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This study encompasses an analysis of the language found in the first Serbian copy of *The History of the Jewish War* (HM.SMS.280) compared to its Russian original (HM.SMS.281). This research follows the clues in the colophon written by the Serbian scribe, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije, in which he states that the Serbian people could not understand the Russian words of the original manuscript. For this reason, Grigorije Vasilije states, he had to “translate” the unknown words into Serbian.

Since the Serbian manuscript consists of a large number of folia, 255 of them, a sampling approach was used, whereby eight folia from six sections were extracted and analyzed. The results of the findings identify a number of lexical variations which were distinctive in Serbian and the Russian recensions at the end of the sixteenth century. Some of the lexemes found in the Serbian manuscript are attested for the first time, and as such they make an addition to our knowledge of medieval Serbian lexicography.

The findings of this research show that many of the hard-to-understand words were very specific technical terms from military vocabulary—not words that a monk (or most laymen) could be expected to know. These lexemes pertain to siege warfare, military installations, court expressions, social interactions, and non-Orthodox ecclesiastical concepts. The collected data, consisting of the samples from the Russian and Serbian manuscripts, indicates that almost 80% of the lexemes which appeared be foreign or
ambiguous to the Serbian scribes are either not listed in the Serbian dictionaries that were consulted, or else were not attested in the meaning found in the Russian original. The remaining 20% of the lexemes appear to be due to synonymy, avoidance of figurative language, concrete vs. specific terminology, censorship, and scribal errors. Some of them could only be explained by extra-linguistic factors, specifically by the scribes’ attitude toward certain religious issues and views, particular to a strict Orthodox monk and ascetic.

In addition to reconstructing the biography of the main Serbian scribe, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije, this study provides evidence that was a second Serbian scribe, who worked on one segment of the Serbian manuscript. Although the identity of this scribe could not be ascertained for certain at this time, this study provides the material and suggests a possible answer. Based on the style and hand-writing, which closely resembles the writing found in the segment of the Serbian manuscript written by the second Serbian scribe, this study indicates a possibility that this person could be one of the scribes who was involved in copying in the Karyea cell of Hilandar Monastery close to the time the copy of The History of the Jewish War was created.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1. Extent and goals of the study

The purpose of my dissertation is, through close reading and comparison of variant readings, to examine two closely related manuscripts of Josephus Flavius’ *The History of the Jewish War*: (1) HM.SMS.280, copied in 1585 by the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije and written in the Serbian recension of Church Slavonic; folia 73v-126v have different handwriting, which strongly suggests that there was one other scribe besides Grigorie Vasilije who worked on this manuscript. (2) HM.SMS.281, a manuscript of the Russian recension dated to the third quarter of the sixteenth century. The name of the scribe of HM.SMS.281 is not known (Bogdanović 1978: 125; Matejić and Thomas 1992: 442-443). The two manuscripts represent two links of the same chain.¹ The Russian manuscript is the “parent” of the Serbian and was used as the source of what the hieromonk Grigorie Vasilije calls his “translation” into the Serbian recension (see Bogdanović 1978:124, where this is explicitly stated: “Српски препис са руског извода XVI века сачуваног у Хил. 281” [“A Serbian Copy from a Russian Source of the 16th century preserved in Hilandar 281”]). It is also important to note that HM.SMS.280 is, as will be shown below, the earliest extant Serbian copy of *The History of the Jewish War.*

¹ There is one more Serbian copy of the *History of the Jewish War*, HM.SMS.282, which dates from 1826.
The Serbian manuscript also includes a second historical text, *The Tale of the Capture of Constantinople (Povest o Tsarigradu)* (ibid.). In my analysis I will refer to HM.SMS.280 as Srb, and HM.SMS.281 as Rus.

The Rus’ian/Russian translations of *The History of the Jewish War* have come down to us in two groups, the *Chronographic* and *Separate* redactions (Leeming 2003:16-17). The Chronographic redaction consists of the whole text; the Separate redaction begins with the First Book, Chapter 26. Both Hilandar copies reflect the Separate redaction.

Although the Serbian manuscript is a copy of the Russian one, there are many significant differences in terms of use of lexemes; in his colophon, the scribe, hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije claims to have "translated" the manuscript from Russian into the Serbian recension, because Serbian readers could not understand many of the "Russian" words (see below). It is also important to note that the Serbian scribe translated the manuscript from a nearly contemporary Russian manuscript. While many of the linguistic features found in the Russian manuscript HM.SMS.281 may be older, the manuscript itself is virtually of the same date as the Serbian, HM.SMS.280.

My goal in comparing the two manuscripts is to determine the extent to which they differ in language. Specifically, I will explore what the Serbian scribe meant when he stated that the Russian text was not understandable to Serbian readers. This will reveal how difficult recensional differences, East vs. South Slavic, may have been for readers in the late sixteenth century. My sample includes the following folia: [Rus 5r-9v], [Srb 2v-7v]; [Rus 49v-55r], [Srb 45r-50r]; [Rus 101r-106r], [Srb 93v-98r]; [Rus 108v-113v],
In the colophon of HM.SMS.281 (quoted below), the scribe states that he could not find a Serbian (or even a South Slavic) text of Josephus anywhere and that he looked on Mount Athos and in the Serbian and Bulgarian lands but could not find one. He then states that he had been sent to Russia twice, thereby learning a small amount of Russian.

That knowledge, the scribe says, was enough to enable him to read and understand Russian words. He brought the Russian manuscript to Karyes, Mount Athos, where he “copied” (prepisax) it into the Serbian language. Here is the colophon:

В з лето 7093, и.e., 1585, прпвиха си книгу Иосифа против Будаго же ит ертн оудърыдн рускн преписки, ит шу монастырь Мат’тала. Шу рускн извода понеже не въръгаше, си си книга Иосифа нашни сръбскн езикнйк, ни в’ съвети горн въ сръбскн монастиръх, ни въ съревен земали понеже много искан и испитовал, ни дозволено мнь, аще гд’е, ест въ българскн земали, не понеже и тамо пита, нь принесена бысть, шу рускн земали. Велики же се върт я книгамо сръбскм езикъ, на у’ чене, ако испитвал, не знати, го в’ръгът рускн рево и не разсъдиваше. Аз’ же монастирскнмъ посланемъ и въ роиръден бъл къ рускн зем’ алх оу благочестиваго царя и великаго кнеза Ивана Василевича въ низо Иосифа, а и многица църквей и иконостаси, гдево гозу̀д въръгаше. И тамо прпвиха нем’ ного рускнго езикъ, елико мнь, разумеш, рускн певу в’ си книгв, и прпвиха сръбсквмъ реву в’ си никати слово не оукате, ни слово оукате на слово, ни слово оукате на слово. Нь, яко едино, утпепостистъ (sic) и неговда, простите господ ради. И мн’ноги паки искан други извод послъдвати, нь не въръгаше се. Се писах въ пир’гов свете Цвят въ Карае, тога ми оукато прпвналошо въ том впреде. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго. И тога бысть. Тога паки изъдомъ из’ пир’гат вратимъ събор’ными нинзы шутъдати въ събор’ нои кнези д’ в’ въ и прилеже, понеже не мало въсне предъшнене при вгоуменъ Паново нервонаго.
In the year 7093 I translated this book of Josephus the Most Wise of the Jews, the son of Matthias, who had a most true philosophy. [I translated it] from a Russian version, because this book of Josephus was not to be found in our Serbian language either on the Holy Mount in the Serbian monasteries or in the Serbian land; for I sought [it] much and asked [about it there]. I do not know if it is [available] anywhere in the Bulgarian lands, but I did not learn [of it there], for I also asked there. Rather, [the book] was brought from the Russian land; it was very hard for our Serbian people to read, so that many, not understanding the Russian expressions, could not comprehend what they were reading. But I had been on monastery business twice in the Russian lands at [the court of] the virtuous tsar and grand prince Ivan Vasilevič, in monastic vows Iona the Monk; and I received many acts of generosity and alms from the tsar to whom be eternal remembrance. And there I learned a little of the Russian language, enough for me to understand many [of the] Russian expressions in this book. And I translated [the work] using Serbian expressions; but I did not know how to compose the text, nor did I learn the text; I was not educated but [am] as one of the simple [folk] and an ignoramus. Forgive [me] for the Lord's sake. And I did look a great deal for another version to follow, but it was not to be found. I wrote this in the tower of St. Sava in Karyes, [since] I, a wretch, was at that time dwelling in that place. Thereafter I left the tower [to rejoin] the communal brethren and others, to abide in the communal cell, where I had been previously; for there was quite a lot of sin during [the reign of] Abbot Paisej the Hieromonk. And then there was a horrible earthquake in the month of July on the 18th day; and there was great loss and damage in the monasteries, and many towers collapsed, and all [of the ones] in Prevlaka. The year 7093; the month of August, the 9th [day]; solar cycle 9, lunar 6; themelion 9; calendar letter d after the third leap year; lunar epact of the year 23; Golden Number 9; the Jewish Fast was then the 28th day according to the hand [sc. chart] of Sophronius' index; indiction 13. Wretched Grigorie, in the schema renamed Vasilie, a hieromonk. Oh, oh, oh! Alas for me, a sinner! ²

² Translated by Professor Daniel E. Collins
2. Description of the manuscripts

The Russian (i.e., Church Slavonic in East Slavic, Russian recension) manuscript, designated as HM.SMS.281, is written in Cyrillic semi-uncials on 317 leaves of paper, the watermarks of which date it to the third quarter of the sixteenth century (Bogdanović 1978: 125; Matejić and Thomas 1992: 443). Its paleographic features are consistent with this dating. The original is located in the manuscript library of Hilandar Monastery, on Mount Athos, Greece. A microfilm of the manuscript forms part of the Hilandar Monastery Slavic manuscript collection housed at the Hilandar Research Library, a special collection of the Ohio State University Libraries.³ It was microfilmed in 1971 by the Hilandar Research Project of The Ohio State University (Joković 2007: 23-57).

The main text of HM.SMS.281, Josephus' *The History of the Jewish War*, represents a later copy in a manuscript tradition that dates to the 11ᵗʰ-12ᵗʰ centuries, a time during which the prototype and first original Rus’ian (i.e., East Slavic) manuscript of Josephus was translated from Greek. This translation was first made in the Rus’ian recension, probably in the southeastern region of Rus’. The author of the translation was well versed in ecclesiastical texts (Leeming 2003: 76).

The Serbian manuscript was copied in 1585 by the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije and written in Church Slavonic (Serbian recension). The manuscript consists of 279 leaves written in Cyrillic semi-uncial according to the standards of Resavian orthography (Bogdanović 1978: 124-125; Matejić and Thomas 1992: 442-443). The Resavian

³ I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Hilandar monks for permission to cite the manuscript; and also to the Hilandar Research Library and the Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies at The Ohio State University for providing access to the Hilandar and other manuscripts on microform.
orthography succeeded the Rascian, seen in older Serbian Church Slavonic manuscripts, which dated from the time of Saint Sava (1175-1236). The Resavian School was established in fourteenth century by Constantine Kostenečki, also known as Constantine the Philosopher. The term Resavian comes from the name of the Resava River, which flows alongside the Serbian monastery Manasija, where Kostenečki lived while working out his orthographic system.

Resavian orthography was distinguished by a number of features. Among of the most important was the reintroduction of ξ (pronounced = ξ) in roots, prefixes, and prepositions. The back jer was used also with syllabic r, l. On the other hand ϲ was used elsewhere as a purely graphic sign, and it was not pronounced. In addition, Resavian orthography was characterized by the use of Greek letters ξ, ψ, θ, as well as the use of accent marks based on Greek. These accent marks were often written mechanically rather than in accordance with the actual phonological accents. In addition, the “wide e” was used in word-initial position to denote je. Unlike in Rascian orthography, the sounds ja and je after vowels were written as ξ and ε rather than as ϲ and ϲ, whereas i after vowels was written as ĭ rather than ι. The Rascian ϲ and r (for A (jerv) were replaced by η and υ, (Ranković 2006: 6, Mladenović 2008: 72-73).

---

4 Rascian orthography was, among other, characterized by the following features: denasalization, in which the back nasal was replaced by ηε/ κό, and the front nasal by ε; less use of Greek letters; introduction of ligatures; more frequent occurrences of ς; the use of double ς in the Genitive plural; lack of differentiation between ρ and ε; replacement of Λ (jerv) by r, κ; and merger of z and s into ʒ, (Ranković 2006:5).

5 Manasija Monastery was founded by Despot, later Prince, Stefan Lazarević, the son of the Holy Serbian prince Lazar (Hrebeljanović) of Kosovo.
3. The Josephus tradition

Josephus was born in 37 AD in a priestly family, and as such he himself was destined to be a priest. While still very young, he was trained in Jewish Law. Josephus takes pride in being so well trained that, when he was fourteen years of age, he says, “even senior priests and laymen, prominent in administration of the city, came to him for the elucidation of knotty points” (Williamson 1981:10). Although he studied with the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, he could not decide which of these three sects to join. He was sixteen years old at the time. After living for three years training as an ascetic in a desert, he joined the Pharisees. Not much is known about Josephus’ priestly life for several years. When he was twenty-six years old, he was sent on a mission to Rome as an advocate for several priests, who had been accused before Nero, and was able to secure their release thanks to Nero’s wife Poppaea (Maier 1988: 10, ibd.).

Two years after, in year 66, when Josephus returned home, he unsuccessfully tried to persuade the rebellion leaders to change their mind and not go to war against the Romans. Consequently, he caused more anger and was forced to seek refuge in order to avoid arrest. When the moderate party came to the power, Josephus returned to Jerusalem (Williamson 1981: 10).

Eventually Josephus joined his countrymen in rebellion against the Romans. After Vespasian conquered Galilee, Josephus, who was a commander at the time, decided to surrender; he was brought before the Roman general Vespasian and imprisoned. Josephus predicted that Vespasian would eventually become the Roman Emperor. When this prediction came true, Josephus was released from prison (Maier 1988: 10).
After his release, Josephus considered Vespasian to be his patron and began calling himself Flavius (the emperor’s middle name). Josephus began serving as a mediator and interpreter between the Romans and Jews, and unsuccessfully attempted to persuade the Jewish rebels to submit to Rome. Under the aegis of Vespasian and, later, Titus, his son, he received Roman citizenship and, subsequently, an imperial pension. This made it possible for Josephus to dedicate himself to writing (ibid.).

*The History of the Jewish War* was written in two languages, first in Aramaic and then in Greek. It was published in Greek in 77 or 78 AD (Maier 1988: 11). This work has seven books and encompasses the time from the capture of Jerusalem in 175 BC to its final destruction in 70 AD, as well as a failed insurrection in Egypt and Cyrenaica in 71–73 AD (Leeming 2003: 22).

Josephus wrote two more works: *The Jewish Antiquities* and *Against Apion*. In *The Jewish Antiquities*, published seventeen years after *The History of the Jewish War* (93–94 AD), Josephus provides the history of the Jews from the Creation to the time preceding the rebellion in 66 AD. This work, comprising twenty books, demonstrates “to the Greco-Roman reader the ancient, lofty, and reasonable beliefs and culture of Judaism” (Maier 1988: 12). The appendix of this work consists of Josephus’ short *Vita*, in which he talks about the period when he was commander in Galilee. Josephus’ other work, *Against Apion*, is a defense of Judaism, Jewish culture, and the superiority of the Mosaic Law (ibid.:12-13).

In his works, Josephus praises and glorifies the Roman Empire. The Roman dominion over Judea was, according to his view, both acceptable and lawful. For example, he tells of a certain speech that he made to the besieged Jewish insurrectionists
in Jerusalem, in which he called for their submission to Rome. In this speech, he states that “the present generation has inherited servitude from its fathers; servitude is therefore legal, and to struggle against it is reckless” (Leeming 2003: 23). Considering that Josephus expressed such an attitude, it is ironic that this work later came to serve as inspiration for future insurrections and struggles for national liberation.

_The History of the Jewish War_ has long been considered a very important historical work. It was very popular in Russian up to eighteenth century. For an example, the description of the Essenes and their ascetic view of life were seen as paralleled in the Orthodox monastic way of life (Leeming 2003: 98, 101). Even though the historical content of the text does not completely correspond to that of the Gospels,³ it was considered by Christians to be an important historical source, written by an intellectual of non-Christian background. For an example, Ivan Nasedka in his polemics about baptism quotes Josephus as an author whose writings were “in accordance with the Gospel” (ibid.: 102). Another reason for the popularity of _The History of the Jewish War_ was the emergence of the idea of Moscow as a “Third Rome” or “New Jerusalem” in the sixteenth century. This was an important period of time for Eastern Christians, marked by the Fall of Constantinople and the rise of a centralized Russian state.

---

³ The claim of Bernard Revel that Josephus had forgotten the traditions of the Jews in the 25 years that he spent in Rome (Revel 1924: 294) is difficult to accept. On the contrary, Josephus knew Jewish customs and the law very well. He belonged to the Pharisee sect and, as such, must have been very well rounded in his education and trained in Jewish law. The fact that he had defected from the Jewish army and desired to please the Roman Emperor are good enough reasons for him to carefully avoid discussion of Jewish traditions and laws; the lack of such discussion does not constitute evidence that he had forgotten them or Judaism in general.

⁴ For example, Josephus records that Pilate received 30 talents to kill Christ [Srb 54r:12]. According to the Biblical account, it was Judas that received the 30 pieces of silver for promising to betray Christ (Matthew 26:15). In Josephus, it is Pilate who decided to have Christ crucified, whereas in the Gospels he did not make the final decision to deliver Christ to be crucified but left the decision to the will of people, after being accused of treason against Caesar (John 19:12). Josephus’ description of St. John’s life and what he ate in the wilderness also differs slightly from the biblical account [Srb 51v:17].
In the context of that which closely preceded it, the timing of the Fall of Constantinople was particularly significant to the Russian Church and the newly established state. Prior to the Fall of Constantinople, a council took place in Florence in 1438 where the Patriarch of Constantinople agreed to unite the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches. When Constantinople subsequently fell, Russians attributed the Fall to divine retribution: God had prohibited an unsuitable union with the Roman Catholic Church from taking place. While Constantinople, the center of Eastern Christendom, had lost its primacy and fallen under Ottoman rule, Moscow was shortly thereafter (1480) liberated from Mongol rule, which Eastern Christians considered to be a clear sign of God’s intervention and His positive disposition toward Moscow and the Russians. As a result of the fall of the Second Rome (Constantinople), the historical and, especially, the spiritual role and authority of Constantinople were believed to have been transferred to the Russian Orthodox Church and the Muscovite state. Russia had inherited Constantinople’s historical legacy, thereby making it the “Third Rome” or “New Jerusalem” (Leeming 2003: 101).

In his article, “Rediscovered Texts from the Life of St. Sergius of Radonezh: Understanding Russia and Russian Orthodoxy in the sixteenth century Moscow as the ‘Third Rome,’” Predrag Matejić provides a valuable explanation of the impact of the Fall of Constantinople on the establishment of the new role of Moscow as “The Third Rome” or “A New Jerusalem.” Matejić particularly concentrates on the portions of the so-called “3rd Pachomian reduction” of the life of Saint Sergius of Radonezh, found in Hilandar Monastery Slavic manuscript 485. He suggests that this specific text is an effective text intended to strengthen the idea of “Moscow the Third Rome.” In it, God, by the means of
His saint, Saint Sergius of Radonezh, intercedes in the preservation of the purity of the Russian Church and the eventual transfer of the spiritual authority from Constantinople to the Russian Church (Matejić 2005: 263-264).

In connection with this article, the coexistence of *The History of the Jewish War* and *the Tale of the Fall of Constantinople*, in HM.SMS.280, copied mostly by hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije, is by no means an accident. It is rather an intentional parallel of the events that led to the turning point of the Russian Church and state of this period (Collins 2002).

Based on the above information, and in an analogous manner, it can be concluded that the presence of *The Tale of the Capture of Constantinople* as an accompanying text to *The History of the Jewish War* in the same manuscript is also significant. While there is no proof of this, it is conceivable that Tsar Ivan the Terrible or someone in his court presented the Russian manuscript to hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije, commissioning him to copy the manuscript in order to spread the message of the newly established leadership role of the Russian Church and state. In their cultural worldview, both the First Jerusalem and the Second Jerusalem (or Second Rome), Constantinople, fell as a consequence of apostasy. Instead, Orthodox Russia received the grace from God to preserve and maintain the pure faith (ibid.)
4. Profile of Hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije

In this section I will reconstruct the biography of the scribe of HM.SMS.280, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije. To date, no one has written specifically about this extraordinary monk. His name is known to us from the colophon from the Serbian manuscript HM.SMS.280. Originally as a monk called Grigorije, he took the name Vasilije when he was tonsured into the Great Schema in the Tower (pirg) of Saint Sava in 1585 (Fotić 2000: 419-421).

Generally, all monks promise to keep three vows: celibacy, obedience and poverty. However, they differ in terms of the strictness of their asceticism. The monks of the Great Schema practice the most intense form of asceticism. When they are tonsured into the Great Schema, their name is also changed. This change represents the monk’s renunciation of his former life and the beginning of a new one, characterized by intensified prayer and stricter fasting (Matejić 1983: 13).

Not only was the hieromonk a noteworthy scribe, he also served as abbot of Hilandar Monastery in 1583, multiple times between 1588 and 1591, and continually from 1591–1597/8 (Fotić 2000: 137). However, because of his frequent travels, he had to leave the abbot’s duty to another hieromonk by the name of Arsenije. The Hilandar records indicate that Grigorije Vasilije served as an abbot five times between 1588 and 1591. This is understandable considering the need of the abbot to travel, since the best were chosen to represent the monastery abroad (ibid.: 231).

In order to understand the hieromomk Grigorije’s role as the scribe and “translator” of HM.SMS.280, as the monastery’s representative, and Hilandar
Monastery’s interaction with the Muscovite court, it is important to understand Hilandar's crucial need for Russian support—especially (but not only) financial support— at this time in its history. This also serves as another illustration of the new and expanding role of Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church at this time.

In addition to writing the manuscript and serving as abbot, the hieromonk Grigorije was well known as the monastery’s representative on foreign missions. Hilandar Monastery sent him on several missions to seek support for the monastery. This type of mission was called *pisanije*. It takes its name from the word for letter/correspondence because it entailed the carrying of a letter, written usually by the abbot or abbots, which would accompany a representative of the monastery as he traveled and came in contact with potential benefactors and donors. The reason for this type of frequent travel of the Hilandar monks in the second half of the sixteenth century (after 1569) was undoubtedly the confiscation of the monasteries and monastery land by the Turkish ruler Sulejman II (Fotić 1994:49, 221).

The monks had to travel and ask for help in order to get the monastery out of debt. According to a document of Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople in 1574, only the representatives of the large monasteries from Mount Athos were allowed to travel outside the monastery. Due to the difficult financial situation, this practice continued though the seventeenth century; indeed, in 1679, out of 6000 monks of the Mount Athos, a least one third of them at all times were traveling and collecting donations. These monks had the written permission of the Turkish authorities, which allowed them to travel and collect donations. It is interesting to note that these monks, in order to protect themselves, often had to resort to disguises in order to avoid robbery (ibid.: 221, 226, 227).
The debt of Mount Athos by the beginning of the seventeenth century had risen to 7,200,000 Ottoman *achki*, or 72,000 Muscovite rubles, or 80,000 florins, which had accrued because of “debts, penalties, and injustice” (Fotić 2000: 65). This debt was eventually paid thanks to the generous donations of mainly Russian and Moldavian rulers. The tax for Hilandar Monastery was 8% to 12% of the overall tax of the monasteries of Mount Athos. Thanks to the Russian monastery, Panteleimon, which played a role in establishing close ties between the Russian court and Hilandar, Hilandar was able to acquire a substantial amount of donations and pay off the debt (Fotić 2000: 73-78, 207).

Hilandar Monastery has preserved five letters addressed to dignitaries that the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije presented on behalf of the monastery: (1) A petition given to the nobleman Nikita Romanov Jur'ev (the grandfather of the future tsar Mikhail Romanov) in April 1586; (2) A petition given to the nobleman Andrej Jakovlevič (written before 1582); (3) A second petition to the nobleman Andrej Jakovlevič (written before 1582); (4) A petition to the Polish king Stefan Batory (1575-1586); and (5) A petition to Duke Andrej Mihajlovič Kurbskij of Smolensk and Jaroslavl' (died in 1583) (Dimitrijević 1922: 22-24). These documents have been published by the Moscow Main Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Relations (ibid.: 23).

One of the important journeys that the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije made was to Russia in September of 1582. He was accompanied by the hieromonks Venijamin and Serafim, the deacon Joanikije, and the elder Jeremija. During this trip, the Hilandar monks stayed in Russia for over a year (Fotić 2000: 419). Eventually, Grigorije Vasilije

---

8 In the second half of the sixteenth century, one ruble was worth around one hundred Ottoman *akche* (Fotić 2000: 65).
and his delegation were admitted to the tsar’s court on December 6, 1583 (Dimitrijević 1922: 21–25, Fotić 2000: 211). During this visit, Grigorije handed the Hilandar abbot Makarije’s letter to the tsar asking for monetary help for the building of a tower. On this occasion, Tsar Ivan the Terrible sent 700 rubles to Hilandar for prayers for the repose of the soul of his son, Ivan. He donated 60 rubles, 40 pieces of beaver’s fur (which, at that time, were worth around 20-30 rubles each), and 20 rubles for each monk (ibid.).

During his stay in Russia, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije most probably lived in the residence in Moscow that Tsar Ivan the Terrible had donated to Hilandar Monastery in 1556. The purpose of this residence was to provide accommodation to visiting Hilandar monks. The space that was not used was rented, mostly to Greek merchants, and the proceeds were given to Hilandar Monastery (Fotić 2000: 209).9

The hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije’s last trip to Russia took place in 1591, when he was archimandrite and abbot of Hilandar Monastery (Fotić 2000: 419-421). By this time the Russian Orthodox Church was no longer led by a metropolitan but had its own patriarch. Grigorije Vasilije visited Patriarch Job, who donated a Gospel to Hilandar. During his visit to the tsar, Grigorije was commissioned to help the monastery of Saint Panteleimon. At the same time, Tsar Fedor Ivanović gave a donation for the health of his daughter Theodosia (ibid.: 220). This is the last known mention of Grigorije Vasilije’s name in Hilandar’s records.

9 The generosity of Tsar Ivan the Terrible and his fondness for Hilandar Monastery could be explained by the tsar’s awareness of his distant Serbian royal lineage and the desire to strengthen his own position by pointing to his royal ancestors. Sreten Petković attributes the presence of the 1564/65 fresco of Prince Lazar Hrebeljanović (St. Lazar of Kosovo) in the Church of the Archangels within Moscow’s Kremlin to Tsar Ivan’s feeling of connection to his Serbian roots. Additionally, the Church of the Archangel Michael in the Kremlin contains depictions of Saints Sava, Saint Simeon, and the Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Palaeologos (Petković 1987: 576–78). Radojičić points out that Ivan the Terrible was of Serbian descent through his mother Jelena, the granddaughter of Duke Stefan Jakšić, a member of the feudal Jakšić family, which emigrated to Hungary (Radojičić 1965: 285).
In addition to traveling, serving as an abbot, and writing, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije lived a very strict life. The Karyes cell in which he lived and copied *The History of Jewish War* provides evidence of the rigors of his monastic life and the circumstances in which he lived. The abbot of Hilandar and the brotherhood of Hilandar Monastery selected the monk that they felt was the most devoted and distinguished in prayer, fasting, and knowledge to live in this cell. A number of these monks, among whom include famous figures such as Domentijan and Danilo, both of whom had lived and written in this cell, served as Hilandar abbots and later also became bishops and archbishops. As residents of the Karyes cell, these monks always held a prominent place in the assemblies of the Hilandar monastic community and were always members of the Hilandar brotherhood (Živojinović 1989:11, 97).  

Saint Sava founded the Karyes cell for strict prayer and fasting. In his Karyes Typikon, he laid down the rules according to which only extraordinary monks were selected to live in it, and as such enjoy special rights and protection. For example, no one was supposed to disturb the monk who lived in this cell, and no one had authority over this cell—not even the abbot of the Hilandar Monastery or the Protos of Mount Athos. This was unusual, because every other cell at that time was under the authority of the Protos. The explanation for this exception could be the fact that Saint Sava bought this cell from the Protos (Živojinović 1972:92).  

---

10 In March of 1581, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije is mentioned as a participant at the Assembly of Karyes, together with the proabbot Pajsije and Prohor (Fotić 2000: 419–21).

11 The *proto* is the head of the monastic government of Mount Athos. He is elected by the assembly of abbots from the monks of the five major monasteries—the Great Lavra, Vatopedi, Iveron, Hilandar and Dionisiou.

12 Not only was this cell independent from the Protos, but also from the authority of Hilandar Monastery. In addition, even though the cell had its own vineyards and its own property, which was, according to Teodosije, very fertile, Hilandar Monastery was supposed to support the cell materially. This, however,
This explains the intensely negative reaction expressed by the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije in the colophon of HM.SMS.280 when he describes how he was forced to live outside the Karyes cell during the time of Archimandrite Pahomije. His removal by Pahomije was obviously in violation of Saint Sava’s rule “that none should disturb the monk who lived in the Karyes cell.” From the colophon, we cannot tell what that dispute was about. All we know is that the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije complains and says that the archimandrite made “a big mistake” when he moved him from an idiorhythmic into a coenobitic setting.\footnote{In coenobitic (communal) monasteries, where communal life is practiced, monks eat meals together in large refectories (dining-rooms). In the idiorhythmic monasteries, sketae, kelliae, and hesychasteriae, monk do not eat together. Each monk receives his supply of bread, vegetable, oil, sugar and salt, prepares own food, and eats it at his convenience” (Matejić 1983: 12-13).}

In sum, during a period of eleven years, from 1580 to 1597/8, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije’s name is mentioned eight times in Hilandar Monastery’s records as a trustee or representative of the monastery. Undoubtedly, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije was a distinguished monk who represented Hilandar monastery during some very difficult times for the Athonite monastic communities. His primary calling was the ascetic life. As an ascetic, he was exemplary. Nevertheless, he served in many capacities above and beyond what his monastic duties required. One of those activities that the monastery critically needed was someone to go on the foreign missions, something which changed later when the monastery ceased taking care of this cell (Živojinović 1972: 93). Later on, a paragraph was added to the Typikon. This chapter of the Hilandar Typikon, paragraph 42, states that this cell has no obligations towards the monastery, neither does the monastery has any obligations towards the cell. This shows that the practice and the relationship of the Hilandar monks toward this cell changed over time. The abbot and the brotherhood of the monastery had the right to choose the monk who would live in this cell. In paragraph 42 it was added that those who elect the monk to live there should not elect the person who will use the cell “for the sake of physical rest, a person who is illiterate, or who would buy the right to live there.” This paragraph also stated that “Hilandar monks could remove the one who is unworthy to live in it.” One such example is mentioned by Živojinović in which, similar to the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije, a certain hieromonk, kir Teodul, was forced to leave the cell and join the brotherhood. Only after the intercession of Tsar Dušan and with the permission of the abbot and all the elders was Teodul allowed to go back to the cell, where he remained for the rest of his life (Živojinović 1972: 95).
he, according to the records, performed over a period of more than ten years. During all that time he was a trustee of Hilandar, as well as an abbot for the last three years for which we have a record. I assume that these are the last three years of his life. In spite of all this work and duties, he also was a scribe. His copy of *The History of the Jewish War* is indicative both of his talent as a scribe as well as his erudition. Yet, in the colophon, the Grigorije Vasilije calls himself “one of those who are unlearned and simple”: “I translated [the work] using Serbian expressions; but I did not know how to compose the text, nor did I learn the text; I was not educated but [am] as one of the simple [folk] and an ignoramus. Forgive [me] for the Lord's sake.” The reader cannot take the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije’s words here literally. One must rather consider them, in light of his work and deeds, as a standard humility topos. His written legacy, including MS.SMS280, is the best indication of his true capabilities.
5. Literature Review

In “Odno nejasnoe mesto v drevnerusskom perevode Iosifa Flavija [“One Unclear Place in the Old Russian Translation of Josephus Flavius”] Ivan Dujčev argues that Grigorije Camblak and Matej Gramatik\textsuperscript{14} knew about Josephus not from The History of Jewish War, but from The Jewish Antiquities. Dujčev also concludes that the first Slavic copy was Hilandar 280, completed by Grigorije Vasilije in 1585. This was, according to Dujčev, the earliest copy of The History of the Jewish War amongst the South Slavs (Dujčev 1960: 420).

In his article “Iosif Flavij v Iužnoslavianskite literature [“Josephus Flavius in the South Slavic Literature”], Boniу Angelov provides a valuable list of the existing Serbian copies of The History of the Jewish War. In contrast to Dujčev, he says that Josephus was known to the South Slavs prior to the sixteenth century. Among those South Slavs familiar with this work were Grigorii Camblak and Metej Gramatik. Angelov states that they probably became acquainted with Josephus through Greek versions of the manuscript. According to Angelov, the 1585 translation from the Russian recension of the Church Slavonic into the Serbian recension is the first South Slavic version of The History of the Jewish War (Angelov 1972:131).

Angelov lists four known copies of this work. The first is the Hilandar manuscript, HM.SMS.280. This is the oldest known South Slavic copy. Among the authors who have written about this copy are Konstantin Dimitriev-Petković, Porfirij Uspenskij, Andrej Popov, Ljubmir Stojanović, Sava Hilandarac, and Đorđe Radojčić.

\textsuperscript{14} A Bulgarian writer from sixteenth century, who wrote \textit{Life of Martyr Nikolaj of Sofija}
The second copy is Hilandar. II. Angelov thinks that this manuscript dates from the seventeenth century (Angelov 1972: 132). The third copy is the Vrhobreznički copy from 1650, Serbian recension. It is located in the Prague National Museum. The fourth is the Sofroniev copy. This is located in the Romanian Academy of Science and dates from 1754. This manuscript was copied in the Serbian recension during the time of Metropolitan Pajsije Dimitrijević, by Archimandrite Sofronije Popović in Užice on August 15, 1754. In addition, there is actually a fifth copy, overlooked by Angelov—the 1826 Hilandar manuscript HM.SMS 282.

Malik Mulić, in his “Otraženje ‘Istorii Iudejskoj vojni’ Iosifa Flavija v drevnej serbskoj literature” [“The Reflection of The History of the Jewish War in the Old Serbian Literature”], discusses the existence of the earliest South Slavic copy of The History of the Jewish War. First, he quotes the colophon of the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije. Mulić concludes that the 1585 copy by hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije is the earliest example of The History of the Jewish War amongst the South Slavs. Mulić states that, despite this, earlier Serbian writers had some knowledge of The History of the Jewish War. As evidence for this claim, Mulić mentions the existence of a quotation from Josephus in the Life of Archbishop Danilo II, written by Danilo’s pupil, whose name is not known, which compares the plunder of Mount Athos by invaders with the plunder of Jerusalem that Josephus described:

Маштить во ив се, вязвовленые, яко сущее рати и страходания подобна суть оныму страданиям иерусалимским, еже приет от Тита кесара римского (“It

---

15 Angelov published three books dealing with the history of Old Bulgarian, Russian, and Serbian literatures. The first book was issued 1958, the second in 1967, and the third in 1978. In them, he extensively discusses the literary relationships between the South Slavs and the Russians.
seems to me, beloved, that the existing wars and fears are like those tribulations of Jerusalem that was taken by Titus the Roman Emperor”; Životi kraljeva i arhiepiskopa srpskih, quoted by Mulić 1969: 109).

Mulić provides a number of possible explanations regarding the familiarity of the author of the Life of the Archbishop Danilo II with The History of the Jewish War. First, he proposes that the author may have had the Chronicle of George Amartolos in front of him when he wrote the Life of the Archbishop Danilo II. He bases this proposition on a brief quotation of a passage from The History of the Jewish War. Alternatively, Mulić suggests that the author could have been acquainted with the History through Greek manuscripts. The author also may have had access to Russian translations of Josephus’ work, keeping in mind Danilo’s good relations with the abbot of Panteleimon Monastery. Mulić even proposes the possibility that a copy of The History of the Jewish War from the fourteenth century may have existed in the Hilandar library. He argues that the colophon of the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije does not specifically state the circumstances under which the book was brought from Russia. Less convincing is Mulić’s argument in which he states that it is not surprising that the Serbian scribe claims that the readers could not understand the Russian language; he erroneously claims that the reason for this was that the monks of Hilandar after Danilo were not formally educated and, therefore, were semi-literate:

Зато в записи указано, что книга эта была очень трудной “нашему сръбскому езыку на чтение” и многие не знали, что читають, ибо не понимали по-русски. Это не удивительно, поскольку прошло уже более двухсот лет со времени жизни Даниила и его ученика Домениана и его ученика. За это время Хиландар перестал быть тем культурным сербским центром, каким он являлся в XIII-XIV вв., когда в нем подвизались Домениан, Даниел и старец Исайя. Кроме того,
The colophon states that the book was very difficult for reading in our Serbian language. Many did not know what they read, because they did not understand Russian. This is not surprising, since two hundred years already had passed from the time when Danilo and his disciples lived. During this time Hilandar ceased to be the Serbian cultural center that it was in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, when Domentijan, Danilo, and the elder Isaija lived. Besides this, the language of the Russian translation of Josephus Flavius’ work, known to Domentijan and Danilo, turned out to be difficult for reading for the semi-literate Serbian monks of the sixteenth century. From this it can be concluded that The History of the Jewish War existed in the Hilandar library for many years; however, no one read it.

Mulić’s possible suggestion that the Russian copy of The History of the Jewish War (HM.SMS.281) may have been kept in the Hilandar library from the fourteenth century onwards is not valid, since the language of the Russian copy that hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije used dates from the sixteenth century. If Mulić has in mind the existence of a missing copy, he has no proof of it. Moreover, Mulić’s claim that after Domentijan and Danilo the monks were semi-literate and could not read Russian manuscripts cannot be substantiated, for the simple reason that the Hilandar Monastery always had educated monks, and that the monastery continued to be a center of culture and learning after the fourteenth century. Besides Grigorije Vasilije and the second unknown Serbian scribe, who worked on the The History of the Jewish War, there were other Serbian monks who were active as scribes in the Karyes cell in the second half of the sixteenth century. These included Sava, who copied three books around 1587; Varlaam in 1587/88, Dionisije in
1596/97; Jeftimije; Elder Lavrentije in 1599; and the priest Antonije (Fotić 2000: 140). This is not to mention other names of great monks and abbots, who traveled along with Grigorije Vasilije on monastic missions in order to obtain donations, as well as representing Hilandar monastery before courts and authorities in legal issues (ibid.: 137-139). These names show that Hilandar had many monks after Domentijan and Danilo who distinguished themselves in both spiritual and intellectual work.

In his book *Južnoslovensko-ruske kulturne veze do početka 18. veka* [South Slavic-Russian Cultural Ties to the Beginning of the 18th Century], which is actually a collection of his lecture notes, Đorđe Radojičić mentions *The History of the Jewish War* and states that was copied from the Russian source by hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije in the cell of Karyes. In his review of the *History*, Radojičić first summarizes the colophon:

> Убоги Григорије...преписао је...књигу Јосипа Премудрог (Флавија) „од рускога извода“, је њу узалауд тражио на српском језику у Ћв. Гори по српским манастирма и у Српској земљи. Распитивао са за њу и по бугарским земљама, али без успеха. Најзад му је донета из руске земље. Веома је тешка била Србима з ачитање. Многи нису знали шта читају, јер руске речи нису разумевали. Он сам двапут је био у Русији, послат од манастира, па се тако привикао руском језику, али „не много“. Преписивао је књигу српским речима, колико је умео као „један од простих и невежда“, који „писати слово не уме“, јер није то ни учио нити је „сам учео“ био. Хтео је да нађе други примерак књиге, да би сравнио свој препис, али ни у томе није успео.

