

Jonah 3:3: A Reflection of Jewish Exegesis in the Croatian Church Slavonic Missals?

Author(s): Andrew R. Corin

Source: *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Spring, 2002), pp. 125-149

Published by: American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3086234>

Accessed: 30-10-2019 01:51 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavic and East European Journal*

JONAH 3:3: A REFLECTION OF JEWISH EXEGESIS IN THE CROATIAN CHURCH SLAVONIC MISSALS?*

Andrew R. Corin, University of California, Los Angeles/United Nations

1. Introduction

The Croatian Church Slavonic (henceforth, CCS) Book of Jonah reveals within its four short chapters a remarkably complex relationship among the four main CCS redactions, between the CCS versions and those of the Orthodox Slavs, and between the CCS versions and those (both Greek and Latin) which served as authoritative sources for the various Church Slavonic traditions. A single verse (3:3) of this text, originally translated from the Greek in the ninth century, contains examples of three distinct classes of textual variation between the two main redactions of CCS missals. These three classes of variation correspond *ipso facto* to three distinct classes of relationship between the CCS versions and those of the Orthodox Slavs. At one location within this verse, the text of the B redaction (the younger, dating probably from the beginning of the fourteenth century) is adapted toward the reading found in the Vulgate, while the text of the A redaction (an older, thirteenth-century version) remains true to the original ninth-century translation from the Greek. At a second location in this verse the text of both the A and the B redaction is adapted toward the Vulgate, while at a third location the two CCS redactions diverge in a manner which cannot be explained in terms of gradual adaptation of the original translation (from the Greek) toward the text found in the Vulgate. At this third location the variant in the B redaction derives from one branch of the Latin stemma. That which is found in the older A redaction, however, appears to reflect an interpretation current within Southern French Jewish exegetical circles at the time when that redaction was carried out (second quarter of the thirteenth century). This example thus suggests a previously unknown source of influence upon one of the CCS textual traditions, and allows us, moreover, to infer the mechanisms by which this influence may have been brought about. Analysis of Jonah 3:3 in the CCS missals thus increases our awareness not only of the relationships among the various Church Slavonic

textual traditions, but also of the broader interconnectedness of European intellectual and spiritual communities during the thirteenth century.

2. *The Parimeinik and Preslav Translations of Jonah*

The Slavonic¹ translations of the book of Jonah have been an object of scholarly interest for about one hundred years. Nahtigal and Mikhailov noted that this book, alone among those of the Twelve Prophets, is included in full in the parimeinik (the Slavonic Old Testament lectionary), just as it is in the Greek prophetologion from which the Slavonic lectionary was translated. These scholars established, moreover, that the Preslav version (otherwise known as the Symeon or commented version) presents an entirely different translation from that found in the parimeinik. This is striking in the light of Evseev's hypothesis that the literati of the Preslav school adopted a deferential, almost reverent, attitude toward the parimeinik translation.²

The Preslav version has received two modern editions, by Tunitsky (1918) and Zlatanova (1998). An exemplar of the parimeinik version has yet to be published, as Brandt's (1894, 1901) edition of the Grigorovič Parimeinik ceased following the first three fascicles. (The recent edition of the Grigorovič Parimeinik [Ribarova, Zdenka and Zoe Hauptova, ed. *Grigorovičev parimejnik. 1. Tekst so kritički aparat*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite, 1998] was not yet available during the preparation of this article.)

In 1987 Ribarova published a study and critical text of the book of Jonah in the Croatian Church Slavonic breviaries. The author demonstrated conclusively that this version reflects the same translation as is found in the parimeinik. Moreover, in certain respects it maintains a purer, more archaic version of this translation than is found in any Cyrillic codex.³

Ribarova also included a shorter discussion of the version of Jonah contained in the CCS missals. She found that it reflects the same "parimeinik" translation as is found in the breviaries, but with a number of adaptations toward the Vulgate.⁴ However, she did not attempt a detailed analysis of this version (actually, as we shall see below, of these versions).

In recent years Bauerová (1986, 1987, 1989, 1991) has devoted a series of articles to the Slavonic text of the Twelve Prophets, including Jonah, also basing her work primarily on the version found in the CCS breviaries.

Finally, Zlatanova also devotes several pages to the text of the Twelve Prophets found in the CCS breviaries. She notes as well the presence of this book in the Oxford Missal-Breviary and the New York Missal,⁵ but does not attempt an analysis of the versions contained in the missals.

3. *Jonah in the CCS Missals*

3.1. The A and B Versions. Of the Slavonic versions of Jonah, then, those found in the CCS missals have been least studied.⁶ In line with what is known about other Biblical lections found in the missals, we have several

expectations. First, we expect to find two versions of the text — an A (often referred to as northern) and B (referred to also as southern) — reflecting two redactions, earlier and later, respectively.⁷ We expect the A version to be nearer to the Greek original, the B exhibiting a greater degree of adaptation toward the readings found in the Vulgate. We also expect to find some (albeit fewer) adaptations toward the Vulgate already in the A version.

This is in fact what we find, as illustrated in Tables 1 and 2. In a single verse (Jonah 3:3) we find both:

Table 1: Adaptation of Redaction B Toward the Vulgate

Cf. the English Authorized Version's: *Now Nineveh . . .* Both CCS Redaction A and the Septuagint (henceforth LXX) contain an enclitic (post-posed) conjunction or particle, in contrast to the proclitic (preposed) conjunction of CCS redaction B and the Vulgate.

CCS Missal Redaction A:	nevđi že ⁸	LXX:	ἦ δὲ Νινευη
CCS Missal Redaction B:	I nev'đit	Vulgate:	Et Nineve

and:

Table 2: Adaptation of Redactions A and B Toward the Vulgate

Cf. the English Authorized: . . . *according to the word of the Lord.* CCS Redactions A and B contain a prepositional phrase, in agreement with the Vulgate (and the English Authorized Version). The LXX, in contrast, uses a subordinate clause.

CCS Missal Redaction A:	po slovesi g<ospod>nju	LXX:	καθὼς ἐλάλησε κύριος
CCS Missal Redaction B:	po s<love>si g<ospod>nju	Vulgate:	iuxta verbum Domini

3.2 A Problematical Divergence Between the A and B Versions. Alongside redactional features which seem to reflect a progressive adaptation of the CCS Scriptural texts toward those found in the Vulgate, other divergences exist which cannot be easily accounted for in this manner. Some appear to parallel differences between the various Greek versions, suggesting the possibility (though certainly not proving) that one CCS version of the text in question may have been corrected at some point in its transmission against a Greek version different from the one from which it was originally translated (see Zlatanova 35, 38–39). Other such divergences appear to defy explanation in this manner.

Jonah 3:3 also contains one such problematic divergence. The Slavonic versions, along with those important for establishing their textual heritage, are as follows⁹:

Table 3: Jonah 3:3 in CCS Compared with Cyrillic (i.e., Orthodox) Slavonic, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and English (Authorized) Versions

Croatian Missal Redaction A (based on Vat4¹⁰):

I vstav' ijuna ide¹¹ v nevđi¹², po slovesi g<ospod>nju, nevđi¹³ že bē grad' veli zēlo, ēko šistiē puti tri d<l>ni —,

Croatian Missal Redaction B (based on Berlin¹⁴):

V'stav¹⁵ že ijuna i ide v' nev'điti po s<love>si g<ospod>nju, I nev' điti bē g'radl velikl, ē šasitiē p<u>ti tri d'ni,

Croatian Breviary Redaction A (Ribarova's reconstruction):

i vstav' ijuna i ide v nevđiju ēkože g<lago>lahь, Nevđi že bē gradь veliki b<og>u, ēko šastiē puti trimь d<ь>nemь,

Parimeinik translation (based on QpI #51¹⁶):

и вѣста ивна иде въ невѣгнѣ ѣкоже гл̑а г̑ь · нинеѣги же бѣ градъ
велен бѣ · ѣко шьствиѣ похти · г̑ · ми дн̑ьми ·

“Symeon” Translation (from Tunitsky):

и вѣста ивна и вѣниде въ нинеѣгнѣ такоже гл̑а г̑ь:
Нинеѣги же бѣаше градъ великъ бѣи. тако трии день пѣтъ:

LXX (from Ziegler):

καὶ ἀνέστη Ἰωνᾶς καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς Νινευθ, καθὼς ἐλάλησε κύριος ἡ
δὲ Νινευθ ἦν πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ ὡσεὶ πορείας ὁδοῦ ἡμερῶν τριῶν.

