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Abstract

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

* This article is an expanded version of a paper presented at the conference “I. I. Срезневский и русское историческое языкознание” held in Ryazan, 26–28 September 2012, to mark the bicentenary of the birth of I. I. Sreznevsky.
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Резюме
Новгородские антифонные псалтыри XIII века предназначены для богослужебного исполнения попеременно двумя хорами или чтецами, поэтому каждая из них содержит неполный текст псалмов, и они дополняют друг друга лишь частично. Тем не менее они представляют интерес в отношении нормирования церковнославянской орфографии и орфоэпии, и с точки зрения текстологии. В одной, более древней, из них прослеживается проникновение диалектного произношения в новгородскую разновидность церковнославянского языка (в приложении дается список разнообразных примеров цоканья в этой рукописи). На основе анализа разночтений, общих для обеих рукописей или засвидетельствованных в одной или другой из них, доказывается их принадлежность ко второй редакции церковнославянского перевода псалмов, а тем самым их ценность для истории распространения этой редакции среди восточных славян до конца XIII века.
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The two antiphonal1 psalter manuscripts from the collection of St. Sophia in Novgorod are remarkable for their very existence. Each contains approximately2 half the contents of the Psalter, selected by copying alternate versicles or verses. This expedient results in a text which taken on its own is elliptical sometimes to the point of unintelligibility, and whose sole use is for antiphonal chanting or recitation of the psalms in combination either with a similar but complementary copy of the omitted versicles, or with a full version of the Psalter. Since this method of reciting the psalms survives only vestigially in liturgical practice [Роту 1983 sub voce антифон], it is not surprising that a book of such limited usefulness should be a rarity, both in Church Slavonic and apparently in Greek: the clearest Greek parallel is a manuscript of 1293 in St. Catherine’s monastery on Mount Sinai, organized in exactly the same way, which the scribe describes

---

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

2 In each case slightly less than half, because the manuscripts are defective: Sof63 starts at ps. 17:21b and ends with the penultimate versicle of the second Canticle, Deut. 32:43g; Pog6 starts at ps. 17:14a and breaks off at ps. 21:15b, at which point Sof62 carries on with ps. 21:16a, continuing to the end of the Canticles, plus the “psalm without number,” which is added in a different hand at the end of the manuscript, no doubt because it was not used liturgically.
as ήμισυ των ψαλμων βιβλιδούς [БЕНЕШЕВИЧ 1911: 21, No. 8]; the two psalters listed in a library catalogue from Patmos as ψαλτήρια στιχολογίας may have been a pair of similar kind [ПАРПУЛОВ 2005: 34, footnote 3].

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

In Sof63 the influence of early South Slavonic orthography can still be detected, whether as a result of direct inheritance from a South Slavonic exemplar or more probably through dissemination in East Slavonic scribal practice; for instance, the conventional use of ж in place of ц in the rubricated initials жшениеъ (1v), жныци (4v), жалышъ (9r), жтвржаните (18r), жмнянність (102r), and also once in the line, маднамм (57v), is clearly an East Slavonic feature. Doubled vocalic letters occur frequently in the genitive singular masculine of definite adjectives or participles, e.g., събршаношалаго (10v), сипаношалаго (77r), даношалаго (108v), рожьшалаго (112r), прѣисподънѧаго (112v) and in imperfect tense forms, e.g., прњошалошов (52v), рачьшпалаховтъ (63r), талашвв (79v). As indicated by these examples, the consonantal letters жнпшп tend to be followed by the letter а in preference to а. The distribution of з and л is to a large extent etymologically correct:3 their replacement by о or е is rare and is treated as a mistake in the scribe’s corrections of назошкомъ to назошкмъ (53r), рого to рогъ (83v); but there is considerable inconsistency in the representation of syllables containing з or л and a liquid, e.g., хлымы (38v), хламы (45v), отвръженни [... на крѣшов горѣ (46r), and sequences of liquid followed by з or л are common, e.g., мазннна (51r), отвръгосла (53v), опаъвашов (103v). The letter ё appears for the most part in conformity with etymology both where it would occur in East Slavonic and also in South Slavonic spellings such as прѫдъ (2r, 20v and elsewhere), прѫдѧо (11v), ко врѣма

3 In East Slavonic terms: third person singular and plural non-past forms of verbs regularly end in тъ, not тз.
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пожелай (13r), посредь (70v); confusion with е, e.g., in the dative себє (74r), is rare.

