

CATHERINE MARY MACROBERT

THE TEXTUAL PECULIARITIES OF THE LUCK PSALTER OF
1384 (ACQUISTI E DONI MS 360, BIBLIOTECA MEDICEA
LAURENZIANA, FLORENCE)

The psalter manuscript written by the priest Ivan in the Volhynian town of Luck in 1384 and acquired by the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in 1932 deserves more scholarly attention than it has so far received. The description of the manuscript and its contents which was published by Carlo Verdiani in 1954¹ touches on most of its peculiarities, but only two have been the subject of more recent study: the language of the scribal colophon has recently been analysed in detail by Kryś'ko² and the unusual practice of commemorating the scribe in the intercalated hymns and prayers is discussed with comparative material by MacRobert.³ Yet the manuscript is also of palaeographical importance, above all because it is dated but also, for instance, because the scribe sporadically employs for the Cyrillic digraph ѿ the unusual horizontal ligature found in some

(¹) Carlo Verdiani, *Il salterio Laurenziano-Volyniense. Codice paleoslavo del 1384*, "Ricerche slavistiche", III (1954), pp. 1-29.

(²) Vadim Borisovič Kryś'ko, 'Bjaše veremja ne stroino, no bėdno': zapis' pisca v Luckoj psaltyri 1384 g., in *Slavistika sinxronija i diaxronija: Sbornik statej k 70-letiju I. S. Uluxanova*. Ed. V. B. Kryś'ko. Institut ruskogo jazyka RAN, Moskva 2006, pp. 429-438.

(³) Catherine Mary MacRobert, 'Remember me in your prayers': *Reading the Church Slavonic Psalter as an act of commemoration*, in *Aspects of the Performative in Medieval Culture*. Ed. M. Gragnolati, A. Suerbaum. (Trends in Medieval Philology, ed. I Kasten, N. Largier, M. Schnyder, 18). De Gruyter, Berlin - New York 2010, pp. 39-59.

South Slavonic, especially Bosnian, manuscripts⁴ and occasionally in East Slavonic sources.⁵ It is one of the few psalters to contain the spiral-shaped design⁶ probably used in selecting at random the fortune-telling inscriptions⁷ which accompany the psalms and which are still visible in some places.⁸ Its peculiarities of spelling and implied pronunciation⁹ ally it with the manuscripts of Galicia and Volhynia analysed by Sobolevskij¹⁰ and illustrate the development of a local norm of Church Slavonic.

The version of the psalms and canticles contained in this manuscript is also of textological interest, as can be seen from Verdiani's brief remarks on lexical variants and the short excerpt, ps. 118:10-20, which he provides.¹¹ He went to the trouble of comparing the text not just with the oldest witness to the Church Slavonic transla-

(⁴) Petar Đorđić, *Istorija srpske ćirilice*. Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika Socijalističke Republike Srbije, Beograd 1971, p. 138; Catherine Mary MacRobert, *On the role of memory and oral tradition in the early transmission of the Church Slavonic psalter text*, in *Xristijanska agiologija i narodni vjarvanija. Sbornik v čest na st. n. s. Elena Koceva*. Ed. A. Miltenova, E. Tomova, R. Stankova. Iztok-Zapad, Sofija 2008, pp. 340-355, especially p. 342. The ligature of ѿ occurs sporadically throughout the Luck Psalter, notwithstanding Verdiani's surmise that the part containing the Canticles derived from an earlier manuscript; his grounds for believing this were not obvious to me when I examined the Luck Psalter in Florence.

(⁵) Gerol'd Ivanovič Vzdornov, *Iskusstvo knigi v Drevnej Rusi. Rukopisnaja kniga Severo-Vostočnoj Rusi XII-načala XV vekov*. Iskusstvo, Moskva 1980, No. 18, ff. 20^rv, 23^v, 24^r, 65^r; Valentin Lavrent'evič Janin - Andrej Anatol'evič Zaliznjak, *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste iz raskopok 1990-1996 godov, X. Paleografija berestjanyx gramot i ix vnestratigrafičeskoe datirovanie*. 'Russkie slovari', Moskva 2000, pp. 109-191.

(⁶) Carlo Verdiani, *Il salterio Laurenziano-Voliniense...*, cit., pp. 3-4 and plate 1.

(⁷) Mixail Nestorovič Speranskij, *Iz istorii otrečennyx knig, I. Gadanija po psaltyri*. (Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti i iskusstva, 129). V. S. Balašev, Sankt-Peterburg 1899, pp. 5-10.

(⁸) Ff. 5^r, 15^r, 24^v, 25^r, 54^r, 56^r.

(⁹) Carlo Verdiani, *Il salterio Laurenziano-Voliniense...*, cit., pp. 8-11.

(¹⁰) Aleksej Ivanovič Sobolevskij, *Očerki iz istorii russkogo jazyka, 1. Galicko-Volynskoe narečie v XII-XV vekax*. Universitetskaja tipografija I. I. Zavadskogo, Kiev 1884, reprinted in A. I. Sobolevskij, *Trudy po istorii russkogo jazyka, 1*. Ed. V. B. Kryš'ko. Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury, Moskva 2004.

(¹¹) Carlo Verdiani, *Il salterio Laurenziano-Voliniense...*, cit., pp. 11-13.

tion, the Sinai Psalter, but also with such other psalter manuscripts as were readily available to him in modern editions: the Pogodin and Bologna commentated Psalters and the variant readings supplied in Jagić's edition from the Tolstoy, Bucharest and Sofia Psalters, the psalter texts in Vajs's edition of the Lobkowitz and Paris Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts, and the Sluck fragment published by Sreznevskij,¹² which determined Verdiani's choice of excerpt. This range of material provides a basis for comparison mainly with the early Redaction I of the Church Slavonic Psalter and the closely related translation of the pseudo-Athanasian commentated psalter; as Verdiani notes, only the Bucharest Psalter, which incorporates variants from Redactions II and III, shares some of the divergent readings in the Luck Psalter. It is to be regretted that Verdiani apparently did not have access to Amfiloxij's edition of the Simonovskaja Psaltyr', which would have provided him with parallels to the only really distinctive variant in his excerpt from ps. 118, *понекоу ѿ* in verse 15. Over the last fifty years, however, a considerable amount of work has been done on the textual tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter and comparative data are available from manuscripts whose contents and even whose existence could not have been known to Verdiani. The purpose of this article is to locate the Luck Psalter on the textological map as it is known today.

The manuscripts cited in this study are listed, with their approximate datings, redactional affiliations and the abbreviated designations used to refer to them, in the appendix. Readings from the Luck Psalter and other individual manuscripts are given in original orthography; *titla* are reproduced but superscript letters are brought down to the line and enclosed in angle brackets; square brackets are used to mark erasures. Where a reading is typical of a whole redaction, this is indicated by the appropriate Roman numeral, and normalized orthography is employed. Readings which are not entirely certain, usually because of erasures or alterations, are indicated by means of question marks.