Poor Grigorije…copied…the book of Joseph the Most Wise (Flavius), from “the Russian source,” since he was searching in vain for it in the Serbian language, on Mount Athos in the Serbian monasteries and in the Serbian lands. He inquired about it in the Bulgarian lands, but without any success. Finally, it [the text] was brought to him from the Russian lands. It was very difficult for Serbs to read it. Many of them did not know what they were reading, since they did not understand Russian words. He himself had twice been in Russia, sent by the monastery, and during that time he became acquainted with the Russian language, but not that well. He was copying the book with Serbian words, as much as he could, being
that he was “simple and ignorant,” who “did not know how to write,” since he did not study nor was he himself learned. He wanted to find another copy of the book to compare to his copy, but had no success. (Radojčić 1967: 82–83)

Contrary to Radojčić’s argument, the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije most probably received the copy of *The History of the Jewish War* as a gift when he was in Russia. Radojčić mentions that at the end of *The History of the Jewish War* there is *The Tale of the Capture of Constantinople* (*Povest o Tsarigradu*). He states that the Hilandar monks, and maybe the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije himself, acquired a Bulgarian text of Josephus after 1585. Radojčić claims that this Hilandar manuscript represents an incomplete version from the sixteenth century. In reply to this claim, however, the fact that this version is abridged does not mean that it is incomplete but, rather, that it represents the Short Redaction. Furthermore, we do not have any record or proof of the existence of a Bulgarian text. From comparing the Russian and the Serbian manuscript, we know that the existing Russian copy of the manuscript, HM.SMS.281, is the source from which the hieromonk Grigorije Vasilije copied HM.SMS.280.

In the following chapters, I will discuss the lexical differences between the Russian and Serbian versions of Josephus, as attested in the two oldest Hilandar copies. My analysis is divided into three categories: lexical variations due to recensional editing (Chapter 2), lexical variations due to disambiguation (Chapter 3), and lexical variations due to other factors (Chapter 4). This last chapter examines a small number of lexemes that were replaced due to either scribal preference of concrete over abstract language, avoidance of figurative terminology, censorship, synonymy, or scribal error.
CHAPTER 2

LEXICAL VARIATIONS DUE TO RECENSIONAL EDITING

2.1 Introductory remarks

In this chapter, I will analyze the lexemes which were substituted or glossed by the Serbian scribes, either because they were completely absent from sixteenth-century Serbian or because they were not used in the particular meanings found in the Russian Josephus. As it will be shown below, lexical variations due to recensional editing account for 50% of the lexemes found in my sample. A number of those recensional substitutions were apparently based on the rarity of the words in Church Slavonic (which, in some cases, are considered hapax legomena), found in specific military vocabulary dealing with siege warfare. Other replaced lexemes deal with ecclesiastical, court, and social vocabulary. The questionable lexemes were either substituted or defined in a gloss. A number of the words appear to be attested for the first time in HM.SMS.280, and so they add to our knowledge of the medieval Serbian lexicon.
2.2 Discussion of the lexemes

2.2.1. *lix-* and *zlo-*

In the following passage, the Serbian scribe substitutes the noun *ζλόνυχαρι* for the adjective *λίξον(ου)άρι* in the Russian text [Rus 5v:21]:

Po малч же дивех, принде макънъ лихомадръ, именеъ ёрьу/клин [Rus 5v:21]
I по малч дивех, принде макънъ ζλόνυχαρι, именеъ ёрьуклин [Srb 3v:21]
"A few days later there arrived an evil man, named Eurycles"16

This is the only substitution of the root *zlo-* for *lix-* in my sample. Otherwise, I came across fourteen examples of the root *zlo-* in both Russian and Serbian manuscripts. Of these, four appear in compounds.

In Russian Church Slavonic the root *lix-* could mean ‘something evil,’ ‘bad,’ but also ‘superfluous,’ ‘plenty.’ According to Sreznevskij, in Russian Church Slavonic, the adjective *lixo* primarily means ‘evil’: Α ντο να χασεμε να ο ηπειρειο ινα να ο δεμο, Α ντο να χασεμε χεραδειν “Tell us what you have been hearing, about that which is detrimental to us or about that which is beneficial to us.” (Dogovornaja gramota velikago knjaza Vasilija Dmitrijeviča, fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “lixo”).

D’jačenko gives similar meanings for *lix*-. As an adjective, *lixo* could mean 'evil, malicious,’ which is found in the term *lixnov’e* ‘devil’ (D’jačenko 1899: 285).

On the other hand, the Serbian root *lix-* could have positive as well as negative connotations. Unlike in Russian, where the primary meaning of *lixo* is ‘evil,’ the main

---

16 In Leeming we find a slightly different translation for *lihomdr’*": "A few days later there arrived in Antioch a most cunning man, named Aurycles" (Leeming 2003:201). Leeming’s translation pertains to the Russian text.
sense in Serbian is ‘excessive,’ ‘abundant,’ praeter: Ot’ c’ po istiné čedoljub’c’ iz lixa ljubov’ iméaše k’ m’nj’šemu synu svojemu “The father, who truly loved [his] children, had especial love for his younger son” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “lix”). In addition, lixo could denote both negative and positive attitudes, e.g., negative ‘greed’ and positive ‘desire’. Thus, lixoimac means ‘a greedy person’: Ašle li kto takov’ obréštstet’ se, lixoim’c’ ili tajnojadnik’, da izgonit’ se iz monastira “If such a person is found, who is greedy or an eater in secret, let him be expelled from the monastery (Glasnik, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “lixoimac”); but lixoimstvovati, ‘to desire,’ ‘to crave,’ ‘to long’ could stand either for virtue or vice: Lixoim’stvujet’ mučenič’skoju s’mr’tiju “He longs to die a martyrs death” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “lixoimstvovati”); Zlato ne lixoim’stvujet’ svetyj “A holy person does not desire gold” (ibid.). Similarly the noun lixva ‘interest’ does necessarily imply ‘greed,’ but could also mean ‘effort,’ ‘zeal’: Jegda s’ lixvoju na nas’ v’zyskano budet’ “When we will be asked (to give) with interest” (ibid.).

From this we can see that lix- could have both positive and negative connotations. Miklošič mentions the compound lixomudr’ ‘cunning,’ ‘crafty,’ male prudens, but does not provide any Serbian examples. No listing of this compound is found either in the Rječnik or in Daničić.

On the other hand, although no Serbian examples of zlomudr’ are attested, the adjective zal’, ‘evil,’ malus is commonly found in medieval Serbian: Zal’ tvari “evil man” (Letter of Dubrovnik prince to Evgenia, Stefan and Vuk, 1396; quoted by Daničić s.v. “zal”). Miklošič does actually list the compound zlomdr’c’, ‘cunning man,’ malevolus, какоферов, but he does not provide any Serbian examples. Nevertheless, the
root zlo- provides a more concrete and clear example of the meaning ‘evil,’ as opposed to lix- which could have more than one meaning. While the root lix- was attested in medieval Serbian, from the examples found in the main Serbian dictionaries, the root lix- could have either positive or negative connotations. It appears, however, that its primary meaning was the ambivalent ‘excessive,’ ‘superfluous,’ ‘abundant.’ Additionally, the meanings ‘interest,’ ‘craving,’ ‘yearning,’ besides implying ‘greed,’ could also refer to a positively evaluated quality—‘zeal’ or ‘desire’.

The intention of Grigorije Vasilije was to transfer the meaning from Russian to Serbian. Since the compound lixomudr’ was not found in Serbian, and as such could have been an obstacle to the reader, the scribe replaces lix- with the concrete zlo-, unambiguously denting ‘evil.’ This was particularly important in order to avoid ambiguity; since the root lix- could have been associated with the positively evaluated ‘abundance’, its combination with mudr’ could hypothetically lead to the conclusion that the compound refers to ‘very wise’ rather than ‘evil-minded.’ Here I have followed Molnár’s discussion of structural calques; according to him, lixo compounds are not literal translations from Greek:

“If we take the basic meaning of πλεοωξία into consideration: its precise rendering would have been *ΒΟΛΗΝΙΑ, ΒΑΣΙΓΟΘΗΝΙΑ, or even *ΒΛΗΝΟΘΗΝΙΑ, if we consider the etymological relation of πολύς to πλέον, πλέον. The Greek compounds underwent a pejorative change of meaning, and the Old Slavic lixo ‘superfluous, excessive, lawless, bad’ followed this process, maybe, influenced by the Old Slavic lixva ‘usurious interest’ (From the Old High German lihan ‘to lend’ + the Slavic suffix –va)” (Molnár 1985:197).
Considering the fact that the compound *lixomudr’* is found only once in my sample, it is striking that Miklošič also mentions only this particular example, ο λιχομογράμμα ἐφρύκλη “about evil man Eurycles” s.v. “lixomόδρ’”). It can be suggested, that like the related compounds, *lixirimstvie, lixoiimiē, lixoimanie*, which are considered hapax legomena (Molnár 1985:196), the compound *lixomudr’* also could fall into this category in Old Russian; in any case, it was undoubtedly a rare word. Since the compound *zломудр’* ‘evil man’ is not found in the major Serbian dictionaries, the attestation in HM.SMS.280 makes an addition to the existing Serbian lexicography.

2.2.2. *dik-* and *dijav-*

Another example of recensional editing is the replacement of the adjective ḏἰκᾶρο [Rus 51r:11] by ḏἰѧβιγρ’:

Τό/κα ο μύχ κ, ἐγὼ το ὅριν/ἀχρ ḏἰκᾶρ, πρέθε κνέλκε εἰς ἄρσείν [Rus 51r:9]
Τάχον Εξ Μύχ Κ, ἐγὼ πλαχοῦ ḏἰѧβιγρ’, πρέθε κλλε | μοῦ εἰς ἄρσείν [Srb 46v:18]
“Only that man, whom they called demonic, came to him in fury”

In my sample I came across two examples of the substitution of the root *dik-* [Rus 51r:9, 162r:12] and *dijav-* [Srb 46v:18, 147r:5].

In Russian Church Slavonic the adjective *dikyi* meant 'rough, wild':
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According to Avanesov, the Old Russian adjective *dikyi*, in reference to people, can denote ‘not enlightened’, ‘not uncivilized’, and also ‘pagan’. Avanesov only gives examples from the twelfth century referring to the pagan Cumans: И посылает дикиног свою и братья свою и детей своих и диких Полоцци в поле своя подарили и даром многими "And from his tent he discharged his companions and his brothers and his children and he discharged the wild Cumans to their camps after he gave them many gifts" (Hypatian Chronicle, circa 1425; Avanesov s.v. “dikyi”).

The fact that the term *dik-* is not mentioned in historical dictionaries of Serbian—the Rječnik, Daničić, or Miklošić, (who does mention one Russian attestation of *dik*’ ‘furious, ‘wild,’ *ferus*)—suggests that this term was foreign to Serbian speakers in the sixteenth century. The term likewise does not exist in modern Serbian.

The Rječnik mentions the term *djavlji* and states that this term is attested from the fifteenth century. It is formed from the root *djavl-* , ‘one who belongs to devil’. However, the Rječnik does not provide any examples.

Grigorije Vasilije does not find *dik-* to be Serbian. He looks for an equivalent of the unfamiliar word. He has a partial phonetic association (*di-* at the beginning of both words). In addition, he knows that John the Baptist's enemies accused him of being possessed by the devil (Luke 7:33). These factors possibly influence him to replace *dik-* with *dijav-* 'demonic.’ This reinterpretation may have been supported by the association between 'demonic' and 'rage.'

17 The expected equivalent for the adjective *diky* in Serbian would be *divlji*, which is graphically similar to what the scribe actually wrote, *dijav*. It originates in Proto-Slavic and comes from the adjectival root *div-* (suffixed *divj-*), which means ‘strange’. When it denotes a person it describes ‘one who is not does not know what other people know’, ‘who is not used living in the society’, ‘who is rude and unrefined in conversation’. In addition it denotes ‘people who are behind and did not advance in civilization’, and people ‘who do not’ toil land, but live from hunting’ (Rječnik s.v. “divlji”).
2.2.3. *versta* and *p'prišče*

Another case of editing based on recensional differences between Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic is the replacement of *versta* [Rus 109r:7] by *p'prišče*:

Прилежит же къ нимъ согаани и селев/кыла. Идёже есть и соционикское езеро. Ширина его 3 верста [Rus 109r:7]

Прилежит же къ нимъ согаани и селевь/кыла. Идёже е и соционикское езеро. Ширина его 3 п'ярпинь. [Srb 100v:22]

“Adjacent to him is Soganii and Seleucia, where there is Lake Semechonitis. Its width is 60 stades.”

The Serbian scribe regularly replaces the noun *versta* (spelled also as *v’rsta*, and *vr’sta*) ‘measure of travel distance’ with *p’prišče* (spelled also as *poprišče*, *paprišče*, and *p’pryšče*) ‘stadium.’ In my sample I came across nine occurrences of this substitution. [Cf. Srb 49v:11, 50r:11, 93v:21, 100v:22, 144v:1, 176v:13, 177v:6, 178v:14, 240v:19]. In one case [240v:19], the noun *vr’sta* is found in the text while *p’prišč* appears in the margin.

According to Sreznevskij, the noun *versta*, *v’rsta*, *v’rsta*, *verst’sta*, in medieval Russian Church Slavonic, besides the meanings, ‘series,’ ‘kind,’ ‘age,’ ‘friend,’ also denoted a measure of travel distance, ‘stadium,’ *µίλιον* : Отець, господь, святаго Спаса и святаго Николы наша путьника от мире удаляя сто верстата отъ людей. “The dwelling, lords, of the Holy Savior and Saint Nicholas, our refuge from the world, is a hundred stadia from people” (Žalovannaja Novogorodskaja gramota Soloveckomu monastyrju, fifteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “v’rsta”). Sreznevskij mentions many examples where this noun was used to denote a measure of travel distance, which shows

---

18 “And Sogane and Seleucia are adjacent to them, where lake Samechonitis is. And it is 60 stades in breadth” (Leeming 2003:392).
that the use of this noun in this meaning was common in medieval Russian. Dmitrij Čiževskij, in his discussion of the distance travel measures of Abbot Danilo, points out that the use of the nouns *versta* and *poprišče* were common in the twelfth century, and that they originate from Greek ἑλυκή, πλέδρον (Čiževskij 1974:521). However, ἑλυκή, as listed by Sreznevskij under the noun *versta*, could also mean ‘ripe age,’ which shows the possibility of ambiguity with this noun.

As in Russian, the noun *vrsta*, *v’rsta*, was attested in medieval Serbian primarily in meaning ‘series,’ ‘kind,’ ‘age,’ ‘rank.’ Neither Daničić nor the Rječnik provide any examples of this noun denoting a measure of traveled distance. Under the discussion of the noun *v’rsta*, *versta*, Sreznevskij mentions that this noun is found in Serbian with the meaning ‘series,’ ‘order,’ and ‘measure of weight’ (Sreznevskij s.v. “versta”), but he does not mention the measure of travel distance. In addition, according to Miklošič, the noun *vr’sta*, besides being attested in Serbian in the meaning ‘age’ ἑλυκή, aetas, is also attested as ‘stadium,’ σταδίον (Prologue of Studenica Monastery, fourteenth century, Miklošič s.v. “v’rsta”’). This one example, showing a possible secondary meaning dealing with a measurement of distance traveled, suggests the possibility that the noun was rarely used in this meaning in medieval Serbian. The Rječnik gives only a single modern example where *vrsta* is used denoting measurement, but a much smaller one, in a regional dialect of Herzegovina—prišve ‘roof tiles, nailed one meter apart from another’. He also mentions that the term is used in South Serbia denoting fields (Rječnik s.v. “vrsta”). But these examples apply to modern Serbian only. Daničić also lists a number of medieval Serbian attestations of *vrsta*, but only in the meaning ‘kind, rank,’ *ordo.*
Unlike versta, the noun poprišče is attested as concretely denoting ‘large distance’—a mile, stadium, in Greek μίλιον. Miklošič states that this noun in attested in medieval Serbian in Various Homilies, thirteenth century, Menaion, sixteenth century, Miscellany, fourteenth century, from Šafarik’s collection. However, no examples are provided. Neither Rječnik nor Daničić list any medieval Serbian examples of this noun.

On the other hand, there are numerous Russian examples of this noun: И актъ кътъ попришчъ та по счасть поприще было “And if someone takes you by force one mile” (Matthew 5: 41; Pandects of Antiochus, eleventh century, quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “poprišče”).

Also, Егъ же видания близъ неруйшани яко и поприще. “Bethany was near Jerusalem, about two miles away” (John 11:18 in the Ostromir Gospel, 1056–57; quoted by Sreznevskij, ibid.). Petar Skok thinks that poprište originates from Russian -ište, popry ‘gallop.’ He quotes Matzenauer, who states that poprište (meaning stadium), comes from the root *p’r- currere, festinare (Skok 1973:10).

From the above examples it can be suggested that the regular replacement of the noun versta by porpršče, by both Grigorije Vasilije and the second Serbian scribe, may be due to either recessional editing or disambiguation. While both nouns were attested in medieval Serbian, the primarily meaning of versta, v’rsta, v’rsta, was ‘series,’ ‘kind,’ ‘age.’ As opposed to medieval Russian, where we find many examples of this noun denoting the measure of traveled distance, only one such example is found in Serbian, which suggest the scarcity of use of this noun with this meaning. On the other hand, the attestation of the noun poprišče, ‘large distance’—a mile, stadium, μίλιον, in number of

---

19 These manuscripts were collected from a Serbian monastery, by Antun Mihanović (1796-1861), Austrian consul, who served in Thessaloniki and Belgrade. Some of those manuscripts are found in Vienna, Austria, and others in Zagreb, Croatia.

20 Literally, fifteen stadia.
Serbian manuscripts indicates that this noun was common, and at the same time provides an adequate equivalent of Russian *versta*, found in the Russian Josephus passage.

2.2.4. *dumati* and *s’vëтовати*

The next example is the replacement of the verb *думати* [Rus 7r:14] by

*свëтовати*:

И завидя љубу и *думал*, како ље мо омутрети [Rus 7r:14].

И завидя и *свëтовати*, како и мо омутрети [Srb 5r:12].

“And they envied and plotted against me, how to kill me”

The Serbian scribe regularly replaces the root *duma-* with *s’вëт-. This substitution occurs five times in my sample. Cf. [Srb 5r:13, 103v:9, 148r:5, 176r:9, 176r:11]. In two examples, *s’вëту* [Srb 176r:9] and *s’вëшчауе* [176r:11], *s’вëт-* denotes ‘consultation,’ referring to the consultation of the Roman generals; *s’вëшчауе* in [Srb 103v:9] denotes ‘contemplation’; *zlos’вëтиу* in [Srb 148r:5] denotes ‘perfidy.’ In the following six examples, the root *s’вëт-* is not substituted by the Serbian scribe. It appears twice as an agent noun: *s’вëтники* Rus 198v:11 and *s’вëтники* [Srb 180r:13], where it denotes ‘advisors’ of the rebels, as opposed to the ‘council’ of the Roman generals, which in the Russian manuscript is rendered with the root *duma-*; and once as an action noun— *s’вëшчауие* [Rus 276r:1], *s’вëшчауие* [Srb 250v:6], denoting ‘decision.’ The verb *s’вëшчау*, meaning ‘decide,’ found four times in my sample, is also found in the Russian manuscript.
The verb *dumati* comes from Proto-Slavic and is found in Russian, Polish, and Bulgarian. It means ‘talk’ (in Bulgarian) and ‘think’ (Russian and Polish). According to Sreznevskij, the verb *dumati* in medieval Russian Church Slavonic, in addition to the meanings ‘to reflect,’ ‘to consult,’ ‘to think,’ also denoted ‘to plot’: Не думали есмь на грата сего на лукь, ыто его вятин  “We did not plot against our brother, in order to kill him” (*Novgorodskaja letopis*, fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “dumati”).

There are no examples of *dumati*, in the meaning ‘to talk’ in medieval Serbian texts. However, the verb must have existed in the spoken language, given that there are examples in songs and sayings. Most probably it came to Serbian from Bulgarian. The Rječnik provides examples from the nineteenth century, but only in songs and sayings: "Hajde Rado da dumamo" ‘Rada (girl’s name) let’s talk.’ However, the verb *dumati* in any meanings not found in the modern Serbian language.

On the other hand, the verb *savjetovati* is found in Church Slavonic, where it means ‘to advise,’ ‘to consult,’ ‘to bear witness, and ‘to plan’ (Havránek 2006: 243). This verb is also found in Serbian manuscripts in the fourteenth century meaning ‘to consult’: *Savetovavьse s vlasteli* “He consulted with the noblemen” (*Sons of Duke Radoslav in Dubrovnik*, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “savjetovati”).

The absence of instances of *dumati* in medieval Serbian and its absence in the modern Serbian language (apart from the Rječnik’s debatable example), at least in the meaning ‘take counsel’ suggests the reason why the Serbian scribe replaced it with *savjetovati*. It would appear that the term *dumati* was foreign to the Serbian speakers in the sixteenth century; hence the scribe throughout the manuscript consistently substituted it for the familiar term *s”vjетovati*. 
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2.2.5. *medliti* and *kasněti*

In the following example is another case of editing based on recessional differences. Here the Serbian scribe replaces *medliti* [Rus 195v:12] with *kasněti*:

*Ακού να σβάδει τελικά α να πάτη, α το νε εοισιέα να μεδλιτε να στοπράατε να δαγή δαχάε [Rus 193v:8].
*Яко на пиръ тевахъ а не на ратъ, ёнкудъ не каснěти и ни спотръпие ни боелъсе со [Srb 175r:10].
“For they were running as if not to a battle but to a wedding, not lingering, nor looking around, nor afraid” (Leeming 2003:251).

There are three examples of the substitution of the verb *kasněti* for *medliti*— [Srb 175r:11, 176v:11, 183v:10]. However, the verb *medliti* is found two times in both the Russian and the Serbian manuscript: *pomědlim*” [Rus 105r:20] and *pomedlim* [Srb 97v:9]; *medlili* [Rus 201r:7] and *medlily* [Srb181v:21]. In another example, the verb *medlim”*[Rus 105r:10] is replaced by the verb *kr’smaem* [Srb 97r:22] denoting ‘tarry.’

The use of the verb *krsmati* instead of *kasněti* reflects the distinction between the second Serbian and Grigoriije Vasilije, who regularly uses *kasněti*.

In medieval Russian Church Slavonic, the verb *med’liti* (the equivalent of Greek *ξρονζειν*) means ‘to tarry,’ ‘to linger’: Медлить подати, ігроже просать “he delays [giving] the tribute-money that they are requesting” (Sbornik” Svjatoslava 1076; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “medliti”). The same root is also attested in the adjectival form m’dl’ni: и несъцькала и мъ ць съцьагъ кървати о восехъ, яже гълаша пророци “о senseless [man] and dilatory in heart to believe in everything that the prophets said” (Luke 24:25 in the Ostromir Gospel, 1056-57; ibid.).

---

21 Attested in *Life of Saint Sava*, thirteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “krsmati”).
The Rječnik only briefly mentions the verb *medliti*, meaning ‘to linger,’ and ‘tarry’, and the related adjective *medleno*, meaning ‘slow’. It provides only one example, but does not say from what period it comes: *Ne medli obratiti se k’ gospodu* “Do not delay to turn to the Lord” (Rječnik s.v. “medliti”). Miklošič also mentions the verb *m’dliti, tardare, χρονίζειν*, but only the attestations from Old Russian sources. He provides one example of the adjective *m’dl*, *tardus*, but only the attestations from Old Russian sources. He provides one example of the adjective *m’dl*, *tardus*, *βραδίς*, *νωθρός*, attested in the Epistle in the Serbian Monastery of Šišatovac from 1324.

According to the Rječnik, the verb *kasniti* denoted ‘to be late’ in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic: *Prič’ti me v’ red’ svih’ svetyh’ čr’noriz’c’ služeštih’ ti, da ne k’s’neštu mi v’ně z’lym’ zvěrem’ starym’ zlodějem’ izđen’ budu v’ně čr’toga tvojego* “Join me to the rank of these holy monks who are serving you, lest, being kept late outside, I be eaten by the evil beast, the old evildoer, outside of your chamber” (*Life of Saint Sava*, thirteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “kašnjeti”).

The fact that neither Miklošič nor Daničić provide an example of *medliti* may be an indication that this verb was not common in Serbian Church Slavonic. MacRobert, in her discussion of the lexical variations of *zamodi*, ‘delay,’ *zabdži* ‘forget,’ *zam’dli* ‘delay,’ and *zak’sni* ‘delay,’ rendered from Greek *µὴ χρονίζεις*, thinks that that these variations occurred due to the confusion of “words of the similar sound or appearance” (MacRobert 1991:407). However, this reasoning could not be applied to the examples found in my sample. Instead, I would suggest that a possible motivation for the substitution of *kasněti* for *medliti* was due to scarce use of this word in medieval Serbian and other South Slavic dialects. In support of this possibility, I would like to adduce Cejtlin’s observation that, out of 898 vocabulary words of the Enina Epistle found in
1960, more than 120 were not used in other Bulgarian manuscripts. One of those 120 not used words was *m”d’liv*” (Cejltin 1986:43).

2.2.6. *obraziti* and *poraziti*

In this passage, the second Serbian scribe replaces the verb *образити* [Rus 110r:15] with the verb *поразити*.

*Њесто се вржал пусти на ка/мень и образи ему локет* [Rus 110r:14]
*Њесто се вртал пусти камень нань и порази ему лакет* [Srb 102r:2]
“Someone threw a stone at him from the ramparts and *struck*22 his elbow”.

This substitution occurs only once in my sample. The verb *obraziti* in Russian Church Slavonic primarily means to ‘draw,’ ‘to portray,’ ‘to realize’: Бяху образени яко же киноваремь “They were portrayed as if by cinnabar” (*Menaion*, fifteenth century Sreznevskij; s.v. “*obraziti*”); *Возложете къ истину к сего образити образъ Хьбъ въ ебь житынишъ, прийестомь, словомь... “You can truly realize the image of Christ within yourself with all your life, conduct, and word…* (Pandects of Antiochus, eleventh century; ibid.).

Secondarily, *obraziti* could mean to ‘hit,’ as in the Josephus text: Тежъ, ести ви хрестьининъ йида вдарилъ такъ, яко бы криви не розналъ... вдареному и образложеному даешь доять вунити, яко шляхтичу “Also, if a Christian should strike and hit a Jew, so as not to spill blood... he ought to gratify the person who was struck and hit, the same as [he

---

22 *struck* him in the elbow (Leeming 2003:393)
would] a nobleman. (Žalovannaja gramota vel. kn. Aleksandra-Vitovta Litovskim’ Evrejam” fourteenth century 1388; ibid).

Unlike in Russian where the verb *obraziti* could mean both ‘draw,’ ‘portray,’ and ‘strike,’ neither the Rječnik, Daničić or Miklošić provide any medieval Serbian examples of this verb in the meaning ‘hit,’ ‘stike.’ They only list this verb in the meaning ‘form’ (related to the first Russian sense). Thus, the absence of this verb in the main Serbian dictionaries makes it very likely that the verb *obraziti* was not attested in medieval Serbian in the meaning ‘hit,’ ‘strike’.

On the other hand, the verb *poraziti*, which is actually used in the Serbian Josephus manuscript, is found in the Rječnik, Daničić, and Miklošić and was very common in medieval Serbian. It could denote ‘strike,’ ‘smote,’ ‘knock,’ and ‘kill,’ *ferire, percutere*: Da go porazi sila čustnago krsta “Let the power of the precious cross strike him” (*Charter of King Milutin*, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “poraziti”).

Thus, after considering these examples, I would suggest that the second scribe, most probably due to the lack of the meaning ‘hit,’ ‘strike,’ in the verb *obraziti* in medieval Serbian, replaces it with common and straightforward *poraziti*, denoting both ‘hit,’ ‘strike,’ and ‘kill.’ While the verb *obraziti* was attested in both medieval Russian and Serbian, it apparently did not have the same range of connotations in the two recensions. Therefore, the replacement of the verb *obraziti* with *poraziti* appears to provide a faithful rendering of the meaning ‘strike,’ found in the Josephus passage.
2.2.7. Šatajtsja and v’znositi se

This is another example of recensional editing, in which the Serbian scribe replaces the verb шатаjтсja with в’зносить:  

Тогда възноситсja и шатаjтсja теоргjеса яко над всъл люди съют [Rus 113r:17]  
Тогда възноситсja и възносить теоргjесе яко над всякъ люди съютъ [Srb 104v:13].  
“Then they brag and exalt themselves pretending as if they are above all people.”23

This is the only example of this substitution in my sample. There are three other cases in which the second Serbian scribe uses the Serbian equivalent šetatise: šatajutsja [Rus 101v:7, 103r:5] and šetatutse [Srb 94r:3, 95v:7]; and also the noun štanja [Rus 160v:19], and šetania [Srb 146r:19], found in Grigorije Vasilije’s section of text.

In Russian Church Slavonic the verb šatajtsja, besides the meanings ‘wonder,’ ‘worry,’ could denote ‘to boast’: Шатаjта везаконнъыхъ сътворище “The council of the ungodly is boasting” (Irmologion, thirteenth century; ibid.).

Unlike in Russian, where we find the verb šatajtsja in the meaning corresponding to the given Josephus passage, in medieval Serbian we find only the related noun šetanije ‘haughtiness,’ ‘arrogance,’ ‘pride,’ fremitus, festus (Various Homilies, fourteenth century, Milkošić s.v. “šetanije”). Additionally, we find in Miklošić the verb šetaštija, with the somewhat related meaning ‘murmur,’ ‘speak idly,’ fremere, nugar, but no medieval Serbian examples are given. Similarly, Daničić mentions the related noun šetanije ‘loud noise,’ ‘murmur,’ ‘roar,’ fremitus: оубо се нпомщенинъыхъ варваръ шетани “I will not become afraid of the roar of the foreign barbarians” (Life of Saint Simeon, thirteenth

23 “For thoughtless [people] exult and boast when they enjoy success, pretending they are above all men” (Leeming 2003: 397).
The absence of tokens of the verb šatati se in the meaning ‘to exalt,’ ‘elevate’ in other texts suggests that this verb did not, in fact, occur in this meaning in medieval Serbian; the Josephus passages in question would then be the first Serbian attestations of this verb in this meaning. The attested deverbal noun šatanije ‘haughtiness,’ ‘arrogance,’ appears to be equivalent to the meaning found in the Russian Josephus passage.

On the other hand, Daničić mentions a reflexive example of the verb v’znositi se, ‘to ascend,’ evhere (though he lists it in his entry for the non-reflexive verb): Господь вынёс на небеса “The Lord ascended into heaven” (Foundation Charter of King Uroš I, thirteenth century, quoted by Daničić s.v. “v’znositi”). Daničić also lists a somewhat closer meaning, ‘lift up,’ in the non-reflexive form v’znesti: Na vysotu v’znesem’ oči “Let us lift our eyes up to the height” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “v’znositi”). Nevertheless, like with the verb šatati se, neither of these meanings would concretely provide an equivalent to the sense ‘exalt,’ ‘boast,’ found in the Josephus passage. Therefore, since Miklošić does not mention any Serbian examples either, and since no meaning of v’znositise with the meaning ‘exalt,’ ‘boast,’ is found in either of the main Serbian dictionaries, this is apparently the first attested example in Serbian with this meaning. Possibly, the substitution of the verb v’znositi se for šatatisja, ‘exalt,’ only in one of three examples, could be due to alliteration (v’shvaletse i v’z/nosetse) cf. the substitution of the noun puškar’ (puškari puščaše) for strēlec (Leeming 2000:353). In both of these examples, it appears that the second Serbian shows tendency to use a rhyme in order to make the text more elaborate.
2.2.8. stroenije and s”motrënije

Аще нисе мало смерть прияхомз в них бъстенъмъ сттроеніеъ [Rus 113r:12]
Аще ниса мало смерть прияхом вз них бъстенъмъ смотрѣніеъ [Srb 104v:10]
“If (We) have now received a small death from them by God’s Providence.”

This the only substitution of the noun s”motrënije for stroenije. Otherwise, the
noun s”motrënije ‘Providence,’ is found once in both the Russian and the Serbian
manuscript: smot/reniem” [Rus 165r:2] and smotrëniem’ [Srb 149r:17], accompanied by
the noun promyslom’ ‘Providence.’

In Russian Church Slavonic, according to Sreznevskij, the noun stroenije was
polysemous. It could denote ‘building,’ ‘decoration,’ ‘arrangement,’ ‘constitution,’
‘preparation,’ ‘work,’ ‘help,’ ‘governance,’ ‘predestination,’ and ‘God’s Providence.’
The following is an example in which the noun strojenije indicates God’s Providence, the
meaning found in the Josephus passage: Στροήνεται το Βάσιμος πολύτιμος εστή ναυτή
συμβουλίας “God’s providence is more beneficial than our reasoning” (Pandects of
Antiochus, eleventh century; Sreznevskij s. v. “strojenije”).

Similarly, according to the Rječnik, the noun strojenije in medieval Serbian
Church Slavonic could denote ‘government,’ ‘administration’: ТребуJuštu мjuту потрёб
strojenija radi i bratijam тy živuštimъ на утёшеньye “for the sake of governing this needy
place and for the consolation of the brotherhood living here” (Donation Charter of Tsar
Dušan, fourteenth century; ibid.). However, unlike in Russian, no examples of the

24 “(We)have now endured some small suffering from them and by God’s providence” (Leeming
2003:397).
meaning ‘God’s Providence,’ for *strojenije* were found in any of the Serbian historical dictionaries consulted.

On the other hand, according to the Rječnik, the noun *s”motrjenije* can denote concretely an ‘action by which something is monitored.’ It also can indicate ‘worry,’ ‘plan,’ ‘care,’ and ‘vigilance,’ used, in particular, of God’s Providence: *Strašno i slavno s”motrenije tvojega člověkoljubija, vladiko Hriste!* ”Awesome and glorious is the Providence of your love for mankind, o Lord Christ!” (*Donation Charter of King Stefan Uroš*, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “s”motrenije”); *Vršačska uđvljajut se takovomu s”motreniju* “All things are amazed at such vigilance” (*Foundation Charter of Tsar Uroš*, fourteenth century; ibid.); *Bogu s”motrenijem vîsa na polţu mînê tvorêstu* “God doing all things by Providence for my benefit” (*Edict of Despot Stefan*, fifteenth century; ibid.). Here we see that the Russian noun *stroenie* corresponds to the Serbian s””motrënije* in which both could denote ‘God’s providence,’ the meaning found in the Josephus passage.

Since no meaning of ‘God’s Providence’ is found for the noun *strojenije* in Serbian dictionaries, it can be suggested that its replacement by *s”motrjenije* may be an example of recensional editing. While the noun *strojenije* is attested in both Russian and Serbian medieval documents, it had different connotations in two recensions. In particular, the meaning ‘Providence,’ which occurs in the given context in the Russian manuscript, appears not to be attested in Serbian. This could be a possible reason why the Serbian scribe substitutes it for the straightforward noun *s”motrjenije*, pertaining to God’s ‘Providence,’ ‘worry,’ ‘care,’ ‘vigilance.’
2.2.9. *pereskočniky* and *prębęgši*

The next example involves the replacement of the noun *переско́ники* [Rus 192r:17] by *пребе́гши*:

Мятежицы же приведшее родные а не расколници казаху и на казоква зла праха пригнахом къ римляном. Ранчатель вон не творахося въ въ *переско́ники* [Rus 192r:17]

Мятежицы же приведше роднье а не расколници показоваху на казоква зла приялешъ пригнахом къ римляномъ. Ранетих вон не т/ворахуся въ *пребе́гших* [Srb 173v:20]

“And the rebels, bringing relatives [of the dissenters] but not the dissenters [themselves], told them what evils those fleeing to the Romans had endured. For they did not crucify captives but *deserters*.”

There are three substitution of the noun *prębég’* for *pereskočnik’*, also found as a *pereskok’* ‘deserter’: [Rus 192v:17] and [Srb 173v:20]; [Rus 199v:18] and [Srb 181r:11]; [Rus 199v:19] and [Srb 181r:13]. Additionally, there are two examples where the noun *pereskok’/preskok’* is found in both Russian and the Serbian text [Rus 199v:22], [Srb 181r:15]; [Rus 200v:10], [Srb 182r:2].

In Old Russian, according to Sreznevskij, who cites a fifteenth-century copy of Josephus’ *Jewish War*, the noun *pereskočnik’*, *pereskok’,* could mean ‘deserter’, as shown in another Russian Church Slavonic text: *Někto pereskok’* pride k” nemu iz Němec’ “A certain deserter came to him from Latins” (Melissa Canon, fifteenth century; Sreznevskij s.v. “pereskok’”). However, this noun appears not to be attested in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic. Thus the two examples of the noun *preskok’* found in the Serbian Josephus would be its first attestation in medieval Serbian. While this noun was

---

25 “And the rebels, bringing the relatives of the deserters showed them what evil those who had fled to the Romans had endured. The men crucified were not captives but *deserters*” (Leeming 2003:518)
not found in the main Serbian dictionaries, there are a few examples of the related verb *preskočiti*, but only with the meaning ‘to violate,’ ‘to transgress’: *Kto sije prëskoči, da je klet*—“Whoever violates this, let him be cursed” (*Dubrovnik Treaty*, 1243; Riječnik s.v. “preskočiti”). Miklošič also mentions the verb *prëskočiti* ‘jump over,’ ‘leap over,’ ‘transgress,’ but provides no example of the relevant meaning ‘flee,’ ‘desert’.

In medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, the verb *prebeći* could convey the appropriate meaning found in the Josephus passage, ‘flee,’ ‘desert’: *Ako bi glavom’ i s čeljad’ju i s inem’ imanjem’ prebegal u Dubrovnik*—“If he himself had fled to Dubrovnik with his children and other possessions” (*Dubrovnik Treaty*, 1405; Rječnik s.v. “prebeći”). Similarly, Miklošič mentions examples of *prëbëgnoti* ‘flee to the other side,’ ‘go over to the enemy,’ ‘desert’ *transfugere* (*Monastery of Krušedol Old Testament*, sixteenth century; *Czar Dušan’s Law*, fourteenth century; Miklošič s.v. “prëbëgnoti”). From these examples we see that the Serbian substantivized participle *prëbëgši* corresponds to the noun *pereskočiki* found in the Russian Josephus passage.

The absence of the noun *pereskočik*, *pereskok*, ‘deserter,’ as well as the verb *pereskočiti*, ‘flee,’ ‘desert’ in medieval Serbian sources makes it likely that this is another case of recensional editing. Although the verb *pereskočiti*, ‘transgress’ was attested in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, it had a different meaning than ‘desert’, so nouns derived from it would not convey the necessary meaning. Therefore, in order to convey the meaning ‘deserter’ clearly, the Serbian scribe replaces the noun *pereskočniki* with the substantivized participle *prëbëgši*. 
2.2.10. *vdastisja* and *prèdati se*

The next example involves the replacement of the verb *встать* \([\text{Rus}195\text{r:8}]\) by *предать*: 

Ами беспокйт ихь и и*в глада излабуть или встать* \([\text{Rus}195\text{r:8}]\)  
Ами беспокйт ихь или *в глаза излабуть или предать* \([\text{Srb}176\text{v:8}]\)  
"If we besiege them, they will either die from hunger or surrender."\(^{26}\)

This substitution of the verb *прèdatise* for *vdastisja* occurs only once in my sample. Additionally, I found one example of the verb *vdatisja* ‘surrender’ in both the Russian and Serbian texts: *vda/шетисja* \([\text{Rus}109\text{r:5}], \ v'dа se [\text{Srb}101\text{r:6}]\). Also, both texts contain one example without the prefix *v*, *dajahutsja* \([\text{Rus}108\text{v:21}], \ dajahuse [\text{Srb}100\text{v:14}]\), with the meaning ‘surrender’. Two other examples of the verb *vdastisja* have different meanings, ‘offer oneself to help’ \([\text{Srb}4\text{r:14}]\), and ‘pretend’ \([\text{Srb}4\text{r:15}]\).

In medieval Russian Church Slavonic, as seen above, *vdastisja* could mean ‘to give oneself up,’ ‘to surrender’: *не встать* за похотью житимочных “Let us not give ourselves up to worldly desires” (\*Edificatory Miscellany, twelve-thirteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “вдатисja”); *вдатисja* Печениым “Let us surrender to the Pechenegs” (the *Primary Chronicle*, eleventh century, in the Laurentian Copy, 1377; ibid.).\(^{27}\)

As we see from the Russian example, the expression for the meaning ‘to surrender’ is based on the varying compounds of the verb *dati* ‘to give.’