Vulgate (from *Biblia Sacra: Duodecim Prophetæ*)

et surrexit Iona. et abiit in Niniven iuxta verbum Domini
et Nineve erat civitas magna Dei itinere dierum trium

Masoretic¹⁷:

וַיָּקָם יוֹנָה וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶל־נִיְנְוֵה פְּדַבְרַ יְיָ וַיִּגְנַה הַיְתָה עִיר־אֲדוֹלָה לְאַלְהֵים
מִהַר שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים
vāyyâqâm yônâ(h) vāyyēlēkh 'ēl-nîṇəvē(h) kīdhəbhār YHWH
vənîṇəvē(h) hāyəthâ(h) 'îr-gədhôlâ(h) lē(')lôhîm māhə^alăkh šəlôšəth
yâmîm

English Authorized (i.e., King James) Version:

So Jonah arose, and went unto Nineveh, according to the word of the Lord. Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city of three days' journey.

The adverb *zělo* ‘very, exceedingly’ of the phrase *nevďi že bě grad’ veli zělo* in the A version is not rendered in the B version, while in the breviary we find the unclear *bogu* ‘to God’ (dative). The latter reading corresponds to that found in both major Cyrillic versions, and was clearly present in both original 9th-century translations.

The question therefore arises: what is the source of the reading *zělo* in the A version? Three solutions present themselves: 1) this reading results from an error — a misinterpretation, *lapsus calami*, or interpolation — in the prototype (redaction) of this version, which was then carried over into all of the copies, being eradicated only upon the establishment of the B redaction; 2) this reading has a textual prototype in a Slavonic, Latin, or even Greek manuscript used in the preparation of the A redaction; 3) this reading reflects a conscious innovation in the A redaction resulting from an innovative interpretation of the explicit meaning of the text by the people responsible for its compilation. The goal of the present article is to analyze these three possibilities and to decide which is most likely.

4. History of Interpretation and Translation of Jonah

Before attempting to explain the unexpected reading in the CCS A version, we must understand the history of interpretation and translation of this location, as best it can be reconstructed. Bearing in mind Smalley’s admonition (*Study* xii) that only a small proportion of Medieval Biblical exegesis has come down to us, and that, moreover, little of the extant corpus is available for inspection in modern publications, the essential points in this development nevertheless emerge clearly.

4.1 The Interpretation. The underlying Hebrew phrase עִיר־גְּדוֹלָה לְאֱלֹהִים *‘ir-ghədôlâ(h) lē(‘)lôhîm*, literally ‘city great to God,’ is itself not clear, and has been the subject of commentary by both Jewish and Christian exegetes.

4.1.1 Jewish Interpretation. Among the Jews this phrase has been discussed since at least the 12th century (cf. Thomas, Zlotowitz, Lockshin). Several scholars of that period interpreted לְאֱלֹהִים *lē(‘)lôhîm* ‘to God’ as connoting, or even explicitly expressing, a meaning of extreme size or degree (henceforth referred to as superlative meaning). Thus Radak (Rabbi David Kimchi, 1160–1235) imputed to the larger phrase the meaning of “an enormously large city” (as paraphrased by Zlotowitz 120). R. Bachya (Rabbi Bachya ben Asher, 13th century) suggested that “something of such great power is not to be attributed to human resources, but to the power of God” (in Zlotowitz’s paraphrase—120). Rashbam (Rabbi Shmuel ben Meir, 11th–12th century) interpreted the phrase as meaning: “In all of God’s world there was never a city as large as Nineveh” (Zlotowitz 120, Lockshin 152). In contrast, Rabbi Avraham Ibn Ezra (1089–1164) “conjec-

tures that this phrase implies that Nineveh had previously been a city of God-fearing people but had in Jonah's time deteriorated, and become sinful" (as interpreted¹⁸ by Zlotowitz 120).

It is clear then that the expression לַאֱלֹהִים *lē(')lōhîm* 'to God' in Jonah 3:3 was widely, though not universally, understood to express or connote superlative meaning by 12th- and 13th-century Jewish exegetes. Moreover, this location was seen as parallel to others in which the adjunction to a noun of a term for God rendered superlative meaning. Radak, the leading Hebrew grammarian of his time, saw this example as parallel to Psalm 36:7, Psalm 80:11, Song of Songs 8:6, and Jeremiah 2:31 (see §4.3.2). Rashbam, in expressing his similar conclusion (in his discussion of Genesis 27:7), compared the expression in Jonah 3:3 to one found at Genesis 10:9.¹⁹

The difficulty with the superlative interpretation of the Hebrew phrase, and thus perhaps the reason why it failed to attain universal recognition among the Jewish exegetes,²⁰ derives from the fact that it differs in construction from all of the other examples in which a term for God is seen as imparting superlative meaning. In the other instances cited by Radak we find a genitive construction consisting of a *noun* (i.e., *substantive*) in construct with one of the godly terms other than the tetragrammaton,²¹ of the type *îr-'ēlōhîm*, literally 'city of God' (though this specific example does not occur). In Jonah 3:3, in contrast, the term for divinity follows an adjective, גְּדוֹלָה *ghədōlā(h)* 'large, great,' which would be superfluous if the intended meaning of the narrower phrase were already a superlative one. Moreover, the simple preposition לְ *lə* 'to, dative'²² appears nowhere else in Hebrew Scripture in phrases for which superlative force has been claimed.

The parallel cited by Rashbam, in contrast, contains the prepositional phrase לְפָנַי *lipnē(y) YHWH*, literally 'to/before the face of God,' metaphorically also 'in the eyes (i.e., judgment) of God.' In this latter construction (which, incidentally, is discussed by neither Thomas nor Sasson) there is no objection to seeing an *implication* of great size or stature, deriving from an explicit meaning which does not depart from the usual (literal) meanings of the words themselves.

These considerations taken together favor a more straightforward, literal reading of the phrase עִיר־גְּדוֹלָה לַאֱלֹהִים *îr-ghədōlā(h) lē(')lōhîm*, 'city great to God,' taking the preposition לְ as imparting its basic, dative (or perhaps secondary, genitive; see note 22), meaning, while the contextual meaning of the phrase remains unclear.

4.1.2 Christian Interpretation. In the various Late Antique and Medieval Christian commentaries on the Twelve Prophets, the phrase לַאֱלֹהִים *lē(')lōhîm* 'to God' and its translations either is not discussed or is provided with a distinctly non-superlative interpretation.

Among the commentaries likely to have been known among Croatian

Glagolites (bearing in mind that no evidence for their presence in this region has been established) are those by Jerome (see Antin 93a–94b), the abbreviated version of the commentary by Theodoret of Cyrhus (see Zlatanova, Tunitsky) which is found in the Slavonic (Cyrillic) commented Jonah, and possibly that by Theophylactos of Ohrid (*PG* 126:905–68), though neither a Slavonic nor Latin translation of his commentary is known from an early enough time to have affected the issue dealt with here.²³ In Jerome’s commentary on Jonah 3:3 the phrase is ignored, and attention is focused on the following *itinere dierum trium*,²⁴ which is itself subject to various interpretations (see Antin 93a–94b). The abridged Slavonic translation of Theodoret’s commentary (which follows the modern verses 3b and 4) does not support a superlative interpretation. The first clause of the commentary distorts the meaning of the Greek source text by a literal translation, the translator having failed to understand the Greek idiom. However, the sentence as a whole clearly claims that the size of the city, expressed by the adjective **великъ** ‘large,’ motivates God to attempt to save the city:

Нινевѣи же бѣаше гра великъ бѣ· такоже трѣи днѣ пѣ· ...
 Многа дѣла бѣ семоу градоу строаше спѣс· имже и многа чл бѣахѣ
 въ немъ· и вбразь дааше вѣсѣмь члкомъ ѡ покаяніи ...

