On the Language of the OR Translation of Josephus' *Jewish War*
Bill Darden
University of Chicago

I feel like I should apologize to the people on the panel who read the first drafts of this paper. I started out studying the Slavic translation of Josephus' *Jewish War* as part of a broad project to study the use of verbal categories in Old Rusian. The translation is reputed to be an originally Old Rusian translation, done in the eleventh or twelfth century. It is a very free translation, with substantial textual insertions which are found in no Greek version. It is huge, covering 300 printed pages in Meshcherskii's edition. It should therefore be a treasure trove of data on OR.

To my knowledge there are two scholarly versions published: Meshcherkii (1958) and Istrin (1934-8). Meshcherskii cites variants from Istrin, along with multiple other manuscript versions. His version is in standard transliteration, which is relatively easy to process with an OCR. I was interested in the formal and functional morphology of the verb, not spelling, so Meshcherskii's text seemed more than adequate. With the help of a graduate student (Josh Brody) I created digitized files of the text in Microsoft Word, using ABBYY's FineReader.

Meshcherskii thought that the translation originated in the 11th century. For reasons that have little to do with this paper, I agree with Istrin that the text reflects the language of Southern or South-Western Rus' and is from the 12th century at the earliest.

I rapidly discovered that the text that has been preserved is messy, and the messiness makes it difficult to use the language of the text as authentic 12th century Rusian. There is the added difficulty posed by the fact that Meshcherskii is not consistent in citing variants from Istrin, so I had to redo the comparisons. All the examples I cite, except when otherwise noted, agree in all the cited texts.

In my first efforts at analyzing the text I tried to get around the messiness. Using what I think I know about 12th century Rusian, I tried to isolate those aspects of the text that were intrusions from sloppy copyists and bad editing. For instance, there are many young looking uses of the perfect in Book One, which makes up the first fourth of the text. I simply excluded Book One from consideration. There are strange uses of *byst'* throughout the text, so I cited them and intended to ignore them. It is true that without these elements, the text looks much more like a twelfth century document.

However, about three weeks ago, I realized that the mess that I was trying to eliminate might just say something interesting not only about the history of the manuscript, but about the history of the translation. I revised the argument, but the version that I sent to the panelists still lacked examples from Book One, which is crucial to the argument.

According to Meshcherskii (pp 30-36) there are two basic variants of the text: a fuller chronograph version, and a shorter separate version. The chronograph version is found in two chronographs, the Vilna Chronograph and the Archival Chronograph. The parts of the Chronographs that contain Josephus, according to Istrin and Meshcherskii, go back to a single earlier chronograph, probably put together in the thirteenth century. The text of Josephus is not presented as a continuous whole. It is integrated with excerpts form the gospels and from the chronicles of Hamartolus and Malalas. Most of the intrusions occur in the early parts of the text. The text of the separate edition seemingly

comes from the same prototext as the chronograph version, but is shorter. There is one discrepancy between Meshcherskii's description of the missing parts on p 30 and his notations in the text. The notations in the text indicate the following parts are missing in the short version: most of Book One (from the beginning to page 217, line 31 in Meshcherskii's edition);   the final part of Book Two and the beginning of Book Three (285, 4 to 293, 30); another part of Book Three (295, 4 to 296, 8); a short section of Book Seven (460, 9 to 462, 10); and the very end of the text (465,13 to the end). For want of an easy neutral term for the parts found only in the chronograph version, I will refer to them as "unshared parts."

      Meshcherskii (p 32-3) argues that the separate version was derived from the chronograph version. He bases his argument on: (1) identity in style between the two versions, (2) the presence of rare vocabulary items shared by both parts of the text; (3) the presence of margin notes only in the long version which indicate the source of the text; (3) the fact that the shorter version abridges parts of paragraphs; and (4) the shorter version is noticeably less Christian. He argues that once the text was separated from the chronograph, which had many excerpts from the gospels, the Christian elements might have seemed incongruous for a text by Josephus.   One could just as well argue the opposite: that Christian elements would be natural additions to any medieval historical text, particularly one covering the time of Christ and the early years of Christianity.

      Part where separate version refers to chronicle insert 267, 3, 348, 2,

      Part where separate version is more complete with regard to Greek 302, 11, 372, 14

      There are some hints as to absolute dating. A passage shared by both versions has:

      454, 10-11: Языкъ же ясескыи вѣдомо есть, яко от печениженьска рода родися,

      The Osetian people, it is known, descended from the Pecheneg people.

Here the Greek has *Alano:n ethnos* "tribe of Alans" descended from *Skúthai* "Scythians.".   Mescherskii (p108) points out that the last mention of *jasy* in the chronicles is from 1116, while the last mention of Pechenegs is from 1143.   One can take this to indicate that some version of a translation of Josephus existed by the middle of the 12th century.