¹² Izmail Ivanovič Sreznevskij, *Drevnie slavjanske pamjatniki jusovogo pis'ma*, "Sbornik statej Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti", 3 (1868), pp. 155-165.

By the late fourteenth century the textual history of the Church Slavonic Psalter had developed significant ramifications.¹³ Redaction I had long since been supplanted in the East Slav lands by Redaction II. This redaction is also attested, as well as Redaction I, in South Slavonic manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth century,¹⁴ but from the early fourteenth century they both started to yield place to new revisions: Redaction III, which is known mainly and widely in South Slavonic manuscripts and early printed books, and Redaction IV, which is apparently extant only in one manuscript, the Norov Psalter, but seems to have influenced the development of Redaction V, the version associated with Metropolitan Kiprian which gradually became standard among the East Slavs from the end of the fourteenth century.¹⁵ In the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, however, there is also evidence of revived interest, particularly among the East Slavs but also in the South Slav area (as attested by the fourteenth-century Sofia Psalter), in the early Church Slavonic translations of commentaries on the Psalms: the pseudo-Athanasian catena which was added to Redaction I and the commentary of Theodoret of Cyrillus, for which Redaction I had been extensively revised, probably in tenth-century Bulgaria. Thus textual peculiarities of both these early versions can be found several centuries later in a range of East Slavonic psalter manuscripts without commentary¹⁶

⁽¹³⁾ Francis J. Thomson, *The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament*, in *Interpretation of the Bible*. Ed. J. Krašovec. Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti - Sheffield Academic Press, Ljubljana - Sheffield 1998, pp. 605-920, especially pp. 797-825; Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century*, in *Interpretation of the Bible*, cit., pp. 921-942.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *On the Problems of Identifying a 'Pre-slav Redaction' of the Psalter*, in *Studia in honorem professoris Angelinae Minčeva*. Ed. M. Dimitrova, P. Petkov, I. Hristova. (Acta palaeoslavica, 2). Heron Press, Sofia 2005, pp. 39-46.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Elena Vladimirovna Češko, *Vtoroe južnoslavjanskoe vlijanie v redakcii psaltyrnogo teksta na Rusi XIV-XV vv.*, "Palaeobulgarica", V (1981) 4, pp. 79-85.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *A Missing Link in the Early Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter (the Tolstoy, Sluck, Eugenius and Vienna Psalters and MS 34 of the Moscow Synodal Typography)*, "Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch", 39 (1993), pp. 57-81; Id., *Alphabetic suspension in Glagolitic and Cyrillic manu-*

and above all in a small but highly distinctive group of psalters with compilatory commentaries.¹⁷

In 1384 Ivan could have had been conversant with any of these versions, except perhaps Redaction III, which is a rarity in the East Slavonic area; and the textual evidence of his manuscript speaks for influence from more than one of them. Whether Ivan was acquainted with them directly, through his own reading and use, or indirectly, through the mediation of his exemplar, is not possible to determine with certainty, but some tentative conclusions can be drawn from what Ivan himself said about the process of his copying task and from the errors and corrections in his text. In the colophon he explains that the exigencies of the time forced him to write in haste, and that he was not able to produce as finished a manuscript as he wished; the picture which he draws of a scrupulous worker operating under pressure accords well with the product of his labours. Ivan was a competent scribe who wrote in a clear, well-formed, even hand. If the peculiarities of his spelling (the confusion of \mathfrak{z} with ϵ or и , of вз with оу , and his tolerance of vernacular forms such as $\text{тѡбѣ} / \text{ѡбѣ}$ *passim*, чегѡ f. 70^r, полечю f. 69^r) are conceded as manifestations of a local norm, rather than aberrations, then it can be said that he made rather few careless mistakes or substantive omissions¹⁸ in copying. Indeed it seems likely that to some extent he corrected as he wrote: although one or two corrections appear to be in a different hand,¹⁹ others appear to be Ivan's, e.g. in 17:7, where црѣквы сѣбѣ (V) is written over an erasure, probably of сѣбѣ црѣквы , in 39:3,

scripts, "Slovo", 56-57 (2007), pp. 319-332; Id., *The impact of interpretation on the evolution of the Church Slavonic psalter text up to the fifteenth century*, in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*. Ed. A. Lemaire. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 133). Brill, Leiden - Boston 2010, pp. 423-440.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The compilatory Church Slavonic catena on the Psalms in three East Slavonic manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries*, "Slavia", 74 (2005) 2-3 (= *CyrilloMethodiana 2005 ad honorem Zdeňka Ribarova et Ludmila Pacnerová*), pp. 213-238.

⁽¹⁸⁾ The only substantial omissions, of versicles rather than single words, are: 30:10b, 66:4b, 113:5a-7a, 142:6b, 144:18b.

⁽¹⁹⁾ On f. 99^r the word $\text{ци}<\text{т}>$, omitted from 75:4, has been added in a later hand, and on f. 148^v $\text{вз}<\text{прос}>\text{ать}$ has been introduced as a correction to a different reading, perhaps взсплчють , in 108:10.

where *ТИНЬНА* has been changed by the addition of superscript letters to *ТИ<МЕ>НЬНА*, and in the first of the Canticles, Ex. 15:4, where the form *ФАРАВНАВЪ* must have arisen as a correction from *ФАРАВНА* to *ФАРАВНОВЪ*. Elsewhere he allows two competing expressions to stand side by side, in 77:26 *ЛИВОУ ЗАПАДЕНЪ*, 77:30 *ЄДИНАЧЕ* и *ЄЦЕ* and perhaps also in the composite readings 62:2 *МНОЖИЦЕЮ ПРОСТРЕТЬ* and 104:17 *АКЪ РДВЪ В РАВОТОУ*. Another instance of a duplicate reading is the addition between 88:51 and 52 of the phrase и *ПОМАНИ ОУКОРИЗНОУ РДВЪ ТВОИХЪ*, if we suppose that Ivan first wrote the traditional opening words of 88.51 и *ПОМАНИ ПОНОШЕНЬЕ РДВЪ ТВОИХЪ*, then realised that his exemplar contained a different version with a crucial change of noun, and added this as a belated correction. There are also some corrections by erasure, most notably: 11:7 [*пре*]ч<с>та, 15:10 [*ра*]стлѣнья, 103:28 *свержеть са*, 118:94 [*сѣ*] сѣи. Obviously these cannot be definitively attributed; but the scarcity of later interventions leaves open the possibility that they were afterthoughts on Ivan's part.