Theodoret’s full commentary (see *PG* 81:1733), in contrast, contains the somewhat clearer explanation:

“Ἡ δὲ Νινευὶ, φησὶν, ἦν πόλις μεγάλη τῷ Θεῷ, ὡσεὶ πορείας ὁδοῦ ἡμερῶν τριῶν.” Περὶ πολλοῦ, φησὶν, ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ταύτης ἐποιεῖτο σωτηρίαν, ἅτε δὴ πολλοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ διαπλάσας ἀνθρώπους. Τὸ δὲ, “Ὡσεὶ πορείας ὁδοῦ . . .

“Nineveh,” it says, “was a city great to God, as of three days travel.” God, it says, considered its [i.e., Nineveh’s] salvation important, as he had formed many people within it. The “as of three days travel” . . .

The second sentence (i.e., the first sentence of commentary) definitely refers to the phrase πόλις μεγάλη τῷ Θεῷ. According to it, the meaning of great size is borne either by the adjective μεγάλη or the following ὡσεὶ πορείας ὁδοῦ ἡμερῶν τριῶν (or, more likely, by both together), the reference to God indicating one *consequence* of this size — viz., the city’s importance in the eyes of God and, therefore, God’s insistence on an attempt to save Nineveh (presumably, despite the fact that it was not a Hebrew city). Clearly, Theodoret did not see the reference to God as an *expression* of the city’s great size. Theophylactos incorporates Theodoret’s commentary into his own and expands upon it:

Ἡ δὲ Νινευὶ, φησὶν, ἦν πόλις μεγάλη τῷ Θεῷ ὡσεὶ πορείας ὁδοῦ τριῶν ἡμερῶν. Μεγάλη ἦν Νινευὶ τῷ μεγέθει, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ μεγάλη ἦν, καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ἐποιεῖτο τὴν αὐτῆς σωτηρίαν, ἅτε δὴ πολλοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ διαπλάσας ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τούτους πάντας σωθῆναι θέλων. Τὸ δὲ “Ὡσεὶ πορείας ὁδὸν . . .

“Nineveh,” it says, “was a city great to God, as of three days travel.” Nineveh was great in size, and thus was also great to [i.e., in the eyes of] God, and (God) considered its [i.e., Nineveh’s] salvation important, as he had formed many people within it, and he desired to save them all. The “as of three days travel” . . .

making it absolutely clear that he intended no superlative interpretation of the phrase τῷ Θεῷ.²⁵

Of the commentaries less likely to have been known among the Croatian Glagolites, but nevertheless of importance for the development of 12th- and 13th-century Western exegesis, most prominent would be those emanating from Paris. Bearing still in mind that only a portion of the exegetical corpus of that period is available to modern investigators, it would seem that Parisian exegesis favored a translation of Jonah 3:3 in which *dei* was simply omitted. Thus the *Glossa Ordinaria*²⁶ (which I have examined according to the 1480/81 *editio princeps*; see Rusch 402) fails to cite or discuss either *dei* or any of the non-null variants. The same is true of the postilla on Jonah by Nicholas of Lyre (c. 1270–1349), which I have examined according to the 1492 edition (Nicholas of Lyre 1971).

4.2 The Translations. While the Christian commentators appear to have shown relatively little interest in the phrase which concerns us, the translators and scribes seem to have been severely exercised by it, and they are far from unanimous in their solutions. The various Greek versions in which Jonah 3:3 is preserved (Quinta and the several redactions of the LXX) do, it is true, uniformly translate the phrase literally, i.e. as πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ/κυριῷ (Ziegler 249). Sasson, moreover, finds that *none* of the ancient translations expresses a superlative meaning in this phrase, and that all except the Vulgate and the Arabic translate it literally (228). This is especially noteworthy in the case of the Targum (Aramaic translation and/or interpretation), whose compilers translated *ad sensus*, occasionally paraphrasing, with the intent of providing the broad populace with access to the sense of Scripture (see Levine *passim*, esp. 15, 18).²⁷

The solutions found in the Latin versions, however, differ both among themselves and from those found in the Greek. Since Jerome’s commentary (in a majority of manuscripts) cites the phrase as *civitas magna dei* ‘great/large city of God,’ and this reading is also reconstructed in *Biblia Sacra: Duodecim Prophetarum* (166) from the combined testimony of the Alcuinian (including *Codex Amiatinus*) and Theodulphian manuscript families, it would appear certain that the original Vulgate (i.e., Jerome’s translation) contained this phrase so rendered. However, in the manuscripts the readings *dñi* (i.e., *domini*), *die*, *de*, and *et* also appear, while many manuscripts simply do not render the phrase לַאֱלֹהִים *lē(‘)lōhīm* ‘to God’ in any form (viz., *civitas magna itinere* . . .). One manuscript and one of the correctoria also cite in their margins *magni dei* as an alternate reading.

Disagreements as to the explicit meaning of this phrase, and thus as to its correct translation, go back at least as far as Jerome. His translation *dei*, in the genitive case, departs from the model of the Greek τῷ θεῷ, which must already have existed at this time since all of the extant Greek versions agree upon it (or κυριῷ). Clearly, he was aware of this translation and rejected it. Had he been uncertain as to the contextual meaning of the Hebrew expression and wished to render it as literally as possible, the expected result would have been dative case, as in the Greek, since this renders the more basic meaning of Hebrew לַיהוָה. Had he viewed the phrase לִפְנֵי לַיהוָה *lē(')lōhîm* 'to God' as synonymous with those containing לִפְנֵי לַיהוָה *lipnê(y)* 'to/before the face of' or similar plus a term for God (which do easily admit, or even demand, an *inference* of extraordinary size or importance), his expected translation would be *coram domino*, as in other such instances (e.g., Genesis 10:9). Had he, like Radak, seen this Hebrew expression as a variant of genitive constructions in which a name of God is used to express superlative meaning, he could have given some indication of this either implicitly, by the use of the dative case (i.e., adhering to the model of the Greek translation) or *coram domino*, or explicitly, by wording such as *valde magna* or similar. By a process of elimination, then, we are forced to conclude that Jerome probably interpreted the preposition לַיהוָה here as having genitive – possessive – meaning, i.e., an explicit, meaning corresponding to the literal meaning of his translation. In any case, his translation provides no indication that he imputed superlative meaning, either explicit or implicit, to the Hebrew expression.

Strikingly, the superlative reading resurfaces in the English Authorized (i.e., King James) Version. Here, according to Thomas (211), it surely results from interaction between Christian and Jewish scholarship. Such interaction had begun to develop in England no later than the 13th century.²⁸

The A redaction of the Croatian Church Slavonic missal thus stands alone among the Medieval and Late Antique versions in rendering (indirectly, in this case) עִיר־גְּדוֹלָה לַיהוָה *'îr-ghədôlâ(h) lē(')lōhîm*, 'city great to God' with an explicitly superlative wording. The source of this translation appears to be both clear and enigmatic. It is clear in that there can be no doubt which of the possible explanations is the correct one: that based on an interpretation by the people responsible for this redaction. It is enigmatic in that the eastern Dalmatian littoral is not among the first places in Europe in which we would expect such an interpretation to have arisen among 13th-century textual revisers.²⁹

4.3 The Differing Attitude of Christian Commentators and Translators. It may seem odd that commentators exhibited little interest in the phrase עִיר־גְּדוֹלָה לַיהוָה *'îr-ghədôlâ(h) lē(')lōhîm*, 'city great to God' and its various translations, while translators from Jerome onward (and perhaps even

before him: this location in the Hexapla is not preserved) appear to have struggled with it, unable to reach a consensus.³⁰ In fact, this apparent paradox reflects an ongoing tension (and in later centuries also *contention*) which existed within Christian (but also Jewish!) exegesis from the early Christian centuries onward. As has been shown by Smalley, until the 12th century Western (Catholic) commentators practiced almost exclusively the mode of exegesis established by the Alexandrian school.³¹ This approach, which went back at least to Origen and his teachers, who themselves owed much of their direction to the first-century Jewish commentator Philo, focused primarily on the allegorical meaning of Scripture at the expense of the literal, on the assumption that the intrinsic content and message of Scripture was to be found in its prophesy of events revealed in the New Testament and of those yet to be revealed. Difficulties in the specific wording of passages could in many cases be ignored as insignificant.

