth and readable semi-uncial script in one column on 27 lines per folium by a well-trained writer, (hereinafter *Ba*).

The original pagination is missing, and it was made later when the manuscript had to be described. It contains only *De Christo et Antichristo* by Hippolytus of Rome on 23 folia. Following the text, there are 40 blank folia; they were likely intended to be filled with other works. Our humble speculation is that it must have

⁷ The same text in: РНБ 0.XVII.20, National library of Russia, 18th c., f. 102v: Гадание Соломоне. 103v–108r: Толкование. See: Белокуров 1891. For detailed description, see Miltenova, Iliev 2023: 3–4.

⁸ This manuscript was discovered during our research in the National library of Russia in 2019.

been *In Daniele*, but the pages were never filled in. The manuscript lacks an analytical description, and its contents are not publicly known. In some places in the margins, there are added glosses, marking errors and omissions of the writer, as well as later additions by a pencil of a scholar who worked with the manuscript. The book lacks ornaments, except for some initials, for which cinnabar was used. The manuscript was exposed to moisture that damaged not only the bottom of its pages, but also its centre, so the book had to be restored at the museum.

The text begins on f. 1r: СЛѢДО СТАГѠ НППОЛНТА ПАПЫ РѢСКѦ К ѠЄСОНЛС Ѡ ПОСЛѢДНІИХЪ ВРЕМЕНѢХЪ. Н Ѡ ЛЕСТЬЦѢ С АНТХРІСТѢ СЛОВО СИ СЛОВЕСА ѠУЖЕ СЪЩІИ АѢ. ПОМЫСЛИВШ ТИ ПО НС ТОВАРОМ НАѠУУНТИ СѦ. The language of the text is Russian Church Slavonic, and the big yus (Ѡ) is rendered by Ѡу/8, but occasionally, the small yus (Ѧ) is used in non-etymological places for Ѧ and Ѧ. Both jers (ъ and ь) occur, but their use is inconsistent; in some cases of the metatheses, there are pleophonic forms, but basically, the Old Bulgarian prototype can be seen clearly.

3. Manuscript from the collection of P. P. Vyazemsky (Описание 1902: 445–447), signature Q.272, dated around the beginning of the 18th century, today at the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg. This miscellany is described, but it is not well-known. It is written on good-quality paper, of Dutch origin, and is partly damaged over time. Its watermarks include: “Coat of arms of Amsterdam”, which is not identical but similar to the type known as No. 448 (1696–1704) and No. 449 (1700)⁹. It consists of 255 + II f. with some missing folia, and its dimensions are 187 × 135 mm, written in clear semi-uncial writing. The texts are placed in one column, but were typed by different hands, and the book features ornaments in the form of illustrations, red headpieces, and initials (hereinafter referred to as *Va*).

The miscellany has the following content: 1r.: Hippolyti Romani *De Christo et Antichristo* and *In Daniele* with omissions in some of the folia (it corresponds to f. 5r: Ѡ ЮДЫ with the copy *Ro* up to: f. 121v: ДОШЕСТВЕНЕ ЦѢРЬСКА РОДА. Ѡ НДЫ ДО. Later, the text continues to correspond to *Ro* from 123r: НЪ РѢ НЕКТО СЕ Ѡ САМСОНѢ to 149v: БОЮ НИ УЪЛЪВѢКА СѦ СРАМѢЮ. A part of the text is repeated, and then it finishes on 23v, corresponding to *Ro* on 151r: ѦКОЖЕ НСАѦА РЕЧЕ ГОРЕ ЗЕМЛИ. This way *De Christo et Antichristo* is without an end; from 24r the text is from *In Daniele* without beginning about the fiery furnace: Н ПЕШНЫИ ПЛАМЕНЬ ѠУДАВѢ ѠУГАСИТИ; 107r: *Pseudo-Methodius of Olympus Apocalypsis* (CPG 1830)¹⁰; 115v–122r: Excerpts from a Chronograph: Ѡ РАЮ НЖЕ НА ВОСТОЦѢ etc.; 122v: Epiphanius. De gemmis: ВЫПИСАНО ИЗ КНИГИ ЖЕМУЮЖНЫА МАТНИЦЫ. Sermo Grigorii Nazianzeni Ѡ ЧЮВСТВЕННОМЪ СЛЪНЦЫ; 123v: *The Tale of Aphroditian* or *Apocryphal Vita Matris Dei by Aphroditian*¹¹; 124r: Martyrdom of St. Christophorus and his mates on the

⁹ Дианова 1998; Дадыкин 2006: 214–216.

¹⁰ Истрин 1897; Thomson 1985. This manuscript is not mentioned in either of the publications.

