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 century¹. It is today preserved in two Serbian manuscripts: one dating back to 1418 (National Research Library of Odessa, Ukraine, n° 6 = SlavO)² and the other 1523-1543 (Moscow, Russian State Library, f. 87 N° 1-1684, ff. 210-373 = SlavM)³. 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).


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). 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.

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. 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 -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 OG. LXX O would preserve a text closer to the original than LXX M, and LXX M derives from a common, untraced, East Slavic source dating from the fourteenth-sixteenth centuries. According to 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 Kul’bakin (1901: 23, 43), this secondary tradition is usually not even mentioned in studies dealing with the textual history of Samuel-Kings. A rare exception is Tov’s expressing the opinion that the Russian scholar was the first to establish that LXX Slav Slav O would preserve a text closer to the original than LXX Slav M, is a new translation based on a different Greek prototype. In recent times, a number of other studies have also been produced.

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-LXX. Along with the edition of excerpts from the biblical text and from the marginal notes, which include readings from “the Three” (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) and from J, he presented a brief sketch of the grammatical features and of the orthography of the manuscript. Some years later

2. Overview of past research on Slav-LXX


Fischer 1951; Spottorno 1995; Tov 1999; Piquer et al. 2008; Torijano Morales 2012.


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 SlavM (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, \textit{Slav}^O would preserve a text closer to the original than \textit{Slav}^M, 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 \textit{Slav-LXX}^L on a Lucianic model.

In more recent times, a number of other studies have also been produced. On the one hand, several readings from \textit{Slav}^O 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 \textit{Slav-LXX}^L and should therefore not have been used for such a purpose. On the other hand, S. Nikolova expressed the opinion that \textit{Slav}^O and \textit{Slav}^M 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 \textit{Slav}^O.

3. \textit{The Crucial Issue: The Nature of the Lucianic Text in Slav-LXX}^L

As of mid 2017, the \textit{Slav-LXX}^L remains unpublished and still awaits to be studied in detail: nowadays no systematic collation of its two testimonies, \textit{Slav}^O and \textit{Slav}^M, is available. Moreover, this tradition has not yet been investigated in the light of the apparatus of the reference edition of LXX, 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...
1972 (1999) paper on the proto-Lucianic problem in Samuel-Kings, in which reference is expressly made to the Slavonic version. In this contribution, the fundamental question was raised as to whether Slav-LXX\(^L\) is based on the ancient textual layer of the five Greek testimonies of LXX\(^F\) only, or whether, being chronological post-Lucianic, it reflects LXX\(^L\) as a whole\(^17\). This crucial issue, which was left unanswered by Slavicists\(^18\), currently remains at the very core of research into this tradition\(^19\).

With the aim of clarifying the nature of the Lucianic text in Slav-LXX\(^L\), the present writer embarked on a preliminary assessment of the major textual features of the Old Serbian version of Samuel-Kings. At a first stage the circumstances imposed to limit autoptic analysis to Slav\(^M\) only, due to the temporary inaccessibility of Slav\(^O\) (in this case available data necessarily derived from scholarly literature)\(^20\). Despite these constraints, research has produced encouraging results that envisage new prospects for comparative textual criticism and reveal the importance of this Serbian tradition for the textual history of the LXX\(^L\) of these books.

4. The Internal Division of 3-4 Kgdms in Slav\(^M\)

In 1-2 Kings (3-4 Kgdms) codex Slav\(^M\) displays distinctive textual features that cannot fail to capture scholars’ attention. The text’s arrangement in this manuscript only partially corresponds to that of Slav\(^O\) and of other Lucianic witnesses\(^21\). Textual affinity is in fact limited to the incipit of 3 Kgdms that in all these sources starts at 3 Kgdms 2:12\(^22\). The subsequent textual organization is however completely different, since Slav\(^M\) ends 3 Kgdms at 3 Kgdms-LXX\(^L\) 11:41\(^23\) and begins 4 Kgdms at 3 Kgdms-LXX\(^L\) 11:42\(^24\). Consequently,

---

\(^{17}\) Tov 1999: 488.