What most of these corrections and confections have in common is a tendency to replace an early variant, characteristic of Redaction I or II, with a later one. So in 17:7 *сѣя цркви* is usual in I, II and the compilatory versions in JB, while IV and V follow the Greek word order in the literal way characteristic of the fourteenth century. The same applies to 11:7 *прѣчиста* in I, II and J versus *чиста* in IV and V, 103:28 *свержеть са* in I, II and JS but *свержеть* in IV, V and B; in Ex. 15:4 both *ФАРАВНА* and *ФАРАВНОВЪ* occur in I and II, but IV, V and JSB prefer *ФАРАВНОВЪ*. The erasure in 118:94 can also be attributed to the purism of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries which removed from this verse the addition *сѣе*.²⁰ In some instances the earlier reading can be referred to a specific tradition: so 77:30 *ЄДИНАЧЕ* occurs only in early witnesses to I, while *єце* is preferred in other redactions; 39:3 *ТИНЬНА* is peculiar to II, and 62:2 *КАКО ПРОСТРЕТЬ СА* is found only in II and JSB, whereas other redactions, including I, have *КОЛЬ МНОЖИЦЕЖ*. Even where an earlier reading might seem to have been substituted for a later one, an alternative explanation may be available. So in 15:10 *растлѣнья* is attested only

⁽²⁰⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The impact of interpretation...*, cit., p. 436.

in IV, while other redactions have *истлѣнина*, but the reading of II is uncertain because early witnesses lack the beginning of the Psalter. In 77:26 *ливѣ* is the majority reading of all redactions, but the variants *западънѣ* and *западъ*, which occur in a few witnesses to I, re-surface in some East Slavonic manuscripts of the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries.²¹ Similarly in 88:51 *поношение* is the standard reading from Redaction I onwards, whereas *оукоризноу*, although it does not have an exact parallel in any of the manuscripts consulted for this study, is in line with a lexical tendency displayed in JSB which can be traced back to the Church Slavonic version of Theodoret's commentary, where *оукоризна* occurs in 30:12. The only aberrant doublet is in 104:17, where the order in which the variants occur is reversed: the second element, *въ рѣвотѣ*, is more common in I and II while the first more literal rendering, (*въ*) *рѣвѣ*, comes to predominate in IV, V and JSB.

Modifications of these kinds could in principle be the outcome of deliberate textual conflation, and the exemplar which Ivan used may indeed have been the outcome of such a process. For Ivan's own manuscript, however, such an explanation seems implausible: copying from more than one exemplar concurrently is a laborious undertaking, in which the need to keep track concurrently and recurrently of the text on several different pages is bound to hamper and delay the scribe. Given the time at which Ivan lived and the fact that he wrote in haste to produce a psalter which could be used in case of sudden death, including his own, it seems more likely that, while he set himself to copy an up-to-date Church Slavonic version of the psalms, he relied partly on memory and so in places reproduced the earlier version with which he was more familiar. Signs of working from memory can indeed be detected in his manuscript. For instance, there are several places where he departs from standard word order:

21:15 *таѣа посрѣдѣ ѱрѣва моего ѣако воскъ* ← *ѣако воскъ таѣа посрѣдѣ ѱрѣва моего*

56:12 *и истина твоѣа до вѣлакъ* ← *и до вѣлакъ истина твоѣа*

(²¹) Fп14 Sf64 JSB.

83:11 ПАЧЕ ТЪСАЦЬ ЛѢ<Г> ВЪ ДВОРѢХЪ ТВОИХЪ ← ВЪ ДВОРѢХЪ ТВОИХЪ ПАЧЕ ТЪСАЦЬ ЛѢТЪ.

The intervention of memory is also betrayed by reminiscences, where a similarity of wording in two different places in the psalms prompts the transfer of a word or phrase (underlined in the following examples) from one to the other:

13:1 РАСТЛѢША И ОМРАЗИША ВЪ БЕЗАКОННИХЪ from 52:2

17:35 НА БРАНЬ И ПЕРЪСТЪИ МОЯ НА ОПОЛУЧЕНІЕ from 143.1

48:14 ТМА И СЪБЛАДНЪ from 34:6

54:16 ПОСРѢДѢ ИХЪ НЕПРАВДА from 54:11

67:34 ПОУТЬ СЪВОРИТЕ ВЪШЕДШЕМОУ from 67:5

72:21 ИЗМѢНИ СА ОЛѢА РАДИ from 108:24

93:10 РАЗОУМОУ НЕ РАЗОУМѢЕТ ЛИ from 93:9

95:2 СПѢСЕНІЕ БѢ НАШЕГО from 97:3

104:31 МОУХЪИ ПОА<ША И> from 77:45

117:15 ДЕСНИЦА ГНА СЪВОРИ МА anticipating 117:15b-16a

118:12 БЛГ<С>ВНЪ НЕСИ Г<С>И БЛГОСТЮ ТВОЮ from 118:68.

Some of these transfers could have occurred in any redaction, but others are more distinctive. The forms 77:45 ПОАША and 108:24 ОЛѢА are typical of Redactions I and II, but alien to the revised versions of the fourteenth century, which prefer the secondary aorist form ПОАДОША and the Greek loan елен in IV and V or the native ма-сла found in many East Slavonic manuscripts including JB. In 52:2 ВЪ БЕЗАКОННИХЪ is the standard reading of I, IV, V, JSB and some representatives of II,²² though the variant ВЪ НАЧИНАНИИХЪ, which must go back to Greek, predominates in II and is found sporadically in later witnesses to I. By contrast, 93:9 НЕ РАЗОУМѢЕТ ЛИ occurs only in

(²²) Har Sf62 Jar.

II, and the insertion of the phrase $\tau\mu\alpha$ и before the word $\epsilon\zeta\beta\lambda\lambda\alpha\zeta\eta\zeta$ in 48:14 depends on the remembered co-occurrence in 34:6 of these two nouns in II and JS; this demonstrates how memory can conflict with scribal choice of redaction, for in 34:6 the Luck Psalter actually has the reading $\tau\mu\alpha$ и $\pi\lambda\zeta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\zeta$ as in I, IV, V.

