

THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF THE OXFORD SERBIAN PSALTER MS e Mus.184

C.M. MacRobert

Since 1688 the Bodleian Library in Oxford has possessed a late 14th-century Serbian Church Slavonic psalter, MS e Mus. 184. This manuscript, which has been described by Stefanović¹ and by Cleminson², is one of the very few Serbian psalters to have survived virtually intact from so early a date (it lacks only one leaf, which contained Ps. 118.108-21). Yet it has attracted little scholarly attention, perhaps partly because it is written on coarse parchment, in a hand which is clear and careful but not elegant, and there is virtually no ornamentation.

Recently the Oxford Psalter has been used in textological analysis of some other Serbian psalter MSS. Altbauer³ refers occasionally to it in his discussion of the variant readings in MS Sinai 8. A more detailed comparison is drawn with the Munich Psalter by Ševčenko⁴, who points out that both MSS follow the revised version of the psalter text which is found from the early 14th century onwards. This version, which was recognized by Jagić⁵ and Pogorelov⁶, has recently been the subject of researches by Češko⁷, who argues that it originated on Mount Athos. It was a thorough and minute revision with certain systematic features and characteristic variants, listed by Ševčenko⁸, which make it easy to distinguish at least from older versions of the psalter text. The Oxford Psalter (= O in abbreviation here) contains a large number of these typical 'Athonite'

¹ D. Stefanović, 'Paleografske beleške o starim srpskim i nekim drugim rukopisima u Velikoj Britaniji', *Arheografski prilozi*, 6-7, 1984-5, 86-8, with a list of earlier references.

² R. Cleminson, *The Anne Pennington Catalogue, A Union Catalogue of Cyrillic Manuscripts in British and Irish Collections*, London 1988, 265-7.

³ M. Altbauer, *Der älteste serbische Psalter*, Cologne/ Vienna 1979 (= Slavistische Forschungen 23).

⁴ S. Dufrenne, Sv. Radojičić, R. Stichel, I. Ševčenko, *Der serbische Psalter*, Wiesbaden 1978-83, 1-2, 165-7.

⁵ I.V. Jagić, 'Zwei illustrierte serbische Psalter', in J. Strzygowski, 'Die Miniaturen des serbischen Psalters der Königl. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München', *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philos.-hist. Klasse, 52, 1906, II, IV-LXXXVII.

⁶ В.А. Погорелов, 'О редакциях славянского перевода Псалтыри', *Псалтыри*, Библиотека Московской Синодальной Типографии, часть 1, выпуск 3, Москва 1901.

⁷ Е.В. Чешко, 'Об афонской редакции славянского перевода Псалтыри в ее отношении к другим редакциям', *Язык и письменность среднеболгарского периода*, Москва, 1982, 60-92.

⁸ Op. cit., 2, 165-6, fn. 3.

readings. By the same token, it displays almost all the variants which Češko⁹ has proposed as diagnostic for the ‘Athonite’ redaction (as represented by the Tomič Psalter). The only exceptions are:

19.2:	О: ОУСЛЫШИ ТЕ	Athonite: ОУСЛЫШИТЪ ТА
37.7:	О: ПРЪКЪЛОНИХЪ СЕ	Athonite: СЛАКОХ СА
54.8:	О: ВЪДВРОРИХЪ (sic)	Athonite: ОУДВОРИХ СА
56.7:	О: <ПРЪКЛОНИШЕ>	Athonite: СЛАКОШѦ
58.6:	О: ТВОРЕЩИХЪ	Athonite: ДЪЛАДѦЩИХЪ

These divergences from the ‘Athonite’ norm presented by Češko might seem trivial; but they acquire more significance from the fact noted, though without further comment, by Ševčenko, that a number of the ‘Athonite’ readings in the Oxford Psalter, especially the latter half of the MS, are in fact corrections, written over erased words which are sometimes still partly legible. The letters of the corrections are sometimes uneven (naturally enough, since the surface of the parchment was roughened by erasures) and they include the three-legged t, which was not originally used in the main body of the MS. However, the ink of the corrections is not for the most part perceptibly different in colour from the rest, and the man who claimed in the marginal note on f. 171v to have written the MS did there use the three-legged t. The possibility that the scribe himself corrected his work gains support from the two places in the MS. In Ps. 16.1 we have the ‘Athonite’ reading:

ВЪНЪМИ МЛѦЕНІЕ МОЕЪ ВЪНОУШИ МЛТВОУ МОЮ

However, the word МЛѦЕНІЕ is written over an erasure and it is fairly clear that the original reading was the older МОЛИТВОУ; whereas in the second half of the verse there is no trace of the older МЛѦЕНІЕ. It seems that the scribe began by writing the earlier version, stopped and corrected to the ‘Athonite’ wording and then completed the verse in its ‘Athonite’ form. Further evidence of interaction between the two versions of the text is supplied by the ‘psalm outside the count’, David’s song of triumph over Goliath, where we find both the ‘Athonite’ and the pre-Athonite translations of εἶς συνάντησιν:

ИЗИДОХЪ ВЪ СРЪТЕНІЕ ПРОТИВОУ ИНОПЪЛЕМЕНЪНИКОУ

It looks as if either the scribe was working from two originals simultaneously, correcting to the ‘Athonite’ version as he went along, or else he knew the older version by heart and sometimes wrote it automatically even when he was trying to conform to the new standard text from Mount Athos. This impression is further backed up by a scattering of uncorrected variant readings which, like the exceptions to Češko’s diagnostics, are foreign to the ‘Athonite’ version as we have it in MSS such as the 14th-century Šopov/Karadimov Psalter (Nos. 454 &

⁹ Е.В. Чешко, ‘Редакция и особенности перевода Псалтыри Томича’, *Старобъл-гарска литература*, 14, 1983, 37-58.

34.7:	О: БЕЗОУМА S6 A Pog2 T28 Bel	М: ТОУНІЄ
39.3:	О: ТИНІЄ A Sof64 Pog2 T28: ТИНЬНА	М: ТИМБН'НА S6
39.8:	О: ВЪ ГЛАВІЗНѢ КНИЖ'НБИ S6 A Sof64 Pog2	М: ВЪ СВИТ'ЦѢ КНИЖНѢМЬ T28
48.17:	О: НЕ ОУБОУЮ СЕ S6 A Pog2 T28	М: НЕ ОУБОИ СЕ Sof68
63.3:	О: ЛОУКАВНОУЮЩИИ ^х S6 A Plj: ЛѢКАВѢСТВОУЮЩИХЗ T28: ЛУКАВЫХЗ	М: ЗЛОБИВЫХЪ Pog2
68.3:	О: ВЪ ТИНЮ S6 A Pog2 T28 Plj Bel: ВЗ ТИНАХЗ Sof64: В ТИНѢ	М: ВЪ ТИМѢНИ
68.5:	О: БЕЗОУМА S6 A Sof64 Pog2 T28 Plj Bel	М: ТОУНІЄ
70.6:	О: К' ТЕБѢ ОУТВРДИХ' СЕ S6 A Sof64 Pog2 Plj Bel	М: НА ТЕ ОУТВРДИХ' СЕ T28
72.17:	О: СВѢТИЛЩЕ S6 A Sof64 T28 Plj Bel	М: СВ'ЛО Pog2
73.7:	О: СВѢТИЛ<ИЩЕ> S6 A Sof64 Pog2 T28 Plj Bel	М: СВѢТИЛО
77.47:	О: ГАГОДИЧИЄ S6 A Sof64 Pog2 T28 Plj Bel: СМОК'ВЫ	М: СИКАМИНИ
100.5:	О: Б' ЛИЖ'НІАГО S6 A Sof64 Pog2 T28 Plj Bel	М: ИСКРЬНАГО
119.7:	О: БЕЗОУМА S6 A Sof64 Pog2 T28 Plj	М: ТЪНІЄ

Most of the readings from the Munich Psalter just listed are common to the 'Athonite' redaction and the so-called 'Archaic' version which is found in such early MSS as the Sinai Glagolitic Psalter, the Pogodin Psalter and the Bologna Psalter. The only distinctively 'Athonite' readings here are in Pss. 34.7, 68.5 and 119.7. Consequently some of the Russian MSS occasionally coincide with the Munich Psalter because they happen to have an isolated 'Archaic' reading. Contaminated MSS containing sporadic variants from one redaction while mostly conforming to a different version are commonplace by the 13th century;¹⁶

¹⁶ This emerges clearly from the textological work done by I. Karačorova, summarized in E. Коцева, И. Карачорова, А. Атанасов, 'Некоторые особенности славянских псалтырей на материале XI-XVI вв.', *Polata Knigopisnaja*, 14-15, 1985, 26-38.

indeed there are some signs of such contamination in the Munich Psalter itself, as compared with the Karadimov Psalter (= K), e.g.:

57.5: М О: ΔСПИΔΔ ΓΛΟΥΧΔ К: ΔСПИДЬ ГЛОУХЫИ
S6 A Pog2 Plj Bel (T28 has the 'Archaic' reading, in the plural)

Similarly in Pss. 61.9 and 67.31 the Oxford and Munich Psalters use the word *сборь* from the 'Russian' redaction where the 'Archaic' and the 'Athonite' redactions agree in using *сзньмз*.