      External evidence for the age of the longer version is provided by a passage from the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle under the year 1226 that is clearly derived from a translated passage in Josephus—a passage that occurs only in the longer version (Meshcherskii, p 98).   This section of the chronicle was probably compiled by 1246 (Biblioteka literatury drevnei Rusi, V, 2000: 483).

      In this paper I will discuss two basic phenomena: (1) the use of perfects without auxiliary with reasonably clear past tense reference, as opposed to present perfects, which refer to acts anterior to the present, but with some kind of present relevance., and (2) what I consider to be the misuse of *byst'* as a simple past tense copula.

In the examples cited below, I have consulted the excellent translations by L. Osinkina and H. Leeming in Leeming and Leeming 2003. When I depart from them, I do so at my own risk.

I. Perfect Forms

I am not one of those who believe that the aorist and imperfect had disappeared from the colloquial language of East Slavs before the advent of writing. I believe and have argued that in the Primary Chronicle, the present perfect was still part of the present tense system. The encroachment of the present perfect on the range of use of the aorist and imperfect may have begun in the twelfth century, but there is no reason to think that this process was uniform for all functions, nor that is was a rapid change.   I will talk about three functions where the perfect (or l-forms) may show up with seemingly past meaning in narrative texts.

1) Probably through elision of the auxiliary *bie* where it was redundant in context, l-forms without auxiliary show up with a signification of anteriority to the narrative time (past), rather than anteriority to the present.   There are several examples of this in the Primary Chronicle. As they occur in the Primary Chronicle (without present auxiliary), I would not consider them to be distinctively present perfects.

2) Imperfective l-forms (all as far as I know without auxiliary) used to indicate states or stative activity taking place in the narrative time. I know of no examples of this in the Primary Chronicle. They begin to show up chronicles originating in the twelfth century—primarily as forms of the verb *byti*.

3) Perfective or imperfective l-forms indicating events in the narrative sequence. There is one instance of this in the published reconstructions of the text of the Primary Chronicle, but I think that this is a mistake.   It is found under the year 1065, Ostrowski (2003: 1301), line 164, 5 shows the following variants (somewhat simplified, to ignore superscripts):

Laur: в се же лѣт҇ Всеславъ рать почалъ
Radz: Всеславъ ж в се лѣт҇ рат почал
Acad: Всеславъ же в се лѣто рат копилъ
Hyp: в то же лѣто . Всеславъ . сѣде рать почалъ
Khleb: в се же лѣто Всеславъ рать почалъ

The variants found in the mladshii izvod of the Novgorod First Chronicle are:
Comm: В се же лѣто поча рать копити Всеславъ
NAcad: В се же лѣто нача всеславъ рать строити
Tols: В се же лѣто нача всеславъ рать строити

The passage in the Commissionnyi version Novgorod Chronicle has both the verbs pochati and kopiti, which show up individually in separate versions of the northern variant of the primary Chronicle. This is a rational sentence, and has an aorist.

To my knowledge, the first clear examples of narrative perfects in a narrative text are in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle, which originated in the 13th century—and even

there they are rare.   (I am ignoring birchbark letters, which are never strictly narrative, and generally involve reports of situations and events whose results are relevant in the present. Moreover, the Novgorod dialect is sufficiently different that data from it may not pertain to the rest of East Slavic.)

We find all three types of l-form pasts in Josephus. We also find that verbs with these functions have a strongly skewed distribution. We could describe this distribution in two ways. We could say that the innovative past tense forms are abnormally concentrated in Book One, or we could say that they are concentrated in the unshared parts.

1.1. Narrative Perfects

I would like to first discuss examples from the fourth and most radically innovative use of perfects—the use as narrative pasts.   In a computer search of the text, I found 20 forms which could legitimately be interpreted as narrative pasts. In a 300 page text, that may not seem a lot, but to me it is.   Moreover, the examples not randomly distributed.   Josephus is divided into seven "books".   All 20 examples of narrative perfects are found in Books One and Two, which are contained in the first 125 pages of the work (in Meshcherskii's edition). There are eighteen in Book One (75 pages) and two in Book Two (50 pages).   A large part of Book One and a small part of Book Two are found only in the longer version of Josephus. When we compare the longer version to the shorter version, we find that 17 of the twenty examples of narrative perfects are in the unshared parts: 16 of 18 in Book One, One of the two in Book Two.

I. 1 Narrative Perfects in the Shared Parts

This leaves three examples of narrative perfects in both editions. The examples are:

222 29-32 И **писал** к нему противу, утвержая и творя и господина своим дѣтем.
And he wrote back to him, confirming and making him master of his own children.