Thus both types of evidence for textual contamination in the Luck Psalter, the corrections and the reminiscences, indicate an interplay between older and newer traditions and provide some grounds for supposing that the version in the back either of Ivan's mind or in that of the scribe who provided his exemplar was Redaction II. This is further supported by other readings found in the manuscript which are typical of that redaction. Some of them are isolated and highly distinctive variants, e.g.:

39:5 $\mu\alpha\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ $\Gamma\eta\beta\upsilon\zeta\iota$ as II, cf. $\text{нелстоблененн}\alpha$ I IV V JSB

40:10 $\pi\epsilon\rho\nu\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ as II, cf. $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\beta\zeta$ I IV $\pi\alpha\tau\tau\kappa$ V $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\upsilon$ и $\rho\omicron\text{-}\eta\omicron\sigma\epsilon\zeta$ JSB

54:23 $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\eta\eta\eta\alpha$ as II JSB, cf. $\mu\lambda\zeta\upsilon\zeta\iota$ I IV V

70:14 $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ \omicron $\upsilon\beta\epsilon\mu\beta$ as II, cf. $\upsilon\zeta\eta\eta\kappa$ I IV $\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\gamma\delta\alpha$ V \omicron $\upsilon\beta\epsilon\mu\beta$ $\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\gamma\delta\alpha$ JSB

72:7 $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ $\rho\alpha\zeta\mu\zeta\iota\psi\lambda\eta\eta\eta\epsilon$ as II, cf. $\lambda\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\beta\zeta\upsilon\epsilon$ I IV JS $\lambda\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\beta$ V B

81:6 $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\upsilon\zeta\iota$ as II, cf. $\beta\kappa\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ I IV V JSB

84:5 $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\eta\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$ as II S, cf. $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\epsilon\eta\eta\eta$ I IV V JB

132:2 $\tau\eta\eta$ $\omicron\alpha\nu$ $\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\kappa\epsilon\zeta$ as II B, cf. $\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\zeta\iota$ I IV V

As can be seen here in pss. 54, 70, 84 and 132, the compilatory catenas JSB also retain occasional elements from Redaction II²³ and so agree sporadically with the Luck Psalter.

Other features of Redaction II recur in the Luck Psalter more or less systematically: $\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ introducing similes is frequently rendered by $\lambda\kappa\zeta\iota$, which is alien to the other redactions; $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is translated

⁽²³⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The compilatory Church Slavonic catena...*, cit., pp. 222-223.

as *вѣзѹма*, rather than *ашѹтъ* or *спѣити* of Redaction I, except in 34:7, where *тѹнѣ* is borrowed from the fourteenth-century revisions; nine of the twelve instances of *συναγωγή* elicit the translation *сѣборъ* which predominates in Redaction II, as against three examples²⁴ of the word *сѣнемъ* preferred in I, IV, V. Rather similarly JSB, true to their compilatory provenance, vacillate between *сѣборъ* and *сѣнемъ*, *вѣзѹма*, *вѣсѹѣ* and *испѣитати* as a corruption of the Redaction I reading *спѣити* in 118:161. To these unambiguous and pervasive proofs in the Luck Psalter of a textual background based on Redaction II we may assimilate some other recurrent usages which that redaction shares with one or other of the later ones. For instance, certain translations which distinguish II and III from I, *πλησίος* as *ближнии* rather than *искрънии* and *ἐντείνειν* as *напраци* rather than *налаци*, are found sporadically in IV and V; but their consistent use, apart from 87:19 *искрънаго*, in the Luck Psalter and also in JSB suggests that they derive here from Redaction II.

As indicated above, Redaction II is to be expected as the traditional version which in the East Slav area would have been familiar from liturgical and devotional practice well into the fourteenth century, and the Luck Psalter conforms to that expectation. In addition the manuscript reflects some lexical preferences which come to the fore in East Slavonic psalters at this period. One of these is the use of *плѣма* rather than *сѣма* to render *σπέρμα* in 20:11,²⁵ 88:30²⁶ and 104:6;²⁷ this is most prominent in the Church Slavonic translation of Theodoret's commentary and in psalter manuscripts influenced by that version²⁸ but is also found more widely.²⁹ Some lexical choices are more distinctive, apparently characteristic of a narrower range of witnesses, notably *наслѣдыѣ* instead of *достоѣниѣ* for *κληρονομίαν* in 134:12 x2.³⁰ Other lexical peculiarities are specific to the commented psalters and a group of manuscripts dependent on them: *пѣвении*

⁽²⁴⁾ 73:2, 105:17, 105:18.

⁽²⁵⁾ 7/177 Vat 8662 Fп12 JB.

⁽²⁶⁾ 7/177 Sf60 Fп14.

⁽²⁷⁾ Amf B.

⁽²⁸⁾ 7/177 x8, Fп14 x3, 8662 x6, Sf64 x3, T28 x3, Fп12 x5, J x4, S x2, B x8.

⁽²⁹⁾ Fп11 x1, Amf x4, P2 x1, P3 x1, Sf60 x1, Vat x3.

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. elsewhere Amf x2, Sf60 x1, Fп14 x4, 8662 x2, T28 x1, Fп12 x2.

replaces псаломьѿѿѿ for ψαλμοῦ in 97:5,³¹ похоулиша appears in place of ουνηγιжиша for ἐξουδένωσαν in 105:24³² and хоуленые instead of гаждание for ψόγον in 30:14.³³ The association with exegetical tradition becomes explicit where $(\text{по})\text{пеци са}$ rather than $(\text{по})\text{гломити са}$ renders ἀδολεσχεῖν χ6 , in 76:7 and 13, 118:15, 23, 27 and 78;³⁴ this set of departures from mainstream tradition is of importance because it links the Luck Psalter not only with the East Slavonic manuscripts Amf, T28 and FпI2, but also with the South Slavonic psalters Oх³⁵ and Hval.³⁶

Although such innovations clearly place the Luck Psalter in the group of psalter manuscripts whose text has been sporadically modified under the influence of the commentated versions, it stands out among them in two important respects. On the one hand it preserves more traces than usual of a conservative tradition going back to Redaction I. In this respect its closest analogues are those manuscripts which draw primarily on the pseudo-Athanasian commentated psalter, most obviously T34 and FпI4, to some extent T28 and FпI2, the last of which agrees with the Luck Psalter in omitting the un-commentated ‘psalm without number’, David’s song of triumph over Goliath, rather than 8662 and S64, which are more inclined to follow Redaction II. On the other hand the Luck Psalter exhibits a number of innovatory peculiarities, alien to Redaction I, which ally it unambiguously with the conflated catenas JSB.

⁽³¹⁾ Amf FпI4 T28; Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The impact of interpretation...*, cit., p. 429.

⁽³²⁾ Tol 7/177 T34 FпI4 FпI2 JSB; Catherine Mary MacRobert, *A Missing Link...*, cit., pp. 75-6; Id., *The compilatory Church Slavonic catena...*, cit., p. 225; Id., *Alphabetic suspension...*, cit., pp. 326-327.

⁽³³⁾ Vat JSB.

⁽³⁴⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The impact of interpretation...*, cit., p. 431.

