

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,² has led to its becoming “a mediator between ancient texts and modern translations”.³

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

¹ 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.

² 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).

³ 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.”

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 MT¹¹ by archpriest Gerasim Petrovich Pavskii (1787-1863).¹² Pavskii's translation apparently dates from before 1826, the year Pavskii left the St Petersburg Theological Academy.¹³ In the case of the historical books, including 3 Kingdoms, Pavskii's work had been lightly revised by archimandrite Makarii.¹⁴ Makarii was a pupil of Pavskii and had obtained a copy of Pavskii's unpublished translation of the whole of MT in 1840.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ It seems likely, therefore, that this was the work revised by the three biblicists and two Byzantists¹⁷ who constituted the Synodal's Bible translation committee, and whose task began in 1867.¹⁸ 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."¹⁹ 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; 6:37-38,²⁰ 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.²¹ Of these variations between the texts, the Synodal registers just two, both pluses, with a third plus omitted.²² Septuagintal minuses and alternative readings (in comparison with MT) are not incorporated.²³

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

¹² 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.

¹³ See Batalden, 'Gerasim Pavskii's Clandestine Old Testament', 487.

¹⁴ 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."

¹⁵ See Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 329-30.

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

¹⁷ See Alexeev, 'Masoretic Text', 26.

¹⁸ See Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 322.

¹⁹ Chistovich, *Istoriya*, 339.

²⁰ 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.

²¹ (1) 5:16/30: 600 (и шестъ ѿтъ) for 300 (ואל של מאה); (2) 'foremen doing tasks' (присѣвникъ дѣлающихъ дѣла = R) for 'those who are ruling over the people, who are doing the work' (הררים בקם העשים במלאכה); (3) 5:17/31: addition of 'and' before the last clause (и каменіе негѣсаное = R; MT: ואבני יהוה); (4) 5:18/32: 'sons (of)' (сынове = R) for 'builders of' (בני) (twice); (5) omission (with Rahlfs) of 'for building the house' (לבנות הבית); and (6) addition of / replacement by '(for) three years' (въ три дѣта = R); (7) 6:1: 440 (четырѣдесѣтное = R) for 480 (שמנים); (8) 'from Egypt' (изъ египта = R) for 'from the land of Egypt' (מארץ מצרים); (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.²⁴

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.²⁵ 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.²⁶

мицъ второй = R) for 'in the month of Ziv, that is the second month' (בְּחֹדֶשׁ זִיב הַיּוֹם 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 мицъ = R) added at end of verse.

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

²³ 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 покрѣи (LXX: καὶ συνεκάλυψεν) for the Synodal's и отворотил (cf. MT: פָּרַח; see, e.g., Lopukhin, *Tolkovaya Bibliya*, 1.469; according to *BHS*, the underlying Hebrew here was פָּרַח). Towards the end of 18:36 (see below), the Synodal's по слову Твоему = MT: דְּבַרְךָ (Qr) is retained, with no mention made of the Slavonic alternative: ꙗкоже рѣди = LXX: διὰ οὗ. Similar comments apply in the same verse to the Slavonic's ѿкъвалъ (following Alexandrinus; אָרַבְלָא is also attested in some Peshitta traditions), rather than ѿрарл 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: וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ וַיַּעַשׂ; Synodal: и сделал всё; contrast Slavonic: сотвори́хъ дѣла́ гл̑ = LXX: παποίηκα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα). For another LXX minus / MT plus not noted in the Synodal, cf. at 12:20 MT: וְעַל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל = Slavonic над всеми Израильтянами; LXX (Rahlfs): ἐπὶ ὅραηλ = Slavonic: над̑ ѿлемъ.

²⁴ 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=6:1c זין = MT וּ :: Rahlfs (ἐν μνη) Νισα; or at 5:32 / 18b=6:1b: ѿ каменосѣчцы гевѣмстѣн = MT: וְהַבְּלִיָּה, lacking in Rahlfs.

²⁵ 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 приготавливали 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.

