



The Novgorod
Antiphonal
Psalters: Their
Orthographical
Peculiarities
and Textological
Significance*

Новгородские
антифонные
псалтыри:
орфографические
особенности и
текстологическое
значение

Catherine Mary MacRobert
University of Oxford

Кэтрин Мэри МакРоберт
Оксфордский университет

Abstract

The thirteenth-century Novgorod antiphonal psalters were written for liturgical use by two choirs or readers in alternation; consequently each of them contains an incomplete version of the psalms, and they complement each other only in part. Nevertheless, they are of interest both in relation to the development of Church Slavonic norms of orthography and orthoepy as well as from a textological standpoint. In one of them, the older of the two, the infiltration of dialect pronunciation into the Novgorod variety of Church Slavonic can be detected (a list of the various different examples of *cokan'e* in this manuscript is provided in the appendix). On the basis of an analysis of the variant readings found in both manuscripts or attested in either of the two sources, it is demonstrated that they belong to Redaction II of the Church Slavonic translation of the psalms, and that they are important witnesses to the dissemination of this redaction among the East Slavs up to the end of the thirteenth century.

* This article is an expanded version of a paper presented at the conference “И. И. Срезневский и русское историческое языкознание” held in Ryazan, 26–28 September 2012, to mark the bicentenary of the birth of I. I. Sreznevsky.

Keywords

Church Slavonic psalter; antiphonal psalter; early Novgorod dialect; *cokan'e*

Резюме

Новгородские антифонные псалтыри XIII века предназначены для богослужбного исполнения попеременно двумя хорами или чтецами, поэтому каждая из них содержит неполный текст псалмов, и они дополняют друг друга лишь частично. Тем не менее они представляют интерес и в отношении нормирования церковнославянской орфографии и орфоэпии, и с точки зрения текстологии. В одной, более древней, из них прослеживается проникновение диалектного произношения в новгородскую разновидность церковнославянского языка (в приложении дается список разнообразных примеров цоканья в этой рукописи). На основе анализа разночтений, общих для обеих рукописей или засвидетельствованных в одной или другой из них, доказывается их принадлежность ко второй редакции церковнославянского перевода псалмов, а тем самым их ценность для истории распространения этой редакции среди восточных славян до конца XIII века.

Ключевые слова

церковнославянская псалтырь, антифонная псалтырь, древненовгородский диалект, цоканье

The two antiphonal¹ psalter manuscripts from the collection of St. Sophia in Novgorod are remarkable for their very existence. Each contains approximately² half the contents of the Psalter, selected by copying alternate versicles or verses. This expedient results in a text which taken on its own is elliptical sometimes to the point of unintelligibility, and whose sole use is for antiphonal chanting or recitation of the psalms in combination either with a similar but complementary copy of the omitted versicles, or with a full version of the Psalter. Since this method of reciting the psalms survives only vestigially in liturgical practice [ROTY 1983 sub voce антифон], it is not surprising that a book of such limited usefulness should be a rarity, both in Church Slavonic and apparently in Greek: the clearest Greek parallel is a manuscript of 1293 in St. Catherine's monastery on Mount Sinai, organized in exactly the same way, which the scribe describes

¹ In English 'antiphonal' adequately indicates the probable use of these manuscripts; 'антифонный' is unfortunately less transparent because 'антифон' has developed secondary meanings in Eastern Orthodox practice [Дьяченко 1899, РОТЫ 1983, ONASCH 1993, sub voce антифон].

² In each case slightly less than half, because the manuscripts are defective: *Sof63* starts at ps. 17:21b and ends with the penultimate versicle of the second Canticle, Deut. 32:43g; *Pog6* starts at ps. 17:14a and breaks off at ps. 21:15b, at which point *Sof62* carries on with ps. 21:16a, continuing to the end of the Canticles, plus the "psalm without number," which is added in a different hand at the end of the manuscript, no doubt because it was not used liturgically.

as ἡμῖσιν τῶν ψαλμῶν βιβλιδούς [БЕНЕШЕВИЧ 1911: 21, No. 8]; the two psalters listed in a library catalogue from Patmos as ψαλτήρια στιχολογίας may have been a pair of similar kind [PARPULOV 2005: 34, footnote 3].

As I. I. Sreznevsky pointed out [СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1861–63: 59], the Novgorod manuscripts are not a pair: they are independent copies of the psalms for antiphonal use, made by different scribes at separate times, probably somewhat earlier than the Greek one on Sinai. Previously *Sof63* was thought to date from the fourteenth century, whereas *Pog6+Sof62* was ascribed to the late thirteenth century [КУПРИЯНОВ 1857: 29–31; ШМИДТ 1984: 363–364, nos. 473 and 474]. However V. I. Sreznevsky observed that *Sof63* exhibited early features of spelling not found in *Sof62* [СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1877: 60–61], and recently its dating has been put back to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century [ШМИДТ 2002: 653–653, no. д61]. Indeed, against the background of similar layout and style of lettering the orthographical differences between *Sof63* and *Pog6+Sof62* reflect in a striking way the direction of change in norms during the thirteenth century.

In *Sof63* the influence of early South Slavonic orthography can still be detected, whether as a result of direct inheritance from a South Slavonic exemplar or more probably through dissemination in East Slavonic scribal practice; for instance, the conventional use of **ж** in place of **оу** in the rubricated initials **ж**ШНРНЛЪ (1v), **ж**НЬЦН (4v), **ж**СЛЪИШН (9r), **ж**ТВЪРЖАНТЬ (18r), **ж**МНОЖНЛЪ (102r), and also once in the line, МАДНАМЖ (57v), is clearly an East Slavonic feature. Doubled vocalic letters occur frequently in the genitive singular masculine of definite adjectives or participles, e.g., СЪВРЪШАЮЩААГО (10v), СПСАЮЩААГО (77r), ДАЮЩААГО (108v), РОЖЪШААГО (112r), ПРЪНСПОДЪНААГО (112v) and in imperfect tense forms, e.g., ПРНХОЖААХОУ (52v), РАСХЪИЩААХОУТЬ (63r), ТАНАШЕ (79v). As indicated by these examples, the consonantal letters **жцшщ** tend to be followed by the letter **а** in preference to **я**. The distribution of **ъ** and **ь** is to a large extent etymologically correct:³ their replacement by **о** or **е** is rare and is treated as a mistake in the scribe's corrections of НАЗЪКОМЪ to НАЗЪКЪМЪ (53r), РОГО to РОГЪ (83v); but there is considerable inconsistency in the representation of syllables containing **ъ** or **ь** and a liquid, e.g., ХЛЪМЪИ (38v), ХЪЛМЪИ (45v), ОУТВЪРЖЕННН [..] НА ВРЪХОУ ГОРЪ (46r), and sequences of liquid followed by **ъ** or **ь** are common, e.g. МЛЪНННА (51r), ОТЪВРЪГОША (53v), ОПЛЪУАХОУ (103v). The letter **ѣ** appears for the most part in conformity with etymology both where it would occur in East Slavonic and also in South Slavonic spellings such as ПРЪДЪ (2r, 20v and elsewhere), ПРЪДАЮ (11v), БО ВРЪМА

³ In East Slavonic terms: third person singular and plural non-past forms of verbs regularly end in **тъ**, not **тъь**.

ПОТРЪБЪНО (13r), ПОСРЪДЪ (70v); confusion with *ε*, e.g., in the dative *сѣбѣ* (74r), is rare.