⁽³⁵⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The Textual Tradition of the Oxford Serbian Psalter MS e Mus 184*, “Polata k”nigopis’naja”, 35-36 (1994), pp. 146-54; Katarina Mano-Zisi, *Anagnost Jovan, hilendarski pisar druge polovine XIV veka*, in *Proučavanje srednjovekovnih južnoslovenskih rukopisa*. Ed. P. Ivić. Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Beograd 1995, pp. 231-243, especially pp. 233-234 and plate 2.

⁽³⁶⁾ Jagoda Jurić-Kappel, *Die Stellung des bosnischen Psalters (1404) innerhalb der verwandten slawischen Texte*, “Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch”, 38 (1992), pp. 37-52.

Conservatism is manifested in several different ways. One is the absence of secondary readings which became current in the fourteenth century: for instance, as mentioned above, the Luck Psalter prefers *оуѣи* to the Grecizing *ελεи* of Redactions III, IV and V and to the native Slavonic *мало* which is used in the translation of Theodoret's commentary and many East Slavonic psalter manuscripts of the fourteenth century;³⁷ it keeps all four instances of the loanword *оупостаъь*, which tends to be ousted in the later representatives of Redaction II and in other redactions by the translations *сѣставъь* or *вѣитиѣ*,³⁸ and in 77:28 *σκηνομάτων* it retains the reading *оуѣрца* as in Redactions I and II, as do T34 and B, rather than *кѣцѣь*, found in a multiplicity of East Slavonic manuscripts,³⁹ *жилица* in Amf V JS or *селеніи* in IV. More specifically, the phrasing in 57:6 *ω̄ прѣмодра* *оубавника оубавіема* and 67:28 *въ оумѣ оужаснѣ* is peculiar to Redaction I, as are the vestiges of asigmatic aorist forms in 24:1 *въздвигъь* and 130:2 *възнесъь*.

A second and more distinctive type of conservatism is represented by minority readings within the tradition of Redaction I. The unusual variant *изъоустригъь*, shared with FпI2 and paralleled by *наоустригъь* in Bon, Hval and JB, for 7:13 *στιλβώσει*, and the translation of 108:23 *ἀκρίδες* as *проутнии конци*⁴⁰ both reflect early ventures into interpretation. Modifications of this kind merge with a third type of inherited variant, consisting of actual misinterpretations. Presumably a misguided attempt at easy intelligibility gave rise in 131:4 to *колѣнома*, also attested in some South Slavonic manuscripts,⁴¹ in place of the loanword *κροταφομα* in most witnesses to Redaction I; Redactions II, IV and V opt here for the more accu-

⁽³⁷⁾ Čud x1, 7/177 x10, Amf x2, P2 x1, Sf60 x1, Vat x1, FпI4 x1, 8662 x8, Sf64 x2, FпI2 x3, T28 x3, J x8, S x6, B x8.

⁽³⁸⁾ 88:48 *вѣитиѣ* 7/177 S8 JB, *житиѣ* S, *сѣставъь* IV V; 38:6 *сѣставъь* 7/177 Bel Oх Hval Vat FпI4 8662 Sf64 T28 FпI2 IV V; 38:8 *сѣставъь* 7/177 S8 Bel Oх Hval Vat FпI4 8662 Sf64 T28 FпI2 IV V, *вѣитиѣ* JS; 138:15 *сѣставъь* 7/177 Har S7 Plj Bel Ath Oх FпI1 Jar Amf P2 P3 Sf60 Vat FпI4 T33 8662 Sf64 T28 FпI2 IV V JSB.

⁽³⁹⁾ Čud 7/177 T27 FпI1 P2 P3 Sf60 Vat T33 FпI4 8662 Sf64 T28 FпI2.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Ban Plj Amf T28 JSB; Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The impact of interpretation...*, cit., p. 427.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Gri Ath Hval.

rate translation $\kappa\rho\alpha\eta\eta\iota\alpha\mu\alpha$. Similar perplexity in the face of unusual words can be detected in 47:4 $\tau\epsilon\alpha\rho\epsilon\chi\zeta$ ⁴² instead of $\nu\alpha\rho\epsilon\chi\zeta$ and 71:10 $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\iota$ ⁴³ instead of Redaction I's $\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ ⁴⁴, even though the Luck Psalter elsewhere follows the translations of $\beta\tilde{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ / $\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and $\nu\eta\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ usual from Redaction II onward: 44:9 $\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\eta\iota$ and 96:1 $\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\upsilon\beta\iota$. Scribal unfamiliarity with the antiquated vocabulary of Redaction I also accounts for the corruption of 119:7 $\sigma\pi\alpha\iota\tau\iota$ to $\nu\zeta$ $\nu\epsilon\tau\gamma\tau\iota$, which has parallels in 68:5 $\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\gamma\iota\delta\upsilon\sigma\eta\alpha$ $\varsigma\alpha$ $\Phi\eta\text{I4}$ and 118:161 $\iota\sigma\pi\alpha\iota\tau\alpha\tau\iota$ JB . Corruption to the *lectio facilio*r is generally not uncommon in the weakly controlled tradition of Redaction I,⁴⁵ and therefore in the Luck Psalter, which has 8:6 $\gamma\eta\eta\omicron\mu\beta$ ⁴⁶ instead of $\gamma\eta\mu\beta$ and several instances⁴⁷ where $\mu\omicron\upsilon\zeta\beta$ $\kappa\rho\zeta\upsilon\epsilon$ is replaced by $\mu\omicron\upsilon\zeta\beta$ $\kappa\rho\iota\upsilon\zeta$, as is often found in manuscripts with a direct or indirect affiliation to the South Slavonic tradition of Redaction I.⁴⁸ That South Slavonic transmission underlies the text of the Luck Psalter is apparent from distortions caused by incongruent orthographical practices: $\iota\sigma\pi\omicron\lambda\eta\iota$ $\zeta\epsilon\mu\lambda\omicron$ for 118:64 $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\eta\varsigma$ η $\gamma\eta$ must derive from $\iota\sigma\pi\lambda\zeta\eta\zeta$ $\zeta\epsilon\mu\lambda\eta$ through a putative intermediate stage $*\iota\sigma\pi\lambda\zeta\eta\zeta$ $\zeta\epsilon\mu\lambda\eta\zeta$ in which the back nasal vowel was used incorrectly in the Middle Bulgarian manner, and the same kind of confusion presumably transformed the reiterated genitive singular feminine adjectival form $\omicron\upsilon\tau\rho\gamma\eta\mu\alpha\alpha$ corresponding to 129:6 $\pi\rho\omega\iota\alpha\varsigma$ via $*\omicron\upsilon\tau\rho\gamma\eta\mu\eta\zeta$ into $\omicron\upsilon\tau\rho\gamma\eta\mu\eta\omicron\upsilon\tau$ and $\omicron\upsilon\tau\rho\gamma\eta\mu\eta\alpha$.⁴⁹

The innovations which the Luck Psalter shares with JSB differ sharply in character from the relics of Redaction I. Some individual

(⁴²) Tol Gri Rad S7 T34 JS.