²⁶ MT: וַיִּבְנֶה עֶשְׂרֵים וָשֶׁבַע יָמִים וְשִׁבְעֵים יָמִים אֶל־הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְשֵׁנָי; LXX: ἐνώπιον κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ἡμέρας τῶ οἶκῳ ᾧ ὠκοδόμησεν ἐθίβαν καὶ πέναν καὶ εὐφραϊνόμενος ἐνώπιον κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμέρας = Slavonic: пред̑ гд̑емъ в̑гомъ нашнимъ, ѿ хр̑ама, ἐгоже созда, ѿдн̑и ѿ п̑ла ѿ всееласа пред̑ гд̑емъ в̑гомъ нашнимъ; Synodal: пред Господом Богом нашим; [и ели, и пили, и молились пред Господом Богом 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.²⁷ In fact, the Synodal here incorporates only two of the extra words in the Slavonic.²⁸ 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.²⁹

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!³⁰

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]'.³¹ 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.³²

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'.³³ 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;³⁴ 21:27 (LXX 20:27);³⁵ and 22:19.³⁶

храма, ἐγόμει созда by the impersonal у построенного храма (and its re-positioning in the sentence) as well as that of the participles *ἰδὲν ἢ πῖλ ἢ νεσελάσα* by indicative forms: и ели, и пили, и молились.

²⁷ MT: *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם*; LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ἐστοίβασεν τὰς σχίδακας ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ὃ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐμέλεισεν τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὰς σχίδακας καὶ ἐστοίβασεν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον (Rahlfs notes only one significant ms. variant: ἐπέθηκεν τὰς σχίδακας for ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὰς σχίδακας) = Slavonic: *И воскладе дрова на олтарь, ἐγόμει сотворн, ἢ расстеса на ѿды веесожегарама, ἢ возложн на дрова, ἢ воскладе на олтарь.*

²⁸ и положил дрова [на жертвенник], и рассек тельца, и возложил его на дрова.

²⁹ In fact, the reviser could easily have also added the following two words in the Slavonic: *ἐγόμει сотворн.*

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

³¹ MT 18:37b: *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם*; LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ οὐ ἔστρεψας τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου ὅπως (to which Lucian adds a final σου); Slavonic: *И ты ѡбратишь сердце их [к Тебел].*

³² Note also in v. 37 that the Slavonic reviser has overlooked both *ὀργνέμῃ* (LXX: ἐπάκουσόν μου ἐν πυρί; MT: *עני*) and *всн (всн мѡдѣе сн; contrast LXX: ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, for which Rahlfs [or Weber] gives no variants; MT: *עני*).*

³³ 21:4b (MT): *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם*; 20:4 (LXX [Rahlfs]): καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ πνεῦμα Ἀχαβ τεταραγμένου καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης αὐτοῦ καὶ συνεκάλυψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν ἄρτον; 21:4b (Slavonic): *И вѣсть дѡхъ ахава смѡдѣнъ, ἢ ѿспе на ѡдрѣ своѣмъ ἢ покрѣ лицѣ своѣ ἢ не ѡдѣ 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 *עני* (see n. 23, above) and the additional clause at the beginning. (Note that the Slavonic renders both τεταραγμένου in this clause and συγκεχυμένος earlier in the verse by *смѡдѣнъ* 'confused, perturbed'.)*

³⁴ MT: *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָה עַל הַתְּרֵיִם*; LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ἐστοίβασεν τὰς σχίδακας ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ὃ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐμέλεισεν τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὰς σχίδακας καὶ ἐστοίβασεν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον

LXX (Rahlf's): καὶ ἀνεβόησεν Ἠλίου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ εἶπεν κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰσραηλ ἐπάκουσόν μου κύριε ἐπάκουσόν μου σήμερον ἐν πυρὶ καὶ γνώτωσαν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ καὶ γὰρ δούλος σου καὶ διὰ σὲ πεποίηκα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα.