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

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

The orthographical habits reflected in Pog6+Sof62 are a different matter. They contain no instances of ъ, doubled vocalic letters are rare, the consonantal letters жчшщ are normally followed by а, and sequences of liquid plus ы.

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

5 In citations from these manuscripts, folio references are to Sof62 unless Pog6 is specified.
or Ь occur only in conjunction with line end, e.g., прымълѣ | уншн (8r), нѣвѣръ | же (39v), зѣ | лѣун (177r). The jers are omitted in weak position more often than in Соф63, and there is occasional confusion of ъ with ь, e.g., прымолун (18v), the aorist пограѣша (172v) and the corruption of праѣдѣлъ сѣй то праѣдѣлноси (180v). The letters ъ and ь are used indiscriminately, not only in Church Slavonicisms such as погрѧзъша (44v, 76v, 127r, 132r, 172v), предъ (Pог6 1v, 2v; 58r), потрѣбнин (43v), прелѣбѣнно (89v), престолъ (110v), крѣма (180v), обѣлѣсе сѧ (99r, 111r, 126r), but also in words and forms current in East Slavonic, e.g., сѣмѣ (22v), уѣбѣкъ (76v, 125v), уѣбѣкомъ (Pог6 8r; 169r), исповѣдать сѧ тѣбе (43r), поѣрѣу тѣбе (43v), даѣ прѣблиянъ сѧ (90r).

There are some East Slavonic or even local spellings, e.g., юѣжнин (43v, 125v, 174v) as well as щюжнин (Pог6 4v, 6r; 165r), дрѣгѣн (71v), одѣжн (76v), дѣжгѣ (169r, 173v), but the standard Church Slavonic зиждѣмѣ (147r) is preferred to the dialect treatment found in Соф63. Evidence of cokan’e is minimal: ѣ instead of ъ x3 in various forms of the possessive adjective прѣшѣнѣца (20r, 43v, 124v) and the reverse substitution х4, ѣ in place of ѣ which may result either from the second palatalization, in оѣлтѧ (62r) and уѣлѣуѣхѣ (79r), or from the third, in лѣуѣ (171v) and сѣлѣуѣмѣ (176v). From this small number of examples it is difficult to draw firm conclusions. It is possible, for instance, that through training, experience and a good visual memory the scribe of Пог6+Соф62 was usually able to arrive at the etymologically correct distributions of ѣ and ѣ even though he had no basis in pronunciation for distinguishing between them. Another conceivable possibility is that this manuscript was produced by a well trained scribe working from an exemplar characterized by cokan’e which he managed in most though not quite all instances to eradicate. On this hypothesis Pог6+Соф62 would be representative of a shift towards a supradialectal norm of Russian Church Slavonic spelling in the later thirteenth century.

However, there is a third possibility, that the scribe of Pог6+Соф62 copied from an antigraph which was unaffected by cokan’e and that the occasional instances of this dialectal feature betray his own local pronunciation. This interpretation deserves to be weighed along with the others because in general the manuscript is not as carefully written as Соф63. Although the scribe’s hand is clear, it is larger and less elegant than that of the older manuscript. Mistakes in copying are somewhat more frequent and are left uncorrected, e.g., поношенинная пругдан instead of поношенинный пругда (61v), оуѣнѣса in place of оуѣлоуѣнѣса (98v), прющѣвѣсь сѧ as a corruption of прющѣвѣсть сѧ (129r). The impression of work carried out hastily or inattentively is compounded by blatant errors in rubrication, e.g., пѣрѣхопаданнѣ for прѣпѣхопаданнѣ (Pог6 5v), нѣ for тѣ (37r).
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They often used different orthographical rules, such as using the letter ы for о (38r), ы for ы (109r). Even when the rubricator realised that the initial letter which he had inserted at the beginning of ps. 111:2b was wrong, his attempt at emendation by adding a superscript letter was misguided and resulted in a superficially plausible corruption: ы instead of ы (128v).

