

FOLIA ORIENTALIA  
VOL. 47 2010

J.F. Elwolde

United Bible Societies

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG  
THE RUSSIAN SYNODAL BIBLE,  
THE SLAVONIC TEXT, AND THE SEPTUAGINT:  
SOME INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

*United Bible Societies*

*Introduction*

Whatever its intrinsic merits, the importance and influence of the Russian Synodal Bible of 1876 is obvious to all who work in Biblical Studies or Bible translation in Russia and in a large number of countries to the west and south that have experienced a pervasive Russian cultural influence and that became constituent parts of the USSR. In a significant number of translation projects into the many minority languages of the former USSR, the Synodal Bible is employed as a primary source for interpretation of the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts. This use of the Synodal Bible, often by Bible translators with limited knowledge of the original biblical languages,<sup>2</sup> has led to its becoming “a mediator between ancient texts and modern translations”.<sup>3</sup>

In my experience of working with the Synodal Bible in projects that employ it as a kind of substitute ‘base text’ there are two broad sets of issues that arise with some regularity. The first, which I do not propose to address here, concerns the accuracy of the Synodal’s translation of MT. The second relates to the Synodal’s representation of Septuagintal pluses, which are incorporated in Orthodox editions of the Synodal in square brackets. Here, my aim is to move from the statements I have seen that are sometimes superficial or misleading, to the presentation of firm evidence and, ultimately, to conclusions that can withstand scholarly scrutiny and be of guidance to those who for whatever reason have to engage with the Synodal Bible’s relationship to the Septuagint. The material discussed is drawn from 1 Kings (Third Kingdoms in the Synodal).

Before proceeding, we should make clear in advance one conclusion of our modest study, although it simply supports something that is already relatively well-known. Beneath the first column of Genesis in the Synodal Bible there is a note stating that “Words placed in brackets are taken from the Greek translation of the 70 interpreters (3rd cent. B.C.)”. However, it appears most unlikely that the Synodal

---

<sup>1</sup> An early and much less detailed form of this paper was presented at a meeting of United Bible Societies Europe-Middle East Area translation consultants and invited members of national Bible Societies, Crawley (United Kingdom), 8 January 2007. In its present extended form, the paper was read at the IOSOT XIX meeting in Ljubljana (Slovenia), 17 July 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Often the mother-tongue translators of a minority language Bible translation project will not be biblical scholars and the draft translation will be made from a literal translation (such as the Synodal), with reference to other Bibles that take a different translational approach. In such cases, direct insight into the linguistic and exegetical meaning of the original biblical texts is provided by members of Bible translation agencies assigned to a project. In Russia and the countries of the former USSR, the relevant agencies are typically the United Bible Societies (which comprises the different national Bible Societies as well as the United Bible Societies Service Organization), SIL (Summer Institute of Linguistics) / Wycliffe Bible Translators, and IBT (Institute for Bible Translation).

<sup>3</sup> Andrei S. Desnitsky, ‘The Septuagint as a Base Text for Bible Translations in Russia’, *The Bible Translator* 56 (2005) 245-52 (251), who continues: “thus establishing a tradition of its own and, for better or worse, passing on its eclectic nature to translations for other languages and cultures.”

translators and revisers directly employed published editions or manuscripts of the Septuagint in the course of their work, at least in any regular way. Rather, their knowledge of the Septuagint seems to have been mediated entirely through the Slavonic Bible. As Anatoli Alexeev puts it: "There is a common belief that the Synodal version contains the Greek and Hebrew originals, but actually the place of LXX is taken by the Slavonic version".<sup>4</sup> A striking indication of this fact is that "additions of LXX, absent from the Slavonic version, were not inserted in the Synodal version either" (ibid.).<sup>5</sup> In fact, in the preparation of the Synodal Bible, the square was circled by treating the Slavonic text as a representative of unavailable Greek manuscripts!<sup>6</sup>

Of course, some, perhaps many, of the bracketed pluses included in the Synodal are unproblematic in regard to both the Slavonic and the LXX. For example, at 1 Kings 1:48, the Synodal adds 'from my seed', in line with the Slavonic, which in turn derives from the LXX;<sup>7</sup> similarly, at 1 Kings 12:20 the Synodal adds in brackets 'from Egypt' as well as 'and of Benjamin', following the Slavonic and LXX.<sup>8</sup>

At times specific translational decisions are evident within these bracketed pluses. For example, at the end of 1 Kings 18:29 LXX adds a long additional sentence, which is translated in the Slavonic and found in brackets in the Synodal.<sup>9</sup> In its incorporation of the Slavonic, the Synodal renders 'shameful prophets' as 'prophets of Baal', presumably a contextual translation.<sup>10</sup> This suggests that at least on some occasions the bracketed additions were inserted by biblical specialists and in a thoughtful, not a mechanical, way.

But any window onto the LXX that the Synodal Bible might provide is much more closed than open and the glass in it is far from transparent. Before beginning to attempt to cast some additional light on the matter, it will be helpful to give a few relevant details about how the Synodal Bible was produced. If

---

<sup>4</sup> A.A. Alexeev, 'Masoretic Text in Russia', in *Text, Theology & Translation: Essays in Honour of Jan de Waard* (ed. Simon Crisp and Manuel Jmbachian; [Crawley, UK]: United Bible Societies, 2004) 13-29 (26).

<sup>5</sup> Alexeev, 'Masoretic Text', 26, gives 1 Kings 16:28 and 22:46 as examples. A further case is the omission of the long plus of eleven extra verses at the end of 1 Kings 2 (2:46a-l), a sequence that is also absent from the Slavonic text.

<sup>6</sup> Thus, Ilarion A. Chistovich, *Istoriya perevoda Biblii na ruskii iazyk* (Second ed.; St Petersburg, 1899 [some parts were written much earlier, in 1872-73, according to the footnotes on pp. 316, 318, 323]) 317-40 (339): "In cases where the Slavonic text of the Bible represents significant differences from the available texts of the Greek Bible, the translators accepted it as a variant, alongside other known Greek manuscripts, on the assumption that underlying these passages were early Greek manuscripts that were different in some readings from other known manuscripts and editions." (My own renderings are used here and throughout this paper.)

<sup>7</sup> MT: אֲרָבֶי-עַד שֶׁבַח הָיָה לַיהוָה; LXX (Rahlfs): ὃς ἔδωκεν σήμερον ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός μου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου μου; Slavonic: иже даде нѣсе ѿ сѣмене моего сѣдѣща на престоли моѣмъ; Synodal: Который сегодня дал [от семени моего] сидящего на престоле моем.

<sup>8</sup> MT: וַיָּשָׁב מִן־מִצְרָיִם וַיָּשָׁב מִן־מִצְרָיִם; LXX: ἀνέκαμψεν ἱεροβοὰμ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ... παρέξ ἀκήπτρου Ἰουδα καὶ Βενιαμὴν μόνοι = Slavonic: возвратѣша ἱεροβοάμъ ѿ ἐγύπτα ... токъмъ хорѣгъ ѿдана ѿ вениамина; Synodal: Иероваам возвратился [из Египта] ... кроме колена Иудина [и Вениамина].

<sup>9</sup> LXX: καὶ ἐλάλησεν Ἡλίου ὁ Θεοβίτης πρὸς τοὺς προφῆτας τῶν προσοχθισμάτων λέγων μετὰστῆτε ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμά μου καὶ μετέστησαν καὶ ἀπῆλθον; Slavonic: И рече илїа бсѣвітанинъ прорѣкѣмъ стѣданимъ, глагола: ѿстѣпните нѣѣ, да ѿ ѡзъ сотворѣ жертвазъ моѣ. И ѿстѣпниша тїи, ѿ ѡмолкнѣша (here, ѡмолкнѣша is, presumably, a very free contextual rendering of LXX's ἀπῆλθον [for which Rahlfs indicates no variants]) = Synodal: [И сказал Илия Фесвитянин пророкам Вааловым: теперь отойдите, чтоб и я совершил мое жертвоприношение. Они отошли и умолкли.]

<sup>10</sup> Although the Slavonic and Septuagintal plus has been unproblematically incorporated into the Synodal, the result is in fact once more technically a mixed text, in view of the fact that no Greek ms tradition represents all of the final three phrases of MT (and Synodal), שָׁרַח פְּנֵי הָיָה לַיהוָה; correspondingly, the Slavonic has no equivalent of פְּנֵי הָיָה (и не вѣ глагола, ниже послашѣнїа). The Slavonic follows a LXX tradition that includes καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἀκρόασις after καὶ οὐκ ἦν φωνή, in line with v. 26 (see the apparatus in Rahlfs); on the other hand, Vaticanus (Brenton) does not have even καὶ οὐκ ἦν φωνή (in v. 29). Aleksandr Pavlovich Lopukhin, *Tolkovaya Bibliya, ili Kommentarii na fce Knigi Cvetoi Pisaniya Vethovo i Novovo Zavetov* (3 vols.; St. Petersburg, 1912-13) 1.455, mentions the LXX plus in v. 29 but does not comment on the translational choices of the Synodal (or Slavonic). Note that Peshitta includes the LXX plus (apart from ὁ Θεοβίτης) and all of the preceding text of MT, and thus represents here a mixed tradition, like the Synodal.

my understanding is accurate it seems that a considerable part of the labour of the Synodal's translation committee would have been dedicated to the insertion of these additions.

As I understand, the Synodal translation of the Bible, which was published in its entirety in 1876, constitutes broadly speaking a revision of an unpublished but quite widely distributed rendering of the MT<sup>11</sup> by archpriest Gerasim Petrovich Pavskii (1787-1863).<sup>12</sup> Pavskii's translation apparently dates from before 1826, the year Pavskii left the St Petersburg Theological Academy.<sup>13</sup> In the case of the historical books, including 3 Kingdoms, Pavskii's work had been lightly revised by archimandrite Makarii.<sup>14</sup> Makarii was a pupil of Pavskii and had obtained a copy of Pavskii's unpublished translation of the whole of MT in 1840.<sup>15</sup> A version of 3 Kingdoms by Makarii appears in *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie* (Orthodox Review) 7 (4-7) (April-August 1866) 59-126. A very brief glance at this publication indicates that the translation is reasonably close to the Synodal.<sup>16</sup> It seems likely, therefore, that this was the work revised by the three biblicists and two Byzantists<sup>17</sup> who constituted the Synod's Bible translation committee, and whose task began in 1867.<sup>18</sup> As the Synodal version of the historical books was published just two years later (1869), it seems likely that the source-language revision of the work of Makarii (and Pavskii) was rather slight, and that in fact much of the committee's labours were dedicated to the incorporation of the 'Septuagintal' additions.