At the same time *Sof63* contains a large number of local spelling variants, some of which are simply East Slavonic, e.g., *олєнн* (1v), *дъжь* (40v), *ѣжнхъ* (112r), as well as the hybrid *ѣжнн* (2r, 56v, 106v) and *знжюѣнн* (87r, 97r), while others are specific to the north-western part of the East Slav area, e.g., *дъжгъ* (45v with superscript *г* to correct from *дъжь*, 109r) and *дъжгѧ* (76r), *ѣжнн* (81r), *жнжємн* (71v) and *жнжємъ* (95v). The most prominent local feature is *cokan'e*. This is not applied consistently, and variants can be found in close proximity, e.g., *оѣнстн* (30r x2) but *оѣнѣю сѧ* *ibid.*, *пнѣю* (74r) but *пнѣю* *ibid.*, *наѣннаннхъ* (77v) but *наѣннанннхъ* (78r), *ѣто* (95r) but rubricated *ѣто* *ibid.* Nevertheless, the scribe's predilection for *ѣ* is patent: I have noted 120 instances of *ѣ* in place of *ѣ*, including the correction in ps. 19:6b of *вѣзвєсєлнмъ сѧ то вѣзвєлнѣнмъ сѧ* (3v), and only 4 with the reverse substitution of *ѣ* for *ѣ*. What is more, the scribe of *Sof63* betrays no familiarity with the contextual rules which have been posited [ЖИВОВ 1984: 267–268 and 2006: 105–106] to explain how other copyists determined the distribution of *ѣ* and *ѣ*: he writes *ѣ* instead of *ѣ* x76 in places where only the first palatalization of the velars could apply, x42 in contexts where the conditioning of both the first and the third palatalizations is present, and x2 in place of **tj*. The list of examples in the appendix to this article suggests that the scribe of *Sof63* had no reliable way of deciding where to write *ѣ* or *ѣ* and that he made no distinction in this respect between more and less familiar lexical items.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that he was a poorly trained or negligent copyist. On the contrary, he was on the whole a careful writer who corrected his own mistakes, as can be seen from the examples mentioned above and from the places where letters have been deleted in the middle of a word or phrase which is then completed.⁴ It must be concluded that the orthographical tradition in which he wrote allowed a significant measure of flexibility; if in addition orthoepy played a part in the graphical representation of well known liturgical texts such as the psalms [ЖИВОВ 1984: 285, footnote 10 and 2006: 88–89, footnote 10], it may be inferred that in Novgorod at the turn of the twelfth to thirteenth century the distinction between *ѣ* and *ѣ* was not observed in Church Slavonic pronunciation any more than it was in the vernacular.

The orthographical habits reflected in *Pog6+Sof62*⁵ are a different matter. They contain no instances of *ж*, doubled vocalic letters are rare, the consonantal letters *жѣѣшѣ* are normally followed by *ѧ*, and sequences of liquid plus *ж*

⁴ On folia 6r, 7r, 10r, 39v, 40v, 49r, 56v, 72v, 78v, 84r, 88v, 97v.

⁵ In citations from these manuscripts, folio references are to *Sof62* unless *Pog6* is specified.

or ъ occur only in conjunction with line end, e.g., прѣмълѣ | ѹншн (8r), нзвѣрь | же (39v), зъ | лѣѹн (177r). The *yers* are omitted in weak position more often than in *Sof63*, and there is occasional confusion of ѣ with о, e.g., прѣмолѹн (18v), the aorist погрѣзѣша (172v) and the corruption of правѣдѣнѣ съи to правѣдѣноси (180v). The letters ѣ and ѓ are used indiscriminately, not only in Church Slavonicisms such as посредеѣ (44v, 76v, 127r, 132r, 172v), прѣдеѣ (*Pog6* 1v, 2v; 58r), потребѣнши (43v), прѣславѣно (89v), прѣстолѣ (110v), времѣ (180v), облеѹе сѣ (99r, 111r, 126r), but also in words and forms current in East Slavonic, e.g., семѣне (22v), ѹлѣекѣ (76v, 125v), ѹлѣекомѣ (*Pog6* 8r; 169r), нсповѣдатѣ сѣ тебѣ (43r), пожроѹ тебѣ (43v), адепрнеблнжн сѣ (90r). There are some East Slavonic or even local spellings, e.g., ѹюжнн (43v, 125v, 174v) as well as ѹюжнн (*Pog6* 4v, 6r; 165r), дрожгнѣ (71v), одѣжгн (76v), дѣжгѣ (169r, 173v), but the standard Church Slavonic знждѣмѣ (147r) is preferred to the dialect treatment found in *Sof63*. Evidence of *cokan'e* is minimal: ѣ instead of ѹ x3 in various forms of the possessive adjective грѣшѣннѣца (20r, 43v, 124v) and the reverse substitution x4, ѹ in place of а ѣ which may result either from the second palatalization, in оѹлта (62r) and ѹлѣѹеѣ (79r), or from the third, in лнѹе (171v) and старѣѹемѣ (176v). From this small number of examples it is difficult to draw firm conclusions. It is possible, for instance, that through training, experience and a good visual memory the scribe of *Pog6+Sof62* was usually able to arrive at the etymologically correct distributions of ѹ and ѣ even though he had no basis in pronunciation for distinguishing between them. Another conceivable possibility is that this manuscript was produced by a well trained scribe working from an exemplar characterized by *cokan'e* which he managed in most though not quite all instances to eradicate. On this hypothesis *Pog6+Sof62* would be representative of a shift towards a supradialectal norm of Russian Church Slavonic spelling in the later thirteenth century.

However, there is a third possibility, that the scribe of *Pog6+Sof62* copied from an antigraph which was unaffected by *cokan'e* and that the occasional instances of this dialectal feature betray his own local pronunciation. This interpretation deserves to be weighed along with the others because in general the manuscript is not as carefully written as *Sof63*. Although the scribe's hand is clear, it is larger and less elegant than that of the older manuscript. Mistakes in copying are somewhat more frequent and are left uncorrected, e.g., поношѣннѣ проѹдѣ instead of поношѣннѣ прнѹдѣ (61v), оѹбншасѣ in place of оѹглоѹбншасѣ (98v), провѣктѣ сѣ as a corruption of прогнѣвѣктѣ сѣ (129r). The impression of work carried out hastily or inattentively is compounded by blatant errors in rubrication, e.g., нрѣхопадѣннѣ for грѣхопадѣннѣ (*Pog6* 5v), ѹз for тѣ (37r),

НТЪ СЛАВЪИ for **ОТЪ СЛАВЪИ** (38r), **ПАКЪИ ШДЪЖЮ** for **НАКЪИ ШДЪЖЮ** (109r). Even when the rubricator realised that the initial letter which he had inserted at the beginning of ps. 111:2b was wrong, his attempt at emendation by adding a superscript letter was misguided and resulted in a superficially plausible corruption: **П^ОДЪ ПРАВЪИНХЪ** instead of **РОДЪ ПРАВЪИНХЪ** (128v).

Such disparities between manuscripts of similar date, provenance, type and content offer a salutary corrective to a priori assumptions about how orthographical norms developed and were applied in the period before reference works or spell-checks became available. On the one hand, ostensible consistency in some point of scribal practice is not necessarily a guarantee of general competence or attentiveness to the task of copying; on the other hand, inconsistent spelling may be a sign not of incompetence or carelessness, but of an orthographical system which permits specific kinds of variable usage.

I. I. Sreznevsky's conclusion that the two Novgorod manuscripts are not a pair was not based simply on the palaeographical and orthographical differences between them, but above all on discrepancies in their contents. In 92 psalms⁶ *Sof63* and *Pog6+Sof62* contain largely complementary selections of verses; this means that their combined witness supplies an almost complete text of those psalms. In 42 psalms,⁷ however, these manuscripts contain largely or entirely the same selection of verses; they therefore cover approximately half the text of the psalms in question. Sometimes they differ in the way they divide the text, especially when division is into full verses⁸ rather than verses. In such cases they may coincide for part of the text, e.g., in ps. 117, where they both start with even-numbered verses but diverge at verse 22, because *Sof63* goes from 22a to 23, omitting 22b, and so switches to odd-numbered verses, whereas *Sof62* continues with even-numbered ones throughout. Conversely in ps. 118 *Sof63* starts with even-numbered verses, *Sof62* with odd-numbered ones, but they agree between verses 73 and 112; in Canticle 2 *Sof63* starts with odd-numbered verses, *Sof62* with even-numbered ones, but they converge from verse 15 onward.

These facts are significant for several reasons. Firstly, they suggest that each manuscript originally had its pair, thus doubling the putative number of such books. Secondly, they imply that there was an ongoing liturgical need for antiphonal psalters. Further support for such an inference may be found in *Sof62*: at the beginning of pss. 26, 47, 65, 92 and 131 no heading or number

⁶ Pss. 18–24, 27–38, 40–43, 46, 49–75, 77–97, 101–107, 109–115, 118, 135, 136, 139, 146, 150, plus Canticle 2.

⁷ Pss. 17, 25, 26, 39, 44, 45, 47, 48, 76, 98–100, 108, 116, 117, 119–134, 137, 138, 140–145, 147–149; in addition *Sof62* supplies half the text of Canticles 1 and 3–9.

⁸ Pss. 50, 117, 118 and Canticle 2 in both manuscripts; pss. 140 and 148–150 in *Sof63*; the other Canticles in *Sof62*.

is supplied,⁹ so that the text runs on without break from the preceding psalm. Such oversights might perhaps occur more readily in copying from a pre-existing antiphonal psalter¹⁰ than from the full text of the psalms, especially as only the even-numbered versicles of pss. 26, 65 and 92 are supplied and the copyist therefore would not have had the initial versicle to prompt his memory. If this is what happened, there must have been at least a third pair of antiphonal psalter manuscripts in thirteenth-century Novgorod, for *Sof62* cannot have been copied from *Sof63*, which contains only the odd-numbered versicles of pss. 65 and 92.