The primary competitor to Alexandrian exegesis in Late Antiquity was the Antioch school, which emphasized interpretation of the literal meaning of Scripture (see Smalley 14ff.). Memory of this school faded in Europe, so that its accomplishments were irrelevant to developments in Medieval Western Europe. Yet even its outstanding representative, Theodore of Mopsuestia, ignored this phrase, choosing rather to discuss the following ὡσεὶ πορείας ὁδοῦ ἡμερῶν τριῶν (Sprenger 185).

5. Explanation of CCS Version A

Let us now review the three possible explanations mentioned above so as to determine whether the one positing a conscious intervention in the text, based on an original interpretation of it, is indeed the only likely one.

5.1 Explanation by Error.

5.1.1 *Lapsus calami.* Explanation by *lapsus calami* (slip of the pen) in the strict sense can be ruled out, in that there is no likely scribal error which could account for such a transformation, other than those which might also be subsumed under the heading of interpolation (see §4.1.3).

5.1.2 Misinterpretation. Explanation by misinterpretation would begin from an abbreviated form of **Б҃҃҃҃** *bogu* ‘God, dative’ as **Б҃** in the phrase *gradъ veli bogu* ‘city great to God,’ and would depend on a misreading of this word as **З҃҃҃҃** *zělo* ‘very.’ This, in turn, would entail: 1) misinterpretation of the **Б** “b” in the abbreviated form as **З** “z,” which is the usual abbreviation for *zělo*³²; and 2) failure to note the presence of the dative desinence *-u*.

The misreading of **Б** as **З** is unlikely, but nevertheless cannot be ruled out since we cannot know in what manner the antegraph might have been

damaged or altered. However, it is hard to imagine a scribe so poorly trained that he would fail to note and properly interpret the following desinenca if it were clearly present. The antigraph would have to be severely damaged in order for this to occur. Yet it is hardly likely that a new redaction would be undertaken working from such a poor original. If the original was indeed damaged, surely the compiler(s) of the new redaction would have sought confirmation from some other manuscript.

There was yet another clue available to the compilers which should have prevented any possibility of misinterpretation, at least of the type examined here. In extant manuscripts the abbreviation лѣ for лѣнѣ is accomplished through the usual technique of abbreviation—contraction, indicated by the *titla* over the contracted portion of the word. The modifier ѣнѣ , in contrast, belongs to a small set of words abbreviated *per suspensionem*, indicated by an alternate form of the *titla*, usually in the form of a short diagonal stroke: ѣ . The absence of this alternate form of the *titla* would be one more indication to a trained scribe—as surely the compiler of any new redaction would be—that the proper interpretation of the word in question was not ѣнѣ . Once again, only a severely damaged antigraph, hardly the proper starting point for a new redaction, could support such an interpretation.

5.1.3 Interpolation. The possibility that the redactor interpolated at this location must be considered.³³ It is not unknown for a scribe to include into his text material taken from a commentary on that text. This is most likely to occur when the scribe is copying out of a manuscript which contains both the text being copied and commentary on that text. Mikhailov reported such a location, for example, in the version of Job preserved in the Gennady Bible (Mikhailov 439). Similarly, interpolation can occur if a scribe or redactor carries in memory a passage from commentaries, or perhaps from some synoptic or similarly worded location parallel to, but different in detail from, that in the text being copied. Finally, interpolation can also occur if the scribe or redactor is extracting text from a location in which portions of two distinct texts have been joined together to form a single reading as, for example, in the first reading for the sixth Saturday of Lent in the CCS missals, in which portions of Wisdom and Jeremiah are combined into a single reading. In regard to Jonah 3:3 each of these possibilities may be discounted.

Mechanical interpolation of text from a commentary is out of the question. There exists no Slavonic commentary which contains the expression *veli zĕlo* at this location. Moreover, the redactor was not translating, but revising an existing translation which already contained the expression *veli bogu*. The authoritative text against which he was correcting his Slavonic version was a Latin one; as we have seen, there is no evidence for a Latin

commentary proposing a superlative interpretation (aside from which a Latin word order corresponding to Slavonic *veli zělo*, i.e., *magna valde*, would be unusual). Jerome's commentary contains the expression *civitas magna et tanti ambitus ut . . .*, which could not lead the reviser to such a solution as *veli zělo*. For these same reasons, there is no possibility that the redactor might have accidentally interpolated into the text wording from a commentary which was ingrained in his memory.

There remains the possibility that the redactor might have accidentally interpolated this phrase from some other biblical location containing a similar phrase. However, such an interpolation could only occur at a textual location which did not draw the attention of scribes or revisers to it, during the copying of which they could have become distracted. Jonah 3:3, to the contrary, represented a well-known difficulty more likely to draw a sigh of despair from the reviser than to be passed over unnoticed (see note 26). Yet even had his attention not been drawn to it, what should have remained was the wording *bogu* 'to God,' rather than *zělo* 'very.'

Finally, the implausibility here of interpolation due to the joining together of two distinct texts is obvious, since there was no joining of texts at this location.

5.1.4 Would an Error Have Been Corrected? One further factor should be considered. Even had a new redaction contained a mistake, we would expect that mistake to have been corrected over the course of transmission in at least some manuscripts. Yet this did not occur, even though the "correct" reading was available in the breviary: the word *bogu* appears nowhere in the A version of the missal, nor is the original phrase לאלהים left untranslated in any of the manuscripts of this version. This is especially striking in that Jonah was clearly one of the best known Scriptural books, and it is hardly likely that no readers or listeners would have noticed the presence of a "mistake" in one of its passages.³⁴ Although we cannot know, in a positive sense, how the reading with *zělo* was received in the Glagolite community, it is clear that it was not viewed as a scribal error.

This conclusion is supported eloquently by the evidence of the Kukuljević Fragment.³⁵ Although the extant codices of the A version all date from the 14th and 15th centuries, this earliest fragment of a missal of the Papal curia dates from the mid-13th century, almost contemporaneous with the redaction itself. That the reading with *zělo* was contained in the prototype (redaction) itself is confirmed with near certainty by the fortunate circumstance that it is preserved in this fragment. The sum total of evidence thus suggests strongly that this reading was indeed contained in *all* manuscripts of the A version. Conversely, that perceived errors in the original redaction were indeed subject to correction in the course of transmission is proven by another location in this same fragment. The reading

from John 8:46–59 concludes with the interpolated clause *I proš'd' po srědě ih', iděse i hoždaše tako*. This clear (from the point of view of the Vulgate) error had the force of Cyrillic and Greek manuscript traditions in its favor, and was certainly contained in the original redaction. Nevertheless, it is found in *none* of the later codices.

In conclusion, the explanation of *zělo* in the A version by a scribal or editorial mistake appears most unlikely.

5.2 Textual Prototype. The argument for or against a textual prototype for the superlative reading in the A version depends on empirical evidence — the discovery of such a prototype. As yet this has not occurred. The two editions of the Preslav version fail to note such a reading in any manuscript. None has been found to date among the parimeiniks and triodia.³⁶ While the possibility of a textual prototype cannot be ruled out until the entire manuscript corpus has been examined, at this time there is no reason to believe that one will be found. As already noted, no such reading has yet been discovered among the Greek or Latin manuscripts.

5.3 Innovative Interpretation.

5.3.1 The Mechanism. Finally, we come to the possibility that the *zělo* of the A version of the CCS missal owes its presence to a conscious innovation by the original redactors. This innovation would derive from their interpretation (i.e., that interpretation which they accepted) of the *literal*, or *explicit meaning* of Jonah 3:3. Such an interpretation can have originated, in principle, either with the redactors themselves, or with one or more commentators of whose interpretation they were aware. The first of these possibilities can be ruled out, as we are aware of no exegetical tradition among 13th-century Glagolites, and it is unlikely that textual revisers would intentionally modify Scripture in the absence of what they considered to be an acceptable authority. Therefore the only remaining possibility is that these people were aware of, and accepted, an interpretation according to which the literal, or explicit, meaning of the phrase in question was: “a very large city.”