---

\(^{26}\) “But if we besiege them, then they will die from famine or surrender”\(^{26}\) (Leeming 2003: 523)  
\(^{27}\) In addition the meaning ‘to surrender’ the verb *vdastisja* could mean ‘to get married’: *вдатися* на брак “To get married” (\*Kormчaja kniga, fifteenth century; Sreznevskij, s.v. “vdatisja”).
The Rječnik does not provide any medieval Serbian examples of the verb *vdastise*. Daničić provides examples of the verb *v’dati, dare*, denoting ‘give,’ ‘marry,’ but does not mention the reflexive form or the meaning ‘to surrender’ found in the Josephus passage. Miklošić lists the verb *v’datise αντωμολείν, transfigere, ‘flee on the other side,’ ‘desert,’* but does not provide any examples (*Pentateuch and Other Old Testament Books*, sixteenth century; Miklošić s.v. “v’datise”). Although no examples are provided, this verb shows to be attested in medieval Serbian and closely corresponds to the Josephus meaning ‘surrender.’ However, this one of the meanings of this verb, since it could also mean ‘offer oneself for help,’ ‘pretend,’ and as such could cause ambiguity. Perhaps, this could be the reason the Serbian scribes replace it with more concrete *predati se*, clearly denoting ‘to surrender.’ Similarly in the Old Church Slavonic, the verb *v”dati se* ‘to give up oneself to slavery,’ ‘to enslave self,’ *πειθεσθα*, is found in Suprasliensis (136, 27). Also, one can give oneself up to a vice: *не въламвь себе пьынствкоу “not to give oneself up to drunkenness”* (ibid. :493, 7).

On the other hand, the medieval Serbian examples of the verb *predati se* meaning ‘to surrender’ show that the prefix *pred-, ‘over,’* and *dati ‘give,’* therefore, *predati se*, is synonymous to the Russian *v”dati se* ‘surrender,’ ‘give oneself up’: *Urošic‘ kon’činu prijem’ grobu predast’ se “Little Uroš, having accepted the end, gave himself up to the grave”* (*Šafarik Chronicle*, fifteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “predavanje”).

Likewise, the non-reflexive and perfective forms of this verb attested in medieval Serbian denote the same meaning that we find in medieval Russian for the verb *v”dati.*
Thus, we find, *prědati* (*dare, tradere*) meaning ‘give oneself up, hand over,’ appears in both the concrete and figurative senses.\(^{28}\)

All these example show a synonymous semantic relationship between the Russian *v’datisja* and the Serbian form *prědati se* ‘to give oneself up,’ ‘hand over,’ ‘surrender.’ The use of the meaning to ‘surrender’ in the military context is found in other Indo-European languages also based on the verb ‘to give’ (Cf. Greek παραδίδωμι, Latin *dedere, tradere*, Russian *sdat’*, Polish *podac*) (Buck 1949:1413).

The above examples suggest that the reflexive form of the verb *v’dati se*, could have more than one meaning. Depending on the context, the verb *v’dati* could mean to ‘give,’ ‘allow to speak,’ ‘hand over,’ ‘offer one’s hand, in terms of making peace,’ ‘marry,’ ‘go over to the enemy side’. Perhaps, in order to avoid the possibility of ambiguity, the Serbian scribes uses a more concrete verb *prědati se*, clearly denoting meaning ‘surrender,’ found in the Russian Josephus passage.

---

\(^{28}\) *Imamь vмь i... grobu prědati telesa naša* “we all have to give our bodies to the grave” (*Dečani Chrysoboull*, 1330; Rječnik, s.v. “predati”); *Da je prědanь ... u dojavnje ruke* “May he be handed over to the devil’s hands” (Bosnian Queen Helen’s Decree, 1397; ibid.); *Dijavolь ...vloživu prědatelju ljudě vь sрдce prědati Gospoda svojego na propetije* “The devil ... having put in the traitor Judas’ heart to betray his Lord to crucifixion” (*Dečani Chrysoboull*, 1330; ibid.).
2.2.11. *dlja* and *radi*

The next example involves the replacement of the preposition *для* [Rus 199r:15] by *ради*:

И известно о немъ его и нарда сал/шавъ драхъ вьстъ. съшавъ па/юще по немъ. егоже *для* и свободитьмъ надъвомъ и къ римлановъ безъ страха пребивати† [Rus 199r:15]

И известно о немъ вэсъуфъ салшавъ дрэй халъ вые и плакахоу по немъ, егоже *ради* и свободитьмъ надъвомъ и къ римлановъ безъ страха пребивати [Srb 180v:8]

“And it was reported about him everywhere; heaving heard [this] [people] became dejected and they wept over him, for whose sake we were hoping to free ourselves and flee to the Romans without fear.”30

The substitution of the preposition *dlja* for *radi* occurs four times in my sample,

cf. [Rus 163r:10, Srb 147v:16], [Rus 163r:22, Srb 148r:4], [Rus 193r:3, Srb 174v:5], [Rus 199r:14, Srb 180v:8]. The preposition *dlja* ‘for sake of,’ *диа*, is found once in the Serbian sample, cf. [Rus 55v:2, Srb 50v:9]. There are twelve examples of the preposition *radi* in both the Serbian and Russian texts.

In Russian Church Slavonic, the preposition *dlja* is quite common and means ‘for the sake of’, ‘for’; *сътаго для спаса и сътаго для благовщения*… “For the sake of the Holy Savior and for the Holy Annunciation… (Immunity Charter of 1410-1417; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “*dlja*”). Lunt points out that both prepositions *radi* and its “eastern equivalent” *дёлья* are found in the Old Church Slavonic Codex Suprasliensis, however *radi* ‘for the sake of’ is found seventy times, as opposed to *дёлья* only eight times (Lunt

---

29 See the discussion of this verb in section 3.5.
30 “And [news] of him became known everywhere. And the people hearing [this] became dejected [and] wept for him, through whom they were hoping to free themselves and flee to the Romans without fear” (Leeming 2003: 529).
1994:17). This shows that this preposition was not common in Old Church Slavonic, and that *radi* was used instead. This can explain its absence in medieval Serbian.

The Rječnik does not mention the preposition *dlja* at all. Nevertheless, the form *dělě*, denoting ‘for sake of,’ ‘for,’ ‘because of,’ *diá*, is attested in medieval Serbian. Miklošić provides the following two examples: *не може влнити народу дѣлѣ* “He could not enter because of the people” (*Patericon from Serbian monastery Krka*, fourteenth century; Miklošić, s.v. “dělě”); also, *са мара дѣлѣ* “for sake of the assembly” (*Various homilies*, fourteenth century; ibid.).

On the other hand, the preposition *radi* ‘because’, ‘for the sake of’: *Ja že postradahь ... ne moje radi bolezni* was very common: “I suffered a loss … not because of my illness” (*Chrysoboull of Stefan Uroš*, 1330; Rječnik, s.v. “radi”); *Sego radi i az pripadaja ... molju se* “Because of this, I, falling down … pray” (*Chrysoboull of Stefan the First Crowned*, 1222; ibid.). The preposition *radi* could also mean ‘for the sake of’, in the sense of ‘caring for someone’: *Posla на zemlju ... spasenija radi človečorskago* “He sent to earth … for the sake of the salvation of mankind” (*Chrysoboull of Stefan Uroš Milutin*, 1302; ibid.). It appears from the above examples that the preposition *dlja* was not at all common in medieval Serbian. Except for one instance of *dlja* found in my Serbian sample, no attestations of this preposition are found in the main Serbian dictionaries. Thus, with the exception of the form *dělě*, found in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Serbian documents, this one example of the form *dlja* makes an addition to the Serbian medieval lexicography. A consistent replacement of the preposition *dlja* with *radi*, with one exception, could indicate that the scribe Grigorije Vasilije considered it one of those Russian words that the Serbs were not familiar with.
2.2.12. *potosnetisja* and *potaštatiše*

The following example involves the replacement of the verb *потовщего* [Rus 279г:7] by *порошище*:

> Просея плененія потощего оусто́и дити опи́вание их [Rus 279г:7]
> Просея пленения их на пتوقيше оусто́и дити опи́вание их [Srb 253г:13]
> “Let us hasten before their capture to lower [literally, cool] their hope.”

This is the only example of this substitution. In Russian Church Slavonic *potosnetisja* could denote a number of meanings, including ‘hasten,’ ‘hurry,’ ‘attempt,’ ‘motivate,’ *Κά σε πτοσείνεις ἄλλα πταζωλάς εἰς You hastened well to judgment* (Hymnologion, twelfth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “potosnetisja”). Although this particular example of *potosnetisja* ‘hasten’ does not quite concretely correspond to the meaning ‘hurry’ in the physical sense of movement found in Josephus passage, it nevertheless shares common nuances of will, readiness, and motivation for an action found in the passage.

Serbian dictionaries do not mention the verb *potosnetisja*. Miklošić provides numerous examples of this verb but all of them are from Russian sources. The absence of this verb indicates a good possibility that this verb was not attested in medieval Serbian.

As a substitute, the Serbian scribe uses a verb *pot’štati se* ‘to hurry,’ which appears to share synonymous semantic features with the verb *potosnetisja*. The following example, similar to the Russian, although not denoting concrete physical movement, but rather ‘God’s quick response,’ shows ‘good will,’ and ‘speedy action,’ which we find in Josephus passage. Consider the verb *pot’štati se* ‘to hurry’ *festinare: Πολυπινα, πομοκυνή*

---

31 “Let us hasten before capture to forestall their expectation” (Leeming 2003: 631).
Lord, hurry to help me” (*Life of Saint Sava*, thirteenth century quoted by Daničić 1863:398). Miklošić also lists a number of medieval Serbian examples found in various liturgical books (see Miklošić, s.v. “pot”štati, pot”štanije, pot”štaliv”). This verb was quite common in medieval Serbian and its meaning corresponds to the verb *potosnetisja* found in the Russian text. Since the verb *potosnetisja* is not found in the main Serbian dictionaries, it is likely that this verb was not in use in medieval Serbian.

Judging from the other examples of substitutions in the Serbian text, the Serbian scribe exercised great freedom in rendering the equivalents of words that were either ambiguous or unknown to him. One may expect this, considering the fact that the text in question did not deal directly with the Bible of a church service book, unlike sacred ones, did not require word for word translations.

2.2.13. *dostrojati* and *s’tvoriti*

The following is another case of editing based on recensional differences. Here the Serbian scribe replaces *достроjити* [Rus 110v:5] with *строjити*.

‘*To уцо зла нe достроjити* ли намъл [Rus 110v:4]  
‘*To коhика зла нe строjити* ли нам [Srb 102r:13]  
“How much evil did not they do to us.”

This is the only example of this substitution in my sample. Otherwise, the non-prefixed verb *stroiti*, including the nouns *stroitel’, ustroenie* (once rendered from Russian as *narjada*) is found seven times in both Russian and Serbian texts, and *s’tvoriti* appears
nine times in both texts. This shows that both verbs *stroiti* and *s’tvoriti* were common in medieval Serbian, however, the verb with the prefix *do-* that is not attested.

The verb *dostrojati* is not mentioned by Sreznevskij. In Avanesov we find the related verb *dos’tvoriti* meaning ‘to do,’ ‘to achieve,’ ‘complete’: Λύε γε, εξαρτομένοι ούις σύ, ην δεσποινά, το πο ουσιωτήν “What he did not do [achieve] while he was young he did after his death” (*Chronicle of Georgius Amartolos*, thirteenth–fourteenth century; quoted by Avanesov, s.v. “dos”tvoriti”).

The Rječnik does not mention the verb *dostrojiti*, either. It only provides a few examples of the verb *strojiti* meaning ‘to do,’ ‘to create,’ to perpetrate*: Ako se kto от них нађе, опленившело, ил град, или љубо что кроме воле careve, да му се узьме држава, и тај, који je strojil, da вьсе плати “If any (nobleman) of them is found having robbed a village or a city, or that he did anything against the will of the king, let his power then be taken away from him, and the one who did this, let him pay all” (*Law of Tsar Dušan*, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “strojiti”); *Vьsako jako Богъ stroje на умьша ́чоловькомь “God created many things for men’s betterment’ (*Nemanjina darovnica hilandaru*, twelfth century; quoted by Rječnik, ibid.). In addition: Ašte ... и сьблазамь инуть братијатъ stroje, da se изгонитъ оть игумена и все братије “If … he scandalizes other monks, let him be expelled by the abbot and the monks” (*Studenički tipik*, thirteenth century; quoted by Rječnik, ibid.).

According to the Rječnik, the verb *stvoriti* means primarily ‘to create something that has not existed before’: *Milosrdova o rodé ́чловечъществь, jegože sъtvroi вь пречисты обрасть svojего бо´жства “Caring about mankind, which he created according to the image of its divinity (*Edict of King Tvrtko*, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “stvoriti”).
Svtori Bog nebo i zemlju “God created heaven and earth” (Donation Charter of Stefan Nemanja, twelfth century; ibid.). It can also mean to create a concrete or an abstract object: I svtori sije Petr zlatar “Petar the goldsmith created this” (Inscription on a silver lid in Krušedol monastery, 1514; ibid.); I takь прёbyvajuštю mi ašte inoje dobrodёteli ne stvoriь “And so, residing, I have not done any good deed” (Donation Charter of King Stefan the First Crowned, 1220; ibid.).

Based on the numerous examples in the Serbian Josephus, as well as from the attested medieval Serbian examples from the Serbian documents, we see that both verbs strojiti and s’tvoriti were common in medieval Serbian. It is only the prefixed form dostrojiti, not attested in medieval Serbian. The Serbian scribe chooses s’tvoriti as its closest equivalent.

2.2.14. šeika drёvenaja and plod ot drёves

In the following example, the Serbian scribe retains the noun шенками дрёваными [Rus 42v:8] in the text, but as a gloss he provides the translation плодом ṣ drёвес’:

И крылласа тросялья корениемъ и шенками дрёваными [Rus 42v:7]
И крылассе трьестыны ко ṣ рёнемъ и шенками дрёвенными [Srb 39r:5]
He was feeding himself with roots and the fruits of trees”.

The noun šeika drёvenaja occurs two times in my sample: as šeikami drёvenymi, found in the text, and glossed as plodom’ ot drёves [Serb 39r:5], and as drёvenyne šeiky,

32 I feed on the roots of reeds and the shoots of trees” (Leeming 2003: 249).
found in the text, and glossed as *kraj drēves sy reč plod* [Srb 47v:1]. The Russian manuscript has *šeikami drevjanymi* [Rus 42v:8] and *drevjanyja šeiky* [Rus 51v:18].

First, I would like to review medieval Russian examples of the noun *šeika*. Sreznevskij does not mention this noun in the form found in my sample. The closest forms to this noun that he mentions are *šč’pa, ščepa*, and *ščopa*, denoting ‘splinter of a tree’: "Крыжиги иглы и щипцы за ногти блаху” “The others had needles and splinters under their nails” (*Nikon Chronicle*, eleventh century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “šč’pa”). These forms mentioned by Srzenevskij appear similar to variants found in Meščerskij’s edition of *Istoriia iudeiskoi voiny Iosifa Flavia v drevnerusskom perevode*, where we find two additional variants: *ščepky*, in the Volokolamsk, and *ščipky* in the Solovki manuscript. Meščerskij suggests that the noun *šče’pka* may be related to the Ukrainian *priščeptit* ‘to graft a young tree’, *priščepa* ‘grafter branch.’ Similarly Vasmer provides the rendering of this noun in different languages, Russian, Bulgarian, Polish, Czech, with the meanings related to ‘grafting,’ and ‘splinter,’ while Slovenian has *ščepe* ‘fruit’ (Vasmer, s.v. “ščepa”), a translation that is found in Grigorije Vasilije’s gloss.

An additional explanation of this word is found in the gloss from the 1520 Russian Chronograph that has ‘*sireč veršije dubnoje*’ corresponding to the Greek *akroδρονα* ‘oak tips,’ as opposed to *akρίδες* ‘locusts,’ which would be considered unclean for the prophet to eat, according to commentaries of Theophylact of Bulgaria (ibid.:654). Copies of the Russian chronographs of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries quote parts of the *History of the Jewish War* and, their editors add an explanation of the phrase ‘tree shoots’ as ‘oak tips’: “Thus, after the words ‘and for his use there were tree shoots,’ we read: ‘that is to say, oak tips’” (Meščerskij in Leeming 2003:101).
It is interesting that the gloss “that is to say, oak tips” partially contains the identical wording to the gloss provided by Grigorije Vasilije, i.e., both have the words ‘that is to say.’ Cf. *kraj dréves sy reč plod* [Srb 47v:1], although this phrase is not found in the Russian manuscript from which Grigorije Vasilije copied his text. This suggests that he was familiar with this gloss, but it is not known if he obtained it from Theophylact’s Gospel commentaries, from Russian chronographs, or elsewhere.

Similar to medieval Russian, no attestation of the form šeika is found in Serbian. Thus, this would but the first such example in medieval Serbian. Nevertheless, what appears to be its variant form, šip”k”, ρoία, malum granatum, ‘pomegranate,’ provided by Miklošič, is attested in a sixteenth-century Pentateuch, (Miklošič, s.v. šip”k”).

Grigorije Vasilije explains the meaning of šeika as plod’ [Srb 47v:1] ‘fruit,’ attested in medieval Serbian in forms such as plod’ ‘fruit’: obolije plodov’”, “abundance of the fruits” (*Life of Saint Stevan of Dečani*, fifteenth century; quoted by Miklošič, s.v. “plod’”); plodovit’ ‘fruitful’: maslina plodovita “fruitful olive tree” (*The life of Saint Stevan of Dečani*, fifteenth century; Daničić, s.v. “plodovit’”); and plodonos’n’, ‘bearing fruit’ fructifier: město plodonosnymi drévy ukраšasmo “we have beautified the place with the fruitful trees” (*Life of Saint Sava*, thirteenth century; ibid., s.v. “plodonos’n’”).

Here we see that Serbian scribe uses plod’ most probably in the meaning of ‘fruit of a tree,’ which, in this case, based on the above examples, corresponds to šip”k” ‘pomegranate.’ If we take it one step further to assume that the noun šip”ak” is a variation of the noun ščep,’ which, in Slovenian, translates as rod, (see Vasmer, s.v. “ščepa”), we see that this noun corresponds to the noun rodij ‘pomegranate’ ρoá malum punicum, Modern Greek ρόδι, attested in the seventeenth century in a Slavonic copy of
the *Canticle of canticles* written by Dionysius Areopagiticus, translated by monk Isaia from Zographos monastery (Miklošič, s.v. “rodij”).

Thus, I propose that the noun šip’ak” ‘pomegranate’, attested in medieval Serbian, could be a variation of the forms šeika, in addition to variations, ščepka, ščepk, ščipka found in other Russian Josephus manuscripts. Grigorije Vasilije could very well be acquainted with this fruit, which was common in Mediterranean. He also could have been well aware of its religious symbolism referring to the benefit of ascetic life. Although this fruit was found in the Adriatic coast area, it is probable that this fruit was not common among medieval Serbs who lived inland. While it is very difficult to say what kind of fruit Grigorije Vasilije may have had in mind, the attested noun šip’ak” ‘pomegranate’ shows a resemblance to the variants ščepka, ščepk, ščipka found in other Russian manuscripts.

---

33 Saint Gregory of Nyssa elaborates on this, noting that a pomegranate externally looks unattractive but inside it hides an extremely tasty fruit: “Its branches are lined with thorns, and its fruit is covered and protected with a rind that is extremely bitter and harsh to the taste”, but when peeled it provides a fruit “quite pleasant and honey-sweet, to the taste, and a joy to the palate” (Musurillo 1979:231). The nature of this fruit corresponds to the nature of ascetic life. Externally it looks unattractive, but when practiced it provides protection to those who observe it. According to Saint Gregory of Nyssa “pomegranate teaches us that we ought never to grow soft in the indulgence and luxury of this life, but that we should choose the way of life that has become hardened by continence,” and just like pomegranate, which is protected by thorns, we ought to be “surrounded by a severe and rigorous way of life” that will “sting those who approach it bent on an evil purpose” (ibid.).
2.2.15. lěsti and iz’lazyti

In the following passage, we see the replacement of the verb ꙗѫтꙗ [Rus 88v:6] by изълѧзꙗти.

Тѣбеꙗ неꙗлѧша жиꙗдꙗкꙗ ꙗѫтꙗ на стѣнꙗ [Rus 88v:5]
Тѣбеꙗ неꙗ изълѧша жиꙗдꙗкꙗ изълѧзꙗти на стѣнꙗ [Srb 82r:8]
“For this reason the Jews did not dare to walk out onto the walls.”

This substitution occurs only once in my sample. There are, however, two examples where the same root is retained: выѧтꙗ [Rus 201v:15] and изълѧтꙗ [Srb 183r:6]; вѣлѧ/ѣлѧ [Rus 68r:13] and изълѧтꙗ [Srb 62v:7]. These examples pertain to the text copied by Grigorije Vasilije as oppose to the other scribe.

In Russian Church Slavonic the verb lěsti could mean both ‘to go’ and ‘to climb’:

Не љєрꙗ сꙗ глоѧдѧкꙗ сѧ дружꙗнꙗ и людꙗнꙗ не пꙗлꙗфꗘ, но љєзꙗ сꙗ кꙗ нѧлꙗ “Do not torture yourself and your colleagues with hunger and do not destroy your people, but come now here to us” (Laurentian Chronicle, 1237; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “лєзи”: 同等ꙗ на дѫꙗвѧ въ выѧтꙗу “To climb to the top of the tree” (February Reading Menaion, fifteenth century; ibid.).

Unlike in Russian, the verb lěsti, according to the Rječnik, meant generally ‘to go’ and had the same meaning as the verb laziti. But the Rječnik does not provide any medieval Serbian examples. Even if attested, as such the un-prefixed verb lěsti would not match the needed meaning ‘to go out’ found in the Russian passage. The verb that was more commonly used, according to the Rječnik, had the prefix iz-, izlaziti. A related noun lєстиꙗцꙗ ‘ladder,’ was attested in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic in thirteenth century.

34 “And so the Jews dared not mount the walls” (Leeming 2003: 348).
Thus, Grigorije Vasilije examples of izlěsti ‘clime out, appears to be the first such attested examples in medieval Serbian.

In order to provide the equivalent of the Russian meaning of the verb lěsti ‘to go out, ‘to climb,’ the Serbian scribe uses the verb izlaziti. The Rječnik provides a number meanings of this verb, e.g., ‘to go out’ ‘to ascend’: Đelomić medu Gornju Gadimlju i medu Slovinju izlazeći u put koštansky, i đelomь više Gronje Gadaimlje “Partially between Gornja Gadimlja and between Slovinja walking out towards the road of Koštan, and partially above Gornja Gadimlja” (Donation Charter of Vuk Branković, 1371; ibid.).

It appears that the substitution of the verb lěsti is another case of change due to a recensional difference. In order to provide the equivalent meaning ‘to go out’ found in the Russian passage of Josephus, the Serbian scribe uses the familiar verb izlaziti.

2.2.16. vazn- and čest-

In this example, the Serbian scribe substitutes vaznь [Rus 161v:6] with უვეთь:

Iny же из града ви/даче вдалеся із прітеклі к ним. Ридалне же втіломем майму і вале их сусіде значіи прійде и вазнь лошалла [Rus 161v:2]
Iny же из града видаще прітеклою к ним. Ридалне же втіломем майму і вале их сусіде. Зане поева ням прійде и უვეთь лошалла [Srb 146v:4]

“And others, seeing from the city, ran to them. The Romans, fleeing, thought they were more numerous. That (since) victory and better fortune came to them”35

The Serbian scribes regularly substitute the root vazn- with čest-. There are eleven

35 “And others, seeing from the city their success, ran and [joined] them. And the Romans fleeing thought they were more numerous, since victory and better luck had come to them” (Leeming & Leeming 2003:472). Leeming’s translation, provided in the footnote, is based on the Russian text.
examples of this substitution in my sample. Of those eleven, two are prefixed [Rus 7v:18, Srb 5r:17; Rus 32v:7, Srb 29v:5], and eight are not prefixed [Rus 9r:1, Srb 6v:20; Rus 54v:5, Srb 49v:17; Rus 84v:17, Srb 78v:13,\(^{36}\) Rus 103r:7, Srb 95r:22; Rus 113r:9, Srb 104v:6; Rus 161v:6, Srb 146v:4; Rus 162r:21, Srb 147r:13; Rus 165r:5, Srb 149r:19; Rus 193r:6, Srb 174v:9]. In all of these examples čest- denote ‘fortune’. This is explicitly stated by the second Serbian scribe where he, after the substitution نبيط [Srb 78v:13] for  kaznya [Rus 84v:17], adds the explanation, أن يب وظيفة “that is to say with fortune.” Furthermore, only in one place do we find čast’ [Rus 106r:7], čest’ [Srb 98r:15], denoting ‘honor.’

Both Grigorije Vasilije and the second Serbian scribe are consistent in their use of čest- for vazn-. According to Sreznevskij, in medieval Russian Church Slavonic the noun vazn’ denoted ‘happiness, luck,’ тифи: ἀπειρεί καὶ τῇ ἱσχύεισθαι τῇ καζνα τῇ εξήπαλης κρπτενηκαδο εγγενεία “If he professed luck, he will fall away from the Christian teaching” (Izbornik 1073; Sreznevskij, s.v. “vazn’”). Another example, vazniv’ ‘happy,’ fortunate,’ ἐφορος, felix, is found in the Trinity Chronicle: καὶ ἀντίκρα καζνεάς “fortunate in a hunt” (Trinity Chronicle, thirteenth century; Miklošič, s.v. “vazniv’”). Also, vazn’ ‘fortunate,’ тифи, fortuna: ἱππεί καὶ ἱστετές καζνή “which in wars of fortune” (Chronograph, seventeenth century; ibid “vazn’”). When these medieval Russian examples of the root vazn- ‘fortune, are compared to Josephus, we see that they correspond in meaning. On the other hand, no attestations of this root are found in the main Serbian dictionaries, which suggest that this root was simply not used in medieval Serbian. Consistent replacement

\(^{36}\) This example, although found in the text that does not cover my sample, is helpful because the Serbian scribe, in addition to čest, provides further clarification of the noun vazn’ as srešča.
with the root čest- ‘fortune’ by both Serbian scribes provides additional support to this argument.

Furthermore, this root, with examples denoting ‘luck, fortune,’ ‘prosperity,’ *fortunatis*, is mentioned by both Daničić and Miklošić: вѣ слави и много уститьи дворь господства ти “to the glorious and much fortunate (prosperous) court of your majesty” (Letter from Dubrovnik to Despot Stefan, fifteenth century; Daničić, s.v. “čest’”). Also: рождство и честь улобъкомъ повѣдае “birth and fortune speak along with people” (Nomokanon, 1262; Miklošić, s.v. “čest’”); о неуставна улобъска уести “o wavering fortune of men” (Life of Alexander the Great, sixteenth century; ibid.). As we can see from these examples the root čest- seems to be synonymous to vazn-, both showing the potential of denoting the meaning ‘fortune.’ The consistent replacement of the root vazn-by both Serbian scribes, found eleven times in my sample, and the absence of this root in the main Serbian historical dictionaries, which implies that the root vazn- was not used in medieval Serbian, suggest that the motivation for the substitution is based on recensational editing. In the following, and the only such example, we find both vazn- and čest- in the Serbian text: Consider the adjectives blagovazniv’ and blagočestiv’:
2.2.16.2. *blagovazniv*” and *blagoč'stiv*’

Here, Grigorije Vasilije places the adjective **blagovazniv** in the text, while in the margin he puts **blagovazniv**. The Russian manuscript has the adjective **blagovazniv** | **blagovazniv** (Rus 32v:7):

Ουμρε ζρηκοκαβγ ηοκέλ/νίες κεσαρεκένε, λεΓ. η. Ι. **blagovazniv** | **blagovazniv** πανε κεκχ [Rus 32v:7]

Ουμρε ζρηκοκαβγ ηοκέλενενε κιεκ | ροκέκ λεΓ. η. Ι. **blagovazniv** | **blagovazniv** πανε κεκχ [Srb 29v:5]

“He died, having reigned by Caesar’s decree for 37 years, the most fortunate of all (men)”.

The substitution of the compound adjective **blagovazniv** for **blagoč'stiv** occurs only once in my sample. This adjective in Russian Church Slavonic means ‘fortunate’: **cь вьпросиць**, кто **blagovazniv**’ **несть**, и рё: иже тьму здацю ньньь, а дцйно бгтой, а нстьецко наказано “We ask this, who is fortunate, and [he] said: one who has a healthy body, a rich soul, and a nature under control” (Melissa, fourteenth–fifteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “blagovaznivy”). This example of **blagovazniv** ‘fortunate’ provides an equivalent to the example found in the Russian Josephus passage. The Serbian situation is quite different. Unlike in medieval Russian, no entry of **blagovazniv**’ is found in any of the main Serbian historical dictionaries. Thus, this example would be its first attestation in medieval Serbian.

Although the adjective **blagoč'stiv**/**blagoč'stivo** is attested, no examples with the meaning ‘fortunate’ are found. Yet the rendering ‘pious’ **evσεβῆς**, **pius**, is very common: *S'bljudьno i blagoč'stivo tvorešte* “Working abstemiously and piously (Hilandar

37 “He lived 5 days and died, having reigned at Caesar’s bidding for 37 years. He was the most successful of all men” (Leeming 2003: 231). Leeming’s translation pertains to the Russian text.
Typicon, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “blagočastan”); Pravoslavno i blagočastno živuštih “Those living piously and according to the Orthodox faith” (Donation Charter of Tsar Dušan, 1348; ibid.); Blagočestivago kralja “Of the pious king” (Inscription in the church in Bodašće, 1269; ibid.). However, neither of these examples of blagočestiv’/blagočesto contains the meaning ‘fortunate,’ characteristic of the Russian blagovaznen’. Only when we take the compound blagočestiv’ apart do we find the meaning ‘fortune’ in the root čest-. Since the attested core meaning of the pronoun blagočestiv’ was ‘pious,’ possible in order to avoid ambiguity between ‘pious’ and ‘fortunate,’ ‘Grigorije Vasilije, while using blagočestiv’ in the text, retains blagovaznen’ in the margin. Since the main Serbian historical dictionaries list only one meaning for compound blagočestiv’, ‘pious’, this would be the first attestation with the meaning ‘fortunate.’

2.2.17. podučivati and podostrevati

The following example shows the substitution of the verb podostrevaji for poduguškaja [Rus 280v:21].

"And they incited those living in Alexandria and Judea not to submit to the Romans.”

---

38 “And they incited the Jews resident in Alexandria not to submit to the Romans” (Leeming 2003: 634).
This substitution occurs only once in my sample. Otherwise, the verb *podostriti* is found seven times. Of these seven examples four are found in both Russian and Serbian manuscripts. The other three instances of *podostriti* [Srb 4v:13, 4v:17, 254v:14] serve to translate the Russian *povjazati* [Rus 6v:13], *podstroiti* [Rus 6v:18], and *podučivati* [Rus 280v:22].

I did not find any listing for the form *podučivati* for Russian Church Slavonic in either Sreznevskij or in Avanesov. The closest listed form *poučati* ‘will’ is found in Sreznevskij: Глійте і молітеся, да не звинните ві своєму, дай бо почуваєтъ, пазьт же неперема “Watch and pray, lest you enter into temptation, the spirit indeed is willing, but the body is weak” (Simeon’s Gospel, 1164; Sreznevskij, s.v. “poučati”). Sreznevskij mentions here that the Mstislav’s Gospel has *poučati* in stead of *poučati*, under which we find the meaning ‘incite’ corresponding to Josephus passage: ὅψαυτι θέν ἐν ἀρτί, ῥάκαμας μάχας με ποσαλάτης, καὶ καινεν και νίκος “In a war there is a custom to encourage (incite) by waving hands and crying out with a shout” (From the Manuscript of Upyr’ Lixyi, 1047; Sreznevskij, s.v. “poučati”).

As in Russian, the form *podučati* is not found in the major Serbian historical dictionaries either. A similar verb, *poučati*, denoting ‘teach,’ ‘instruct’ (Zakonu bož’stv’nyh’ pisanih prilež’no poučaj se “Instruct yourself diligently in the law of the Holy Scriptures”), differs from the Josephus passage in terms of the grade of intensity and emotion, and it is closest to the meaning ‘encourage.’ This meaning is found under *poučati* ‘encourage,’ horitari in Suprasliensis (Miklošič, s.v. “poučati”). However, from

---

39 The verb *podučivati*, meaning ‘incite,’ is found twice, cf. [Srb 179r:6, 179r:9], as opposed to *poučenije* [Srb 254v:1] meaning ‘instruct,’ which is found once.
the other examples of this verb found in my sample, we see that Grigorije Vasilije clearly distinguishes the verb *podučavati*, meaning ‘incite,’ found twice, cf. [Srb 179r:6, 179r:9], from *poučavati* [Srb 254v:1] ‘instruct,’ which is found once.

In addition, while the Rječnik does not mention the form *podostrevati* ‘incite,’ we find a very close form in the verb *poostriti, pooštrjavitati, ‘incite,’ παροχόνεν, incitare* in Miklošić: *poostriti umjetne “to incite the Jews” (Various Homilies, thirteenth century; Miklošić, s.v. “poostriti”). There are also a number of attested roots, e.g., *oštr-, ostr-,* which indirectly share the same semantic nuances of the verb *poučati*. For example, the related verb *oštriti* is attested only in a figurative sense pertaining to ‘anger’: *Oružije jarosti ... na pravednago oštriti umilišljajet se “The sharpening of the weapon of anger against the righteous is being planned” (Chysoboull, sixteenth century, Rječnik, s.v. “oštriti”). A similar meaning is found in the following example, where the root, *oštr-*, denotes ‘to sharpen,’ i.e., ‘incite,’ in a figurative sense, bringing to mind by teaching, instruction: ‘to incite’: *Začeň *pooštravitati myslj svoju i poučavati umъ svoj “I began to incite my thoughts and teach my mind” (Nemanja’s Chrisoboull, twelfth century; Rječnik, s.v. “pooštravati”).

Grigorije Vasilije clearly distinguishes the verb *poučati* ‘instruct’ from *podučati* ‘incite.’ The use of the verb *podučati* alongside *podostrevati*, both meaning ‘incite’ in the same context, cf. *podući* [Rus 197v:13] and *podući* [Srb 179r:6] ‘incite,’ *podući/vaxu* [Rus 280v:21] and *podostrevaxu* [Srb 254v:17], suggests that these verbs were synonymous in Grigorije Vasilije’s view. The absence of the form *podučati* ‘incite’ in the main Serbian dictionaries may be an indication that the verb was not used in this form in
medieval Serbian. Consequently, the presence of the example *podući* ‘incite,’ in [Srb 179r:6] would be the first medieval Serbian attestation.

2.2.18. *syn” and *pirg’

In this example, Grigorije Vasilije substitutes the noun πύργος for σύν while placing the noun σταλπ in the gloss:

```
Βιβλίο σταλπ και η σταλπ του μύτηνος συν [Rus 159v:1]
Ο Βιβλίο και η σταλπ του μύτηνος πυργ [Srb 144v:13]
```

“He was riding alongside the wall, toward the Mosaic Tower”  

There are ten examples of the noun *syn”* either being replaced by *stl’p’, pirg’, polata,* or retained along with the gloss *stl’p’, pirg’.* Only in one example was the noun *syna [Rus 198r:20]* retained as *synu [Srb 180r:12]* without any gloss. Of these ten examples there are four cases where the noun *syn”* was replaced with *stl’p’* in the text, accompanied by a gloss *pirg’*, cf. [Rus 150r:14, Srb 136v:12], [Rus 101r:7, Srb 101v:18], [Rus 273v:7, Srb 248v:11], and in one case accompanied by a gloss *syn’* [Rus 219v:17, Srb 200v:7]. In three examples the noun *syn”* [Rus 164v:2, Srb 148v:11], [Rus 177r:12, Srb 160r:82], [Rus 150r:14, Srb 136v:12] was retained in the Serbian text, while *pirg’, stl’p’, or both pirg’ and stolp’ were added in the gloss. In one case *syn”* [Rus 159v:2, 159v:5] was replaced by *pirg”* [Srb 144v:13] and accompanied by a gloss *stl’p’;* and in another example, it was replaced by *polata [Srb 144v:16]* and accompanied by the gloss *pyrg’.*

---

40 “Alongside the wall, he was riding toward the Mosaic Tower” (Leeming 2003:469)
In my discussion I will first address the substitution of the nouns *stl’p’* and *pirg’* for *syn’*, and in the following sections I will treat other substitutions individually. According to Sreznevskij, the noun *syn’*, in addition to its core meaning ‘son,’ could mean ‘tower.’ Sreznevskij also cites Greek *πόργον* and Latin *turrim*, stating that the form *стлп’*, *стлпн*, is attested in other Russian manuscripts: *Да създадем град сесть и сълп*, *еллп же постройте върху до небъ “Let us build to a city to ourselves and a tower whose top will reach heavens”* (Anthology, fifteenth-century anthology; quoted by Sreznevksij, s.v. “*syn’*”). Also: *Иродъ къ Иерусалимъ създадъ сълп въското и лъвъто предивдъ (πόργον) “Herod built a tower in Jerusalem distinguished by its height and beauty”* (Antiquities by Josephus Flavius, fifteenth century; ibid.). We see here that the Russian *syn’* was polysemous. This was not the case in medieval Serbian. While the lexeme *syn’* (*sin’*) ‘son’ is pervasive in medieval Serbian, the homonym *syn’* (*sin’*) ‘tower’ appears to be unattested. Therefore, the examples of the noun *synu* [Srb 180r:12], ‘tower,’ would be the first attestation in medieval Serbian.

According to the Rječnik, the noun used as its replacement *pirg’*, which denotes ‘tower’ and comes from the Greek word *πόργος*. The Rječnik provides a number of examples from the fourteenth century: *Създадъ имъ пиргъ и на нжем съб храмъ Спасовъ “I built for them a tower and in it this Savior’s church”* (Chysoboull of King Milutin, fourteenth century; Riječnik, s.v. “pirg”); *В дому Pandokratorovе trapezariju zdaše и veliki пиргн nad por’томъ “In Pantokrator’s residence they built a dining hall and a large tower above the court”* (Chrysoboull, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “pirg”). From the above examples we see that the noun *pirg’* which serves as an equivalent to *syn’*, is found in the Russian text.
Evidently, close proximity to the Greeks as well as the common Orthodox faith served as vehicle for the Slavs to adopt many Greek words. One of those words was \textit{pirg}' which also was used to denote ‘cell’ [Srb 290v:5]. According to Mirjana Živojinović, a cell in Karyes began first to be called \textit{pirg} by Queen Jelena a few decades after King Milutin renovated this cell (Živojinović 1972:95). This, however, does not mean that there were no buildings by this name before. There are a number of “towers” \textit{pirgi} that were built much earlier as fortifications designated for the defense of the monastery from outside attacks. The first such \textit{pirg} outside Hilandar was built by King Uroš I in 1262/3 (ibid.:116).

This all suggests that Grigorije Vasilije, who copied \textit{The History of the Jewish War} in his monastic cell, used the word \textit{pirg}' as a part of his everyday language. The use of the noun \textit{pirg}' along with the noun \textit{stl'p}' in so many examples\footnote{Half of the examples that mention \textit{pirg}' are used along \textit{stl'p}'.} suggests that these two words, one Greek and the other Slavonic, complemented each other in denoting this specific military term.

Similarly, the noun \textit{stl'p}', denoting ‘tower,’ \textit{turris}, is attested numerous times in medieval Serbian: in the tower of the Holy Transfiguration of the Savior” (King Uroš I \textit{Builds a Tower}, 1261; Daničić, s.v. “\textit{stl'p}'”); “I built for them a large and strong tower” (\textit{King Milutin’s Donation Charter}, fourteenth century; ibid.). In the texts where these examples are attested, similar to the Serbian Josephus, one notes the interchangeable use of \textit{pirg}' and \textit{stl'p}', which can be explained as a rhetorical and stylistic method of avoiding redundancy, and enriching the text.
However, it can be added that since the noun stil’p’ could also denote ‘pillar,’ it is possible that the use of pirg’ alongside it could be also due to disambiguation. In fact, all except one of the attested Serbian examples recorded by Miklošić denote the meaning ‘pillar,’ columnna. This indicates that both of the meanings of stil’p’ were common. Nevertheless, the replacement of the noun syn” (unattested in medieval Serbian in the meaning ‘tower’) by stolp’ and pirg’, appears to be an example of a recensational difference. A similar situation can be observed in the replacement of the noun syn” with polata.