¹¹ This text corresponds to the manuscript No. Акс. 2743, Zbornik z Bunarówki, 16th–17th century, from Warsaw (Трифоновна 2015). This manuscript contains excerpts of the two works

9th of May; 137v: *Ioannis Damasceni Vita* (BHG 844); 157r: *Vita sancti Onufrii* (Ονούφριος ὁ Αἰγύπτου) (BHG 1378); 169v: Sermon by St. Cyprian; 176v: Martyrdom of St. Cyprian and Justina; 179r: Novelette about a juvenal who became a priest and then gave it up; 181r: *Vita Philareti* (BHG 1511z); 201r: *Vita sanctae Euphrosinae Alexandrinae* (BHLS 2723); 206v: Novelette about the murder of the great prince Dmitrii Ivanovich from Moscow; 213r: Sermon on the Dormition of the pious king and great prince of the whole of Russia Theodor Ivanovich; 223v: Discussing about the narrow and wide road towards salvation in the form of questions and answers; 231v: Dispute of Athanasius Alexandrinus against Arius (excerpt from the sermons by Athanasius, translated by Constantine of Preslav). There are later additions by various Russian sources on the last three folia.

There is an addition at the end of the manuscript (written most probably by Prince Vyazemsky): “The sign, according to Tromonin No 857, pertains to 1701, 30th of January, Hippolytus lived in the year 5761 *ex Creatione mundi*; 20th of June, the author of *Pseudo-Methodius of Olympus Apocalypsis* in 5775. These two Fathers of the Church first give information about the Antichrist, one after the other, with a small time difference”.

4. Manuscript No 3256 from the Museum collection (f. 178)¹², Russian State Library, Moscow. The paper is dated around the end of the 18th or the beginning of the 19th century. The volume of the miscellany is 23 folia, the first and the last being blank, with dimensions 170 × 210 mm. The miscellany lacks any ornaments, even in the initials; it is written by one hand with late Russian shorthand without any efforts to follow semi-uncial or uncial writing. The booklet was meant for individual usage. The text is written in one column with 22 lines per folium. In some places in the brochure, there are blank spaces, most likely intended to be filled in later with decorations or other text. The booklet initially lacked a cover, and the first and last pages are heavily smudged; traces of moisture can also be found within it (hereinafter referred to as *Ms*).

The manuscript contains only excerpts of the two works by Hippolytus of Rome – *De Christo et Antichristo* and *In Daniele*. On f. 1r the beginning of the homily is acephalous, corresponding to *Ro* at I.1.¹³ on f. 115r: н саму вещь смотрнѣв всяко, бѣга славнѣи мощи наунешн; 2v: како же ꙗко льстецъ людемъ сотворнтъ, собравъ нхъ ѿ конецъ земаля. скорѣв, corresponding to *Ro* at V.1. on f. 119r; 3r: гдѣ ꙗко н спсꙋ нашему ꙗсу хрꙋту снꙋ бжїю цр҃тва дѣля, corresponding to *Ro* at VI.1. on f. 119r 3r: неꙗнмскн каменнын храмъ. сїя ꙗко лестныя его хнтростн сꙋть н прорꙋя его послѣдн явнмъ, нынѣ же къ прѣдлежащнмъ вѣратн сѧ, corresponding

by Hippolytus of Rome and some of its parts correspond to similar manuscripts, especially for *De Christo et Antichristo*. For more detailed explanation of the contents, see Stradomski 2013; Stradomski 2017; Илиев 2017: 200–212 where it is abbreviated *Wa*.

¹² Описание 1968–1994: 95. The description says: Сказание Ипполита, папы Римского, о Христе и Антихристе. Without end. The end of the 18th c. or the beginning of the 19th c. The paper: 1800. Cursive script, the text is placed on 21 folia. It was brought by V. F. Miller.

¹³ See Αθανασόπουλος 2013.

