This paper deals with the second Church Slavonic (hereafter abbreviated as Slav) version of 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings (1-4 Kingdoms in Septuagint), which was undertaken in the Balkan region (in all probability) in Serbia, no later than in the early fifteenth century. It is today preserved in two Serbian manuscripts: one dating back to 1418 (National Research Library of Odessa, Ukraine, n° 6 = SlavO) and the other 1523-1543 (Moscow, Russian State Library, f. 87 N° 1-1684, ff. 210-373 = SlavM). This translation closely replicates a recension of the Septuagint of 1-4 Kgdms that is commonly linked with the name of Lucian of Antioch, a theologian who was martyred in 312 CE and, accordingly, is widely known as the Antiochene or the Lucianic text (hereafter LXXL). Research into the Lucianic Slav 1-4 Kgdms (hereafter Slav-LXXL) is still in the beginning stages. Consequently, this report is a work-in-progress paper. The few remarks offered here demonstrate how the study of this almost unexplored manuscript legacy is particularly relevant to the textual criticism of the Bible; its inclusion in comparative research may open new avenues of investigation into the textual history of LXXL.

1. The LXXL of Samuel-Kings and the Old Greek text

The books of 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings (1-4 Kgdms) pose serious challenges for biblical scholars, given the major textual differences between the

---

1 According to the colophon of SlavO (ff. 332-334), this version was carried out in 1416 (Popruženko 1894: 1-4). Authorship has been attributed to Constantine of Kostenets (ca. 1380- after 1427) or to his contemporary, the monk Gabriel of Hilandar, who is known for having rendered from Greek the Catena in Job (Thomson 1998: 762-763). In Nikolova’s view, the translation was however undertaken in the fourteenth century by a representative member of the Tarnovo Literary School (Nikolova 1995: 62).

2 Močul’skij 1890: 5-6; Popruženko 1894; Kopylenko et al. 1960: 550; Korol’kova et al. 1963.

3 Viktorov 1879: 3-4. This manuscript was discovered by Grigorovič in Ohrid (Grigorovič 1877: 184). Folios ff. 210-373 are thought to have been written by the Hieromonk Vissarion of Debar (See: Nikolova 1995: 62 and 1996: 363-402; Turilov 2004: 545).
existing testimonies. Within this framework, a crucial, yet unsolved, issue lies in the appraisal of LXX, a text-type found in only five Byzantine minuscule codices (N° 19, 108, 82, 93, 127; previous sigla of the first four: b, o, c, e)\(^4\). This group significantly deviates from the rest of the Greek tradition, but finds parallels in some Latin, Syriac and Armenian sources. The denomination Antiochene or Lucianic recension is to be understood conventionally: the redaction was shown to be composed of different layers, the earliest of which was named proto-Lucianic, since its characterizing readings are to be found in several sources preceding the historical Lucian, namely the Qumran scrolls (Q), Josephus (J), the Vetus latina (VT) and the writings of some Church Fathers\(^5\).

Several scholars assume that LXX constituted (or probably constituted) the Old Greek (OG) text of LXX (namely its earliest textual stratum), which was translated from a Hebrew source, differing from the Masoretic text (MT). The analysis of LXX is especially relevant in the case of 1 Sam, since it has been suggested that the former derives from the same archetype of 4QSam\(^6\). In a different opinion, however, LXX is not believed to plainly represent the OG. Doubts have been mainly voiced regarding those parts of the translation that, in virtue of a hebraizing revision, are commonly known as the kaijge-sections. Moreover, the claim has been made that OG readings must be assessed on a case-by-case basis, since neither LXX nor LXX directly represent the original translation. Recently, Kreuzer’s studies have brought new arguments in support of the identification of LXX with the OG, but the question seems to be still open, especially because of the process of the preparation of the Göttingen editions of LXX Samuel-Kings is in progress\(^6\).

2. Overview of past research on Slav-LXX

Over more than a century, Slavicists very rarely addressed the question of the textual analysis of Slav-LXX. The two major contributions on this topic date from the late eighteenth century. In 1894 M.G. Popruženko published a short monograph on Slav\(^7\). Along with the edition of excerpts from the biblical text and from the marginal notes, which include readings from “the Three” (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion)\(^7\) and from J, he presented a brief sketch of the grammatical features and of the orthography of the manuscript. Some years later

\(^4\) Reference critical edition: Fernández Marcos et al. 1989-1992.
\(^5\) Fischer 1951; Spottorno 1995; Tov 1999; Piquer et al. 2008; Torijano Morales 2012.
\(^6\) For reference bibliography see (at least): Barthélemy 1963; Brock 1996; Cross 1964; Fernández Marcos 1994; Hugo 2010 and 2013; Kauhanen 2012; Kreuzer 2015; Rahlfs 1911; Tov 1999; Taylor 1992-1993; Ulrich 1978.
\(^7\) In Slav-LXX the number of the available readings from “the Three” is consistently higher than assumed by Popruženko (1894: 123-129), at least if looking at 1 Sam in manuscript Slav\(^M\) (see: Bruni 2016b: 442-443). This new material awaits editing and
S.M. Kul’bakin undertook a comparative textual examination of some passages of 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) that he carried out by taking as a basis selected South and East Slavic sources dating from the fourteenth-sixteenth centuries. According to his conclusions, SlavO would preserve a text closer to the original than SlavM, since in 1 Sam 5:6,9; 6:4,18; 9:8, 23, 27; 10:2; 17:43; 19:4; 24:4 the latter would display textual contamination with the previously existing Slavonic version of the book, dating back to the Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) period (late ninth-early tenth century). Moreover, the Russian scholar was the first to establish the reliance of Slav-LXXL on a Lucianic model.

