Catherine Mary MacRobert

Maksim Grek in linguistic context

Abstract

This paper examines the ways in which Greek nominalized infinitives were translated in the various Church Slavonic redactions of the psalms extant from the 11th to the late 15th century, and compares them with the approaches taken in Maksim Grek's revisions of the psalter text. It uses this material as evidence to support the view that Maksim's translations from Greek were not influenced by Latin, but were informed by the usage of Redaction V, the psalter text included in the Gennadian Bible which would have been known to his Russian assistants. It suggests that this was the route by which the grecizing infinitival constructions characteristic of fourteenth-century South Slavonic translational practice became known to Maksim and were adopted by him, together with several other morphosyntactic innovations which became established in the 14th century. On this basis proposals are made for further research.

Keywords: Maksim Grek, Church Slavonic Psalter, Catena on psalms, Gennadian Bible

Introduction

The Church Slavonic compendium of patristic comments on the psalms which was produced in the early sixteenth century by Maksim Grek and his Russian assistants Dmitrij Gerasimov, Vlasij, Mixail Medovarcev and Sil'van was by any standards a considerable achievement: in seventeen months, according to his own account (Sinicyna 1977: 64-65), Maksim translated from Greek into Latin and his collaborators turned from Latin into Church Slavonic (Kovtun 1975: 8, n. 2) a text which occupies 1,352 folia (288-300mm by 200mm) in the two volumes of the earliest known complete copy, MSS 116 and 117 in the Hilandar monastery on Mount Athos.[1] Moreover, this was no simple matter of finding linguistic

[1] Watermark datings to 1550 in Bogdanović (1978/1: 86-87). The failure to attribute the translation to Maksim here and in Matejić & Thomas (1992/1: 353-354) probably results from the fact that MS 116 is slightly defective: it starts about a folio after the beginning of the dedicatory letter to Vasilij III. The second half of the catena, from ps. 77 to the end, is attested in a manuscript dating from the 1520s, MS 63 in the Ovčinnikov collection, Russian State Library, Moscow, but the earliest attestation of the first half, in a manuscript of

equivalents for readily intelligible wordings: as he explains in his dedicatory letter (Sinicyna 2007: 162-163), from time to time Maksim found himself obliged also to engage in textual emendation.

The resulting catena on the psalms is potentially of considerable linguistic interest not only as an extended exercise in a complex process of translation but also as a rich source of information about Russian Church Slavonic in the early sixteenth century. That most of it has not been studied in any depth is regrettable but understandable: in the apparent absence of a parallel Greek compilation, the task of identifying its numerous sources would be a laborious undertaking. Instead, investigation of the language used by Maksim and his assistants has concentrated on the wording of the psalms themselves, which can readily be compared with the Greek, Latin or earlier Church Slavonic versions.

1. Aims and data used in the study

It has been asserted that Maksim's point of departure was in fact the text of the Gennadian Bible, and that in one of the manuscripts containing his catena on the psalms Gennadian readings are found in text with Maksim's corrections in the margins (Gorskij & Nevostruev 1857: 99-100). More recently Karačorova (2015) has drawn attention to the numerous similarities between the Gennadian version and the psalms in Maksim's catena. The present paper aims to show:

1) that if Maksim resorted to Latin in communicating his revisions to the translation of the Psalms, this is not apparent in his choices of wording, which for the most part can be explained simply by reference to Greek and Church Slavonic;

2) that the text of the psalms in Maksim's catena translation must in fact have been supplied by Maksim's Russian collaborators, as it is based on the pre-existing Church Slavonic version found in the Gennadian Bible, and was sporadically revised in the light of Maksim's knowledge of the Septuagint text;

---

the 1540s, MS ДА A.I. 171, Russian National Library, St Petersburg, covers only pss. 1-54 (Kovtun et al. 1973: 100-102; Sinicyna 1977: 12-13, 65, 71).

3) that even where Maksim's revisions diverge in detail from the text of the psalms in the Gennadian Bible, they rely for their grammatical model on the South Slavonic variety of Church Slavonic introduced into Russia in the late fourteenth century and gradually assimilated in the course of the fifteenth century, rather than on traditions of Church Slavonic usage current in Russia up to that time;

4) that although the work which Maksim carried out on the Church Slavonic psalter in the 1540s and 1550s is less closely dependent on the text of the Gennadian Bible, its syntactic usage is still informed by norms which became established in Church Slavonic during the fourteenth century.

Three sources of evidence are used to support these claims:

1) the manuscript traditions on the basis of which six[2] distinct redactions (represented by Roman numerals) of the Church Slavonic psalter text have been identified up to the end of the fifteenth century;

2) various manuscripts of the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (listed with sigla in the appendix) which are mentioned where they exhibit similarities to Redactions IV;[3]

3) various manuscripts associated with the work of Maksim Grek (listed with sigla in the appendix), containing either the two volumes of the catena on the Psalms, here represented by 171+116[4] and 63+117, or subsequent revisions.

---

[2] Redactions I-V of the Psalter for liturgical and devotional use, and one redaction, indicated as Th, found only in association with the commentary by Theodoret of Cyrrhus (MacRobert 1998; Thomson 1998: 797-825). In practice Redaction I seems to have been little known in the East Slav area, where Redaction II is most frequently attested up to the late fourteenth century (Ostrowski 2009; MacRobert 2013).

[3] Where the readings of these manuscripts are not specified, FпI2 T28 8662 S64 Luck agree with Redactions I and II, Ox agrees with Redaction III and BJ with Redaction V.

[4] Pss. 55-76 are attested in 116 only.

The data collated from these sources relate to a specific problem in translation from the Greek of the Septuagint, the treatment of the nominalized infinitive. This is found in two types of construction: when introduced by a preposition and the definite article in the appropriate case,[5] it conveys the sense of a circumstantial subordinate clause; when combined simply with the definite article, it is equivalent either to a verbal noun or, with a definite article in the genitive case, to a final clause. The resulting combinations of nominal morphosyntax and verbal rection are inevitably difficult to handle in word-for-word translation, especially into languages which lack the definite article. So in the Latin versions of the Psalms, including the Vulgate which had presumably become known to Maksim during his stay in Italy, Greek prepositional phrases containing infinitives usually gave rise to subordinate clauses containing a conjunction (*cum, dum, postquam, priusquam*) and a finite verb in the appropriate tense and mood, less often to a verbal noun, while the simple article plus infinitive was rendered variously by the bare infinitive, by a final clause (introduced by *ut* or *ne*), or occasionally by the preposition *ad* plus a gerund.

2. Overview of translation technique up to the fifteenth century

The early Church Slavonic versions of the Psalter, found in manuscripts extant from the eleventh century onwards, took a similar approach to that of the Latin translators and therefore arrived at parallel solutions, though probably independently of Latin (Pastrnek 1913: 385-391): indeed the early Church Slavonic translators and revisers were rather more adventurous than their Latin predecessors, since they rendered expressions containing nominalized infinitives not only with infinitives, subordinate clauses or verbal nouns, but also by means of participial constructions, including the dative absolute. In a few instances their choices stood the test of time and survived to the sixteenth century:[6]

---

[5] Most often *ἐν τῷ*, also *εἰς τό* x3, *ἀπὸ τοῦ* x2, *πρὸ τοῦ* x5, *ὑπὲρ τό, ἀντὶ τοῦ*, *μετὰ τό.*

[6] In the examples cited here, normalized spelling is used except where a variant attested in a single manuscript is quoted. For brevity's sake introductory expressions such as (въ)егда and да are followed by the sign + when they apply to more than one reading, and a semicolon is used to mark a change from one conjunction to another (or to the absence of conjunction). The Greek text and the numbering of verses are based on Rahlfs (1979).