### Mixed texts

Towards the end of his account of the Synodal translation process, Ilarion Chistovich comments: "The mixing, even one might say, the merging of two texts with a preference in one case for the Hebrew, in another for the Greek, was and always remains a matter of the arbitrary will of the translators, and there is no way whatever to place limits on that arbitrariness."<sup>19</sup> Chistovich does not clearly exemplify this statement, and so we turn now to see what a 'mixed text' might mean in the Synodal context.

To give an example, in the seven verses that comprise 1 Kings 5:30-32 (Slavonic/Synodal and English versions: 5:16-18); 6:1-2; 6:37-38,<sup>20</sup> the Slavonic includes some thirteen more or less significant differences from MT, derived from the fact that the Slavonic is a rendering of the Greek Bible and not of MT.<sup>21</sup> Of these variations between the texts, the Synodal registers just two, both pluses, with a third plus omitted.<sup>22</sup> Septuagintal minuses and alternative readings (in comparison with MT) are not incorporated.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>11</sup> With the exception, of course, of books included in the Synodal from outside the Hebrew canon.

<sup>12</sup> A survey of Pavskii's life and work can be found in Stephen K. Batalden, 'Gerasim Pavskii's Clandestine Old Testament: The Politics of Nineteenth-Century Russian Biblical Translation', *Church History*, 57 (1988) 486-498.

<sup>13</sup> See Batalden, 'Gerasim Pavskii's Clandestine Old Testament', 487.

<sup>14</sup> See Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 329: "Archimandrite Makarii had before his eyes the translation of G.P. Pavskii and in only a few places corrected it in accordance with his own understanding, so that his translation does not possess the significance and status of an independent work."

<sup>15</sup> See Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 329-30.

<sup>16</sup> Unlike the translation of Ivan Maximovich in *Trudi Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* (Acts of the Kiev Theological Academy), 2.4-11 (April-Nov 1862) 237-360.

<sup>17</sup> See Alexeev, 'Masoretic Text', 26.

<sup>18</sup> See Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 322.

<sup>19</sup> Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 339.

<sup>20</sup> The relationship between MT and LXX, as represented by Rahlfs, is quite complicated. The order in MT is as follows: 5:30-32; 6:1-2; ... 6:37-38. In Rahlfs' edition of LXX, this material is ordered as follows (M = MT; R = Rahlfs): M 5:30 = R 5:30, M 5:32b = R 5:32, M 6:1a = R 6:1, M 5:31 = R 6:1a, M 5:32a = R 6:1b, M 6:37 = R 6:1c, M 6:38a = R 6:1d. (Equivalents of MT 6:1b and 6:38b are lacking in Rahlfs; other versions of LXX, followed by most translations, including the Slavonic and the Synodal, number MT 5:30-32 as 5:16-18.) However, the Slavonic, following Hexaplaric and Lucianic traditions, which come much much closer to the Hebrew in both the arrangement and the wording of the text (for details, cf. the apparatus to Rahlfs), in effect follows the order of verses found in MT.

<sup>21</sup> (1) 5:16/30: 600 (и шестъ ѿтъ) for 300 (וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת = R); (2) 'foremen doing tasks' (прислѣвникъ дѣлающихъ дѣла = R) for 'those who are ruling over the people, who are doing the work' (הַרְדִּים בְּעַם הָעָם בְּמִלְאָה); (3) 5:17/31: addition of 'and' before the last clause (и каменіе негѣсаное = R; MT: וְהָיָה); (4) 5:18/32: 'sons (of)' (сынове = R) for 'builders of' (בְּנֵי) (twice); (5) omission (with Rahlfs) of 'for building the house' (לְבִנְיַת הַבַּיִת); and (6) addition of / replacement by '(for) three years' (въ три лѣта = R); (7) 6:1: 440 (четырѣдесѣтное = R) for 480 (שְׁמֹנִים); (8) 'from Egypt' (изъ египта = R) for 'from the land of Egypt' (מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם); (9) 'in the second month' (въ

The fact that, on the one hand, Septuagintal pluses represent only a small portion of the variations between LXX and MT and, on the other hand, that the Slavonic (which is the Synodal's source for LXX readings) follows a non-standard and eclectic text of the LXX means that the Synodal may be used only as a very limited guide to the LXX.<sup>24</sup>

More importantly for present purposes, because Septuagintal minuses and alternative readings are generally not recorded by the Synodal, the bracketed pluses that the Synodal does display can mislead the reader into seeing a simpler relationship between MT and LXX than is justified by the facts.<sup>25</sup> Rather than a straightforward relationship of *shorter or longer readings* of the same text, the situation is better characterized as having to do with *variant editions* of a text.

For example, towards the end of 1 Kings 8:65, the Synodal includes a rather lengthy bracketed plus between 'the Lord our God' and the words that immediately follow it in MT: 'seven days and seven days — fourteen days'. The bracketed plus in itself is unexceptionable, with the Slavonic matching the LXX as presented by Rahlfs. The problem, however, is that the Slavonic and Rahlfs follow this plus only with the words 'seven days', and not with 'seven days and seven days — fourteen days' as found in MT and Synodal.<sup>26</sup>

мѣъ второй = R) for 'in the month of Ziv, that is the second month' (בְּחֹדֶשׁ זִיב הַשֵּׁנִי); (10-12) 'and he founded' (созда) for 'and he built' (בָּנָה [the clause introduced by this verb is not found in Rahlfs]; similarly in vv. 2 [Rahlfs as MT] and 38 [not in Rahlfs, which does not include 6:38b in 6:1d], at the end; (13) 6:37: 'in the second month': (во второй мѣъ = R) added at end of verse.

<sup>22</sup> In order, these are: 5:18/32, и приготавлиали дерева и камни для строения дома [три года]; 6:37, в месяц Зиф, [в месяц второй, ]; 5:17/31.

<sup>23</sup> In the Synodal, the only information about alternative readings (as against pluses and minuses) in the Greek/Slavonic comes from occasional asterisked footnotes. In 3 Kingdoms there are two: 10:26: "В греческом переводе: сорок тысяч коней колесничных"; 11:32: "В греческом переводе: два колена". Variants are otherwise not registered even when they occur in verses in which various Slavonic pluses have been incorporated (and so in which it is likely that the Slavonic reviser would have noticed the variation); for example, at 21:4 (LXX 20:4), where Slavonic has ѿ покрѣ (LXX: καὶ συνεκάλυψεν) for the Synodal's и отворотил (cf. MT: פָּתַח; see, e.g., Lopukhin, *Tolkovaya Bibliya*, 1.469; according to *BHS*, the underlying Hebrew here was פָּתַח). Towards the end of 18:36 (see below), the Synodal's по слову Твоему = MT: בְּדִבְרֵי (Qr) is retained, with no mention made of the Slavonic alternative: ꙗкоже рече = LXX: διὰ οὗ. Similar comments apply in the same verse to the Slavonic's ѿдквѣль (following Alexandrinus; פִּתְחוּ is also attested in some Peshitta traditions), rather than лоранл of other manuscript traditions, MT, and Synodal (Израилев). From the same verse, we can also see that LXX minuses (or MT pluses in respect of LXX) are not noted. Cf. MT: וַיַּעַל הָאֱלֹהִים מֵעַל הָאֹרֶן וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּעֶבֶד; Synodal: и сделал всё; contrast Slavonic: сотвори хъ дѣла ѿл = LXX: πεποίηκα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα). For another LXX minus / MT plus not noted in the Synodal, cf. at 12:20 MT: וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶת הָאֵשׁ; Slavonic над всеми Израильтянами; LXX (Rahlfs): ἐπὶ λοραηλ = Slavonic: над ѿлемъ.

<sup>24</sup> With regard to the relationship between the Slavonic and LXX as represented by Rahlfs, we see that of the variants noted two (6:2, 38) occur in sequences of text not included in Rahlfs (although only two, both in 6:2 [600/300 and founded / built], actually disagree with Rahlfs). Moreover, as already indicated, the Slavonic (based on Greek traditions that approximate to MT) has some other readings that agree with MT and not with Rahlfs, for example in 6:37=6:1с зѣи = MT ѿ :: Rahlfs (ἐν μηνί) Νισω; or at 5:32 / 18b=6:1b: ѿ каменосѣщцы геѡмѣстѣи = MT: וְהַבְּנִי, lacking in Rahlfs.

<sup>25</sup> Indeed, such a case is found in the material already presented. At the end of 1 Kings 5:18 (MT 5:32), the Synodal has и приготавлиали дерева и камни для строения дома [три года] 'and they prepared wood and stones for the construction of the house [(for) three years]', which represents neither the reading of MT, which does not include '(for) three years', nor that of the Slavonic, which has no equivalent to 'for the construction of the house', a sequence that is also missing in Rahlfs and Brenton, although Rahlfs indicates that it is found in slightly different forms in Hexaplaric and Lucanic sources.