(⁴³) Čud Rad Hval T34 $\Phi\eta\text{I4}$.

(⁴⁴) Also found in 7/177 T28 $\Phi\eta\text{I2}$.

(⁴⁵) Catherine Mary MacRobert, *On the role of memory...*, cit., p. 346.

(⁴⁶) Bon Lob Par T34 $\Phi\eta\text{I4}$ Hval.

(⁴⁷) 5:7, 25:9, 54:24.

(⁴⁸) Sin x1, Tol x1, Bon x4, Ban x3, Gri x4, Dec x2, Rad x3, Lob x3, Par x2, S7 x1, Plj x3, Bel x3, Ath x4, S8 x3?, Hval x5, T27 x1, $\Phi\eta\text{I1}$ x3, P3 x1, $\Phi\eta\text{I4}$ x2, T28 x1, B x1.

(⁴⁹) This confusion can be detected in a number of South and East Slavonic manuscripts, see Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The enigmatic Athens Psalter (Greek National Library, MS 1797)*, forthcoming in "Slova i zolota vjaz!". *Sbornik statej pamjati V. M. Zagrebina*. Ed. Ž. L. Levšina. Sankt-Peterburg 2010?, pp. 338-345.

79:7 ἐμυκτήρισαν πορουγασα (as 101:9 ὠνειδίζον πορουγασα JSB),
cf. подражаша I II IV V

79:8 ἐπίφανον ἡβι (as 66:2 ἐπιφάναι ἡβι JSB да ѿбытъ Hval and
118:135 ἐπιφάναι ἡβι JS), cf. просвѣти I II IV V

88:52 ὠνειδισαν ογκοριша x2 (as 21:7 ὄνειδος ογκορѡ B, 68:8 and
20 ὄνειδος ογκορѡ JSB) cf. поносиша I II IV V; also 88:51
ὄνειδισμού ογκοριζноу instead of поношение, as mentioned above.

These patterns of agreement, albeit incomplete or indirect, suggest that the four manuscripts draw on the same innovatory linguistic and textual type, but that the Luck Psalter reflects a stage in its dissemination at which it was still constrained or even masked by the influence of Redactions I and II, while JSB represent more radical developments.

The most cogent evidence that the Luck Psalter shares the exegetical provenance of JSB is of two kinds. Firstly, there are places where highly unusual wording in the text of the psalm appears to derive from commentary:

20:4 блг<с>вленъи щедротнъими instead of the usual reading благословеніемъ благостнъимъ is presumably related to the addition to this verse, и щедротами, in B;

34:13 пакости дѣхочу in place of ѿгавіе творѣхѡ deploys the same distinctive phrase as the comment on 87:18 in JSB, жидове пакости дѣюще;

93:1 деръзноуль несть in place of the usual не обвинялъ сѧ естъ is seemingly prompted by деръзновеніемъ in the pseudo-Athanasian commentary on this verse;

102:1 ср̄дѣнѧ instead of вѣнѣтрѣнѧ, the usual translation of τὰ ἐντός, is a typical exegetic locution, matched by ѡчи <с>р̄дѣнии inserted in 68:24 and 118:18 in JSB and by the expression ѡчи ср̄дѣнѣи in the pseudo-Athanasian commentary to 118:18.

Secondly, the explanatory headings which Ivan provided for psalms 1-8 and 18 are for the most part similar or even identical in

wording to those in J (and B from ps. 4 onward):

ps. 1 поученьє на благоустыє и ѿмѣтаниє противнѣхъ, cf. на бл̄гоу<с>тыє поущение и на ѿмѣта<н>е противны<х> жидовъ J (and Fn12)

ps. 2 в стр<с>ти х<с>въ, cf. в стр<с>ти х<с>въ на жиды J в стр<с>ти 8662

ps. 3 егда бѣжа ѿ лица авесоломла с̄на его и в въздвиженни а́дамѹ, cf. в а́дамѣ J

ps. 4 в явленѣи г<с>ни на конецъ вѣкъ, cf. в авле<н>и г<с>ни на слн<ц>е в ко J в авле<н>и г<с>ни на слн<ц>е на конецъ вѣка B

ps. 5 в цр̄кви и в вѣрнѣхъ, cf. в црквы и о люде<х> вѣрнѣхъ JB

ps. 6 в боудуцѣмъ вѣцѣ и в соудѣ also JB

ps. 7 в погыбѣни дѣволи и в исверженѣи с̄ нѣсе, cf. о погыбени дѣволѣ и в сѣверженѣи сѣ нѣсѣ JB

ps. 8 в цр̄кви и крѣви х<с>въ и о тайнахъ, without parallel in JB, which here follow the Hebrew heading, в конецъ о точилѣхъ.

ps. 18 в ап<с>лѣхъ also JB.

The beginning of the heading to ps. 3 in the Luck Psalter renders the traditional Hebrew superscription carried over into the Septuagint, but the others summarize allegorical Christian interpretations: the one supplied for ps. 1 is a version of the appropriate Eusebian hypothesis, while the rest are based on the pseudo-Athanasian commentary. They are in the same laconic style as the headings in S64,⁵⁹ since this manuscript unfortunately lacks the first 35 psalms, no direct comparison can be made between it and the Luck Psalter, but a number of its headings are similar to or the same as those in JB.

Finally, the Luck Psalter exhibits a number of singularities, for which as yet no parallels have been found, though as bold departures

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The classificatory importance of headings and liturgical directions in Church Slavonic psalters of the 11th-15th centuries*, "Byzantinoslavica", LVII (1996), pp. 156-181, especially pp. 165-167.

from traditional wording they are reminiscent of JSB. Among the more striking are:

- 16:10 συνέκλεισαν ἰσκαλιουρισα, cf. затвориша I II IV V JB
- 37:9 ὠρυόμην εἶσωναχῶ, cf. ρикаαχῶ I II IV V JSB ρεβα<χ> 7/177
- 55:2 ἔθλιψεν ωκερβη, cf. етѣжи I II IV V JSB
- 68:24 σύγκαμψον εἶσρβη, cf. сѣлаци I IV V, сѣмѣри II JSB, прѣклопи II, сѣломи II, κρογυши Hval
- 71:3 εἰρήνην εμѣρениη, cf. мирῶ I II IV V JSB
- 77:30 οὔσης βογδογцию, cf. сѣцию I II IV V JS
- 111:8 οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆ ἱεже не подвижати са, cf. не подвижитῶ са I II V не оубоитῶ са Вон 7/177 Ban IV V Hval JS.