In Psalms 76 and 118 the original readings of the Oxford Psalter seem to link it with a rather different set of MSS: the Simonovskaja Psalter, No. 64 from St. Sophia and, marginally, No. 28 from the Typographical Library can here be grouped with the three MSS in the Saltykov-Ščedrin Public Library in Leningrad, F.p.I.1, ascribed to the 13th century, and the 14th-century F.p.I.2 and F.p.I.4. Preliminary examination suggests that the text of F.p.I.2 has been influenced by the 'Athonite' redaction: the affiliation of the other two MSS is less clear. To them may be added the corrected text of the late 14th-century Kiev Psalter¹⁷ (=Ki) and the psalter included in the Bosnian Hvalov Zbornik¹⁸ (=H) from the beginning of the 15th century.

76.7:	О: ? Sof64 F.p.I.2 & 4: скорбѣхъ и тоужаше Ki corrected: поучахъ сѧ и клецаше	М: ГЛОУМЛѦХЪ сѧ и кльцаше А T28 F.p.I.1 Ki original? H
76.13:	О: попекоу сѧ F.p.I.4: попрѧ ^{ма} Ki corrected: поѡчю сѧ	М: ПОГЛОУМѦЮ сѧ А T28 F.p.I.1 & 2 Ki original? H
118.15:	О: по<пекоу сѧ> F.p.I.1: попеку сѧ Ki: пооучю сѧ А original: ?	М: ПОГЛОУМ'ЛЮ сѧ А corrected Sof64 T28 F.p.I.2 & 4 H
118.23:	О: ? А: пооучаше сѧ Ki: любомѡрствоуѧ H: печаше сѧ F.p.I.2 original: ?	М: ГЛОУМЛѦШЕ сѧ Sof64 T28 F.p.I.1 & 4 F.p.I.2 corrected
118.27:	О: поѡ<ч>ю сѧ	М: ПОГЛОУМЛЮ сѧ

¹⁷ *Киевская псалтырь 1397 года*, ред. Т.А. Юрова, with Г. Вздорнов, *Исследование о Киевской Псалтыри*, Москва, 1978.

¹⁸ *Zbornik Hvala Krstjanina*, ed. H. Kuna et al., Sarajevo, 1986. The textual affiliation of the psalter in this MS has been analysed by J. Jurić-Kappel, 'Der Psalter des Hval-Codex — zur paläografischen und grammatikalischen Charakteristik', *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 30, 1984, 23-42. I am grateful to Dr. M. Pantelić and Dr. D.E. Stefanović for drawing my attention to this text and the article on it.

- | | |
|---|---|
| А Н: ПОПЕКОУ СА
Кі: ПОУЧЮ СА
F.p.I.2 original: ? | Sof64 T28 F.p.I.1 & 4
F.p.I.2 corrected |
| 118.39: О: <СОУДЪБЫ>
А: СОУДБЫ | М: ПОВЕЛЪНИГА
Sof64 T28 F.p.I.1,2 & 4 Кі Н |
| 118.48: О: ?
А T28 F.p.I.2: ПЕЧАХЪ СА
Кі: ПОУЧАХ СА | М: ГЛОУМЛѦХЪ СЕ
Sof64 F.p.I.1 & 4 Н |
| 118.75: О: ?
А F.p.I.2 Н: СОУДБЫ | М: ПОВЕЛЪНИГА
Sof64 T28 F.p.I.1 & 4 Кі |
| 118.78: О: ?
А F.p.I.2 Н: ПОПЕКОУ СА
Кі: ПОУЧЮ СА | М: ПОГЛОУМЛЮ СЕ
Sof64 T28 F.p.I.1 & 4 |
| 118.85: О: <ПОДЪЧЕНЛД>
Кі: ОУЧЕНИА | М: ГЛОУМЛІЕНИА
А Sof64 T28 F.p.I.1,2 & 4 Н |

The tendency apparent here from the late 13th century to replace ГЛОУМЛѦТИ СА by other words seems not initially to have affected the ‘Athonite’ redaction: the Karadimov Psalter and MS No. 34 from the Belgrade University Library show no sign of it, and F.p.I.2 and the Oxford psalter, which have been corrected to bring them in line with the ‘Athonite’ redaction, both reinstate ГЛѦМЛѦТИ СА at least sporadically. If this interpretation is correct, then the Kiev Psalter’s corrections represent a later or local preference.

Some other unusual variants occur in Psalm 72, where the Oxford Psalter agrees with the 11th-century Čudov Psalter:¹⁹

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 72.20: О: <ВБРАДЪ>
Čudov Sof64
F.p.I.2: ВБРАЗЫ | М: ИКОНОУ |
| 72.27 О: БЛОУДЕЩАГО
Čudov | М: ЛЮБИДЪЮЩАГО
Sof64 F.p.I.2 |

More curious still is the correction at the end of Ps. 136.9 in the Oxford Psalter, where МЛЪНЦЕ ТВОЕ has been changed to СВОЕ, as in three 13th-century MSS, the Bologna Psalter, Sinai 8 and the Dečani Psalter, No. 17 in Hilferding’s collection (ГПБ ф. 182).