Slavonic: **И** возопи ѿ нѣбъ на небо и рече: гдѣи бже авраамовъ и исаакъовъ и ѿковаль, послѣдшай менѣ, гдѣи, послѣдшай менѣ днѣсь огнемъ, и да оуразумѣють всѣ мѣдѣе сѣи, ѿкхъ ты ѣси гдѣи ѣдинъ ѿиелевъ, и азъ рабъ твоѣи, и тебе радѣ сотвори хъ дѣла сѣа.

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 все 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 Ἀβραὰμ and Ἰσαακ (ἰσκαβα), 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: $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע} \text{ } \text{וַיִּשְׁמַע}$.) 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 $\text{וַיִּתֵּן} \text{ } \text{וַיִּתֵּן}$ '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: $\text{וַיִּתֵּן} \text{ } \text{וַיִּתֵּן}$ = LXX: καὶ γνώτω ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, in the next verse, 37; on the other hand, the Slavonic has всѣ мѣдѣе 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 וַיִּתֵּן 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 וַיִּתֵּן) for the Slavonic's гдѣи, which in turn is only an incomplete rendering of LXX's κύριος ὁ θεὸς. Although Rahlf's 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 μόνος, and the Slavonic (v. 37: ѿкхъ ты ѣси (ѣдинъ) гдѣи 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 (ѣдинъ) 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 оуразумѣють, всѣ мѣдѣе сѣи, and the addition of ѣдинъ in both verses with the different forms found in each verse in the LXX).

³⁵ 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: ... וַיִּתֵּן לְאַחַב אֶבְרָחָם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה; LXX (Rahlf's): καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λόγου ὡς κατενύγη Ἀχάαβ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐπορεύετο κλαίον καὶ διέρρηξεν ...; Slavonic: **И** выстъ ἐгда оуслыша ахавъ словеса сѣа, оумниасъ ѿ лица гдѣна, и идаше плачась, и раздръ ...; Synodal: Выслушав 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*, 1.471). 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 ѿ лица гдѣна, represents a further step along the path of idiomatic rendering.) At the end of the verse, the Slavonic follows a Hexaplaric tradition (see Rahlf's): и χοδαίσε σκόρβενъ (καὶ ἐπορεύθη κεκλιμένος), which matches MT's וַיִּתֵּן . No further light is cast on these matters by Vulgata, Peshitta, or TgJon.

³⁶ Here the Synodal only registers just the first of three Slavonic / LXX pluses. The two missing pluses are οὐχ οὗτως εἶδον = не тѣкхъ: видѣхъ (MT: וַיִּתֵּן) and τὸν κύριον θεὸν Ἰσραηλ = гдѣи бгѣи ѿиелева (MT: וַיִּתֵּן). Curiously, the first plus, [Михей] (also in Peshitta), is merely italicized (not bracketed) in the parallel at 2 Chron. 18:18, even though мѣхѣа occurs in the Slavonic text (but not in LXX; Rahlf's 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

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.⁴⁴

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. 9:26.⁴⁵ In the Synodal, the bracketed sequence in Kings differs slightly from the text in Chronicles.⁴⁶ However, the Slavonic differs more significantly between these two parallel texts,⁴⁷ 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 10:26.⁴⁸

Other examples of the influence of parallel texts on the Slavonic revision of the Synodal can be seen at 2:35m⁴⁹ and n.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ 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 2:35l сына Иеминиина is used (cf. Slavonic: сынъ сѣиене іемениина), instead of Вениамитянин(а), as found in 2:8 (cf. MT: בנימין). 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 פָּרַח 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 הַיְסוּדִים *рѣзвма соломиѣнь* (2:35) as И Соломон имел разум, especially as the Slavonic’s construction here (и ѡспѡниса *рѣзвма соломиѣнь*) is parallel to that of 4:30 (и ѡмножила *мѡдрость соломиѣнова*), where MT (5:10) has מְלֶכֶת חָכְמָה בְּרָחָה (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 חָכְמָה מְלֶכֶת, ἡ σοφία is suplied as subject of ἐπιηθύθη). In 2:8 and 2:35m, there is an unnecessary distinction between как and когда in the two verses (когда / как я шел в Маханаим), especially as the Slavonic uses въ дѣнь въ Оньже 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 *валалѣръ* (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 *валалѣръ* 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 Βαλαφ 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.)