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

I. I. Sreznevsky’s conclusion that the two Novgorod manuscripts are not a pair was not based simply on the palaeographical and orthographical differences between them, but above all on discrepancies in their contents. In 92 psalms the manuscripts contain largely complementary selections of versicles; this means that their combined witness supplies an almost complete text of those psalms. In 42 psalms, however, these manuscripts contain largely or entirely the same selection of versicles; they therefore cover approximately half the text of the psalms in question. Sometimes they differ in the way they divide the text, especially when division is into full verses rather than versicles. In such cases they may coincide for part of the text, e.g., in ps. 117, where they both start with even-numbered verses but diverge at verse 22, because sof63 goes from 22a to 23, omitting 22b, and so switches to odd-numbered verses, whereas sof62 continues with even-numbered ones throughout. Conversely in ps. 118 sof63 starts with even-numbered verses, sof62 with odd-numbered ones, but they agree between verses 73 and 112; in Canticle 2 sof63 starts with odd-numbered verses, sof62 with even-numbered ones, but they converge from verse 15 onward.

These facts are significant for several reasons. Firstly, they suggest that each manuscript originally had its pair, thus doubling the putative number of such books. Secondly, they imply that there was an ongoing liturgical need for antiphonal psalters. Further support for such an inference may be found in sof62: at the beginning of ps. 26, 47, 65, 92 and 131 no heading or number

---

8 Pss. 50, 117, 118 and Canticle 2 in both manuscripts; pss. 140 and 148–150 in sof63; the other Canticles in sof62.
is supplied,\(^9\) so that the text runs on without break from the preceding psalm. Such oversights might perhaps occur more readily in copying from a pre-existing antiphonal psalter\(^{10}\) than from the full text of the psalms, especially as only the even-numbered versicles of pss. 26, 65 and 92 are supplied and the copyist therefore would not have had the initial versicle to prompt his memory. If this is what happened, there must have been at least a third pair of antiphonal psalter manuscripts in thirteenth-century Novgorod, for Sof62 cannot have been copied from Sof63, which contains only the odd-numbered versicles of pss. 65 and 92.

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

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

\(^9\) Perhaps as a consequence, the numbering of pss. 133–149 is incorrect in Sof62.

\(^{10}\) The inclusion of hypopsalmata to Canticle 2 in Sof62 [MACROBERT 1996: 168 and 175] is a further indication that the antigraph of this manuscript was intended for liturgical use [ONASCH 1993 sub voce Responsorien]. The refrains are written immediately after the appropriate versicles, sometimes without even a point to mark them off; it is possible that the scribe of Sof62 did not realise that they were extraneous to this little used text.
and the somewhat later but conservative Ath. Of these, Plj Bel offer the clearest supporting evidence for Redaction II, agreeing to a large extent with Sin6 Har, but unfortunately they both have substantial lacunae in the first third of the psalter text. Sin7 Ath are more nearly complete, but have been sporadically corrected, usually to readings of Redaction I which were reinstated in the later revisions of the fourteenth century; the fact that these corrections were made suggests strongly that the original readings in Sin7 Ath were those of Redaction II. After them come three fourteenth-century East Slavonic manuscripts, Jar Fn11 Sof60, which have been selected as relatively pure examples of Redaction II. The readings of Amf, the Simonovskaja Psalter published by Archimandrite Amphilochius [Амфилохий 1880–1] are included in spite of their occasional idiosyncrasies [Погорелов 1901: xxxii–xxxiii, MacRobert 2010] because this manuscript was used as a source for Redaction II by Jagić [Ягич 1884] and Pogorelov [Погорелов 1901] and remains one of the few representatives of that redaction easily accessible today.