(1) 31:4 *ἐν τῷ ἐμπαγῆναί μοι* → (вън)егда оунъзе ми I II Th III IV V 171+116
(2) 38:14 *πρὸ τοῦ με ἀπελθεῖν* → прѣжде даже не отидѫ I II Th III IV V 171+116
(3) 67:8 *ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαί σε ... ἐν τῷ διαβαίνειν σε* → (вън)егда исхождаше ... (вън)егда мимо хождаше I II Th III IV V 116

At the same time, however, the early versions opened the way to more literalistic approaches.
Firstly, in a small number of places they admitted the use of the infinitive in subordinate clauses introduced by the conjunction (вън)егда, apparently to convey hypothetical or counterfactual situations:

(4) 9:4 *ἐν τῷ ἀποστραφῆναι* → (вън)егда възвратити сѧ I II Th III IV V 171+116
(5) 18:12 *ἐν τῷ φυλάσσειν* → (вън)егда + съхранѣти / съхранити I II III V съхранитъ II IV 116 хранить J храни⟨т⟩[7] 171 съхранѧщиꙗ Th
(6) 50:6 *ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε* → (вън)егда + сѫдити сѧ I сѫдити ти II III FпI2 T28 Luck V сѫдити тѧ 8662 сѫдити ти сѧ Th IV сѫдити сѧ ти B сѫдиши сѧ 171+116[8]
(7) 118:7 *ἐν τῷ μεμαθηκέναι με* → (вън)егда наоучити ми сѧ I II Th III IV V 63+117[9]
(8) 118:9 *ἐν τῷ φυλάσσεσθαι* → (вън)егда + съхранити I II Th III IV V съхрани⟨т⟩ 117 съхранить 63
(9) 123:2 *ἐν τῷ ἐπαναστῆναι ἀνθρώπους* → (вън)егда въстати чл҃вкомъ I II Th III IV V 63+117
(10) 123:3 *ἐν τῷ ὀργισθῆναι* → (вън)егда прогнѣвати[10] сѧ I II Th III IV V 63+117

---

[7] The ambiguity of verbal forms ending in superscript ⟨т⟩ cannot always be resolved.
[8] Also supported by MS 752/862: всегда сѫдиши сѧ.
[9] With всегда instead of вънегда.
[10] разгнѣвати in Th.

Secondly, in one isolated instance the relative pronoun **еже** was deployed at an early stage to mark the infinitive used as a noun referring to a type of activity:[11]

(11) 132:1 *τί καλὸν ἢ τί τερπνὸν ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ κατοικεῖν ἀδελφοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* → **коль добро и коль красьно + еже жити братии въкоупѣ** I II Th BJ **нъ еже жити** III IV FпI2 V **токмо еже жити** 63+117

These instances of conjunction or relative pronoun plus the infinitive persisted in later versions and were therefore available as models in the subsequent redactional history of the text. In the early fourteenth-century Redactions III and IV, revision on the basis of comparison with the Greek text gave rise to greater use of the infinitive. For Redaction III this was a sporadic tendency, producing a few more examples of conjunction plus infinitive and a rather larger number of bare infinitives (Karačorova 1989: 154-158). By contrast, Redaction IV took a systematic approach: it imitated the Greek use of the infinitive in almost all instances and generalized the use of **еже** as a translational equivalent to the Greek article in most infinitival constructions, apart from those introduced by *ἐν τῷ*, which it standardly rendered with **вънегда** plus infinitive (Češko 1988: 225-226; Češko et al. 1989: 70-71).

Redaction IV is at present known only in an early fourteenth-century Bulgarian manuscript, the Norov Psalter. The extent to which this version circulated among the South Slavs has not been investigated, and such influence as it had among the East Slavs is supposed to have been mediated through Redaction V, a version associated with the name of Metropolitan Kiprian and incorporated into the Gennadian Bible at the end of the fifteenth century (Češko 1981; Thomson 1998: 823-825). However, that association is less than secure (Knjazevskaja & Češko 1980) and the exact circumstances in which Redaction V came into existence are not clear: various other revised versions of the Psalms found in East Slavonic manuscripts of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries display striking similarities to Redaction IV (MacRobert 2010a, 2010b), and some show clearer

[11] This function is also singled out as typical in the examples of **еже** plus infinitive cited in the fourteenth-century Serbian account of the eight parts of speech: **иеже чисти пользно, иеже ѣсти потрѣбно, иеже играти ѕкорно** (Weiher 1977: 404).

signs of a South Slavonic origin (MacRobert 2005, 2006). The possibility cannot be excluded that Redaction IV, or something like it, reached the East Slavs in the late fourteenth century under the auspices of Metropolitan Kiprian, and was then subjected to various editing processes, of which Redaction V was merely one outcome (Češko 1981: 84).

3. Analysis of data from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries

The gradually expanding use of the infinitive in the fourteenth-century redactions, and its entrenchment in subsequent versions up to the time of Maksim Grek, can be seen in the following sets of examples.

Redaction III, which usually adheres to the option of a subordinate clause in place of Greek preposition and nominalized infinitive, substitutes an infinitive in only three instances:

(12) 38:2 *ἐν τῷ συστῆναι τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν* → (вън)егда + въстанетъ грѣшьникъ I II Th въстати грѣшьномоу[12] III 8662 S64 V[13] 171+116 сьстанѫти грѣшнїкоу IV

(13) 57:10 *πρὸ τοῦ συνίεναι* → прѣжде даже + не разоумѣете[14] I II Th не разоумѣти III IV 8662 Luck J разоумѣти V; прѣжде разоумѣниꙗ Ox разумиꙗ B; прѣже еже разоумѣти 116

(14) 89:2 *πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι ... καὶ πλασθῆναι τὴν γὴν καὶ τῆν οἰκουμένην* → прѣжде даже + горъı не бъıшꙗ и създꙗ сѧ землꙗ I II Th J[15] горамъ не бъıти и създати сѧ земли III Luck V 63+117; прѣжде горамъ бъıтїꙗ и созданїꙗ земли Ox(original reading) 8662; прѣжде еже гѡрамъ бъıти и сьздати сѧ земи IV

[12] грѣшнику in 8662 and S64.

[13] In Kiprian's psalter; the Gennadian Bible has a faulty reading: въста грѣшному.

[14] With variants разоумѣѭтъ in some witnesses to Redaction I, разоумѣють in T28 and J.

[15] In B a finite verb is conjoined with an infinitive; this is presumably a case of incomplete revision.

However, this redaction is less tolerant of the final clause introduced by the conjunction да as a translation of the Greek *τοῦ* or *εἰς τό* plus infinitive; half the instances of this solution are replaced in Redaction III by bare infinitives:[16]

(15) 25:7 *τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι ... διηγήσασθαι* → да оуслъшѫ ... исповѣмъ I II Th J; оуслъшати ... повѣдати[17] III FпI2 8662 B V; еже слышати ми ... повѣдати IV еже оуслъшати ... повѣдати 171+116

(16) 26:4 *τοῦ θεωρεῖν με ... καὶ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι* → да зьрѫ ... посѣщаѭ I II Th; зрѣти ми ... посѣщати III V 171+116; еже зрѣти ми ... посѣщати IV 8662

(17) 68:24 *τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν* → да не видатъ I II Th; не видѣти[18] III FпI2 Luck V 116 не видѣти имъ BJ; еже не блюсти IV

(18) 75:10 *τοῦ σῶσαι* → да съпасетъ I II Th; съпасти III V 116; еже с҃ти IV

(19) 79:3 *εἰς τὸ σῶσαι ἡμᾶς* → да нъı съпасеши I II Th да съпасеши насъ Luck; съпасти насъ III V 63+117; въ еже съпасти насъ IV

(20) 100:8 *τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι* → да потрѣблѭ[19] I II Th; потрѣбити III V 63+117; иже потрѣбити IV; ако потрѣбити Luck

(21) 104:22 *τοῦ παιδεῦσαι ... σοφίσαι* → да + наоучитъ ... оумѫдритъ I FпI2 Luck накажетъ ... оумѫдритъ II S64; наоучити ... оумѫдрити III J ѹчити ... оумоудрити B наказати ... оумѫдрити T28 V 63+117;[20] еже наказати ... ѹпрѣмѫдрити IV

(22) 104:39 *τοῦ φωτίσαι* → да просвѣтитъ I II Th;[21] просвѣтити III V 63+117; еже просвѣтити IV

(23) 105:8 *τοῦ γνωρίσαι* → да скажетъ I II Th; сказати III BJ познати V показати 63+117; еже сказатї IV

(24) 105:23 *τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι αὐτούς* → да ѭ потрѣблѭ I II Th; потрѣбити III V 63+117; еже потрѣбити IV

---

[16] Similarly in ps. 103:27 a bare infinitive in Greek is translated with a да-clause in I II but an infinitive in III IV Luck V; there is occasional variation elsewhere between infinitive and finite verb in the witnesses to I II (Karačorova 1989: 154-156).

[17] исповѣдати in FпI2 and 8662.

[18] Also in one witness to Redaction I.

[19] да потрѣбатъ сѧ as a minority reading in Redaction I and FпI2.

[20] In Th and 8662 a finite verb is conjoined with an infinitive, reflecting incomplete revision.

[21] Without the conjunction да.