to *Ro* at VI.1. on f. 120r; The text continues from XV.1. to XVI.1. on 3r to 3v: ГЛЕТЪ БО ІЕРЕМІЯ ТАКО ПОДВЪЗАНІЕ ѿ ДАНА УСЛЫШНМЪ, ТО Н НѢСТЬ АКН ПЛѢНЪ ДѢЛА corresponding to *Ro* on f. 123r to 135r. 3v–7v: СНМЪ СЛОВЕСЕМЪ Н УКАЗАМНН (sic!) СЕ ВНАДНМЪ ... СЕ МН ВНАДНМЪ СН. СЕ Н СЛАВНМЪ БѢГА ѿ ТЕБЕ ЧУНМН, corresponding to *Ro* at XIX.1. on f. 127r to XXXIII.1. on 135r. After a gap the text continues from 7v to 12r from chapters XLIII.1. to LVI.1., corresponding to *Ro* from 140v to 149r: ЛѢПО ЖЕ ВРЕМЯ ПО НЕГОВОМУ ПОЛОЖИТИ В НЕМ ЖЕ ВРЕМЕНИ СЛУЧУНТ СЯ... ГОНИТИ СЪТЯ. АКН ВРАГН Н СУПѢРНИКН НМЪ СЪЩА. From there on, after a blank space, begins *In Daniele*, with the first words of B.XXI.1.¹⁴: ВНАДНШН ЛН КАКО ѿЦѢ ДХЪ ЧУНТИ МУЧЕНИКН ПОУЧАТИ СЯ ПОНУЖАЯ Н УТѢШАЯ НХЪ ДА ПРЕВЕНДЯТЪ СМЕРТЬ СЮ... and it ends with: НО ЕЛМА ЧБО В ПЕЦИН ТРѢ БѢЯШЕ УТРОКОМЪ ЛѢПО СЛАВУ ПРІЯТИ, НА 14r, corresponding to B.XXV.1. Later it continues with B.XXVII.6: Ё ЛѢТО БО РЕЧЕ ВСМИ НА ДЕСЯТОЕ НАВХОДОНОСОРЪ ЦАРЬ СОТВОРН ВБРАЗЪ ЗЛАТЪ, which ends with: НЕ ВѢДЫ НЖЕ ѿ БѢГА ГОТОВАННУЮ ЕМУ ВЪУНУЮ МУКУ. After that on 14v: ТОГО ЖЕ СЛОВО Ѿ ВНАДѢНН ВСМОЕ Н ЧЕТЫРЕХЪ СВѢРЕХЪ, which ends on 21v: ДА НЕ ПАКН Ѿ НЕМЪ ВТОРОЕ ВЕСѢДЪЕМЪ ННЫ ЖЕ КЪ ПРЕДЛЕЖАЩЕМУ ДА ПРІНДЕМЪ Н СКАЖЕМЪ Ѿ СУЩЕМЪ ННѢ ЗВѢРН. ГЛЕТЪ БО ДАНІИЛЪ. The language of the monument is Russian Church Slavonic, even though preserving the archaic style of the text – there are no yuses, they are replaced by оу/ѡ and я. There are jers, but not in their etymological places, and their usage is not consistent. This manuscript has not been studied, published or known to the public.

Table 1. Manuscripts, containing *De Christo et Antichristo* (DA) or *Commentarii in Daniele* (CD), or both; * means partly containing or fragments:

	<i>Po</i>	<i>Ch</i>	<i>Pe</i>	<i>Ro</i>	<i>Ba</i>	<i>Kb</i>	<i>As</i>	<i>Ka</i>	<i>Ma</i>
DA	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
CD	+*	+*	+	+	-	+*	+	+	+*
	<i>Mo</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Ts</i>	<i>Wi</i>	<i>Bu</i>	<i>Ga</i>	<i>Wa</i>	<i>Va</i>	<i>Ms</i>
DA	+	-	+	+*	-	-	-	+*	+*
CD	+	+	+	-	+*	+*	+*	+*	+*

The proximity of the codices can be demonstrated by two simple, yet significant, examples: the calculation of different numerical letters to form the Number 666 (Rev. 13:16–18), in which the name of the Antichrist is found, and one Bible quote. This first topic was broadly discussed, but with only six manuscripts (Iliev 2019), whereas this article presents all eleven witnesses in a presumably chronological order. What is more important here is that these two names, Εὐάνθας and Παῖσκος, follow a specific Greek tradition¹⁵.

¹⁴ See Илиев 2017: 268–279.

¹⁵ In the manuscript *Ch* the name ‘Παῖσκος’ exists as well, but Nevostruev did not include it in his edition of the Slavonic text, but mentioned it in the endnotes, due to the fact that it did not correspond to the Greek text he was aware of. (Невострюев 1868: 79; 172). This reading in Greek is found only in the Meteora 573 fragment (*E*) (description in Βεῆς 1967: 598–601; Илиев 2017:

Table 2. The names of the Antichrist in all manuscripts containing *De Antichristo*:

Greek	<i>Ch</i>	<i>Ro</i>	<i>As</i>	<i>Pe</i>	<i>Ka</i>
L.1. εἰπεῖν τὸ Τεῖτάν ἐστιν, ἀρχαῖον τε καὶ ἔνδοξον ὄνομα ἢ τὸ Εὐάνθας · (καὶ <u>Παπίσκος</u>)· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τῆ αὐτῆ ψήφῳ ἐμπεριέχεται	51 ρεϋн. ТНТАН. Ѡкоже ѡсть Древльнєє н славноє нмѧ. ннн еванѠас ннн <u>папнскос.</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь ѡнслѡмь сѡть	146ν ρεϋн ТНТАН. Ѡкоже єсть Древленєє н славноє нмѧ. ннн еванѠас ннн <u>папнскосѡ.</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь ѡнсломь сѡть.	376г Ѡкоже ρεϋн тнταν. Ѡкоже єсть Древле н славноє нмѧ. нлї евѡанѡѠѡ , ннн <u>папїскѡ.</u> та бо нмєна тѣѡ ѡнслѡ сѡть.	120г ρεϋе ТНТАН Ѡкоже єсть Древле. н славноє нмѧ ннн евѡанѡѠосѡ. ннн <u>папнскѡ.</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь чнсломь сѡть.	21ν ρεϋн ТНТАН. Ѡкоже єсть Древнє н славно нмѧ. ннн еванѠас. ннн <u>папнское</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь ѡнслѡ сѡть.
<i>Mo</i>	<i>Is</i>	<i>Ba</i>	<i>Wi</i>	<i>Va</i>	<i>Ms</i>
54ν ρεϋн ТНЕНТАЊ. (sic!) Ѡкоже єсть Древьнє н славноє нмѧ ннн еванѠасѡ. ннн <u>папнское</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь ѡнсломь сѡть	114ν ρεϋн ТНТАН. Ѡкѡже є Древле н славноє нмѧ нлї евѡанѡѠосѡ ннн <u>папнскѡ.</u> та бѡ нмєна тѣмь ѡнсломь сѡть.	17г ρεϋн ТНТАН. Ѡкоже єсть Древле славноє нмѧ ннн евѡанѡѠаса. ннн <u>папнское.</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь ѡнсломь сѡть	351г ρεϋн ТНТА (sic!) Ѡко(ж) є Древнєє н славноє нмѧ. нлї евантѡ ннн. <u>папнскѡ.</u> та бо нмєна тѣѡ ѡнслѡ сѡ	20ν ρεϋн ТН- 21г таЊ. Ѡкоже єсть Древней славннє нмѧ. ннн евѡанѠає (sic!) ннн <u>папнское.</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь ѡнсломь сѡть,	10ν ρεϋн. ТНТАНѡ. Ѡкоже єсть Древней славноє нмя. ннн еванѠас, ннн <u>папннское.</u> та бо нмєна тѣмь ѡнсломь сѡть.

The parallel again demonstrates the Balkan monastic connection (Piiev 2019: 200–201), including the Monastery of Hilandar on Mount Athos, of the Hippolytus’ tradition that later evolved on Russian soil in at least three distinct branches

52–54), Athanasopoulos included it as a footnote in his text-critical edition (Αθανασόπουλος 2013: 178). The name ‘Papisus’ is absent from the recent American English translation of the text (Apocalypse 2025: 152). We have proven that the Slavonic tradition follows the Balkan monastic tradition of Hippolytus’ works that correspond to the manuscript Meteora 573 (Илиев 2017: 118–120; Piiev 2019: 197–201). The name appears as well in the fragments of Irenaeus, again in the context of the number 666: ὡς Εὐάνθας καὶ Λατῖνος καὶ Παπίσκος (Halloix 1636: 500).

(this research is forthcoming). It must be noted again that all of the presented nine witnesses contain both Hippolytus' works, even the later ones, or at least parts of them (except *Ba* and *Wi*, which are focused on *De Christo et Antichristo* only). They also confirm the fragmented Greek codex Meteora 573 (*E*) readings. Some of the connections in most manuscripts can be explained by the revival of such works among the Old Believers (or Old Ritualists) in Russia, who were interested in eschatological thoughts (a topic for future research).

Table 3. Changes in words and meaning

Greek text	<i>Ch</i>	<i>Ro</i>	<i>As</i>	<i>Pe</i>	<i>Ka</i>
LXI.3. καὶ ἰασίς ἐν ταῖς πτέρυξι αὐτοῦ	60 Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ СКР'НЖАЛ'Б'ХЪ ¹⁶ ЄММ.	153v Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ СКР'НЖАЛ'Б'ХЪ ЄМОУ	381r Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ КР'НЛ'Є ЄММ	126r Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ КР'НЛ'Б'ХЪ ЄМОУ	39r Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ КР'НЛ'Б'ХЪ ЄММ
<i>Mo</i>	<i>Ts</i>	<i>Ba</i>	<i>Wi</i>	<i>Va</i>	<i>Ms</i>
70r Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ КР'НЛ'Б'ХЪ ЄММ	123r Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ КР'НЛ'ЄХЪ ЄММ	21v Ц'Б'А'Б'А ВЪ КР'НЛ'Б'Є ЄММ	This part is not presented in the text.	This part is not presented in the text.	This part is not presented in the text.