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

100:4b τοῦ πονηροῦ — δούλος ἀγαθός Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar
Fn11—ἀλλαγή I Ath Sof60 Amf;

102:13b σιχτιστὴς — υψηλὴ ἀνθρώπη Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf — πολυιδούτης I Har Sin7 Plj Bel;

131:4c τοῖς κροτάφοις — κρανηματα Σof63+Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Jar Fn11? Sof60 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna) — κροτοφομα I—κολεφομα Ath;

131:7a σκηνώματα — σενα Σof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I) — σελα I Jar;

132:2a μύρον — μυρο Σof63+Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har Bel lacuna) — χρημα I;

132: 2c ὅφν — ποιδόλακη Σof63+Sof62 Sin6 Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I) — ωμιπτζι I Sin7 Plj;

146:8d ἐν θρόπονων — θληκμα Σof63+Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj? Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har lacuna) — θληκμεντζι I.

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

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

39:5b μιαίς — γνωβί Σof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I) — γνωστομα I;
39:8b καφαλίδι βιβλίου—γλαβνζνβ κνннζнбн Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Jar Fn11 Amf (Plj Bel lacuna)—σζζντζνβ κνннζнбнъ I Sof60;
68:21a ταλαπωρόλαν—οκαλεέткα Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Sof60 (Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—στραετη I Jar Fn11 Amf;
81:2b λαμβάνετε—πρκελмоετε Sof63+Sof62 Har Amf πρκеλмоετε Sin6? Jar (Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—σηκκνκητε (A) Plj Bel Fn11 Sof60;
108:23b ἀκρίδες—αερβδηκ Sof63+Sof62 Har Jar (Sin6 Bel lacuna; Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—προντυνη κονζη Ρλ Αμф?—πραζη Ι Fn11 Sof60;
138:3b προειδες—πραβδζναθ Sof63+Sof62 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Fn11 Sof60 (Sin6 lacuna)—πραβζε Αθη Αμφ—προζε ι.

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

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

39:9b κοιλίας—ου τροβζα Sof63+Sof62 Har Sin7 Jar Fn11? Amf—υρεβα Sin6 Sof60 (Plj Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I); χαρδιας—τρεδζηα ι
46:9a ἐπὶ τὰ ἐθνη—ναςβζηζιει Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Sof60 Amf; ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἐθνη11—ναςβζηζιει ι Αθι Fn11;
68:14b δυνάμεως12—ζαζα ι Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Fn11 Sof60 Amf; ἐλεφος—μηλοτην ι Jar Sin7;
97:5a το χωρόω—γαζει Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf; το χεω ημων13—εον ναζεμου ι;
97:6a ἐλαταίς confused with ἐλατιναίς—ἀερβαναζαζα Sof63+Sof62 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Jar (Sin7 corrected to I); ἐλαταίς—κεκαναζαζα Ι Fn11 Sof60 Amf;
98:4b ευθυτητας—πραβζαζι Sof63+Sof62 Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Fn11 Sof60—πραβνηα Αμφ; ευθυτητα—πραβνηα ι πραβδογ Jar;

11 Cf. 46:2a.
12 Cf. 32:17b and 65:3b.
13 Cf. 46:7b.
108:23b ἐξετινάχθην mistakenly associated with ἐκτείνω—προστροχής 
Sof63+Sof62 Har Plj Jar (Sin6 Bel lacuna; Sin7 corrected to I)—
съпрострохъ сѧ 
Sof60. 

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

140:9a συνεστήσαντο—σταμβλια Σοφ63+Σοφ62 Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Amf (Sin6 Har lacuna; Jar corrected); εκρύψανε14—στρυβα FпI1 Sof60. The absence of the readings for Sin6 Har makes it difficult to determine whether the variant σταμβλια, which is found in a number of fourteenth-century East Slavonic manuscripts, was original to Redaction II [MacRobert 1998: 932] but was ousted in South Slavonic manuscripts by the reading of Redaction I, or whether it was a later modification.