(25) 105:47 *τοῦ ἐξομολογήσασθαι ... τοῦ ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι* → да исповѣмъ сѧ … хвалимъ сѧ I II; исповѣдати сѧ … хвалити сѧ III V 63+117; еже исповѣдати сѧ … хвалити сѧ IV[22]

(26) 112:8 *τοῦ καθίσαι* → да посадитъ I Th[23] II; посадити III V 63+117; иже посадити IV

(27) 118:173 *τοῦ σῶσαι* → да съпасетъ I II Th J;[24] съпасти III V 63+117; еже спс̄ти IV

The same applies in the one place where the early redactions offer a participial construction in place of the standard Greek reading with *τοῦ* plus infinitive:

(28) 60:9 *τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι* → въздаѭ I II Th; въздаѭти ми III V 116; еже въздати ми IV 8662 BJ

The examples already cited also serve to illustrate the gradual spread of South Slavonic influence into East Slavonic sources: Redaction III itself seems to have had a delayed and limited circulation among the East Slavs (Češko 1981), and the fourteenth-century conflated texts contained in the East Slavonic manuscripts FпI2 T28 8662 S64 Luck agree with it only occasionally, perhaps fortuitously. By the fifteenth century, however, the revisions found in the Russian catena manuscripts BJ and slightly later in Redaction V extend the substitution of infinitive for final clause to most remaining instances:

(29) 22:6 *τὸ κατοικεῖν με* → да въселиѫ сѧ I II Th III; вселити ми сѧ V; еже вселити ми сѧ 171+116 еже жити ми IV

(30) 26:4 *τοῦ κατοικεῖν με* → да живѫ I II Th III; еже жити ми IV 8662 V 171+116

(31) 35:2 *τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν* → да съгрѣшаетъ I II Th III J; съгрѣшати[25] V 171+116; еже съгрѣшати IV

---

[22] Here again Th combines finite verb with infinitive.

[23] Without the conjunction да.

[24] спаси in B.

[25] согрѣшате in B.

(32) 35:4 *τοῦ ἀγαθῦναι* → да оублажитъ I II Th III V; оубл҃женъ бъıти 8662 бл҃готворити 171;[26] еже оублажити IV

(33) 38:2 *τοῦ μὴ ἁμαρτάνειν* → да не съгрѣш(а)ѫ I II Th III 171+116; еже не съгрѣшати (ми) IV 8662 S64 V

(34) 66:3 *τοῦ γνῶναι* → да познаемъ I II Th III; познати V 116; еже познати IV 8662

(35) 72:28 *τοῦ ἐξαγγεῖλαι* → да + исповѣмъ I II Th възвѣщѫ III; възвѣстити ми Ox(original reading) V 116 → еже извѣстити ми IV

(36) 93:13 *τοῦ πραῦναι* → да + оукротиши I II Th III изволудетъ BJ оукротиши 63 ѯкротите 117; оукротити V; еже оукротити IV

(37) 118:37 *τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν* да не видите I II Th III не видѣти V 63+117 еже не видѣти IV

In addition, however, the East Slavonic sources can be seen occasionally[27] to follow the more radical line taken by Redaction IV, which, as mentioned above, rejects the option of final clauses introduced by да, deploying instead the combination of еже plus infinitive as a calque on Greek *τοῦ* plus infinitive in all the instances cited above. Similarly, and putatively under the influence of Redaction IV, the East Slavonic revised texts of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries sometimes add еже in places where earlier redactions employed the bare infinitive:

(38) 30:3 *τοῦ σῶσαι* → съпасти I II Th V 171+116→ еже съпасти IV Luck

(39) 33:14 *τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι* → не глаголати I II Th III BJ; еже не глаголати IV V 171+116

(40) 33:17 *τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι* → потрѣбити I II Th III J; еже потрѣбити IV V 171+116

(41) 36:32 *τοῦ θανατῶσαι* → оумрътвити I II III BJ оуморити Th; еже оумртвити V 171+116 еже оусмр҃тити IV

(42) 36:34 *τοῦ κατακληρονομῆσαι* наслѣдити I II III B прѣнати Th; еже наслѣдити V 171+116 еже наслѣдствовати IV

---

[26] 116 is illegible at this point.

[27] Examples (12), (16), (28), (34).

(43) 39:9 *τοῦ ποιῆσαι* → сътворити I Th III V 171+116; еже сътворити II IV T28 Luck
(44) 59:6 *τοῦ φυγεῖν* → оубѣжати I II Th III J; еже оубѣжати[28] IV Ox(original reading) V 116
(45) 67:19 *τοῦ κατασκηνῶσαι* → въселити I II Th III; еже въселити IV V 116
(46) 70:3 *τοῦ σῶσαι* → съпаси I II; съпасти Th[29] 8662 S64 III V 116; еже съпасти IV Luck
(47) 106:7 *τοῦ πορευθῆναι* → вънити I II Th III V 63+117; еже вънити IV FпI2 8662 Luck

The sporadic and unpredictable distribution of еже plus infinitive in the East Slavonic sources strongly suggests that they represent a range of conflations and compromises between Redaction IV and earlier versions; there is in fact a residue of more than seventy places where еже plus infinitive is found only in Redaction IV, while all other versions have the bare infinitive, or even retain a final clause, e.g.:

(48) 8:3 *τοῦ καταλῦσαι* → да раздроушиши I Th BJ; раздроушиши II III раздроуши Ox; раздроушити V?[30] 171+116; еже раздроушити IV
(49) 9:32 *τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν* → да не видитъ I II Th III V 171+116; еже не видѣти IV
(50) 9:35 *τοῦ παραδοῦναι* → да прѣданъ бѫдетъ I II Th III V 171+116; еже прѣдати IV
(51) 118:76 *τοῦ παρακαλέσαι* → да оутѣшитъ I II Th III V 63+117; еже оутѣшити IV

There is another respect, however, in which the influence of the approach taken in Redaction IV can be clearly detected in subsequent versions, particularly those of the fifteenth century. Redaction IV, with characteristic literalism, substitutes infinitives for finite verbs in those subordinate clauses which translate the Greek

[28] егоже оубѣжати in B.
[29] Also in one witness to Redaction I.
[30] Kiprian's psalter has раздроушити, the Gennadian Bible has раздроуши.

combination of preposition plus infinitive, and this option is often adopted by Redaction V and the closely related catenas on the psalms, BJ:

(52) 9:30 *ἐν τῷ ἑλκύσαι αὐτόν* → да и привлѣчетъ[31] I II Th III; (вън)егда привлѣщи его IV V 171+116

(53) 13:7 *ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κύριον* → (вън)егда + възвратитъ гь I II Th III V 171+116 възвратити гу IV BJ

(54) 21:25 *ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με* → (вън)егда + възъваχъ I II Th III B V 171+116 възъвати ми IV J

(55) 26:2 *ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν ... κακοῦντας* → (вън)егда + приближатъ са зълобоуѭщиеи I II Th приближаахѫ са III приближати са зълобоуѭщимъ IV Ox(original reading) V[32]

(56) 27:2 *ἐν τῷ με αἴρειν* → (вън)егда + въздѣѭ / въздежда[33] I II Th III BJ въздѣ(а)ти ми IV V 171+116

(57) 30:14 *ἐν τῷ ἐπισυναχθῆναι αὐτούς* → (вън)егда + събираχѫ са I II Th III събрати са имъ IV Ox(original reading) Luck V 171+116

(58) 36:34 *ἐν τῷ ἐξολεθρεύεσθαι ἁμαρτωλούς* → (вън)егда + потрѣбатъ са грѣшьници I II Th III потрѣбляти са грѣшникомъ IV V 171+116

(59) 37:17 *ἐν τῷ σαλευθῆναι πόδας μου* → (вън)егда + подвижасте са нозѣ мои I II Th III BJ подвизати / подвижати са ногама моима IV Ox 8662 S64 подвижати / подвизати са ногамъ моимъ V 171+116

(60) 41:4 *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαί μοι* → (вън)егда + глаголаχѫ мънѣ I II Th III BJ глаголати мънѣ V глаголати са мънѣ IV 171+116

(61) 41:11 *ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτούς* → (вън)егда + глаχѫ I II Th III глати имъ IV V 171+116

(62) 52:7 *ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κυρίον* → (вън)егда + възвратитъ гъ / бъ I II Th III V 171+116 възвратити бу IV гѕ възвратити BJ

(63) 63:2 *ἐν τῷ δέεσθαί με* → (вън)егда + молѭ са I II Th III 116 молити ми са IV V

---

[31] This reading seems to imply a variant in Greek.

[32] Here again Kiprian's psalter has a better reading than the Gennadian Bible's приближати са зълобоуѭще, which is mirrored in 116.

[33] въздѣхъ in T28.