This is a significant change in the meaning, and actually, it shifts the whole theological point of the text. The earliest copies in manuscripts *Ch* and *Ro* demonstrate a clearer-cut view, no matter how incorrect it may sound to the original Bible quote: 'But unto you, that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.' (Mal 4:2) In this specific place, the theological idea stands for Moses' tablets of stone, bearing the rules of life, not about wings at all. This change could not have occurred in the Slavonic translation; it was present in the original Greek version. Later, the Slavonic text was corrected by consulting another text, possibly in agreement with the Old Testament. This correction was preserved in later Russian copies (Iliev 2021a: 294–295). It is worth noticing the use of the Dative possessive in this case, a typical and occasional phenomenon in both Slavonic translations of works by Hippolytus (Илиев 2017: 137).

The study presents preliminary research on newly discovered manuscripts for individual reading, containing Hippolytus of Rome's *De Christo et Antichristo* and *In Daniele*, focusing on a few codicological features and provenance. *De Christo et Antichristo* serves as the exegetical groundwork for *Commentarii in Daniele*,

¹⁶ In the publication of Nevostruev, the lexeme СКР'НЖАЛ'Б' has been corrected to КР'НЛ'Б, but the author explicitly notes that is precisely СКР'НЖАЛ'Б that is contained in MS Chudov 12 (Невострюев 1868: 182).

with the latter expanding the Prophet's words into a fuller theological polemics. Their connection lies in Hippolytus's effort to harmonise Scripture, counter contemporary threats (both political and doctrinal), and affirm the Church's hope in Christ's ultimate victory. The newly discovered manuscripts enhance our understanding of Hippolytus' reception in Slavonic manuscript traditions, complemented by a similar context provided by other significant Church fathers. It highlights the intertwined transmission of *De Christo et Antichristo* and *Commentarii in Daniele* in Slavia Orthodoxa in the Late Middle Ages. The newly identified codices (*Pe, Ba, Va, Ms*) offer fresh avenues for studying eschatological thought and textual transmission in the Late Medieval Orthodox context. Further perusal of watermark databases and digitisation efforts would enhance accessibility and verification. The findings presented here illuminate the dynamic interplay of theology, scribal practice, and cultural transmission in medieval Orthodox communities. This structured approach ensures clarity for scholars while emphasising the importance of these discoveries for patristic and Slavonic studies*.

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS, CONTAINING *DE CHRISTO ET ANTICHRISTO*:

MS No. 12 from the 11th–12th c. from the Chudov collection, State Historical Museum (*Ch*)

MS No. 448, dates to the end of the 15th c., collection of the Rogozhskoe Graveyard, today at the Russian State Library (*Ro*)

MS No. Q.I.622, f. 550 (OCPK), 15th c., miscellany with mixed content, National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg (*Pe*)

MS No. 92 from the end of the 15th–16th c., from the Siya Monastery of St. Antonius, today part of the Arkhangelsk collection, Д 171 (*As*)

MS No. 74 (71), from the 15th c., formerly from the library of the Petrozavodsk Archbishopric No. 11, Petrozavodsk, Russia (*Ka*)

MS No. 486 (f. 113), dated to 1519, the Volokolamsk collection, formerly from the Moscow Theological Academy, today at the Russian State Library, almost identical to *Ka* (*Mo*)

MS No. 782, 16th c., collection of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra, Russian State Library (*Is*)

MS ÖNB 9, 16th c., National Library of Austria (*Wi*)

* Acknowledgements. This study is financed by the European Union NextGenerationEU, through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria, project SUMMIT BG-RRP-2.004-0008-C01.

MS No. 214 from the collection of E. V. Barsov, dated in the 16th c., State Historic Museum, Moscow (*Ba*)

MS No. Q.272, dated around the beginning of the 18th c., from the collection of P. P. Vjazemskii, today at the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg (*Va*)

MS No. 3256, the beginning of the 19th c., from the collection of the Museum's gathering (f. 178), Russian State Library, Moscow (*Ms*)