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

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

17:39a οὐ μὴ δύνωνται—νε μογοўтъ мошѣ Sof63 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Bel Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har lacuna)—νε нмѣтъ мошн I—νε вь змогўтъ Ath Jar;

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

14 Cf. 30:5a.
15 At pss. 55 and 134.
16 The same word occurs, but as a translation of 150:5 κυμβάλοι̋, in the second Glagolitic psalter and the Vienna Croatian Glagolitic commented psalter [Ham 1967]; this may be echoed in the reading звонѣ̇хъ found in Plj Bel Ath [Трифуновић 2000; MacRobert 2010: 429].
48:21b ἀνοήτοις—неразумьныхъ Sof63 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Ath Jar FпI1 Amf (Bel lacuna)—не съмъислънъ I Har Sof60;
61:11c ἔνεσθη—прътѣката I Har Sin7 Ath Jar;
62:12c ἔνεσθη—прътѣката I Har Sin7 Ath Jar
73:8a συγγένεσι—съродѣтели Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar FпI1 Amf—съродители I Har Sin7 Ath Jar
83:3b ῥεῇ—прѣтекаетъ I Har Sin7 Ath Jar;
85:4b ἔθρε—въ зѧхъ FпI1 Sof60 Amf;
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To these may be added a range of recurrent features, too frequently instantiated to be listed individually, whose preponderant or systematic use in manuscripts of Redaction II helps to distinguish them even from the later representatives of Redaction I [MacRobert 2005: 41–42]: the absence of asigmatic aorists, the use of акъі (x29 Sof63, x23 Sof62) rather than яко to introduce similes, великъ (x4 Sof63, x1 Sof62) rather than велии, and the lexical items беозума (x3 Sof63, x4 Sof62), напрашн (x2 Sof63, x3 Sof62), съборъ (x7 Sof63, x3 Sof62) instead of ашоуть or спъіти, налашн, сънимъ in Redaction I.

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

69:6b χρονίσῃ̋ — замѹди Sof63 I Sin6 Har Sin7 Amf — замѧдли Plj Bel Ath — замѣдли Jar FпI1 Sof60

39:18b χρονίσῃ̋ замѧдлѧн Sof62 Jar Sof60 — замѧдлѧн Sin7 Fn11 Amf — замѧдлѧн Ath (Plj Bel lacuna)

The corruption of замѧдлѧн to замѧдлѧн in both South and East Slavonic manuscripts is in itself an indication that замѧдлѧнъ was not in current use, and its replacement by замѧдлѧн in Sof62, as by замѧдлѧн in Plj Bel Ath, merely confirms this. The other instance of lexical variation in Sof63 and Sof62, between the Latin loanword олѣи and the Greek елѣи, is more problematic: Sof63 has елѣи x2 (108:24, 140:5) but also an instance of олѣи (108:18); Sof62 has елѣи x5 (22:5, 54:22, 91:11, 108:18+24) but presents ωлѣи x2 with a rubricated initial (88:21, 140:5) and also x2 in line (103:15, Deut. 32:13d). In Redaction I, in the South Slavonic Sin7 Plj Bel Ath and in the East Slavonic Jar олѣи is found to the exclusion of елѣи, but Sin6 Har Fn11 Sof60 Amf employ an unpredictable mixture of both, with мѧсло as a further occasional option in Sin6 Sof60 Amf. It is not impossible that Redaction II was inconsistent in this respect from the outset, since it seems to have come into existence through a process of checking and correcting Redaction I against Greek.
The character of that process is once again brought into sharp focus by instances of a distinctive approach to translation in Redaction II, sometimes literalistic, sometimes interpretative, which are attested either in Sof63 or in Sof62:

34:6a ὀλίσθημα—σζελαζνει Sof62 Sin6 Har Bel Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Plj lacuna; Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—παλαζεκζει I;
54:23b σάλον—σματεθείνα Sof62 Sin6 Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Har Bel lacuna)—μαζεκζει I;
63:3a συστροφῆς πονευμένων—ραζβραζεσια ΛΟΥΚΑΣΒΕΤΚΟΥ-πομηνχ Σof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Bel lacuna)—σεμεμα ζελεκεκεκτιχι I;
70:14a διὰ παντός—ο βεκεμι Sof63 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Jar Ath Sof60 Amf—κλινξ ι Sin7 Fn11;
72:7b διάθεσιν—σματεθείνα Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7orig. Plj Ath Jar Sof60 Amf (Bel lacuna; Sin7 corrected to I)—λιοκζεκζει I Fn11;
73:4b διάγνωσα—υσιοσα Sof63 Sin6 Har Sin7 Plj Bel Jar Amf (Ath corrected to I)—ποζγεασα ι Fn11 Sof60;
91:8b διακυφαν—πρκζαλεκιαша (α Sof63 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Ath Jar Fn11—κζεπικοσκα ι Sof60 Amf υνπεκσκει Sin7; 92:4b μετεωρισμοί—σματεθείνα Sof63 Sin6 Har Plj Bel Jar Fn11 Sof60 (Sin7 Ath corrected to I)—κζεπικτζει I Amf;
93:9b κατανοεῖ—ραζιμμεμετυ Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Ath Fn11 Sof60 (Bel lacuna)—κμοτρμετυ I Plj Amf (Jar corrected from κματρακτμετυ?);
106:29a αύραν—τζισιονυτ Σof62 Sin7 Plj Bel Ath Fn11 Sof60 (Sin6 lacuna)—χζαζει ι Jar Amf;
108:21b χρηστόν—σμειρα Sof63 Har Plj Fn11 Sof60 (Sin6 Bel lacuna; Ath corrected to I); Jar corrected—βελαγα I Jar? Amf Sin7;
109:3a αρχή—ναμαλεκτει Σof63 Har Ath Jar Sof60 (Sin6 Bel lacuna)—βελαζιεلكτει ι Plj Sin7 Fn11 Amf;
136:3b ζυμνον—κζαλονь Sof62 Har Plj Ath Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf (Sin6 Bel lacuna; Sin7 corrected to I)—πεκεκιι I.

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

33:23b κατασχυνθήσονται—ποστιδατι Σof63 Sin6 Har Bel (Plj lacuna) Jar Fn11 Sof60 Amf; πλημμεισισιν—πρκζαλεκια ι Sin7 Ath;

17 Probably a vague reminiscence of similar wording in 33:6b, 36:19, 68:7a.
34:11 ἀνέστησαν—κύτταρα Sof62 Sin6 Har Sin7 Bel Ath Jar Fn1 Amf Sof60 (Plj lacuna); ἀναστάντες—κύτταρων Ι;
49:18b μοιχόν—προφήτων Ι; μοιχῶν—προφήτων I Fn11
57:5b ἀστίδος κωφής—αἰσθήτας Ι; ἀστίδου κωφίν—αἰσθήτας Ι;
57:6b φαρμακοῦται φαρμακευομένη παρὰ σοφοῦ—σφαλμα Ι;
70:19a ἡμετὰ—κύριοι Ι;
70:20c ἄνηγαγε—εὐθυγράμτηθαι Ι;
73:17a ὅρια—κυρτοὶ Ι;
83:11c οἰκεῖν με—εἰς Ι;
84:5 σωτῆρα ημῶν—σωτηρίων Ι;
104:42b τοῦ πρὸ Αβρααμ—κατὰ Πρωταμὴν Ι;
138:20α ἐρεῖτε ἐσται—προφήτης Ι;

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

52:2b ἀνομίαι—ἐξακονμῆς Ι; ἐπιτηδεύματι Ι; ἐπιτηδεύματοι Ι;

Here the support in other manuscripts for ἡμετὰ as the reading of Redaction II is strong; the minority preference for ἐξακονμῆς(χῆς) could have any of several possible explanations: sporadic influence of Redaction I, sporadic consultation of Greek at some early stage, or simply the appropriateness in context of ἐξακονμῆς, which occurs much more frequently in the psalms than ἡμετὰ.
Apart from these isolated deviations and a few omissions from both manuscripts, Sof63 and Sof62 taken together present a pattern of readings which corresponds closely to the set of diagnostic variants posited for Redaction II [MαRRobert 1998: 929–933]. They also follow Redaction II almost without exception in agreeing with the liturgical rather than the commentated version of Redaction I where those two traditions diverge [MαRRobert 1998: 933–935]. Of the three exceptions, the one in 106:19b, where Sof63 agrees with the commentated tradition, is probably a reminiscence of 106:13b; in the other two cases, the omission from 136:6b of ῥακο in Sof63 and the reading Deut. 32:43 οὐκ ξεπάται ἡ in Sof62, the variant reading is a minority one, not widely enough supported to be typical of any redaction.