More importantly, the partial coincidence between the texts in *Sof63* and *Pog6+Sof62* makes it easier to demonstrate that both manuscripts follow the same textual redaction. Where they coincide, each manuscript corroborates the other's witness, and they do this with a high degree of consistency, indicating unambiguously their joint affiliation to what is currently known as Redaction II of the Church Slavonic Psalter [THOMSON 1998: 810, MACROBERT 1998]. This is the version which was provisionally termed 'Russian' in the monographs by V. I. Sreznevsky and V. A. Pogorelov [СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1877, ПОГОРЕЛОВ 1901] because they met it attested in manuscripts which follow an East Slavonic orthographical recension (*izvod*); and the designation has been redeployed recently [OSTROWSKI 2009: 226–227, footnote 24], presumably because the earliest witness found so far, which goes back to the eleventh century, is likewise East Slavonic [ALTBAUER, LUNT 1978, КРИВКО 2004]. However, it does not necessarily follow that the textual Redaction II originated in the East Slav area; a Bulgarian provenance in the tenth century has also been mooted [THOMSON 1998: 813–814]. The question of local origin remains open [MACROBERT 2005], and it has become clear in recent years that this redaction is attested not only in East but also in South Slavonic manuscripts of the thirteenth century, in association with vestigial spellings of Middle Bulgarian type [MACROBERT 2008: 342].

The following examples comprise the main variant readings characteristic of Redaction II which are to be found in *Sof63* and *Sof62*. Each is given together with the Greek expression which it translates and is followed by a list of supporting witnesses, notes of any lacunae or corrections, and the contrasting variant from Redaction I, the other version in widespread use up to the fourteenth century. Uncertain or corrupt readings are indicated with a question mark. The two earliest witnesses used, the East Slavonic *Sin6 Har*, are cited first, followed by four South Slavonic manuscripts, three of the thirteenth century, *Sin7 Plj Bel*,

⁹ Perhaps as a consequence, the numbering of pss. 133–149 is incorrect in *Sof62*.

¹⁰ The inclusion of hypopsalmata to Cantic 2 in *Sof62* [MACROBERT 1996: 168 and 175] is a further indication that the antigraph of this manuscript was intended for liturgical use [ONASCH 1993 sub voce Responsorien]. The refrains are written immediately after the appropriate versicles, sometimes without even a point to mark them off; it is possible that the scribe of *Sof62* did not realise that they were extraneous to this little used text.

and the somewhat later but conservative *Ath*. Of these, *Plj Bel* offer the clearest supporting evidence for Redaction II, agreeing to a large extent with *Sin6 Har*, but unfortunately they both have substantial lacunae in the first third of the psalter text. *Sin7 Ath* are more nearly complete, but have been sporadically corrected, usually to readings of Redaction I which were reinstated in the later revisions of the fourteenth century; the fact that these corrections were made suggests strongly that the original readings in *Sin7 Ath* were those of Redaction II. After them come three fourteenth-century East Slavonic manuscripts, *Jar Fn11 Sof60*, which have been selected as relatively pure examples of Redaction II. The readings of *Amf*, the Simonovskaja Psalter published by Archimandrite Amphilochius [АМФИЛОХИЙ 1880–1] are included in spite of their occasional idiosyncrasies [ПОГОРЕЛОВ 1901: xxxii–xxxiii, МАСРОВА 2010] because this manuscript was used as a source for Redaction II by Jagić [Ягич 1884] and Pogorelov [ПОГОРЕЛОВ 1901] and remains one of the few representatives of that redaction easily accessible today.

The readings attested in both *Sof63* and *Sof62* can be divided into three types, each of which reflects a different aspect of the revision which produced Redaction II. The first consists of simple lexical or occasionally syntactic variation, where one expression is preferred to another of broadly similar meaning or function:

100:4b τοῦ πονηροῦ – ΛΟΥΚΑΒΑΓΟ *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Fn11* – ЗЪЛАГО I *Ath Sof60 Amf*;

102:13b οἰκτίρει – ΟΥΨΕΔΡΗΤЬ *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf* – ПОМНЛОУЕТЬ I *Har Sin7 Plj Bel*;

131:4c τοῖς κροτάφοις – КРАНИНАМА *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Jar Fn11? Sof60 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna)* – КРОТОФОМА I – КОЛЪНОМА *Ath*;

131:7a σκηνώματα – СЪНН *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I)* – СЕЛА I *Jar*;

132:2a μύρον – МЮРО *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har Bel lacuna)* – ХРНЗМА I;

132:2c ᾠαν – ПОДОЛЪКЪ *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I)* – ОМЕТЪ I *Sin7 Plj*;

146:8d ἀνθρώπων – УЛЪКМЪ *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj? Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har lacuna)* – УЛОВЪУЪСТЪ I.

Such adjustments could either have been made in the process of checking against Greek or have arisen subsequently within the Church Slavonic textual tradition; consequently they tend to constitute supplementary rather than decisive evidence for a particular redaction.

The other two types of variant can only be explained by reference to the Greek text of the psalms. Some of them arise from divergences between Redactions I and II in the interpretation of polysemous Greek words:

39:5b μανίας – ГНЪБЪ I *Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I)* – НЕНСТОБЛЕННІА I;

39:8b κεφαλίδι βιβλίου—ГЛАВНЗНѢ КННЖНѢН Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Jar FnI1 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna)—СЪВНТЪЦѢ КЪННЖНѢМЪ I Sof60;

68:21a τάλαιπωρίαν—ОКАНЬСТВА Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Sof60 (Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—СТРАСТН I Jar FnI1 Amf;

81:2b λαμβάνετε—ПРННМАКТЕ Sof63+Sof62 Har Amf ПРННМЛΕΤΕ Sin6? Jar (Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—ΟΒΗΝΟΥΗΤΕ СΔ I Plj Bel FnI1 Sof60;

108:23b ἀκριδες—АБРЪДЪК Sof63+Sof62 Har Jar (Sin6 Bel lacuna; Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—ΠΡΟΥΤ'ΝΥΗΝ ΚΟΝ'ЦΗ Plj Amf?—ПРЖЗН I FnI1 Sof60;

138:3b προεἶδες—ПРЪДЪВНДѢ Sof63+Sof62 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar FnI1 Sof60 (Sin6 lacuna)—ПРЪДЪЗРЕ Ath Amf—ΠΡΟΖΡѢ I.

On the whole these variants suggest a more literalistic approach in Redaction II than in Redaction I, but the reading in 108:23b may be an exception: the meaning and etymology of АБРЪДЪК are a matter of debate, but the gloss provided in *Plj* and garbled as ΠΡΟΥΓΗΝ ΗΚΟΝΟΥ in *Amf* suggests that the word was understood to refer to plants rather than insects [MACROBERT 2010: 427].

The third type of diagnostic readings reproduces variants within the Greek textual tradition. Several of these are reminiscences, phrases transferred from similar contexts in other psalms; in principle such transferences could take place as readily in the Church Slavonic textual tradition as in Greek, but the regularity with which these readings appear in manuscripts containing one or other redaction suggests strongly that they go back to the Greek version from which their redaction derived. Some of the others betray misinterpretations of Greek and may indicate that Redaction II was based on a less competent knowledge of Greek than Redaction I:

39:9b κοιλίας—ΟΥΤΡΟΒЪ I Sof63+Sof62 Har Sin7 Jar FnI1? Amf—ΥΡΕΒΑ Sin6 Sof60 (Plj Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I); καρδίας—СРЪДЪЦА I

46:9a ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη—НАДЪ ІАЗЪІКЪ I Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Sof60 Amf; ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη¹¹—НАДЪ ВЪСѢМНІАЗЪІКЪ I Ath FnI1;

68:14b δυνάμεως¹²—СНДЪ I Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath FnI1 Sof60 Amf; ἐλέους—МНЛОСТН I Jar Sin7;

97:5a τῷ κυρίῳ—ГДѢН Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf; τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν¹³—БѢΟΥ НАШЕМОУ I;

97:6a ἐλαταῖς confused with ἐλατιναῖς?—ДРЕВАНАХЪ Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Jar (Sin7 corrected to I); ἐλαταῖς—КОВАНАХЪ I FnI1 Sof60 Amf;

98:4b εὐθύτητας—ПРАВЪДЪ I Sof63+Sof62 Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath FnI1 Sof60—ПРАВННА Amf; εὐθύτητα—ПРАВННЖ I ПРАВДОУ Jar;

¹¹ Cf. 46:2a.

¹² Cf. 32:17b and 65:3b.

¹³ Cf. 46:7b.