Finally, the Oxford Psalter contains a number of readings which I have not as yet found in any other earlier or contemporary MSS, e.g.:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 43.23: О: ОУМРЫШЪВЛѦНЕМЪ СЕ | М: ОУМРЫШЪВЛѦНЕНИ НЕСМЫ |
| 55.14: О: ЖИВИИ ^х | М: ЖИВОУЩИ ^х |
| 57.5: О: ПО ПОЛЪБИЮ | М: ПО ВБРАЗОУ |

¹⁹ В.А. Погорелов, *Чудовская псалтирь XI в.*, (= Памятники старославянского языка, том 3, выпуск 1), Санкт-Петербург, 1910.

57.10:	О: приж [^] е разоумѣниѣ	М: приж [^] е даже не разоумѣти
57.11:	О: ѿмышениѣ	М: мьсть
61.4:	О: прѣградѣ ѿложеноу	М: плоть възриновенъ
68.29:	О: живъ	М: живущи ^х
73.8:	О: соуродства S6 Pog2 T28 Plj Bel F.p.I.4: сродители А: сзѡужикы Sof64: сродници	М: оужикы
73.17:	О: красна зем [^] ли S6 A Sof64 Pog2 T28 Plj Bel: горы земльнѣя	М: прѣдѣли землѣ
75.3:	О: <сѣдѣ>лицѣ	М: жилище
77.14:	О: наставѣ и ^х	М: ведѣ ю
77.40:	О: огор [^] чише	М: прогнѣвашѣ
77.51:	О: прѣворо [^] на	М: прѣвѣнцъ
79.2:	О: настав [^] лѣнѣ	М: водѣи
80.13:	О: по <желанію>	М: по начинанію
85.11:	О: настави	М: наведи
89.2:	О: прѣж [^] е горамъ быті<а> и сз [^] данлѣ зем [^] ли и вселенѣи	М: прѣж [^] е даже горамъ не быті и сз [^] дати се землѣи и вселенѣи
93.1:	О: <ѿ>мьстѣи	М: мьстыи
95.6:	О: въ свѣтил<иши>	М: въ стѣилъ
103.14:	О: злакъ	М: травѡу
106.7:	О: наставѣ и ^х	М: наведѣ ихъ
108.13:	О: въ погыбѣль	М: въ пагѡубѡу
109.3:	О: изъ <оутробѣ>	М: изъ чрѣва
114.8:	О: живы ^х	М: живущи ^х
126.5:	О: желаніе своѣ	М: похоть свою
127.2:	О: плоды трѡудъ	М: трѡуды плѡдъ
147.6:	О: ледь	М: голоть
148.8:	О: ледь	М: голоть
Dt 32.25:	О: съ прѣ [^] сѣдѣнии ^м	М: съ ѡтрокѡмъ
1 Kg 2.4:	О: свръшеноу любовѣ	М: лю<бо>въ

These readings are disparate in character and significance. Some of them are simply extensions of linguistic tendencies which can be seen elsewhere: Ps. 95.6 is similar to the 'Russian' version of Pss. 72.17 and 73.7, mentioned above; the lexical replacement in Pss. 80.3 and 126.5 is found in Ps. 77.29-30, not only in the Oxford Psalter but also in the Kiev Psalter (both verses) and the Munich Psalter (v. 30).

In other places we find calques of Greek words, on the principle of literal translation, morpheme for morpheme, which is characteristic of the ‘Athonite’ redaction itself: consider the rendering of ἐκδίκησις in Pss. 75.11 and 93.1, συγγένεια in Ps. 73.8, παραπικραίνω in Ps. 77.40 and πρωτότοκος in Ps. 77.51. Close dependence on a Greek model is also probably to be detected in Ps. 73.17, which seems to derive from a Greek variant reading, τα ὠραῖα τῆς γῆς, perhaps under the influence of Ps. 64.13, τα ὠραῖα τῆς ἐρήμου. The unusual order of nouns in Ps. 127.2 is paralleled in some Greek (and Latin) MSS. In the second Canticle, Deut. 32.25, the reading rests on the standard Greek wording καθεστηκότος.²⁰

Elsewhere, however, we appear to be faced with specific and deliberate choices of vocabulary (Pss. 75.5, 61.4, 75.3, 77.14, 79.2, 85.11, 106.7, 108.13, 109.3, 147.6 and 148.8), morphological form (Pss. 55.14, 68.29, 114.8) or syntactic construction (Pss. 43.23, 57.10, 89.2) which are without parallel in the other MSS mentioned above. They are not the least of the peculiarities which make the Oxford Psalter deserve more detailed study.

²⁰ A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta ed. Rahlfs X: Psalmi cum Odis*, Göttingen 1931, 206, 310, 344.