<sup>26</sup> MT: וַיִּבְנוּ בְּיָמָיו הַמֶּלֶךְ הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי; LXX: ἐν ὧν χρόνῳ κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ἡμέρας = Slavonic: предъ гдѣмъ вѣомъ нашинъ, ѿ хрѣма, ѿбоже созда, ѿдѣи ѿ пѣл ѿ всеелѣса предъ гдѣмъ вѣомъ нашинъ; Synodal: предъ Господомъ Богомъ нашим; [и ели, и пили, и молились предъ Господомъ Богомъ нашим у построенного храма] — семь дней и еще семь дней, четырнадцать дней. *BHS* indicates that the LXX plus is found in the "original Greek text" (although it is not reflected in TgJon or Peshitta). Lopukhin, *Tolkovaya Bibliya*, 1.407-408, makes no comment. Note the Synodal's rendering of the Slavonic active construction ѿ

Another example can be seen at 1 Kings 18:33. There LXX (and Slavonic) has a much longer text than MT, but this text cannot strictly constitute a plus, as in LXX there is no mention of the ‘bullock’ of MT, whereas in MT there is no explicit mention of the ‘altar’ that is found twice in LXX.<sup>27</sup> In fact, the Synodal here incorporates only two of the extra words in the Slavonic.<sup>28</sup> In this case, one imagines that the Slavonic reviser realized, while attempting to incorporate what at first sight had appeared to be a simple plus, that in fact the texts were significantly different, and therefore restricted himself to the addition of a small sequence that, had it occurred in isolation, would indeed have represented a typical LXX/Slavonic plus.<sup>29</sup>

In any case, the result in both these examples is that the Synodal ends up providing a mixed text, either incorporating MT pluses with regard to LXX as well as LXX pluses with regard to MT; or selecting only those LXX variations from MT that fit into MT as apparent pluses!<sup>30</sup>

A mixed text can also arise when the Slavonic reviser fail to incorporate one plus but does incorporate another. For example, at the end of 18:37 the Slavonic has 'you have turned the heart of this people behind you' and Synodal has 'you have turned their heart [toward you]'.<sup>31</sup> There are two main points of note here: (1) 'of this people' has not been incorporated; (2) the bracketed form should not really be '*toward* you' but just 'you', as a preposition is present in both the Hebrew and the Greek/Slavonic traditions. The result is that, even on such a small scale, the Synodal reviser has not done justice to either MT or LXX/Slavonic.<sup>32</sup>

Our final example of a mixed text comes from 21:4 (LXX 20:4), where the Synodal transforms LXX's plus 'and the spirit of Ahab was troubled' into an adverbial clause, 'in a confused spirit', modifying 'he lay down'.<sup>33</sup> The aim of the Slavonic reviser was probably to fit the addition to the syntactic structure of the primary translation (from MT to Russian), but in so doing he created yet again a mixed text, representing neither MT nor Slavonic/LXX accurately.

Among other examples of mixed text arising from the Synodal reviser's labours are 18:36;<sup>34</sup> 21:27 (LXX 20:27);<sup>35</sup> and 22:19.<sup>36</sup>

храма, ἐποίησεν by the impersonal  $\gamma$  построенного храма (and its re-positioning in the sentence) as well as that of the participles  $\epsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\iota\ \eta\ \pi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\ \eta\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha$  by indicative forms:  $\epsilon\iota$  или,  $\epsilon\pi\iota$  пили,  $\epsilon\mu\omicron\lambda\iota$  молились.

<sup>27</sup> MT: ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τῇ ῥαβδί ἧς ἐκείνη ἔγραψεν; LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ἐστοίβασεν τὰς σχιδάκας ἐπὶ τὸ θυσι-  
αστήριον ὃ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐμέλισεν τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὰς σχιδάκας καὶ ἐστοίβασεν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον  
(Rahlfs notes only one significant ms. variant: ἐπέθηκεν τὰς σχιδάκας for ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὰς σχιδάκας) = Slavonic: и  
воскладе дрова на олтάρѣ, егоже сотвори, и растеса на ѡды всесожегашама, и возложи на дрова, и  
воскладе на олтάρѣ.

и положил дрова [на жертвенник], и рассек тельца, и возложил его на дрова.

<sup>29</sup> In fact, the reviser could easily have also added the following two words in the Slavonic: *εὐλόγε* *сотвори*.

<sup>30</sup> At 8:65 the Synodal's 'mixed text' is, coincidentally, reflected as well in Lucianic and Hexaplaric traditions (see Rahlfs).

<sup>31</sup> MT 18:37b: *ἡ γὰρ καρδία αὐτῶν ἠκολούθησεν τῇ σαρκί*; LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ οὐ ἐστρεψας τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου ὅπως (to which Lucian adds a final σου); Slavonic: *и ты ѡбрати́тъ ѣси́ сердце людіи о́ухо ѡблѣдѣ тебѣ*; Synodal: *и Ты обратишь сердце их [к Тебе]*.

<sup>32</sup> Note also in v. 37 that the Slavonic reviser has overlooked both ὉΡΗΜΕΥ (LXX: ἐπάκουσόν μου ἐν πυρί; MT: שמעו) and ΒΕΛ (ΒΕΛ ΜΕΛΑΪΕ ΕΪΗ; contrast LXX: ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, for which Rahlfs [or Weber] gives no variants; MT: (העם הזה)).

<sup>33</sup> 21:4b (MT): ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι ἔσθω· 20:4 (LXX [Rahlfs]): καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ πνεῦμα Αἰσαβ τεταραγμένον καὶ ἐκοίμηθη ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης αὐτοῦ καὶ συνεκάλυψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν ἄρτον; 21:4b (Slavonic): **И выстъ дръхъ аѡаѡѡ смущѣнъ, ѥ о҃упе на о҃дрѣ своѣмъ ѥ покрѹ лицѣ своѣ ѥ не ѡде хлѣба;** 21:4(b): Synodal: И [в смущенном духе] лег на постель свою, и отворотил лице свое, и хлеба не ел. The Slavonic follows the longer Greek text of Vaticanus and Lucian (see Rahlfs), which includes the first half of the verse according to MT, lacking in other Greek traditions. In the second half of the verse, LXX agrees with MT apart from καὶ συνεκάλυψεν for εἴσθω (see n. 23, above) and the additional clause at the beginning. (Note that the Slavonic renders both τεταραγμένον in this clause and συγκεχυμένος earlier in the verse as смущѣнъ ‘confused, perturbed.’)

<sup>34</sup> MT: וְהָיָה בַּשְּׁמִירָה הַזֶּה אֵלֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל הַיּוֹם וְדָעַת כִּי-אַתָּה אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאַתָּה עֲבָדְךָ.

LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ἀνεβόησεν Ἡλίου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ εἶπεν κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπάκουόν μου κύριε ἐπάκουόν μου σήμερον ἐν πυρὶ καὶ γνώτωσαν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ κἀγὼ δούλος σου καὶ διὰ σέ πεποιήκα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα.

Slavonic: **И** возопи ѿлаі на нѣо ѿ рече: гдѣ бже авраамовъ и ісаакъовъ и іаковъ, послѣдшій менѣ, гдѣ, послѣдшій менѣ анѣсь огнемъ, и да ѳуразмѣнтъ вси лбдіе сн, ѡкж ты єси гдѣ єдинъ іілевъ, и азъ рабъ твоѣ, и тебѣ радн сотворихъ дѣла сіа.

**Synodal:** Во время приношения вечерней жертвы подошел Илия пророк [и воззвал на небо] и сказал: Господи, Боже Авраамов, Исааков и Израилев! [Услышь меня, Господи, услышь меня ныне в огне!] Да познают в сей день [люди сии], что Ты один Бог в Израиле, и что я раб Твой и сделал всё по слову Твоему.

This is a rather complicated example. As *BHS* points out, LXX lacks the first clause of MT ('and it came to pass at the offering up of the *minchah*') and then diverges from MT in what is the second clause of MT and the first one of LXX. There MT has 'Elijah the prophet approached' and LXX, 'Elijah cried out to heaven'. Naturally, the verse starts with the same words in the Slavonic. However, the Slavonic reviser has converted the textual variation between MT and LXX here into a plus, and has thus once more created a mixed MT-LXX text: 'At the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, Elijah the prophet approached [and called out to heaven]'. The reviser then ignores the additional *καὶ* of LXX (and Slavonic; also Peshitta) between Ἀβρααμ and Ἰάκωβ (Ἰάκωβ), but includes in brackets an additional sentence from the Slavonic and LXX, which opens Elijah's invocation: 'Hear me, Lord, hear me today with fire!' (The same text, but without σήμερον / *днѣсь*, is found at the beginning of the next verse, 37, where MT lacks an equivalent to σήμερον and ἐν πυρὶ: *שמע ~ שמע*). This is unproblematic. The next plus we see marked in the Synodal is in the following clause, 'May [these people] recognize on this day' (for *שמעו*: *היום* 'today let it be known' of MT), from which the 'all' ('all this people') of the Slavonic and LXX has been inexplicably omitted. (Perhaps the reviser was influenced by Synodal's *Да познает народ сей* = MT: *היום היום שמעו* = LXX: *καὶ γνώτω ὁ λαὸς οὗτος*, in the next verse, 37; on the other hand, the Slavonic has *всѣ мѡдѣ сѣи* in both verses.) The additional (with respect to Slavonic and LXX) 'on this day' in the Synodal appears to have entered from the reviser's understanding of the preceding long bracketed sequence as a complete plus, rather than as overlapping, as it were, with *היום* in MT. The next clause of MT, 'that you are God in Israel' appears in the Slavonic as 'that you are the one Lord of Israel', which clearly lies behind the Synodal's 'that you are the one God in Israel'. Here the Slavonic has *Бог* (= MT's *עליון*) for the Slavonic's *гдѣ*, which in turn is only an incomplete rendering of LXX's *κύριος ὁ θεός*. Although Rahlfs gives no evidence for a reading consistent with the Synodal (or the Slavonic) in v. 36, at v. 37 he indicates that Alexandrinus does indeed add *μύσος*, and the Slavonic (v. 37: *іако ты єси (єдїнъ) гдѣ бгъ*) appears to derive from such a tradition. How the reading came to be in the Synodal is another matter. Perhaps the Slavonic reviser confused v. 36 with v. 37, from which he reproduced in the Synodal the *(єдїнъ)* of Slavonic, but without the brackets? Or perhaps the translator of MT for the Synodal here actually referred to the Greek or the Slavonic during the drafting process? The translators / editors of the Slavonic text itself appear to have attempted to harmonize vv. 36 and 37 as much as possible (contrast *да раздѣлїишъ, всѣ мѡдѣ сѣи*, and the addition of *єдїнъ* in both verses with the different forms found in each verse in the LXX).