⁴⁵ וְהָיָה כִּי יֵצֵא מִן הַיָּם וְיֵרֵד מִן הַיָּם וְיֵרֵד מִן הַיָּם וְיֵרֵד מִן הַיָּם (2 Chron. 9:26) = LXX (Rahlfs) 1 Kings 10:26a: καὶ ἦν ἡγούμενος πάντων τῶν βασιλέων ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ ἕως γῆς ἀλλοφύλων καὶ ἕως ὀρίων Αἰγύπτου (2 Chron. 9:26 differs only in its use of the singular ὀρίου). A similar sequence is found at MT 5:1, עָרְצָא בִּיבַגְתִּי וְעָרְצָא חָכְמָה מְלֶכֶת חָכְמָה בְּרָחָה = LXX (Rahlfs) 2:46k: καὶ ἦν ἄρχων ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ ἕως γῆς ἀλλοφύλων καὶ ἕως ὀρίων 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.

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

⁴⁷ 2 Chron. 9:26: *И вѣтъ вѡждь всѣхъ царѣи ѡ рѣкѣ (ѡвφрата) дѡже до землѣ иноплеменникъ и дѡже до предѣлѣи ѡвφратѣи*; 1 Kings 10:26: *и вѣ властелинѣи всѣмъ царѣмъ ѡ рѣкѣ и до землѣ иноплеменникъ и до предѣлѣи ѡвφрата*.

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

⁴⁹ LXX 2:8, 35m: εἰς Παρεμβολὰς ‘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.

⁵⁰ At 2:35n (Rahlfs’s numbering), the Synodal renders just as at 2:8: но он вышел навстречу мне у Иордана (MT 2:8: וַיֵּצֵא מִן הַיָּם וְיֵרֵד מִן הַיָּם). The Synodal’s non-literal rendering of וַיֵּרֵד (καταβαίω) is characteristic of its translational style at least in 3 Kingdoms, where each of the seven instances of וַיֵּרֵד (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’.⁵¹

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.⁵² 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 פָּרָשָׁה.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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’ (сѣбѣ ѿ = LXX ἐαυτῷ καὶ), 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: ἡ τῶν σιδήρεων οὐκ ἐπέστησεν αὐτῷ; LXX (Rahlfs): 2:8: κατέβη εἰς ἀπαντὴν μου; 2:35n: κατέβαινον εἰς ἀπαντὴν μου. 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).

⁵¹ LXX (Rahlfs) 2:35f: καὶ ἠκοδόμησεν τὴν ἄκρην ... τότε ἠκοδόμησεν τὴν ἄκρην (Rahlfs indicates no variants) = Slavonic: ѿ созда краєградѣ ... тогда созда краєградѣ; Synodal: и построил замок ... тогда построил Соломон стену вокруг города; MT 3:1: בָּנָה סָבִיב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל ... לְבָנָה = 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.

⁵² MT: וַיַּעַשׂ מִשְׁכָּב לְכָל עַבְדָּיו (the sequence is missing in the 2 Chron. 2:13 parallel); LXX (Rahlfs): καὶ ἐποίησεν πότον μέγαν ἑαυτῷ καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς παῖσιν αὐτοῦ; Slavonic: ѿ сотвори пиръ великъ сѣбѣ ѿ всѣмъ ѿтрокѣмъ своимъ; Synodal: и сделал большой пир для всех слуг своих.

⁵³ Contrast 1 Sam. 25:36 and 2 Sam. 3:20, where on three occasions פָּרָשָׁה is rendered in the Synodal by пир alone.

⁵⁴ Contrast *Nova Vulgata*, which correctly omits the *grande*.

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.⁶² 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.⁶³

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 1697.⁶⁴

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 $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ וְיָרַד}$: 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 *kýrios*.⁶⁵

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

⁶² 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/aleksejev/02/87.htm> [23 November 2010]).