In more recent times, a number of other studies have also been produced. On the one hand, several readings from SlavO were included by D. Dunkov in his edition of the Old Church Slavonic (supposedly Glagolitic) version of 1-4 Kgdms, even though the manuscript is a witness to Slav-LXXL and should therefore not have been used for such a purpose. On the other hand, S. Nikolova expressed the opinion that SlavO and SlavM derive from a common, untraced, exemplar of middle Bulgarian and not Serbian origin. Finally, R.V. Bulatova published a paper on the accentual system of SlavO.

3. The Crucial Issue: The Nature of the Lucianic Text in Slav-LXXL

As of mid 2017, the Slav-LXXL remains unpublished and still awaits to be studied in detail: nowadays no systematic collation of its two testimonies, SlavO and SlavM, is available. Moreover, this tradition has not yet been investigated in the light of the apparatus of the reference edition of LXXL, whose authors were not aware of the existence of a Slavonic text. This last point is not surprising since this secondary tradition is usually not even mentioned in studies dealing with the textual history of Samuel-Kings. A rare exception is Tov’s

---

8 Kul’bakin 1901: 23-25, 43.
9 Some scholars ascribe this earliest translation to Methodius, while others to Gregory the Presbyter (see: Thomson 1998: 758; Alekseev 1999: 120-122; Bruni 2016b: 437).
10 Kul’bakin 1901: 23, 44.
11 Dunkov 1995-1996.
12 Slav-LXXL is a new translation based on a different Greek prototype.
13 With the aim of substantiating the hypothesis of a Bulgarian origin of the translation, Nikolova (1995: 62) refers to Lavrov’s (1914: 305-306) remarks concerning the use of nasal vowels in SlavM. These characters are, however, to be found in the first part of SlavM only, in which the Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) Octateuch is preserved (ff. 1-209; see, e.g., ff. 116v-117).
14 Bulatova 1995.
15 Fernández Marcos et al. 1989-1992.
16 See above bibliography (footnotes 5 and 6).
4. The Internal Division of 3-4 Kgdms in Slav

In 1-2 Kings (3-4 Kgdms) codex SlavM displays distinctive textual features that cannot fail to capture scholars’ attention. The text’s arrangement in this manuscript only partially corresponds to that of SlavO and of other Lucianic witnesses. Textual affinity is in fact limited to the incipit of 3 Kgdms that in all these sources starts at 3 Kgdms 2:12. The subsequent textual organization is however completely different, since SlavM ends 3 Kgdms at 3 Kgdms-LXX 11:41 and begins 4 Kgdms at 3 Kgdms-LXX 11:42. Consequently,
according to \( \text{Slav}^M \), 4 Kgdms consists of 3 Kgdms-LXX\(^L\) 11:42-22:54 and 4 Kgdms-LXX\(^L\) 1:1-25:30. Such an arrangement of 1-2 Kings (3-4 Kgdms) is not to be found elsewhere.

The analysis of \( \text{Slav}^M \) proves that this unique feature is not due to scribal mistakes, but instead intentionally appears to replicate a lost prototype. In this regard the following observations can be made. On the one hand, before 3 Kgdms-LXX\(^L\) 11:42 codex \( \text{Slav}^M \) inserts a heading informing the reader that 4 Kgdms begins at the reign of Rehoboam\(^25\). On the other one, a very interesting marginal comment is to be found alongside the translation of 4 Kgdms 1:1 (333v)\(^26\). This note tells us that in the original the copyist had before his eyes 4 Kgdms started precisely at this point, while in other testimonies at the reign of Rehoboam\(^27\). Whether such an alternative structure was Slavonic or Greek, is unfortunately not specified by the Serbian glossator. Regardless of this, it is however evident that the author of \( \text{Slav}^M \), or of its archetype, deliberately orientated his work towards a different LXX\(^L\) tradition, known today thanks to a single secondary witness.

5. **Proto-Lucianic Readings in \( \text{Slav}^M \)**

A first text-internal comparative analysis of \( \text{Slav}^M \) with LXX\(^L\) has produced the following results. This source includes several readings that belong to the ancient textual layer of the Antiochene recension. Accordingly, a positive response to Tov’s question\(^28\) may now be given: the Serbian tradition represents a new witness not only to LXX\(^L\) as a whole, but also to the proto-Lucianic textual stratum. With an aim to providing an initial illustration of this crucial textual feature, an edition of selected passages of \( \text{Slav}^M \) is offered below.