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

Appendix: Confusion of χ and η in Sof63

Multiple instances of type I χ > η (x62):

- οὐζ- x15: forms of οὐχ οὐνηθη (7r, 66v, 87v, 88r, 90r x3, 91v, 92v, 93r, 106r), forms of οὐνηθη ηθ (50v, 93v, 105v), οὐνηθη ηθ (94v);
- ηςτ- x6: ηςτοτη (1r), forms of ηςτοτη (30r x2, 81v), ουνηθη ηθ (63r, 98r);
- γητο x4: γητοτητη (20v, 62r), γηο τημητη (33v), γητο (95r);
- αλιθε- x4: (78v, 79r, 80r, 108v;)

---

22 The thirteenth-century psalter manuscript in RGADA [АВТОКРАТОВА, НЯЗЕВСКАЯ, ШМИДТ 1988: 104–106, no. 40] is unfortunately incomplete: it breaks off at ps. 103.
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мьлц- x4: forms of прямьлцнц (9b, 29r), сымлцнц (20v), нымц | льц (42r);

улыбьцск- x4: (56r, 79r, 107v, 108r);
онц x3: (88v, 96r, 98v);
пац x3: (30r, 103r, 105r);
рец/-рец- x3: рец (2v), рецеть (59r), вельрецдйв (31r);
мьрц/-мрац- x2: мьрц (75v) омрацнц є (102v);
нацинн/-наца- x2: нацинаннцъ (77v), нацало (101v);
облац-/обац- x2: облацнцъ (70r), обац є (81v);
планъ x2: (10v, 71r);
свц- x2: отьсвцеть (50v), сць (77v);
тоцънъ x2: (4v, 41r);
цлац x2: (22r, 109r);
паст- x2: принястнша є (77v), цасть (111v).

Single instances of type I ρ > ρ (x14):
вецера (74r), зълцї (113r), истоцънкъ (41v), паоуцъннм (21r), отьлоцънин (40v), менц (34r), сумоуцн (2r), непороцън (70v), притцю (42v), ссоуцн (48r), растоцн (83v), црвка (99r), нецдсцкъм (7v), цюдеса (79v).

Multiple instances of type I’ ρ > ρ (x36):
оуннцъж- x12: forms of оуннцъжннц (5v, 24v, 43v, 34v, 71v, 77v, 89v, 92r), оуннцъжынннк (12r, 89r, 96r x2);
блиц- x8: въбллицъм (2r), forms of въбллицънц є (22r, 34r, 65v, 73v) въбллицыннц (111r), въбллицн (111r), въбллицъмь є (3v);
конъц- x6: forms of нсконъцатн є (21r, 64r, 74v), сконъцъю (112v), конъцънн (35v, 91r);
лц- x4: forms of облицнц (19r, 29v, 104v), облицнннкъ (47r);
грвщнынц- (adjective) x2: (81r, 104v);
объцъа x2: (adjective 55v, noun 94v);
пунцнцън- x2: (57r, 109v).

Single instances of type I’ ρ > ρ (x6):
агньцемъ (adjective112r), кѣнцьцяющалаго (72r), всацскан (74r), лобъца (adjective 64v), оцъстыннц (68r), принцъ (59r).

Single instances of *тj > ρ > ρ (x2):
полцию (32r), пницю (74r).

Single instance of type II ρ > ρ:
юрће (7r).
Single instances of type III η > υ (x3):
скорописьчѧ (genitive, 28r), лъв (43r), птѐньуємъ (109r).
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