108:23b ἐξετινάχθην mistakenly associated with ἐκτείνω?—**ΠΡΟΣ ΤΡΟΧЪ** **СА Sof63+Sof62 Har Plj Jar (Sin6 Bel lacuna; Sin7 corrected to I)—****СЪПРОС ΤΡΟΧЪ СА Amf**; ἐξετινάχθην—**СЪ ΤΡΑСОΧЪ СА I Fn11 Sof60**.

While the number of these shared readings in *Sof63* and *Sof62* is inevitably limited, their evidence for affiliation to Redaction II is unambiguous; there is only one problematic variant:

140:9a συνεστήσαντο—**СЪСТАВΗΣА Sof63+Sof62 Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Amf (Sin6 Har lacuna; Jar corrected)**; ἔκρυψαν¹⁴—**СЪКРЪША Fn11 Sof60**. The absence of the readings for *Sin6 Har* makes it difficult to determine whether the variant **СЪКРЪША**, which is found in a number of fourteenth-century East Slavonic manuscripts, was original to Redaction II [MACROBERT 1998: 932] but was ousted in South Slavonic manuscripts by the reading of Redaction I, or whether it was a later modification.

Divergence between *Sof63* and *Sof62* is also rare and can be explained by the relative conservatism of *Sof63*. In particular, in the headings to the eighth and nineteenth kathismata¹⁵ *Sof63* retains in abbreviated form, **СЪ**[Ⓢ], the early Church Slavonic translation of the term **СЪΔΗΛΗΝΑ** or **СЪΔΗΛΗΝΟ**, which is otherwise found mainly in association with Redaction I; but *Pog6+Sof62* has throughout the abbreviation **КА**[Ⓢ] of the more widely used Greek equivalent *kathisma*, as does *Sof63* elsewhere. Another example of possible conservatism in *Sof63* occurs in 150:4a, where the equivalent supplied for τυμπάνω is not the loanword **ТОУМЪПАНЪ** found in *Sof62* and most other Church Slavonic psalter manuscripts regardless of redaction, but **КУМΠΑΝЪ**, which, if it is not merely a slip of the pen, can be paralleled only by **КЕМЪПНЪ**¹⁶ in the second Glagolitic psalter from Sinai [MIKLAS 2012].

On the textological foundation provided by those portions of *Sof63* and *Pog6+Sof62* which coincide textually it is possible to build up a fuller picture of Redaction II by taking into account diagnostic readings attested only in one of the two manuscripts. The same three-fold division can be applied. The lexical variants, even when they only occur once, speak for a different approach to translation from that of Redaction I, for instance in the use of of native words rather than loans:

17:39a οὐ μὴ δύνωνται—**НЕ МОГОУТЬ МОЦІ Sof63 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Bel Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har lacuna)—НЕ НМЖТЬ МОЦН I—НЕ ВЪЗМОГЪТЬ Ath Jar**;

30:23b ἀπέρριμμαι—**ЪРΗΝΟΒЕНЪ Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Plj lacuna)—ЪВРЪЖЕНЪ I**;

¹⁴ Cf. 30:5a.

¹⁵ At pss. 55 and 134.

¹⁶ The same word occurs, but as a translation of 150:5 *κυμαλοισ*, in the second Glagolitic psalter and the Vienna Croatian Glagolitic commented psalter [НАММ 1967]; this may be echoed in the reading **ЗВОНЪХЪ** found in *Plj Bel Ath* [ТРИФУНОВИЋ 2000; MACROBERT 2010: 429].

48:21b ἀνοήτοις—**HEPA3OYMBHNIΧΖ Sof63 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Amf (Bel lacuna)**—**HEC3M3ICΛHNIΧΖ I Har Sof60;**

61:11c ῥέη—**ΠΡΕΤΕΚΑΚΤЪ Sof63 Sin6 Plj Bel Fn11 Sof60 Amf—MHMO TEKAE TЪ I Har Sin7 Ath Jar;**

62:12c ἐνεφράγη—**ЗАГΡΑΔΗША CA Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Bel lacuna)**—**ЗА҃ША CA I;**

73:8a συγγένεια—**СЪРОΔΙΤΕΛΗ Sof63 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Jar (Sin7 corrected to I)**—**СЪΟΥЖНКЪ I Amf—ЖНКЪ I Fn11 Sof60;**

83:3b ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα—**КЪ БОУ ЖНБОУ Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar (Amf without КЪ)**—**О БѢЪ ЖНБЪ I Fn11 Sof60 Ath;**

85:4b ἦρα—**ВЪЗДВНГОХЪ Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar – ВЪЗАХЪ I Fn11 Sof60 Amf;**

92:3b ἐπιτρέφεις—**СТ(ВО)РЕННѦ, i.e., СЪТРЕННѦ Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Bel Fn11 (Ath corrected to I)**—**СТРОУѦ Jar Sof60—СТРОУГЪ I Har Amf;**

101:8b δώματι—**ЗЪДАНН Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar Fn11 S60—ЗЪДѢ I Amf;**

101:28 ἐκλείπουσιν—**ОСКОУДѢЮТЪ Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60—НСКОНЪУАЮТЪ CA I Amf;**

105:42a ἔθλιψαν—**ОСКЪРБѢША Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60—СЪТЖЖНША I Amf;**

113:8b ἀκρότομον—**HEC3BKOM3IH Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Bel lacuna)**—**AKPOTOMЪ I;**

138:15b ὑπόστασις—**СЪСТАВЪ Sof63 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Sin6 lacuna)**—**УПОСТАСЪ I;**

140:7b διεσχορπίσθη—**РАСЪИПАША CA Sof63 Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Sin6 Har lacuna)**—**РАСОУША CA I.**

Parallels can be found to the lexical choices recorded in both manuscripts:

42:3c σκηνώματα—**СЪНІ Sof63 Sin6 Har Bel S60 Amf СЪНЪ Jar (Plj lacuna; Ath corrected to I)**—**СЕЛА I Sin7 Fn11;**

105:46a οἰκτιρμούς—**ЩЕДРОТЪ I Sof63 Sin6 Sin7 Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf—MHΛOC TЪ I Har Plj Bel;**

118:156a οἰκτιρμοί—**ЩЕДРОТЪ I Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Bel lacuna)**—**MHΛOC TH I.**

Repeated attestations in one or other of the two manuscripts similarly reflect lexical preferences either in Redaction II itself or at any rate in the period during which this version was in use:

18:2 ποίησιν—**СЪТВОРЕННѦ Pog6 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Fn11 Amf—ТВАРЬ I Sin7 Ath Jar Sof60;**

63:10c ποιήματα—**СЪТВОРЕННѦ Sof62 Sin6? Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Amf (Bel lacuna)**—**ТВАРН I Sof60;**

65:16a διηγῆσομαι—**СЪКАЖЮ** *Sof62 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf*
(*Ath* corrected to I)—**ПОВѢМЪ** I *Sin6?*;

72:15a διηγῆσομαι—**СЪКАЖЮ** *Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Ath Sof60*
Amf—**ПОВѢМЪ** I *FnI1*;

77:67b φυλήν—**ΠΑΕΜΕΝΕ** *Sof62 Sin6 Har Jar FnI1 Amf Sof60*—**ΚΟΛΨΗΑ**
Plj Bel Ath;

77:68a φυλήν—**ΠΑΕΜΑ** *Sof63 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf*—
ΚΟΛΨΗΘ I *Sin6 Ath*;

90:6b συμπτώματος—**СЪРѢТЕННѦ** *Sof63 Bel Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf*—
СРѢЩА I *Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath*.

To these may be added a range of recurrent features, too frequently instantiated to be listed individually, whose preponderant or systematic use in manuscripts of Redaction II helps to distinguish them even from the later representatives of Redaction I [MACROBERT 2005: 41–42]: the absence of asigmatic aorists, the use of **АКЪ** I (x29 *Sof63*, x23 *Sof62*) rather than **ѦКО** to introduce similes, **ВЕΛΗΚЪ** (x4 *Sof63*, x1 *Sof62*) rather than **ВЕΛΗΗ**, and the lexical items **ΒΕΖΟΥΜΑ** (x3 *Sof63*, x4 *Sof62*), **НАΠΡΑΨΗ** (x2 *Sof63*, x3 *Sof62*), **СЪБОРЪ** (x7 *Sof63*, x3 *Sof62*) instead of **ΑΘΟΥΤЪ** or **СПΪΤΗ**, **НАΛΑΨΗ**, **СЪНЪМЪ** in Redaction I.