2.2.18.2. syn” and polata

In this example Grigorije Vasilije replaces the noun συνα [Rus 159v:4] with πολατάμ [Srb 144v:16], while placing the noun πύργομ in the gloss.

Въдече външаны из града мнезы противу женескым συνα [Rus 159v:4].
Истече външаны из града мнезы про/тых женескым πολατάμ [Srb 144v:16]
“And suddenly many poured out from the city opposite to the Women’s Towers.”

In addition to the above example, the noun polata is found in both the Russian and Serbian texts, two times in my sample, cf. [Rus 196r:21, Srb 177v:16], [Rus 280r:4, Srb 254r:3]. According to Meščerskij, this Graecism, rendered from πολάτιον, ‘palace,’ is found in the Greek original and is also recorded in the dictionaries of Sreznevskij and Miklošić (Meščerskij 1956:248). Meščerskij points out that the noun is a common Greek

42 “And many of the Jews suddenly poured out from the tower opposite the Women’s Towers” (Leeming 2003:470).
borrowing found in both Church Slavonic and medieval Russian, and it belongs to the category of commonly used Greek words such as ἄγγελος ‘angel,’ ἀναπολογηθεῖν ‘foreigner,’ τράπεζα ‘table,’ and ἱστορία ‘history’ (ibid.:250). Meščerski, however, distinguishes the word polata, πολάτιον from polaty, which comes from the Greek original βασίλεια ‘palace.’ Such are the Greek words βυζαντινός οπτάρα ‘altar,’ στηλή τράπεζα ‘table,’ λαρνάξ κιβοτ ‘ark.’ Thus, here the Russian scribe did not render the word polata from the corresponding Greek πολάτιον, but from βασίλεια.

There are number of medieval Serbian attestations of the noun polata, τά α βασίλεια, and adjectives polat’n”, βασίλειων, corresponding to the noun pigr, ‘tower, cell’: Πολάτι θλοκρήος τρικρήος ένας τρικρήος Μοναστήρα συνδέτα “(They) built two- and three-floor cells within the monastery” (Life of Saint Sava; thirteenth century, Danićić, s.v. “polata”). Another attestation of this noun with the same connotation is found in Saint Sava’s Typicon: κρύπται πολατν “the cells’ roofs” (Saint Sava Typicon, 1619; quoted by Miklošič, s.v. “polat’n”). Although these examples pertain to a ‘cell,’ we know from the earlier discussion that Grigorije Vasilije was aware of the noun pigr, denoting both ‘tower,’ and ‘cell.’ Therefore, it can be suggested that since the noun syn” was not attested in medieval Serbian in the meaning ‘tower,’ its replacement by the Greek nouns polata, βασίλεια, and pigr” in the margin are needed to clarify the meaning of ‘tower.’
2.2.19. *rězati* and *sěči*

Another example of the recensional difference is the substitution of *сѣш* [Rus 111v:20] for *рѣзати*:

\[
\text{сята/чёмща около аки сепи и } \text{дрѣгъ друга рѣзати} \ [\text{Rus 111v:18}]
\]

\[
\text{врытъхъ около йако сатни, дрѣгъ друга сѣшемъ} \ [\text{Srb 103r:21}]
\]

“They were whirling around like blind men, slaughtering each other”\(^{43}\)

This is the only example of this substitution. In the other example, also rendered by the second Serbian scribe, *rѣzati* [Rus 111v:14] was replaced by *zaklati* [Srb 103r:22] ‘to kill oneself by jumping off a building.’\(^{44}\)

In Russian Church Slavonic the verb *rѣzati* could, among other meanings, mean ‘cut with a sharp tool’ and ‘slaughter’ (*occidere*). The following three examples provided by Sreznevskij reflect to a certain degree the meaning in the Josephus passage: Рѣжъ и на ыазвы “Cut him into wounds” (*Pandects of Nikon of the Black Mountain*, thirteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “*rѣzati*”); А не рекъ ти, къ недѣлю не рѣздь, ни того ласти, но не въ стѣпѣ пикалахъ рекъ ти, но въ ского сѣцъ “And what I told you, not to slaughter on Sunday, nor to eat it, I did not say it from the Holy Scriptures, but from my heart” (*The Works of Saint Theodosius of Caves*, eleventh century; ibid.); Иньи простая уадъ рѣзахъ лѣ жиѣла и ыдалво “Some primitive people slaughtered people alive and ate [them]” (*The Chronicle of Novgorod*, thirteenth century; ibid.).

On the other hand, no medieval Serbian Church Slavonic examples of the verb

\(^{43}\) Leeming 2003: 395.

\(^{44}\) In Grigorije Vasilije’s part of the text however, we find *razrazati* ‘to kill one self by jumping on the rocks from the temple,’ which is also found in the Russian part of the text, cf. [Rus 278v:17] and [Srb 253r:3]. There are also two examples of the verb *otrѣzati* ‘to cut hope,’ cf. [Srb 7r:9, 177v:14], also rendered by Grigorije Vasilije. But they do not have the same meaning as *rѣzati*. 
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rězati are found in the Rječnik. Daničić mentions this verb with the meaning ‘to cut’ (secare) pertaining to books. There are, however, attested examples of the same root with prefixes. Here is an example with the prefix ot-, which with the root rěz- means ‘to cut off,’ ‘to separate by cutting’: Da mu se obě rucě otsěkut’ i nos’ otrěžet’ “Let both of his hands be chopped off and his nose cut off” (Law of Tsar Dušan, fourteenth century; Rječnik “otrjezati”). In addition, this root is found also with the prefix raz-, ‘to cut a limb or the entire body in two or more parts’: Utrobu jego razrězavšete “Having cut his intestines [in two]” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century, ibid.). While the two examples share basic semantic nuances with the Russian verb rězati, they denote cutting off individual body parts or cutting up the entire body, while the meaning ‘to slaughter’, was not attested in these sources that were available to me.

A similar situation is found in Old Church Slavonic, where the verb rězati is attested with the meaning ‘to cut,’ referring to branches (kóπτειν), while the verb with the prefix ot- ‘to cut off’ is attested only referring to individual parts of the body (Cejtlin et al., eds. 1994: 587, 434). On the other hand, the verb sěšći (τεμνειν) ‘to behead’ and the noun sěć (θραύσσε) ‘cutting in battle’ (ibid. 680), specifically denote an action of cutting bodies/heads in battle, which corresponds to the verb rězati found in the Russian Josephus passage. The same situation is found in medieval Serbian where the root rěz- and sěć- both denote ‘to cut,’ but only the latter is attested with the meaning ‘cutting in battle.’

In order to provide an equivalent to the Russian meaning of the verb rězati ‘to slaughter’ that was common in Serbian Church Slavonic, the scribe chose the verb sěći. A comparison of the Russian verb rězati and Serbian sěći shows that these two share
semantic nuances. Both verbs denoted ‘to cut animal or human body or body parts.’ The following example corresponds to the meaning of the Josephus passage: ‘Voji že i sily gospodina kraľa běhu gomešte sily i mnogý jezyky cara Mihajla, ovy sěkšte; ovy že strělajušte’ “The soldiers and the forces of his majesty the king were pursuing the forces and many people of Tsar Michael; slaughtering some and shooting others” (Praise of Prince Lazar, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “seći”).

In another attested example the verb seći could mean ‘to mutilate’: Kto Dubrovčanin ubije ali poseče u Bosni ili Bošnjanin Dubrovčanina, taj pravda da je prěđ gospodinom banom “Whomever a man from Dubrovnik kills or mutilate in Bosnia, or a Bosnian - a man from Dubrovnik, let there be a trial before the lord governor” (Bosnian ruler Stefan’s Treaty with Dubrovnik, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “pravda”).

Considering the attested medieval Serbian meanings of the verb sěći, it appears that this verb provides the equivalent meaning to the verb rězati found in the Russian Josephus passage, ‘to slaughter,’ ‘to cut a human body.’ Since the Rječnik provides no examples of the un-prefixed verb rězati, and the prefixed forms of the root rěz denote only ‘cutting with a sharp object individual body parts,’ the replacement of the verb rězati for sěći seems to be due to a recensional difference. The attested Old Church Slavonic examples show that medieval Serbian retained the distinction between the two verbs in which the verb sěći, could be used to mean to ‘slaughter’, ‘to cut human bodies in the battle,’ or ‘wound.’ Thus the Serbian correctly reflects the meaning of the verb rězati found in the Russian Josephus passage.
2.2.20. svadba and pir’

Another case of substitution can be found in the following passage, where the Serbian scribe replaces the noun svadba [Rus 193v:8] with пирь:

Аки са свадбe тевакe а не на рат, а ть не бошаса не медасе ни сватраше по серед врагов ходае [Rus 193v:8]
Ако са пир и тевакe а не на рать, дино не каютче и ни сватраше ни бошасе [Srb175r:10]
“They were running as if not to a battle but to a celebration, not lingering, nor looking around, nor being afraid.”

This is the only example of this substitution. In Russian Church Slavonic the noun svadba (svat’ba) primarily denoted ‘marriage’: свадобы створите съ ники ‘you will make marriages with them’ (Book of Joshua, fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “svadba”). The noun svadba (svat’ba) could also mean a ‘celebration of a marriage’ or a ‘wedding reception’: И се лице видети въ мире семь въ дывших соучасти: оъ сихъ сватебою творать, а оъ дружныхъ вретыца планиють “And this one can see clearly in this world among two neighbors: at the one [house] they are having a wedding celebration, and at the other they are mourning a dead man” (Izbornik of 1076, quoted by Sreznevskij, ibid.).

The Rječnik does not provide any medieval Serbian examples of the noun svadba. There are no medieval Serbian derivatives of this noun pertaining to a ‘celebration of marriage’ either. This indicates that this noun was not attested in the medieval Serbian. Otherwise, the Rječnik mentions two attested nouns with the same root svat-; the first svat, meaning ‘in-law,’ and the second, svast, svastika, ‘brother-in-law,’ ‘sister-in-law,’
which suggest that this root occurred in Serbian, but only denoting ‘relatives by marriage.’

On the other hand the noun *pir*, according to the Rječnik, is attested in medieval Serbian, and it could mean ‘wedding’ and more generally a ‘celebration,’ ‘festivity.’ According to the Rječnik, the noun was used by Domentijan in the thirteenth century, and it is attested in folk language from the fifteenth century onwards, but no examples are provided (Rjčenik, s.v. “pir”).

Comparing the medieval Russian and Serbian meanings of *svat-*, *svad-* and *pir*, one can observe that, while they both share common nuances in terms of ‘celebration,’ *svadba* was specifically linked to ‘marriage’ and a ‘celebration of marriage.’ The noun *pir*, on the other hand, as attested in medieval Serbian, meant celebration of both marriage and festivity in a more general and informal sense.

Therefore, the Serbian scribe’s choice of *pir* over *svadba* could possibly be explained as due to recensional difference and/or generalization. Although the root *svat-*, denoting ‘in-laws,’ related to the noun *svadba*, is attested, the absence of the noun *svadba* in the Rječnik suggests that this noun was foreign to medieval Serbian Church Slavonic. Therefore, *pir*, in a more general sense, expresses the meaning of ‘festivity’ reflected in the context of the passage in the Russian Josephus.
2.2.21. *podxupiti* and *ukrēpiti*

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the verb *подхіпіти* [Rus 110v:13], with *укрѣпівше*:

Виділилоась нако не на многі дні могу́тися про/мини́ти безводі́нь і безнара/да. і
поскрившись свої ізведі́ша із гра́ддя [Rus 110v:10]

Виділилоась нако не на/вого могу́тесе противити безводі́т і безнаре́женьємь. і *укрѣпівше* і
поскривши свої ізведіша із гра/да [Srb 102r:18]

“Having seen that they could not long withstand the lack of water and supplies, and having strengthened and urged their [men], they led them out of town.”

Verbs with the root *xup-* occur three times in my sample: *podxupšе* [Rus 110v:10] and *ukrēpivšе* [Srb 102r:18]; *xupetsja* [Rus 218v:3] and *v”zositese* [Srb 199v:18]; *poxupomsja* [Rus 278v:5] and *v”zehomse* [Serb 252v:13]. The Serbian scribe also offers the translation *v”zosetse* [Srb 104v:13] for the semantically similar verb *šatajutsja* [Rus 113r:16], which Sreznevskij denotes as ‘to get carried away,’ ‘to get a swelled head’, бы́ть заносчи́вымь, φραττόμενον. Sreznevskij lists one example of the verb *poxupatsja* in collocation with the noun *mužestvom*” ‘courage,’ and he offers only one meaning here, ‘to boast.’ However if we used the verb ‘to boast’ in this context, we would not come up with a meaningful English sentence. (Cf. Srb 199v:18 where the Serbian scribe translates the verb *hupite* (in the margin), in Rus 218v:3 *xupetsja*, as *v”zositese*: αμите κτό ζεβ μα χαίνεις “if someone foolishly boasts”, the translation ‘to boast’ makes a perfect sense). In the following context that Sreznevskij provides I would rather suggest the translation ‘to invigorate oneself”

45 “Having seen that they could not long withstand because of the lack of water and supplies, and having encouraged and urged on their [men], they led them out of town” (Leeming 2003:394)

46 As a justification for this observation, I follow Nida’s discussion of the difficulties the translator encounters while trying to provide the proper equivalent of a foreign word. Nida points out that dictionaries
We invigorated ourselves with courage and took off the Roman yoke” 

(\textit{History of the Jewish War}, fifteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “\textit{poxupitisa}”\textsuperscript{47}). In this example, we see the meaning to ‘invigorate’ is closely related to the accompanying adjectival substantive \textit{mu\v{z}estvom}, which shows the semantic relation between the meaning ‘invigorate’ on one hand, and ‘strong,’ and ‘firm’ on the other, and additionally to ‘zeal,’ and ‘enthusiasm’ that result from it. Vinogradov considers the noun \textit{krëpost} ‘strength’ to be synonymous with the noun \textit{mu\v{z}estvo} ‘valor,’ ‘courage.’ He states that the two nouns complemented one another. The first noun denoted conduct and the second a state of mind:

\begin{quote}
Элемент стойкости, твердости духа, который присутствовал в \textit{мужество}, настолько усиливался в лексеме \textit{кр\'япость}, что переходил в оттенок значения. Это приводило к тому, что \textit{мужество} несколько больше означало поведение человека, чем состояние; \textit{кр\'япость} же — наоборот, больше обозначало состояние. Поэтому в древнерусских памятниках слово \textit{кр\'япость} приурочивалось иногда к характеристике духовной силы, силы ума. Употребляясь в бинарной синтагме \textit{кр\'япость и мужество} (\textit{мужество и кр\'япость}), эти синонимы дополняли друг друга (Vinogradov 1952:101).
\end{quote}

Vasmer states simply that the Old Russian \textit{xupav}” ‘vain’, ‘proud’ is related to the Old Russian verb \textit{xupstisja} ‘to boast’ (Vasmer s.v. “\textit{xupavij”).

\footnotetext{47}{Srezenvskij also provides one example of the adjective \textit{xupavyi} meaning ‘arrogant,’ ‘proud’: 

Три же порою втручаются в свои дела … \textit{су\u0161ага љуштара}, и богата \textit{ложка}, и старца не кротка, \textit{суллалышта} разукрашать своим. “My soul disdains three habits … an arrogant poor man, a boastful rich man, and a monk that is not meek, [all] degrading themselves with their thought” (\textit{Sbornik Svjatoslava}, 1076; quoted by Srezenvskij, s.v. “\textit{xupavyi”).}
Since the Rječnik does not include the verb *podhupiti* at all, and since no examples of the root *hup-* are found either, I provide here the possibly related attested root *hup-* ‘to kiss,’ which could belong to same lexical semantic field. Consider the verb *ohupiti* ‘to kiss,’ cf. Old Church Slavonic *ohupati* ‘to hug’: *Da nazru se tvojih’ svetyih’ sèdin’ i ljub’zně ohuplju je* “May I look for a long time at your holy gray hair, and lovingly kiss it” (*Life of Sts. Simeon and Saint Sava*, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “ohupati”). Here, the meaning of the gestures ‘kiss’ and ‘hug’ could be related to ‘strength,’ ‘encouragement,’ ‘praise,’ in the sense of giving moral support.

Comparing the above examples with the verb *ukrèpiti*, ‘to strengthen,’ we can see that the latter, as attested in medieval Serbian, shares semantic nuances with the verb *podhupiti*, but it differs in that it expresses the concrete meaning ‘to strengthen.’ Here are two examples: *Blagodarimo Boga, koji mu je ukrèpil’ sr’ce na tom*’ “Let us praise God, who strengthened his heart in this matter” (*Donation Charter, 1399*; Rječnik s.v. “ukrèpiti”); *Blagi $e$ Bog’ ispr’va v’sa vidyji i ispitajeji sr’dca, ukrèpivy prodanago prekras’nago Josifa* “The good God, from the beginning seeing everything and searching hearts, having strengthened the most beautiful Joseph, who was sold” (*Dečani Chrysobolll*, fourteenth century; ibid.). Both of these examples are associated with ‘strength’; the first, however, shows ‘spiritual strength, ‘courage,’ the second ‘material possession,’ ‘authority.’ The Josephus passage indicates the association of both of these meanings in which ‘strength,’ ‘praise,’ and ‘zeal’ are based on both physical and spiritual attributes.

The absence of attested examples of the verb *podxupsti* in the meaning ‘to invigorate’ suggests that its replacement with the verb *ukrèpiti* is due to a recensional
difference. A number of related attested forms such as *hup-* and *ohupiti*, show to some extent indirect semantic correspondence to the meaning of the verb *ukrépiti* chosen by the Serbian scribe.

2.2.22. *lzé* and *moščno*

Another case of editing based on recensional differences between Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic is the replacement of the adverb *лз* [Rus 160v:3] by *мошно*:

> То бо е гора, и *лз* виђећи и знати храмы, и цркве превелик и свећи [Rus 160v:2]
> То бо е гора, и *мошно* виђећи и знати храмы, и цркве превелик и свећи [Srб 145v:8]

“For that is a hill, and from there it [was] possible to see and recognize the temples, and the enormous and brilliant temple”

This is the only example of this substitution in my sample. In Old East Slavic and Russian Church Slavonic, *lzé* is an adverb that means ‘it is possible,’ ‘one can,’ ‘one may,’ ‘it is allowed’: *не лз бе реи: не већа ог кого неке му купише* “One cannot say: I do not know from whom I bought [it]” (*Russkaja Pравда*, thirteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “l’зé”); *и не баше лзé кона напои* “And it was not possible to water the horses” (*Laurentian Chronicle*, 1377; quoted by Avanesov, ibid.); *и вы(ч) лзé ходити по трупьял акси по месту* “And it was possible to walk over the corpses as over a bridge” (*Hypatian Chronicle*, 1425; ibid.). The first example of *lzé* expresses negated obligation

---

48 “For that is a hill and from there it was possible to see and recognize the buildings and the temple, enormous and brilliant” (Leeming 2003:471).
(deontic modality), that is, forbidding someone to do something, and such is not relevant in this case. The last two examples relate to the Josephus example in that they express the physical possibility of accomplishing the task (epistemic modality).

The Rječnik does not mention the izers at all. Miklošić provides a number of medieval Serbian examples of izers, but only with the meaning ‘it is permitted, allowed.’ The semantically similar adverb in Serbian dužno, denoting ‘be right,’ ‘be supposed to be,’ ‘be lawful,’ ‘be polite,’ is attested in one example in the fourteenth century, which shares some of the nuances of the Russian izers. However, it does not provide the needed epistemic meaning ‘be possible.’ Therefore, in order to provide an appropriate equivalent of izers, the scribe replaces it with mošćno.

If we compare the use of izers in Russian, and mošćno in Serbian, it can be seen that the two appear to be synonymous to a large extent. Mošćno in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic denoted ‘be possible’ ‘be able’: Začeh ... pešti se od duši svojej ... kako bi mošćno vjsprijeti mi angelški i apostolški obraz “I began ... taking care of my soul ... so that it would be possible for me to receive the angelic and apostolic image” (Donation Charter of Stefan Nemanja, twelfth century; Rječnik, s.v. “moćno”); Kako bude moćno i kyršete izvratiti se u grad “So that it be possible for merchants to return to the city” (Edict of King Stefan Uroš I, thirteenth century, ibid.). Of these two examples, the second deals with the physical ability of the merchants to come back to the city, which corresponds to the Josephus passage in that it expresses the physical ability to do something.

Based on the above information, it appears that izers was not attested in the meaning ‘be possible’ in the medieval Serbian. Thus a probable reason for the replacement of izers
by *moščno* is recensional editing. Grigorije Vasilije replaces it with the familiar *moščno*, which appears to be the semantic equivalent of *lzê*, found in the Josephus passage.

2.2.23. *tovarišč*” and *drug’*

In the following example, Grigorije Vasilije copies (with one phonetic change) the noun *товарицa* [Rus 219v:4] while providing the gloss *другa* ‘friend’ in the margin:

```
Призда λχ/κία съвсего товарицa [Rus 219v:4]
Призда λξηβία съвсего товарицa [Srb 200:16]
He invited Lucius, his friend.”
```

This is the only such example in my sample. In Russian Church Slavonic, the noun *tovarišč*” means ‘participant,’ ‘associate,’ or ‘colleague’: Ᾱσάδω διῆκε, ὅτι πρήσαναι ἐξαίσε [sic] καὶ ναῦλ μετὰ χαρίτονά ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοφαριτά ἡ θέσην ἡμεῖς ‘It is known to you that the priest Khariton came here to us from you with his associates for the dedication’ (*Encyclical letter of Metropolitan Kiprian*, fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “*tovarišč*”); Γκ ωσπονύμι, εξαίσει, και συγκριτικ… καὶ ὅτι τοφαριτά ἡ ἡμείας καὶ ὅτι ἡ συγκρίτικαὶ οὐ λέει “May our Lord and Father protect and preserve… both from the uncompassionate colleague and from the unkind neighbor (*Shbornik Kirilo-Belozerskogo monastirja*, fifteenth century; ibid.).

On the other hand, the Rječnik does not mention any medieval Serbian examples of the noun *tovariš’* (the spelling found in HM.SMS.280) or *tovarišt’* (the direct equivalent of the Russian Church Slavonic form). The Rječnik does state that examples of this word are attested with Croatian writers, i.e., non-Orthodox Slavs.
To provide a possible reason for the replacement of the noun *tovarišč*" with the noun *drug’,* one can look at the possible semantic relationship between the noun *tovarišč*" and the related noun *tovar’* ‘load,’ ‘burden’ (*onus*): *Sela tovara da ne nose, n’ da hrani vsako selo po jednoga konja kudra, da nosi cr’kovni tovar’* “Let villages not carry the load, but let every village raise one loading horse to carry the church load” (*Dečani Chrysoboull*, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “tovar”). Likewise, the derived verb *tovariti* has the meaning ‘to load’: *Boljar’sciji konji da se ne tovare* “Noblemen’s horses are not to be loaded” (ibid.). Metaphorically, in an immaterial way, the meaning ‘load,’ ‘burden’ can denote an emotional, mental, spiritual state in terms of ‘worry,’ ‘sorrow,’ ‘fear’ that one shares with or confines to a friend. This shows a possible semantic relation among the meanings ‘friend’ and ‘burden,’ ‘load’ which show that they can be construed as belonging to one extended semantic network.

If we look at the noun *drug’,* its meaning is associated with the notion of sharing in terms of the social sphere. Miklošić lists the noun *drug’* ‘friend,’ *amicus,* attested in *the Epistle of the Serbian Monastery Šišatovac* from 1324, but does not provide any examples. It can also mean ‘spouse’: *Ako ima svadbu Dubrovčaninь z drugom svojijem* (svojem) “If a man from Dubrovnik celebrates marriage with his spouse” (*Dubrovnik Treaty*, fourteenth century; ibid.).

Thus, the comparison of the noun *tovarišč*” found in the Josephus passage, with the noun *drug’* shows that the two share a similar connotation, denoting ‘the person with whom lives and works.’ Similarly, in Old Church Slavonic the noun *drug’* is attested in the meaning ‘friend,’ ‘neighbor’: *Друже како выйде ство не ивы отдам врагама* “Friend, how did you enter here not having wedding garments?” (Matthew 22:12 in
Ostromir Gospel; quoted by Kurz, s.v. “drug”). The address in the passage is referring to the marriage feast as a metaphor for the heavenly kingdom, in which the righteous dwell, in this case showing a parallel between the meaning ‘friend’ and ‘living together’ in one place. Thus, an additional parallel is found in Old Church Slavonic, where drug’ is also a synonym of iskr’nii ‘neighbor’ (πληρόν) (Cejtlin et al., eds., 1994: 265).

Considering the examples in which the noun drug’ is attested, it appears that the choice of the Serbian scribe corresponds to the sense of the word tovarišć in the equivalent passage of the Russian Josephus manuscript. In order to provide a suitable equivalent, Grigorije Vasilije uses the familiar noun drug’. Since the main Serbian historical dictionaries do not provide any attested example of the noun tovarišć, this would be the first attestation of this noun in medieval Serbian.

2.2.24. trux- and drēx-

In another example of editing due to recensional differences, the Serbian scribe substitutes the adjective τροχατ [Rus 9r:18] for дрёхь:

Илеи τροχατ бысть Антипатр и имено быь веьмь иако вспомяне спяло [Rus 9r:18]
Илеи дрёхь быь Антипатрь и имено быь веьмь иако вспомяне спяло [Srb 7r:14]
“Antipater immediately became sorrowful, and it was made known to all that he had become very grieved.”

This replacement of the root trux- with drēh- is found only once in my sample. In two subsequent examples, we find the lexeme drēh- in both the Russian and the Serbian

49 “Antipater felt a sudden pang and it was obvious that he was greatly dismayed” (Leeming 2003:210).
manuscript (Rus 197r:8 and Serb 178v:1; Rus 199r:4 and Srb 180v:7). In my sample the root drēh- was found in collocations with words plakati, 'cry,' glad', 'hunger,' and pečal, 'sorrow.'

According to Sreznevskij, the adjective/adverb truxlyi/truxlo in Russian Church Slavonic denoted ‘dark,’ ‘gloomy,’ ‘sorrowful’: Кнiвiм же тнуюся ревет къ неуг “The prince said to him sorrowfully” (Service Menaion for September, fifteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “truxlo”).

The Rječnik does not cite any medieval example of the root truh- with the meaning ‘gloomy,’ ‘sorrowful.’ Although Miklošič lists a similar form in the verb truhviti, he provides only the meaning ‘doubt,’ sensus dubius, and does not mention any medieval Serbian examples. The possibly related adjective trul-, truo, ‘rotten,’ indicating a dark color of an object, could relate to the meaning ‘gloomy,’ but it is found only in medieval documents by Croatian writers (Rječnik, s.v. “truo”). Vasmer defines the adjective truxlyij in Russian as ‘dark, gloomy,’ and states that this verb is related to the meaning ‘fragile, soft, rottening’ (Vasmer s.v. “truxa”).

A phonologically similar root that may have suggested a possible semantic association of the root truh- with the meaning ‘sorrowful’ is the verb trz- denoting ‘to pull abruptly,’ ‘pull violently,’ in regard to hair, and ‘tear apart’ relating to clothes, as a sign of sadness or sorrow: I tu velik’ plač i rydanije s’tvori tr’zaje vlasi glavi svojeje “And here great sorrow and lamentation created [sc. caused] the pulling of the hair of his head” (Lives of Serbian Kings and Archbishops, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “trazati”); Jegda sliša Efimijan’, jako syn’ jego jest ... rastrza rizy svoje i sedinniji svoje trzaše “When Efimian heard that it is his son … (he) tore apart his clothes and was
pulling his gray hair” (Life of Alexius the Man of God, fifteenth century; ibid.). Neither of
those verbs, however, show a straightforward semantic correspondence to the root trux-
‘sad, sorrowful’ found in the Russian Josephus passage, so it is uncertain that the
connection would be perceived by a medieval Serbian scribe.

In order to find a matching equivalent to the adjective truxl”, Grigorije Vasilije
uses  drēh’. This root, also reflected in the Old Church Slavonic dřesel” and drehl”, is
mentioned in the Rječnik in the form of dreseo, meaning ‘sad,’ ‘unhappy.’ Besides the
Rječnik, which provides examples attested in the fifteenth century, but only in Western
(Croatian) writers, Miklošič mentions attested Serbian examples of the adjective dřesel”
‘fretful’, σκυθρωπός, morosus, but without any examples (Various Homilies, thirteenth
century; quoted by Miklošič s.v. “dřesel””). Thus, the Serbian Josephus example of drēh’
sorrowful’ would be the first medieval Serbian attestation of the root in this particular
shape. Additional attested examples of the phonologically similar root dr- ‘tear’ suggest a
possible semantic association with the root truh-. Cf. razdrah’ odeždu “I tore apart my
clothes” (Nomonkanon, 1262; Miklošič s.v. “razdrati”); razdražiti, ‘irritate’, épeðličěv,
irritare, (ibid. s.v. “razdražiti”).

In sum, the absence of the root truh-, with the meaning ‘sad, sorrowful,’ in the
major Serbian dictionaries suggests that this root was probably not used in medieval
Serbian. Based on the examples that were available to me, it appears that the Russian
trx- and Serbian drēh-, show, to a certain extent, a semantic correspondence.
2.2.25. *kacija* and *ručka*

In the following example the Serbian scribe replaces the noun ΚΑΙрабат [-Rus 33v:5] with *Poγώχα*

Φιρ же раче нечоша многоценью ароматы вь златых ΚΑΙрабат [-Rus 33v:4]
Φири же раче ностя многоценьи аромати вь златых *Poγώхα* [Srb 30r:22]
“500 slaves carried very valuable spices in the golden *handheld censers*.”

This substitution occurs once in my sample. Meščerskij points out that the noun *kacija* in the Old Russian Josephus translation is one of the words of Greek origin that does not correspond to the reading in the Greek original. Rather, it was introduced by the Russian translator for stylistic and rhetorical reasons in order to make the text more vivid and elaborate (Meščerskij 1959: 253). In Meščerskij’s view, this noun is the same as the one reflected in Modern Greek κάστρο, ‘censer’; thus, *kacija* was used in Old Russian to denote a censer with a handle used specifically in church services (ibid. 255). This is one of many Greek words, (cf. *gisterna* ‘cistern’), partly borrowed in Russian though oral communication (Meščerskij in Leeming 2003:45).

The following is one example of the noun *kacija* attested in medieval Russian Church Slavonic denoting a ‘hand-held censer’: И церке святыю Въздесица ихо облатица..., и Кадъцантъ деф, и кацы, и евангеле кована “They robbed the entire church of the Holy Ascension … and two standing censers, and handheld censers, and a Gospel with a cover made of metal” (*Hypatian Chronicle*, s.a. 1146; quoted by Sreznevksij, s.v. “*kacija*”).

For Serbian, the Rječnik provides one example of this noun from the seventeenth century that has the same meaning as in Russian Church Slavonic, ‘hand-held censer’: *Sr*
sudi srebrnii različnii i pozlašteni obogatvī jego, portire, diskosi, kadilnice, kacije, ripidi... “Having enriched it with different silver and gilded vessels, cups, plates, chain censers, handheld censers, fans…” (Glasnik, seventeenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “kacija”).

There is, however, a much earlier attestation of this noun in the Typikon of Archbishop Nikodim, from the beginning of fourteenth century, in the section dealing with censing during the church service. Here the noun kacija, from tà katzheimer, or kataži, denotes a ‘censer that had a handle’ as opposed to ‘censer with a chain,’ θυματήρι (Savić 2008: 159, Fundulis 2004: 36).

Likewise, the noun ručka is attested in Serbian at the beginning of fourteenth century. According to the Rječnik, ručka in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic denoted a ‘wooden or any other hand-held censer’: Kadilnice že (ručki, ripidy) i sveštoniki zlaty “Censers (hand-held censers, fans) and golden candle holders” (Lives of the Serbian Kings and Archbishops, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “ručka”).

From the above examples we see that the noun kacija was used strictly in church-related vocabulary. Unlike many religious terms that were simply borrowed into Serbian from Greek such as анђео ‘angel,’ јаво 'devil,' Јеванђеље ‘Gospel,’ антиминс ‘antemension’, the noun kacija had its equivalent in ručka. Since both nouns kacija and ručka were attested in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, it is uncertain to what degree the Greek noun kacija was used. Such examples of Greek loanwords in alternation with words of Slavonic origin are common particularly in church vocabulary. Compare, for example, Greek πάσχα to the Serbian Church Slavonic Пасха, a direct borrowing from Greek, or Ускрс ‘Easter,’ a calque of ανάσταση involving native morphemes, or δοξολογία rendered as a loanword доколови или as a calque славословоб ‘glorification.
2.2.26. *rodostoma* and *rufizna voda*

In the following example, the Serbian scribe retains the noun *rodostom* [Rus 33v:6] in the text, but in the gloss he provides the translation *rufizna voda*:

Φιλοκλής: *ροδόστομον λίγο βαφής αλλάτιχα σοφούλετα* [Rus 33v:6]

Στέφανος: *ροδόστομον βαπτιστής φόρτισε* [Srb 30v:2]

“9 (slaves) carried rose water in golden vessels”

The translation of the noun *rodostoma* as *rufizna voda* is found only once in my sample. According to Meščerskij, the use of the noun *rodostoma* ‘rose oil’ is another addition by the Russian translator not found in the Greek original. He adds that this Graecism is not found in the main dictionaries and is absent from Vasmer as well. This is due to the rarity of this word, which, in Meščerskij’s opinion, was introduced via oral tradition from Byzantium (Meščerskij 1956:255).

According to D’jačenko (1899: 552), *ροδόστομα* denotes ‘rose water,’ which bishops use for the blessing of antimensions and the altar table. Although used only for special occasions, the translation *rufizna voda*, rendered by Grigorije Vasilije, shows that he was familiar with this obscure term. Since none of the major Serbian dictionaries lists the adjective *rufizna*, this would be its first attestation, and hence an addition to Serbian lexicography.

The Rječnik states that the noun *rodostoma* is borrowed from the Greek *ροδόστομα* and means ‘rose water.’ It provides one example in which the noun denotes a medication: *Rodostomu držit v uste* “It is necessary to keep rose water in the mouth” (*Starine*, fifteenth century, Rječnik, s.v. “rodostoma”). In addition, Miklošić lists

---

50 Antimension is a word of Greek origin and means “instead of the table”. It is a rectangular piece of cloth into which a small relic of a martyr or a saint is sewn, on which the Divine Liturgy is served.
an example of \textit{rodostoma} ‘rose water’ \textit{ροδόσταγμα rosarum liquor} (Miklošič, s.v. “rodostoma”), as well the adjective \textit{šip”čana voda}, ‘rose water,’ \textit{ό διὰ ρόδου, rosaceus} (ibid. “šip”čanije”), which corresponds to the color ‘red’ found with the word \textit{rufizna}.

It is interesting that Grigorije Vasilije, while providing an explanation for the Greek word \textit{rodostoma}, uses what appears to be an altered Latin word for ‘reddish’ \textit{rufus}, \textit{rufuzna voda} ‘red water,’ which corresponds to the meaning found in the Josephus passage. The use of Greek and Latin words could be based on the fact that the scribe could not find an equivalent in his native language, and that this specific church word was only used in its Greek or Latin form. Although Miklošič does not concretely list the adjective \textit{rufizna}, he provides the verb \textit{ruměnit} ‘to make it red,’ \textit{rufare}, which corresponds semantically to the adjective \textit{rufus}. When compared to the Greek word \textit{rodostoma}, which in addition to meaning ‘rose,’ could also mean ‘reddish,’ cf. Sreznevskij’s example \textit{ρόδιαν} ‘reddish,’ \textit{τo ρόδινo}, we see that this could easily be perceived as an equivalent to the \textit{rodostoma} found in the Josephus passage. If so, the noun \textit{rodostoma} could, in Grigorije Vasilije’s view, denote ‘rose’ or ‘reddish,’ based on the use of \textit{rodostoma} for the consecration of the holy tables and antimensions. According to the Biblical Encyclopedia, this consecration is performed using holy water mixed with red wine (see \textit{Biblejskaja Enciklopedija}, s.v. “voda svjataja”), which ultimately would provide a ‘reddish’ color. An alternative explanation would be that the adjective \textit{rufizna} may be influenced by the Greek \textit{ροδιζω} ‘reddish.’ The use of Greek terminology could be explained as due to the geographical proximity and close contact with Greeks. Indeed, some scribes, as Meščerskij points out, purposely used “foreign” words borrowed from Greek, in order to show off their knowledge of the foreign words (Meščerskij 1958:258).
In any case, his proper rendering of Greek words shows that Grigorije Vasilije knew Greek terminology, and possibly the Greek language, particularly words that pertained to the liturgy.

2.2.27. frijamva and toržestvo

In the following example, the Serbian scribe retains the noun φριαμβα [Rus 259r:16] in the text, but in the margin he makes reference to it as τρίγαστρο ‘triumph’:

И не много дней минуло/шеса сечи/иха да вси три естъ/борать единого φριαμβα [Rus 258r:9]
И немного дне/нь миноу́ще/ше сечъ/щи/че да вси три сгатереть единого φριαµβα [Srb 236r:9]
“And not many days having passed, they agreed that all three would make one triumph.”

This is the only example of the noun frijamva, which Grigorije Vasilije renders in the margin as тр'жасто ‘triumph.’ Although outside the scope of my sample, there are two more instances of this concept, found in the same form as in the Russian text, involving a Greek loanword: погетное прхождение иже есть преластиок “the triumphal entry, which is [to say] triumph [Srb 221v:12], φριαμβα [Srb 227v:21] ‘triumph.’

In Meščerskij’s view, frijambva, like rodostoma, in classical Greek θριαμβός, is one of those rare words of Greek origin not found in the Greek original, but subsequently added by the Russian translators. Meščerskij further states that this Graecism, not recorded in Sreznevskij’s or Miklošić’s dictionaries or by Vasmer, is an example of a

51 “And a few days having passed, they agreed that all three would make one triumph” (Leeming 2003: 602).
hapax legomena (Meščerskij 1956: 251, 258, 259). On one hand, the Russian scribe keeps the word frijamva, which in one example he explains as “a triumphal procession,” on the other, he uses the equivalent proelipsis, προέλευσις, an expression that originates in the Byzantine vernacular (ibid.: 258-259). As in the other examples of Graecisms, here too it can be stated that the Greek rendering of the word frijamva, because of its very specific military use, pertains to the procession of the Roman generals after a victory. Keeping the word in Greek, while providing the explanation in the gloss, shows that the word did not have an exact semantic equivalent in the scribe’s native language, and that it was necessary to retain the Greek form.

As in Russian, no record of the word frijamva is found in the main Serbian historical dictionaries. Thus, its use in the Josephus passage would be the first medieval Serbian attestation of this word. In addition, the noun tr’žastvo is recorded in Daničić as тръжество ‘solemnity,’ sollemne. Besides the religious connotation of tr’žstvo, no examples of the military use of the noun is found in either Daničić or Miklošić; cf. the purely religious sense in Принесем Богородице тръжество съ дары “we offer glorification to the Mother of God with gifts” (Czar Dušan’s Donation Charter, 1348; quoted by Daničić, s.v. “тъжество”). Also in Miklošić we find the noun tr’žstvo, meaning ‘feast,’ festus: тръжеството и празника творим “we are observing a feast and celebration” (Life of Czar Lazar, seventeenth century; Miklošić, s.v. “тъжство”). Although neither Daničić nor Miklošić mentions tr’žstvo except as a religious ceremony or celebration, there is an attestation of this world meaning ‘festivity,’ when welcoming someone (Dančić 1860:199). Nevertheless, the use of the noun tr’žstvo, in the meaning ‘triumph,’ i.e., ‘the
victory procession of a Roman general,’ would be the first such attestation in medieval Serbian.