The variant in 111:8 can be regarded as emblematic of the complexities underlying the text of the Luck Psalter. It derives from a minority Greek reading, οὐ μὴ σαλευθήσεται / σαλευθῆ, which was apparently current when Redactions I and II came into existence, but was suppressed in other redactions under the influence of the standard Greek text. In the form in which it appears in the Luck Psalter, however, it presupposes a rather different wording in Greek, *τοῦ μὴ σαλευθῆναι, which has been rendered in the literalistic manner characteristic of the secondary translations carried out in the fourteenth century.

This review of the Luck Psalter is not comprehensive – more examples could be adduced at various points – but it aims to be representative, bringing into focus this manuscript's multifarious textual affinities and highlighting its special relationship to the compilatory catenas JSB. In this respect the fact that the Luck Psalter is precisely dated is of particular importance, because it provides a *terminus ante quem* for the inception of those revisionist linguistic strategies which can already be glimpsed in its text and are more clearly in evidence by the early fifteenth century in JB. Whatever the common textual starting point for the Luck Psalter and JSB was, it must have come into existence before 1384.

In other respects, however, the textual character of the Luck Psalter is both problematic in itself and an instantiation of more far-reaching problems. Its relationship to Redaction II, although undoubtedly substantive, cannot be unequivocally termed affiliation, because at least some of the readings typical of that redaction may be adventitious, random imports by memory on the part of the scribe, as in other East Slavonic manuscripts of the same period. The similarities between the Luck Psalter and various distinctive textual traditions in South and East Slavonic manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are probably typological, resulting from independent consultation of Redaction I in commentated psalters, rather than genetic in nature: thus there is no trace in the Luck Psalter of the highly distinctive grammatical usage which links T34 and FпI4 to the Sluck and Tolstoy Psalters,⁶⁰ and few, if any, of the lexical and interpretative elements taken from the Church Slavonic translation of Theodoret's commentary which are prominent in 8662 and Sf64 and especially in T28 and FпI2.⁶¹ Likewise, the preference for (по)пещи сѧ over (по) глoумити сѧ which the Luck Psalter shares with manuscripts as widely separated in provenance as the East Slavonic Amf, T28 and FпI2, the Serbian Ox and the Bosnian Hval could be indicative of a single source earlier in the fourteenth century, but could equally have a more distant common origin through unrelated recourse to the pseudo-Hesychian commentary. The signs of South Slavonic influence in the copying tradition underlying the Luck Psalter are also capable of more than one interpretation: they could derive either from an early source, perhaps Redaction I in an early commentated psalter manuscript of South Slavonic provenance, or from a fourteenth-century South Slavonic revised version (which itself could very well be a reworking of Redaction I, as the Norov Psalter probably is).

Above all, the relationships which evidently obtain among the Luck Psalter, the compilatory commentated psalters JSB and Redac-

⁶⁰) Catherine Mary MacRobert, *A Missing Link...*, cit., p. 70; Id., *Alphabetic suspension...*, cit., p. 326.

⁶¹) Catherine Mary MacRobert, *The impact of interpretation...*, cit., pp. 428-429, 432-434.

tion V are problematic. Is the Luck Psalter less systematic and radical in its innovatory tendencies than JSB because it represents an early stage in their development, or because the lingering influence of Redaction II has largely suppressed them, or for both reasons? Where the Luck Psalter agrees with JS against B, or less often contains a reading found in B but not in JS, can these patterns be used to reconstruct earlier stages in the divergent textual development of JSB, or are they mere chance coincidences? What is the textological significance of the variants typical of Redactions IV and V which occur sporadically in the Luck Psalter, more frequently in JSB? Do they represent yet another superimposed textual layer borrowed from the new redaction, associated with the name of Metropolitan Kiprian, which was later incorporated into the Gennadian Bible? Or do they go back to the interpretative version underlying the Luck Psalter and JSB? Did that version take shape in the East Slavonic lands, antedating the arrival of Kiprian in the 1370s, or was it the redaction which he introduced to the East Slavs, who then variously elaborated or extirpated its more radical features? At present we do not have enough pieces of the puzzle to answer these questions. Investigation of more South and East Slavonic psalter manuscripts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, particularly those in the State Historical Museum in Moscow, may fill in some of the gaps, but the Luck Psalter will remain important because it allows us to glimpse, even if in hazy outline, a crucial part of the picture.

The research for this article was carried out with the support of the British Academy and the Hilandar Research Library at Ohio State University. I take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to those institutions, and also to the colleagues who commented on an earlier version given as a paper at the conference *A. I. Sobolevskij i russkoe istoričeskoe jazykoznanie*, organized in Moscow by the Institute for the Russian language of the Russian Academy of Sciences in June 2007.

APPENDIX OF MSS CITED

Tol = the Tolstoj commentated Psalter, MS F.п.I.23 in the Russian National Public Library in St. Petersburg, 12th century, Redaction I.

Bon = the Bologna commentated Psalter, 13th century, Redaction I.⁶²

Čud = the Čudov commentated psalter of Theorodet, 11th century.⁶³

7/177 = the commentated psalter of Theorodet, MS 7/177 in the State Historical Museum in Moscow, 15th century.

Sin = the Sinai (Glagolitic) psalter, 11th century, Redaction I.⁶⁴

Ban = MS 1 in the Library of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in Sofia, 13th century, Redaction I.

Gri = the Grigorovič Psalter, *fond* 87, MS 4 (M. 1687) in the Russian State Library in Moscow, 13th century, Redaction I.

Deč = the Dečani Psalter, 13th century, Redaction I.⁶⁵

Rad = the Radomir psalter, 13th century, Redaction I.⁶⁶

Lob = the Lobkowicz or Prague Breviary, written in 1359, Redaction I.⁶⁷

⁽⁶²⁾ Vatroslav Jagić, *Slovenskaja psaltyr'. Psalterium bononiense*. Gerold & Co. - Weidmann - C. Ricker, Vienna - Berlin - St. Petersburg 1907; Ivan Dujčev, *Bolonski psaltir*. Bălgarskata akademija na naukite, Sofija 1968.

⁽⁶³⁾ Valerij Aleksandrovič Pogorelov, *Čudovskaja Psaltyr' XI veka: otryvok. Tolkovanija Feodorita Kirrskogo na Psaltyr' v drevne-bolgarskom perevode*. (Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka, 3:1). Otdelenije ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk, Sankt-Peterburg 1910.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Sergej Sever'janov, *Sinajskaja psaltyr'. Glagoličeskij pamjatnik XI veka*. (Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka, 4). Otdelenie ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk, Petrograd 1922; Franciscus V. Mareš, *Psalterii Sinaitici pars nova*. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Schriften der Balkan-Kommission, Philologische Abteilung, 38, Fontes Nr. 2). Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1997.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Ljupčo Mitrevski, *Dečanski psaltir*. (Makedonski srednovekovni rakopisi, V). Institut za staroslovenska kultura, Prilep 2000.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Liljana Makarijoska, *Radomirov psaltir*. (Stari tekstovi, V). Institut za makedonski jazik 'Krstev Misirkov', Skopje 1997.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Josef Vajs, *Psalterium palaeoslovenicum croatico-glagoliticum*, 1. Academia palaeoslavica Veglensis-Politika, Krk - Prague 1916.