As we have seen, the early Christian commentators either did not deal with this phrase, or attributed to it a clearly non-superlative interpretation. However, as we have also seen, several outstanding Jewish commentators of the 12th and 13th centuries favored precisely such an interpretation (Radak), or a very similar one (R. Bachya, Rashbam). In very broad terms, then, the most likely explanation for this wording in the A version of the CCS missal is as follows: 1) a Jewish interpretation became known among Christian scholars, probably in an environment of intense interaction; 2) knowledge of this interpretation spread within the Christian scholarly com-

munity; 3) the men who would establish the A redaction of the CCS missal (certainly among the earliest Dalmatian Franciscans) became aware of this interpretation and incorporated it into this version. While these men certainly encountered this idea somewhere in Italy (probably in Rome), we must leave open here the question of whether the compilation was actually carried out there and the finished missal brought to the Eastern Adriatic, or the work was done in one of the Dalmatian centers (perhaps Zadar).

Since this explanation contains elements which are not usual in the interpretation of Slavonic Biblical texts, it will be useful to justify them in terms of the conditions which existed during the first half of the 13th century. Three issues are paramount: first, how could a reflection of Jewish exegesis find its way into Christian textual traditions during a time of intense animosity between the two communities; second, how could an interpretation originating in southern or northern France find its way into a Dalmatian Slavonic textual tradition without leaving any intermediary traces. As we shall see, the answers to the first and second questions are really one and the same (§5.3.2). The third issue is: how could an *interpretation* of the sense of the text come to be reflected in the *literal wording* of the Slavonic translation (§5.3.3). Let us address these issues in order.

5.3.2 Contacts between Christian and Jewish Exegesis. First, it is necessary to understand that the 12th century saw the rise of a new trend in Jewish exegesis—specifically, a shift from an almost exclusive dependence on midrashic commentary (*dəraś*: homily or interpretation) to an ever increasing emphasis on the simple meaning (*pəšať*) of the text divorced from tropological or allegorical considerations (cf. especially Talmage *passim*, but esp. 72ff., and Lockshin 9–24). The first noticeable movement in this direction is found in the 11th-century commentaries of Rashi (Rabbi Shlomo ben Yitzchak), but it is his 12th- and 13th-century followers (most notably his grandson, Rashbam, in northern France, and Radak in Provence) who thoroughly reversed the earlier prejudice which had favored midrashic interpretation. To a certain extent, especially in Provence, this was due to the influence of the Spanish exegetical school, in which grammatical and philological study already had considerable roots. However, this shift surely reflected at least in part the rationalist mood which swept also through Christian society in western Europe during the 12th and 13th centuries, driven especially during the latter century by the rediscovery of Aristotle's scientific works. This rationalist current is exemplified by Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon (usually known as Maimonides or Rambam, 1135–1204). His works (most notably the *Guide for the Perplexed*) reflected the polarization of positions among Jewish intellectuals of his time, and thus served to fuel controversy within the Jewish scholarly community (see, for example, Talmage 27ff.).

Christian scholarship did not remain unaware of the disagreements among Jewish exegetes. By the 12th century Jewish and Christian scholarship were no longer entirely isolated from one another. The best-studied case of interaction from this century involves the scholars of St. Victor's in Paris, who consulted Jewish scholars over an extended period of time on a variety of exegetical issues (see Smalley *Study*, especially chapters 3 and 4). The most radical of these scholars, Andrew, in many instances preferred Jewish interpretations over those prevalent in Christian scholarship. (He was, moreover, a practitioner of literal exegesis to the virtual exclusion of the spiritual; see Smalley *Study*, especially ch. 4.) However, by the late 12th century, and especially by the 13th, relations between Jews and Christians had deteriorated, and among their scholars a war of polemic was being waged.³⁷ The most visible manifestations of this argumentation (at least to modern students) were public disputations, two of which (those of 1240 in Paris, and 1263 in Barcelona) have been described in extensive reports.³⁸ For Christian scholars, study of Jewish exegesis became a means to learn about their adversary and his arguments, and to find ammunition with which to counter them. Internal conflict among the Jews presented the Christian scholars with opportunities which they could not pass up. We are aware, for example, of at least one instance in which Jews denounced to the Christian authorities the books of their (Jewish!) opponents (see Talmage 28). The Christian authorities knew, of course, how they could turn such disputes to their benefit. On the one hand, they could use the very fact of such disagreements as proof of the uncertainty of Jewish doctrine. On the other, they could seize upon the specific arguments presented by one or the other camp as ammunition to use against the Jewish side in Christian-Jewish disputations. Understandably, it was by and large the *pāṣaṭ* interpretations which were used by the Christian side to ridicule fanciful *midrashim* (see, e.g., Talmage 80–82).

During the 12th and 13th centuries one of the primary points of conflict between Jewish and Christian scholarship would have been among converts from Judaism to Christianity. It is true that by this time Christian hebraists were no longer entirely absent and played a crucial role in preparations already for the 1240 Paris disputation (Maccoby 22–23, 32), and especially for the 1263 Barcelona disputation (Maccoby 41, Talmage 81–82). Moreover, a majority of converts during this period were probably of modest economic and intellectual stature.³⁹ However, there were also learned converts who possessed not only an excellent knowledge of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages and Jewish exegesis, but moreover the convert's zeal in bringing that knowledge to bear in defending their new faith (or pillorying the old, as in the case of Nicholas Donin), either by educating Christian scholars in the style and substance of Jewish exegesis and argumentation, or through active participation in disputations.⁴⁰

That disputations were fairly common during this period can be inferred from attempts by the Church to curtail them, limiting participation to those specially trained in countering Jewish argumentation (Grayzel 26–27). Implicit in such a stance is the realization that the Jews, being a small group continually on the defensive yet on average possessed of greater learning than their Christian counterparts,⁴¹ would also on average have more practice in debating, a better command of the relevant arguments, and thus a natural debating advantage. When disputation was indeed called for, the assistance of learned converts from Judaism to Christianity could therefore be crucial. In fact, the leading Christian participants in the Paris (1240) and Barcelona (1263) disputations were the converts Nicholas Donin and Pablo Christiani (cf. Berger *passim*, Maccoby *passim*, Grayzel *passim*).

The case of Nicholas Donin⁴² provides the best illustration of how an interpretation of Jonah 3:3 by Radak or Rashbam might have crossed over into a Christian milieu and, ultimately, found its way into the Croatian Slavonic version of the *Ordo Missalis Secundum Consuetudinem Romanae Curiae*. Nicholas clearly possessed an extensive knowledge of Jewish exegesis, as demonstrated *inter alia* by his leading role in the Paris disputation of 1240. He had, moreover, a strong motivation to use his knowledge to the detriment of his former community. Specifically, there is a consensus in the literature that Nicholas converted not out of a sincere acceptance of the Christian faith, nor in order to gain temporal benefit. Rather, Nicholas had an axe to grind with the Jewish community: it appears that he exhibited Karaite sympathies. In the words of Maccoby (20), “Nicholas . . . had the typical Protestant’s desire to commune with Scripture without the intervention of the centuries of history which had elapsed between the Revelation and his own day. He wished to stand on Mount Sinai and receive the Law in its pristine purity.” His anti-Talmudic tendency brought Nicholas into conflict with the rabbis, leading finally to his excommunication. Following his conversion Nicholas joined the Franciscan order. He thus brought his knowledge into the very circle of men responsible for promulgating and revising the version of the Latin missal which was to become nearly universal in the Western Church, and who most likely were also responsible for producing its Slavonic version.⁴³ Finally, we may note that Nicholas lived at precisely the right time to have been the very person who brought the interpretation in question into the sphere of Christian exegesis. The first (but not final) version of this Latin missal was probably prepared at c. 1225. This is approximately the year of Donin’s excommunication. The date of his actual conversion, and, most importantly, whether he converted immediately or only after some delay, is not known with certainty (see Grayzel 340), though at least two authors – Lewin (101) and Blumenkranz (280)⁴⁴ – have placed the date of his conversion in 1235 and 1236, respectively.

All this is not to say that it was in fact Nicholas Donin who conveyed the new *p̄sať* interpretation of Jonah 3:3 to the compilers of the Slavonic “Franciscan” missal. If, however, out of the very few converts of this period whose identities and activities are known to us, one fits so perfectly the profile of a potential conduit of this interpretation from a French Jewish to a Dalmatian Franciscan environment, we may consider it likely that other such people also existed. We must also bear in mind the possibility, suggested above on the basis of the almost simultaneous appearance of this interpretation in Provence (Radak) and northern France (Rashbam), that the superlative interpretation was in fact becoming widespread at that time in Jewish exegetical circles. If this is correct, the likelihood of its being communicated from Jewish to Christian scholarship increases considerably.