I. 1 Sam 9:3

\( \text{Slav}^M \) (fol. 220v): η κβση εανοπλη, η ποτη δημονο υστρομήση αιδα αυτου εν σωση, η πολλα ρακα ταθετα κευσκα αιδα σωση.

LXX\(^L\): και αναστη Σαοωλ, και παρελαβεν εν τοι παιδαριον του πατρος αυτου μετ αυτου, και επορευθη ρητευν τας ονος Κις του πατρος αυτου\(^29\).

\(^{25}\) \( \text{Slav}^M \), fol. 313: η νανευ αρτεων νευτρητδανο, ρεβαλωκα, αια εαολωνικα, αψεκαλινη ινετρητδανο.

\(^{26}\) \( \text{Slav}^M \), fol. 333v: η ὑπερτηκε εα ηρετη εε υσι το ρηνεξα ομορητης αστιθη Αηειον [και ἱδετης Μωιας εν Ισραηε].

\(^{27}\) \( \text{Slav}^M \), fol. 333v: εε ηρετα εε αια ζε δει πιστη ρολκεςι ρεκετηα νετργεν αυτον ου αυτον.

\(^{28}\) Tov 1999: 480.

\(^{29}\) Fernández Marcos et al. 1989: p. 23.
II. 1 Sam 9:24

Slav\textsuperscript{34} (fol. 222): и въззвиши приставникъ ведро, и еже на него жребійда, и постави

III. 1 Sam 10:2

Slav\textsuperscript{34} (fol. 223v): и се ти здогадніе, ико помыка те въ властілии надъ дюстоліемъ земь.

IV. 1 Sam 10:23

Slav\textsuperscript{34} (fol. 223v): и тнє салоунъ и поетъ его вдоклѣ, и ста салогъ пукѣ людемъ, и

V. 1 Sam 16:14

Slav\textsuperscript{34} (fol. 223v): и дѣу гшю душууи въ салогъ и шеладамъ его душу лоугвъ въ fla, и

VI. 1 Sam 30:15

Slav\textsuperscript{34} (fol. 254): и рене дѣу, душу наведову ие на виніцетво се. и рене, казненъ ии се

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.: 25.  
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.: 26. Some textual affinity can also be found with the Old Latin translation: VL (L\textsubscript{113}) In finibus Beniamin in Selom [in c"ilwne\textsuperscript{e}] in bachallat salientem magna stadina (see: Ibidem). On the importance of the VL for the study of the proto-Lucianic text see: Tov 1999; 479 n. 12.  
\textsuperscript{32} Fernández Marcos et al. 1989: 28.  
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.: 47.
The Old Serbian Version of the Antiochene Recension of Samuel-Kings

209


described in detail in a previous paper. The presence of the LXX text in the Old Serbian version suggests a close
connection with the Antiochene recension of the Hebrew Bible, which was translated into Greek and served as a
model for the Old Serbian translation. The LXX text is especially significant for the study of the Hebrew
Bible, as it reflects the text of the LXX of the Old Testament. The Old Serbian version of the Samuel-Kings
books provides valuable insights into the history of the biblical text and its transmission in the Balkans, as well
as into the cultural and linguistic context of medieval Serbia.
6. Conclusions

Research presented in this paper represents a first attempt towards a comprehensive analysis of the textual features of Slav-LXX against the background of the Greek testimonies of the Antiochene recension of Samuel-Kings. Despite being preliminary, the undertaken work indeed looks to be promising.

The most notable implication of the current study is that SlavM was shown to be a new witness to the ancient textual layer of the Lucianic recension, namely to the proto-Lucianic stratum. Moreover, the analysis has furthermore provided indirect evidence of the existence of a lost edition of LXX 1-2 Kings that featured an alternative subdivision of the books, according to which 4 Kgdm-LXX consisted of 3 Kgdm-LXX 11:42-22:54 + 4 Kgdm-LXX 1:1-25:30. The simultaneous presence in the Serbian version of text-internal proto-Lucianic elements makes it very likely that this arrangement dates back to Late antiquity and not merely to the Middle Ages. Consequently, the hypothesis may be advanced that this Slav translation provides scholars with a new window into the textual history of Antiochene recension of Samuel-Kings and, ultimately, into the OG text of these books. Accordingly, this Serbian tradition can safely be placed at the very center of the debate surrounding one of the most complex issues facing contemporary biblical scholarship.
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Abstracts

Alessandro Maria Bruni

La versione serba antica della recensione antiochena dei libri di Samuele e dei Re: alcune questioni preliminari di critica del testo

Il contributo è dedicato all’antica traduzione slava meridionale dei libri biblici di Samuele e dei Re, preservata in due testimoni serbi dei secoli XV-XVI. Questa versione è un testimone indiretto della cosiddetta recensione antiochena o lucianea della Septuaginta, pervenutaci in soli cinque codici manoscritti greci di epoca bizantina. Il presente lavoro si configura come un primo tentativo di studio comparato del testo slavo con il suo originale greco. Particolare attenzione è prestata all’individuazione delle cosiddette lezioni protolucianee e all’analisi di alcune caratteristiche testuali del tutto uniche che sono rinvenibili nella tradizione serba.
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