LITERATURE

- Apocalypse 2025 *A p o c a l y p s e*, J. *The Eschatology of St. Hippolytus*. North Haven, 2025.
- Birkfellner 1975 *B i r k f e l l n e r*, G. *Glagolitische und kyrillische Handschriften in Österreich*. Wien, 1975.
- Briquet 1923 *B r i q u e t*, C. M. *Les filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier*. B. 1–4. Leipzig, 1923.
- CPG *G e e r a r d*, M. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*. T. 1–6. Turnhout, 1974–2003.
- Halloix 1636 *H a l l o i x*, P. *Illustrium Ecclesiae Orientalis scriptorum, qui sanctitate iuxta et eruditione, primo secundo Christi saeculo floruerunt, ... vitae et documenta*. Auctore R. P. Petro Halloix Leodiensi, Societatis Iesu presbytero... Douai, 1636.
- Iliev 2017 *I l i e v*, I. I. *The Greek Tradition of Hippolytus' Commentarii in Danielelem and the Slavonic Translation*. – *Scripta & e-Scripta*, 17 (2017), p. 243–265.
- Iliev 2019 *I l i e v*, I. I. *A possible Anti-Jewish Trace in the Figure of the Antichrist in the Early Christian Patristic Literature and its Connection to the Slavonic Studies?* – *Scripta & e-Scripta* 19 (2019), p. 191–203.
- Iliev 2021 *I l i e v*, I. I. *On Lexical Choices in the Slavonic Tradition of Hippolytus' De Christo et Antichristo*. – *Palaeobulgarica*, 45 (2021), № 3, c. 93–110.
- Iliev 2021a *I l i e v*, I. I. *Bilingual Dictionaries on Hippolytus' De Christo et Antichristo – Problems, Approaches and Solutions*. – *Scripta & e-Scripta* 21 (2021), p. 283–301.
- Kałużniacki 1901 *K a ł u ż n i a c k i*, E. *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*. Nach den besten Handschriften herausgegeben von Emil Kałużniacki. Wien, 1901.
- Migne 1857 *M i g n e*, J.-P. *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris, 1857–1866.

- Miltenova, Iliev 2023 M i l t e n o v a, A., I. I l i e v. *An Unstudied Interpretation of Ecclesiastes 12:3–6 in Slavonic and Its Context*. – *Scrinium*, 2023, 1–19.
- Müller 1959 M ü l l e r, D. *Die russisch-kirchenslawische Handschrift von Hippolyts Schrift über den Antichrist im Kodex Slav. 9 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades an der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Wien eingereicht von Dorothea Müller. Wien, 1959.
- Norrelli 1987 N o r r e l l i, E. *Ippolito L'Antichristo* (= *Bibliotheca Patristica*, 10). Firenze, 1987.
- Obolensky 1948 O b o l e n s k y, D. *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*. Cantabrigiae, 1948.
- Piccard 1987 P i c c a r d, G. *Wasserzeichen Hirsch*. Findbuch XV.1; *Wasserzeichen Raubtierre*. XV.2; *Wasserzeichen Vierfüsser*. XV.3. *Die Wasserzeichen Piccard im Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart*. Stuttgart, 1987. <https://www.piccard-online.de/detailansicht.php?klassi=023.001.003.003&ordnr=161429&sprache> [last accessed on 18.02.2025].
- Richard 2000 *Hippolyt Werke*: Erster Band. Erster Teil: *Kommentar zu Daniel*. Hrsg. von G. N. Bonwetsch. 2. Vollständig veränderte Aufl. von M. Richard (= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*, N. F.;7). Berlin, 2000.
- Schmidt 2017 S c h m i d t, T. J. *Hippolytus of Rome: Commentary on Daniel and 'Chronicon'*. Piscataway, NJ, 2017.
- Stradomski 2013 S t r a d o m s k i, J. *Kodeksu z Bonarówki cyrylometodejskie związki bliskie i dalekie*. – *Krakowsko-Wileńskie Studia Slawystyczne*, 8 (2013), p. 111–120.
- Stradomski 2017 S t r a d o m s k i, J. *Cykl apokaliptycznych egzegez wizji proroka Daniela w kontekście doktrynalnego sporu wschodniego chrześcijaństwa z judaizmem (na materiale kodeksu BN 12245)*. – *Slavia Meridionalis*, 17 (2017). [https:// doi.org/10.11649/sm.1439](https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.1439).
- Thomson 1985 T h o m s o n, F. *The Slavonic Translations of Pseudo-Methodius of Olympu[s'] Apocalypsis*. – В: Търновска книжовна школа. 4. Културното развитие на българската държава – край на XII–XIV в. София, 1985, с. 143–173 [V: Tarnovska knizhovna shkola. 4. Kulturnoto razvitie na balgarskata darzhava – krayat na XII–XIV v. Sofia, 1985, s. 143–173].