<sup>35</sup> Here, LXX and MT appear to represent distinct editions of the text. Again the Slavonic reviser has inserted a bracketed sequence in the first part of the verse that has the effect of masking the more radical structural differences between MT and LXX / Slavonic — MT: ... וַתִּשָּׁק אֶת־רַגְלָיו בְּאֶרְצָה שֹׁפָף הָיָה; LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λόγου ὡς κατενύγη Αχάβ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐπορεύετο κλαίων καὶ διέρρηξεν ...; Slavonic: И вѣсть єгда ѻсѣиша ахавѣвъ словеса сїа, оумниисѧ Ѡ лица г҃аа, и ндѧше плачѧси, и раздрѧ...; Synodal: Вслушавъ все слова сии, Ахав [умилился пред Господом, ходил и плакал,] разодрал .... The Synodal's introduction of все (все слова сии) appears to be a mistake (not noted by Lopukhin, *Tolkovaya Bibliya*, 1471). The Slavonic's 'And when Ahab heard these words, he was silent from the face of the Lord' appears to be an attempt at a more idiomatic rendering of 'And on account of the word, Ahab was as it were pierced from the face of the face of the Lord'. (Synodal's пред Господом for Ѡ лица г҃аа, represents a further step along the path of idiomatic rendering.) At the end of the verse, the Slavonic follows a Hexaplaric tradition (see Rahlfs): и χοждаμε εκορρευθη (καὶ ἐπορεύθη κεκλιμένος), which matches MT's וַח רָחַץ. No further light is cast on these matters by Vulgata, Peshitta, or Tjon.

<sup>36</sup> Here the Synodal only registers just the first of three Slavonic / LXX pluses. The two missing pluses are οὐχ οὕτως εἶδον = не такъ: видѣхъ (MT: תִּכְרַךְ) and τὸν κύριον θεὸν ἱσραήλ = гдѣ бгд ѿнаеа (MT: אֱלֹהֵינוּ). Curiously, the first plus, [Михей] (also in Peshitta), is merely italicized (not bracketed) in the parallel at 2 Chron. 18:18, even though μιχαῖα occurs in the Slavonic text (but not in LXX; Rahlfs gives no variants). Synodal also contains a second bracketed sequence, [не так; не я, а] выслушай, which is not strictly a plus at all but a different

*Influence of parallel passages*

Occasionally, the Synodal makes changes within longer Slavonic pluses, sometimes under the influence of a parallel text in MT.<sup>37</sup> For example, at 2:35g, the Synodal says 'and he caused there to be incense on it before the Lord'. The words 'on it', that is on the previously-mentioned incense-altar, have no counterpart in the Slavonic or in the LXX.<sup>38</sup> Almost certainly, the additional на нем 'on it' has entered the Synodal from a parallel MT passage in 1 Kings 9:25, which includes the sequence אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי.<sup>39</sup> In this parallel passage, the difficult אֲשֶׁר<sup>40</sup> is rendered by Synodal as precisely 'on it'.<sup>41</sup>

A particularly striking example of the influence of a parallel text is found at 2:35l, where the Greek and Slavonic have 'Shimei son of Gera son of the seed of Iemen from Hebron', which appears in the Synodal as 'Shimei son of Gera son of a Iemenite from Bahurim', and this is broadly in line with the parallel at 2:8.<sup>42</sup>

A further example comes from 2:35b, where the Synodal's 'all the sons of east' in place of 'all the ancient sons' of the Slavonic (and LXX) has clearly been influenced by its rendering of קָדְמֵי-יָמֵינוּ in the MT parallel to this verse at 4:30 (MT 5:10).<sup>43</sup>

In all three cases we see that the Slavonic additions have not been incorporated in a mechanical fashion, but rather appear to have taken into account MT parallels from elsewhere in the primary translation of the Synodal. On the basis of the two passages examined, we can say that the revisers from the Synod's Bible translation committee placed consistency with broadly parallel passages from MT already found in

reading: Slavonic: не тѣмъ: не дѣмъ: сѣмѣи = LXX (Rahlfs): οὐχ οὕτως οὐκ ἐγὼ ἄκουε < (?) אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי. Although Lopukhin, *Tolkovaya Bibliya*, 1.475, comments on не тѣмъ for לִפְנֵי, he makes no specific observation on the Synodal's omissions (with regard to Slavonic/LXX) here.

<sup>37</sup> Excluded from discussion here are those passages where an approximation to an MT parallel already exists in the Slavonic, presumably on the basis of Greek traditions that converge more closely with MT. For example, at 1 Kings 12:2 a bracketed sequence in the Synodal reads и возвратился Иероваам из Египта. This clearly does not follow MT's וַיָּשָׁב יִרְמְיָהוּ (= Rahlfs 11:43: καὶ ἐκάθιστο ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ), but is instead consistent with Slavonic's и возврати́сѣа іероваамъ изъ єгѣпта and Alexandrinus's καὶ ἐπίστρεψεν Ιεροβοαμ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου (at 11:43), which appears to harmonize with the parallel in 2 Chron. 10:2 (MT: וַיָּשָׁב יִרְמְיָהוּ = LXX: καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν Ιεροβοαμ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου).

<sup>38</sup> LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ἐθυμία ἐνώπιον κυρίου = Slavonic: и кадыше предъ гдѣмъ; Synodal: и курение совершал на нем пред Господом;

<sup>39</sup> The parallel to 1 Kings 9:25 in 2 Chron. 8:12 is significantly different and lacks these words.

<sup>40</sup> Both John Gray, *I & II Kings* (Old Testament Library; Third rev. ed; London: SCM Press, 1977) 253, and Gwilym H. Jones, *I & 2 Kings* (New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans / London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984) 219, qualify אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי as "impossible" and instead accept the emendation אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי 'his offering by fire'; A. Jepsen [*BHS*] has "fir di" for the sequence, in part at least because it is absent from LXX at 2:35g.

<sup>41</sup> на нем (и курение на нем совершал). The Synodal's interpretation might well depend on KJV's "and he burnt incense upon the altar that was before the LORD" (cf. NJPS: "and he used to offer incense on the one that was before the LORD"; all three renderings can be broadly traced to TgJon and Peshitta: אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי).

<sup>42</sup> MT 2:8: וְשִׁמְיָהוּ בֶן-גֵּרָא בֶן-יֵמֶן מִחֶבְרוֹן; Synodal: Вот еще у тебя Семей, сын Геры Вениамитянина из Бахурима (the еще here is curious); LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ σοῦ Σεμεὶ υἱὸς Γηρα υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰεμεν ἐκ Βαουριμ = Slavonic: и сѣ, съ тобѣмъ сѣмѣй сынъ гирѣанъ сынъ іемениннъ ѿ бахурима; LXX (Rahlfs) 2:35l: ἰδοὺ μετὰ σοῦ Σεμεὶ υἱὸς Γηρα υἱὸς σπέρματος τοῦ Ἰεμινι ἐκ Χεβρων = Slavonic: сѣ, съ тобѣмъ сѣмѣй сынъ гирѣанъ, сынъ сѣмене іеменинна, ѿ хевруина; Synodal: вот у тебя Семей, сын Геры, сына Иеминина из Бахурима.

<sup>43</sup> 2:35b: И Соломон имел разум выше разума всех сынов востока и всех мудрых Египтян (LXX: καὶ ἐπληθύνθη ἡ φρόνησις Σαλωμων σφόδρα ὑπὲρ τὴν φρόνησιν πάντων ἀρχαίων υἱῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας φρονίμους Αἰγύπτου; и исполни́сѣа рѣзѣма соломѣннъ паче рѣзѣма дрѣвниихъ сынѣвъ и паче всѣхъ мѣдарыхъ єгѣпетскихъ; note the Slavonic's 'Egyptian sages' for LXX's 'sages of Egypt' and the omission, with Lucian [according to Rahlfs], of an equivalent for σφόδρα). MT 5:10: מְלָכִים וְעַמְּמֵי-לְבָבוֹתָם מִכָּל-עַמְּמֵי-לְבָבוֹתָם; Synodal 4:30: И была мудрость Соломона выше мудрости всех сынов востока и всей мудрости Египтян; LXX: καὶ ἐπληθύνθη Σαλωμων σφόδρα ὑπὲρ τὴν φρόνησιν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας φρονίμους Αἰγύπτου; Slavonic: и ѿмножи́сѣа мѣдрость соломѣнова зѣлаѡ, паче смѣсла всѣхъ дрѣвниихъ челоуѣкъ и паче всѣхъ смѣсленныхъ єгѣпетскихъ.

the primary translation over the reproduction of small differences in the Slavonic version of such parallel passages. The level of consistency achieved between parallel passages was far from complete, however.<sup>44</sup>

A striking example of this policy of 'harmonization over translation' is to be seen at the end of 10:26, where LXX reads a bracketed plus that corresponds to the addition in the parallel text in the MT of 2 Chron. 9:26.<sup>45</sup> In the Synodal, the bracketed sequence in Kings differs slightly from the text in Chronicles.<sup>46</sup> However, the Slavonic differs more significantly between these two parallel texts,<sup>47</sup> and it appears that the Slavonic reviser of the Synodal has based his insertion at 1 Kings 10:26 on the rendering of the MT parallel at 2 Chron. 9:26, rather than actually translating the Slavonic text of 1 Kings 10:26.<sup>48</sup>