(64) 75:10 *ἐν τῷ ἀναστῆναι ... τὸν θεόν* → (вън)егда + въскръснетъ бъ I II Th III въстати бу IV FпI2[34] 8662 S64 V 116[35]

(65) 80:6 *ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτόν* → (вън)егда + изиде I II Th III изъити емоу IV V 63+117

(66) 101:23 *ἐν τῷ συναχθῆναι λαούς* → (вън)егда + съньмѫтъ са людие I Th FпI2 съберѫтъ са людие I II III BJ събрати са людемъ IV V 63+117

(67) 104:12 *ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτούς* → зане + бѣша I II III бахоу Th быти имъ V; вънегда быти имъ IV; въ еже быти имъ 63+117

(68) 106:6, 13, 19, 28 *ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι αὐτούς* → (вън)егда + въсътѫжиша[36] I II Th III BJ скръбѣти имъ IV V 63+117

(69) 108:7 *ἐν τῷ κρίνεθαι αὐτόν* → (вън)егда + сѫдатъ емоу I II III соуди⟨т⟩ емоу Th сѫдити са емоу IV V 63+117

(70) 108:23 *ἐν τῷ ἐκκλῖναι αὐτήν* → (вън)егда + оуклонитъ са I II Th III V 63+117 оуклонити са еи IV 8662 T28

(71) 118:6 *ἐν τῷ με ἐπιβλέπειν* → (вън)егда + призьрѫ I II Th III V 63+117 призирати ми IV призрѣти ми FпI2

Even when the choice of lexical item is different, the syntactic model of Redaction IV may still be followed:

(72) 29:10 *ἐν τῷ καταβῆναί με* → (вън)егда + съниджѫ I II Th III съними ми IV BJ съходити ми V; въ еже съходити ми 171+116

(73) 34:13 *ἐν τῷ αὐτοὺς παρενοχλεῖν μοι* → (вън)егда + они огавие творѣхѫ[37] I II Th III wни wгавствовати IV wни стоужахоу V 171+116 онѣмъ стоужати 8662 тѣмъ стоужати Ox

(74) 70:9 *ἐν τῷ ἐκλείπειν τὴν ἰσχύν μου* → (вън)егда + изнемагаетъ крѣпость I II Th III сконѹати са крѣпости IV изнемагати крѣпости BJ изѹазати крѣпости V оскоудѣвати крѣпости 116

---

[34] стати in FпI2.

[35] A grecizing construction is found in the Gennadian Bible, въстати бъ, and in 116, въстати бга.

[36] 106:6 въстѫжїшѫ also in IV; 106:13 въскорвѣша in BJ.

[37] зло и поносъ творѣхоу in J, пакости дѣахоу in Luck.

(75) 105:44 *ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι αὐτούς* → (вън)егда + въсътѫжишѧ[38] I II Th III сътѫжити имь IV скръбѣти имъ V 63+117(+сѧ)

This leaves a relatively small number of places where an infinitive replaces a finite verb solely in Redaction IV:

(76) 9:31 *ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν κατακυριεῦσαι τῶν πενήτων* → (вън)егда + оудоблѣлъ бѫдетъ оубогъıмъ I II Th III оудоленъ будеть J only оуделѣет V ѡбладаетъ FпI2 171+116 емоу оудолѣти IV

(77) 16:15 *ἐν τῷ ὀφθῆναι* → (вън)егда + ꙗвитъ ми сѧ I II Th III V ꙗвити ми сѧ IV 171+116

(78) 27:2 *ἐν τῷ δέεσθαί με* → (вън)егда + молѫ[39] сѧ I II Th III V молити ми сѧ IV 171+116

(79) 30:23 *ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι* → (вън)егда + възвахъ I II Th J V 171+116 молих ти сѧ B възовѫ III вьзвати мї IV

(80) 41:11 *ἐν τῷ καταθλάσαι* → (вън)егда + съкроушахѫ сѧ кости I II Th III V ськроушати сѧ кости IV съкроушати ⟨с⟩ косте⟨м⟩ 171+116

(81) 42:2 *ἐν τῷ ἐκθλίβειν τὸν ἐχθρόν* → (вън)егда + сътѫжаетъ (ми) врагъ I II Th III V 171+116 V ѡпечалѹеть врагъ BJ стѫжати врагѹ IV

(82) 45:3 *ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι τὴν γῆν καὶ μετατίθεσθαι ὄρη* → (вън)егда + съмѫщаетъ сѧ землꙗ и прѣлагаѭтъ сѧ горъı I II Th III V 171+116; сьмѫщати сѧ земи и прѣдлагаѫт сѧ горы IV[40]

(83) 60:3 *ἐν τῷ ἀκηδιάσαι τὴν καρδίαν* → (вън)егда + оунъı сръдце I II Th III V 116 оуныти ср҃цоу IV

(84) 67:15 *ἐν τῷ διαστέλειν τὸν ἐπουράνιον βασιλεῖς* → (вън)егда + раздѣлитъ нб҃снъıи ц҃рь I II III V 116 разлоучаетъ Th растраꙗѥть FпI2 разсилати небеснѡмоу ц҃рѧ IV

(85) 91:8 *ἐν τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τοὺς ἁμαρτωλούς* → (вън)егда + прозѧбнѫшѧ / прозѧбошѧ грѣшьници I II Th Ox(corrected reading) V 63+117 прозѧбнѫтъ III прозѧбнѫти грѣшьникомъ IV Ox(original reading)

---

[38] оскорбиша in 8662, осквьниша in S64.

[39] помолѫ in 8662 and B.

[40] Here again syntactic inconsistency can be attributed to incomplete revision.

(86) 105:44 *ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν εἰσακοῦσαι* → и оуслъша I II III; егда оуслъша Th Ox; вънегда + оуслышаше BJ V 63+117 емоу оуслъшати IV

(87) 118:67 *πρὸ τοῦ με ταπεινωθῆναι* → пръвѣе даже не съмѣрихъ са I II Th III V; пръжде даже не съмѣрїхъ са 63+117; пръжде еже смѣрити са мнѣ IV

(88) 119:1 *ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με* → (вън)егда + въскръбѣхъ I II Th B скръбѣхъ III J V 1143 съкръбѣти ми IV 63+117

(89) 125:1 *ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κύριον* → (вън)егда + възвратитъ гѣ I II III V възвратилъ е⟨с⟩ 63 възвратити гⷭ 117 възвратити гⷭу IV

(90) 140:1 *ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με* → (вън)егда + възовж I II Th III V 63+117 вьзывати ми IV

(91) 141:4 *ἐν τῷ ἐκλείπειν* → (вън)егда + ищѣзаше дⷯъ мои I II Th III BJ изчазает V изтѣзати дⷯъ мои IV wскоудѣвати дⷯоу моемоу 63+117

There is only one counter-example where Redaction IV, as attested in the Norov Psalter, retains a finite verb while Redaction V has an infinitive:

(92) 72:18 *ἐν τῷ ἐπαρθῆναι* → (вън)егда + разгръдѣша I II Th III IV BJ разгордѣти V възнесоша⟨с⟩ 116

Additionally, there are two places at the beginning of the Norov Psalter where an innovative infinitival reading has apparently been corrected to an older wording which employs a finite verb:

(93) 4:2 *ἐν τῷ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι με* → (вън)егда + възвахъ I II III IV (corrected reading) V 171+116 възъиваахъ I Th FpI2 призывати ми IV (original reading)

(94) 4:4 *ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με* → (вън)егда + възовж I Th II III IV (corrected reading) V 171+116 вьзывати ми IV (original reading) молити ми са B

There is no perceptible rationale for the vacillations in choice of verbal form with (вън)егда which can be seen in Redaction V and other East Slavonic sources of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: the same meaning may be expressed either by a finite verb or by an infinitive, e.g. for *ἐπιστρέψαι* in ex-

amples (53) and (89); *κεκραγέναι* in (54), (90) and (94); *δέεσθαι* in (63) and (78); *θλίβεσθαι* in (68) *passim*, (86) and (88).