- Белокуров 1891 Б е л о к у р о в, С. А. *Арсений Суханов*. Москва, 1891 [Belokurov, S. A. Arsenii Sukhanov. Moskva, 1891].
- Вершинин 2021 В е р ш и н и н, К. В. *Первая редакция славянского перевода жития Феодора Эдесского*. – В: Слова, конструкции и тексты в истории русской письменности. Сборник статей к 70-летию академика А. М. Молдована. Ред. А. А. Пичхадзе и др. Москва–Санкт-Петербург, 2021, с. 473–484 [Vershinin, K. V. Pervaia redaktsiia slavianskogo perevoda zhitia Feodora Edesskogo. – V: Slova, konstruktсии i teksty v istorii russkoj pis'mennosti. Sbornik statej k 70-letiiu akademika A. M. Moldovana. Red. A. A. Pichhadze i dr. Moskva–Sankt-Peterburg, 2021, s. 473–484].
- Викторов 1890 В и к т о р о в, А. Е. *Описи рукописных собраний в книгохранилищах Северной России*. Санкт-Петербург, 1890 [Viktorov, A.E. Opisi rukopisnykh sobranij v knigokhranilishchakh Severnoj Rossii. Sankt-Peterburg, 1890].
- Дадыкин 2006 Д а д ы к и н, А. В. *Определение и датировка бумаги русских кириллических книг XV–XX вв. Методические рекомендации*. Ростов, 2006 [Dadykin, A. V. Opredelenie i datirovka bumagi russkikh kirillicheskich knig XV–XX vv. Metodicheskie rekomendatsii. Rostov, 2006].
- Дианова 1998 Д и а н о в а, Т. В. *Филиграни XVII–XVIII вв. „Герб города Амстердама“*. Москва, 1998 [Dianova, T. V. Filigrani XVII–XVIII vv. „Gerb goroda Amsterdama“. Moskva, 1998].
- Евсеев 1905 Е в с е е в, И. Е. *Книга пророка Даниила в древнеславянском переводе*. Москва, 1905. [Evseev, I. E. Kniga proroka Daniila v drevneslavianskom perevode. Moskva, 1905].
- Иларий, Арсений 1879 И л а р и й, иером., А р с е н и й, иером. *Описание славянских рукописей Библиотеки Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой лавры*. Ч. 3. Москва, 1879 [Iarii, ierom., Arsenii, ierom. Opisanie slavianskikh rukopisej Biblioteki Svyato-Troitskoj Sergievoi lavry. Ch. 3. Moskva, 1879].
- Илиев 2017 И л и е в, И. И. *Тълкуванието на Книга на пророк Даниил от Иполит Римски в старобългарски превод*. София, 2017 [Iliev, I. I. Talkuvaniето na Kniga na prorok Daniil ot Ipolit Rimski v starobalgarski prevod. Sofia, 2017].
- Ильинский 1929 И л ь и н с к и й, Г. А. *Погодинские кирилловско-глаголические листки*. – *Byzantinoslavica*, 1 (1929), p. 86–118

- [P'inskiĭ, G.A. Pogodinskie kirillovsko-glagolicheskie listki. – Byzantinoslavica, 1 (1929), p. 86–118].
- Иосиф 1882 И о с и ф, иером. *Опись рукописей перенесенных из библиотеки Иосифова монастыря в библиотеку Московской духовной академии*. Москва, 1882 [Iosif, ierom. Opis' rukopiseĭ perenesennykh iz biblioteki Iosifova monastyria v biblioteku Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii. Moskva, 1882].
- Истрин 1897 И с т р и н, В. М. *Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифические видения Даниила в византийской и славянорусской литературах. Исследование и тексты*. Москва, 1897 [Istrin, V. M. Otkrovenie Mefodiia Patarskogo i apokrificheskie videniia Daniila v vizantiiskoi i slavianorusskoi literaturakh. Issledovanie i teksty. Moskva, 1897].
- Лихачев 1899 Л и х а ч ё в, Н. П. *Палеографическое значение бумажных водяных знаков*. Ч. 1–3. Санкт-Петербург, 1899 [Likhachev, N. P. Paleograficheskoe znachenie bumazhnykh vodianykh znakov. Ch. 1–3. Sankt-Peterburg, 1899].
- Невоструев 1868 Н е в о с т р у е в, К. И. *Слово святого Ипполита об антихристе в славянском переводе по списку XII века*. Москва, 1868 [Nevostruev, K. I. Slovo sviatogo Ippolita ob antikhriste v slavianskom perevode po spisku XII veka. Moskva, 1868].
- Описание 1902 *Описание рукописей князя Павла Петровича Вяземского*. Москва, 1902 [Opisanie rukopiseĭ kniazia Pavla Petrovicha Viazemskogo. Moskva, 1902].
- Описание 1968–1994 *Российская государственная библиотека. Отдел рукописей. Музейное собрание. Фонд. 178. Славяно-русская часть. Описание*. Том 2. № 3006–4500. Москва. 1968–1994 [Rossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia biblioteka. Ot-del rukopiseĭ. Muzeinoe sobranie. Fond. 178. Slaviano-russkaia chast'. Opisanie. Tom 2. № 3006–4500. Moskva. 1968–1994].
- Пигин 2010 П и г и н, А.В. *Памятники книжной старины Русского Севера: коллекции рукописей XV–XX веков в государственных хранилищах Республики Карелия*. Санкт-Петербург, 2010 [Pigin, A.V. Pamiatniki knizhnoi stariny Russkogo Severa: kollektzii rukopiseĭ XV–XX vekov v gosudarstvennykh khranilishchakh Respubliki Kareliia. Sankt-Peterburg, 2010].