5.3.3 From New Interpretation to New Translation. Finally, we must address the issue of how an *interpretation* of Hebrew לְאֱלֹהִים *lē(')lōhîm*, literally ‘to God’ (indirectly) or Latin *dei*, literally ‘of God’ (directly) as ‘very, exceedingly,’ could have found itself introduced into the actual Slavonic *text*, in place of the expected literal translations *bogu* ‘to God’ (following the Greek and Hebrew) or *boga* ‘of God’ (following Jerome’s Vulgate). The compilers of this redaction must have considered the motivation to be an especially compelling one. The form *bogu* (dative) was, after all, supported by the force of Slavonic (and Greek) textual tradition. Moreover, it differed only in case (dative vs. genitive, an especially minor difference if one considers the interchangeability of these two Slavic cases in some of their primary functions) from the wording found in most Latin versions. If any correction were called for, we might therefore have expected the compilers to merely change the case to genitive *boga* in order to bring the Slavonic version into literal accord with the Latin. Alternatively, had they been working from a Latin version in which the word *dei* was omitted, we would expect *bogu* to have been simply omitted from the Slavonic text (as indeed occurred in the B redaction).

We might be tempted to conclude simply that the redactors were intent on translating the sense of the Latin (and, indirectly, Hebrew) text, willing to depart from the literal meaning where this diverged from the intended sense of the text. Yet this “simple” solution is implausible. Let us note once again that the redactors were not translating: the earlier Slavonic text with which they were working already contained the reading *bogu* ‘to God.’ Furthermore, if their goal had been to express the sense (i.e., the intent or interpretation) of Scripture in the Slavonic version, this should be apparent in many locations, and the resulting Slavonic text should read almost as a paraphrase of the Greek or Latin versions. Yet this is not the case. One of the most striking lessons to be learned from the history of Scriptural exegesis in western Europe, especially of the 12th and 13th centuries, is that the

interpreters were acutely aware of the distinction between the various levels of meaning: the literal, allegorical, and the tropological, as well as of the issue of whether metaphorical meaning belonged to the literal sphere or the allegorical. That the compilers of the A redaction of the CCS missal would have lost sight of this distinction—in this one location, and in contrast to all of their Christian and Jewish predecessors—is hardly likely.

It can only be the case, then, that the people who introduced the reading *zělo* into the Slavonic text considered this meaning to be expressed at Jonah 3:3 not *implicitly*, but rather *explicitly*, i.e., as the *explicit meaning* of the Latin text (presumably in a version containing *dei*). This point of view is not likely to have come from Rashbam. Not only is his interpretation less visible, being contained in his commentary on Genesis, but it compares Jonah 3:3 to a location (Genesis 10:9) where the meaning of great size or degree is unquestionably expressed *implicitly*. Radak, in contrast, was the most prominent Hebrew grammarian of his time, and in his commentary he speaks as a grammarian. Rather than working from the text to its meaning, he begins from a rule of grammar: “Every thing which one wishes to enlarge, one dedicates it [or “makes it closer”] to God by way of enlargement, as in *mountains of God* [Psalm 36:7], *cedars of God* [Psalm 80:11], *flame of God* [Song of Songs 8:6], *darkness of God* [i.e., total darkness, Jeremiah 2:31].⁴⁵ By associating this rule with the Hebrew phrase עִיר־גְּדוֹלָה לְאֱלֹהִים *‘ir-ghədôlâ(h) lē(‘)lôhîm*, literally ‘city great to God’ of Jonah 3:3, he claims that this location is an instantiation of the rule. It is the acceptance of this concept—that a term for divinity can express a *grammatical category* approximately equivalent to the Latin superlative—which is the only plausible justification for altering the existing Slavonic translation in the manner witnessed by the A version of the CCS missal.⁴⁶ It is thus to Radak, or at least to the idea of which his commentary is the earliest preserved attestation, that we owe the wording *veli zělo* in the A version.

6. Supporting Evidence

If we assume that the argument presented in the previous section is valid, then there is one last issue which must be addressed in this paper. Specifically, if the redactor, or one of the redactors, of the A version of the CCS missal was aware of, and applied in practice at Jonah 3:3, the conception of Radak described above, then we must ask whether this conception was applied at other Scriptural locations as well. A conclusive answer cannot be provided at this time, though suggestive facts are not entirely absent.

On the one hand, “Radak’s” idea may have been applied only at this one location, in order to deal *ad hoc* with a difficulty which had long tormented scribes and correctors of the Latin text.

On the other hand, there exists at least one other location which may also represent an application of this concept.⁴⁷ At 1 Samuel 2:17 the Hebrew

וַתְּהִי חַטָּאת הַנְּעָרִים גְּדוֹלָה מְאֹד אֶת־פְּנֵי יי is rendered in Greek literally, with variations in word order among the versions, as καὶ ἦν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐνώπιον Κυρίου τῶν παιδαρίων μεγάλη σφόδρα (Brooke, McLean and Thackeray 7); in the Vulgate as *erat ergo peccatum puerorum grande nimis coram Domino* (*Biblia Sacra: Samuhel* 80); and in the English Authorized Version as *Wherefore the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord*. As this location is not contained in the parimeinik, the primary Slavonic Cyrillic text is the Preslav version, which literally, with variations in word order, translates the Greek as **И БѢ ГРѢХЪ ОТРОКОУ ПРѢДЪ ГОСПОДЬМЪ ВЕЛИКЪ ЗѢЛО** (Dunkov 59–61, incl. notes 94 and 95).

In CCS this location is found only in the breviaries. Just as is the case with the missals, the breviaries exhibit an A and a B version, which appear to parallel the respective versions of the missal in origin and geographic distribution. The B version contains the reading *běše bo grěh' otrokov/ veliki velmi pred' gospodem!*, which corresponds well to the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and Cyrillic, leaving aside variations in word order. The A version, however, in contrast to all of the other versions, omits the reference to God: *Běšě bo grěh' otrokom' veli zělo*. Since this difference is, with one exception, consistent between the A and B versions,⁴⁸ it follows that the A reading was not perceived as a mere scribal error. The only likely explanation is that the redactor believed that this wording accurately rendered the meaning of the original Scripture. This, in turn, could only be the case if that person considered the reference to God in other versions with which he was familiar to be superfluous. This, finally, could — probably — only be the case if he considered the reference to God synonymous with the *zělo*, *velmi*, *nimis*, or perhaps σφόδρα, of the version or versions from which or with which he was working.

The persuasiveness of this example is attenuated by the fact that in the case of Jonah 3:3 the A version of the breviaries retains a reading identical to that found in the Cyrillic, Greek, and some Latin versions. If the A version of the breviary has applied “Radak’s” idea at 1 Samuel 2:17, we must ask why we do not find this idea applied in the same version of the same book at Jonah 3:3. The reason could be that several individuals participated in the redaction of the A version of these books, not all of whom were equally willing to apply “Radak’s” idea in their work. This difference in attitude may have been influenced by the fact that in the case of Jonah the redactor was working with and adapting a much older Slavonic translation. The translation of 1 Samuel found in the breviaries, in contrast, appears to represent an original translation from the Vulgate unconnected with any found in the Cyrillic manuscript traditions (see Nahtigal). Nevertheless, the striking fact remains that at both locations the A version of a CCS liturgical book contains a reading which stands unique among the various versions in the several languages, and which admits the interpreta-

tion that it results from the understanding that a reference to God can represent a partially grammaticalized expression of extreme size or extent.