Although attested in medieval Serbian, the noun tr’žstvo is attested exclusively as a religious ‘celebration.’ Alone, it would not be sufficient to render the technical military usage of the noun frijamva ‘triumph.’ It is evident that Grigorije Vasilije prefers to use the Greek version due to the obscurity of this very specific technical term, while providing in the gloss the noun tr’žstvo as clarification for the reader.
CHAPTER 3
LEXICAL VARIATIONS DUE TO DISAMBIGUATION

3.1 Introductory remarks

In the following sections I will discuss and analyze the second largest category of lexical changes found in my samples, next to the recensional substitutions discussed in Chapter 2—lexemes that are found in both Serbian and Russian, but with different connotations in the two recensions. Because of this, the lexemes in question, like the more transparent recensional differences, could be considered ones which Grigorije Vasilije perceived to be either foreign or confusing to Serbian readers of the sixteenth century. As will be shown, in certain instances, some of the substitutions may be motivated by more than one factor, but here I will focus on disambigustion as the primary one. In some cases, due to an inadequate number of the attested examples in the existing medieval Serbian dictionaries, I have proposed possible hypothetical conclusions based on the sources that were available to me.
3.2. Discussion of the lexemes

3.2.1. vlas” and oděžda

An example of the substitution due to disambiguation is the replacement of the noun влась [Rus 50v:16] by одеялахь:

о Иоанне пророке. Мужья же онь еготе прё пикахомь, въ зверскыхъ влась холдама [Rus 50v:14]
о Иоанне пророке. Мужья же онь еготе прежде пикахъ, въ зверскыхъ одеялахъ холдема [Srb 46v:4]
“About Saint John the Forerunner, that man about whom I wrote earlier, going around in animal clothing”52

The replacement of the noun vlas” by oděžda occurs only once in my sample. According to Sreznevskij, in Russian Church Slavonic the noun vlas” primarily means ‘hair,’ θρίς; И влась стъ главы башенъ не погърьютъ “And not a hair of your head shall be lost” (Luke 21:18 in the Ostromir’s Gospel, 1056-57; quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “vlas”). Vlas” can refer also to ‘wool,’ ‘hair,’ ‘fur of an animal’: Ισамъ вельежданъ власы вельеждан “John was clothed with camel’s hair” (Mark 1:6; ibid.). Avanesov provides an example from the fourteenth century: Βιδάτι θάκα...страшна нт поустъна исходымъ, велей во бладея нлоутица, велей власи, и въ вельеждик | класи идъна (τρίχας καμήλουν) “To see an awesome man…coming from the wilderness, having a big beard, long hair, and dressed in the hair of a camel” (Chronicle of George Hamartalos, fourteenth-fifteenth century; quoted by Avanesov s.v. “vlas”).

52 “The man we have already described as walking about in animal hair” (Leeming 2003: 259).
As in Russian, the noun *vlas’* in Serbian Church Slavonic primarily meant ‘hair.’ However, no meaning ‘clothing’ is attested for this noun. The only attested noun with the same root and a pertinent meaning is *vlasëna* ‘covering,’ *vestis, cilicina*, attested in the *Life of Saint Sava*: .words from the Life of Saint Sava: Χορωδίου Εὐαγγελίου Δοκολάβη. “He had been satisfied with a worn-out covering” (*Life of Saint Sava*, thirteenth century; Daničić s.v. “vlasëna”). Similarly, Miklošić lists the noun *vlas*” only with the meaning ‘hair,’ θριζμένος, *cilicinus*. Since the noun *vlas’* in the meaning ‘clothing’ is not mentioned by the Serbian dictionaries, the example found in the Josephus passage would be first such attestation in the medieval Serbian.

On the other hand, according to the Rječnik, the noun *odeđa* concretely denotes *odeđa* ‘clothing’, ‘priest’s vestments’: *Kaluder* da ne ima pećalb o pastyrskoj hrani i o *odeđi* “Let the monk not worry about the shepherd’s food or clothing” (*Edict of King Milutin*, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “odeđa”). *Da je na pištu staršet i na odeđu slépít i hromym* “Let it be for food for the elderly and for clothing for the blind and lame” (*Donation Charter of King Milutin*, fourteenth century; ibid.). In addition, *odeđa* may denote ‘priest’s vestments’: *Ukrasih svetyje i čjstnyje hramy...sveštennymi oděždami* “I have decorated the holy and honorable churches...with priest’s vestments” (ibid.). When compared to the Josephus passage, the noun *oděžda* seems to provide a more concrete meaning, ‘clothes.’ After checking *Miroslav’s Gospel*, I came to the conclusion that the Serbian scribe was not influenced by the wording of the description of Saint John in the New Testament. In Old Church Slavonic, however, there are examples of *odeđa*, figuratively denoting ‘sheep skin,’ which would indirectly correspond to the
noun vlas’ found in Josephus: ἵνα προσδωτῇ κυ βασιλείᾳ κο ὀδεξάδας ὀβενάξας “who come to you in sheep’s clothing” (Math. 7, 15 Assemanianus, eleventh century; quoted by Cejtlin 1994:405).

In the modern Serbian language, odeća primarily means ‘human clothes,’ but metaphorically it is used in sayings, where it denotes a person disguised in ‘sheep’s clothing’ or ‘wolf’s fur.’ The Church Slavonic term odēžda, however, is used only in the church context for ‘priest’s robe.’

It appears from the above examples that, while both nouns vlas’ and odēžda were attested in medieval Serbian, only odēžda concretely denoted ‘clothing.’ While there are a number of related attested forms in medieval Serbian, such as the noun vlasēna, adjective vlasēn”, it seems that there are no attested examples of the noun vlas’ with the meaning ‘clothing.’ Perhaps, in order to convey the meaning ‘clothing’ to the reader clearly, the Serbian scribe uses the straightforward and concrete noun odēžda.

3.2.2. običaj and zakon’

The noun zakon’ is found in the text while the noun običaj is found in the margin.

"Others thought that he was sent from God. But he contradicted the Law in much and did not observe the Sabbath according to the ancestral law."

53 Leeming has “ancestral custom” (Leeming 2003: 261)
This is the only substitution of the noun zakon’ for običaj in my sample. Otherwise the noun zakon’ is found, in both Russian and the Serbian manuscripts, nine times with the meaning either ‘Mosaic Law,’ or ‘Roman Law.’ The noun običaj is also found nine times in both manuscripts. Only once does Grigorije Vasilije substitute zakon’ [Srb 48v:12] for običaj [Rus 53r:15], while writing običaj in the margin. From the context we can see that običaj denotes ‘Mosaic Law’ here. In all but of one of the other cases, where običaj denotes ‘custom,’ ‘practice,’ ‘tradition,’ Grigorije Vasilije retains it without alteration; the exception is običaj [Srb 48r:1] in the meaning ‘law,’ which is retained by Grigorije Vasilije in the Serbian text.

In Russian Church Slavonic the noun obyčaj could mean both ‘custom,’ and ‘unwritten law,’ συνήθεια: ЕВАНГЕЛЕ (Мис) по обичај сконецу ег дьнь ежедневны ег събориште “According to His custom (Jesus) entered into the synagogue (Luke 4:16 in Ostromir Gospel, 1056–57; quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “obyčaj”); ἑκτὸς ἴνα ὄρθιν εἰκατά δε ἕλικου εἰς σταυρώσει ἐν πάση “You have a custom [unwritten law—ŽJ] that I should release someone to you at the Passover” (John 18:39, ibid.).

In his discussion of the Greek noun νόμος, Eugene Nida points out that this noun in different context could have a range of different meanings, so that it is often difficult to determine the appropriate meaning in a given context: ‘Law of Moses,’ ‘Scripture in general,’ ‘The Old Testament,’ ‘law in general, both religious and secular.’ In Saint Paul’s writing, according to Nida, νόμος could denote ‘regulatory principle of behavior’ (Rom. 7:23) or ‘spiritual principle of life’ (Rom. 8:2). In Classical and Helenistic Greek, the noun νόμος commonly pertained to ‘custom,’ ‘customary practice’:
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The rendering of νόμος as a ‘principle’ in the sense of ‘principle of operation’ or ‘normal procedure’ should not be regarded as unduly strange, since νόμος in both Classical and Hellenistic Greek is regularly used in the sense of ‘custom’ and ‘customary practice’ (Nida 1992:70).

As in Russian, according to the Rječnik, the noun običaj, mos, mores, ritus could mean ‘habit,’ ‘custom’ in medieval Serbian: Kako je to bio našeћь stareћь običaj dobri “As it was the good custom of our ancestors” (Edict of King Stefan Ostoja, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “obicaj”); Kako je njih počteni i krasni običaj “How honored and beautiful is their custom” (Letter of Duke Sandalj to Dubrovnik, fifteenth century; ibid.). However, unlike in Russian Church Slavonic, no examples of the noun običaj in the meaning ‘law’ were found in any of the main Serbian dictionaries. Thus, the mention of this noun in Josephus passage with the meaning ‘law’ would be the first such attestation in medieval Serbian.

In medieval Serbian Church Slavonic the noun zakon’ denotes ‘law’: A se zakon’ metohijam crkovnim “And this law is for the church land” (Chrysoboull, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “zakon’); Ljudem že crkovnim ustavismo zakon, da daje vsaki njih u godišti tri dni oranija “We have instituted a law for the church people that each of them donates three plowings a year” (Donation Charter of Queen Evdokija, 1370; ibid.); Zakon’ blagověrnago cara Stefana “The Law of the pious Tsar Stefan” (fourteenth century; ibid.). Considering the Josephus passage, it appears that the noun zakon’ provides the proper rendering of the Russian noun običaj. Possibly, in order to clearly convey the meaning ‘law,’ Grigorije Vasilije replaces the ambiguous običaj with the straightforward noun zakon’ ‘law,’ while retaining the Russian noun običaj in the gloss in order to point out its possible secondary meaning.
3.2.3. odati and otpustiti

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the verb ṢDa [Rus 200r:7] with Ṣotuči in the meaning 'forgive'.

И многества ихъ рад ṢDa нить [Rus 200r:7]
И многества ради имь сихъ нить [Srb 181r:22]
“And because of their great number he forgave them.”

This substitution occurs only once in my sample. Otherwise, the verb odati [Rus 108v:10, Srb 100v:4] is found in the section written by the second Serbian scribe in the meaning ‘hand over.’ In Russian Church Slavonic, the given verb could mean ‘give,’ ‘forgive,’ ‘pay back,’ ‘sell,’ but the only meaning relevant to the Josephus passage is ‘forgive’: Ḡάκо, ṢDa итъ греxъ ть, мene же покои ць стьм “Master, forgive them this sin, and grant me repose with the saints” (Lection on Boris and Gleb, fourteenth century; Sreznevskij, s.v. “otdati”).

According to the Rječnik, in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic the verb odati could denote the meanings ‘donate,’ ‘appropriate by force,’ ‘betray,’ ‘hand over’; however, no examples of the meaning ‘forgive’ are attested. Of these meanings possibly the verb ‘donate,’ i.e., ‘in order to receive forgiveness of sins,’ shows an indirect semantic relation to the verb ‘forgive’: Da sutь voljni njimi... ili podь срьковъ dati ili za

---

54 Брата мои брата и любия, изолли ио вреяма Ṣдадите ли, да поне помолисе Баг вложенъ “My dear and beloved brothers, give me a little time to pray to my God” (Tale of Boris and Gleb, fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “otdati”); Никогдa же же ни продати, ни Ḡдати “Never to sell or to give [it] as gift” (Inscription on the Cross of Efrosinija of Polock, 1161; ibid.); Не помошь же моему хлопку продати, поелъ... да продадать и н житъ его и Ḡдада и бые, калко нерадно, и Ḡдати “Since he was not able to pay, the master ordered that they sell him and his wife and his children and all that he had and to repay the debt” (Matthew 18:25, Ostromir Gospel, 1056–57; ibid.); Аще кто Ḡдате храмь “If anyone sells a house” (Leviticus 25:29, fourteenth century; ibid.).

55 Kto hoce si krosto odadati odь svetye trojice ili ga silomь uzeti “Whoever will give away the cross from the Holy Trinity or take it by force” (Donation Charter of Queen Jelena, 1273-1314; ibid.).
dušu otdati ili prodati “Let them be free with them... either to give [them] to the church or to donate [them] for [their] soul or to sell [them]” (Tsar Dušan’s Law, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “odati”).

Although not directly corresponding to the Josephus passage, the above example indirectly shows a further semantic relation between the verb ‘forgive’ and ‘donate,’ in a sense to ‘give freely and not expect anything back,’ ‘give out of compassion,’ ‘show mercy.’ The action of giving is motivated by goodwill, and so is the action of forgiveness. Thus, both deal with the emotion of sympathy, cf. the Greek word συγγιγνώσκω ‘to have sympathy with, to forgive,’ or συγχωρέω ‘to give way, yield’ (Buck 1949: 1174).

In addition, the verb otdati with the meaning ‘forgive’ is attested in Old Church Slavonic and is used with the noun ‘sin’: ἀφέωντες τις ἐν γῇς “Your sins are forgiven” (Matthew 9:2 in Savvina kniga, eleventh century; quoted by Cejtlin, s.v. “ot”dati”). The absence of the verb otdati in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic with the meaning ‘forgive’ may be an indication that this verb was not used in this context. Thus, Grigorije Vasilije may have chosen for this reason to use the verb otpustiti ‘forgive.’

According to the Rječnik, the verb otpustiti could mean ‘release,’ ‘let go,’ and ‘abandon.’ The first two meanings, relevant for Josephus, are, according to the Rječnik, attested in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic in the thirteenth century, but no examples are provided.

These examples indicate that the substitution of the verb otdati for otpustiti may be an example of a recensional difference. While the verb otdati was attested in both medieval Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic, it did not have the same connotation in
the two recensions. The verb *otdati* is attested in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic in a spiritual sense to mean ‘give for one’s soul,’ ultimately, ‘in order to receive forgiveness of sins,’ or, in a negative sense, ‘appropriate by force,’ ‘hand over,’ but not in the meaning ‘forgive’. Grigorije Vasilije may perhaps use the verb *otpustiti* to convey the equivalent meaning ‘forgive’ in a clear way.

### 3.2.4. *prebyvati* and *pribégati*

In the following example, the Serbian verb *пебежати* has been substituted for the Russian *пребывать* [Rus 199r:17]:

\[\text{For whose sake we were hoping to free ourselves and flee to the Romans without fear.}\]

The replacement of *prebyvati* with *pribegati* occurs only once in my sample, and it appears to be a correction on the part of Grigorije Vasilije. If we compare all the examples of the use of this verb, as well as of its deverbal noun, we see that the Serbian scribes are consistent. We find the verb *prebyvati* twice in both the Russian and the Serbian, cf. *prebyvati* [Rus 53v:2, 194r:1], *пебывать* [Serb 48v:20, 175v:4] meaning ‘to remain,’ ‘stay.’ Also, in both manuscripts, the verb *пебежнуть/pribежнутi* occurs four
times in the meaning ‘run to,’ ‘flee’ [Rus 102v:2, Srb 94v:17], [Rus 191v:15, Srb 173v:18], [Rus 192r:8, Srb 173v:21], [Rus 199v:14, Srb 181r:8]. It can also be noted that the noun *pereskok*” ‘deserter’ [Rus 191v:17, 199v:18, 199v:20] is replaced three times by *prëbeg*’ [Srb 173v:20, 181r:11, 181r:13]; while *pereskok*” [Rus 199v:22,299v:10] is twice retained (with conversion to Serbian orthography) as *preskok*’ [Srb 181r:15, 182r:2].

The verb *prebyvati* in medieval Russian is attested in the meaning ‘to stay,’ ‘to reside,’ and could be related to the meaning ‘to flee in order to find a place to live, or a place of refuge, harbor.’ No concrete examples of the meaning ‘to flee’ are found under the entry of this verb either in Sreznevskij or Avanesov. Associated meanings are found with the prefix *pre-* and the root *byt-* in the noun *prebyvatel*’ ‘hermit’ (Avanesov 2008:25), that is, one who leaves (for a monk it is often said that he ‘flees’) the world and finds refuge in a solitary place.

The equivalent verb *prebivati* in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic could not convey motion. Its primary meaning was ‘to stay,’ ‘to remain.’ In addition, *prebivati* could mean ‘to reside’: *Da imъ obladajetъ starьsъ prëbyvajej vъ semy pirьgu* “Let the elder who resides in this tower be in charge of them” (*Chrysoboull of King Milutin*, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “prëbyvati”).). The verb *prebivati* could also mean ‘to live’: *Jere bi namъ drago, da biste u miru prebivali* “We would be happy for you to live in peace” (*Spom. serb. 1, 51*, fifteenth century; ibid.). None of these meanings fits the Josephus passage directly; however, all of these indirect examples deal with people who

---

58 Όχι δεν μπορώ πρεβυβατιν κε θεσιν μνιστερια &απεθανε ο ετερ νην “I cannot reside in the cell any more, because of the multitude of demons living in it” (*Life of St. Feodosij Pečerskij*, eleventh century; quoted in Sreznevskij, s.v. “prebyvati”).
look for refuge either by fleeing from the world, i.e., hermits, or seek refuge from physical harm.

While *prebivati* shows an indirect relation to the meaning ‘flee’ in terms of living as a hermit, the verb *pribjegati* denotes a concrete meaning ‘flee (to),’ ‘desert (to),’ ‘escape (to)’: *Tvoj vrag pribegne i naš grad kь namь* “Your enemy will escape to us, to our city” (*Promissory Note of Duke Jovan Dandal of Dubrovnik*, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “pribjegati”).

The above examples suggest that the substitution of the verb *pribjegati* for *prebyvati* is an example where Grigorije Vasilije’s perceives the two words as antonyms rather than synonyms. Since the needed meaning in the given context was ‘flee,’ rather than ‘stay,’ Grigorije Vasilije uses the concrete verb *pribjegati*, which agrees with the use of this verb, or related noun, in eleven other examples found in my sample.

3.2.5. *imati* and *v’zimati*

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the verb *имать* [Rus 275v:14] with *в’земат’*.

И помышляла еже создать [sic] нын римане злата аще имать а и цеца да вськь окупасть равно [Rus 275v:12]
И помышляша ле а и сакъ нын римане злата аще *в’зематъ* и и сакъ це вськь окупасть равно [Srb 250r:20]
“And [they] thought that the Romans would do bad things to them if they captured them, they decided that all would die equally.”

59 “And imagining what evils the Romans would do to them, should they capture them, decided they should all die equally” (Leeming 2003: 624).
This replacement of the verb *imati* with *v’zimati* occurs once in my sample.

In medieval Russian Church Slavonic, the polysemous verb *imati*, besides meaning to ‘take and to borrow,’\(^{60}\) also could mean to ‘seize,’ ‘to capture’: Καρδιλι же

имать... “The barbarians having captured them...” (*Pandects of Antiochus*, eleventh century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “*imati*”).

In medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, based on the attested examples, the verb *imati* had different connotations. The Rječnik provides numerous examples of this verb, but none of them conveys the meaning ‘to seize or to capture.’ The medieval Serbian examples of the verb *imati* could mean ‘to have,’ expressing possession of something, which can be physical objects, such as money or land, or spiritual or emotional characteristics, such as love or friendship. In an active sense, the verb could mean ‘to make peace,’ ‘to promise.’ It also can express deontic modality, the need to do something. However, none of these instances applies to the meaning in the Josephus passage, ‘to capture.’

The verb *uzeti*, besides meaning ‘to take by force,’ and ‘to confiscate’\(^{61}\) in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, also conveys the meaning ‘to capture,’ which corresponds to one of the meanings of the Russian *imati*: *Inije carje pobedio i razbih i vzezhi dostojanija ih.* “I defeated the other tsars and smashed and confiscated their possessions” (*Dečani Chrysoboull*, 1330; Rječnik, s.v. “*uzeti*”).

---

\(^{60}\) *A таньи продават не имати “And not to take secret briberies”* (*Russkaja Pravda*, ca.1280; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “*imati*”); *Оу людем управо купи не имати на тую звану “Do not borrow money from Tartars for that land”* (*Foundation Charter of Bishop Vlasij*, 1349; ibid.).

\(^{61}\) *Ako se tko najde prodav vino s vodom ... da mu se vše uzeme, što ima “If someone is found to have sold wine mixed with water ... let everything that he has be taken away from him”* (*Treaty of Stefan the First Crowned with Dubrovnik*, 1222-1228; ibid.). It also could mean to ‘to take by force’: *vzmi vzmi, raspi “Take him, take him, and crucify him”* (*Dečani Chrysoboull*, 1330; ibid.).
Thus, the substitution of the verb *imati* with *v’zimati* appears to be an example of disambiguation. Although the verb *imati* was common in both Russian and Serbian, it conveyed different meanings in the two languages. In order to provide a good equivalent of the Russian verb *imati* which could denote ‘to capture,’ Grigorije Vasilije used the corresponding Serbian verb *uzeti*.

3.2.6. *obrýtisja* and *ostanovitse*

Another example of disambiguation can be seen with the verb *obrýtisja* [Rus 82v:17], which the Serbian scribe retains, but glosses in the margin as *ostanovitse*:

То не поунают рати преѥ даѥне не *obrýtisja* [Rus 82v:16]  
То не поунают рати прѥдꙗ даѥне не *obrýtisja* [76v:19]  
“Тhey do not begin a battle before they dig all around.”

The two Serbian scribes rendered the verb *obryti se* differently. Out of seven examples found in the section copied by second Serbian scribe, the verb *obryti se* is replaced five times and retained twice: *obryti se* [Rus 82v:16] and *ostanovitse* (in the margin *obryjutse*) [Srb 76v:9]; *obrys* [Rus 110r:2] and *očr’tav’* [Srb 101v:12]; cf. the replacement of the verbal noun *obrytija* [Rus 82v:17] by Serbian *stana* (in the margin *obrytija*) [Srb 77v:14]. Outside the scope of my sample I found also *obrysja* [Rus 101v:2] replaced by *sède* [Srb 93v:19] and *obrysja* [Rus 102r:21] retained in the Serbian text with a gloss, *obrise si reč stanovis* [Srb 94v:14]. In two examples the second Serbian scribe retains the Russian verb or its derived noun: *obryl* [Rus 109v:6] and *ob/ryl’* [Srb 101v:4],

62 “They never start battle until they have encamped” (Leeming 2003: 337).
obrytiju [Rus 112v:17] and obritiju [Srb 104r:15]. This is the first attestation of the verb obryti/obriti in medieval Serbian, which makes an addition to the existing Serbian lexicon.

Grigorije Vasilije, on the other hand, regularly retains the verb obryti without any alteration. Thus, in Grigorije Vasilije’s section we encounter eleven examples,⁶³ of which seven are of the verb obryti ‘dig all around,’ and four examples of the noun obytije ‘trench.’ The different renditions of obryti se/obytije are one of the features that distinguish the two scribes involved in copying of the Serbian version of The History of the Jewish War.

In Russian Church Slavonic the verb obryti could mean “to encircle with a trench”: ὁμοριτὸς τῇ ṣτεφανᾷ “He will encircle you with a trench” (Interpreted Book of Ezekiel, fifteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij s.v., “obryti”). The equivalent verb in medieval Serbian denotes ‘dig all around,’ pertaining to a specific military practice, in which the Romans would, before settling in one place, dig a trench (Leeming 2003: 658). No medieval Serbian attestations of the prefixed verb obryti are found in the Rječnik. However, the Rječnik does mention the related verb izryti ‘to dig out’ effodere, which contains the same root: Sami sebė rov’ izryše “They dug out a grave for themselves” (Lives of Sts. Simeon and Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “izryti”). Daničić also mentions the corresponding noun rov’ ‘pit, grave’ fora: ровь и гроба “He dug out and scooped out a grave” (Life of St. Simeon by Stefan the First Crowned, thirteenth century; quoted by Daničić s.v., “rov’”). While these examples are helpful in determining the meaning of the verb ryti, they do not provide any specific attestation of the military

term ‘dig all around in order to make a trench.’ Thus, the Serbian scribe places the verb obryti in the margin, possibly as an introduction to an obscure military term, while placing the familiar verb ostanovitise in the text.

In Serbian Church Slavonic, the verb ostanoviti se means ‘to stop,’ ‘to stay.’ According to the Rjećnik, this verb has the same connotation as the verb ostiti ‘to remain, ‘to stay,’ ‘to stay in the same place’ (Rjećnik, s.v. “ostati”). Compared to the verb obryti, which specifically denotes ‘dig around,’ the verb ostanoviti, although sharing semantic nuances with this verb, has a much broader scope of meaning. Therefore, by placing the verb obryti in the margin, the scribe narrows down the meaning of ostanovetse ‘stay’, at least for readers who could understand the gloss.

The scribe’s choice of this verb is clearly connected with the related noun stan,’ which, besides its core meaning ‘residence,’ also could mean ‘military camp’ castra: въ воинскыхъ станахъ “in the military camps” (Nomokanon, 1262; Miklošič, s.v. “stan”’). The noun stan’ is actually found once in [Srb 77v:14], where obrytija is written in the margin, cf. obrytija [Rus 82v:17]. Since the noun stan’ could have a number of other meanings besides ‘military camp,’ it did not concretely denote this technical military term, and so the scribe retains obrytija in the margin for additional clarification.

We have a similar situation in the next example, in which the verb obryti is replaced by očr’tati.
3.2.6.2. *obryti* and *očr’tati*

There is only one example of this substitution in my sample. Since I have already mentioned medieval Russian examples of *obryti* in 3.2.6, I will restrict my discussion here to the verb *očr’tati*, which literally denotes ‘draw a line,’ for which no medieval Serbian attestation is found in the main Serbian dictionaries. However the meaning found in Josephus connotes ‘settling in a camp’ (evidently, by setting up a defensive perimeter). Nevertheless, this would be the first such attestation of this verb, which makes an interesting addition to the existing Serbian lexicography. In order to establish a parallel between the verb *obryti* and *očr’tati*, I will suggest number of possible related attestations.

Of the main dictionaries, only Miklošić provides an example of the related verb *očr’sti* ‘draw a line,’ ‘sketch’ *delineare* (*Various homilies*, fourteenth century; Miklošić, s.v. “očr’sti”). However, although related semantically, in terms of a designated place of stay, this verb does not clearly denote ‘camp.’ Closer in meaning to the military word ‘camp’ is the attested noun *očr’šta*, denoting ‘tents made of stretched skin’ *σκήνωμα, tentorium* found in the Psalter\(^65\) (Miklošić, s.v. “očr’šta”). These examples show that the military verb *obryti*, found in the Russian text, could be semantically related to *očr’sti*,

---

\(^{64}\) “And he posted strong guards from afar, and he himself ‘was on the mountain which faced it’” (Leeming 2003:393).

\(^{65}\) This Psalter is printed in 1561 in the printing house of Božidar Vuković in Goražde.
očr’ pige, and thus presumably očr’ tati. The three different renderings of the verb obryti correspond to a certain degree to the meanings found in Russian, and they show that the scribe understood this technical term. A possible reason for the substitution could be that this word was limited to the military vocabulary and so was obscure in the scribe’s view. This substitution was made only by the second scribe, while Grigorije Vasilije consistently retained the original obryti.

3.2.7. puščati and metati

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the verb пуцати [Rus 88r:21] with метацать.

Идёц же камене велике пуцаху на на [Rus 88r:20]
Идёц же камене велике метацать на не [Srb 82r:1]
“The Jews threw great stones at them.”

The replacement of the verb puščati with metati occurs two times in my sample, [Srb 82r:1, 149r:7].

In Russian Church Slavonic the verb puščati could mean ‘to throw, toss, drop’: И се пуцающа жагаху насъ “And lo, throwing, they were burning us” (Primary Chronicle in the Laurentian Copy, 1377, s.a. 1186; ibid.). The verb puščati could also mean ‘to drop’: Взиявающи яица свою (птица алковость), и носить на среду моря и пуцаютъ

66 “And the Jews launched great stones at them” (Lemming 2003: 347).
67 Other meanings of the verb puščati include ‘to send, to emit, to inflict (destruction, calamity), ‘to order someone to go, let go, liberate, dismiss, persecute, divorce.’
“Having taken her eggs, (the halcyon) carries them to the middle of the sea and drops them to the depth” *(Chronograph Palaea*, fourteenth century; ibid.).

Similar to Russian, a cognate verb existed in medieval Serbian, but with a more restricted range of meanings. *Puštati* could mean ‘to abandon,’ ‘forsake,’ ‘release’ in terms of letting people go: *Uže puštaet’ me vladyla s' mirom* “The Lord is already releasing me in peace” *(Life of Saint Simeon*, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “puštati”); *Naše trgovce puštaju minovati slobodno* “They let our merchants pass freely” *(Spomenici srpski* 68, fourteenth century; ibid.). However, none of these meaning matches the Russian example of *puščati* meaning ‘to throw, to toss.’

The Serbian scribe uses the equivalent verb *metati*, ‘to throw’: *Nitkor ne brani metati* “No one prevents throwing [the excessive baggage from the boat]” *(Spomenici srpski*, fifteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “metati” ). Miklošić provides a number of examples of *metati* with the meaning ‘throw,’ in collocation with ‘rock,’ ‘lot,’ as well as ‘to expel’ (see Miklošić, s.v. “metati”). For a detailed discussion of *metati* in medieval Serbian, see the comparison between *metati* and *spěšiti* in section 3.13. Considering all these examples, it appears that the substitution of the verb *puščati for metati* could be an example of recensional editing. Based on the attested examples, it seems that the verb *puščati* in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic was used only with people meaning ‘to release, let go.’ This could be a motive for the Serbian scribe to replace it with the verb *metati*, which primarily meant ‘to throw, toss,’ in a physical sense.

---

68 *Spomenici srpski* (Serbian Monuments) consist of a collection of the letters sent from Dubrovnik to Serbian kings, rules, and noblemen. They were written by a Serbian recorder (*cancellarius*), Rusko Hristiforović, who composed the documents by order of the administration/ruler of the Dubrovnik Republic.
3.2.8. *strelec”* and *puškar’*

The following example involves the replacement of the noun *стремец* [Rus 80r:21] with *пушкарь*.

*ё коньникъ а *ё стрелец* [Rus 80r:21].
*ё коньникъ и пушкарь *ё [Srb 74v:7]
“2000 cavalry and 3000 archers”. 69

Both replacements are rendered by the second Serbian scribe. There are two substitutions of the noun *puškar’* for *strellec* in my sample. In the first case, the scribe substituted the noun *puškar’* [Srb 74v:7] for *strellec”* [Rus 80r:21]. In the second example, the scribe kept the noun *strellec”* [Srb 81r:13] in the text, but placed the noun *puškar’* in the margin; the Russian manuscript has *strellec”*. In two cases the second Serbian scribe retained the noun *strellec”* from the Russian text without alteration: *strellec’* [Rus 104v:3] and *strelac’* [Srb 96v:17].

In Russian Church Slavonic, *стремец днёр* “A good archer” (*Chronicle of George Hamartalos*, fourteenth-fifteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “стрем’ч’’”). Presumably the meaning *стрем’ч* corresponds to the meaning found in Josephus, indicating ‘soldier with a bow an arrow.’ More precisely, the noun *strellec”* in Josephus text refers to an archer belonging to the Roman military unit called *auxilia* ‘auxiliaries’ 70 or, more generally, a Roman soldier who was equipped with bow and arrow—*sagittarius*, from Latin *sagitta* ‘arrow’.

---


70 This unit included both cavalry and infantry forces. *Auxilia* consisted of three formations: cavalry, mixed troops (cavalry and infantry), and infantry. Their weapons included bows, slings, throwing spears, long swords, thrusting spears, and cavalry heavy lances (Luttwak 1979:15). The *auxilia* used a composite bow, which had the advantage of a smaller size and higher power. Its range was 60 feet or 178 meters (McLeod 1965:7). Of 43 units of *sagittarii*, half were Syrians (Davies 1977:261). Unlike legionaries, who were
The substitution notwithstanding, it appears that the second Serbian scribe was acquainted with the idea of an archer. Indeed, the meanings of the noun *strēlec'* found in medieval Serbian correspond to the Russian: *Do strēlĕ’ke međe “Up to archer’s border’ (Foundation Charter of Stevan of Dečani, 1330; Rječnik, s.v. “strijelački”). However, in the following example the term may pertain to ‘pirates,’ ‘crusaders,’ ‘robbers,’ who were known to attack the monasteries on Mount Athos: *Ašte v’mož’no jest’ za strēl’čevěh’ radi nαlet’ “If it is possible, because of the pirates’ attacks” (Hilandar Typicon, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “strijelčev’”); In addition, the base noun *strēla* is attested in Domentijan with the meaning ‘arrow’ in a metaphorical sense: *Poučenija mnoga i pol’zna ... i blagoslovenije ot’ njih’ prijem’, strelu r’venija v sr’d’ci nose(či) “Having received many beneficial instructions … and a blessing from them [and] carrying the arrow of zeal in our heart” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “strijela”). Also we find many examples of the related verb *streljati* ‘to shoot’: *Bezь strēl’b strēljaje i bezь kopija body “Without arrows they were shooting and without lances they were piercing” (ibid.); Ovy sēkušte, ovy že strēljajušte, drugyje že bodušte “Some cutting, others shooting, still others stabbing (Lives of the Serbian Kings and Archbishops, fourteenth century; ibid.).

Daničić gives the noun *strēla* in the meaning ‘arrow’ *sagitta: с луци и стрелами* “with bows and arches” (Letter from Dubrovnik, fifteenth century; Daničić, s.v. “strēla”).

Roman citizens, *auxilia* were troops composed of mostly barbarians and mercenaries (Gmirkin 1996:95). Luttwark suggests that up to and after 70 A.D. there were approximately 150,000 to 174,000 legionaries and, in addition to legionaries, the *auxilia* consisted of an almost equal size, totaling approximately 300,000 to 350,000 troops. *Auxilia* were forces intended to support legionaries (Luttwark 1979:16). Along with artillery, slingers, lance launchers, they were positioned in the background as a support to advancing troops, but also in order to deter the possible capture of the heavy machinery (Gmirkin 1996:122). The training and use of bow and arrow was not limited to the auxiliaries, but also legionaries. The young legionary soldiers were trained to shoot bow and arrow both on foot and horseback (Davies 1977:265).
There is also a corresponding verb strēlati ‘to throw, to cast [arrows]’ jaculare: νῆσαμενε 
βελαμαία κεντράντα “they began even more fiercely to cast [arrows]” (Letter from Dubrovnik 
to duke Sandalj, fifteenth century; ibid.).

The motivation for the Serbian scribe’s use, on two occasions, of the noun puškar' 
remains unclear. No Serbian medieval examples of the noun puškar’ are mentioned by 
the main Serbian dictionaries. There are attested example of the verb streljati denoting ‘to 
shoot’ together with the noun puška, but it is unclear whether this noun meant ‘bow and 
arrow’ or ‘gun’: I nača trubiti i streljati is pušek”... ot jutra do poludne “And he began to 
shoot from the pušky… from morning until noon” (Chronicle of Priest Dragojlo, 
thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “streljati”).

Later attestations of the noun puška, now clearly denoting ‘gun or cannon,’ do not 
provide the answer for the substitution. In a copy of the Typicon of Saint Sava from 1619 
we find the adjective puš’č’n” ‘that which belongs to a gun’ (sclopetorum), puš’č’n” boj, 
pušečno zelie, ‘gun battle/canon battle,’ ‘gun/cannon bullets’ (Rječnik, s.v. “puščani”). 
Similarly, the Rječnik also mentions the noun top’ ‘canon’ (from Turkish top ‘ball’), 
semantically related to the word puška since both are weapons of ‘a tubular form,’ 
‘cylindrical box[es]’ that are used for ‘throwing or shooting’ (Buck 1949:1394). During 
the siege of Constantinople (AD 1453) there is a reference to the use of ‘a monster 
cannon.’ At first it appears that none of these examples would correspond to the Josephus 
meaning of puškar’ refering to ‘archer.’ However, it is likely that the noun puška could 
correspond to Roman types of light, artillery such as hand-held ballistae, manuballista, or 
the ‘scorpion,’ which denoted some kind of ‘small machine’ (Corfis 1995:140-141). 
Possibly, the second Serbian scribe was aware of different Roman weapons; by the
substitution of the noun \( puškar' \) for \( strēlec \), he may have wanted to distinguish between ‘soldier with a bow and arrow’ from ‘soldier with a light artillery piece.’

The second Serbian scribe may have used the noun \( puškar' \) for \( strēlec \) due to alliteration. Leeming (2000: 353) commented on the use of the phrase \textit{launches launching lances} in the sentence: “and with the archers shooting and the launchers launching lances and the catapults firing stones,” suggesting that the “Old Russian phrase seems to be deliberately alliterative; the word ‘launchers’ could be understood as men or machines” (ibid.). In addition to disambiguation, I would suggest that the Serbian scribe could have substituted the noun \( puškar' \) for \( strēlec \) alliteratively to the verb \( puščati \) ‘to launch, cast, release’ denoting a ‘person who is launching a missile or projectile.’ Cf. the alliteration in the following passage: 

\textit{Vespasian sent against them archers and set the slings and all-long range missiles} [Srb 81r:12].

3.2.9. \textit{lēs”} and \textit{gora}

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the noun \textit{lej/lejva} [Rus 80v:4] with \textit{ro/rož}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{lej/lejva} \textit{bo ca po lej/lejva} [Rus 80v:4]
  \item \textit{ro/rož} \textit{bo ražagavaše po ro/rož} [Srb 74v:12]
\end{itemize}

“People had scattered through the hills/forests.”

This association between \textit{lēs”} and \textit{gora} occurs only once in my sample.

\footnote{\textit{People had scattered in the forests} (Leeming 2003: 308).}
In Russian Church Slavonic, the verb lēs” could mean ‘forest, timber, firewood.’ Of these three meanings, only ‘forest’ fits the Josephus passage: И водой и огнем и дрехи из леса на свое постель “And carrying water and wood from the forest on his shoulders” (Life of Feodosij Pečerskij, eleventh century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “lēs’”).

However, in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, according to one example that the Rječnik provides, it appears that the equivalent noun lijes’ (ekavian les’) denotes ‘trees in general’ rather than ‘forest’ as in Russian: Gore i polja dubrave, lies, trave “Forests, fields, valleys, trees, pastures” (Donation Charter of Stefan Ban, 1333; Rječnik, s.v. “lijes”). Possibly for this reason, the Serbian scribe uses the noun goru as the equivalent of the Russian noun lēs” ‘forest.’ The earlier meaning of the noun goru, up to the fourteenth century, was ‘hill’: Kako putь grede uзь goru u Košutu “As the road goes up the hill to Košuta” (Dečani Chrysoboull, 1330; ibid.). When the noun underwent a semantic shift in the history of Serbian it came to mean ‘forest,’ ‘woods’ (which typically covered hills): Da raste goru “That woods can grow” (Tsar Dušan’s Law, fourteenth century; ibid.). Daničić points out that it is not possible to distinguish goru denoting ‘hill’ from ‘forest’ in many cases. He mentions a number of examples with the meaning ‘hill,’ but states that in some of these cases goru may mean ‘forest,’ as well: И земле и горе и пыше “And the lands and forests/hills and pastures” (Župan Beljak and Radić Trade Treaty, 1391; quoted by Daničić, s.v. “gora”).

From the above information, it can be inferred that the substitution of the noun lēs” by goru appears to be due to disambiguation. While the noun lēs” was attested in both medieval Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic, it had a different meaning in the
two recensions. Presumably, in order to provide the meaning of the Russian noun lês”, ‘forest,’ the Serbian scribe replaced it by the equivalent noun gora.

3.2.10. pravda and istina

The next example involves the replacement of the noun пра̀дѧ [Rus 192r:9] with истинѧ:

И много ищущих пребывавла въ этихъ мѣстахъ пра̀дѧ [Rus 192r:17]
И много хотѣли пребывавшее въ этихъ мѣстахъ истинѧ [Srb 173v:20]
“And many of those wanting to desert refrained72 from doing so, until they learned the truth.”