Direct discrepancy between *Sof63* and *Pog6+Sof62* cannot of course be detected in those portions of the text where the manuscripts complement each other, but there are two examples of indirect inconsistency. One of these is probably an instance of linguistic updating independent of redaction:

69:6b χρονίσης—**ЗАМОУДН** *Sof63 I Sin6 Har Sin7 Amf*—**ЗАКЪСНН** *Plj*
Bel Ath—**ЗАМЕΔΛН** *Jar FnI1 Sof60*

39:18b χρονίσης **ЗАМЕΔΛН** *Sof62 Jar Sof60*—**ЗАМЖДН** I *Sin6 Har*—
ЗАБОУДН *Sin7 FnI1 Amf*—**ЗАКЪСНН** *Ath* (*Plj Bel* lacuna)

The corruption of **ЗАМЖДН** to **ЗАБОУДН** in both South and East Slavonic manuscripts is in itself an indication that **ЗАМЖДНТН** was not in current use, and its replacement by **ЗАМЕΔΛН** in *Sof62*, as by **ЗАКЪСНН** in *Plj Bel Ath*, merely confirms this. The other instance of lexical variation in *Sof63* and *Sof62*, between the Latin loanword **ΟΛΨΗ** and the Greek **ΕΛΨΗ**, is more problematic: *Sof63* has **ΕΛΨΗ** x2 (108:24, 140:5) but also an instance of **ΟΛΨΗ** (108:18); *Sof62* has **ΕΛΨΗ** x5 (22:5, 54:22, 91:11, 108:18+24) but presents **ΩΛΨΗ** x2 with a rubricated initial (88:21, 140:5) and also x2 in line (103:15, Deut. 32:13d). In Redaction I, in the South Slavonic *Sin7 Plj Bel Ath* and in the East Slavonic *Jar* **ΟΛΨΗ** is found to the exclusion of **ΕΛΨΗ**, but *Sin6 Har FnI1 Sof60 Amf* employ an unpredictable mixture of both, with **ΜΑCΛΟ** as a further occasional option in *Sin6 Sof60 Amf*. It is not impossible that Redaction II was inconsistent in this respect from the outset, since it seems to have come into existence through a process of checking and correcting Redaction I against Greek.

The character of that process is once again brought into sharp focus by instances of a distinctive approach to translation in Redaction II, sometimes literalistic, sometimes interpretative, which are attested either in *Sof63* or in *Sof62*:

34:6a ὀλισθημα—**СЪБΛΑΖΗЪ** *Sof62 Sin6 Har Bel Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf* (*Plj lacuna*; *Sin7 Ath* corrected to I)—**ΠΛΥΖΥΚЪ** I;

54:23b σάλον—**СМАТЕННІА** *Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf* (*Har Bel lacuna*)—**МΛΖΒЪ** I;

63:3a συστροφῆς πονευρομένων—**РАЗВРАЩЕННІА ЛΟΥΚΑΒΕΣΤΒΟΥ-ЮЩИННХЪ** *Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf* (*Bel lacuna*)—**СЪНЬМА ЗЪЛОБЕНЪИХЪ** I;

70:14a διὰ παντός—**О ВСЕМЪ** *Sof63 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Jar Ath Sof60 Amf*—**ВЪИНЖ** I *Sin7 FnI1*;

72:7b διάθεσιν—**РАЗМЪИШΛΕΝНІА** *Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7orig. Plj Ath Jar Sof60 Amf* (*Bel lacuna*; *Sin7* corrected to I)—**ΛΗΕΖΒΕ** I *FnI1*;

73:4b ἔγνωσαν—**ΥЮША** *Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Amf* (*Ath* corrected to I)—**ΠΟЗНАША** I *FnI1 Sof60*;

91:8b διέκυψαν—**ΠΡΕΚΛΟΝΗША СΛ** *Sof63 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Jar FnI1*—**ВЪЗННКОША** I *Sof60 Amf* **ΟΥΝНΗКОШЕ** *Sin7*;

92:4b μετεωρισμοί—**ЗАПРЪЩΕΝНІА** *Sof63 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Jar FnI1 Sof60* (*Sin7 Ath* corrected to I)—**ВЪΙСОТЪ** I *Amf*;

93:9b κατανοεῖ—**РАЗΟΥМЪКТЬ** *Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Ath FnI1 Sof60* (*Bel lacuna*)—**СМОТРΗΤЪ** I *Plj Amf* (*Jar* corrected from **СМАТРАКТЬ**?);

106:29a αὔραν—**ТНШННΟΥ** *Sof62 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath FnI1 Sof60* (*Sin6 lacuna*)—**ΧΛΑΔЪ** I *Jar Amf*;

108:21b χρηστόν—**ЩЕДРА** *Sof63 Har Plj FnI1 Sof60* (*Sin6 Bel lacuna*; *Ath* corrected to I); *Jar* corrected—**БЛАГА** I *Jar? Amf Sin7*;

109:3a ἀρχή—**НАΥΑΛΕΣΤΒΟ** *Sof63 Har Ath Jar Sof60* (*Sin6 Bel lacuna*)—**ΒΛΑΔЪΙΥΕΣΤΒΟ** I *Plj Sin7 FnI1 Amf*;

136:3b ὕμνον—**ΧΒΑΛΟΥ** *Sof62 Har Plj Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf* (*Sin6 Bel lacuna*; *Sin7* corrected to I)—**ПЪСННН** I.

Although some of the manuscripts adduced here deviate occasionally in the direction of Redaction I, the majority reading of Redaction II is in most cases clear and is usually supported by the earliest witness, *Sin6*. The same can be said of those variants which can be referred back to the Greek textual tradition:

33:23b καταισχυνθήσονται¹⁷—**ΠΟСТЪΙДАТЪ СΛ** *Sof63 Sin6 Har Bel* (*Plj lacuna*) *Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf*; πλημμελήσουσιν—**ΠΡЪΓΡЪШАТЪ** I *Sin7 Ath*;

¹⁷ Probably a vague reminiscence of similar wording in 33:6b, 36:19, 68:7a.

34:11 ἀνέστησαν?—**ВЪСТАША** Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Bel Ath Jar FnI1 Amf Sof60 (Plj lacuna); ἀναστάντες—**ВЪСТАВЪШНН I**;

49:18b μοιχοῦ—**ПРЪЛЮБОДЪНМЪ** Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Sof69 Amf (Bel lacuna); μοιχῶν—**ПРЪЛЮБОДЪН I FnI1**

57:5b ἀσπίδος κωφῆς—**ΑΣΠΗΔΑ ΓΛΟΥΧΑ** Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf (Har lacuna); ἀσπίδων κωφῶν—**ΑΣΠΗΔЪΙ ΓΛΟΥΧЪΙ I**;

57:6b φαρμακοῦται φαρμακευομένη παρὰ σοφοῦ?—**ΟΒΑΒΑΚΜΑ ΟΒΑΒΑЮЩН СΔ Ѡ ПРЪМОУΔΡΑ** Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Jar FnI1 Sof60 (Har lacuna); φαρμακοῦ τε φαρμακευομένη παρὰ σοφοῦ?—**ΟΒΑΒΑΚΜΑ Ѡ ΟΒΑΒЪННКА ПРЪМОУΔΡΑ** Plj Bel—**ΟΒΑΒΑΚΜΑ Ѡ ΟΒΑΒΑЮЩАГО Ѡ ПРЪМЪΔΡΑ** Amf—**Ѡ ПРЪМОУΔΡΑ ΟΒΑΒЪННКА ΟΒΑΒΑΚΜΑ I Ath**;

70:19a θαυμασία¹⁸—**УЮДЕСА** Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Amf; μεγαλεῖα—**ВЕΛΗΥЪСТВННА I FnI1 Sof60** (Ath corrected to II?);

70:20c ἀνῆγαγες—**ВЪЗВЕДЕ** Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Amf (Ath corrected to I); πάλιν ἀνῆγαγες—**ДРЕВЛЕ ВЪЗВЕДЕ I FnI1 Sof60**;

73:17a ὄρια misread as ὄρεα?—**ГОРЪИ** Sof62 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Jar Sof60 Amf (Sin7 corrected to I); ὄρια—**ПРЪДЪЛЪИ I Ath FnI1**;

83:11c οἰκεῖν με—**ЖНТН МН** Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 (Har lacuna); οἰκεῖν—**ЖНТН I Bel Amf**;

84:5 σωτήρ ἡμῶν—**СПЕНТЕЛЮ НАШЪ** Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf (Plj corrected to I); σωτηρίων ἡμῶν—**СПЕННН НАШНХЪ I**;

104:42b τοῦ πρὸς Αβρααμ—**НЖЕ КЪ АВΡΑΑΜΟΥ** Sof62 Sin6 Har Ath Jar FnI1; ὃν διέθετο τῷ Αβρααμ—**ΕЖЕ НМЪ КЪ АВΡΑΑΜΟΥ I Sin7 Plj Bel Amf Sof60**;

138:20a ἐρεῖς ἔσται?—**РЕУЕ БОУДЕТЬ** Sof63 FnI1 Sof60 (Sin6 lacuna; Sin7 corrected to III); ἐρεῖτε ἔσται?—**РЕУЕТЕ БОУДЕТЬ** Har Plj Bel Jar Amf (Ath corrected to I); ἐρεῖτε—**РЕУЕТЕ I**; ἐρισταί ἐστε—**РЕВННВН КСТЕ III**.