By contrast, where the early redactions used a noun or participle to translate a Greek nominalized infinitive governed by a preposition, the later versions mostly remain true to this tradition, rather than imitating the infinitival constructions introduced in Redaction IV:

(95) 9:23 *ἐν τῷ ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ* → въ гръдости неѹьстиваго I II Th III V 171+116; вьнегда гръдѣти неѹестивомоу IV

(96) 41:10 *ἐν τῷ ἐκθλίβειν τὸν ἐχθρόν με* → отъ печали[41] врага моего I II Th; (вън)егда + съткжаетъ врагъ III V 171+116 стѫжати врагоу IV

(97) 54:21 *ἐν τῷ ἀποδιδόναι* → на въздание I II Th III V 171+116; въ еже въздаати IV

(98) 108:4 *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαπᾶν με* → въ любъве мѣсто I II Th III BJ въ мѣсто любъве V; въ мѣсто еже любити IV 63+117

(99) 126:2 *μετὰ τὸ καθῆσθαι* → по сѣдѣнии I II Th III V 63+117; по еже сѣдѣти IV

(100) 128:6 *πρὸ τοῦ ἐκσπασθῆναι* → прѣжде въздръваниꙗ / издръвениꙗ I II Th III BJ истрьженїиа Ox въстьргновениꙗ T28 въстръжениꙗ V 63+117; прѣжде еже издръвати сѧ IV

The weight of tradition in favour of these syntactically free translations was so strong that even Redaction IV retains the two examples of the dative absolute, albeit with the addition of ѿ еже as a gesture towards literal faithfulness to the Greek:

(101) 31:3 *ἀπὸ τοῦ κράζειν με* → зовѫщю ми I II Th III V; ѿ еже зовѫщоу ми IV; ѿ еже въпити ми 171+116

(102) 68:4 *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλπίζειν* → оупъваѭщю ми I II Th III V; ѿ еже оуповаѫщоу ми IV 116

[41] Omitted in BJ.

However, the fact that the later redactions sometimes compromise by using a clause containing a finite verb or a bare infinitive instead of a noun or participle suggests that their compilers were not entirely at ease with the earlier solutions:

(103) 17:7 *ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με* → въ скръбь мою I II Th III; вънегда скръбѣти ми IV V 171[42]

(104) 39:14 *εἰς τὸ βοηθῆσαι* → на помощь мою I II Th въ помощь мою III 8662 S64 171+116; помощи ми V; на еже помощи ми IV[43]

(105) 48:18 *ἐν τῷ ἀποθνῄσκειν* → иде умираѭ I II III; ѣко умирающю ємоу Th; зане умираѭ B; ѣко да умираеть J; ѣко вънегда умираетъ V 171+116; ѣко не вънегда ли умирати ємоу IV

(106) 136:1 *ἐν τῷ μνησθῆναι ἡμᾶς* → помѣнѫвъше I II Th III; вънегда + помѣноухомъ Ox(original reading) FпI2 T28 помѣнѫти ны IV помѣнѫти намъ V 63+117

All these revisions clearly aim at approximation to Greek syntax, but whereas in Redaction IV they are carried through almost without exception, in the subsequent versions attested in East Slavonic manuscripts piecemeal change produces inconsistent outcomes which appear to be less well motivated than the usage of the early redactions.

4. Impact of tradition on Maksim Grek's early translational practice

Such was the linguistic complexity which confronted Maksim Grek in Muscovy; what may we suppose he made of it? On the one hand his Russian assistants were able to offer him in Redaction V a Church Slavonic translation of the psalms which was recognizably based on Greek. This must have obviated the need to explain to them, through the inconvenient medium of Latin, the uses of the Greek nominalized infinitive: Redaction V and allied fifteenth-century versions exhibit a far higher rate of formal correspondence between Greek and Church Slavonic infinitival constructions than the Vulgate does. The degree to

[42] Missing in 116.

[43] Similarly in the heading to 69:2 for *εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου* either a prepositional phrase or an infinitive may be found: помощи ми V and въ еже помощи ми IV, but въ помощь мою 116.

which Maksim and his assistants relied on Redaction V or some very similar version can be traced through the attestations of 171+116 and 63+117 in the citations above and summed up in simple numerical terms. Where the Greek text has a preposition governing a nominalized infinitive, Maksim's catena version usually agrees with Redaction V. Consequently, just like Redaction V, it is inconsistent in its treatment of these constructions: not infrequently it preserves the combination of conjunction, usually внєгда, with a finite verb (x24)[44] or a preposition plus verbal noun (x5)[45] inherited from the earlier redactions; but just as often (x24)[46] it combines the conjunction with an infinitive in the style of Redaction IV, or even uses a bare infinitive, in example (19). There are a very few places where an older variant seems to have slipped into the catena version, but this presumably happened because it was known either to Maksim's assistants or to a copyist: there is one instance of preposition plus noun instead of infinitive, in example (104), and a finite verb is found instead of an infinitive at most six times, five of them securely attested only in one of the witnesses used here.[47]

On the other hand the inconsistent treatment of Greek nominalized infinitives in Redaction V cannot have escaped Maksim's notice, and it is hardly surprising that the other divergences from Redaction V in the manuscript copies of his catena appear to be sporadic attempts to harmonize Church Slavonic syntax with Greek by extending the use of infinitival constructions. In four places[48] the change is only in the form of the verb, and the conjunction вънєгда is retained as a conventional equivalent to *ἐν τῷ*. Consequently the catena readings coincide syntactically, and for the most part lexically, with those of Redaction IV at these points, and the relevance of this redaction, both as an indirect model and as a parallel example of revision, begins to emerge. Moreover, although Redaction IV

---

[44] Examples (1), (2), (3), (53), (54), (62), (70), (71), (73), (76), (79), (81), (82), (83), (84), (85), (86), (87), (90), (92), (93), (94), (96), (105).

[45] Examples (95), (97), (99), (100) and heading in 69:2 (fn. 43).

[46] Examples (4), (9), (10), (12), (14), (18), (52), (55), (56), (57), (58), (59), (60), (61), (65), (66), (68) x4, (69), (74), (103), (106).

[47] Examples (5) as in 116 but not in 171; (6) where a desire to clarify meaning may have prompted the use of the finite verb in the catena and in MS 1143; (8) and (89) as in 63 but not in 117; (63) and (92) in 116, lacking in 171.

[48] Examples (77), (80), (88), (91).

uses вьнєгда plus infinitive with a high degree of consistency[49] to render infinitival constructions introduced by *ἐν τῷ*, it tends to employ the combination of preposition plus єже and infinitive where other prepositions govern nominalized infinitives in Greek.[50] This type of calque on Greek syntax must have been the starting point for the sporadic use of preposition with єже plus infinitival construction in subsequent Church Slavonic versions, including Maksim's; consequently the process of revision by which they were introduced occasionally produces convergent readings in the Norov Psalter and Maksim's catena.[51] What is remarkable, and demonstrates yet again the dependence of Maksim's catena on Redaction V, is the limited use of such literal translations: Maksim adds one more example of ѿ єже plus infinitive, in example (101), and deploys въ єже rather than вънєгда for *ἐν τῷ* only in four places.[52]

The mediating and moderating role of Redaction V is likewise apparent in the treatment in Maksim's catena of nominalized infinitives introduced simply by *τό* or *τοῦ*. There are over a hundred instances of these in the Greek Psalter: in Redaction IV, as explained above, they are systematically rendered as єже plus infinitive, but Redaction V follows this option only in a handful of places, reverting for the most part to the bare infinitives or final clauses introduced by да which are found in earlier redactions. In large part Maksim's catena follows the same pattern. So it shares with Redaction V eight instances[53] of єже plus infinitive, but also four instances[54] of да plus finite verb, and in more than eighty places[55] both versions translate the Greek article plus infinitive with bare infini-

---

[49] Exceptions only in the places noted above: examples (1), (2), (3), (5), (68) (fn. 36), (82), (92), (93), (94).

[50] Examples (14), (19), (87), (97), (98), (99), (100), (104) and heading in 69:2 (fn. 43).

[51] Examples (98), (102) retaining the dative absolute as in Redaction IV.

[52] Examples (13), (67), (72) and in ps. 51:5 *ὑπὲρ τὸ λαλῆσαι* → нєже глⷣти I II Th III V паче єже глⷣти 171+116, likewise in MS 1143 and Verner (2013: 110); omitted in IV.

[53] Examples (11), (30), (39), (40), (41), (42), (44), (45).

[54] Examples (33), (49), (50), (51).

[55] Examples (15), (16), (17), (18), (20), (21), (22), (23), (24), (25), (28), (31), (34), (35), (37), (38), (43), (46), (47), (107) and pss. 9:30, 10:2, 13:2, 26:2, 26:13, 30:14, 35:3, 36:14, 36:20, 39:13, 39:14, 40:7, 40:9, 52:3, 58:16, 61:10, 62:3, 63:5, 63:6, 67:31, 76:8, 77:5, 77:17, 77:18, 77:38, 84:10, 85:11, 88:23, 90:11, 91:2, 91:3, 100:6, 101:5, 101:14, 101:21-22,

tives. The number of divergences between the catena and Redaction V is correspondingly small. In a couple of examples the lingering influence of earlier redactions can once again be detected in the use of a clause with a finite verb where Redaction V has either the bare infinitive, in example (93), or **єже** plus infinitive, in example (33). Equally, there are only a few places where Maksim's catena either substitutes an infinitive for a final clause introduced by **да**, in examples (32) and (48) or adds **єже** to the bare infinitive found in Redaction V, in examples (15) and (29). Thus it appears that when dealing with the text of the psalms within his catena, Maksim accepted the short cut which his Russian assistants offered him: he used Redaction V, which was palpably based on Greek, introducing modifications only where they seemed to him essential, as far as the tempo of his work allowed.