This is the only example of the substitution of истина for правда in my sample. In Russian Church Slavonic, the noun правда could mean ‘justice,’ ‘righteousness,’ and ‘truth.’ The following well-known Biblical verse illustrates the meaning ‘righteousness’:

Блажени алужци, жаждущи пра̀дѧ “Blessed are those who hunger and thirst after righteousness” (Matthew 5:6 in the Ostromir Gospel, 1056–57, quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “pravda”). The meaning ‘truth’ is illustrated by the following two examples, the first vernacular East Slavic, the second Church Slavonic: {скажите вы къ Божью правдѧ вѣдь то земля “Tell God’s truth, whose land this is” (Legal Case regarding Popovsko’s Field, sixteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, ibid.); Асвѣ тѣ пра̀дѧ нызглѣдѣвши въ гнѣвѣ впадающи отъ кого лосо, не скрывъ о томъ “If you, after having spoken the truth, anger someone, do not worry about it” (Sbornik Svjatoslava, 1076, ibid.).

72 The translation applies to the Serbian, while the Russian has the historical present tense.
Unlike in Russian, the meaning ‘truth’ is not attested for the noun pravda in medieval Serbian. Rather, the noun pravda primarily denoted ‘justice’ or ‘righteousness’:

Pravda da bude našim ljubim v zemljan svetogu ti carstva “May there be justice to all of our people in the lands of your holy kingdom” (Tsar Asen’s treaty with Dubrovnik, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “pravda”). Other attested examples of the noun pravda in medieval Serbian may indirectly relate to the meaning ‘truth,’ but no examples with that specific meaning are found. Such an indirect relationship between the nouns pravda and istina could be seen in terms of examples that deal with courts of justice,\(^{73}\) which provide a hearing in order to find out the truth and, based on this information, render (at least in principle) a just decision. But none of these examples corresponds directly to the Russian meaning denoting ‘truth.’

Additionally, the attested examples of adjectives with the root prav- in the meaning ‘truthful’ and ‘sincere’ are found only in a specific environment, in collocation with the noun srce ‘heart’: S prava srca jesmo prisegli “We gave an oath from a sincere heart” (Transfer of Konavlje and Vitalia to Dubrovnik, 1391; Rječnik, s.v. “prav”). Other attested examples of the related adjective prav’ are used to mean ‘real, authentic’, referring both to people and objects, e.g., an ‘authentic book.’ While these examples show the semantic relation of the root prav- and the meaning ‘truth,’ ‘truthful,’ they do not provide any concrete instance of the meaning that corresponds to Josephus’ passage.

\(^{73}\) Твді упросивше правдь Димітра, імає ли св’єдоке, а он реє: не імає “Then the court asked Dmitar, do you have witnesses, and he said: I do not” (Spomenici srpski, thirteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “pravda”); Кто Дубровчанин убие али посєче у Босни ли Бошанинь Дубровчания, тай правда да я прєд’ господиньмь баномь “Whomever a man from Dubrovnik kills or slays in Bosnia, or a Bosnian - a man from Dubrovnik, let there be a trial before the lord governor” (Bosnian ruler Stefan’s Treaty with Dubrovnik, fourteenth century; ibid.).
Looking at the examples of the noun *pravda* attested in Old Church Slavonic, we see that this noun denoted both ‘justice’ and ‘truth’ (ἀλήθεια); cf. τὸ γὰρ ἐκεῖνον ἡ πραξὶς “What do you therefore say about truth?” (*Codex Suprasliensis* 250, 26; eleventh century; quoted by Cejtlin et al., eds., 1994: 496). Thus medieval Russian in this regard preserved both meanings, while in Serbian the meaning ‘justice’ for *pravda* supplanted the meaning ‘truth’ found in Old Church Slavonic.

On the other hand, the noun *istina* in Serbian Church Slavonic primarily denoted ‘truth’: *Iz̄naci jeli toj istina* “To find out if this is truth” (*Letter to Duke Radić of Dubrovnik*, 1407; Rječnik, s.v. “istina”). The noun *istina* is used when someone wants to admit something: *Mi se na tvoju milost tužili nėsmo; istina pisali smo gospodstvu ti mnogošti i tužili na vlasti gospodstva ti* “We did not complain about your mercy; [it is] the truth, we wrote to your majesty a lot and complained against the officials of your majesty” (*Letter from Dubrovnik to Despot Stefan*, 1407; ibid.).

It appears from the above examples that the replacement of the noun *pravda* by *istina* is an example of recensional editing. Unlike in Russian Church Slavonic, where the noun *pravda* could denote both ‘justice’ and ‘truth,’ in the Serbian recension of Church Slavonic it only could apply to ‘justice.’ In order to avoid ambiguity and convey the meaning found in Russian passage of Josephus, the scribe uses the noun *istina*. 
3.2.11. *pogibnuti* and *postradati*

The next example involves the replacement of the verb *погибнуть* [Rus 55v:8] with *пострадать*:

Аще во престъплю и възь пре/щажъ го *погибнуть* по пралать [Rus 55v:7]

Аще во престъплю и възь по/щежъ го *пострадать* по пралать [Srb 50v:14]

“For if I transgress and spare you, I shall then justly suffer.”

In medieval Russian Church Slavonic the verb *pogibnuti* was polysemous. It could denote ‘die,’ ‘vanish,’ ‘get lost,’ ‘go broke.’ The meaning ‘to get lost,’ ‘go astray' probably best fits the Josephus passage: Μρήκηκε τί η ζήσε, και πογήβαζ η εσφέκα “He was dead and revived, and he got lost and was found” (*Pandects of Antiochus*, eleventh century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “pogybnuti”).

In Serbian Church Slavonic the verb *pogibnuti*, in contrast to Russian, was much more specific; in regard to people it denoted to ‘die a violent death, die in a battlefield,’ or ‘perish’: *Jerь su vam pogibli 2 bratućeda na Kosovu Poľu* ‘For your two nephews died on Kosovo Field’ (*Spomenici srpski*, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “pogybnuti”); *Pogybè kněź Lazár na Kosovu* ‘Prince Lazar died on Kosovo [Field]’ (ibid.). The verb could also mean ‘to perish,’ ‘to fail’, without any specific reference to a violent death: *Nemojte ostaviti moju Angelinu i moju dečicu, da poginu po meni* “Do not leave my

---

74 For if I transgress and spare you, I shall then justly *perish*” (Leeming 2003:265). Note that Leeming's translation applies to the Old Russian but not to the Serbian. Additionally, the Serbian verb *postradati* can also be translated as 'die'.
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Angelina and my little children to perish after me” (Letter of Stefan Branković, fifteenth century, ibid.).

As such, the verb poginuti did not clearly fit the meaning found in Josephus’ passage, where it can be interpreted as ‘suffer a loss,’ ‘go broke,’ or ‘get lost.’ The Serbian scribe for this reason replaces this verb with postradati, which provided a verb that better reflected the Russian meaning, as he understood it. According to the Rječnik, the verb postradati in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic denoted ‘die, ‘endure, suffer, to suffer a loss’: Imam je našēh vlastel i građan ... nê dostojno da izgube ili postradaju “The property of our nobleman and citizens … it is not right that they lose [it] or suffer a loss” (Spomenici srpski, fifteenth century; quoted by Rječnik, s.v. “postradati”). As a transitive, the verb postradati denoted ‘suffer,’ ‘endure,’ ‘undergo’: Zlaja moja, ježe postradah “The evils of mine, which I endured” (Foundation Chapter of King Stefan Uroš, fourteenth century; ibid.); Mnogyje muky za Hrista postradati ukrêplêni byše “They were strengthened in order to endure many tortures for Christ” (Lives of Ss. Simeon and Sava, thirteenth century; ibid.). The Rječnik also gives one example of the imperfective form stradati in the meaning ‘suffer, endure,’ Vê potrebu vê nemoštêh stražduštîh “For the benefit of those suffering sicknesses” (Glasnik, fourteenth century; ibid.).

Based on the above examples, it can be suggested that the Serbian scribe perceived the mismatch between Russian and Serbian meaning of pogybnuti and chose one of the possibilities for the rendering of what he felt was the Russian meanings of this verb. Thus, it appears that his replacement of the verb pogybnuti with postradati is an

75 From what we know Stefan Branković had five children: Jovan, Đorde, Irena, Marija, and Milica.
example of disambiguation. While the verb *pogybni* existed in both medieval Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic, it had somewhat a different connotation. The two verbs show a difference in the intensity and the result of the state of one’s ‘suffering.’ Consequently, the verb *pogybni* in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic exclusively denoted ‘die a violent death,’ while the verb *postradati* on the other hand, depending on the context, in addition to the meaning ‘die’ also meant ‘suffer a loss’ or ‘get lost,’ corresponding to the Russian passage of Josephus.

3.2.12. *bran’* and *rat’*

The next example involves the replacement of the noun *брани* [Rus 113r:1] with *рати*:

И в тако напасти николи же не быше, и стыдящихся и срамящихся, яз/не оставиша иглема своего въ оустъях *брани* [Rus 112v:19]
И въ таки напасти николи не быше, и стыдящихся и срамящихся, занье оставише иглема на своего въ оустъя *рати* [Srb 104r:18]

“They were never in such temptation, and being ashamed and embarrassed, for they left their general in the jaws of the war.”

This is the only substitution of *bran’* for *rat’* in my sample and has to do with a military expression. In all other examples we find both in the nouns *рат’,* found eleven times, and *bran’,* found ten times in both Russian and Serbian manuscripts.

In Russian Church Slavonic both *rat’* and *bran’* could mean both ‘battle’ and ‘war’: Гъни же [осажденные] вынауцая излезание из града не врани дѣла не жажы ради водныя “They [the besieged] were fighting, leaving the city not for the sake of the battle,
but because of a thirst for water” (Laurentian Chronicle, 1377; quoted by Avanesov, s.v. “bran’”); Учене на победах и на брани “A reading for the victory of the king in war” (Ostromir Gospel, 1056-57, quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “bran’”).

On the other hand, unlike in Russian, where we find numerous examples of the noun bran’, in Serbian Church Slavonic we find only one attestation, which pertains to Saint Nicholas as a mighty aid to those that are in need, difficulty, or struggle: Ђбра-neh помагај “The one helping in struggle” (Donation Charter of King Stefan Vladislav, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “bran’”). No example of the noun bran’ in the actual meaning of ‘war’ or ‘battle’ is attested.

The above examples show that the noun bran’ had different meanings in Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic. While in Russian it could mean both ‘war’ and ‘battle,’ in Serbian it generally denoted ‘struggle,’ ‘need,’ ‘tribulation.’

If, however, we look at the noun rat, we will see that this noun closely relates to Russian bran’. The noun rat in medieval Serbian, listed in the Rječnik, denotes ‘war’ both in the concrete sense and the metaphorical, denoting ‘spiritual struggle’: Činiti rat kraju Urošu i jegovu ludem, do kolë vaš grad u ratu stoji s krajem “To make war with King Uroš and his people, as long as your city is at war with the king” (Dubrovnik Treaty, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “rat’); I ratem ... hotešte jedini od drugih vžeti bogotstvo ih “And with war ... some wanted to take their riches from the others” (Lives of the Serbian Kings and Archbishops, fourteenth century; ibid.). As such the noun rat seems to be an equivalent to the noun bran’ found in the Russian Josephus passage.

“They left the leader in the jaws of death” is one of those military expressions, which corresponds to Greek ‘to leave behind in perils’ (Leeming 2000:50). According to
Meščerskij, “the military expressions quoted were typical and in general use at the time when the translation was made, and were familiar to everyone who came into contact with military exploits, then so frequent in knightly circles. Similar phrases can be encountered both in the Tale of Bygone Years and in the Kievan and Galician Chronicles, as well as in the Lay of Igor’s Campaign” (Leeming 2000:50).

The above examples suggest that the substitution of the noun bran’ for rat’ is due to a recensional difference. While the noun bran’ was attested in both medieval Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic, it had a different meaning in the two recensions. In medieval Russian it primarily denoted ‘war,’ but in Serbian it meant ‘struggle,’ ‘tribulation,’ ‘need.’ In order to convey precisely the meaning ‘war,’ found in the Josephus passage, the Serbian scribe used the equivalent noun rat’.

3.2.13. metati and spěšiti

Another case of editing aimed at disambiguation is found in the following passage, where the Serbian scribe replaces the verb me/γαλε [Rus 7r:12] with σπέσαμε:

Ον же me/γαλε εβάμ κα Τυρ [Rus 7r:12]
Ον же σπέσαμε εβαμ κα Τυρ [Srb 5v:11]
“He rushed his own [people] to Tyre.” 76

This substitution occurs only once in my sample. In medieval Russian Church Slavonic, the term metati means primarily ‘to throw,’ ‘to push,’ ‘to shove,’ ‘to hurl’: λα βε

76 But he dragged his sons to Tyre (Leeming 2003:277).
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innocence in Smolensk, he should not be thrown into prison” (Smolensk Treaty of 1229, quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “metati”). In addition, the verb can mean ‘to leave, abandon’: А доколе са Новгород са Литовским князем и са Тверским князем Михаилом не умирать, ни са Немцем, князем великолу Дмитрием Ивановичем ... Новгорода не месати, любо ли самому быть князем великолу, са Новгород, ни брата пошли доколе Новгородъ умирьо “Until Novgorod is at peace with the Lithuanian prince and prince Mixail” of Tver’, or with the Germans, I, the grand prince Dmitrij Ivanovič, ... am not to abandon Novgorod; rather I, the grand prince, am to remain myself in Novgorod, or I will send [my] brother until I pacify Novgorod” (Treaty, fourteenth century; ibid.).

In medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, the verb metati had some of the same nuances as Russian Church Slavonic; it meant ‘to throw’ or ‘to put.’ According to the Rječnik, examples of the first meaning are found in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and examples of the second after the seventeenth century: Nitkorь ne brani metati “No one prevents throwing,”77 referring to items being thrown from a ship into the sea during a storm (Spomenici srpski, fifteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “metati”).

In both the Russian and the Serbian examples, the verb metati denotes ‘throwing something in great need or hurry.’ The possible association of the Russian and the second Serbian meaning of metati, ‘to throw items into the sea from a ship during a storm,’ is that both indicated an action done in hurry because of upcoming danger. Likewise, in Josephus’ passage, the motive for the movement is avoiding danger of the assault by the enemy. The difference between Russian and Serbian here is that the Russian verb metati can collocate with nouns referring to people: ‘leave under pressure,’ ‘send somebody

77 ἐξῆλθα: ‘to throw’ in this case refers to the Acts 27.58, describing the crew eliminating the excess wheat to protect the ship (Nida 1992:52).
forcefully,’ ‘throwing a person in prison.’ The absence of such examples in Serbian makes it difficult to say if \textit{metati} was ever used with personal objects, or only concretely, in reference to non-living entities.

Eugene Nida provides a similar argument in regard to variations of the translation of the verb ‘to throw out’ in the Greek New Testament. Nida points out 23 possible different English equivalents of the verb \textit{ἐκβάλλω} ‘to throw’, depending on the different contexts in which this Greek verb is used. He states that the majority of the renderings of this verb have nothing to do with the action of physical tossing. Thus, when used in collocation with ‘merchants in the temple’, \textit{ἐκβάλλω} ‘throw out’ means ‘to expel’ (Mathew 21:12); in collocation with ‘workers in the harvest’, it connotes ‘to send’ (Luke 10:2); in collocation with ‘the servant’, it conveys ‘to force a person to leave’ (Galatians 4:30), etc. (Nida 1992:52-55).

In a comparable fashion, the attested Serbian examples show that the verb \textit{spješiti} 'to hurry,' 'to rush,' was used in association with people: \textit{Spješaše sihь nasytiti} “He was hurrying to feed all” (\textit{Life of Saint Sava}, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “spješiti”). Serbian \textit{spješiti} appears to be to a large degree synonymous with Russian Church Slavonic \textit{metati} in rendering the meaning ‘swift,’ ‘rapid’ movement, which corresponds to Josephus’ passage.

The lack of more information of the use of the verb \textit{metati} in Serbian makes it difficult to conclude with certainty why the scribe replaced the verb \textit{metati} with \textit{spješiti}. The only attested example of \textit{metati} in Serbian, unlike the verb \textit{spješiti}, shows only that this verb could be used to reference non-living entities and that there is a correspondence
in the meaning between the verbs *metati* and *spješiti* in medieval Russian and Serbian in the sense that both denoted a quick, rapid movement.

3.2.14. *roditel’* and *rod’*

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the noun Ṝṩdde[ί / ũ抽查l with Ṝṩ方言:

И испили слези оун ском и Ṝṩdde[ί κ илалалам ском [Rus 8v:18]
И испили сал/зъ оун ском, и Ṝṩ方言 илалалам ском [Srb 6v:15]
“And his eyes, having filled with tears, he said: “My *kinsmen* and my noblemen!”

This is the only example of this replacement in my sample. There are three examples where we find *rod’* in both Serbian and Russian. Cf. [Rus 103r:14, Srb 95v:6], [Rus 201r:13, Srb 182v:3], and [Rus 277v:12, Srb 252v:5]. In two examples the noun *rod’* is substituted for *narod’* (see the next section 4.2.2). This substitution can possibly be explained by the Serbian scribe’s wish to avoid ambiguity between the two terms. Both *roditel’* and *rod’* were common in sixteenth-century Serbian Church Slavonic; however, they conveyed a number of different semantic nuances.

In Russian Church Slavonic, the noun *roditel’*, in addition to meaning ‘father’ or ‘parent,’ could also mean ‘kinsman’: ḵikoγ σο πρωννινιεθ и σε Ṝṩdde[ί “Xisufra with his spouse and with kinsmen” (*Christian Topography*, quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “roditel’”).

78 “And his eyes filled with tears as he said: “My *kinsmen*, my lords!” (Leeming 2003: 209).
Unlike in Russian, where the noun *roditel’* could express the more general meaning of a relative, in medieval Serbian the noun was limited to ‘parent,’ ‘people who play a role of a parent,’ or ‘ancestor’: *Roditelja kraljev’stva mi svetago zapisanije* “The testament of the holy father of my kingship [i.e., of mine]” (*Glasnik* II, 12, 59, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “roditelj”). In addition, *roditelj* could mean ‘both parents,’ ‘father and mother’: *Tвžde svеdњy љub’vь pravdu srdca моjega k моjemu roditelju ... i izvedь posadi me na преstolь svetuh roditelь i praroditelь kraľevstva mi* “Also, knowing the love [and] truth of my heart toward my parent … and, having brought [me] forth, placed me on the throne of my kingship’s [i.e., my] holy parents and ancestors” (ibid.). Finally, the noun *roditelj* could mean ‘a person who plays the role of a parent but is not the biological father or mother’—‘father-in-law,’ ‘uncle,’ ‘grandfather,’ ‘grandfather’s brothers,’ ‘great-grandfather,’ or ‘great-grandmother,’ or ‘royal predecessor’: *Gospodina i roditeљa моjega, despota Stefana (Lazarevića)* “My lord and uncle, the despot Stefan Lazarević” (*Letter of Despot Đorđe*, fifteenth century; ibid.); *Prъvuћь моїхь roditeљь, gospode srьbske, kraљevь i careвь* “Of my first parents, Serbian lords, kings, [and] tsars” (*Letter of King Tvrtko*, 1382; ibid.). In this last example, the predecessors have to be interpreted as ancestors, since Tvrtko was related to Nemanjić’ through his grandmother Jelisaveta.

Thus, in all of the above examples, the Serbian noun *roditelj* has a very limited range of uses denoting close predecessors (actual or metaphorical parents). In the Josephus passage, the use of this noun, however, is much more general. It expresses people who are close associates rather than forebearers. Thus it appears that, in the
Serbian Josephus passage the polysemous noun *rod’* corresponds better to Russian *roditel’*.

Medieval Serbian *rod’*, a collective noun, had a broader range of meanings than *roditel’*: ‘kind,’ ‘class,’ ‘close or distant relatives, i.e., brothers and their children and cousins’; ‘tribe,’ ‘nation,’ ‘descendents.’ In the Josephus context, Herod has summoned his associates and noblemen, which would correspond to the attested examples in Serbian with the meanings ‘kind,’ ‘class,’ or ‘maybe ‘distant relatives’: *Ašte li kotora v nj prêstuplenije zakona vëpadet, ašte bude otv vlastel’, to vlastel’skim nakazanijem da nakazujet se; ašte li otv niznih, to protivu rodu da nakazujet se* “If someone transgresses the law, if he is a nobleman, he shall be punished by the punishment prescribed for nobleman; if he is of a lower class, then let him be punished in accordance with his kind” (*Chysoboull of Stefan the First Crowned, 1222-1228; Rječnik, s.v. “rod”).

In addition, the noun *rod’* could denote “close or a distant relatives”: *da nitko že ne imate vlasti nikoe nad simi dannimi crkvi ... ni moja bratija, ni bratućedije, ni ini moj rod’* “No one should have any power over what was given to the church … neither my brothers, nor their children, nor any of my relatives” (*Chysoboull of King Stefan Vladislav and Uroš III, thirteenth century; ibid.*).

Considering the attested examples of the noun *rod’*, it is evident that this noun is closer to the meaning of the noun *roditel’* found the Russian Josephus than the direct Serbian cognate, *roditelj’*. Thus, I suggest two possible reasons for the replacement of the noun *roditel’* by *rod’. The first would recensional editing, since the noun *roditelj’* has different connotations in Russian and Serbian. Unlike Russian *roditel’*, which had a much wider range of meanings pertaining to distant relatives, the denotational field of the
Serbian word was limited to ‘parents,’ ‘people that played role of parents,’ and ‘ancestors’. Thus, this word was not adequate to provide the semantic equivalent needed for the Josephus passage. The attested examples of the noun *rod’*, on the other hand, indicate that this noun, although not completely synonymous, was closely related to the Russian *roditel’*. Both shared some of the nuances found in the Russian passage such as ‘class,’ ‘kind’ and ‘distant relatives’. This suggests that the noun *rod’*, in the given context, provides the necessary meaning to reflect the sense of the Josephus passage while avoiding the possibility of ambiguity with the basic meaning of the noun *roditel’*, which had a different connotation in medieval Russian.

3.2.15. *pečal’*” and *plač’*

In the following example, the Serbian scribe has replaced the noun *певал* [Rus 199v:3] with *плач*:

```
Не не продлжил радостъ разбойникоў и нѣ трй певал [199v:2]
Њ не продлжил се разбойникоў радостъ и нѣ трй плач [Srb 180v:18]

“The joy of the brigands did not last long, nor did (his) mother’s *lamentation.*”
```

This is the only such substitution in my sample. Otherwise, different forms of the word *plač’* are found five times in my sample in both the Russian and the Serbian manuscripts, denoting ‘lament, cry for the dead’. On the other hand, different forms of the word *pečal’* are found nine times in my sample, in both the Russian and the Serbian manuscript, denoting ‘sadness,’ ‘worry,’ ‘suffering,’ ‘care.’
In Russian Church Slavonic, the primary meaning of the noun *pečal’* is ‘distress,’ ‘grief’ ‘sorrow’ ‘misfortune’: 


The noun *pečal’* can also denote ‘concern’: 

> ОТВЕТЯТЕЙТЕ ФАДИА ВАША ... ПЕУДАЛЬМИ ЖИТИИЕНИЯ “Your hearts will be weighed down with … cares of this life” (ibid.). From these examples we see that its meaning is very broad, denoting the spiritual, emotional, or mental state of a person.

Similarly, in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, the noun *pečal’* denoted a broad range of related meanings: ‘misfortune,’ ‘misery,’ ‘sadness,’ or ‘worry.’ This word was, according to the Rječnik, very common in Serbian up to the end of the eighteenth century. After that, the word was used only as an archaism. The first meaning that the Rječnik provides for *pečal’* is ‘misfortune’ or ‘tribulation’: 

> Да ви je отворена земља моја u всећ вашић pečалехь “Let my country be open for you in all your misfortunes” (Donation Charter of Stefan Ostoja, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “pečal’”). Also, *pečal’* can mean ‘worry’ or ‘concern’ due to economic hardship: 

> Kaluđer piržanin da ne ima pečal o pastyrskoj hrane “The monk that lives in the tower, let him not have any worry about [his] shepherd’s food” (Edict of King Milutin, fourteenth century; ibid.).

Thus a comparison of the Russian and Serbian examples shows that the noun *pečal’* in both Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic had a similar broad connotation meaning ‘misfortune,’ ‘grief.’

On the other hand, the noun *plač’* denoted ‘lamentation’: 

> Prěstavi se ... Despota Stefana i многу plač’ Srěbleمص ostavi “Despot Stefan passed away and left the Serbs in great lamentation” (Chronicle, fifteenth century; s.v. “plač’”). Similarly, Miklošič also
provides one example of the related verb *plakati* from a copy of the Typicon of Saint Sava from the beginning of the seventeenth century with the meaning ‘worry, concern’ *flere,*: да не плаујећи ницаћи “Let him not lament because of poverty” (*Saint Sava Typicon*, 1619; quoted by Miklošić 1977: 568). These examples show that the word was used to denote both actual crying and the symbolic sense of ‘care,’ ‘worry’.

From the numerous examples found in my sample and from the attested medieval Serbian examples, it is evident that both nouns *pečal’* and *plac’* were common. The only example of the substitution of the *pečal’* for *plac’* apparently has to do with Grigorije Vasilije’s consistency in distinguishing actual ‘crying, lamentation’ from ‘worry,’ ‘concern,’ ‘care,’ ‘distress’—meanings evident from the fourteen examples of both *pečal’* and *plac’* found in my sample.
3.2.16. \textit{ukor}’ and \textit{porok’}

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the noun \textit{о́коро} [Rus 277r:15] with \textit{норо}. He places the noun \textit{о́коро} in the margin:

И да о́коро жены наше безь \textit{о́коро} [Rus 277r:14]
И да о́коро жены наше безь \textit{норо} [Srb 251v:11]
“Let our women die without blemish.”

This is the only example of this substitution in my sample. However, one example of the related verb \textit{ukaratì}, with the meaning ‘to abuse verbally,’ is found in both the Russian [Rus 192v:2] and the Serbian [Srb 174r:4] manuscripts.

In Russian Church Slavonic, the noun \textit{ukor}’ was polysemous. It could mean ‘condemnation, insult, humiliation, accusation, and shame.’ The closest of these meanings to the one in the Josephus passage would be ‘insult, abuse’: И и́ Болеслав къ дружины свою ну же вы сего о́коро не жаль, а́ще едины поги́бы “And Boleslav said to his companions, if you are not ashamed of this insult, I will die alone” (\textit{Laurentian Chronicle}, 1377; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “	extit{ukor}’”). Here we see that the noun \textit{ukor}’ denotes ‘insult’ that results in ‘shame’ or ‘humiliation—a meaning that, as we will see, does not exist in medieval Serbian.

While the \textit{Rječnik} does not provide any medieval Serbian examples of the noun \textit{ukor’}, the derivation of this noun shows a close association with the meaning ‘reproach.’ In opposition to the Russian \textit{ukor’}, which denotes an ‘insult,’ the Serbian example expresses the less intense sense of ‘reproach’ (a speech act that have positive connotations of moral correction) rather than ‘shame, abuse, or insult.’ Thus, the attested example of the associated verb \textit{ukoriti} ‘to reprimand,’ ‘to rebuke’ (referring to Saint
Sava) denotes a mild sense of ‘degradation,’ ‘taking away from one’s glory, or fame’: ‘Mnogymi pohvalami sego ukorim pače pohvalim’ “With many praises we will rebuke rather than praise this one” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “ukoriti”).

Similarly, Miklošić (1977: 1046) includes a noun *ukor*’ ‘insult,’ ‘reproach,’ *ūβρις*, *contumelia*, but does not provide any examples (Various Homilies, thirteenth century; quoted by Miklošić, s.v. “ukor’”). Cejtlin (1994:732) provides the same meanings for OCS *ukor*’—*ūβρις*, *contumelia*, ‘insult,’ ‘harsh language,’ ‘abuse,’ ‘reproach,’ ‘defamation,’ and ‘humiliation.’

It appears from the above examples that, while the meanings of the noun *ukor*’ in medieval Russian and Serbian are related, the Serbian noun seems to express a lesser degree of intensity. If we consider the meaning ‘blame’ as opposed to ‘praise,’ we see that this meaning is connected with ‘reproach of wrongdoing,’ based on the notion of ‘speaking against,’ i.e., ‘accuse’ (κατηγορέω) (Buck 1949: 1187, 1439).

Furthermore, the Serbian attestation of the noun *porok*’ very much resembles the noun *ukor*’ found in Russian. Miklošić defines it as ‘shame,’ ‘dishonor,’ ‘disgrace,’ *μῶμος*, *dedicum*, but does not provide any examples (Various Homilies, thirteenth century; quoted by Miklošić, s.v. “porok’”). However, Daničić provides an example of the noun *porok*’ ‘shame,’ ‘dishonor,’ ‘disgrace’, *dedicum*: πορόκου καὶ ουκορισθῆνεν ποτὲ ἕως ἐκεῖνος “you will become liable to disgrace and reproach” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; quoted by Daničić, s.v. “ukor’”).

79 Other examples of the noun *porok*’ ‘blemish,’ ‘reproach,’ ‘wrongdoing,’ ‘fault’ found in the Rječnik are: *Da uvědět vssí bes poroka Božiju blagodat* “Let everybody know God’s grace without blemish” (Life of Šs. Simeon and Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “porok’”); *Běsta oba pravedna předře Bogoty hodešta vži zapovědeňho všeča gospodiňihněh bes poroko* “Both were righteous before God, walking according to all the commandments of the Lord without reproach” (ibid.). Similarly, the opposite meaning
*ukor’* and *porok’* are used in the same context alongside each other, just as in the Serbian Josephus manuscript.

On the other hand, when we compare the Serbian noun *porok’* to the Russian *ukor’*, this noun seems to be much closer to the Russian in meaning, than to the Serbian *ukor’*. Nevertheless, since words can change meanings, i.e., they may be assigned new general meanings or become more specialized, depending on the interpreter (Nida 1992: 17), this suggestion cannot be proven. For this reason, we can only hypothesize as to how Grigorije Vasilije perceived the difference between *ukor’* and *porok’*. It seems from the attested examples that, although both Russian and Serbian recensions had the noun *ukor’* /*ukor’*, this noun differed in terms of intensity. The Serbian meaning ‘rebuke’ appears to have less intensity than the meaning ‘insult,’ ‘humiliation,’ found in the Russian Josephus.

---

of the noun *porok’* is found in Old Church Slavonic denoting ‘without blemish, fault, reproach, physical defilement’ (ἀμοιβός): Ἡμέρα ἐν πορῳ ἀμοιβά τεραλαξ ἴππων ἀμοιβά “(One) walking without blemish and “doing righteousness” doesn’t make sense righteousness” (Psalm 14:2 in Sinaiticum; Luke 1:6 in Euchologium, Suprasliensis; quoted by Cejtlin et al., eds., 1994: 481).
3.2.17. narod” and rod’

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the noun нарodъ [Rus 276v:3] with родь:

Поехавше во намъ иперва егда вѣходиша въ свободь и видалъсѧ своина оунала найѧ бѣхь раздѣлиѧ божи промылѧ и извѣстно нылъѧ ико наро дѣ ѣде/къе вѣсходениѧ бѣхь и извѣстнѣѧ да нѣвъ осужѣться на погибелѣ [Rus 276r:21].

Поехавше во намъ ис/яка едѧ вѣходиша въ свободь и видалъсѧ своина оунала навождѣние Божѣе, раздѣлиѧ божи промылѧ и известно нылъѧ ико родъ ѣде ѣде/къе вѣсходениѧ бѣхь и извѣстнѣѧ, и нѣвъ осужѣться на погибелѣ [Srb 251r:1].

“For it behooved us at first, when we were fighting for freedom and saw with our own eyes God’s prompting, to understand God’s providence and to realize that the Jewish people, ancietly loved and chosen by God, is now condemned to perish.” 80

The substitution of the noun rod’ for narod” is found twice in my sample—narod” [Rus 276v:3, Rus 277r:5] and rod’ [Srb 251r:5, 251v:4]. In these cases, the Serbian scribe used the noun rod’ to denote ‘Jewish people’ as oppose to narod’ ‘people in general,’ ‘a crowd,’ which the Serbian scribe retained. There are six such examples in my sample: Rus 53r:19—Srb 48v:15; Rus 54r:1—Srb 49r:15; Russ 101v:6—Srb 94r:2; Russ 103r:19—Srb 95v:11; Rus 159r:18—Srb 144v:7; and Rus 163v:21—Srb 148r:3.

In Russian Church Slavonic, the noun narod” primarily denoted ‘people,’ ‘citizens,’ ‘crowd,’ ‘gathering of people’. 81 Avanesov provides the following example of this noun in medieval Russian in the meaning ‘tribe,’ ‘nationality,’ ‘race,’ corresponding

---

80 “For it behooved us at first, when we were fighting for freedom and saw with our own eyes the guidance of God, to understand God’s plan and to realize that the Jewish race, ancietly loved and chosen by God, is now condemned to perish” (Leeming 2003: 625).
81 Бѣхь сѧ вѣхо дѣ я знанѣнѧ, яко сѧ есть вѣ хъ пѣ дѣ вѣ дѣ нѣ земля прѣ вѣ “The people, having seen the miracle which Jesus performed, were saying that He was indeed a prophet” (Ostromir Gospel, 1056–57; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “narod”’).
to the Josephus passage: Τιττα οράδες κελλιδοβολήσει επεφέραμα επά σπε εναν εις, αλά
“Then all the Jewish people believed in our Savior Jesus Christ” (Prologue for September, 1313; quoted by Avanesov, s.v. “narod”).

Similarly, in medieval Serbian we find the noun *narod* with related meanings denoting ‘people in general,’ ‘crowd’: *Odvračaju narod, da ne gredu u naše mesto po solb* “They are discouraging people from going to our town to get salt” (Letter from Dubrovnik to Duke Sandalj, fifteenth century; Rjećnik, s.v. “narod”). Furthermore, we find in Serbian, as in Russian, examples of *narod* with religious connotations. If we look at the context of the Josephus passage, ‘Jewish race’ denotes ‘people of the same faith, origin, nationality.’ In Serbian, however, we find this noun denoting those of the same faith, without any implication of national origin: *Dary darovašese ... vsemu narodu pravoslavija* “Gifts were given to all Orthodox people” (Tsar Dušan’s Chysoboull, fourteenth century; ibid.). A comparison of the Russian and Serbian use of the noun *narod* in the attested examples shows that the cognates shared basic semantic nuances, both denoting a very broad concept of ‘people in general,’ ‘crowd,’ ‘people who share the same faith,’ but not necessarily the same origin, nationality, common ancestors; that is, Orthodox people share the same religious teaching, but their origin or nationality are not necessarily the same.

The noun *narod* is attested in Old Church Slavonic in the meaning ‘kind,’ ‘tribe,’ also referring in a religious sense to ‘pagan people’: *И не отдавай нашего тысячника и не обрать нас в плаху народа паганского. “And do not give ours to foreigners, and do not deliver us in captivity to pagan peoples”* (Kiev Fragments, tenth century; quoted by Cejtlin 1994: 353). From these examples, we can see that the noun *narod* deals with
‘kind,’ ‘race’ and, in a religious connotation, ‘pagan’ as opposed to ‘Christian’; cf. the use of *język*” in OCS and *jazyk*” Old Russian to denote both ‘language’ and ‘pagan.’

If we look at the Serbian scribe’s choice of the noun of *rod’*, we see that this effectively narrows down its meaning. According to the Rječnik, the noun *rod’* in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic meant ‘relative,’ ‘generation,’ ‘heir,’ ‘descendent’, ‘people of the same origin who live in one country and speak the same language.’ In addition, the noun *rod’* could also mean ‘people who have the same faith’ (always with the attribute ‘Christian’): *Glagolušte ... k’ jedinocedomu sinu jego, k’ nadeždi i pohvali roda hristijanskago* “Speaking … to his only son, for the sake of the hope and the praise of the Christian people” (*Chysoboull of King Stefan Uroš*, 1302-1321; ibid.).

The last example suggests one of the possible motivations for the Serbian scribe to use *rod’* instead of *narod’* can be related to extra-linguistic factors—religious ones, in particular. The Josephus passage refers to the ‘Jewish race’ in the Old Testament setting in which it represented the ‘chosen nation,’ ‘God’s first born,’ ‘chosen people of God,’ ‘Abraham’s offspring.’ However, in the New Testament, the basis for this attribute of ‘chosen people’ is used pertaining to those who believe in Christ, i.e., Christians, as explained by Saint Paul in Romans 9:6-9, in which “there is no difference between Jew and Greek” (i.e., Gentile).

From the above examples, we see that the Russian noun *narod’* and Serbian *rod’* share some semantic nuances. The noun *rod’* narrows down the meaning of ‘people’ to denoting people who a share common belief, i.e., in which the referents are the Jews in the Old Testament and Christians in the New Testament as ‘a chosen people.’
Possibly in order to convey the specific meaning of ‘kinship, relation’—in this case, in a religious sense—found in the Josephus passage meaning Jewish ‘kind,’ ‘people of the same origin, faith, country, language,’ rather than the broad noun *narod* ‘people in general,’ ‘crowd,’ the Serbian scribe chose the corresponding noun *rod*.
CHAPTER 4

LEXICAL VARIATIONS DUE TO OTHER FACTORS

4.1 Introductory remarks

In this chapter, I will discuss a third category of lexical substitutions—those evidently due to factors such as the choice between abstract or concrete language, the avoidance of figurative language, censorship, synonymy, and, finally, scribal error. In discussing these categories, it needs to be noted that lexemes, as Nida points out, often “cannot be precisely defined” (demarcated from one another) due to their broad spectrum of meanings which “overlap with other words, so that “the boundaries between words closely related are fuzzy and indefinite” (Nida 1992: 2). An additional difficulty in defining these lexemes arises from lack of dictionary entries for each context of occurrence; dictionaries, according to Nida, often “fail to distinguish between the various meanings in the various contexts in which they are used” (ibid.: 4). Words can have numerous meanings (polysemy), and these meanings could overlap in case of partial synonymy; thus “in some contexts they can stand for the same referent,” and in others the same word “may mean a different thing, depending on the context” (ibid.: 5).
4.2. Abstract vs. concrete language based variations

4.2.1. priimati and vyděti

In the following example the Serbian scribe substitutes the verb выдѣти (normalized viděti) for приимати [Rus 199r:20]:

И не увѧла сѧ́лъ жиѡа приимати сиѧ́ своєго [Rus 199r:20]
И не увѧла сѧ́лъ жиѡа выдѣти сиѧ́ своєгпо[Srb 180v:14]
“And I did not expect to see my son alive.”

The substitution of the verb viděti for priimati occurs once in my sample. In Russian Church Slavonic priimati, in addition to other meanings, could mean ‘to welcome, to receive’: Меньшѧ́ сєє тѧ́ любѧ́нъ приимати “Welcome those subordinate to you with love” (Izbornik of 1076; ibid.). The verb priimati could also denote ‘to receive’: Аєз же не оє тѧ́лъ сѧ́лъѧ сѧ́лъѧ приимательѩ “I do not receive testimony from men” (John 5:34, Ostromir Gospel, 1056–57; ibid.); Нє можєтъ тѧ́лъ приимати няєъ ѓє, ає зє не єєдєтъ нєлъ дѧє сѧ́ ієесъ “A man cannot receive anything unless it be given to him from heaven” (John 3:27; ibid.).

While the examples of the verb primati that are attested in medieval Serbian have meanings similar, to a certain extent, to the Russian sense of ‘to welcome, to receive,’ they specifically pertain ‘to guests, refugees, fugitives’: Къдагоде ... дођу къ пѧ́ть

82 “And I did not expect to receive my son” (Leeming 2003: 529)
83 It could also mean ‘to take’: Алѧ кътъ дѧєтъ няє прииматеѧ пѧдѧнове “If someone gives or takes the fruit” (Efremovskaja Kormčaja kniga, ca.1100; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “priimati”). It could also mean ‘to follow’: Кєє сєєдєтъ не прииматеѧ, нє стрѧнныѧхъ пѧстуєтє прииматеѧ “You do not follow his words, but you follow foreign shepherds” (Epistle of Metropolitan, 1356; ibid.). Furthermore, primati could mean ‘to acknowledge’: јєже пѧдѧванъ прѧдѧла пѧѧѧѧ, приимате “Which they conveyed to us through the writing, I acknowledge” (Confession of Faith of the Metropolitan of Kiev, eleventh century; ibid.).
Whenever ... the noblemen of your majesty come to us, we welcome them in a fitting manner” (Letter of Queen Mara to Dubrovnik, fifteenth century; ibid.); Vaši ljudije, koji ovamo utěču, da ih primamo i naměštamo po našëh selëh “Your people, who will flee here, let us receive them and settle [them] in our villages” (Donation Charter of King Tvrtko to Dubrovnik, fifteenth century; ibid.). Other meanings of the in Serbian, primati, could be ‘to consider, to receive an object in an abstract sense, to endure, and to agree.’