Par = the Paris Breviary, 14th century, Redaction I.⁶⁸

Har = the Harvard Psalter, MS Typ. 221, in the Houghton Library, Harvard University, 12th century, Redaction II.

Sf62 = *fond* 728, MS 62 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg; eight folia held in the same library as *fond* 588, MS 6, 13th century, Redaction II.

S7 = MS 7 in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, 13th century, Redaction II.

Bel = MS 36 in the University Library, MS 331 in the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, MS 589 in the National Library, MS 314 in the Library of the Belgrade Patriarchate, and two unnumbered bifolia in the Museum of Applied Arts, 13th century, Redaction II.

Plj = MS 80 in the monastery of the Holy Trinity at Pljevlja; seven folia held in the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, MS 45.8.263, 13th century, Redaction II.

Ath = MS 1797 in the National Library of Greece, 14th century, Redaction II.

S8 = MS 8 in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, 13th century, mixed redaction.⁶⁹

Ox = MS e Mus 184 in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, 14th century, mixed redaction.

Hval = the psalter included in the Hvalov Zbornik, written in 1404, mixed redaction.⁷⁰

T27 = *fond* 381, MS 27 in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (RGADA) in Moscow, 13th century, Redaction II.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ *Ibid.*

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Moshé Altbauer, *Der älteste serbische Psalter*. (Slavistische Forschungen, 23). Böhlau, Köln - Wien 1979.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Herta Kuna, Nevenka Gošić, Jovanka Maksimović, *Zbornik Hvala Krstiana*, 1-2. Svjetlost, Sarajevo 1986.

FπI1 = MS F.π.I.1 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, Redaction II.

Jar = MS 15482 in the Historical Museum in Jaroslavl', 14th century, Redaction II.

Amf = the Simonovskaja psalter, 14th century, later Redaction II.⁷¹

Pog2 = *fond* 588, MS 2 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, later Redaction II.

Pog3 = *fond* 588, MS 3 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, later Redaction II.

Sf60 = *fond* 728, MS 60 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, later Redaction II.

Vat = MS Slavo. 8 in the Vatican Library, 15th century, later Redaction II.

FπI3 = MS F.π.I.3 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, mixed redaction.

T34 = *fond* 381, MS 34 in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (RGADA) in Moscow, 14th century, mixed Redactions I and II.

FπI4 = MS F.π.I.4 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, mixed redaction.

T33 = *fond* 381, MS 33 in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (RGADA) in Moscow, 14th century, mixed redaction.

8662 = *fond* 304/III, MS 8662 (now MS 7)⁷² in the Russian State Library in Moscow, 14th century, mixed redaction.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Archimandrite Amfiloxij, *Drevle-slavjanskaja Psaltir' Simonovskaja do 1280 goda*, 1-4. 2nd ed. L. F. Snegirev, Moskva 1880-1881.

⁽⁷²⁾ I am obliged to O. V. Lada for supplying me with the current archival reference for this manuscript.

Sf64 = *fond* 728, MS 64 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, mixed redaction.

T28 = *fond* 381, MS 28 in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents (RGADA) in Moscow, 14th century, mixed redaction.

Фп12 = MS F.п.1.2 in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, 14th century, mixed redaction.

Nor = the Norov Psalter, 14th century, Redaction IV.⁷³

Ki = the Kiev Psalter, written in 1397, mixed redaction.⁷⁴

J = MS 15231 in the archive of the regional history museum (located in the Spasskij Monastery) in Jaroslavl', 15th century, compilatory commentated redaction.

B = MS 96 of the Barsov collection in the State Historical Museum in Moscow, 15th century, compilatory commentated redaction.

S = MS 1250 in Saratov University Library, 16th century, compilatory commentated redaction.

RIASSUNTO

Il salterio manoscritto redatto nel 1384 a Luc'k (Volinia) e ora conservato presso la Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana di Firenze è di un certo interesse per gli studiosi non solo perché la sua datazione e il suo luogo di origine sono conosciuti, ma anche per le affinità testuali che ha con varie versioni del salterio slavo-ecclesiastico. Il manoscritto presenta un testo ibrido, che si basa sulla Redazione II – generalmente in uso tra gli Slavi Orientali fino al tardo Trecento –, ma che incorpora varianti della Redazione V – la quale in seguito ha sostituito l'altra –, tratti residui della Redazione I probabilmente risalenti a un antigrafo slavo meridionale e una serie di ca-

⁽⁷³⁾ Elena Vladimirovna Češko - Irina Konstantinovna Bunina - Vladimir Antonovič Dybo - Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Knjazevskaia - L. A. Naumenko, *Norovskaja psaltir': Srednebolgarskaja rukopis' XIV veka*, 1-2. Bălgarskata akademija na naukite, Sofija 1989.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Gerol'd Ivanovič Vzornov, *Kievskaja psaltir' 1397. Issledovanie Kievskoj Psaltiri*. Iskusstvo, Moskva 1978.

ratteri peculiari collegati soprattutto a catene compilatorie slave orientali del primo Quattrocento relative ai salmi. Quindi il Salterio di Luc'k è con ogni probabilità un importante anello di collegamento per risalire al processo di rielaborazione cui la traduzione slava ecclesiastica dei salmi è stata sottoposta in area slava orientale durante i secoli XIV-XV.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Рукописная псалтырь, написанная в 1384-ом году в волынском городе Луцке, а теперь хранящаяся в Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana в Флоренции, представляет научный интерес, не только потому что ее можно точно датировать и локализовать, а еще из-за текстологических связей с разными редакциями церковнославянского перевода Псалтыри. Рукопись предлагает смешанный текст, в котором, на фоне II редакции, общепринятой среди восточных славян почти до конца XIV в., выделяются разночтения из V редакции, которая пришла на смену ее, остаточные следы I редакции, восходящие скорее всего к южнославянскому антиграфу, и ряд необычных особенностей, сродних прежде всего с восточнославянскими компилятивными толковыми псалтырями раннего XV в. Таким образом Луцкая псалтырь, по всей вероятности, окажется важным связывающим звеном при исследовании переработки церковнославянского перевода псалмов в восточнославянских землях в течение XIV-XV вв.