\(^{19}\) Bruni 2016a: 403 and 2016b: 442.

\(^{20}\) Information on Slav\(^O\) is based on Popruženko’s description (1894: 41-54) and Kul’bakin’s remarks (1901).

\(^{21}\) See: Mosqu. Syn. gr. 31, fol. 318v, as well as other Eastern and indirect sources such as Vat. Syr. 162, J and Theodoret.

\(^{22}\) Tov 1999: 480. See also Popruženko’s description (1894: 49)

\(^{23}\) Slav\(^M\), fol. 313: οὐχ ὂντες σελομὼνν, εὐ καὶ ὅποιοι πρὸς τὸν γράμμα τὸ ἁθάνην, καὶ ἠθέτησε ᾽Αχαάβ ἐν ᾽Ισραὴλ μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ᾽Αχαάβ.

\(^{24}\) Slav\(^M\), fol. 313: ἔλευσεν Ἰεροβόαμ υἱὸς Ναβάτ, ἔτι ὦν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ὡς ὁ ψηφισμένον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὅτα ἐκάθησεν σελομὼνν καὶ ἐκάθησεν ἀυτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὃς ἠθέτησεν τῇ ἱππῳ τῇ ἐν τῇ ἡρωί τῆς Αἰγύπτου (Ibidem)].
according to Slav⁸, 4 Kgdms consists of 3 Kgdms-LXX⁴ 11:42-22:54 and 4 Kgdms-LXX⁴ 1:1-25:30. Such an arrangement of 1-2 Kings (3-4 Kgdms) is not to be found elsewhere.

The analysis of Slav⁸ 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-LXX⁴ 11:42 codex Slav⁸ inserts a heading informing the reader that 4 Kgdms begins at the reign of Rehoboam. 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. 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 Slav⁸, or of its archetype, deliberately oriented his work towards a different LXX⁴ tradition, known today thanks to a single secondary witness.

5. Proto-Lucianic Readings in Slav⁸

A first text-internal comparative analysis of Slav⁸ with LXX⁴ 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 may now be given: the Serbian tradition represents a new witness not only to LXX⁴ 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 Slav⁸ is offered below.

I. 1 Sam 9:3

Slav⁸ (fol. 220v): η κείτα εσραήλ, η ποτήριον είναι οία σωζόμενο εν σοφόν. η πιεύει οικατί οσλήθη κυσόντα οία σωζον.

LXX⁴: καὶ ἀνέστη Σαουλ, καὶ παρέλαβεν ἕν τῶν παιδαρίων τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπορεύθη ζητεῖν τὰς οὖνας Κις τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

²⁵ Slav⁸, fol. 313: Νάνειον υρτέβια νεπερβιτάταο, ρεβαλλώνα, οία σολαλλώνα. υρκελλωνα υπερβιτάταο.

²⁶ Slav⁸, fol. 333v: η οἰκέτες καὶ γνακίνες εκ ιδίωο ἐπεινεργής ἀνακάμενος [καὶ ήθέτησεν Μωὰβ ἐν Ισραὴλ μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν Ἀχαάβ (Ibidem)].

²⁷ Slav⁸, fol. 333v: εκ ισολήθη εἰς Φειδί ζῆς πνευμένον κοιλώσα ὑρτέβια ἡ γ. ἐπεκαίνεται κατ’ ημέραν ιοὺς. ζῆς ρεβαλλώνα υρτέβια επεκαίνεται.

²⁸ Tov 1999: 480.