Since the medieval Serbian verb primati, when its objects had human referents, conveyed a very specific meaning, ‘to welcome someone as a guest, to provide asylum,’ the Serbian scribe looks for a verb that would convey the more general meaning of ‘seeing’ someone. The Rječnik provides a number of examples of the verb vidjeti in the meaning ‘to see someone or something, to read, to verify, to realize, notice and understand.’ The verb vidjeti could also mean ‘to see an event’: Da vidite oči moji spasenije “So that my eyes can see salvation” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; ibid.).

Since the meaning of the verb primati in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic denoted a specific meaning of welcoming someone on official visit, or providing an asylum, the verb as such was inadequate for the Josephus passage. Grigorije Vasilije instead chooses the less specific and less marked verb vydëti that provides the

---

84 The direct object of the verb also could be something abstract: Ako mene za prijatelja držite i moj savet primate “If you consider me a friend and receive my advice” (Letter from Achmet Paša to Dubrovnik’s noblemen, sixteenth century; ibid.). In addition, primati could also denote ‘to endure’: Mnogo mi bi čudno, da takova ... primaju naši ljudije od vaše ljube “I was very surprised that our people endure a such thing ... for your love” (Spom. Srb. 1,20, fourteenth century; ibid.).
corresponding meaning of ‘seeing or visiting with someone’ that is found in the Josephus passage.

4.2.2 domysliti and stvoriti

In this example, the Serbian scribe replaces the Russian Church Slavonic verb домыслити [Rus 111r:12] with створити.

И не думысили они домыслити лазахъ на градныя храмы [Rus 111r:11]
Не думысили они створити лазахъ на храм [Srb 102v:18]
„Not knowing what to do, they climbed on the buildings.”

As in the previous example, this substitution occurs only once in my sample. However, the corresponding reflexive verb domyslitisja [Rus 280r:21], domyslitise [Srb 254r:18] ‘to attain” is found in another passage in both the Russian and the Serbian manuscript.

In Russian Church Slavonic, the verb domysliti could mean ‘to imagine’: Ўтьо есте соинество или естество не думыслить, ни домыслить низъ нать “It is unknown to us what the essence or nature of being is, nor can we imagine it (Theology of Saint John Damascene, thirteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “domysliti”). Also it could mean ‘to think up,’ ‘to devise’: и домысли Амонъ домысли залго “And Amon devised a wicked plan” (Chronicle of Georgius Amartolos, thirteenth–fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, ibid.). This second example is much closer to the meaning found in the Josephus passage.

“Not knowing what to do, they climbed onto [the roofs of] the town buildings.” (Lemming 2003:394)
As for medieval Serbian, on the other hand, no non-reflexive form of the verb *domisliti* is attested in the dictionaries I consulted. The Rječnik mentions one reflexive medieval example: ‘*Ino ni inako ne moremo se domisliti vidëvši vaš veliki trud* “We cannot think in any other way, having seen your great labor” (*Spomenici srpski*, fifteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “domisliti se”). In addition to being reflexive, this example is abstract and vague, and so is not very helpful in this case.

The scribe’s choice of the verb *stvoriti* appears to be close to the meaning of *domysliti*. The verb *stvoriti* is polysemous, and its meanings vary according to the context in which it is used.

According to the Rječnik, the verb *stvoriti* means primarily ‘to create something that has not existed before’: *Milosr’dova o rodě člověc’šcem’, jegože s’tvori v’ prěčisty obraz’ svojego bož’stva* “He had mercy on the human race, which he created in the pure image of His own divinity” (*King Tvrtko confirms privileges to Dubrovnik*, fourteenth century, Rječnik s.v. “stvoriti”). Here the verb *stvoriti* needs to be interpreted theologically, whereby God creates by His Word, which at first was an idea or thought. This example, although implying a metaphysical realm, can be applied here in a sense that the physical creation was preceded by an idea.

In a more concrete physical sense, *stvoriti* can denote ‘crafting a man-made object’: *I stvori sije Petrь zlatarь* “Petar the goldsmith created this” (*Inscription on the Gospel cover in the monastery Krušedol*, 1514; ibid.). Here the two verbs could be related in a sense of thought being connected with physical realization, which can be used to support the idea of a semantic relation between *domysliti* and *stvoriti*. 
These examples imply both the physical action of doing good or evil and the idea of thinking and planning in order to achieve it.

From the above, we see that the verb *stvoriti* was very common in medieval Serbian, and could, depending on the context, have many meanings. As such, this verb appears to be semantically relatable to *domysliti* ‘think of,’ ‘devise,’ which was not listed in the main Serbian dictionaries in its non-reflexive form. This may very well indicate that this verb was not used in medieval Serbian and explains why the Serbian scribe replaced it. Second, the attested examples of the reflexive form denote a vague abstract notion meaning ‘attain by thinking,’ ‘devise,’ while the rendered *stvoriti* could denote a concrete physical activity. This may only be a possibility, and one can only suggest how the scribe may have viewed these words, which were ultimately based on his personal feeling for language. Nida (1993:62) makes a good point when he notes, “Lexicographers should not attempt to make more distinctions than actually exist for most speakers, because there is always a temptation to read a text more precise than the original author ever imagined.”
4.2.3. uklonitisja and svesti se

In the following example, the verb огклониться [Rus 196r:3] is replaced by

έκδοσθενε:

Ι ἔ των δυχομένων ὀγκλονίσασθα ἄνα πατόν καὶ ὑπάγει τὴν ναόντα [sic—ΖЈ] γρεθ [Rus 196r:3]
Ι ἔ των ἐκδοσθένει ἀνὰ πατόν καὶ ὑπάγει τῇ κλάτῃ ναόντας [sic—ΖЈ] γραφ [Srb 177r:21]
“And from there they descended to the west and enclosed the well, the tomb of Ianan [sc. John—ΖЈ].”\(^\text{86}\)

This substitution occurs only once in my sample.

In Russian Church Slavonic uklonitisja may have a number of meanings such as
‘to distance oneself, to digress, to step away, to disappear, to turn toward.’ Of these meanings, the one closest to the Josephus passage is probably ‘to distance oneself,’ ‘to move away’:

“Distancing ourselves from our enemies, we will be good participants of the divine glory” (Service Menaion for September, 1096; ibid.); Ῡκλονίσθη καὶ στῆνῃ “To step away from the streets” (Sinai Patericon, eleventh century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “uklonitisja”).\(^\text{87}\)

---

\(^{86}\) “And from there they turned way to the west and enclosed the well, the tomb of John” (Leeming 2003: 524).

\(^{87}\) The verb uklonitsja could mean ‘to slip away’: Ἰησοῦς γάρ ἐν ἡμέρας, καθάτιστα, Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ὀγκλονίσκει, ἐπάθον ἐκεῖνος ἡμέρας “And the man who was healed did not know who He was, for Jesus slipped away, since there were many people in that place” (John 5:13 in Ostromir’s Gospel, 1056-57; ibid.). Furthermore, uklonitisja could mean to “disappear”: Αἱ ἡμέραι μου, ὡς σέλην, ὀγκλονίσθησα ἐν ἑαυτῇ, ὡς σέλην, ἱσχύει. “My days have disappeared like a shadow, and I have dried up like straw” (Simonov Psalter, 1280; ibid.). It could mean ‘to be depraved,’ ‘to debase oneself’: Να ἐνταπεύσετε ὀγκλονίσθησαι αὐθεντία “People have debased themselves to [commit] idolatry” (Letter of Metropolitan Nikifor, fourteenth century; ibid.). Finally, it could denote ‘to look toward,’ ‘to turn toward’: ὀγκλονίσθησα καὶ ἑαυτῷ λαοῦ καὶ καὶ θαυμάστη “They turned their face toward Sodom and Gomorrah” (Genesis 18:16 in a fifteenth-century miscellany; ibid.). The verb uklonitisja could also mean ‘to turn away’ in a figurative sense: Ζωής ἐναλλάξασιν καὶ ἱστήσασθαι ἑαυτοῦ ὀγκλονίσθησα εἰς τὴν ᾿Αγαθοπροκειμένης Ἰησοῦς “Keeping the Lord’s laws, they turned away from the counsel of lawbreakers” (Service Menaion for September, 1096; ibid.).
According to the Rječnik, in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic the verb *uklonjtja* denoted ‘to move away’ and ‘to back off’ in order to escape danger: *Da kneza našega ubiju, ako bi se u onj čas ne uklonij* “[They would have] killed our prince, if had he not moved away at that moment” (Letter from Dubrovnik, fifteenth century; ibid.); *Ne imani ustrašiti se vas, niže ukloniti se vašega množestva všhoštem* “We will not be afraid of you, nor will we want to back off because of your great number” (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “ukloniti se”). However, neither of these two senses directly corresponds to the Josephus passage.

On the other hand, in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, *svesti*, the verb chosen by the scribe, could mean ‘to descend,’ ‘to bring,’ ‘to lead’ (most often from an elevated to a lower area). The earliest attestations are from the thirteenth century: *Ogњь svь nebese molitvoju svedь* “Having brought down fire from heaven by prayer’ (Life of Saint Sava, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “svesti”). The verb could also mean ‘to bring down’ in a figurative sense: *Vь poslednju, uvь, pogibьvь svedь obrazь carьskyi* “In the last destruction, alas, the image of the tsar was brought down” (Chrysoboull of Tsar Stefan Dušan, fourteenth century; ibid.).

When we consider the above information, we see that both verbs *ukloniti se* and *svesti se* were attested in medieval Serbian. The attested examples however, indicate that the two verbs were probably used in different contexts. It seems that the verb *ukloniti se* was used to denote a ‘movement in order to avoid immediate danger,’ while *svesti se* was used to denote a ‘more general movement, particularly from a higher to a lower area.’ As such, the second verb seems to be more appropriate for the context of the Josephus passage.

146
4.2.4. \textit{voziti} and \textit{prinositi}

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the verb \textit{voziti} [Rus 197r:11] with \textit{prinositi}:

\begin{quote}
Свиме пшеничное и вса потребная \textit{voziti} с Леви [Rus 197r:10]
Свиме пшеничное и вса потребная \textit{prinositi} с Леви [Srb 178v:4]
\end{quote}

“Having an abundance of wheat and bringing all necessities from Assyria.”\footnote{88 \hspace{1em} “They had an abundance of wheat and all necessities were \textit{brought} from Assyria” (Leeming 2003: 526).}

The substitution of the verb \textit{voziti} with \textit{prinositi} occurs once in my sample.

In Russian Church Slavonic the verb \textit{voziti} primarily meant ‘to transport’: Кого дауры задажке, къ ныдже крашно вошыв вошах (\textit{комицованос}) “He set on fire the ships in which they shipped the flour to the soldiers” (\textit{Chronicle of George Hamartalos}, thirteenth–fourteenth century; quoted by Avanesov, s.v. “\textit{voziti}”); Наши наймыты вошли мъртвци из города “They hired underlings to transport the dead men from the city” (\textit{Novgorod Chronicle}, thirteenth–fourteenth century; ibid.); Зауутра же въстали извеници, и плаша(а) на брегъ хотше вошити древо “In the morning the waggoners having woken up, went to the bank, wanting to transport the timber” (\textit{Kiev Caves Patericon}, twelfth century, in a manuscript of 1406; ibid.).

As in medieval Russian, the verb \textit{voziti} in medieval Serbian specifically denoted ‘to transport,’ either by water or land (\textit{vehere}): \textit{Pisanije kraljev’stva ti primismo i razuměsмо, što nam’ ... upisa, da vi damо drěvo [sc. ship—ŽJ] da žito vozi iz Luke u Omiš’ “We have received and understood the letter from your majesty, where you ... wrote to us that we give you a ship to transport the wheat from Luka to Omiš” (\textit{Letter from Dubrovnik to King Stefan Ostojа}, 1403; Rječnik, s.v. “\textit{voziti}”). As in Russian, the
verb *voziti* denoted also transportation by land, usually by a cart pulled by a horse, which was called a *voz*: *Kto konje ima, roždestvu Hristovu vsaki merop’h’ da dovozi po vozu dr’v’* “Whoever has horses, let every *merop*[^89] transport one cart of wood to the Birth of Christ (church)” ([*Foundation Charter of King Milutin*, 1321: *Rječnik*, s.v. “voz”). *Voznik’, a derivative of *voz’,* denoting ‘public road,’ is also attested. Thus, the medieval Serbian examples of the verb *voziti* and its derivatives, mentioned in the *Rječnik* are synonymous in terms of denoting ‘transportation’ by a vehicle. In Serbian, however, this verb is generally accompanied by a noun denoting the type of vehicle, which is not the case in the Josephus example.

The Serbian scribe uses the verb *prinositi* (*Greek φέρω*, *Latin ferre, adferre*), which specifically mention the action ‘bring,’ which ‘involves the implication of a definite goal, often the position of the speaker’ ([Buck 1949: 709]). According to the *Rječnik*, the verb *prinositi* in Church Slavonic primarily meant ‘to bring to,’ ‘to carry to.’ *Simeon star’c’ prěbyvajej v’ pir’zě č’to si je svoje prinesl’... da je v’ oblast’ star’cu* “Simeon the elder living in the cell, whatever he brought of his own... let that be in the domain of the elder” ([*Donation Charter of King Milutin*, 1302-1321; *Rječnik*, s.v. “prinositi”); *Prinesoše kraljevstvu mi hrisovulj gospodina cara Stepana* “They brought to me a chrysoboull from the lord Emperor Stephen” ([*King Vukašin confirms privileges to Dubrovnik*, 1370; ibid.]).

The verbs *voziti* and *prinositi* share common meanings in the sense that they both describe an action in which an entity is transferred from one point to another. The difference between them is that the verb *voziti* denotes the general/repeated action of

[^89]: *Merop* refers to the class of people in medieval Serbia who did not possess their own land, served as hirelings, were people without homes, or prisoners.
transfer by vehicle, while *prinositi* implies transfer toward the point of reference. Secondly, the verb *voziti* is limited in denoting transportation by a vehicle, while *prinositi* expresses an action of ‘bringing,’ ‘carrying,’ that is not limited to a means, i.e., a vehicle, like a ship, cart, etc.

Presumably, the Serbian scribe, in order to convey the meaning of transport toward the point of reference, chooses the verb *prinositi* over *voziti*.

4.2.5. *pristroiti* and *ugotoviti*

In the following example, the Serbian scribe replaces the participle *пристрынше* [Rus 28r:16] with *уготовише*:

Римляне же еще уложив и камни устро битва. И *пристрынше* в пришли и до стены помости, и еже приступиша [Rus 280r: 16]

Римляне же еще уложили камни настрия битви. И *уготовише* в пришли и до стени помости, и еже приструнено жесто [Srb 254r:13]

The Romans were still waiting, thinking to fight in the morning. And, having got into readiness from the embankment to the walls, they bridged the accessible area. 90

This substitution occurs once in my sample. In Russian Church Slavonic, the verb *pristroiti* primarily denotes ‘to build’91: 

“*They had built a strong barrier on the fortress*” (*First Novgorod Chronicle, thirteenth–fourteenth century;* quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “*pristroiti*”).

90 “*The Romans, still expecting to fight in the morning, drew up between the embankment and the walls and laid bridges*” (Leeming 2003: 633).  
91 The verb *pristroiti* could also mean ‘to prepare, organize, line up’: *Се оружье сдеши к влади, да приструнте меды, когон же град еже устроите мяка мясо* “*I am already coming to you; prepare plenty of mead in the city where you killed my husband*” (*First Novgorod Chronicle, thirteenth–fourteenth century;* quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “*pristroiti*”).
On the other hand, while the verb *pristroiti* is found in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, the attested examples show that it was used in a more abstract sense to mean ‘to situate’ in terms of ‘finding a refuge’ or ‘getting into position’, as well as the more concrete ‘building’ or ‘creating a building’: *Ne imyj gde pristrojiti se pribegajet k blagočestivomu ... Stefanu* “Not having where to situate himself, he fled over to pious ... Stefan” (*Life of St. Sava*, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “pristrojiti”). The Rječnik also mentions the substantive *pristrojenje*, from the verb meaning ‘to build,’ ‘to create’: *O semь našemь monastirь povelē jemu pešti se i podignuti se na pristrojenje jego* “And he ordered to him to take care of this monastery of ours and to initiate its building” (*Life of St. Simeon*, thirteenth century; ibid.). Nevertheless, Miklošić lists the verb *pristroiti* denoting to ‘prepare’ *parare*, which is attested in *Various Homilies* in the thirteenth century, but he does not provide any examples.

Although the two verbs *pristroiti* and *ugotoviti* share nuances, they seem to be used in different contexts. The first verb, *pristroiti* seems to be used primarily to denote ‘construct,’ ‘build a refuge, settlement’, while the second, *ugotoviti*, tends to be used more generally or abstractly to denote ‘to prepare,’ line up, organize, put into position’: *Primeť většь životьny, iže Gospodь ugotovao lubеštim i* “He will receive the crown of life, which the Lord has prepared for those who love Him” (*Hilandar Typicon*, thirteenth century; Rječnik, s.v.); *Vь světlēmь i ěstněmь grobě, iže bē jemu Vladislavь kralь ugotovalь ... položiše i* “They placed him in the radiant and honorable tomb that King Vladislav had prepared for him” (*Life of St. Sava*, thirteenth century; ibid.).

From the above examples, it appears that, while both *pristroiti* and *ugotoviti* could both denote ‘prepare,’ the core meaning of the verb *ugotoviti* ‘prepare’ provides a
more general meaning that fits the Josephus passage better. While the verb *pristoiti* is attested in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic, it was used in more than one meaning to denote ‘settle,’ in a sense of ‘finding a refuge,’ ‘construct a building.’ In order to convey the more general meaning ‘prepare,’ in this case ‘line up the troops,’ the Serbian scribe uses *ugotoviti*. 
4.3. Lexical variations due to avoidance of figurative language

4.3.1. lajati and zlosloviti

Another case of substitution, though apparently with a different motivation, can be found in the replacement of the verb лаяла [Rus 7r:13] by злашавала:

Яко лаяла и рьятала на мя. И завидеста и доуместа на мя како мя оуморити [Rus 7r:13]
Яко злашавала и рящала еста наме. И завидеста и сребстоваста на мя ако ми оуморити [Srb 5r:12]
"They have railed and grumbled at me. And they envied me and plotted against, how to kill me."

This is the only substitution of this verb in my sample.

In Russian Church Slavonic, in addition to ‘bark’ (of dogs), lajati could also mean ‘scold, swear, slander’: лаялъ мя посаднику вашу Остafeй, назвалъ мя помъ “Your governor Ostafej slandered me, [and] called me a dog” (The Chronicle of Novgorod, fourteenth century; Sreznevskij s.v. “lajati”). Figuratively, this verb could denote ‘machinations of the devil, who suggests impure and evil thoughts’: лялъ бо лъстивъ львъ въ ъгородъ своемь… меня ниветь и неулице “The cunning lion barked behind its fence… impure and evil thoughts” (Sbornik poučenij, twelfth century; ibid.).

The Rječnik states that the verb lajati originates in Proto-Slavic and that it primarily denotes ‘to bark (of a dog).’ The Rječnik further states that this verb is used for other animals that have the similar voice to a dog, such as foxes, wolves, badgers, and lions. In addition, figuratively it can be used of a person to denote ‘to speak evil’ and ‘to yell: Kr’stomъ ограђдаемь врагу противљаем се не бојешти се казни его ни лајанja
“Guarded by the cross, we oppose the enemy, not being afraid of his punishment or his barking” (Monumenta serbica, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “lajanje”); Ne ustrasi se kramoly jeg no lajanija “Do not be afraid of his disruptions or slandering” (The Lives of Serbian Kings and Archbishops, fourteenth century; Rječnik ibid.). Similarly Daničić provides a medieval example of lajati, ‘to bark,’ latrare, pertaining to person: meko ceoni pačь але “He barks like a mad dog” (History of Creation and Kingdoms of All Generations, fifteenth to seventeenth century; quoted by Daničić, s.v. “lajati”)

The verb z”losloviti, which Grigorije Vasilije substitutes for the Russian lajati, is well attested in Russian Church Slavonic in the meaning ‘to revile’ kakolojėtn. According to Meščerskij, the related compound noun z”losloviye corresponds to the single stem noun λοιδοπία ‘abuse,’ found in the Greek Josephus: “In many cases the Old Russian compound words correspond in the Greek original either to simple, single-stem words, or word combinations of a subordinating and subordinate word. In the first group we have: drëvoimanije (Greek ξυλεία), z”loviije (Greek λοιδορία)” (Leeming 2003: 79). However, no cases of the verb zlosloviti have been recorded up to now for medieval Serbian. Daničić does not mention the compound verb zlosloviti at all. In Miklošiĉ we find related Serbian forms such as zlosloviye ‘dishonor, disgrace,’ attested in a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century Menaion, but no examples are provided. Thus Grigorije Vasilije’s example is evidently the first attestation of the verb in medieval Serbian.

From the above examples, we can infer that the term lajati has the same basic meaning in both Serbian and Russian. It appears that Grigorije Vasilije shows a tendency to use straightforward over figurative language. In order to transfer the meaning in a way
that would be clear to Serbian readers, he replaces the figurative verb *lajati*, ‘speak evil, create intrigues’, with the concrete verb *zlosloviti*, ‘speak evil.’

4.3.2. *strašnyi* and *veliky*

In this example the Serbian scribe replaces the adjective *strašnyi* [Rus 109v:22] with *veliky*:

Ne могло же въ величия вели град, зами пропасти *strašnyi/velik* не *dulexe* [Rus 109v:21]
Ne могло же въ велки въ вели град, зами пропасти *velik/veliki* не *dulexe* [Srb 101v:9]
‘It was impossible for him to besiege the entire city, because the big ravines did not allow it.’92

This substitution occurs only once in my sample. In medieval Russian Church Slavonic, the adjective *strašnyi* could have a number of meanings including, ‘something that evokes fear,’ ‘dreadful,’ ‘big,’ ‘heavy’: *Проходя по душевно страшное* “We went through a dreadful desert” (*Book of Deuteronomy*, fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v “strašnyi”). In addition, the adjective *strašnyi* could mean ‘big,’ heavy,’ e.g., of sins: *По праздности же въ уловство страшного греха* “Having become aware of the heavy sin” (*Efrem Kormčaja* twelfth century; ibid.). In both cases the meaning of the adjective *strašnyi* is associated with something that has extraordinary size, importance, number, strength, etc.

The same occurs in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic. According to the Rječnik, the adjective *strašan* in medieval Serbian Church Slavonic could mean ‘one who evokes

92 “He could not besiege the whole city, for big ravines did not allow it” (Leeming 2003).
fear by his looks,’ ‘terrible,’ ‘difficult,’ ‘something that has grave consequences.’ One of the meanings in medieval Serbian that relates to Josephus’ passage is the example in which the appearance or presence of something or someone evokes the feeling of fear: 

\[\text{Внукъ превисокаго и светаго и страшнаго краља Стефана Уроша} \] “Grandson of the most high, holy and awesome king Stefan Uroš” (Donation Charter of King Stefan, 1320-1326; Rječnik, s.v. “страшан”). Examining these examples, we see that in both medieval Russian and Serbian the adjective \textit{strašan} is comparable to \textit{veliky} in terms of expressing something of an extraordinary size, importance, and consequence, that evokes the emotion of fear.

Cejtlin draws a parallel between the meanings ‘terrible’ and ‘invisible, dark,’ and says that the two are related in the sense that the inability to see something evokes fear. Consequently, the evil powers are connected with darkness, lack of eyesight or vision, relating to the god of dead, \textit{Аио̣н̣} ‘terrible, invisible’ (Cejtlin 1996: 89). In connection with Josephus’ passage, it can be observed that the adjective ‘terrible’ is based on the sight or lack of sight of something so large that it cannot be overcome or grasped.

On the other hand, the adjective \textit{veliky} is straightforward. It denotes concretely the meaning ‘great,’ ‘large.’ According to the Rječnik, \textit{veliky} means ‘great,’ ‘grand.’ It is recorded in the medieval Serbian Church Slavonic: \textit{Пе̣чат великаго žупана Нemaне} “The seal … of the grand župan Nemanja” (Donation Charter of Stefan Nemanja, twelfth century; quoted by Rječnik, s.v. “veliki”); \textit{Савы, свetạго велика̣го архиеписко̣па сръбскаго} “Of Sava, the holy great Serbian archbishop” (Donation Charter of Despot Stefan, fifteenth century; ibid.).
From the above, it appears that the replacement of the adjective *strašnyi* with *veliky* is another example that indicates the scribe’s tendency to avoid abstract, figurative language. While the adjective *strašnyi* in medieval Serbian is associated with *veliky* in terms of the perception of something of extraordinary size, importance, consequences that evoke feelings of fear and dreadfulness, it nonetheless, expresses only subjective perception.

In order to avoid figurative and stylistic language, the Serbian scribe uses the straightforward adjective *veliky*, which concretely expresses the meaning ‘grand,’ ‘great,’ ‘big’ found in the Russian Josephus passage.
4.4. Lexical variations due to censorship

4.4.1. naložnica and odar

In the following example we see an instance of censorship employed by Grigorije Vasilije:

И нaložnica своjа ила ей вдво од/уша "[Rus 5v:14]
И одаrb своj илби вдво полна "[Srb 3v:14]
“And having his own bed all night.”

This is the only instance of censorship found in my sample, and it deals with the replacement of the noun naložnica [Rus 5v:14] ‘concubine’ by одаrb [Srb 3v:14] ‘bed.’

In order to explain this change we have to look at extralinguistic factors. First and foremost, Grigorije Vasilije was a strict Orthodox monk. As such, it is expected that he would avoid the language and ideas that would be considered improper and scandalous in the view of an Orthodox Christian believer. In this case a king having a concubine is an issue, which, in the view of an Orthodox monk, would not only be condemned, but even improper to discuss.

This notion, first and foremost, stems from the New Testament and was elaborated by the Fathers of the Church. The only proper institution blessed by the Church was marriage. Marriage had to be monogamous. A second marriage, according to the rules of Saint Basil the Great, was considered sinful, but allowed along with a period of penance. A third marriage involved up to four years of exclusion from Holy Communion. A fourth marriage was strictly forbidden (Mayendorff 1990:101). In

93 “And his favorite concubine whose name was Pannychis” (Leeming 2003:201).
general, marriage was considered a union between a man and a woman, who represent Christ and the Church. Their bodies were considered temples of the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:19). Whoever joins himself to a harlot becomes one flesh with her (1 Corinthians 6:16). And thus, every such practice was condemned as fornication and abomination before God. Among medieval Orthodox Christians, such practice was considered shameful, dishonorable, and carried with itself a social stigma, which had detrimental consequences for the honor and reputation of an individual (French 1998: 306). Therefore, only a monogamous relation in marriage was considered chaste, while all other relations outside of this framework were condemned as adulterous (Mayendorff ibid.: 101). The practice of putting crowns, during the marriage ceremony, on the heads of the groom and bride, in the view of Saint John Crysostom, signified the victory of chastity before marriage (ibid.: 105).

It is thus not surprising that Grigorije Vasilije evidently censors the word 'concubine' and replaces it with the noun 'bed.' Although the text of the History that he was copying is secular by its nature, it was intended for a Christian audience who would find the mention of a concubine—especially one called "All Night"—unseemly and shameful.
4.5. Lexical variations due to synomyic substitutions

4.5.1. muž’sky and krêpko

In the following example the Serbian scribe replaces the adverb моужьска [Rus 113r:5] with крêпко:

И гла ны в падоле свъ моужьска тыгтьти уебуем [Rus 113r:4]
И гла ны в пёдё въ крêпко тыгть/ти овъм [Srb 104v:1].
And he said to them: “We have to endure bravely the customs”.

This is the only example of the substitution of krêpko for muž’ski in my sample. Otherwise, there are two instances of the noun krêpost’, in addition to other derivationally related forms—seven adverbs, three verbs, and two adjectives—found in both the Russian and the Serbian manuscript. Out of these thirteen, twelve examples denote ‘strength,’ ‘valor,’ ‘energy,’ ‘firmness,’ and one denotes ‘courage.’ I also found seven examples of the noun muž’stvo, in addition to derivationally related forms—two adjectives, and one adverb—in both manuscripts. Out of these twelve examples, eleven denote ‘courage,’ and one denotes ‘strength.’

In Russian Church Slavonic, the adverb muž’sky denotes ‘bravely, courageously.’ The following Russian example shows the use of this adverb in a context that indicates a situation in which one must endure the affliction bravely: Приготои себе на терпьн скрюнни, и моужьсы пристопи въ сьборъ ёмиышьсы “Prepare yourself for the endurance of sorrows, and bravely join the monastic community” (Pandects of Nikon, 1296; quoted by Avanesov, s.v. “muž’sky”). In this case, endurance implies both the spiritual and the physical efforts that a monk faces. Other examples imply a primarily spiritual struggle:
The courageous soul is not supposed to be weakened by these sorrowful attacks” (Life of St. Feodosij Pečerskij, eleventh century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “muž’ski”); Мужественны подвиги и победы “Courageous deeds and victories” (October Menaion, eleventh century; ibid.).

In medieval Serbian, as in Russian, the adverb muž’sky means ‘bravely,’ ‘courageously,’ according to the Rječnik. However, the only example of this adverb mentioned in the sources I consulted for medieval Serbian Church Slavonic is in the context of an actual battle: Mužsky be boe se sь bezbožnymi oть utra daže kъ večeru “They had fought bravely with the ungodly from morning until evening (ibid.).

From the above examples, it can be seen that the Serbian adverb muž’sky shared with the Russian the common underlying meaning ‘bravely,’ ‘courageously.’ Nevertheless, the adverb was used in somewhat different contexts in the two recensions. The Russian examples exhibit the use of this adverb in a spiritual sense to denote an effort that is made in overcoming personal weaknesses and vices. The Serbian, however, shows the use of this adverb only in a concrete sense: ‘to fight bravely’ in a battle.

The adverb krепко is mentioned in the dictionaries of medieval Serbian Church Slavonic that I consulted in only one instance, pertaining to ‘a law or a letter that cannot be changed’: Vsakije zakoni i hrisovuše ... sъvръшати lu pače boļše krепче потвръжdatи “All the laws and chrysoboulls ... must be observed and not changed, but even more firmly established” (Edict of King Vukašin, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “krjepko”). Although this adverb krепko is attested only with non-living entities, the related adjective krепak’ shows more examples, all of which indicate the firmness and strength of a person: V napastjeh krёpk’ “Firm in temptations” (Donation Charter of
King Vladislav, 1234-1240; Rječnik, s.v. “krjepak”); Krěp'kyj v' braneh’ “Strong in battles” (Life of Sts. Simeon and Sava, thirteenth century; ibid.); Prěvysokyj i krěpkyj i samodržavnyj kralj “Most high and firm sovereign king” (Lives of Serbian Kings and Archbishops, fourteenth century; ibid.).

Considering the above examples, it appears that the primary meaning of the Serbian adverb muž’ski was ‘bravely,’ ‘courageously’, corresponding to meaning found in medieval Russian. On the other hand, although the medieval Serbian adverb krěpko primarily denoted ‘firmly,’ my examples show that krěpko, depending on the context, could also mean ‘bravely,’ which suggests that in these cases muž’ski and krěpko, in agreement with Vinogradov, were synonyms (Vinogradov 1952:101). This would allow the Serbian scribe to make a free substitution, based perhaps on pragmatic factors that cannot be reconstructed.

4.5.2. borzo and skoro

Another case of substitution of one synonym for another can be found in the following passage, in which the Serbian scribe replaces борзo [Rus 110v:6] with скоро [Srb 102r:15]:

И доно/нухавляемь нын припнё борзо minden/ствогл рук.mь [Rus 110v:5]
И доконуваляемь припнё скоро многьстевьмь рък.ь [Srb 102r:15]
And (when) the embankment (was) completed quickly with a multitude of hands."94

94 “(When) the embankment was rapidly completed with a multitude of hands” (Leeming 2003: 394).
My sample contains only one example of this substitution. There are seven additional instances of the adverb *skoro* found in Russian manuscript. For these, the Serbian scribe uses the equivalent adverb *skoro* to denote both ‘quickly’ and ‘soon’.

The adverb *skoro* in Russian Church Slavonic, means, ‘fast,’ ‘quickly,’ or ‘soon’: 

Гързко нштияти книги “Cleanse the books quickly” (*Sbornik Svjatoslava*, 1076; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “borzo”). In Serbian Church Slavonic *skoro* has a wider range of meanings— ‘in the near past,’ ‘in the near future,’ ‘quick,’ ‘soon.’ According to the Rječnik, in the history of Serbian *skoro* was first of all a synonym of *brzo* ‘quick(ly)’:

Веб тебе … чудтвовре Христов Николаје припадају и молу се … skorim zastupljenijem *Boga mojego* “To you, Nicholas, Christ's Wonderworker, I fall down and pray … by the quick intercession of my God” (*Donation Charter of Stevan of Dečani*, 1321-1336, Rječnik, s.v. “skor”). *Skoro* also could mean ‘soon’: 

Na skorе povелеваше kamenосечцем прийти “And soon they ordered those who were cutting stone to come” (*Life of Stefan Uroš*, fourteenth century, ibid.).

While discussing the translation of the Greek adverb ταχύ, ταχέως in Old Church Slavonic Gospels, Grković-Major points out that at first this adverb was rendered by three Slavonic variants, *jadro, skoro, br’zo*. She states that *jadro* primarily meant ‘quickly,’ while *skoro* meant ‘soon,’ except when it was used with a verb of motion, when it meant ‘quickly.’ Since it collocated with the verbs of motion that “denote speed depending on the force and strength”, the adverb *jadro* was limited to meaning ‘[to go] powerfully, strongly’ Ultimately, *jadro* and *skoro* began to overlap. According to Grković-Major, because of the economy of language, the adverb *skoro*, with its potential
for denoting both ‘soon’ and (with action verbs) ‘quickly,’ eventually supplanted the adverb *jadro* (Grković-Major 2008:187-193).

In agreement with the above statements, I would add that the examples of adverb *skoro* in my sample, all seven of them, show that this adverb is used consistently. No example of the adverb *brzo* is found in my sample. This suggests that *skoro*, as Grković-Major and pointed out, was either supplanted by more productive *brzo*, with the potential of denoting both ‘quickly’ and ‘soon,’ or that the Serbian scribe viewed it as a synonym of *brzo*.

4.5.3. *ozemstvovati* and *zatočiti*

Another example of synonymic substitution is the replacement of the verb *ozemstvovati* for *zatočiti* occurs once in my sample. According to Sreznevskij, the verb *ozemstvovati* means ‘to exile,’ εξορισμός: Πριν δε γι' αυτό κακό μαλακία ή ήταν αλατού απέλασε την εξορίσει, εκεί ανεβάστηκε πρόκειται ἑαυτό τον βάθος προσελκύον τον άλλον ἄνθρωπον “In the past, for an insignificant pleasure, we were deprived of God’s glory; because we did not abide by His commandment, we were exiled there, because of the transgression of the old Adam”
(Gramota of the Patriarch of Constantinople, fourteenth century; quoted by Sreznevskij s.v. “ozemstvovati”). The verb ozemstvovati could also mean ‘to leave one’s own country’ (ibid).

The medieval Serbian verb ozeml’stvati, ‘to exile,’ in exilium pellere, proves to have the similar connotation as in Russian: убежать из страны own brothers’ (Life of Saint Simeon; thirteenth century, quoted by Daničić s.v. “ozeml’stvovati”). From this example it is not clear whether this verb meant both ‘to exile as punishment,’ or just ‘to send away from one’s country.’ When we look at the verb zatočiti, we see that this was commonly found with the somewhat similar connotation ‘punish by exile,’ exilio mulctare: Zatočena me byvša roditeljem “Having been exiled by my father” (Chrysoboull of Saint Stevan of Dečani, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “zatočiti”). In this instance, the verb implies ‘to exile and imprison,’ as Saint Steven of Dečani was placed under house arrest in Constantinople.

Considering both verbs zatočiti and ozeml’stvati, we see that both are attested in medieval Serbian and that both correspond to the Josephus passage. The distinction between the two verbs appears to be very fine one. It is unclear whether Grigroje Vasilije substitutes one verb for the other due to mere synonymic substitution, or because the verb zatočiti had a more specific sense, connoting ‘punishment by exile,’ ‘imprisonment in exile,’ rather than less specific ozeml’stvati, ‘exile.’
4.6. Scribal errors

4.6.1. lavica and ugl’

And another centurion named Gallus and with him 10 soldiers in this confusion went into a certain building, concealing themselves in some of the corners [sic].

There are two examples of the replacement of noun lavica ‘bench’ in my sample. In both of these examples the second Serbian scribe made an error. In the first example he mistakenly rendered it as ugl’ ‘corner,’ and in the second example as pod ispod ‘underneath’; cf. [Rus 112v:14] and [Srb 104r:13].

In Russian Church Slavonic the noun lavica denoted ‘bench’: Н деснь стоило есть место, яко лавица засечена къ той камени невероват; и на лавици тои лежало тело Господа нашего Иисуса Христа “On the right side there is place, like a bench cut in the cave’s rock; and the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was lying on that bench” (Life of Andreas Salos, fifteenth sixteenth century; Sreznevskij s.v. “lavica”).

Unlike in Russian Church Slavonic, in medieval Serbian, the homonym lavica could only denote ‘lioness’ (Russian l’vica); no meaning of ‘bench’ was attested: Svirěpyje l’vice ischedije “The offspring of the cruel lioness” (The Praise to Prince Lazar, fourteenth-fifteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “lavica”).

95 Leeming has ‘18 soldiers’ and ‘under the benches’(Leeming 2003:396)
Similarly, in another place, the second Serbian scribe misinterprets the noun *lavica* for *ugao* ‘corner.’ The Rječnik provides two examples of the noun *ugl’* ‘corner, area’ from the fourteenth century: *Na ugl’ po srěď stl’pa na kami, koji postaviše* “On the corner in the middle of the column on the rock which they put up” (Chrysoboull, fourteenth century; Rječnik s.v. “ugao”). In the second example the noun *ugao* denotes ‘an area of a property’: *Vinogradь и Klepine uglé* “A vineyard in Klepa’s corner” (Foundation Charter of Tsar Dušan, fourteenth century; ibid.). When we consider the above examples it can be observed that the second Serbian scribe did not understand the meaning of the homonym *lavica*. Thus, the two substitutions *ugl’* and *pod ispod* are evidently errors, made due to the lack of such idiomatic expression in the scribe’s native language.

4.6.2. *skeptr’* and *otac’*

In the following we see an example of a scribal error, in which the second Serbian scribe misinterprets the noun *сектрь* ‘sceptre’ [Rus 99v:3] as *пать* (Greek ‘father’), which he glosses in the margin as *вце* ‘father’.

Посл̆а́ды же ... в̆бр̆о в̆му г̆да Б̆ стӑлаш̆е э на къӗдарство и пакы сектрь вл̆йы по/р̆ўаша в̆му [Rus 99v:2]
Посл̆а́ды п̆ӑе п̆о̆а | ле в̆бр̆о в̆му, г̆да Б̆ стӑлаш̆е его на къӗдарство. И пакы пать вл̆й | нь пер̆ўаше ее за н̆го [Srb 92г:1]96

“Afterwards (he) rather little by little began to believe him, when God was bestowing kingship upon him, and now the emperor’s father [sic] was being committed to him.”97

97 “But afterwards he began to believe him a little, when God was installing him as Caesar and now committed himself to the emperor’s scepter” (Leeming 2003: 372).
Omitting the first syllable of σκέπτη, σκήπτρον ‘staff,’ the second Serbian scribe reads it as the Greek noun πατήρ, ‘father.’ While he retains this Hellenism, he infers that it will be obscure to his readers, so he places the Serbian translation њићь ‘father,’ in the margin.

4.6.3. želva and lëstvica

The following example is a scribal error, in which the Serbian scribe mistakenly replaces жељви [Rus 88v:9] with жељвици.