Other examples of the influence of parallel texts on the Slavonic revision of the Synodal can be seen at 2:35m<sup>49</sup> and n.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>44</sup> In the examples already given, note how the word order in the Synodal's rendering of the relevant phrase in 2:35g differs from that of 9:25, and that in 2:35i сына Иеминиина is used (cf. Slavonic: сынъ сѣмене іеменіина), instead of Вениамитянин(а), as found in 2:8 (cf. MT: בְּנֵימִינִי). At 2:35b, apart from the inconsistency between разум in 2:35b and мудрость at 4:30 (5:10), the Synodal's choice of Египтян (rather than Египта) for עִרְצָא might reflect a reverse harmonization with 2:35b (unless the rendering at 4:30 was independently influenced by Clementina's sapientiam omnium Orientalium et Aegyptiorum), and the Synodal's choice of выше (rather than больше) to express the verb עָלָה at 4:30 might also reflect harmonization with its use of the same adjective at 2:35. Difficult to explain is the Synodal's rendering of ѿ исполниша рѣзѣма соломѣнь (2:35) as И Соломон имел разум, especially as the Slavonic's construction here (ѿ исполниша рѣзѣма соломѣнь) is parallel to that of 4:30 (ѿ ѿмножиша мѣдрость соломѣнова), where MT (5:10) has מִלְכָּה מִלְכָּה מִלְכָּה (Synodal: И была мудрость Соломона выше). At 4:30/5:10, the Slavonic again appears to match a Lucianic (and Hexaplaric) form of the text, in which, consistent with MT's מִלְכָּה מִלְכָּה, ἡ σοφία is supplied as subject of ἐπληθύνθη. In 2:8 and 2:35m, there is an unnecessary distinction between between как and когда in the two verses (когда / как я шел в Маханаим), especially as the Slavonic uses въ дѣнь въ онѣже in both. A further example of lack of harmonization between parallels in the translation of MT and that of the Slavonic pluses is seen when comparing 2:35i and 9:18, where there is inconsistency in the Synodal's representation of a place name: Валалаф (2:35i) and Ваалаф (9:18 and in the parallel at 2 Chron. 8:6). Here, the first form reproduces the Slavonic валааѣръ (2:35i and 2 Chron. 8:6), which in turn reflects a Hexaplaric tradition (see Rahlfs at 2:35i, where Βααλαφ is found in the main text and at 2 Chron. 8:6). The Slavonic is itself inconsistent, having валааѣръ at 9:18, the form that exactly matches the Greek of the other verse (2:35i)! (9:18 is lacking in Rahlfs's main text of LXX, but Origen here reads Βολαφ rather than the Βααλαφ of 2:35i.). A more substantial case of inconsistency between parallels can be seen when comparing 2:35h, where the number of foremen is 3600 in the Synodal (and Slavonic and LXX), with 5:16 (MT 5:30), where the corresponding number in the Synodal is 3300. (LXX and Slavonic have 3600, consistent with 2:35h.)

<sup>45</sup> וְהָיָה מִשָּׁל בְּכָל-מַלְכֵי מִצְרָיִם וְעַד-מִצְרָיִם וְעַד-נְבוֹל צָרְסִים (2 Chron. 9:26) = LXX (Rahlfs) 1 Kings 10:26a: καὶ ἦν ἡγούμενος πάντων τῶν βασιλείων ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ ἕως γῆς ἀλλοφύλων καὶ ἕως ὁρίων Αἰγύπτου (2 Chron. 9:26 differs only in its use of the singular ὁρίου). A similar sequence is found at MT 5:1, מִצָּרִים וְעַד נְבוֹל צָרְסִים וְעַד מִצְרָיִם וְעַד מִלְכָּה מִלְכָּה מִלְכָּה מִלְכָּה = LXX (Rahlfs) 2:46k: καὶ ἦν ἄρχων ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ ἕως γῆς ἀλλοφύλων καὶ ἕως ὁρίων Αἰγύπτου. However, the long Septuagintal plus at 1 Kings 2:46 is absent from the Slavonic, and, therefore, the Synodal, as already noted. The addition at 1 Kings 10:26 is not found in the Vulgata, TgJon, or Peshitta.

<sup>46</sup> 2 Chron. 9:26: и господствовал он над всеми царями от реки Евфрата до земли Филистимской и до пределов Египта; 2 Kings 10:26: ... над всеми морями от реки до земли ...

<sup>47</sup> 2 Chron. 9:26: ѿ бѣтъ вѣждѣ всѣхъ царей ѿ рѣкѣ (ѿевфрата) дѣже до землѣ ѿнопаемѣнникъ ѿ дѣже до предѣла ѿгнѣтскнхъ; 1 Kings 10:26: ѿ бѣ властелѣннъ всѣмъ царемъ ѿ рѣкѣ ѿ до землѣ ѿнопаемѣнникъ ѿ до предѣла ѿгнѣта.

<sup>48</sup> On the other hand, the insertion of italicized *Евфрата* in Chronicles, but not in Kings, almost certainly indicates checking (of Chronicles) against the Slavonic, where this word occurs in brackets.

<sup>49</sup> LXX 2:8, 35m: εἰς Περυβολὸς 'into "Camp(s)'" (Rahlfs notes no variants in either place; cf. Clementina: ad Castra); Slavonic: въ полкѣ; Synodal в Маханаим; MT (2:8): עִרְצָא. Here the Synodal has correctly interpreted the Slavonic's въ полкѣ as 'into Mahanaim', on the basis of the parallel text at 2:8, rather than attempting to translate it in some other way.

<sup>50</sup> At 2:35n (Rahlfs's numbering), the Synodal renders just as at 2:8: но он вышел навстречу мне у Иордана (MT 2:8: וְהָיָה כִּי יֵצֵא מִן הַיַּרְדֵּן לִקְרַאתִי וְהָיָה עָלַי). The Synodal's non-literal rendering of עָלַי (καταβαῖν) is characteristic of its translational style at least in 3 Kingdoms, where each of the seven instances of עָלַי (Qal) is rendered contextually.

However, such attempts to harmonize could also lead those working on the Slavonic additions astray. For example, at 1 Kings 2:35f, the LXX (Rahlfs, Brenton) begins and ends with virtually the same phrase: 'and he built the citadel ... then he built the citadel'. The Slavonic matches the LXX exactly, but the Synodal differs from the Slavonic (and the LXX) at the end of the sequence, firstly by using a different noun and secondly by adding an adverbial clause absent from LXX: 'and he built the citadel ... then Solomon built a wall around the city'. The ending here might reflect an attempt by the Synodal revisers to harmonize with the ending of 3:1, a broadly parallel verse concerned with Solomon's building activities in connection with his marriage to Pharaoh's daughter, which also concludes with the words 'a wall around Jerusalem'.<sup>51</sup>

#### *Omission of brackets*

Occasionally a Septuagintal and Slavonic plus has apparently been incorporated by the Synodal, without brackets. In such cases, of course, without further evidence about the translation process we cannot be sure whether the Slavonic reviser overlooked the brackets, or whether they were omitted in the printing process, or whether the plus had already been incorporated, mistakenly we might say, by the primary translator (Pavskii or Makarii) or during the checking of the primary translation. An example of the third category probably occurs at 1 Kgs 3:15, where for the last clause the Synodal has 'and he made a *great* feast for all his servants'. Although the 'great' here appears to represent a Slavonic and Septuagintal plus over MT, a second plus '... for himself and for all his servants' is absent.<sup>52</sup> In this case, it seems unlikely that the Synodal's rendering represents, on the one hand, a double oversight — i.e. omission of brackets around the first plus and omission of the second plus altogether — or, on the other hand, a standard rendering of  $\pi\tau\omega\phi$ .<sup>53</sup> Rather, it might be that the primary translator or the reviewer was (mistakenly) influenced by the Clementina (or, more likely, a translation of that), which reflects the first plus only, just as in the Synodal: et fecit ... *grande* convivium universis famulis suis.<sup>54</sup> If so, the Slavonic reviser, comparing simply the Slavonic text with the new Russian translation in front of him cannot be blamed too harshly for the omission of brackets in a plus that did not appear at first glance to be one. Having said that, it is clear that the Slavonic reviser also overlooked the following 'for himself and' ( $\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \eta$  = LXX  $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ ), which should have been incorporated.

#### *Pluses not incorporated*

On other occasions, verses have not been changed at all, even though there are pluses in the Slavonic (and LXX). A clear example is at 1 Kings 22:38, where the Synodal follows MT closely and the Slavonic reviser has not added two potential pluses from Slavonic/LXX: 'pigs and dogs' for 'dogs' on their own in the Synodal (and MT) and 'washing themselves in his blood' for 'they washed' (transitive) in the Synodal (and

---

Note that the Synodal's identical renderings mean that it does not preserve the slight difference in verb complementation in the Slavonic (and Greek) version of the two texts — Slavonic 2:8:  $\eta\ \tau\omicron\gamma\eta\ \sigma\eta\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\ \eta\alpha$ ; 2:35n:  $\epsilon\gamma\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon\ \mu\eta\ \eta\alpha\ \iota\omicron\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ ; LXX (Rahlfs): 2:8:  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\beta\eta\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\pi\alpha\nu\tau\eta\nu\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$ ; 2:35n:  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\beta\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\pi\alpha\nu\tau\eta\nu\ \mu\omicron\iota$ . The distinction between aorist and imperfect is not maintained in the Slavonic, (although according to the apparatus of Rahlfs many mss. have the aorist at 2:35n as well as at 2:8).

<sup>51</sup> LXX (Rahlfs) 2:35f:  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\ \dots\ \tau\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \omega\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu$  (Rahlfs indicates no variants) = Slavonic:  $\eta\ \sigma\omicron\zeta\alpha\delta\ \kappa\tau\alpha\epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\ \dots\ \tau\omicron\gamma\alpha\delta\ \sigma\omicron\zeta\alpha\delta\ \kappa\tau\alpha\epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon$ ; Synodal: и построил замок ... тогда построил Соломон стену вокруг города; MT 3:1:  $\וַיִּבְנֶה סָבִיב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל עִיר וְחָמֶה$  ...  $\וַיִּבְנֶה$  = Synodal: доколе не построил ... стены вокруг Иерусалима. In any case, other parallel passages to 2:35f (9:24 and 11:27) do not contain any obvious equivalent to the Synodal's wording at the end. Note that at 2:35f, the Synodal chooses to use замок rather than the transcription Милло found at 9:24 and 11:27.

<sup>52</sup> MT:  $\וַיִּשְׂכַּח מִן־הַיַּיִן וַיִּשְׁכַּח מִן־הַיַּיִן$  (the sequence is missing in the 2 Chron. 2:13 parallel); LXX (Rahlfs):  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu\ \mu\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ; Slavonic:  $\eta\ \sigma\omicron\tau\tau\omicron\rho\eta\ \pi\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\ \nu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\eta\ \sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \eta\ \nu\sigma\epsilon\mu\eta$ ;  $\omicron\tau\tau\omicron\rho\kappa\omega\mu\eta\ \sigma\omega\gamma\eta\mu\eta$ ; Synodal: и сделал большой пир для всех слуг своих.