5. Developments in Maksim Grek's later translational practice

Subsequently, however, Maksim had leisure – perhaps more leisure than he might have wished – and opportunity to revisit the Church Slavonic translation of the Psalter. Unfortunately some of the sources for his later work on the text provide only selective information, while others are copies produced after his death. The picture which they present is not easy to interpret; sometimes, indeed, it contains internal contradictions. For instance, two psalters of the late sixteenth century from the Soloveckij collection, MSS 752/862 and 753/863, are both explicitly associated with Maksim. MS 752/862 starts with an introduction which states that its text of the psalms is a copy of a new translation made by Maksim during his imprisonment, though it continues with the dedicatory letter to Tsar Vasilij Ivanovič which Maksim prefaced to his catena. The colophon to MS 753/863, written in a different hand from the rest of the manuscript (Porfir'ev et al. 1881: 19-20), asserts that the version of the psalms which it accompanies was dictated to Nil Kurljatev by Maksim as a translation from Greek in 1552. Yet the versions of the text in these two manuscripts differ systemat-ically from each other in lexical and grammatical preferences (Porfir'ev et al. 1881: 17-18; Kov-

---

101:23, 102:20, 103:14, 103:15, 103:21, 104:25, 105:5, 105:26, 105:27, 108:16, 108:31, 110:6, 117:13, 118:5, 118:20, 118:60, 118:62, 118:95, 118:106, 118:112, 118:126, 118:148, 121:4, 125:3, 126:2, 140:4, 141:8, 144:12, 149:7-9.

tun 1975: 90-93), including their treatments of nominalized infinitives, and neither corresponds closely to that of the catena. Similar consider-ations apply to the selected corrections to the Church Slavonic psalter translation which are listed in the seventeenth-century MS 1143 (Kovtun 1975: 65-72): they are prefaced by the account of Maksim's work with Kurljatev (with minor variations in wording) and share many of the distinctive readings which occur in 753/863. The recent investigation (Verner 2013) of two early seventeenth-century interlinear Greek and Church Slavonic manuscripts of the Psalter, in which the translation and marginal glosses reflect Maksim's later work on the text, may bring some clarity to this complex tradition.

The material which can be attributed with confidence to Maksim himself consists of glosses on the texts contained in a fifteenth-century Russian Church Slavonic psalter, MS 315, and a Greek psalter, MS 78; the date at which these annotations were made is not precisely known, but their linguistic character is thought to ally them to his later work (Kovtun et al. 1973: 104-9). The version of the psalms in MS 315 seems to belong to the same ill-defined category as the other late fourteenth and fifteenth century East Slavonic psalters used in the present study: to a considerable extent it agrees with Redaction V, though with aberrations which deserve further investigation.[56]

Consequently Maksim seems to have felt little need to correct its treatment of infinitival constructions, even when he chose a different verb, such as прѣхождаше in example (3) and in ps. 77:38 w҃вратити, though he found it necessary in example (92) to instate the reading of Redaction V разгордѣти rather than a finite verb, and in example (8) he added an isolated gloss, еже, presumably in place of вънегда. There is however a correction from infinitive to participle which suggests that Maksim referred to a Greek text with distinctive variant readings when entering his glosses:

---

[56] Some of the reading which MS 315 shares with Redaction V were the target of Maksim's interventions, e.g. the substitutions of крѣпо⟨с⟩ for дръжава in pss. 30:11, 42:2, хр⟨с⟩ть for помазанныи in pss. 104:15, 131:10 and 17; but elsewhere in MS 315 Maksim's corrections introduce Kiprianic readings in preference to variants which are characteristic of earlier redactions, e.g. 40:10 пяту for ковъ, 72:27 любы дѣющиа⟨г⟩ for блоудящиа⟨г⟩, 77:14 настави for веде, 77:51 порази for поби.

(107) 67:21 *θεὸς τοῦ σῴζειν* → бг҃ъ спс҃ати I II Th III V 116; бг҃ъ еже спс҃ати IV; бг҃ъ спс҃аи 315

Evidence of textual variation in the Greek text which Maksim used can also be detected in MS 78:

(108) 126:2 *ἐγείρεσθε* → въстанѣте I II Th III IV V 63+117 315, but *ἐγείρεσθαι* → въстати 78

The other Church Slavonic glosses on infinitival constructions in MS 78 are once again few in number. This fact may in itself indicate that Maksim regarded a literal treatment of Greek infinitives in Church Slavonic as unproblematic, and he took the trouble to indicate this explicitly only in four places:[57]

(31) еже съгрѣшати
(88) въ еже скорбити ми
(98) в мѣсто є⟨ж⟩ любити
(101) ѿ еже звати ми

The later revisions ascribed to Maksim in the seventeenth century MS 1143 are similarly inconsequential. Sometimes, in fact, they reinstate readings found in Redaction V: so an infinitive rather than a noun is recommended in example (104) помощи мнѣ; the traditional conjunction governing an infinitive is preferred to preposition plus еже in example (13) преже даже разумѣти;[58] and finite verbs, albeit not exactly those of Redaction V, are used in examples (80) внегда сокрꙋшаю⟨т⟩ са кости and (91) внег⟨д⟩а wскꙋдѣвае⟨т⟩ … а҃хъ мо⟨и⟩.
Even when the choice of lexical item is different from that of Redaction V, the same type of infinitival construction is used:

(4) внег⟨д⟩а ѿвратитиса, and ps. 105:23 ѿвратити instead of възвратити in V
(22) свѣтити

[57] Also once in the second Old Testament canticle (Kravec 1991: 256).
[58] Corrected to нежели разумѣло above the line.

(55) вънегда приближити са … w⟨з⟩лоблающи⟨м⟩

Where MS 1143 departs from Redaction V, its recommendations tend to coincide with the wording of Redaction IV. So in MS 1143 an infinitive is preferred to a finite verb after the conjunction вънегда in several, though not all, of the places where the only earlier version to use this construction is Redaction IV:

(70) внег⟨д⟩а ѯклонити⟨с⟩ еи[59]
(76) внегда ему владѣти
(84) внег⟨д⟩а ра⟨з⟩делити нв⟨с⟩номѯ
(85) внегда прозабнути[60] грѣшникw⟨м⟩
(86) внег⟨д⟩а ему ѯслыша⟨ти⟩

The same applies to example (95) внегда ра⟨з⟩гордѣти са нечестивому, where MS 1143, like Redaction IV, opts for an infinitival clause rather than the preposition and noun used in other redactions.

This similarity in approach also gives rise in MS 1143 to a few more examples of еже plus infinitive in place of a bare infinitive: example (16) е⟨же⟩ зрѣти ми (likewise Verner 2013: 118); example (31) е⟨же⟩ согрѣша⟨ти⟩ (likewise Verner 2013: 110), as in 78; ps. 126:2 е⟨же⟩ оутреневати (likewise Verner 2013: 110) and by extension in example (108) еже вста⟨ти⟩, with the same Greek variant reading as was cited above from MS 78. Equally, MS 1143 sometimes mirrors the combination of preposition, еже and infinitive which is otherwise peculiar to Redaction IV: examples (19) во еже с̄п̄сти насъ and (99) по е⟨ж⟩е съдѣти. Yet the scattering of instances with еже plus infinitive in MS 1143 does not even approximate the systematic use of this construction in Redaction IV, and еже as a standard equivalent to Greek *τοῦ* is actually omitted in (98) в мѣсто любити мене, in contrast to Redaction IV and the catena.

In fact, what is curious about the recommendations attributed in MS 1143 to Maksim Grek is that they are so unsystematic: as can be seen from the examples above, *ἐν τῷ* plus infinitive is variously rendered by внегда with a finite verb or

[59] Also in 8662 and T28.

[60] Corrected to возрасти above the line, as in the margin of 753/863.

an infinitive, but it is also translated by во еже followed by an infinitive in examples (71) во е⟨же⟩ при⟨з⟩рѣти ми and (8) во еже сохранити (likewise Verner 2013: 110) or even by a finite verb in example (1) во еже ѹнзе ми. The only point – a relatively minor one – on which MS 1143 is consistent is the substitution of an in-finitive for a dative absolute construction in examples (101) ѿ еже звати ми, as in the catena and MS 78, and (102) ѿ еже ѹповатї ми.