II. 1 Sam 9:24

Slav\m\ (fol. 222): и воздвиженье приставникъ ведро, и еже на неч жертва, и постави ее предъ салоунами, и реє салоунъ къ салоуну, се жесть съвѣтствственно, предложки предъ се и тако. Иако же съвѣтствственно положихъ ту се у люде, и зреѣ съ иладъ салоунъ съ салоунами къ дѣлу. LXX\c: и иръ онъ магиеръ тѣхъ ковласъ и тѣ епъ ауйтъ, и парѣ/type? ауйтъ изъ внюймъ барукъ. и есть Самуилъ тѣ. Самуилъ. Идуо мартыръ папа ауйый сози ихъ въ стѣй тепло илъ въ ковласъ ауйтъ. и дѣло. Олъ жрѣша и сътвори въ илае. и зреѣ съ иладъ салоунъ съ салоунами къ дѣлу. LXX\c: и иръ онъ магиеръ тѣхъ ковласъ и тѣ епъ ауйтъ, и парѣ/type? ауйтъ изъ внюймъ барукъ. и есть Самуилъ тѣ. Самуилъ. Идуо мартыръ папа ауйый сози ихъ въ стѣй тепло илъ въ ковласъ ауйтъ. и дѣло. Олъ жрѣша и сътвори въ илае. и зреѣ съ иладъ салоунъ съ салоунами къ дѣлу.

III. 1 Sam 10:2

Slav\m\ (fol. 222): и се ти званы, иако помаза тѣ къ владычества надъ диванысямъ сео-"wh. Аддакжже аымъ оьпвпвъ дѣль у менѣ, върввпвъ дѣлъ мого при грои бъ рвлиптъ, въ прѣдъвѣлъ вѣшвлѣнѣйъ въ звкъ поживѣла всѣло [...]. LXX\c: и иръ онъ магиеръ тѣхъ ковласъ и тѣ епъ ауйтъ, и парѣ/type? ауйтъ изъ внюймъ барукъ. и есть Самуилъ тѣ. Самуилъ. Идуо мартыръ папа ауйый сози ихъ въ стѣй тепло илъ въ ковласъ ауйтъ. и дѣло. Олъ жрѣша и сътвори въ илае. и зреѣ съ иладъ салоунъ съ салоунами къ дѣлу. LXX\c: и иръ онъ магиеръ тѣхъ ковласъ и тѣ епъ ауйтъ, и парѣ/type? ауйтъ изъ внюймъ барукъ. и есть Самуилъ тѣ. Самуилъ. Идуо мартыръ папа ауйый сози ихъ въ стѣй тепло илъ въ ковласъ ауйтъ. и дѣло. Олъ жрѣша и сътвори въ илае. и зреѣ съ иладъ салоунъ съ салоунами къ дѣлу.

IV. 1 Sam 10:23

Slav\m\ (fol. 223v): и теце салоунъ и позетъ его въшоа, и се салоунъ павебѣ людѣмъ, и вѣзисе се и вѣзисе людѣмъ пане падовѣ и павыше. LXX\c: и ирѣхъ и Самуилъ и вълавести оного епъ ауйтъ, и катѣстѣ Самуилъ съ мѣсямъ садѣ, и вѣзисе съ иладъ салоунъ съ салоунами пане падовѣ и павыше. LXX\c: и ирѣхъ и Самуилъ и вѣзисе съ иладъ салоунъ съ салоунами пане падовѣ и павыше.

V. 1 Sam 16:14

Slav\m\ (fol. 233v): и дѣнь гробъ вѣстѣнъ съ салоунъ, и вѣглаасе его салоунъ, и салоунъ гракавъ съ га, и дѣлаласе его. LXX\c: и певѣма Курію вѣстѣ падѣ Самуилъ, и сътѣвѣ дегъ певѣма сътенѣлъ парѣ Курію, и епѣнѣ онъ певѣма. LXX\c: и певѣма Курію вѣстѣ падѣ Самуилъ, и сътѣвѣ дегъ певѣма сътенѣлъ парѣ Курію, и епѣнѣ онъ певѣма.