<sup>53</sup> Contrast 1 Sam. 25:36 and 2 Sam. 3:20, where on three occasions  $\pi\tau\omega\phi$  is rendered in the Synodal by пир alone.

<sup>54</sup> Contrast *Nova Vulgata*, which correctly omits the *grande*.

MT).<sup>55</sup> Another example of the Synodal's omission of a plus found in LXX and Slavonic can be seen at 2:28.<sup>56</sup>

Elsewhere, there has been only a partial incorporation of the Slavonic's pluses, even in the absence of parallel passages. 1 Kings 14:26 is one of several places in which the Synodal includes only one of two or more Slavonic pluses.<sup>57</sup> It is difficult to ascribe such omissions to anything other than the incompetence, albeit momentary, of the reviser.<sup>58</sup> Other examples can be seen at 2:29;<sup>59</sup> 12:1;<sup>60</sup> and 16:33.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>55</sup> MT: *וְהַכֹּלֹּס הַלְלִים אֲחֻזֵּי הַיָּד הָרָחֵץ קִדְּרָם אֶת־אֶשֶׁר דִּבֶּר*; LXX: αἱ ὕες καὶ οἱ κύνες; Slavonic: сѣннїи ѥ пси; Synodal: псы; LXX: ἐλούσαντο ἐν τῷ αἵματι; Slavonic: *нѣмышаша въ кровѣ* ἐν; Synodal: омывали. Note that the Synodal's omission of the pluses here is consistent with its omission of similar LXX pluses at 21:19. With regard to the MT of 22:38, Keil says all that is necessary: "When they washed the chariot at the pool of Samaria, the dogs licked his blood, while the harlots were bathing (in the pool). הַיָּד הָרָחֵץ is a circumstantial clause, and יָדָה means to bathe, as in Ex. 2:5. This explanation, which is sustained by the grammar and is the only tenable one, disposes of the several arbitrary interpretations of these words". TgJon, Peshitta, and KJV interpret הַיָּד הָרָחֵץ as הַיָּדָה 'and the armour, weapons' (see Gray, *I & II Kings*, 448, 455), as the object of רָחַץ. Peshitta reverses the order of the 'dogs' and the 'prostitutes' / 'weapons'.

<sup>56</sup> MT: צָהֳרַיִם = Synodal: до Иоавы; LXX (Rahlfs): ὥς ἰωάβ τοῦ υἱοῦ Σαρουίς = Slavonic: до іωάва сына сарвіна.

<sup>57</sup> The Synodal has a bracketed sequence between и сокровища дома царского (MT: πρὸ πύργῳ τῇ τρεῖς) and Всѣ взял (MT: πρὶ λήπται): [и золотые шиты, которые взял Давид от рабов Адраазара, царя Сувского, и внес в Иерусалим]. This matches (with one exception presented in the next note) the Slavonic text: и сокровища домѣ царевѣ, и купѣла царѣвѣ, ѡже взѣ давидѣ иже рече ѡтроковѣхъ адраазара царѣ сувскаго и внесѣ ѡ во іерушлѣмъ: всѣ цѣлѣ взѣл. The Slavonic in turn follows the Greek of Alexandrinus (and Rahlfs) exactly, καὶ τοὺς θησαυροὺς οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τὰ δόρατα τὰ χρυσὰ ἃ ἔλαβεν Δαυὶδ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν παίδω Αδρααζαρ βασιλέως Σουβα καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτὰ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὰ πάντα ἔλαβεν, even down to the omission of καὶ at the beginning of the last clause, which Synodal has followed instead of entirely reverting to MT (λήπται) at this point. However, at the end of the verse Slavonic has an additional plus, ѡже сотворѣ соломонѣ, и внесѣ ѡ во ѳνѣпетъ (cf. MT: πρὸ πύργῳ for which Alexandrinus lacks an equivalent), which follows a correction found in Vaticanus (καὶ ἀπήνεγκεν αὐτὰ εἰς Αἴγυπτον, the same sequence found at Dan 1:2, but with εἰς Βαβυλῶνα). But this plus is not registered in the Synodal.

<sup>58</sup> Moreover, in this verse there is also a mistake in the representation of the plus that is included. Synodal's золотые шиты for LXX's τὰ δόρατα τὰ χρυσα and the Slavonic's кѡпѣа златѣа most probably results from confusion with и все золотые шиты, которые сделал Соломон (in the Synodal's translation of MT) on the part of one of the Slavonic editors of the Synodal, although it is just possible that the revisers have harmonized in line with 2 Sam. 8:7 (noted by Lopukhin, *Tolkovaya Bibliya*, 1.436): וְיָדָהּ אֶת הַלְוִיִּם אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ אֵל בְּכֹרֵי הַדְּבָרִים וְיָבִיאָם עִמָּהּ (Synodal: И взял Давид золотые шиты ..., here LXX has τοὺς χλιδῶνας τοὺς χρυσοὺς and Slavonic, correspondingly, ꙗꙋныи златѣа). Curiously in the parallel text at 2 Chron. 12:9 (where there are no LXX pluses and MT differs from 2 Kings only in omitting a -י and a דָּבָר: וְיָבִיאָם אֲחֵיהֶם עִמָּהּ לְקָרְבָן לַיהוָה), the Synodal has a slightly different wording: всѣ взяли онъ, взяли и шиты золотые.

59 At the beginning of the verse, where MT has  $\pi\alpha\sigma\omega\ \gamma\lambda\omega\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\omega$ , LXX (Rahlfs) has  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\pi\eta\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\ \tau\omega\ \Sigma\alpha\lambda\omega\mu\omega\upsilon\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ; a little further, instead of  $\pi\alpha\sigma\omega\ \gamma\lambda\omega\varsigma$ , LXX has  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ . There then follows a third, lengthy, plus,  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \Sigma\alpha\lambda\omega\mu\omega\upsilon\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \iota\omega\alpha\beta\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\iota}\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\upsilon\epsilon\gamma\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omega\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\tau\eta\rho\iota\kappa\iota\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\upsilon\ \iota\omega\alpha\beta\ \theta\iota\ \epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\theta\eta\tau\eta\ \alpha\pi\acute{o}\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\tau\omega\upsilon\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\gamma\chi\omega\mu\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omega\upsilon$ . The end of the verse, LXX has a third instruction to Benaiah:  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ . The only difference in the Slavonic is the addition of  $\varphi\acute{\alpha}\rho\beta$  before  $\sigma\omicron\lambda\omicron\mu\omega\mu\acute{\eta}\eta$  in the third plus. However, of these four pluses, the only one incorporated in the Synodal is the one at the end: [и похорони его].

<sup>60</sup> Here the Synodal does not include LXX's additional βασιλεύς (also in the Slavonic) even though exactly the same plus is correctly incorporated two verses later (12:3).

<sup>61</sup> In this case the Slavonic text, *и приложѣ аѡаѡѣ творѣти прогнѣванїа, ѣже разгнѣвати г҃а б҃га їйлева и дѡшъ своѣхъ погнѣтити*, is derived from an LXX tradition used by (inter alios) Brenton: *καὶ προσέθηκεν Ἀχάβ τὸ πούλησαι παροργίσματα τοῦ κυρίου τὸν θεὸν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἐξολοθρευθῆναι*. Rahlfs has a slightly different Greek text, which lacks *τὸν κυρίον τὸν θεὸν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ* καὶ: *καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐξολοθρευθῆναι*. The Synodal has *Ахав делал то, что раздражает Господа Бога Израилева, [и погубил душу свою]*, which omits the less significant plus represented by *παροργίσματα* / *прогнѣванїа* (cf. *BHS*).

*Incorporated pluses unattested in Rahlfs*

Some bracketed additions in the Synodal do indeed represent pluses (with respect to MT) in the Slavonic, but are not evidenced in the LXX or Vulgata (at least according to the apparatus of Rahlfs and Weber). This is reasonably strong evidence that the Synodal revisers did not actually refer to the LXX before incorporating pluses; rather, it was simply assumed that any differences between the Slavonic and Synodal/MT automatically represented Greek or Latin readings.<sup>62</sup> An example of such a phenomenon is found at 1 Kings 8:59, where the Synodal includes a bracketed 'today' on the basis of the Slavonic, although there is no evidence cited by Rahlfs or Weber for such a reading.<sup>63</sup>

It is, in any case, clear that the Slavonic translates the LXX in a form that often differs from the one found in Rahlfs, with a tendency towards a more MT-type of text as represented by Origen and/or Lucian. Probably we may assume that the edition of the LXX used by the revisers of the so-called Elizabethan Bible (1751) was not more recent than the one made available to the translators of the Synodal version, namely the Leipzig edition of 1697.<sup>64</sup>

For example, at the beginning of 1 Kings 14:16 (no parallel in 2 Chronicles), the Clementina, like the Slavonic, give an explicit subject to MT's  $\text{וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת דָּוִיד אֶת הַמִּלְחָמָה} \text{ et tradet Dominus Israel.}$  The addition is marked by brackets in the Synodal. As the verses corresponding to MT's 14:1-20 are absent in LXX, the Slavonic's text for these verses appears to derive from Origen's translation of the Hebrew, provided by Rahlfs, and incorporated in Alexandrinus, and Origen's text includes at v. 16, an additional  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>65</sup>

Other examples are to be found at the end of 12:30,<sup>66</sup> at the very beginning of 22:48 (MT: 22:49),<sup>67</sup> and towards the end of v. 51 (MT 22:52).<sup>68</sup> 12:3 is a particularly complicated case.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>62</sup> See the quotation from Chistovich in n. 6, above; see also Alexeev, 'Masoretic Text', 21-22, for the influence of the Clementina on the Ostrog Bible (the first printed edition) of 1581 (which was based on the 1499 Novgorod manuscript Bible compiled under the supervision of Archbishop Genady; see <http://ksana-k.narod.ru/Book/alekseev/02/87.htm> [23 November 2010]).