There is however one important respect in which these later versions associated with Maksim's name differ from the catena: they share a tendency, once again sporadic and inconsistent, to use the conjunction ꙗко, rather than еже, to introduce infinitives which translate *τοῦ* plus infinitive in Greek. As a construction, ꙗко plus infinitive is of course not new, but it had a different function in early Church Slavonic. In the Psalter it is attested from the earliest redactions onward in two places, where it renders the consecutive construction *ὥστε* plus infinitive:

(124) 36:8 *ὥστε πονηρεύεσθαι* → ꙗко(же) лѫкавьновати I II Th III IV 171+116; еже лѫкавьновати V

(125) 103:35 *ὥστε μὴ ὑπάρχειν* → ꙗко не бъıти имъ I II Th III IV V 63+117

In addition to this, ꙗко is sometimes prefaced to a да-clause as a means of translating Greek clauses introduced by *ὅπως ἄν*. In Redactions I and II this option is applied in a limited subset of instances[61] where context allows either a consecutive or a final interpretation; an overlap between consecutive and final sense in clauses introduced by ꙗко is observable from Old Church Slavonic on (Večerka 2002: 289-290), no doubt because the consequence of action coincides at least sometimes with the intended aim. The revised version found in the Church Slavonic translation of the commentary on the psalms by Theodoret of Cyrrhus doubles the number of examples.[62] Redaction III then extends the use of the construction to the other places where *ὅπως ἄν* occurs with predominantly

[61] Pss. 9:15, 47:14, 50:6, 70:8, 77:44.

[62] Pss. 67:24, 77:6, 107:7, 118:71, 118:101. The concentration of these instances in the second half of the Psalter is striking, and raises the possibility that these were early readings retained only in Th; but the evidence provided by the manuscripts of Redactions II and II is unambiguous.

final sense,[63] and with minor variations Redactions IV and V do the same, adding ps. 118:80 to complete the transition from a semantically motivated distribution of ѩкѡ to its automatic use as an translational equivalent to *ὅπως*.

Thus the use of ѩкѡ in final clauses was well established by Maksim's time. The difference between his practice and that of his fourteenth-century predecessors is that in his later work he was apparently inclined to extend the infinitival construction with ѩкѡ from consecutive to final clauses, as one of the possible translations of *τοῦ* plus infinitive (Verner 2013:110). So there is a scattering of places[64] in the MS 78 where ѩкѡ (or ꙗкѡ) is entered as an annotation on a Greek infinitive introduced by *τοῦ*, and only one instance, in example (40), where ѩкѡ да is indicated. Among the recommendations of MS 1143 are twenty-five instances[65] where ѩкѡ is preposed to infinitives which in Redaction IV are introduced by ежє while in other redactions, including Redaction V, they are translated either by the bare infinitive or by a final clause introduced by да. The impulse to extend the use of ѩкѡ could have come from the observation that it is employed in the fourteenth-century revisions as the standard equivalent of *ὅπως*, and therefore can introduce final clauses, but in the psalter text these normally contain finite verbs. It could have gained further impetus from the fact that Maksim, like his fourteenth-century predecessors, pre-empted да to mark 3rd person imperatives (Češko 1988: 228-9): he therefore probably felt the need of some other marker for final clauses. The combination of ѩкѡ plus infinitive is thus the only point in which Maksim's later revisions appear to depart from the models which Redaction V, and indirectly Redaction IV, offered him for the translation of Greek nominalized infinitives, and this peculiarity calls for further investigation.

But the sporadic, apparently random distribution of ѩкѡ plus infinitive in the later revisions associated with Maksim is once again perplexing: why is this construction not deployed at other points in MS 1143 rather than the bare infinitive

---

[63] Pss. 16:4, 29:13, 59:7, 91:8, 104:45, 118:11, 124:3.

[64] Pss. 26:4, 35:3, 38:2 (likewise Verner 2013: 118), 62:3, 118:5.

[65] Examples (15), (17), (20), (23), (28), (33), (34), (35), (37), (43), (44), (45), (50), and pss. 10:2, 61:10, 63:5, 77:18, 84:10, 90:11, 100:6, 101:21, 105:5(2nd instance), 118:5, 121:4, 140:4.

in final sense, e.g. in example (21) and pss. 36:14, 77:5, 108:31 or in the places mentioned above, example (22) and ps. 105:27? why does MS 1143 go so far as to reinstate the old clausal reading да ра⟨з⟩роушиши in example (48)? Here again fuller investigation of the manuscript tradition may help to clarify how far such inconsistencies are due to scribal contamination between older and newer versions, and whether for Maksim there was a rationale behind the use of ꙗко, єже or the bare infinitive to translate the Greek *τοῦ* plus nominalized infinitive.

Conclusions and directions for further research

Even with these limitations, the material surveyed above allows several conclusions. First of all, there can be no question of Latin influence in Maksim's treatment of nominalized infinitives: they can be explained simply and most plausibly on the basis of the Greek text and its Church Slavonic translations. Secondly, there are numerous unquestionable coincidences of wording between Maksim's work and Redaction V, the version of the psalms familiar to his assistants from the Gennadian Bible. More generally, the changes in Church Slavonic syntactic usage which had become established in the fourteenth century and can be seen most clearly in Redaction IV were passed on to Maksim through the medium of Redaction V and probably through his assistants' familiarity with South Slavonic revisions of other church texts. These fourteenth-century norms are also reflected in other features of Maksim's linguistic usage, such as the careful distinction between definite and indefinite participles (Češko 1988: 226; Češko et al. 1989: 74), the use of the animate accusative plural (MacRobert 2005: 381, 393-394) and the generalization of perfect tense forms in place of aorist in the 2nd person singular (MacRobert 2015: 169-175).

All these parallelisms tend to vindicate the view that Maksim's usage, at any rate in his psalter translations, was influenced not simply by Greek (Olmsted 2002; Kravec 1991: 247, 265-266) but also by fourteenth-century South Slavonic developments in Church Slavonic (Baracchi 1971: 270). This does not necessarily mean (*pace* Olmsted 2002: 1) that his language would have appeared alien to educated Muscovites of his day; but there seems little ground for the claim that he and his assistants aimed at a rapprochement between Church Slavonic as used

for literary purposes and the colloquial Russian language of their day (Mathauzerová 1976: 48).

From these conclusions lines of further research can be derived. It can be inferred that Maksim's Russian assistants played a rather more active part in the revision at least of the psalter text than has usually been attributed to them by modern scholars or indeed by Maksim himself. It could therefore be illuminating to compare the usage followed in the psalms of the catena with the linguistic practice of Maksim's compilatory commentary, in order to determine how far South Slavonic norms had been assimilated by educated East Slavs of the early sixteenth century and to what extent older usage (e.g. the widespread use of **акы** in the commentary sections of the catena) still prevailed. As indicated above, Maksim's later linguistic practice also needs to be elucidated by a textological investigation of the source material and a wider examination of contemporary Church Slavonic, particularly in texts which he is likely to have studied during his period of confinement.

Finally, the textological prehistory of Redaction V needs to be studied in greater depth: the handful of East Slavonic psalter manuscripts from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century which are excerpted in this paper already suggest more complicated textual developments between Redaction IV and what passes for Redaction V; a fuller investigation of psalter manuscripts from this period could make a substantive difference to our understanding of the textual tradition and more generally of the development of Russian Church Slavonic in the fifteenth century.

Appendix of manuscripts consulted

A. The earliest available witnesses which reflect Maksim's revisions of 1519-1522 and 1552 (Kovtun et al. 1973: 100-102; Sinicyna 1977: 12-13, 65, 71)

MS 63, Ovčinnikov collection, Russian State Library, Moscow (1520s, Maksim's catena on the psalms, ps. 77-end).

MS ДА A.I. 171, Russian National Library, St Petersburg (1540s, Maksim's catena on the psalms, pss. 1-54).

MSS 116 and 117, Hilandar Monastery (1550s, Maksim's catena on the psalms).

MS 315, Troickij collection, Russian State Library, Moscow (late 15th century, annotated by Maksim at an uncertain date).

MS 78, Sofijskij collection, Russian National Library, St Petersburg (1540, annotated by Maksim and Veniamin).

MSS 752/862 and 753/863, Soloveckij collection, Russian National Library, St Petersburg (late 16th century, distinct versions of Maksim's later translation; pss. 1-54 excerpted).

MS 1143, Pogodinskij collection, Russian National Library, St Petersburg (17th century, selected variants from Maksim's later translation).