As before, in the case of 140:9a discussed above, there is only one problematic reading:

52:2b ἀνομίαις—**ΒΕΖΑΚΟΝΗΗ** Sof62 Har—ἐπιτηδεύμασι¹⁹—**ΝΑΥΗΝΑΝΗΗΧЪ** Sin6 Plj Bel Ath Jar FnI1 Sof60 Amf (Sin7 corrected to I)—**ΒΕΖΑΚΟΝΗΗΧЪ I Jar**.

Here the support in other manuscripts for **ΝΑΥΗΝΑΝΗΗΧЪ** as the reading of Redaction II is strong; the minority preference for **ΒΕΖΑΚΟΝΗΗ(ΧЪ)** could have any of several possible explanations: sporadic influence of Redaction I, sporadic consultation of Greek at some early stage, or simply the appropriateness in context of **ΒΕΖΑΚΟΝΗΗ**, which occurs much more frequently in the psalms than **ΝΑΥΗΝΑΝΗΗ**.

¹⁸ Cf. 70:17b.

¹⁹ Cf. 13:1b.

Apart from these isolated deviations and a few omissions from both manuscripts,²⁰ *Sof63* and *Sof62* taken together present a pattern of readings which corresponds closely to the set of diagnostic variants posited for Redaction II [MACROBERT 1998: 929–933]. They also follow Redaction II almost without exception in agreeing with the liturgical rather than the commentated version of Redaction I where those two traditions diverge [MACROBERT 1998: 933–935].²¹ Of the three exceptions, the one in 106:19b, where *Sof63* agrees with the commentated tradition, is probably a reminiscence of 106:13b; in the other two cases, the omission from 136:6b of **ѦАКО** in *Sof63* and the reading Deut. 32:43 **ОУКРЪПАТЬ Н** in *Sof62*, the variant reading is a minority one, not widely enough supported to be typical of any redaction.

Thus the antiphonal psalters from S. Sophia in Novgorod are important in three respects: they preserve evidence of a liturgical practice which is otherwise sparsely attested; in both of them, but especially in the older manuscript, *Sof63*, the interaction of local pronunciation with Church Slavonic can be clearly detected; and their joint witness lends weighty support to the inference, otherwise based mainly on manuscripts of rather later date, that up to the period of Second South Slavonic influence the version of the Psalter most widely known and used in Rus' was Redaction II. Moreover, in some points they agree with the earliest witnesses to that redaction, *Sin6* and *Har*, against the later and more heterogeneous tradition found in the fourteenth century. The combined witness of *Sof63* and *Pog6+Sof62* provides the fullest East Slavonic version of Redaction II extant from the thirteenth century²² and the earliest manuscript evidence for this redaction to have survived continuously in Russian archives.

Appendix: Confusion of **Ѧ** and **Ѧ** in *Sof63*

Multiple instances of type I **Ѧ** > **Ѧ** (x62):

ОУѦ- x15: forms of **НАОУѦНТН** (7r, 66v, 87v, 88r, 90r x3, 91v, 92v, 93r, 106r), forms of **ПООУѦНТН** (50v, 93v, 105v), **ПООУѦНИИ** (94v);

ѦНСТ- x6: **ѦНСТОТЪ** (1r), forms of **ОѦНСТНТН** (30r x2, 81v), **ОѦНѦНИИ** (63r, 98r);

ѦЪТО x4: **НИѦЪТОЖЕ** (20v, 62r), **НЕ О ѦЕМЪЖЕ** (33v), **ѦЪТО** (95r);

АЛѦЮѦ- x4: (78v, 79r, 80r, 108v);

²⁰ 43:8b, 44:9, 47:4, 62:2, 107:10; 134:6, Isa. 26:20.

²¹ In 21:9 *Sof62*, 24:17 *Sof63*, 26:9 *Sof63*, 34:8 *Sof62*, 39:15 *Sof62*, 39:18 *Sof62*, 91:15 *Sof63*, 107:5 *Sof63*, 107:9 *Sof63*, 111:8 *Sof63*, 118:127 *Sof62*, 134:12 *Sof63*, 138:24 *Sof62*, Deut. 32:39 *Sof62*; in 103:27 *Sof63 Sof62*, like other witnesses to Redaction II, prefer the reading found in the commentated version of Redaction I.

²² The thirteenth-century psalter manuscript in RGADA [АВТОКРАТОВА, КНЯЗЕВСКАЯ, ШМИДТ 1988: 104–106, no. 40] is unfortunately incomplete: it breaks off at ps. 103.

мълц- x4: forms of **прѣмълцнѣти** (9b, 29r), **оумлъцн** (20v), **нзмъ | лцѣ** (42r);

уловѣцъск- x4: (56r, 79r, 107v, 108r);

оцн x3: (88v, 96r, 98v);

пацѣ x3: (30r, 103r, 105r);

рѣц-/рѣц- x3: **рѣцн** (2v), **рѣцѣтъ** (59r), **вельрѣцѣѣ** (31r);

мърц-/мрац- x2: **мърцѣ** (75v) **омрацнѣтъ сѧ** (102v);

нацнн-/наца- x2: **нацннанѣнхъ** (77v), **нацало** (101v);

облац-/облѣц- x2: **облацнѣ** (70r), **облѣцѣ сѧ** (81v);

плацѣ x2: (10v, 71r);

сѣц- x2: **отъсѣцѣтъ** (50v), **сѣцѣ** (77v);

тоуцнѣ x2: (4v, 41r);

цнсло x2: (22r, 109r);

цаст- x2: **прнцастнша сѧ** (77v), **цастѣ** (111v).

Single instances of type I **ѣ > ц** (x14):

вѣцѣра (74r), **зълцѣ** (113r), **нстоцнннѣ** (41v), **паоуцнноу** (21r), **отълоуцншн** (40v), **мѣцѣ** (34r), **оумоуцн** (2r), **непороцнноу** (70v), **прнтъцю** (42v), **нсоуцн** (48r), **растоцн** (83v), **црѣва** (99r), **нѣцѣстнѣѣмн** (7v), **цюдѣса** (79v).

Multiple instances of type I' **ѣ > ц** (x36):

оуницѣж- x12: forms of **оуницѣжнѣти** (5v, 24v, 43v, 34v, 71v, 77v, 89v, 92r), **оуницѣженнѣ** (12r, 89r, 96r x2);

вѣлц- x8: **вѣзвѣлцаѣ** (2r), forms of **вѣзвѣлцнѣти сѧ** (22r, 34r, 65v, 73r) **вѣлцѣстнѣю** (111r), **вѣлцнѣ** (111r), **вѣзвѣселнмъ сѧ > вѣзвѣлцнмъ сѧ** (3v);

конѣц- x6: forms of **нсконѣцаѣти сѧ** (21r, 64r, 74v), **сконѣцаю** (112v), **конѣцнѣ** (35v, 91r);

лнц- x4: forms of **облнцнѣти** (19r, 29v, 104v), **облнцнннѣ** (47r);

грѣшннц- (adjective) x2: (81r, 104v);

овѣца x2: (adjective 55v, noun 94v);

пшѣннцн- x2: (57r, 109v).

Single instances of type I' **ѣ > ц** (x6):

лгнѣцѣмѣ (adjective 112r), **вѣнѣцаюшааго** (72r), **вѣцѣскаѣ** (74r), **ловѣца** (adjective 64v), **оѣѣстнѣѣ** (68r), **прнннцѣ** (59r).

Single instances of *tj > **ѣ > ц** (x2):

полѣцю (32r), **пнцю** (74r).

Single instance of type II **ц > ѣ**:

ѣрѣѣ (7r).

Single instances of type III $\Psi > \Upsilon$ (x3):

СКРОПНСЪУА (genitive, 28r), ЛНУА (43r), ПТЕНЬУЕМЪ (109r).

Manuscripts Cited

Amf

State Historical Museum in Moscow, MS Хлуд. 3, East Slavonic, probably 14th century [communication by A. A. Turilov, page ШМИДТ 1984: 318–9, No. 384], published in [АМФИЛОХИЙ 1880–1].

Ath

National Library of Greece, Athens, MS 1797, West Bulgarian or Macedonian, 14th century [ХАРИСИЈАДИС 1978; СТАНЧЕВ, ДЖУРОВА 1981: 34–40; МАСРОБЕРТ 2008; МАСРОБЕРТ forthcoming].