VI. 1 Sam 30:15

Slav\m\ (fol. 254): и вѣсѣ дѣнь, аымъ отовѣнѣсъ его вѣсѣ салоунъ, и салоунъ салоунъ къ салоуну, се жесть съ вѣсѣ вѣсѣ салоунъ, и салоунъ салоунъ къ салоуну, се жесть съ вѣсѣ вѣсѣ салоунъ. LXX\c: и ирѣ съ мѣсъ Саоилъ. Еи катѣзезвѣ емѣ епѣ тѣ състемѣ епѣ, и ирѣ Саоилъ. Еи катѣзезвѣ емѣ епѣ тѣ състемѣ епѣ.

---

31 Ibid.: 26. Some textual affinity can also be found with the Old Latin translation: VL (L115) is finibus Beniamin in Selom [in cillum] 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.
33 Ibid.: 47.
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me eis xeiρas tou kuriou mou, kai kataξw se epi to so斯特ema touto. kai omoevein autw34.

VII. 2 Sam 13:3

Slav34 (fol. 271): kai lalwvno ho evwde xroγtai, kai ine emwv iwhwδanv, eini σalwia brata δέξαμαι. kai iwhwδanv evwδe lalwvno M. 

LXX2: kai to Amnon eπairos, kai onoma autw Ιωναθαν, vioσ Samw a tou aδελφου Δαυιδ. kai Ιωναθαν ην ϕρονιμoς σφόδρα35.

VIII. 2 Sam 17:29

Slav34 (fol. 279v-280): kai meδe, kai makelo, kai see, kai melexwne telezt, kai prineawne δέξαμαι, kai iwhlwmie eγo ictet, kai ine neolwmi kekdoanwmwv kai poγstymi.

LXX2: kai meli kai booutwv kai prpoβata kai yalathvna moscharia, kai proseγyγewkan to Δαυιδ kai to λαι αυτου έσθειεν, oti enegon toon laion peivan kai ekkelwsthai diψhasta en tē ερέμω36.

IX. 2 Sam 18:2

Slav34 (fol. 280): kai ostroan diei λioudi trpete. edwio, evn roγwv inwlalia. evtopoe, evn roγwv deev evwta inwlalia, oia edρwglmia. trpete evn roγwv vδhiγet δαλwnia. kai rene ipo evn λioudi, orhde δυχοβδio kai aξi eλ. 

LXX2: kai eprioσwsew Δαυιδ toν laion, to tritoen en χειρι Ιωαβ kai to tritoen en χειρι Αβεσσα, aδελφου Ιωαβ uiou Σαρουια, kai to tritoen en χειρι Ιηθι του Γεθθαιου. kai epewn o bасileus prros toν laion Εκπερηυμενονς εκπερηυμοναι kai eγw meθi υμwν37.

X. 1 Kgs 20:20

Slav34 (fol. 328v): kai rene αγαλμα ηλι. oφρετελι με brage mo. kai rene iλi oφρετοχ. xamwke eπανων εεi eπανωγε, eee xamwriγet loγklwme πρηδ γιw ekei proγνwβατε eγo. tako ghiot (t). 

LXX2: kai epewn Aγαβα προς Ήλιαν Ει ευρηκας με, o εχθρος μου; kai epewn Ήλιας Ευρηκα, idiτi πηψασα ματην του ποιησα τον πονηρον ενοπιον Κωριου του παροργισαι αυτων• ταδε λεγει Κυριος38.

XI. 2 Kgs 17:21

Slav34 (359v-360): taccw xamwke ρατγυσκε se iλi w δωμωv δεξαμαι. kai eκαμβhame nad oswo ieroβωμα oia iwhwδo. 

LXX2: plhn oti eraghe o Ισραηλ απo tou oikou Δαυιδ, kai epasileusan eph' εναυτως ton Ιεροβωμ ην ναβατ39.

34 Ibid.: 86.
36 Ibid.: 141.
37 Ibid.: 141.
38 Fernández Marcos et al. 1992: 68.
39 Ibid.: 133-134.
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 Slav 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 4Kgdms consisted of 3 Kgdms-LXX 11:42-22:54 + 4 Kgdms-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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