B. Psalter manuscripts containing revised versions of the text current in the 14th-15th centuries

Norov Psalter (Češko et al. 1989) (early 14th century) = IV

MS F.п.I.2, Russian National Library, St. Petersburg (14th century) = FпI2

MS 28, Synodal Typographic collection, Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (RGADA), Moscow = T28.

MS 64, Sofijskij collection, Russian National Library, St. Petersburg (14th century) = S64

MS 8662, Troickij collection, Russian State Library, Moscow (14th century) = 8662

MS Acq. e doni 360, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence (1384) = Luck

MS 96, Barsov collection, State Historical Museum, Moscow (early 15th century) = B

MS 15231, archive of the regional history museum, Jaroslavl' (early 15th century) = J

Gennadian Bible of 1499 in Freidhof (1974) and Russkaja Biblija (1997) and readings from Kyprian's Psalter in Češko et al. (1989) = V.

Bibliography

Baracchi (1971-1972) – Mietta Baracchi, *La lingua di Maksim Grek*, «Rendiconti dell'Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere», Classe di lettere, scienze morali e storiche, 105, 2: 253-289; 106, 2: 243-267.

Bogdanović (1978) – Димитрије Богдановић, *Каталог ћирилских рукописа манастира Хиландара*, том 1: Каталог, том 2: Палеографский албум. Београд: САНУ, НБС.

Češko (1981) – Елена Владимировна Чешко, *Второе южнославянское влияние в редакции псалтырного текста на Руси XIV-XV вв.*, «Palaeobulgarica» 5, 4: 79-85.

Češko (1988) – Елена Владимировна Чешко, *Кирилло-мефодиевский перевод Псалтыри и среднеболгарские правленые редакции. Структура слова и реляционные элементы*. In: Петър Диников и др. (ред.), *Исследования по славяно-византийскому и западноевропейскому средневековью* (Studia slavico-byzantina et mediaevalia europensia 1). София: Център для славяно-византийских исследований имени Ивана Дуйчева, 217-230.

Češko et al. (1989) – Елена Владимировна Чешко и др. (ред.), *Норовская псалтырь: Среднеболгарская рукопись XIV века*, 2 т. София: БАН.

Freidhof (1974) – Gerd Freidhof, *Auszüge aus der Gennadius-Bibel (1499). Nr. 1: Der Psalter* (Specimina philologiae slavicae 5). Frankfurt am Main: Kubon Sagner.

Gorskij & Nevostruev (1857) – Александр Васильевич Горский, Капитон Иванович Невоструев, *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки*, отдел 2: Писания святых отцов, 1: Толкование Священного Писания. Москва: Синодальная Типография, 83-101.

Karačorova (1989) – Ивона Карачорова, *Към въпроса за Кирило-Методиевския старобългарски превод на псалтира*, «Кирило-Методиевски студии» 6: 130-245.

Karačorova (2015) – Ивона Карачорова, *Новонайденная катена к Псалтыри в двух рукописях Хиландарского монастыря*, «Palaeobulgarica» 39, 1: 55-71.

Knjazevskaja & Češko (1980) – Ольга Александровна Князевская, Елена Васильевна Чешко, *Рукописи митрополита Киприана и отражение в них орфографической реформы Евтимия Тырновского*. In: Пеньо Русев и др. (ред.), *Ученици и последователи на Евтими Търновски. Втори международен симпозиум, Велико Търново, 20-23 май 1976* (Търновска книжовна школа 2). София: БАН, 282-292.

Kovtun (1975) – Людмила Степановна Ковтун, *Лексикография в Московской Руси XVI-начала XVII в.* Ленинград: Наука.

Kovtun et al. (1973) – Людмила Степановна Ковтун, Нина Васильевна Синицына, Борис Львович Фонкич, *Максим Грек и славянская Псалтырь (сложение норм литературного языка в переводческой практике XVI в.)*. In: Лидия Петровна Жуковская, Нина Ивановна Тарабасова (отв. ред.), *Восточнославянские языки. Источники для их изучения*. Москва: Наука, 99-126.

Kravec (1991) – Елена Владимировна Кравец, *Книжная справа и переводы Максима Грека как опыт нормализации церковнославянского языка XVI века*, «Russian Linguistics» 15, 3: 247-279.

MacRobert (1998) – Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century*. In: Jože Krašovec (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*. Ljubljana – Sheffield: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti – Sheffield Academic Press, 921-942.

MacRobert (2005) – Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The compilatory Church Slavonic catena on the Psalms in three East Slavonic manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries*, «Slavia» 74, 2-3: 213-238 [= CyrilloMethodiana 2005 ad honorem Zdeňka Ribarova et Ludmila Pacnerová].

MacRobert (2006) – Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The variable treatment of clitics in 14th-century South Slavonic psalter translations*. In: Лора Тасева и др. (отг. ред.), *Многократните преводи в Южнославянското Средновековие. Доклади от международната конференция (София, 7-9 юли 2005)*. София: ГорексПрес, 373-395.

MacRobert (2010a) – Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The impact of interpretation on the evolution of the Church Slavonic psalter text up to the fifteenth century*. In: André Lemaire (ed.), *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, 133). Leiden – Boston: Brill, 423-440.

MacRobert (2010b) – Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The textual peculiarities of the Luck Psalter of 1384 (Acquisti e Doni MS 360, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence)*, «Ricerche Slavistiche», Nuova serie, 8 (54): 101-125.

MacRobert (2013) – Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The linguistic peculiarities and textological importance of the Novgorod antiphonal psalters*, «Slověne» 2, 2: 31-51.

MacRobert (2015) – Catherine Mary MacRobert, *Maximos the Greek: Imprisoned in Polemic*. In: Almut Suerbaum, George Southcombe, Benjamin Thompson (eds.), *Polemic. Lan-*

guage as Violence in Medieval and Early Modern Discourse. Farnham – Burlington: Ashgate, 165-180.

Matejić & Thomas (1992) – Predrag Matejić, Hannah Thomas, *Catalog. Manuscripts on Microform of the Hilandar Research Library (The Ohio State University)*, 2 vols. Columbus, Ohio: Resouce Center for Medieval Slavic Studies.

Mathauzerová (976) – Světla Mathauzerová, *Древнерусские теории искусства слова* (Acta universitatis Carolinae philologica monographia lxiii). Prague: Univerzita Karlova.

Olmsted (2002) – Hugh M. Olmsted, *Recognizing Maksim Grek: Features of his Language*, «Palaeoslavica» 10, 2: 1-26.

Ostrowski (2009) – Donald Ostrowski, *Identifying psalmic quotations in the Povest' vremennykh let*. In: Russell E. Martin et al. (eds.), *Culture and Identity in Eastern Christian History. Papers of the First Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Eastern Christian History and Culture* (Ohio Slavic Papers 9, Eastern Christian Studies 1). Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 217-247.

Pastrnek (1913) – František Pastrnek, *Die griechischen Artikelkonstruktionen in der altkirchenslavischen Psalter- und Evangelienübersetzung. I - In der Psalterübersetzung*, «Archiv für slavische Philologie» 35: 366-391.

Porfir'ev et al. (1881) – Иван Яковлевич Порфирьев, Александр Васильевич Вадковский, Николай Фомич Красносельцев, *Описание рукописей Соловецкого манастыря, находящихся в библиотеке Казаньской духовной академии*, часть 1. Казань: Казанская духовная академия.

Rahlfs (1979) – Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, X: Psalmi cum Odis, 3 ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Russkaja Biblija (1997) – *Русская Библия. Библия 1499 года и Библия в синодальном переводе*, т. 4: Псалтирь. Москва: Новоспасский монастырь.

Sinicyna (2008) – Нина Васильевна Синицына (ред.), *Преподобный Максим Грек: сочинения,* т. 1. Москва: Индрик.

Thomson (1998) – Francis J. Thomson, *The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament*. In: Jože Krašovec (ed.), *Interpretation of the Bible*. Ljubljana – Sheffield: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti – Sheffield Academic Press, 605-920.

Večerka (2002) – Radoslav Večerka, *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax*, Bd. 4 (Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris, Fontes et dissertationes, 46). Freiburg: Weiher.

Verner (2013) – Инна Вениаминовна Вернер, *Грамматическая справа Максима Грека в Псалтыри 1552 г.* In: Александр Михайлович Молдован и др. (ред.), *Письменность, литература, фольклор славянских народов. История славистики. XV Международный съезд славистов. Минск, 20-27 августа 2013 г. Доклады российской делегации*. Москва: Древлехранилище, 104-127.

Weiher (1977) – Eckhart Weiher, *Die älteste Handschrift des grammatischen Traktats "Über die acht Redeteile"*, «Anzeiger für slavische Philologie» 9: 367-427.