NOTES

- * I am grateful to Professor Herbert Davidson, Professor Antonio Loprieno, and Dr. Alphonso S. Rodrigues Pereira for their comments and suggestions concerning earlier drafts of this paper. The responsibility for the concepts presented in this final version is, of course, my own.
- 1 In this article the terms *Slavonic* and *Church Slavonic* refer solely to *Old Church Slavonic* and its regional continuants of the twelfth century onward. The term *Slavic*, in contrast, will refer more broadly to the Slavic nations and any of their cultural attributes, including their vernacular and modern literary languages. On the distinction between *language of literature* and *literary language*, with references to other sources, see Corin "Variation."
 - 2 See Evseev, who attributes this attitude to the stature of its author – Constantine-Cyril – as well as to its literary and linguistic quality.
 - 3 That this is in fact the expected situation is argued by both Nahtigal and Mikhailov, the same ideas being echoed by a number of later authors.
 - 4 The term *Vulgate* refers to the Latin translation of the Bible compiled by Eusebius Hieronymus (c. 347–419/420, generally known as St. Jerome), and its later versions.
 - 5 Zlatanova (28) provides bibliographic data and literature on both of these manuscripts. For a more extensive analysis of the origin and structure of the New York Missal see, however, Corin *New York Missal*.
 - 6 I leave out of account some secondary versions, including those of the triodia.
 - 7 On the two redactions of the CCS missal see several of the articles in Tandarić, as well as the discussion and literature in Corin "O reformama." On the relation of the CCS missal to that of the Papal Curia see Corin (*ibid.*).
 - 8 In this table and elsewhere in this paper, word division in CCS text is rendered according to modern practice in order to facilitate comparison with other versions. In actual CCS orthography, clitics (both proclitics and enclitics) are written together with the accentogenic words with which they are pronounced.
 - 9 No CCS breviary redaction B version of this verse is attested (see Ribarova).
 - 10 For bibliographic data and literature on the missal Vat4, see Corin *New York Missal*, 265 (where this manuscript is designated "III4").
 - 11 Kukuljević Fragment and Vat4 *sic*; other mss. *i ide*
 - 12 Other mss. *nevđit'*
 - 13 Other mss. *nevđit'()*
 - 14 For bibliographic data and literature on the Berlin Missal, see Corin *New York Missal*, 265 (where this manuscript is designated "B").
 - 15 Berlin *V'sta*
 - 16 QpI #51 is a 13th-century Serbian codex of the Saltykov-Shchedrin Library in St. Petersburg. I have examined its text of Jonah from a microfilm in the collection of the Hilandar Research Library of The Ohio State University. I am grateful to M. A. Johnson of the Hilandar Research Library for making this text available to me.
 - 17 The term *masoretic* refers to the standardized and corrected version of the Hebrew Scriptural texts developed by Jewish scholars between the sixth (approximately) and tenth centuries CE and supplied with "points" indicating the vowels.
 - 18 This interpretation is inferred by Zlotowitz from Ibn Ezra's commentary, rather than stated directly by him. Ibn Ezra does attribute superlative force to at least one Scriptural

location in which a term for God is adjoined in a genitive construction to a noun (see Thomas 211).

- 19 A survey of the literature (through 1953, of course) on such constructions, as well as a discussion of the broader issue of the expression of superlative meaning in Hebrew, is provided by Thomas.
- 20 See, e.g., the view of Ibn Ezra cited above as well as Sasson's (228) discussion of a recent revival of the superlative interpretation.
- 21 I.e., the four-letter name of God: YHWH. On the avoidance of the tetragrammaton in such constructions see Sasson 228–30 and Thomas. Thomas (219) makes only passing reference to the possibility of such avoidance, but certainly notes no counterexamples to it.
- 22 The meaning of this preposition is actually broader than is indicated by the bare designation 'dative.' It should especially be borne in mind that in Hebrew, just as in various Indo-European languages, the distinction between the expression of dative and genitive functions can be neutralized, so that ostensibly genitive (possessive) function can also be expressed by לָ *la*.
- 23 For an extensive account of early Christian commentaries on Jonah (though treating primarily the rhetoric, rather than sense, of the text) see Duval. The full commentary of Theodoret of Cyrrhus was published in *PG* 81:1719–40, and that of Theophylactos in *PG* 126:905–68.
- 24 The phrase is cited by Jerome as *itinere trium dierum* (Antin 92).
- 25 On the relationship between the commentaries of Theophylactos and Theodoret (as well as other predecessors of the Bulgarian exegete), see Duval 376, esp. n. 4.
- 26 The Glossa Ordinaria for the Twelve Prophets existed already by the 1150s (cf. Smalley *Study*, 60–61). It consisted almost exclusively of extracts from Jerome's commentary (Smalley *Study*, 227). Migne, in fact, declined to publish the Glossa Ordinaria for the Twelve Prophets, referring readers instead back to the volume of *Patrologia Latina* containing Jerome's original commentary.
- 27 The Aramaic version in fact reads וְנִינְוָה הָיָה קִרְתָּא־רִבְתָּא קֳדָם יי. The preposition קֳדָם *qōdam* 'before, in presence of' (Wright 37, 68) is approximately equivalent to Hebrew לְפָנַי, 'before, in front of,' before the face of, in the view of, in the judgment of.' This version therefore (on account of both the preposition and the Name of God) does not admit the interpretation that the term for the divine presence is used here as a mere epithet (in Thomas's formulation) imparting superlative force to the preceding noun (i.e., as the expression of a grammatical or quasi-grammatical category of superlative degree), though it does allow, perhaps even demand, an *inference* of great size or importance.
- 28 See Thomas 211. On the evidence for Jewish-Christian interaction already in 13th-century England see Smalley *Hebrew Scholarship*, and *Study*.
- 29 See Freidenberg. Available evidence suggests that during the 13th century there were no Jewish communities anywhere on the Dalmatian coast, and that Jews themselves were either absent or present in extremely small numbers.
- 30 It is of signal interest that even the solution reached in the Clementine version (omitting *dei*) has recently been overturned by the new critical text proposed in *Biblia Sacra: Duodecim Prophetæ*.
- 31 In this regard the Jewish commentators were only slightly ahead of their Christian counterparts. An emphasis among them on *pəšat* (plain-sense, as opposed to midrashic) interpretation began to develop only from 11th (Rashi), but primarily during the 12th and 13th centuries. On this trend see Lockshin and Talmage.
- 32 Use of the letter א in this abbreviation indicates that it goes back to a time when the word, even when written in full, was spelled with this letter.
- 33 It should be borne in mind that the term "interpolation" can be used here only impre-

cisely. In its strict sense the term refers to the *addition* of an element not found in earlier copies of the same text. In this case, however, it is really a *replacement* to which we refer, as the form *bogu* existed already in the parimeinik version of Jonah, as reflected in the breviary. Moreover, even if *bogu* had been absent from the earlier Slavonic version, the appearance of *zělo* could, strictly speaking, only be considered an interpolation in relation to a Latin source text in which *dei* was absent.

- 34 See Quentin (234), on the use of variant readings in establishing the filiation of manuscripts: "La variante, pour être utile, doit aussi être sans intérêt pour le copiste." Textual variants which are the subject of debate, or otherwise draw the attention of scribes and readers, are unsuitable for use in determining filiation, as the variation in the manuscript corpus may not correspond to the actual filial relationships within that corpus. By the same token, where the filial relationships among manuscripts have been clearly established, but variation at a given textual location does not correspond well to those relationships, it is likely that the attention of scribes has been drawn to this location, resulting in an unusual number of individual interventions in the transmitted text. This is clearly the case in the Latin textual tradition (as an examination of the apparatus for Jonah 3:3 in *Biblia Sacra: Duodecim Prophetarum* 166 demonstrates), even though enough agreement remains to reconstruct the textual archetype.
- 35 For an analysis of this fragment, bibliographic data, and further literature see Corin "O reformama."
- 36 I am indebted to the staffs of the Hilandar Research Library of the Ohio State University and the Archeographic Department of the Serbian National Library, most especially to M. A. Johnson, Irena Špadijer, and Biljana Jovanović-Stipčević, for their gracious and generous advice and assistance in obtaining copies of manuscripts as well as access to several of the original codices.
- 37 On the timing of the debate see Berger 7–8, 16.
- 38 For an especially detailed recent account of these disputations see Maccoby. On the development of the Christian-Jewish polemic of the 12th–13th centuries see Berger, esp. 3–32 (the "Introduction").
- 39 On the economic (but not only economic!) incentives to conversion offered during this period see Grayzel 15ff.
- 40 For a general discussion of the role of converts (including Nicholas Donin) in anti-Jewish polemics, see Blumenkranz.
- 41 For one remarkable 12th-century Christian expression of the belief that Jews possessed a far higher rate of literacy than Christians, see Smalley *Study*, 78.
- 42 For biographies of Nicholas Donin with literature see Grayzel 339–340 and Blumenkranz 279–280.
- 43 By the time of Nicholas's conversion, the Franciscan Order had already grown into a vast international organization. However, it is clear that Nicholas interacted with the very highest levels: he lived for a time in Rome, was personally acquainted with Pope Gregory IX, and proved able to convince the Pope of the pernicious nature of the Talmud, to persuade him to take action against it, and then to serve both as the Pope's personal emissary and as the major Christian participant in a public disputation. The opinions of such a man in matters of exegesis could easily have become known to textual reformers or revisers of his time.
- 44 Both authors cite the prologue to the accusation against the Talmud. This was published by Loeb (252), but is also found in *Acta Sanctorum* for August, Vol. 5:359.
- 45 The textual locations are identified by Zlotowitz, but are not cited in Radak's actual commentary (which can be found in all editions of the Rabbinic Bible). For a more idiomatic paraphrase of Radak see Zlotowitz 120.
- 46 It may be significant that while the Hebrew phrase עִיר־גְּדוּלָה לְאֱלֹהִים is at best an