<sup>63</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת דָּוִיד אֶת הַמִּלְחָמָה} \text{ Synodal: слова сии, которыми я молился [ныне] пред Господом; Slavonic: словеса сіа, ѿиже молихса предъ гдѣмъ бгѣмъ нашимъ днѣсь; LXX (Rahlfs): οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὗς δεδῆμαι ἐνώπιον κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν. The incorporation of the Slavonic plus in this verse might be connected with its omission at v. 56 (see above). The plus is not reflected in TgJon or Peshitta. Another example is the Synodal's additional [и пей] (following  $\text{и пей}$  of Slavonic) at the end of 19:5 and 19:7 (where the extra word is also reflected in Peshitta). Here, however, the Slavonic might simply represent an exegetical harmonization to vv. 6 and 8. Another possible case of harmonization may be seen halfway through v. 5, where the Slavonic's  $\text{гдѣнь}$  could have resulted from harmonization with v. 7 (MT ~  $\text{גדל}$ ). Rahlfs, which, like the Leipzig edition (see below), reads  $\text{v}\bar{\iota}\varsigma$  at v. 5, gives no support for  $\text{ἄγγελος κυρίου}$  at v. 5. However, the fact that MT has  $\text{וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה}$  in both verses (Vulgata: angelus domini) suggests that here the Slavonic reflects a Hebraizing recension of LXX.$

<sup>64</sup> See Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 337. Although Chistovich's statement seems to refer to the members of the Synod's Bible translation committee, and, hence, to the Synodal Bible as a whole, it appears directly after some detailed references to LXX / MT differences in Psalms, and so it might be that this edition was in practice used only in revising the Psalter and in revising, or drafting translations of, the deuterocanonical books. In any case, the Leipzig edition does not include additional readings found in the Slavonic at 8:59 or 19:5, 7. Through the good offices of Marja Kartano of the Institute for Bible Translation (IBT), Helsinki, I was able to consult this volume, *He palaia diatheke kata tous hebdomekonta (Biblia graece utriusque Testamenti)* (Lipsiae, 1697), at the National Library in Helsinki.

<sup>65</sup> In the Synodal, the plus appears as follows:  $\text{и предастъ [Господь] Израиля.}$  Origen's asterisk-ed text (in the apparatus to Rahlfs) is  $\text{καὶ παραδώσει κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ}$ , perhaps copied from an identical sequence at 1 Sam. 28:19 (MT:  $\text{וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת דָּוִיד אֶת הַמִּלְחָמָה}$ ). Note that TgJon also includes the tetragrammaton (although this does not necessarily reflect its overt presence in TgJon's base text), but this is not found in Peshitta. Curiously, the Clementina's plus is also found in Nova Vulgata.

<sup>66</sup> The Synodal includes the bracketed plus 'and they left the house of the Lord':  $\text{[и оставили храм Господень]} = \text{LXX: καὶ εἶσαν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου.}$  This plus, not found in the main edition of Rahlfs, is noted in Rahlfs apparatus as being represented by many manuscripts, and is also found in the Leipzig edition and in that of Brenton (based on Vaticanus). However, although there is no Vulgata or Peshitta evidence for it and no parallel in 2 Chron. 10, Rahlfs indicates that a different additional sequence is found in Lucian,  $\text{καὶ πρὸ προσώπου τῆς ἄλλης εἰς Βαιθηλ}$ , and this forms the basis of a proposed insertion into MT by BHS (and by Gray, *I & II Kings*, 313). The two Greek pluses might in fact be simply variants of one another, with οἶκον κυρίου ultimately deriving, like the Lucianic Βαιθηλ, from Hebrew  $\text{בית יי}$ .

*Slavonic brackets reproduced in the Synodal*

The mechanical nature of much of the Slavonic reviser's work is indicated by the occasional reproduction in the Synodal of bracketed sequences that are found, bracketed, in the Slavonic itself. An example is found at 1 Kings 8:56. Moreover, in this verse, the reviser has overlooked an actual Slavonic (and Septuagintal) plus ('today').<sup>70</sup>

Somewhat similar remarks apply to 18:24. First the Synodal gives no indication that in the sequence 'the name of the Lord my God' 'my God' represents an addition to MT.<sup>71</sup> On the other hand, the Synodal does use brackets around another sequence at the end of the verse, 'may it be so'. However, this bracketed sequence does not correspond with the addition in LXX: 'good is the word that you spoke'; as against 'good is the word' in MT.<sup>72</sup> The Synodal's text here clearly derives from the Slavonic, which in turn is based on the LXX but with some additions and changes. Instead of 'good is the word that you spoke' of LXX, the Slavonic has 'good is the word (of Elijah), which he spoke. (May it be so).' Unless the bracketed 'of Elijah' and 'May it be so' are derived from some Greek or Latin source not listed in Rahlfs or Weber, they would appear to be explanatory, exegetical, or homiletic expansions, the second of which has mistakenly been incorporated into the Synodal as though it were a Septuagintal plus. The final result is that at the end of the verse the Synodal corresponds to neither the MT nor the LXX (nor to MT plus LXX) nor to the Slavonic, but represents rather a curious hybrid form.

1 Kings 18:26, then, is indicative of the patchy nature of the work of the Slavonic revisers of the Synodal. In one case, a Slavonic plus that matches a Septuagintal one is incorporated but not marked by brackets and in another, a Slavonic bracketed sequence is incorporated as though it corresponded to a Septuagintal plus.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Verses 47-50 are lacking in Rahlfs (and the Leipzig edition). In v. 48 (49), the Synodal's '[King] Jehoshaphat' is taken from the Slavonic, which in turn appears to follow the Hexaplar addition, as provided by Rahlfs' apparatus. MT:  $\text{יְהוֹשָׁפָט}$ ; Synodal: [Царь] Иосафат; Slavonic: Царь же ѿ ѿсафатъ; Clementina (and Nova Vulgata): rex vero Iosaphat. Neither TgJon nor Peshitta includes this plus.

<sup>68</sup> Here, the Leipzig edition and Brenton have an additional 'in Samaria', not present in Rahlfs or noted by him or Weber:  $\text{ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ δύο ἔτη}$ . Slavonic:  $\text{надъ ѿиленъ въ самаріи лѣта двѣ}$ ; Synodal: и царствовал над Израилем [в Самарии] два года. The addition is not attested in Peshitta or TgJon.

<sup>69</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיִּשְׁלַח וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשָׁפָט וְכָל־הָעָם וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּבְרְכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּבְרְכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל$ . For this, LXX (Rahlfs and Leipzig) has a much shorter text:  $\text{καὶ ἐλάλησεν ὁ λαὸς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ροβοᾶμ λέγοντες}$ , which effectively corresponds to an expanded version of the final clause of MT ( $\text{וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּבְרְכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל$ ). The Slavonic precedes this with another text that very closely matches the first part of MT:  $\text{и послала за ним и призвали его. Тогда Иеровоам и все собрание Израильтъян пришли и говорили [царю] Ровоаму и сказали}$ , is a fairly literal rendering of MT along with the addition of the Slavonic's  $\text{цѣрь}$  (LXX:  $\text{βασιλεύς}$ ). But in this way the Synodal gives the impression that LXX simply provides a slightly fuller text than MT, not that it actually follows a different text (or, in this case, more precisely a different ordering of the text, in respect of 11:43 and 12:2).

<sup>70</sup> The Synodal's  $\text{благословенъ Господь [Бог], Который дал покой}$  reflects the Slavonic's  $\text{бл҃гвѣнъ гдѣ (бгъ) а҃нѣсь, ꙗ҃же даде ꙗ҃коу}$  (MT:  $\text{בָּרַךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַיּוֹם וְעַד־עַד}$ ; LXX:  $\text{εὐλογητὸς κύριος σήμερον ὃς ἔδωκεν κατάπαυσιν}$ ). Rahlfs and Weber note no variants here and there is no parallel text in 2 Chron. 7. The bracketed addition might, therefore, have functioned as a liturgical expansion in the Slavonic, with no basis in the Slavonic's *Vorlagen*. However, an additional 'God' does appear in Peshitta ( $\text{ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܝܪܡܝܐ}$ ), which in turn might have depended on a Greek or Latin source of which the Slavonic translators and revisers were also aware.

<sup>71</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשָׁפָט וְכָל־הָעָם וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּבְרְכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל$ ; LXX (Rahlfs):  $\text{καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπικαλέσομαι ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ μου}$  = Slavonic:  $\text{ѿ азъ прѣзовѣ ѿма гдѣ бгѣ моєгѡ}$  (also in Peshitta and in some traditions of Vulgata) = Synodal: а я призову имя Господа Бога моего.

<sup>72</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּבְרְכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַיּוֹם וְעַד־עַד}$ ; LXX (Leipzig, Rahlfs):  $\text{καλὸν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησας}$  (Rahlfs indicates no variants; although the LXX might be reflected in the Syriac  $\text{ܕܝܠܐܠܗܐ ܕܝܝܪܡܝܐ}$ , Weber gives no indication that it is found in the Latin, despite the note in BHS); Synodal: хорошо, [пусть будет так];  $\text{добрѣ глагола (ѿи́нъ)}$ ,  $\text{ѿбоже глагола (да бѣдетъ такъ)}$ .

<sup>73</sup> Additionally, another Slavonic bracketed plus ( $\text{ѿи́нъ}$ ) is not incorporated (although this, of course, is not an error, only an inconsistency).

*Other mistaken use of brackets*

Because they were comparing like with unlike, that is to say, a translation of the Hebrew Bible with another from the Greek, the Slavonic revisers sometimes made other mistakes in their use of brackets. In at least one case, this has led to Russian-speaking Protestants being provided with a text from which not only genuine Slavonic pluses had been removed, but also an incorrectly bracketed section of MT.<sup>74</sup>

*Conclusions*

From our study of the Synodal's bracketed sequences in 3 Kingdoms, the following conclusions may be drawn (always bearing in mind that they might not be equally valid for other books of the Synodal).

1. The bracketed sequences in the Synodal represent pluses over MT from the Slavonic. Only to the extent that the Slavonic is itself a translation of LXX may the Synodal's bracketed sequences be said to represent LXX.