⁶³ MT: $\text{וְיָרַד} \text{ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ וְיָרַד}$; Synodal: слова сии, которыми я молился [ныне] пред Господом; Slavonic: словеса сіа, ѿниже молихса предъ гдѣмъ вѣомъ нынѣмъ днѣсь; LXX (Rahlfs): οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὓς δεδήματι 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 *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 *гдѣнь гдѣнь* could have resulted from harmonization with v. 7 (MT ~ וְיָרַד). Rahlfs, which, like the Leipzig edition (see below), reads *vīs* at v. 5, gives no support for ἄγγελος κυρίου at v. 5. However, the fact that MT has וְיָרַד in both verses (Vulgata: angelus domini) suggests that here the Slavonic reflects a Hebraizing recension of LXX.

⁶⁴ 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 palia diatheke kata tous hebdomekonta (Biblia graece utriusque Testamenti)* (Lipsiae, 1697), at the National Library in Helsinki.

⁶⁵ In the Synodal, the plus appears as follows: и предаст [Господь] Израила. Origen's asterisked text (in the apparatus to Rahlfs) is καὶ παραδώσει κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, perhaps copied from an identical sequence at 1 Sam. 28:19 (MT: $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ וְיָרַד}$). 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.

⁶⁶ The Synodal includes the bracketed plus 'and they left the house of the Lord': [и оставили храм Господень] = 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, καὶ πρὸ προσώπου τῆς ἄλλης εἰς Βαβηλ, 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 Βαβηλ, from Hebrew $\text{בֵּית} \text{ יְהוָה}$.

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.⁷⁴

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.⁷⁵

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,⁷⁶ and another example may be seen at 18:24. Here, at the beginning of the verse the Synodal interprets MT's שם אֱלֹהִים as

⁷⁴ 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 *Ѣра́я же ца́рство утверди́ся въ рѣцѣ́ соломѡны* in the same verse and also to *וְהַמְּלָכָה יָבִינָה 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!

⁷⁵ 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."

⁷⁶ 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 שְׁתַּיִם עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה וְחֹמֶשׁ שִׁמְנֵה עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה וְסָב אֶתְהַעֲמֹד 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 cubitum 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'.⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ The same criticism was also levelled against Pavskii's early reviser, Makarii.⁷⁹

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

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,⁸² 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, פָּחַס הַפְּחָדִים וְשֵׁשׁ וַחֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵים אַרְבָּע אַרְבָּעִים וְשֵׁשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים, with a כֶּן (instead of תַּק) introducing the final אֶשְׂרֵים תְּשַׁבֵּר: ὀκτωκαίδεκα πήχεις ὕψους τοῦ στύλου καὶ περίμετρον τέσσαρες καὶ δέκα πήχεις ἐκύκλου αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ πάχος τοῦ στύλου τεσσαρῶν δακτύλων τὰ κοιλώματα καὶ οὕτως ὁ στῦλος ὁ δεύτερος. (The parallel at 2 Chron. 3:15 is of limited relevance.)

⁷⁷ Synodal: имя бога вашего (not *имя/имена богов ваших); Slavonic ѡмѣна божѣвъ вѣшнѣхъ; 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".

⁷⁸ 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."

⁷⁹ 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."

⁸⁰ 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: אַזְכֵּר אֶת־יְהוָה; LXX (Rahlfs): ἐπάκουσόν μου κύριε ἐπάκουσόν μου = Slavonic: послѣдшѣи менѣ, гди, послѣдшѣи = 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: מוֹתָהוּ בֶן־נָבוֹת; LXX (Rahlfs): ὅτι τέθνηκεν Ναβουθαὶ ὁ Ἰεζραηλίτης; Slavonic: ѡкѡ ѡубѣиѣнъ бѣсть навѡдѣн ѡзраниѣтѣанинъ; Synodal: что Навуфей [Изреелитянин] был убит. 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.

⁸¹ 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".

⁸² 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."⁸³

⁸³ 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."