Bel

Belgrade University Library, MS 36; Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, MS 331; Serbian National Library, MS 589; Library of the Belgrade Patriarchate, MS 314; Museum of Applied Arts, two unnumbered bifolia; Serbian, 13th century [ЦЕРНИЋ 1981: 337 and 346; БОГДАНОВИЋ 1982: 89, nos. 1221–1224; МАСРОБЕРТ 1991 and 2008].

FnII

National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, MS Ф.п.І.І., 14th century [communication by A. A. Turilov, page ШМИДТ 1984: 274, No. 300; SZULC 2000–01].

Har

Houghton Library, Harvard, MS Typ. 221, East Slavonic, 12th–13th century [extract published in ALTBAUER, LUNT 1978: 146–177].

Jar

Historical Museum in Yaroslavl, MS 15482, East Slavonic, 14th century [МАСРОБЕРТ 1992].

Plj

Monastery of the Holy Trinity, Pljevlja, MS 80, and Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, MS 45.8.263, Serbian, 13th century [ЦЕРНИЋ 1980: 363, no. 13; БОГДАНОВИЋ 1982: 89, no. 1227; МАСРОБЕРТ 1991 and 2008].

Pog6+Sof62

National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, MS Порог. 6 and MS Соф. 62, East Slavonic, 13th–14th century; [ШМИДТ 1984: 363–4; КУПРИЯНОВ 1857: 29–31, СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1861–63: 59, СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1877: 60–61].

Sin6

St. Catherine's monastery, Sinai, MS Slav. 6 and Slav 6/N, plus National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, MS Q.п.І.73 (the Bychkov fragment), East Slavonic, 11th century; published in [ALTBAUER, LUNT 1978, TARNANIDES 1988].

Sin7

St. Catherine's monastery, Sinai, MS Slav. 7, Serbian, 13th century [СПЕРАНСКИЙ 1927: 98; МАСРОБЕРТ 2008].

Sof60

National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, MS Соф. 60, East Slavonic, 14th century [ГРАНСТРЕМ 1953: 52–53].

Sof63

National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg, MS Соф. 63, East Slavonic, 12th–13th century [ШМИДТ 2002: 653–4; КУПРИЯНОВ 1857: 29–31, СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1861–63: 59, СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1877: 60–61].

Bibliography

- АВТОКРАТОВА, КНЯЗЕВСКАЯ, ШМИДТ 1988
АВТОКРАТОВА М. И., КНЯЗЕВСКАЯ О. А., ШМИДТ С. О., *Каталог рукописных книг XI–XIV вв., хранящихся в ЦГАДА СССР*, 1–2, Москва, 1988.
- АМФИЛОХИЙ 1880–1
АРХИМАНДРИТ АМФИЛОХИЙ, *Древле-славянская Псалтирь Симоновская до 1280 года*, 1–4, 2-е изд., Москва, 1880–1881.
- БЕНЕШЕВИЧ 1911
БЕНЕШЕВИЧ В. Н., *Описание греческих рукописей Монастыря Святой Екатерины на Синае*, 1, С.-Петербург, 1911.
- БОГДАНОВИЋ 1982
БОГДАНОВИЋ Д., *Инвентар ћирилских рукописа у Југославији (XI–XVII века)*, Београд, 1982.
- ГОРСКИЙ, НЕВОСТРУЕВ 1855
ГОРСКИЙ А. В., НЕВОСТРУЕВ К. И., *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки*, 1, Москва, 1855.
- ГРАНСТРЕМ 1953
ГРАНСТРЕМ Е. Э., *Описание русских и славянских пергаменных рукописей: рукописи русские, болгарские, молдавлахийские, сербские*, Ленинград, 1953.
- ДЪЯЧЕНКО 1899
ДЪЯЧЕНКО Г., *Полный церковно-славянский словарь*, Москва, 1899.
- ЖИВОВ 1984/2006
ЖИВОВ В. М., “Правила и произношение в русском церковнославянском правописании XI–XIII вв.”, *Russian Linguistics*, 8, 1984, 251–293 (= *Восточнославянское правописание XI–XIII века*), Москва, 2006, 76–130.
- КРИВКО 2004
КРИВКО Р. Н., “Графико-орфографические системы Бычковско-Синайской псалтыри”, I–II, *Русский язык в научном освещении*, 7, 2004, 80–124 and 8, 2004, 17–200.
- КУПРИЯНОВ 1857
КУПРИЯНОВ И., *Обозрение пергаменных рукописей Новгородской Софийской библиотеки*, С.-Петербург, 1857.
- ПОГОРЕЛОВ 1901
ПОГОРЕЛОВ В. А., *Псалтыри* (= Библиотека Московской Синодальной Типографии, 1:3), Москва, 1901.
- СПЕРАНСКИЙ 1927
СПЕРАНСКИЙ М. Н., “Славянская письменность XI–XIV вв. на Синае и в Палестине”, *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук*, 32, 1927, 43–118.
- СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1861–63
СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ И. И., “Древние памятники русского письма и языка”, *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской академии наук*, 10, 1861–1863.
- СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ 1877
СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ В. И., *Древний славянский перевод псалтыри. Исследование его текста и языка по рукописям XI–XIV вв.*, С.-Петербург, 1877.
- СТАНЧЕВ, ДЖУРОВА 1981
СТАНЧЕВ К., ДЖУРОВА А., “Археографски бележки от Националната библиотека в Атина”, *Старобългарска литература*, 9, 1981, 3–75.
- ТРИФУНОВИЋ 2001
ТРИФУНОВИЋ Ђ., “Псалтир светога Саве Српског”, *Slavia*, 70, 2001, 499–503.

ХАРИСИЈАДИС 1978

ХАРИСИАДИС М., “Српски рукописи у атинској Народној библиотеци”, *Зборник за ликовне уметности*, 14, 1978, 205–12.

ЦЕРНИЋ 1980

ЦЕРНИЋ Л., “Нека запажања о српским рукописима у збиркама Лењинграда”, *Археографски прилози*, 2, 1980, 359–64.

ЦЕРНИЋ 1981

ЦЕРНИЋ Л., “О атрибуцији средњовековних српских ћирилских рукописа”, у: Д. БОГДАНОВИЋ (ed.), *Текстологија средњовековних јужнословенских књижевности* (= Српска Академија Наука и Уметности, Научни скупови, књ. х, Одељење језика и књижевности, књ. 2), Београд, 1981, 335–360.

ШМИДТ 2002

ШМИДТ С. О. и др. (ed.), *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в России, странах СНГ и Балтии. XIV в.*, 1, Москва, 2002.

ШМИДТ 1984

ШМИДТ С. О. и др. (ed.), *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI–XIII вв.*, Москва, 1984.

ЈГИЧ 1884

ЈГИЧ В., “Четыре критико-палеографические статьи (приложение к отчету о присуждении Ломоносовской премии за 1885 год)”, *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук*, 33, 1884, 37–73.

АЛТБАУЕР, ЛУНТ 1978

АЛТБАУЕР М., ЛУНТ Н. G., *An Early Slavonic Psalter from Rus'*, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.

НАММ 1967

Намм Ј., *Psalterium vindobonense. Der kommentierte glagolitische Psalter der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (= Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Schriften der Balkankommission, Linguistische Abteilung, 19), Vienna, 1967.

МАСРОБЕРТ 1991

МАСРОБЕРТ С. М., “The Systems of Supplementary Penitential Texts in the Psalter MSS Peć 68, Belgrade 36, and Pljevlja 80”, *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, NS 24, 1991, 1–22.

МАСРОБЕРТ 1992

МАСРОБЕРТ С. М., “Two Lykewake Psalters: The MSS Västerås/UUB5/UUB6 and Jaroslavl' 15482,” *Scando-Slavica*, 38, 1992, 108–127.

МАСРОБЕРТ 1996

МАСРОБЕРТ С. М., “The Classificatory Importance of Headings and Liturgical Directions in Church Slavonic Psalters of the 11th–15th Centuries,” *Byzantinoslavica*, 57, 1996, 156–181.

МАСРОБЕРТ 1998

МАСРОБЕРТ С. М., “The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century,” in: J. KRAŠOVEC (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*, Ljubljana–Sheffield, 1998, 921–942.

МАСРОБЕРТ 2005

МАСРОБЕРТ С. М., “On the Problems of Identifying a «Preslav Redaction» of the Psalter,” in: M. DIMITROVA, P. PETKOV, I. HRISTOVA (eds.), *Studia in honorem professoris Angelinae Minčeva* (= Acta palaeoslavica, 2), Sofia, 2005, 39–46.