2. To the extent that the Slavonic does represent LXX, it often does so according to traditions that tended toward convergence with MT.

3. In general, only pluses are incorporated. Slavonic minuses (with regard to MT) are not noted. Variant readings of individual words in the Slavonic (e.g. Jacob for Isaac) do not replace those in the translation of MT, and there seems to be no clear policy behind the footnoting of just two such variants but not of others.<sup>75</sup>

4. Just as there is no (or very little) evidence that the Synodal's Bible translation committee used the LXX or that they adopted Slavonic readings beyond simple pluses, so also there is no evidence that they employed the LXX (either directly or via the Slavonic) for their interpretation of the MT. The limited evidence generally goes against such a hypothesis. Even when a strikingly different LXX/Slavonic interpretation stared the committee in the face it was not adopted in place of the rendering found in the primary translation from MT.

An example already mentioned is 'sons of the east' and 'ancient sons' at 2:35b,<sup>76</sup> and another example may be seen at 18:24. Here, at the beginning of the verse the Synodal interprets MT's שם אלהים as

---

<sup>74</sup> In the case in point, the Synodal places a sequence in brackets, apparently simply because of a difference in verse division between MT and Slavonic (and the LXX tradition that underlies it here, which differs from Rahlfs but is close to the text of Brenton), even though it is present in the Hebrew text. At 1 Kings 3:1, the Synodal's bracketed Когда утвердилось царство в руках Соломона clearly corresponds to the Slavonic's *Ѹра́дѣ же ца́рство утверди́ся въ рѹцѣхъ соломѹны* in the same verse and also to וְהַמֶּלֶךְ יָסֻדָּה בְּיַד־שְׁלֹמֹה, which occurs at the end of the preceding verse, 2:46b, in MT. Consequently, what is the first clause of 3:1 according to the Slavonic (and the last clause of 2:46 according to MT) has been mistakenly marked as a 'plus' in the Synodal and, unfortunately, removed from the 'Protestant' edition of the Synodal Bible!

<sup>75</sup> According to Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 337, there was such a policy: "Accepting the one text and the other as of equal value but at the same time encountering different and hard to reconcile readings the publishers indicate these differences only in those passages that have special significance in ecclesiastical usage." However, the examples used by Chistovich in illustration are all from the Psalter. Moreover, in connection with the translations from *Khristianskoe Chtenie* reviewed by the Synod's Bible translation committee, Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 332, states: "... in general it is impossible not to regret that [the translators] did not explain [what] their system really consisted of ... for the selection of passages from the Greek Bible for inclusion in their translation, made from the Hebrew."

<sup>76</sup> The same conclusion is also supported by examination of difficult passages where LXX (and Slavonic) yield an easier sense, but where the Synodal translator has, nonetheless, stayed with MT and tried to make sense of it. An example is 1 Kings 7:15b, where the Hebrew text is literally: 'eighteen cubits is the height of the first column and a cord of twelve cubits encircles the second pillar' (קִימָה הַעֲמֹד הָאֶחָד שְׁתֵּים־עָשָׂר אַמָּה וְחָטֵם שְׁמֹנֶה עָשָׂר אַמָּה וְכֹב אֶזְרָה־הָעֲמֹד הַשֵּׁנִי). Here, the Synodal has '... each consisting of eighteen cubits in height, and a cord consisting of twelve cubits embraced the circumference of the one and of the other column' (каждый в восемнадцать локтей вышиною, и шнурок в двенадцать локтей обнимал **окружность** того и другого столба). This interpretation, which appears to imply a double ellipsis in the Hebrew (so that the first column stands for the second column as well and vice-versa), probably derives from the Clementina (decem et octo cubitorum altitudinis *columnam unam* et linea duodecim cubitorum ambebat *columnam utramque*) and / or KJV ("of eighteen cubits high apiece: and a line of twelve cubits did compass either of them about"); cf. Keil: "The statement of the height of the one pillar and that of the circumference of the other is to be understood as an abbreviated expression, signifying that the height and thickness mentioned applied to the one as well as to the other". It is striking that here the Synodal did not follow the somewhat

‘the name of your god’ and not, with the Slavonic and Greek, ‘the name(s) of your *gods*’.<sup>77</sup> If Pavskii was, in effect, the primary translator of MT, we know that he was criticized precisely for not adopting the LXX interpretations that had entered Church tradition.<sup>78</sup> The same criticism was also levelled against Pavskii’s early reviser, Makarii.<sup>79</sup>

Although this conclusion doubtless needs some refining,<sup>80</sup> it stands in marked contrast to other statements that might most generously be characterized as 'romantic'.<sup>81</sup>

5. With regard to the insertion of Slavonic pluses, there are omissions and inconsistencies with regard both to the contents of the pluses and to the use of brackets.

6. Frequently, consistency with parallel passages in the primary translation from MT is favoured over precise translation of a Slavonic plus.

7. In part because the revisers did not take account of variant readings or minuses in the Slavonic, mixed texts have frequently been created, which accurately represent neither MT nor LXX/Slavonic. Again, it is difficult to evaluate this phenomenon positively, as some have recently done,<sup>62</sup> and a more realistic view was already presented at the end of the nineteenth century by Ilarion Chistovich, in his history of Russian Bible translation: "In view of these infelicities, one cannot but wish for separate translations of the Bible from the Hebrew and Greek texts." As Chistovich goes on to say, "Separate

easier text of LXX (contrast *REB*, *NRSV*, *NJPS*), which seems to have read a *Vorlage* closer to that found at Jer. 52:21, נָחַם נִפְחָה־נִפְחָה וְנָחַם נִפְחָה אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וְרֹאשׁוֹ וְרֹאשׁוֹ, with a וְנָחַם (instead of נָחַם) introducing the final נִפְחָה וְרֹאשׁוֹ: ὀκτακαιδεκα πηχεις ὕψος τοῦ στόλου καὶ περιμετρον τέσσαρες καὶ δέκα πηχεις ἐκύλου αὐτόν καὶ τὸ πᾶχος τοῦ στόλου τεσσάρων δακτύλων τὰ κοιλώματα καὶ οὕτως ὁ στόλος ὁ δεύτερος. (The parallel at 2 Chron. 3:15 is of limited relevance.)

<sup>77</sup> Synodal: имя бога вашего (not \*имя/имена богов ваших); Slavonic *имѣна богѡвъ вѣшнихъ*; LXX: ἐν ὀνόματι θεῶν ὑμῶν; Clementina: nomina deorum vestrorum (contrast Nova Vulgata: nomen dei vestri). The Synodal also diverges from KJV here: “the name of your gods”.

<sup>78</sup> See Batalden, 'Gerasim Pavskii's Clandestine Old Testament', *passim*; note also Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 326: "This was a translation exclusively from the Hebrew text."; 329: "The translation of G.P. Pavskii is made from the Hebrew language, without any tendency to use the Greek text, by the merits of which in general he was not attracted"; 338: "all the translations of the Bible examined by us (with the exception of the translation by G.P. Pavskii) are made from the Hebrew *under the guidance of the Greek Bible*."

<sup>79</sup> See Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 331, quoting Archbishop Filaret of Chernigov, from 1869: "His translation is faithful to the Hebrew text, and the language of the translation is pure and appropriate to the subject. The only regret that remains is that the translator has made little supporting use of the LXX translation."

<sup>80</sup> However, some refining of this statement is required. At 18:37 the Synodal's 'hear me O Lord, hear me!' for MT's 'answer me, O Lord, answer me' appears to have been influenced by the identical Slavonic plus incorporated in the preceding verse — MT: אָמֵן יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ; LXX (Rahlfs): ἐπάκουσόν μου κύριε ἐπάκουσόν μου = Slavonic: послышай мене, гдѣ, послышай = Synodal: услышь меня, Господи, услышь меня! At 21:16 (LXX 20:16), the verb in the Slavonic's 'that Naboth the Jezreelite had *been killed*' appears to represent a homiletic expansion of LXX's 'that Naboth the Jezreelite had *died*', which has, curiously, been taken into the Synodal, along with the Slavonic / Septuagintal plus 'the Jezreelite' — MT: וַיָּמָת נָבוֹת בֶּן־נִבְחַן; LXX (Rahlfs): ὅτι τέθνηκε Ναβουθα ὁ Ἰεζρεαλίτης; Slavonic: ꙗ́ко ѡбѣнѣ выстѣ навоѡѣ ѡизрѣлиѣтинниѣ; Synodal: что навуфѣ [Изреелитянин] былъ убитъ. I have found no antecedent for the Slavonic interpretation in Rahlfs, Weber, BHS, Peshitta, or TgJon. In both the above cases, however, an analysis of the Synodal's regular treatment of the relevant Hebrew verbs is required before conclusions may be drawn. A clear example of the translator's use of a Slavonic / LXX variant reading is constituted by the presence in the Synodal at 1 Kings 2:28 of the LXX's Solomon, although in this case its selection might be due more to the strong scholarly exegetical tradition that favours the Septuagintal reading here.

<sup>81</sup> See, for example, Desnitsky, 'The Septuagint', 246: "During th[e] process of revision, [the translators'] drafts were checked against LXX *and* the Slavonic version [my italics]. Not only were the parts missing from MT incorporated into the translation, but many exegetical decisions were made to follow LXX as well."; *ibid.*, 247: "To eliminate all the exegetical choices influenced by LXX one would have to rewrite the whole translation verse by verse, carefully comparing it to the Hebrew text".

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Alexeev, 'Masoretic Text', 29: "The combination of MT and Slavonic text in ... the Synodal version turned out to be an interesting and unusual experiment"; Desnitsky, 'The Septuagint', 250: "This translation itself became a symbol of survival for Christians of all the denominations, and its every feature now was precious in their eyes, including the textual eclecticism."

translations from Hebrew and Greek, satisfying scholarly needs and interests, would at the same time be the best preparation for subsequent corrections of the Russian Bible issued by the Holy Synod.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 340 (both citations). Note that Chistovich, 331, reports that Makarii “not undervaluing the Greek Bible, set himself the goal of translating the Holy Scriptures from the Hebrew text, considering it as indispensable or at least useful for another translation of the Bible into the Russian language to be made exclusively from the Greek text of the LXX.”