- Срезневский 1874 С р е з н е в с к и й, И. *Сказания об антихристе в славянских переводах с замечаниями о славянских переводах творений Св. Ипполита*. Москва, 1874 [Sreznevskii, I. Skazaniia ob antikhriste v slavianskikh perevodakh s zamechaniiami o slavianskikh perevodakh tvoreniĭ Sv. Ippolita. Moskva, 1874].
- Строев 1891 С т р о е в, П. М. *Описание рукописей монастырей Волоколамского, Новый Иерусалим, Саввина-Сторожевского и Пафнутиева-Боровского*. С предисл. и указ. Н. Барсукова (= Общество любителей древней письменности, 98). Санкт-Петербург, 1891 [Stroev, P. M. Opisaniie rukopisei monastyrei Volokolamskogo, Novyi Ierusalim, Savvina-Storozhevskogo i Pafnutieva-Borovskogo. S predisl. i ukaz. N. Barsukova (= Obshchestvo liubitelei drevnei pis'mennosti, 98). Sankt-Peterburg, 1891].
- Трифонов 2015 Т р и ф о н о в а, И. *Сказанието на Афродитиан – нови данни за ръкописната традиция на текста (Преписът в Сборник Aks. 2743 от Народната библиотека във Варшава)* [Trifonova, I. Skazaniето na Afroditian – novi dannii za rakopisnata traditsia na teksta (Prepisat v Sbornik Aks. 2743 ot Narodnata biblioteka vav Varshava)]. – *Palaeobulgarica*, 39 (2015), № 3, с. 71–96.
- Шибяев 2013 Ш и б я е в, М. А. *Рукописи Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря XV века. Историко-кодикологическое исследование*. Санкт-Петербург 2013 [Shibaev, M. A. Rukopisi Kirillo-Belozerskogo monastyria XV veka. Istoriko-kodikologicheskoe issledovanie. Sankt-Peterburg 2013].
- Αθανασόπουλος, 2013 Α θ α ν α σ ό π ο υ λ ο ς, Π. *Ἰππολύτου Περί τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου. Κριτική Ἐκδοσι. Διδακτορικὴ διατριβή*. Ἰωάννινα, 2013 [Athanasopoulos, P. Ippolytu Peri tu Antichristu. Kritikē ekdosē. Didaktorikē diatrivē. Iōannina, 2013].
- Βέης 1967 Β έ η ς, Ν. *Κατάλογος περιγραφικὸς τῶν χειρογράφων κωδικῶν τῶν ἀποκειμένων εἰς τὰς μονὰς τῶν Μετεώρων. Ἐκδιδόμενος ἐκ τῶν καταλοίπων*. Τόμος Α. Ἀθήναι, 1967 [Beēs, N. Katalogos perigraphikos tōn cheirographōn kōdikōn tōn apokeimenōn eis tas monas tōn Meteōrōn. Ekdidomenos ek tōn kataloipōn. Tomos A. Athēnai, 1967].

НОВОТКРИТИ СЛАВЯНСКИ РЪКОПИСИ, СЪДЪРЖАЩИ *СЛОВО ЗА ХРИСТА*
И АНТИХРИСТА И ТЪЛКУВАНИЕТО НА КНИГА НА ПРОРОК ДАНИИЛ
ОТ ИПОЛИТ РИМСКИ

(Резюме)

Изследването представя славянските ръкописи, съдържащи *Тълкувание на Книга на пророк Даниил* и *Слово за Христа и Антихриста* от Иполит Римски – два ключови раннохристиянски текста в старобългарски превод, фокусирани върху есхатологията и апокалиптичните пророчества. Проучени са 17 ръкописа, четири от които недокументирани досега (*Pe, Va, Va, Ms*). Анализираните ръкописи, датиращи от XI–XII до XVIII–XIX в., се съхраняват в чуждестранни библиотеки. Новите открития показват, че анализираните произведения често са били предавани като единен корпус, което оспорва предположенията за тяхното независимо разпространение. Ръкописите, предимно руски по произход, но възхождащи към балканската монашеска традиция (по-специално свързана с Метеора и Хилендарския манастир на Света гора), демонстрират преписвачески практики, повлияни от специфичен гръцки прототип и разпознаваеми южнославянски езикови особености.

Ключови думи: славянски ръкописи; Иполит Римски; Тълкувание на Книга на пророк Даниил; Слово за Христа и Антихриста; есхатология; Антихрист; текстово предаване; кодикология.

Иван И. Илиев,
Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски“
ian_ilye@abv.bg
ORCID: 0000-0002-1582-1835

Дата на получаване на статията: 02.04.2025 г.