МАСРОБЕРТ 2008

МАСРОБЕРТ С. М., “On the Role of Memory and Oral Tradition in the Early Transmission of the Church Slavonic Psalter Text,” in: А. МИЛТЕНОВА, Е. ТОМОВА, Р. СТАНКОВА (eds.), *Християнска азиология и народни вярвания. Сборник в чест на ст. н. с. Елена Коцева*, Sofia, 2008, 340–355.

MACROBERT 2010

MACROBERT C. M., "The Impact of Interpretation on the Evolution of the Church Slavonic Psalter Text up to the Fifteenth Century." in: A. LEMAIRE (ed.) *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (= Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, vol. 133), Leiden–Boston, 2010, 423–440.

MACROBERT FORTHCOMING

MACROBERT C. M., "The Enigmatic Athens Psalter (Greek National Library, MS 1797)," in: Ж. ЛЕВШИНА (ed.), "Слова и золота вязь". *Сборник статей памяти В. М. Загребина*, С.-Петербург (forthcoming), 338–345.

MIKLAS 2012

MIKLAS H. (ed.), *Psalterium Demetrii Sinaiticum* (= Glagolitica Sinaitica, 1), Vienna, 2012.

ONASCH 1993

ONASCH K. *Lexikon Liturgie und Kunst der Ostkirche*, Berlin–Munich, 1993.

OSTROWSKI 2009

OSTROWSKI D., "Identifying Psalmic Quotations in the *Povest' Vremennykh Let*," in: R. E. MARTIN, J. B. СПОСК (eds.), *Culture and Identity in Eastern Christian History* (= Ohio Slavic Papers, 9, Eastern Christian Studies, 1), Columbus, Ohio, 2009, 217–247.

PARPULOV 2005

PARPULOV G. R., *Towards a History of Byzantine Psalters* (D Phil dissertation, Chicago, 2004), UMI Dissertation Services, 2005.

ROTY 1983

ROTY M., *Dictionnaire russe-français des termes en usage dans l'église russe*, 2 ed., Paris, 1983.

SZULC 2000–01

SZULC A., *Leksykalne i słowotwórcze zrównicowanie cerkiewnosłowiańskich psalterzy redakcji ruskiej z XI–XIX wieku*, 2 vols. Toruń, 2000–2001.

TARNANIDES 1988

TARNANIDES I. C., *The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, Thessaloniki, 1988.

THOMSON 1998

THOMSON F. J., "The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament," in: J. KRAŠOVEC (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*, Ljubljana–Sheffield, 1998, 605–920, especially 797–825.

References

Altbauer M., Lunt H. G., *An Early Slavonic Psalter from Rus'*, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.

Avtokratova M. I., Kniazevskaia O. A., Shmidt S. O., *Katalog rukopisnykh knig XI–XIV vv., khrania-shchikhisia v TsGADA SSSR*, 1–2, Moscow, 1988.

Bogdanović D., *Inventar ćirilskih rukopisa u Jugoslaviji (XI–XVII veka)*, Belgrade, 1982.

Cernić L., "Neka zapažanja o srpskim rukopisima u zbirkama Lenjingrada," *Arhejografski prilozi*, 2, 1980, 359–64.

Cernić L., "O atribuciji srednjovekovnih srpskih ćirilskih rukopisa," u: D. Bogdanović (ed.), *Tekstologija srednjovekovnih južnoslovenskih književnosti* (= Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, Naučni skupovi, knj. x, Odeljenje jezika i književnosti, knj. 2), Belgrade, 1981, 335–360.

Granstrem E. E., *Opisanie russkikh i slavianskikh pergamenykh rukopisei: rukopisi russkie, bolgarskie, moldovlakhiijskie, serbskie*, Leningrad, 1953.

Hamm J., *Psalterium vindobonense. Der kommentierte glagolitische Psalter der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (= Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Schriften der Balkankommission, Linguistische Abteilung, 19), Vienna, 1967.

Harisijadis M., "Srpski rukopisi u atinskoj Narodnoj biblijoteci," *Zbornik za likovne umetnosti*, 14, 1978, 205–12.

Kniazevskaia O. A., Kobiak N. A., Lifshits A. L., Tikhomirov N. B., Turilov A. A., Shelamanova N. B. (eds.), *Svodnyi katalog slaviano-russkikh rukopisnykh knig, khrania-shchikhisia v Rossii, stranakh SNG i Baltii. XIV v.*, 1, Moscow, 2002.

Krivko R. N., "Grafiiko-orfograficheskie sistemy Bychkovsko-Sinaiskoi psaltyri," I–II, *Russkii iazyk v nauchnom osvshchenii*, 7, 2004, 80–124 and 8, 2004, 17–200.

MacRobert C. M., "The Systems of Supplementary Penitential Texts in the Psalter MSS Peč 68, Belgrade 36, and Pljevlja 80," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, ns 24, 1991, 1–22.

MacRobert C. M., "Two Lykewake Psalters: The MSS Västerås/UUB5/UUB6 and Jaroslavl' 15482," *Scando-Slavica*, 38, 1992, 108–127.

MacRobert C. M., "The Classificatory Importance of Headings and Liturgical Directions in Church Slavonic Psalters of the 11Th–15Th Centuries," *Byzantinoslavica*, 57, 1996, 156–181.

MacRobert C. M., "The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century," in: J. Krašovec (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*, Ljubljana – Sheffield, 1998, 921–942.

MacRobert C. M., "On the Problems of Identifying a «Preslav Redaction» of the Psalter," in: M. Dimitrova, P. Petkov, I. Hristova (eds.), *Studia in honorem professoris Angelinae Minčeva* (= Acta palaeoslavica, 2), Sofia, 2005, 39–46.

MacRobert C. M., "On the Role of Memory and Oral Tradition in the Early Transmission of the Church Slavonic Psalter Text," in: A. Miltenova, E. Tomova, R. Stankova (eds.), *Khristiianska agiologija i narodni viarvania. Sbornik v chest na st. n. s. Elena Kotseva*, Sofia, 2008, 340–355.

MacRobert C. M., "The Impact of Interpretation on the Evolution of the Church Slavonic Psalter Text up to the Fifteenth Century," in: A. Lemaire (ed.) *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (= Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, vol. 133), Leiden–Boston, 2010, 423–440.

MacRobert C. M., "The Enigmatic Athens Psalter (Greek National Library, MS 1797)," in: Zh. Levshina (ed.), "Slova i zolota viaz'." *Sbornik sta-*

tei pamiati V. M. Zagrebina, St. Petersburg (forthcoming), 338–345.

Miklas H. (ed.), *Psalterium Demetrii Sinaiticum* (= Glagolitica Sinaitica, 1), Vienna, 2012.

Onasch K., *Lexikon Liturgie und Kunst der Ostkirche*, Berlin–Munich, 1993.

Ostrowski D., "Identifying Psalmic Quotations in the *Povest' Vremennykh Let*," in: R. E. Martin, J. B. Spock (eds.), *Culture and Identity in Eastern Christian History* (= Ohio Slavic Papers, 9, Eastern Christian Studies, 1), Columbus, Ohio, 2009, 217–247.

Roty M., *Dictionnaire russe-français des termes en usage dans l'église russe*, 2 ed., Paris 1983.

Speranskii M. N., "Clavianskaia pis'mennost' XI–XIV vv. na Sinae i v Palestine," *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Akademii nauk*, 32, 1927, 43–118.

Stanchev K., Dzhurova A., "Arheografski belezhki ot Natsionalnata biblioteka v Atina," *Starobŭlgarska literatura*, 9, 1981, 33–75.

Szulc A., *Leksykalne i słowotwórcze zrównicowanie cerkiewnosłowiańskich psalterzy redakcji ruskiej z XI–XIX wieku*, 2 vols. Torun, 2000–2001.

Tarnanides I. C., *The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, Thessaloniki, 1988.

Thomson F. J., "The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament," in: J. Krašovec (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*, Ljubljana – Sheffield, 1998, 605–920, especially 797–825.

Trifunović Đ., "Psaltir svetoga Save Srpskog," *Slavia*, 70, 2001, 499–503.

Zhivov V. M., "Pravila i proiznoshenie v ruskom tserkovnoslavianskom pravopisanii XI–XIII vv.," *Russian Linguistics*, 8, 1984, 251–293.

Zhukovskaia L. P., Tikhomirov N. B., Shelamanova N. B. (eds.), *Svodnyi katalog slaviano-russkikh rukopisnykh knig, khraniashchikhsia v SSSR. XI–XIII vv.*, Moscow, 1984.

Catherine Mary MacRobert, DPhil

University Lecturer in Russian Philology and Comparative Slavonic Philology

Lady Margaret Hall,

Oxford,

OX2 6QA,

United Kingdom

catherine.macrobot@lmh.ox.ac.uk