Вирычахү аки развоиници изѣра внезапн и жељви њиргахъ, и п/стояњићь съвах' [Rus 88v:8]
Иричахъ из браћь иако р/звиници в'незапн. И жељвици њиръгонахъ, и п/стојећи съвах' [Srb 82r:11]
“But they crept forth from the gates like bandits, suddenly. And they tore away the ladders and cut down those standing underneath.”

This substitution occurs twice in my sample: cf. Rus 88v:8 and Srb 82r:11; and Rus 88r:18 and Srb 81v:19. In Russian Church Slavonic, the chief meaning of the noun жељва, according to Sreznevskij, is ‘tortoise’: Латини ђдцнь жељви “The Latins eat tortoise” (Otvét” Feodosija Pečerskago k” Izjaslavu o Latyněx”, eleventh century; quoted by Sreznevskij, s.v. “želva”).

98 “But they sallied forth, like bandits, from the gates, tore away the testudo and cut down those standing underneath” (Leeming 2003: 348).
However, in the present passage the word denotes a Roman military maneuver designated as the ‘testudo’ or ‘tortoise.’ To defend themselves from the arrows and other shots and projectiles from above, the Roman soldiers used to form a cover with their shields for protection. This military maneuver was used during assaults on the walls of a city under siege. The Latin term *testudo* corresponds to the Greek χελώνη (Leeming 2003: 659, 662).

Although the Rječnik does not provide any medieval Serbian examples of the noun *želva*, this noun is attested as желаљ, χελώνη, testudo, in the sixteenth-century Nomokanon (ζακώνα παραμες, νομοκάνον) from Hilandar Monastery (Miklošić 1977:193). This shows that the Serbian scribe was probably familiar with the noun *želva* denoting ‘turtle’ as an animal. The omission of this word in the text shows that the Serbian scribe misunderstood the use of the word in the context of a military maneuver (though he recognized that the meaning had to do with siege warfare). The replacement of the noun *želva* with лествica ‘ladder’ may have to do with its homophony to *železo* ‘iron’ (Leeming 1978:168), thus possibly, ‘iron ladder.’ Leeming points out here the resemblance of the Greek nouns ‘tortoise’ χέλως and ‘iron,’ χαλκός ‘copper,’ ‘bronze.’

According to the Rječnik, the noun лествica is recorded already in the thirteenth century in the meaning ‘ladder’: *Takovy ubo krěpostiju věry svědčenyje prěpojasany se istinoju ljuboviju jeliko vč Gospodu podpírana je se utpnojo lěstviceju na wysotu dobryje dětěli vňshoditi* “For such a man, having girded himself with the strength of sincere faith, truth [and] love of the Lord, supporting himself with a mental ladder, ascends to the height of a good deed” (*Lives of Serbian Kings and Archbishops*, fourteenth century; Rječnik, s.v. “ｌěstvica”).

168
Based on the above, it is evident that the substitution of the noun Želva for lëstvica is a scribal error. Apparently, the Serbian scribe was not familiar with the military use of the noun Želva. Earlier in the text [Srb 81v:19], the scribe copies only part of the word, l'vy, without noticing the subscript Že above the word in the Russian text, and probably thinking that this is another case of abbreviated form of the noun lëstvica. However, his use of the term for ‘ladder’ shows that he was, to some extent, familiar with siege warfare.
5.1. Findings based on the lexical analysis

In the following sections, I will sum up the main findings of my research, with particular focus on the interlanguage difficulties to which Grigorije Vasilije alludes in the colophon (that, since it was very hard for Serbian people to read the Russian text, and many did not understand the Russian words, he had to translate the text into Serbian).

Since the entire Serbian Josephus manuscript consists of 255 folia, a massive amount of data, in my approach I used a sampling method in order to determine the extent of the difference between the Russian and the Serbian texts. After a close and meticulous reading of my sample, which consists of 40 folia or 80 pages, accounting for almost 20% of the Serbian Josephus text, I identified 56 lexemes that were either substituted or glossed by the Serbian scribe. After analyzing these, I came to the conclusion that 26 of these “translations” appear to be due to recensional editing, 16 to disambiguation, and 14 due to other motivations such as synonymy, scribal error, avoidance of figurative and abstract language, and censorship.

As it can be seen, nearly half of the lexical substitutions that I found appear be due to recensional editing; in other words, the lexemes that the Serbian scribes considered foreign to Serbian Church Slavonic were either replaced or defined in a gloss. The
motivation for their substitution seems to be due to the absence of those lexemes in medieval Serbian (a conclusion that I drew based on their absence in the Serbian historical dictionaries I consulted), or to the absence of the needed meaning, or, in few examples, to the apparent scarcity of their use. In some examples, it was difficult to pinpoint the nature of the change, inasmuch as one and the same substitution could be due to both recensional translation and disambiguation. The lexemes found in the Russian manuscript that were either replaced or defined in a gloss, due to recensional editing, include: *lix-* ‘evil, cunning,’ *dik-* ‘wild,’ *versta* ‘stadium,’ *dumati* ‘consult,’ *medliti* ‘linger,’ *obraziti* ‘hit, strike,’ *šatati* ‘boast, exalt,’ *strojenije* ‘God’s providence,’ *pereskočnik* ‘deserter,’ *v”datišja* ‘surrender,’ *dlja* ‘for the sake of,’ *potosnetišja* ‘attempt,’ *dostrojit’i* ‘come up with, think of,’ *šeika drēvenaja* ‘fruit of a tree,’ *lēsti* ‘climb,’ *vazn-* ‘fortune, luck,’ *blagovazniv* ‘fortunate, luck,’ *podučivati* ‘incite,’ *syn* ‘tower,’ *rēzati* ‘slaughter,’ *svad’ba* ‘wedding celebration,’ *podxupiti* ‘strengthen, encourage,’ *l’zē* ‘possible,’ *tovarišč* ‘friend, colleague,’ *trux-* ‘sorrowful,’ *rufizna voda* ‘rose, reddish water,’ and *frījamva* ‘triumph of a general.’

My research shows that, of the 26 lexemes in question, 19 are not found at all in the Serbian historical dictionaries I consulted. A number of the words were replaced or glossed due to their rarity, and they seem to represent hapax legomena both in Russian and Serbian. Such are the nouns *lixomudr’* and its Serbian replacement *zlomudr’* ‘evil man’; *rodostoma* glossed by *rufizna voda* ‘rose oil,’ ‘reddish water’; and *frījamva,* glossed by *t”ržestvo* ‘triumphal procession of the Roman general.’ The last two nouns, according to Meščerskij, are not found in the Greek original but were introduced into the Russian Church Slavonic translation through oral tradition (Meščerskij 1956: 255). In
addition, three homonyms, syn”, v”datisja, and obraziti, do not have the same

denotations and/or connotations in Russian and Serbian. Finally, three lexemes, versta, 
medliti, and lěsti, based on their consistent replacement by the Serbian scribes, appear to 
have become archaic in Serbian, so that they were not used at the end of the sixteenth 
century.

My findings show that, next to recensional editing, the second largest number of 
replacements consists of the substitutions due to disambiguation. While the following 
lexemes found in the Russian manuscript are attested in medieval Serbian, they have a 
different connotation in the two recensions. The lexemes found in the Russian manuscript 
that were ambiguous for the Serbian scribes include vlas” ‘animal’s fur,’ običaj ‘law’ 

otdati ‘forgive,’ prebivati ‘flee,’ imati ‘capture’ obrytisja ‘entrench,’ puščati ‘launch, 
toss,’ strelec” ‘launcher,’ lěs” ‘hill,’ pravda ‘truth,’ pogybnuti ‘to suffer,’ bran” ‘war’, 
metati ‘hurry,’ roditelj” ‘kin,’ pečal” ‘crying,’ ukor” ‘blemish.’

My analysis suggests that most of the substitutions—42 of them, or almost 80% of 
the examples in my sample—are due to either the complete absence of the words in the 
main Serbian dictionaries, or the absence in Serbian of the particular meaning found in 
the Russian Josephus text. Many of those words are very narrow in their scope of use and 
represent technical terms that were found either in military or ecclesiastical vocabulary. 
As such, the “translations” can only be explained from the perspective of extra-linguistic 
factors. Their attestation in the Serbian Josephus manuscript add to the lexicography of 
medieval Serbian. See the list of the newly attested lexemes in the Church Slavonic-

English Lexicon that I provide in section 5.4.

The third category in my lexical analysis consists of 12 lexemes which were
replaced due to other factors such as censorship, scribal error, avoidance of figurative language, preference of concrete vs. abstract language, and synonymy. I came across only one example of censorship. It involves the substitution of *odor*’ ‘bed’ for *naložnica* ‘concubine’, which can only be explained by extra-linguistic factors. In this case Grigorije Vasilije, as a strict ascetic, employs censorship in order to avoid racy topics and issues that he considered improper.

Furthermore, the additional five replacements, which include *priimati* and *vyděti*, *domyslity* and *stvoriti*, *uklonitisja* and *svestise*, *prineti* and *voziti*, *pristroiti* and *ugotoviti*, appear to be due to the scribe’s preference for either abstract or concrete language in a given context. While all of those lexemes were attested in medieval Serbian and share some semantic nuances with the Russian ones, they seem not to be used in the same kinds of contexts as their Russian equivalents.

In addition, I came across three errors made by the second Serbian scribe. These errors involve the confusion of the nouns *lavica* for *ugl’, *skeptr’* for *otac*, and *želva* for *lēstvica*, which I examined in greater detail in my discussion of the differences between the two scribes. Likewise, there are two apparent examples of editing due of avoidance of figurative language. These are *lajati* and *zlosloviti*, *strašnyi* and *veliky*. Finally, my findings show that some of the Serbian scribes’ editing was simply replacing one available synonym with another. There are three such examples—*muž’ski*/krēpko, *borzo*/skoro, and *ozemstvovati*/zatočiti. Such substitutions may be possibly explained, as Meščerskij has pointed out for similar cases in Russian versions of Josephus, by the scribe’s desire to avoid repetition of one and the same word, and perhaps also to the scribe’s attempt to add to the vividness and beauty of the text (Leeming 2003:82).
5.2 Evidence for the existence of a second Serbian scribe

In addition to Grigorije Vasilije, who identifies himself in the colophon as the scribe of the Serbian Josephus manuscript, I discovered that there was a second Serbian scribe involved in the copying of the manuscript—a fact not noted in previous descriptions of HM.SMS.280. The work of this anonymous scribe is evident first of all from the different handwriting (see the illustration from the Serbian manuscript in Appendix A), and also from a number of errors not found in Grigorije Vasilije’s section of the text. This section includes folia 73v-126v. The name of this second scribe remains unknown, but it seems possible that he could be identified by examining the handwriting in other Hilandar manuscripts of the late sixteenth century.

As just mentioned, one of the distinguishing features of the second Serbian scribe was that he made number of errors, some of which were due to his lack of understanding of military terminology. One such error is his twice repeated misinterpretation of the noun želva ‘testudo’ (a type of siege weapon). The replacement of the noun želva with lěstvica ‘ladder’ may have to do with its homophony to železo ‘iron’ (Leeming 1978:168); thus possibly he interpreted it as ‘iron ladder.’

Along the same lines, the second Serbian scribe omits an entire sentence dealing with various kinds of weapons. The following nouns were skipped: кошь, пиль, секыры, ремени, and серпы [Rus 84r:21]—“baskets, saws, axes, straps and sickles” (Leeming 2003:339). Instead, the scribe offered a general paraphrase: „фужіл ненянована и велми дивна [Srb 78r:22] ”And the unnamed and very strange weapons.”

99 Leeming mistranslated this noun; it should be ‘javelin’ (missile weapon used by infantry), Latin pilum.
Since these lexemes did not belong to the scope of my samples, I did not discuss them in Chapters 2–4. Further analysis would reveal whether they were attested in medieval Serbian and to what degree, if at all, they were used in a meaning appropriate to the military context of Josephus’ narrative.

Another error made by the second Serbian scribe, also repeated twice, is the misinterpretation of the noun lavica ‘bench,’ which the scribe interpreted as ugl’ ‘corner,’ pod ispod ‘underneath,’ due to the absence of the corresponding meaning in medieval Serbian. Here the second Scribe may have been trying to avoid a homonym, lavica ‘lioness’.

No such errors are found in Grigorje Vasilije’s part of the text. In the case of homonyms, Grigorje Vasilije used glosses in order to provide clarification. Such was the noun syn” ‘tower,’ which was regularly, with one exception, replaced by pyrg’, stolp’, or polata’.

The use of alliteration is another characteristic of the second Serbian scribe. Two examples of alliteration are found in my samples: v”shvaletse i v”z/nosetse [Srb 104v:13] instead of Russian v”sxvaljatsja i šatajutsja [Rus 113r:17]; and possibly also strêlci (puškary in the margin) puščaše [Srb 81r:12], cf. strêlci puščaše in the Russian manuscript. No examples of intentional alliteration are found in Grigorije Vasilije’s section of the text.

Finally, the verb medliti ‘linger’ was differently rendered by the two scribes. In three of these examples, Grigorije Vasilije replaces the verb medliti with kasnětî [Srb 175r:11, 176v:11, 183v:10]. The remaining example of medliti is rendered as kr’smati [Srb 97r:22] ‘to linger’ by the second Serbian scribe.
Thus, the above findings show clearly that there was another scribe, in addition to Grigorije Vasilije, who was involved in the copying of the first Serbian version of The History of the Jewish War. These two scribes can be differentiated not only by their different handwritings, but also by their different treatment of certain lexemes, their style, and their knowledge of a very specific type of terminology (siege warfare), which is prevalent in this particular text.

5.3. Profile of Grigorije Vasilije and the provenience of the Russian copy

Comparison of my samples of the Russian and the Serbian manuscripts shows that, apart from purely orthographic recensional changes and the lexical “translations” discussed in Chapters 2–4, the Serbian manuscript HM.SMS.280 is a relatively faithful copy of the Russian manuscript HM.SMS.281. Grigorije Vasilije most probably received it from Tsar Ivan the Terrible as a gift at the time he was admitted to the Tsar’s court on December 6, 1583. This manuscript was probably given in order to promote the idea of Moscow as the Third Rome, or Third (New) Jerusalem. This idea could also be perceived in the presence of both The History of the Jewish War and The Tale of the Fall of Constantinople in the same manuscript. The fall of Jerusalem and Constantinople came to be interpreted in sixteenth-century Russia as acts of God’s retribution and signs that He had transferred the grace of those ancient holy cities to the New Jerusalem, Moscow.

In my research I was able to reconstruct Grigorije Vasilije’s biography, and to a certain degree trace his activities in Hilandar monastery for a period of almost two
decades. During that period he copied the Josephus manuscript; also, because of his extraordinary qualities, he was selected to serve in different responsible capacities—as abbot (in 1583, 1588, 1589, 1590, and 1591-1597; see Fotić 2000: 137) and as Hilandar Monastery’s representative on foreign missions.

In addition to Grigorije Vasilije, at the end of sixteenth century, there were five other Serbian scribes who lived and worked in the Karyes cell. Considering that Grigorije Vasilije had to leave part of the work of his manuscript to another scribe, probably due to some mission(s) outside the monastery, it is possible that one of these scribes was involved as his assistant. The following are the five scribes who are known to have lived and copied manuscripts in the Karyes cell during Grigorije Vasilije’s time: Varlaam, Dionisije, Jefrem, Lavrentije, and Antonije. A further comparison of their handwriting and writing style may show that one of them was the second Serbian scribe who worked on *The History of the Jewish War*. In particular if we look at the handwriting of the hieromunk Dionisije, as seen in the copy of the Psalter with prayers and odes (HM.SMS.93), dated 1597, we can note a strong resemblance to the second handwriting in the Josephus manuscript in the shape, spacing, and thickness of the letters. However, we cannot be sure of this identification without looking at samples of the other scribes’ handwritings.

The existence of numerous scribes during the time of Grigorije Vasilije clearly refutes Mulić, who, in proposing an answer to why Grigorije Vasilije states in his colophon that the Serbs could not understand Russian words, claims that Hilandar did not have highly literate monks after Domentijan, Danilo, and Elder Isaija. Contrary to this claim, my research shows that many of the hard-to-understand words were very specific
technical terms from military vocabulary—not words that a monk (or most laymen) could be expected to know.

In this regard, it can be said that other medieval Slavic scribes and translators, whether their work involved sacred or secular texts, often encountered similar problems. Talking about the Slavic missionaries, MacRobert points out correctly that the evangelizer’s “business is to introduce people to a new and essentially different way of seeing the world, which their language may not be equipped to express” (MacRobert 1991: 402). Although Grigorije Vasilije and the second Serbian scribe worked on a secular text, which gave them more freedom in the rendition of unknown concepts, they still had to deal with the difficult task of transferring ideas that did not exist in their native language, while trying to preserve the basic sense of the original. If we consider Meščerskij’s observation that the original Russian translator of The History of the Jewish War wanted to make his text “more accessible, comprehensive, interesting, and even attractive, bringing it as close as possible to their requirements and needs” (Leeming 2003: 47), we will have an idea of the extent of the difficulty in transferring of such a text into the Serbian recension. My findings about what Grigorije Vasilije calls “Russian words” show that these include multi-layered concepts and expressions, including Russian or Kievan Rus’ian terms describing warfare, court, fortifications, social interaction, military installations, strategies, and weapons; Greek ecclesiastical terms; metaphors and other tyopes of figurative language; and rhymes (ibid.: 49-52). According to Meščerskij, such “military expressions quoted were typical and in general use at the time when the translation was made and were familiar to everyone who came into contact with military exploits then so frequent in knightly circles” (ibid.:50).
5.4. Church Slavonic-English Lexicon of the *Hystery of the Jewish War*

This Church Slavonic-English Lexicon presents the lexemes found in the Serbian copy of *The History of the Jewish War*, HM.SMS. 280, which are attested for the first time, and hence amplify the existing lexicography of medieval Serbian.

*Благовісний* fortunate, lucky [Srb 29v in the margin]

*Благостив* fortunate, lucky [Srb 29v:5]

*Възноситисе* boast, exalt [Srb 104v:13]

*Дръзък* sorrowful [Srb 7r:14]

*Зломъръца* evil, cunning man [Srb 3v:21]

*Злобовити* speak evil, create intrigues [Srb 5r:12]

*Излети* walk out, climb [Srb 183r:6]

*Объръя* law [Srb 48r:1]

*Объръяция* entrenchment [82v in the margin]

*Офръва* entrench, settle in a camp [Srb 101v:12]

*Прекицъ* deserter [Serb 173v:20]

*Подъгу* incite [Srb 179r:6]

*Пускаръ* launcher [Srb 80r:21]

*Руфъця* вода rose water, reddish water [Srb 30v in the margin]

*Стрълъца* launcher [Srb 81r:13]

*Съмъ* tower [Srb 180r:12]

*Товаришъ* friend, colleague [Srb 200r:16]
triumph of a general [Srb 236r in the margin]

triumph of a general [Srb 236r:9]

boast, exalt [Srb 94r:3]

fruit of a tree, possibly pomegranate [Srb 39r:5]

give [Srb 181r:22]
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Appendix A: Illustrations from the Serbian manuscript
Figure 1. A sample of the handwriting of the two Serbian scribes

Grigorije Vasilije’s handwriting

The handwriting of the second Serbian scribe
Figure 2. A sample of the handwriting of the two Serbian scribes.

Second Handwriting (HM.SMS 280, 92v)  Dionisije’s handwriting (HM.SMS.93, 260v)
Figure 3. Comparison of HM.SMS.93, 260v (left) and HM.SMS.280, 92v (right)
Appendix B: HM.SMS.280 vs. Meščerskij’s *Teksty* – Parallel text
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Srb 2r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 218, footnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 2v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 217: 31–218: 5, footnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 3r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 218: 5–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 3v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 218: 20–219: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 4r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 219: 13–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 4v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 219: 13–220: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 5r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 220: 16–19 &amp; 223: 8–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 5v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 223: 20–28 &amp; 1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 6r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 223: 6–8 &amp; 225: 4–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 6v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 225: 16–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 7r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 225: 33–226: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 7v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 226: 15–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 8r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 226: 29–227: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 8v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 226: 8–16 &amp; 223: 29–224: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 9r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 224: 1–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 9v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 224: 14–225: 1 &amp; 220: 20–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 10r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 220: 21–221: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 10v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 221: 4–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 11r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 221: 19–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 11v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 222: 1–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 12r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 222: 17–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 12v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 222: 32–34 &amp; 227: 17–228: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 13r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 228: 1–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 13v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 228: 18–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 14r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 228: 18–229: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 14v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 229: 14–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 15v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 230: 13–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 16r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 230: 29–231: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 16v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 231: 7–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 17r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 231: 21–232: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 17v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 232: 3–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 18r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 232: 18–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 18v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 232: 32–233: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 19r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 233: 12–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 19v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 233: 27–234: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 20r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 234: 5–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 20v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 234: 18–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 21r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 234: 31–235: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 21v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 235: 9–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 22r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 235: 23–236: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 22v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 236: 2–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 23r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 236: 14–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 23v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 236: 26–237: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 24r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 237: 3–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 24v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 237: 16–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 25r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 237: 30–238: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 25v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 238: 8–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 26r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 238: 22–239: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 26v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 239: 2–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 27r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 239: 14–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 27v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 239: 28–240: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 28r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 240: 11–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 28v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 240: 26–241: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 29r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 241: 6–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 29v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 241: 20–242: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 30r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 242: 2–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 30</td>
<td>Meščerskij 242: 18–243: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 31r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 243: 10–244: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 31v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 244: 5–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 32r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 244: 19–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 32v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 245: 1–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 33r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 245: 18–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 33v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 245: 30–246: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 34r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 246: 9–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 34v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 246: 23–247: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 35r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 247: 4–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 35v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 247: 20–248: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 36r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 248: 1–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 36v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 248: 15–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 37r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 248: 28–249: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 37v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 249: 10–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 38r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 249: 25–250: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 38v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 250: 7–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 39r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 250: 23–251: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 39v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 251: 8–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 40r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 251: 25–252: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 40v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 252: 11–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 41r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 252: 25–253: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 41v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 253: 5–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 42r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 253: 19–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 42v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 253: 34–254: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 43r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 254: 12–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 43v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 254: 25–255: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 44r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 255: 5–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 44v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 255: 20–256: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 45r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 256: 4–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 45v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 256: 17–257: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 46r</td>
<td>Meščerski 257: 2–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 46v</td>
<td>Meščerski 257: 15–258: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 47r</td>
<td>Meščerski 258: 2–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 47v</td>
<td>Meščerski 258: 15–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 48r</td>
<td>Meščerski 258: 30–259: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 48v</td>
<td>Meščerski 259: 15–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 49r</td>
<td>Meščerski 259: 30–260: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 49v</td>
<td>Meščerski 260: 11–261: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 50r</td>
<td>Meščerski 261: 5–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 50v</td>
<td>Meščerski 261: 20–262: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 51r</td>
<td>Meščerski 262: 4–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 51v</td>
<td>Meščerski 262: 19–263: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 52r</td>
<td>Meščerski 263: 4–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 52v</td>
<td>Meščerski 263: 18–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 53r</td>
<td>Meščerski 264: 1–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 53v</td>
<td>Meščerski 264: 16–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 54r</td>
<td>Meščerski 264: 30–265: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 54v</td>
<td>Meščerski 265: 15–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 55r</td>
<td>Meščerski 265: 30–266: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 55v</td>
<td>Meščerski 266: 11–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 56r</td>
<td>Meščerski 266: 26–267: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 56v</td>
<td>Meščerski 267: 5–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 57r</td>
<td>Meščerski 267: 23–268: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 57v</td>
<td>Meščerski 268: 9–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 58r</td>
<td>Meščerski 268: 23–269: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 58v</td>
<td>Meščerski 269: 6–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 59r</td>
<td>Meščerski 269: 21–270: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 59v</td>
<td>Meščerski 270: 5–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 60r</td>
<td>Meščerski 270: 21–271: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 60v</td>
<td>Meščerski 271: 3–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 61r</td>
<td>Meščerski 271: 18–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 61v</td>
<td>Meščerski 271: 34–272: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 62r</td>
<td>Meščerski 272: 14–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 62v</td>
<td>Meščerski 272: 29–273: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 63r</td>
<td>Meščerski 273: 12–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 63v</td>
<td>Meščerski 273: 27–274: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 64r</td>
<td>Meščerski 274: 9–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 64v</td>
<td>Meščerski 274: 21–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 65r</td>
<td>Meščerski 274: 35–275: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 65v</td>
<td>Meščerski 275: 14–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 66r</td>
<td>Meščerski 275: 28–276: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 66v</td>
<td>Meščerski 276: 8–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 67r</td>
<td>Meščerski 276: 22–277: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 67v</td>
<td>Meščerski 277: 3–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB 68r</td>
<td>Meščerski 277: 16–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 68v</td>
<td>Meščerski 277: 31–278: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 69r</td>
<td>Meščerski 278: 12–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 69v</td>
<td>Meščerski 278: 25–279: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 70r</td>
<td>Meščerski 279: 5–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 70v</td>
<td>Meščerski 279: 21–280: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 71r</td>
<td>Meščerski 280: 4–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 71v</td>
<td>Meščerski 280: 19–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 72r</td>
<td>Meščerski 280: 35–281: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 72v</td>
<td>Meščerski 281: 18–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 73r</td>
<td>Meščerski 281: 31–282: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 73v</td>
<td>Meščerski 282: 16–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 74r</td>
<td>Meščerski 282: 30–283: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 74v</td>
<td>Meščerski 283: 9–21 &amp; 293: 27–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 75r</td>
<td>Meščerski 283: 29–294: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 75v</td>
<td>Meščerski 294: 5–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 76r</td>
<td>Meščerski 294: 21–295: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 76v</td>
<td>Meščerski 295: 4–5 &amp; 296: 14–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 77r</td>
<td>Meščerski 296: 26–297: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 77v</td>
<td>Meščerski 297: 6–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 78r</td>
<td>Meščerski 297: 21–298: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 78v</td>
<td>Meščerski 298: 5–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 79r</td>
<td>Meščerski 298: 19–299: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 79v</td>
<td>Meščerski 299: 3–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 80r</td>
<td>Meščerski 299: 19–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 80v</td>
<td>Meščerski 299: 34–300: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 81r</td>
<td>Meščerski 300: 14–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 81v</td>
<td>Meščerski 300: 29–301: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 82r</td>
<td>Meščerski 301: 10–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 82v</td>
<td>Meščerski 301: 27–302: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 83r</td>
<td>Meščerski 302 footnote &amp;12–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 83v</td>
<td>Meščerski 302: 18–303: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 84r</td>
<td>Meščerski 303: 11–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 84v</td>
<td>Meščerski 303: 26–304: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 85r</td>
<td>Meščerski 304: 9–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 85v</td>
<td>Meščerski 304: 26–305: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 86r</td>
<td>Meščerski 305: 9–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 86v</td>
<td>Meščerski 305: 24–306: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 87r</td>
<td>Meščerski 306: 8–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 87v</td>
<td>Meščerski 306: 24–307: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 88r</td>
<td>Meščerski 307: 5–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 88v</td>
<td>Meščerski 307: 21–308: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 89r</td>
<td>Meščerski 308: 3–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 89v</td>
<td>Meščerski 308: 18: 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 90r</td>
<td>Meščerski 308: 32–309: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 90v</td>
<td>Meščerski 309: 14–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 91r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 309: 30–310: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 91v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 310: 11–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 92r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 310: 26–311: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 92v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 311: 9–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 93r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 311: 22–312: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 93v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 312: 11–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 94r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 312: 26–313: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 94v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 313: 6–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 95r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 313: 20–314: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 95v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 314: 4–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 96r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 314: 18–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 96v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 314: 30–315: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 97r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 315: 11–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 97v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 315: 25–316: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 98r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 316: 5–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 98v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 316: 19–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 99r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 316: 32–317: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 99v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 317: 16–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 100r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 317: 30–318: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 100v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 318: 14–319: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 101r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 319: 8–320: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 101v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 320: 5–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 102r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 320: 19–321: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 102v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 321: 1–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 103r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 321: 14–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 103v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 321: 28–322: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 104r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 322: 7–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 104v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 322: 22–323: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 105r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 323: 2–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 105v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 323: 15–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 106r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 323: 29–324: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 106v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 324: 11–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 107r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 324: 25–325: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 107v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 325: 10–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 108r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 325: 24–326: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 108v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 326: 5–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 109r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 326: 21–327: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 109v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 327: 3–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 110r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 327: 17–328: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 110v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 328: 2–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 111r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 328: 16–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 111v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 328: 32–329: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 112r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 329: 13–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 112v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 329: 29–330: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 113r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 330: 12–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 113v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 330: 26–331: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 114r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 331: 7–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 114v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 331: 22–332: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 115r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 332: 5–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 115v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 332: 18–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 116r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 332: 32–333: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 116v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 333: 15–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 117r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 333: 30–334: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 117v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 334: 13–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 118r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 334: 27–335: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 118v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 335: 12–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 119r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 335: 27–336: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 119v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 336: 8–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 120r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 336: 22–337: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 120v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 337: 6–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 121r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 337: 21–338: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 121v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 338: 2–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 122r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 338: 18–339: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 122v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 339: 3–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 123r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 339: 19–340: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 123v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 340: 1–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 124r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 340: 15–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 124v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 340: 30–341: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 125r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 341: 13–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 125v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 341: 27–342: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 126r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 342: 9–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 126v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 342: 24–343: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 127r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 343: 10–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 127v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 343: 25–344: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 128r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 343: 11–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 128v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 343: 25–345: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 129r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 345: 9–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 129v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 345: 24–346: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 130r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 346: 8–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 130v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 346: 22–347: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 131r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 347: 6–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 131v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 347: 23–348: 2 &amp; footnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 132r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 348: 3–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 132v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 348: 22–349: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 133r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 349: 12: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 133v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 349: 29–350: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 134r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 350: 12–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 134v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 350: 27–351: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 135r</td>
<td>Meščerskij 351: 10–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 135v</td>
<td>Meščerskij 351: 28–352: 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Srb 136r  Meščerskij 352: 10–25
Srb 136v  Meščerskij 352: 25–353: 8
Srb 137r  Meščerskij 353: 10–26
Srb 137v  Meščerskij 353: 27–354: 7
Srb 138r  Meščerskij 354: 7–21
Srb 139r  Meščerskij 355: 6–23
Srb 139v  Meščerskij 355: 23–356: 6
Srb 140r  Meščerskij 356: 6–22
Srb 140v  Meščerskij 356: 22–357: 4
Srb 141r  Meščerskij 357: 4–20
Srb 141v  Meščerskij 357: 20–358: 4
Srb 142r  Meščerskij 358: 4–359: 15
Srb 142v  Meščerskij 359: 15–360: 7
Srb 143r  Meščerskij 360: 7–24
Srb 143v  Meščerskij 360: 24–361: 7
Srb 144r  Meščerskij 361: 7–21
Srb 144v  Meščerskij 361: 21–362: 3
Srb 145r  Meščerskij 362: 3–18
Srb 145v  Meščerskij 362: 18–363: 1
Srb 146r  Meščerskij 363: 1–17
Srb 146v  Meščerskij 363: 17–364: 4
Srb 147r  Meščerskij 364: 4–20
Srb 147v  Meščerskij 364: 20–365: 1
Srb 148r  Meščerskij 365: 1–17
Srb 148v  Meščerskij 365: 17–31
Srb 149r  Meščerskij 365: 31–366: 13
Srb 149v  Meščerskij 366: 13–28
Srb 150r  Meščerskij 366: 28–367: 10
Srb 150v  Meščerskij 367: 10–27
Srb 151r  Meščerskij 367: 27–368: 12
Srb 151v  Meščerskij 368: 12–27
Srb 152r  Meščerskij 368: 27–369: 8
Srb 152v  Meščerskij 369: 8–23
Srb 153r  Meščerskij 369: 23–370: 4
Srb 153v  Meščerskij 370: 4–19
Srb 154r  Meščerskij 370: 19–32
Srb 154v  Meščerskij 370: 32–371: 11
Srb 155r  Meščerskij 371: 11–26
Srb 155v  Meščerskij 371: 26–372: 10
Srb 156r  Meščerskij 372: 10–14 & footnote
Srb 156v  Meščerskij 372 footnote & 372/3: 16–2
Srb 157r  Meščerskij 373: 2–20
Srb 157v  Meščerskij 373: 20–374: 2
Srb 158r  Meščerskij 374: 2–16
| Srb 158v | Meščerskij 374: 16–31 |
| Srb 159r | Meščerskij 374: 31–375: 11 |
| Srb 159v | Meščerskij 374: 12–25 |
| Srb 160r | Meščerskij 374: 25–376–5 |
| Srb 160v | Meščerskij 376: 5–20 |
| Srb 161r | Meščerskij 376: 21–377: 2 |
| Srb 161v | Meščerskij 377: 2–18 |
| Srb 162r | Meščerskij 377: 18–33 |
| Srb 162v | Meščerskij 377: 33–378: 14 |
| Srb 163r | Meščerskij 378: 15–30 |
| Srb 163v | Meščerskij 378: 30–379–11 |
| Srb 164r | Meščerskij 379: 11–28 |
| Srb 164v | Meščerskij 379: 28–380: 10 |
| Srb 165r | Meščerskij 380: 10–25 |
| Srb 165v | Meščerskij 380: 25–381: 2 |
| Srb 166r | Meščerskij 381: 2–19 |
| Srb 166v | Meščerskij 381: 19–382: 1 |
| Srb 167r | Meščerskij 382: 1–14 |
| Srb 167v | Meščerskij 382: 14–30 |
| Srb 168r | Meščerskij 382: 30–383: 11 |
| Srb 168v | Meščerskij 383: 11–26 |
| Srb 169r | Meščerskij 383: 26–384: 8 |
| Srb 169v | Meščerskij 384: 8–24 |
| Srb 170r | Meščerskij 384: 24–385: 6 |
| Srb 170v | Meščerskij 385: 6–21 |
| Srb 171r | Meščerskij 385: 21–386: 2 |
| Srb 171v | Meščerskij 386: 2–17 |
| Srb 172r | Meščerskij 386: 17–33 |
| Srb 172v | Meščerskij 386: 33–387: 13 |
| Srb 173r | Meščerskij 387: 13–30 |
| Srb 173v | Meščerskij 387: 30–388: 12 |
| Srb 174r | Meščerskij 388: 12–27 |
| Srb 174v | Meščerskij 388: 27–389: 8 |
| Srb 175r | Meščerskij 389: 8–22 |
| Srb 175v | Meščerskij 389: 22–390: 3 |
| Srb 176r | Meščerskij 390: 3–18 |
| Srb 176v | Meščerskij 390: 19–35 |
| Srb 177r | Meščerskij 390: 35–391: 15 |
| Srb 177v | Meščerskij 391: 15–28 |
| Srb 178r | Meščerskij 391: 28–392: 7 |
| Srb 178v | Meščerskij 392: 7–21 |
| Srb 179r | Meščerskij 392: 21–393: 1 |
| Srb 179v | Meščerskij 393: 1–15 |
| Srb 180r | Meščerskij 393: 16–29 |
| Srb 180v | Meščerskij 393: 29–394: 8 |
Srb 181r  Mešcerskj 394: 8–23
Srb 181v  Mešcerskj 394: 23–395: 1
Srb 182r  Mešcerskj 395: 1–15
Srb 182v  Mešcerskj 395: 15–29
Srb 183r  Mešcerskj 395: 29–397: 5
Srb 183v  Mešcerskj 397: 6–20
Srb 184r  Mešcerskj 397: 20–398: 14
Srb 184v  Mešcerskj 398: 14–27
Srb 185r  Mešcerskj 398: 27–399: 4
Srb 185v  Mešcerskj 399: 4–19
Srb 186r  Mešcerskj 399: 20–400: 1
Srb 186v  Mešcerskj 400: 1–15
Srb 187r  Mešcerskj 400: 15–30
Srb 187v  Mešcerskj 400: 30–401: 10
Srb 188r  Mešcerskj 401: 10–26
Srb 188v  Mešcerskj 401: 26–402: 6
Srb 189r  Mešcerskj 402: 6–19
Srb 189v  Mešcerskj 402: 19–33
Srb 190r  Mešcerskj 402: 33–403: 14
Srb 190v  Mešcerskj 403: 14–28
Srb 191r  Mešcerskj 403: 28–404: 8
Srb 191v  Mešcerskj 404: 8–23
Srb 192r  Mešcerskj 404: 23–405: 5
Srb 192v  Mešcerskj 405: 5–19
Srb 193r  Mešcerskj 405: 19–32
Srb 193v  Mešcerskj 405: 32–406: 7
Srb 194r  Mešcerskj 406: 7–22
Srb 194v  Mešcerskj 406: 22–35
Srb 195r  Mešcerskj 406: 35–407: 16
Srb 195v  Mešcerskj 407: 16–30
Srb 196r  Mešcerskj 407: 30–408: 11
Srb 196v  Mešcerskj 408: 11–28
Srb 197r  Mešcerskj 408: 28–409: 7
Srb 197v  Mešcerskj 409: 7–20
Srb 198r  Mešcerskj 409: 20–35
Srb 198v  Mešcerskj 410: 1–17
Srb 199r  Mešcerskj 410: 17–33
Srb 199v  Mešcerskj 410: 33–411: 12
Srb 200r  Mešcerskj 411: 12–26
Srb 200v  Mešcerskj 411: 26–412: 7
Srb 201r  Mešcerskj 412: 7–24
Srb 201v  Mešcerskj 412: 24–413: 3
Srb 202r  Mešcerskj 413: 3–19
Srb 202v  Mešcerskj 413: 19–35
Srb 203r  Mešcerskj 413: 35–414: 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stranica</th>
<th>Meščerski broj</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>Page 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Srb 203v</td>
<td>Meščerski 414: 15–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 204r</td>
<td>Meščerski 414: 30–415: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 204v</td>
<td>Meščerski 415: 13–29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 205r</td>
<td>Meščerski 415: 29–416: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 205v</td>
<td>Meščerski 416: 8–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 206r</td>
<td>Meščerski 416: 24–417: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 206v</td>
<td>Meščerski 417: 8–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 207r</td>
<td>Meščerski 417: 24–418: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 207v</td>
<td>Meščerski 418: 2–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 208r</td>
<td>Meščerski 418: 18–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 208v</td>
<td>Meščerski 418: 35–419–14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 209r</td>
<td>Meščerski 419: 14–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 209v</td>
<td>Meščerski 419: 30–420: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 210r</td>
<td>Meščerski 420: 12–28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 210v</td>
<td>Meščerski 420: 28–421: 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 211r</td>
<td>Meščerski 421: 8–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 211v</td>
<td>Meščerski 421: 24–422: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 212r</td>
<td>Meščerski 422: 4–19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 212v</td>
<td>Meščerski 422: 19–423: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 213r</td>
<td>Meščerski 423: 1–16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 213v</td>
<td>Meščerski 423: 16–31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 214r</td>
<td>Meščerski 423: 31–424: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 214v</td>
<td>Meščerski 424: 12–27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 215r</td>
<td>Meščerski 424: 27–425: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 215v</td>
<td>Meščerski 425: 10–26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 216r</td>
<td>Meščerski 425: 26–426: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 216v</td>
<td>Meščerski 426: 6–21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 217r</td>
<td>Meščerski 426: 21–427: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 217v</td>
<td>Meščerski 427: 2–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 218r</td>
<td>Meščerski 427: 18–428: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 218v</td>
<td>Meščerski 428: 5–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 219r</td>
<td>Meščerski 428: 20–429: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 219v</td>
<td>Meščerski 429: 2–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 220r</td>
<td>Meščerski 429: 18–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 220v</td>
<td>Meščerski 429: 34–14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 221r</td>
<td>Meščerski 429: 14–31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 221v</td>
<td>Meščerski 429: 31–431: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 222r</td>
<td>Meščerski 431: 13–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 222v</td>
<td>Meščerski 431: 30–432: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 223r</td>
<td>Meščerski 432: 11–29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 223v</td>
<td>Meščerski 432: 29–433: 434: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 224r</td>
<td>Meščerski 434: 2–19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 224v</td>
<td>Meščerski 434: 19–435: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 225r</td>
<td>Meščerski 435: 11–26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srb 225v</td>
<td>Meščerski 435: 26–436: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Srb 226r  Meščerskij 436: 6–25
Srb 226v  Meščerskij 436: 25–437: 9