anomalous instantiation of this rule, the Latin wording *civitas magna dei* corresponds more closely to the usual Hebrew examples, which consist formally of a genitive construction (albeit without an adjective). In the mind of someone who knew both Latin and Hebrew, and was aware of Radak's interpretation and the type of Hebrew examples on which it was based, the Latin wording of this passage might have suggested or reinforced the idea of an explicit superlative meaning.

- 47 I am grateful to Julia Verkholtantsev of the University of California, Los Angeles, for bringing this location, and its significance, to my attention.
- 48 The Moscow Breviary, a B manuscript, also omits the reference to God: *bžše bo grěh/ otrokov/ velik/ velmi*. For bibliographic data and literature on this manuscript see Zlatanova 28.

REFERENCES

- Acta Sanctorum Augusti. Tomus V.* Antwerp: apud Joannem Mevsrium, 1746.
- Antin, Paul, ed. *Saint Jérôme: Sur Jonas*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1956.
- Bauerová, Helena. "Prophetae minores v charvátskohlaholských breviářích a ve Vajsově edici *Glagolitiica*." *Slovo* 36 (1986): 217–26.
- . "K morfoložickým archaismům textu proroka Jonaše v breviářním a parimejním čtení." *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis, Philologica* 56 (1987): 197–203.
- . "K problematice předloh textu proroka Jonaše v charvátskohlaholských breviářích." *Slavia* 58.4 (1989): 353–64.
- . "Neslovanské předlohy charvátskohlaholských breviářních textů (Prophetae minores)." *Listy filologické* 114 (1991): 13–24.
- Berger, David. *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979.
- Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem. XVII. Liber Duodecim Prophetarum*. Rome: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1987.
- Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem. V. Liber Samuhelis*. Rome: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1944.
- Blumenkranz, Bernhard. "Jüdische und christliche Konvertiten im jüdisch-christlichen Religionsgespräch des Mittelalters." *Judentum im Mittelalter: Beiträge zum christlich-jüdischen Gespräch*. Ed. Paul Wilpeter. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1966. 264–82.
- Brandt, Roman Fedorovich. *Григоровичев паримейник в сличении с другими паримейниками* Moscow: Университетская типография, Issues 1 & 2, 1894, Issue 3, 1901.
- Brooke, Alan England, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of the Codex Vaticanus. Vol. 2. The Later Historical Books. Part 1. I and II Samuel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1927.
- Corin, Andrew R. *The New York Missal: A Paleographic and Phonetic Analysis*. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 1991.
- . "Variation and Norm in Croatian Church Slavonic." *Slovo* (1993 [1994]): 41–43, 155–196.
- . "O reformama hrvatskoglagoljskih liturgijskih knjiga u 13. stoljeću." *Prvi hrvatski slavistički kongres. Zbornik radova I*. Ed. S. Damjanović, et al. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 1997. 527–38.
- Dunkov, Dimităr. *Die Methodbibel. 5. Die Bücher der Könige. Das erste Buch Samuel*. Die slawischen Sprachen 42. Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1995.
- Duval, Yves-Marie. *Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature Chrétienne Grecque et Latine. Sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1973. 2 vols.

- Evseev, Ivan Evseevich. *Книга пророка Даниила въ древне-славянскомъ переводѣ. Введение и тексты*. Moscow: Отделение русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук, 1905.
- Freidenberg, Marèn. *Евреи на Балканах: На исходе средневековья*. Moscow and Jerusalem: Gesharim, 1996.
- Ginsburg, Christian D. *The Later Prophets, Diligently Revised According to the Massorah and the Early Editions with the Various Readings from Mss. and the Ancient Versions*. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1926.
- Grayzel, Solomon. *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*. New York: Hermon Press, 1966.
- Levine, Étan. *The Aramaic Version of Jonah*. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1975.
- Lewin, A. "Die Religionsdisputation des R. Jechiel." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 18 (1869): 97–110, 145–48, 193–210.
- Lockshin, Martin I. *Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir's Commentary on Genesis: An Annotated Translation*. Lewiston/Lampeter/Queenston: E. Mellen Press, 1989.
- Loeb, I. "La controverse de 1240 sur le Talmud." *Revue des études juives* 1 (1880): 247–61; 2 (1881): 248–70; 3 (1881): 39–57.
- Maccoby, Hyam. *Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages*. London and Toronto: Associated UP, 1982.
- Migne, J.-P., ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Patrologia Graeca*. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1857–1866.
- Mikhailov, A. V. "Къ вопросу о литературномъ наслѣдіи Свв. Кирилла и Мефодія въ глаголическихъ хорватскихъ миссалахъ и бревіаріяхъ." *Русскій филологическій вѣстникъ* 51 (1904): 1–145.
- Nahtigal, Rajko. *Нѣсколько замѣтокъ о слѣдахъ древне-славянскаго паримейника въ хорватско-глаголической литературѣ*. Moscow: Тип. Г. Лисснера и А. Гешеля, 1902.
- Nicholas of Lyre = Nicolaus de Lyra. *Postilla Super Totam Bibliam. II. Strassburg 1492*. Frankfurt/Main: Minerva, 1971.
- PG. See Migne.
- Quentin, Henri. *Mémoire sur l'Établissement du Texte de la Vulgate*. Collectanea Biblica Latina 6. Rome and Paris: Desclée et cie., 1922.
- Ribarova, Zdenka. "Knjiga proroka Jone." *Slovo* 37 (1987): 123–59.
- Rusch, Adolph, ed. *Biblia Latina cum Glossa Ordinaria. Facsimile Reprint of the Editio Princeps. Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81*. Vol. 3. Brepols: Turnhout, 1992.
- Sasson, Jack M. *Jonah: A New Translation with Introduction, Commentary, and Interpretations*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- Smalley, Beryl. *Hebrew Scholarship Among Christians in XIIIth Century England, As Illustrated By Some Hebrew-Latin Psalters*. Lectiones in Vetere Testamento et in Rebus Judaicis. Vol. 6. London: Shapiro, Vallentine, 1939.
- . *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Notre Dame, IN: U of Notre Dame P, 1964.
- Sprenger, Hans Norbert. *Theodori Mopsuesteni: Commentarius in XII Prophetas*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977.
- Talmage, Frank Ephraim. *David Kimhi: The Man and the Commentaries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1975.
- Tandarić, Josip Leonard. *Hrvatsko-glagoljska liturgijska književnost*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1993.
- Thomas, D. Winton. "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953): 209–24.
- Tunitskii, N. L. *Книги XII малыхъ пророковъ съ толкованіями въ древне-славянскомъ переводѣ. I. Книги Осии, Иоила, Амоса, Авдія и Іоны*. Sergiev Posad: Отделение русского языка и словесности Российской Академии наук, 1918.

- Wright, William. *The Book of Jonah in Four Oriental Versions, Namely Chaldee, Syriac, Aethiopic and Arabic*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1857.
- Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Duodecim prophetae*. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum. Vol. 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Zlatanova, Rumjana. *Книга на дванадесетте пророци с тълкования*. Vol. 1. София: Българска академия на науките. Кирило-методиевски научен център, 1998.
- Zlotowitz, Meir. *Jonah: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic and Rabbinic Sources*. Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 1980.