224, 21-23. И отдавшю ему, рече, яко Александръ посла нощию къ моему отьцю и **молился** ему, да убиеть тя, и яся по убиение.
After he (Herod) released (the father), (the son) said «Alexander sent by night to my father and asked him to kill you, and he agreed to the killing.»

281, bottom   Едини же антиохиане, исидоняне, и апамиане, и герасиане **пощадѣли** вся живущаа в них июдѣя
Only the people of Antioch, Sidon, Apamea, and Gerasa spared all the Jews who lived among them.

It is striking that these examples are in Books One and Two, somewhat close to those which are found in unshared parts. If these books were copied and reworked by a person who wrote the unshared parts and who clearly used narrative perfects, we might explain

their presence in the longer edition, but there is no reason why they would appear in the original short version as well, which they apparently do.

I.2. Pseudo Pluperfects

The unshared part of Book One has eight cases where an l-form without auxiliary is used to indicate anteriority to the narrative time, rather than to the present. Outside of that, there is one case in Book Two, and two more cases in the rest of the text. The example from Book Two is:

264 И абие нача здати стѣны въ Иерусалимѣ, тако высота их и толъстота, яко же прѣже не **была** [**было** Istrin, *Вол.*]   And he immediately began to build walls in Jerusalem, the height and width of which had never been (known) before.

The examples from the rest of the text are:

307, 17 И священых книгъ пророческих не **утаилося** от него, зане иерѣи бысть и от ереискаго плѣмене родися.
The holy books of prophecy were not hidden from him, for he was a priest, and was born in a tribe of priests.

377, 10 Титъ же,[6] став от перваго мѣста обрытия, и приидѣ на мѣсто, идѣ же асирии **стояли** дрѣвле.
Titus, having moved from the first place with entrenched fortification, came to the place where the Assyrians had camped in times past.

The greater density of these forms in the chronograph-only (or in Book One) confirms the special nature of these sections.

I. 3. Stative Pasts in Narrative Time

There are few enough examples in this category that I can list all that I found. The examples number five in the "chronograph-only", one elsewhere.

Book One:

186. 1-2 Урканъ же разжеся о томъ словеси, не **моглъ** что сътворити, имѣя противника крѣпльша собе.
Ourkanos became very angry at that speech, he could not say anything, having an enemy stronger than him.

187, 13-16 . И Абие на обѣдѣ испилъ[54] [испи А.] смьртное. И   одинъ[55] отрокъ побѣдилъ[56] [Istrin, А. побѣди] силнаго, его же **боялися** вси земли.
And immediately at dinner he drank the deadly drink. And a servant alone defeated a strong man whom all the nations feared.

198 плачь и рыдание въ Иерусалимѣ, аще бо кто хлѣбъ **имѣлъ**, тъи бѣ яко не **имѣлъ**, да аще богатъ, тои акы нищь.
There was crying and sobbing in Jerusalem, if anyone had bread, he acted as if he did not have any, and if rich, then like a poor person.

200, 14-15, Тогда бо и пророци людем **были** учителевѣ и обѣщаху о плѣне и о възвращеиии.
For then the prophets were teachers of the people and promised captivity and return.

208.14.* **Было** же тѣло его крѣпко, яко и душа.
His body was strong, as was his soul.

Book Three

311, 9-10 **Былъ** же град остѣненъ двѣма стѣнама.
        The city was enclosed (walled) with two walls.

These examples again seem to justify a separation of the "chronograph-only" (or Book One) from the rest of the text.

        There are a set of sentences with *было* plus infinitive with modal meaning, indicating what is supposed to happen but did not or has not. These have no skewed distribution.

200. 5-7. При помазанницѣ **было** хромым ходити и слѣпым прозирати, убогым обогатети, а при семь здравии хроми быша, видящеи   ослѣпоша,   богатии обнищаша
Under the anointed one the lame were to walk and the blind see, the poor get rich, but under him the healthy have become lame, the sighted have become blind, the rich become poor.

323, 7-10 А им же стѣны раздрушихом, а град разорихом, то **было** намъ, на мѣстѣ стояще, вывабити я на твердо мѣсто и широко, идѣ же бы льзѣ битися.
When we tore apart the walls and destroyed the town, we should have instead stayed where we were and lured then onto a hard and open place where it would have been possible to fight.

414, 3-8 Тѣмь же и достоино имъ таку пищю приимати и покрыти скверность чадоядѣния, падѣниемь града, да не останутся по вселеннѣи живи,[84] ни видить сълньце града в немь же матери чада своя ядять; его же **было** отьцемъ сътворити пред матерьми, зане такое страсти зрящи и еще въ оружии пребывають.
Thus it is right for them to take such food and to cover up the abomination of the eating of children with the fall of the city, so that they will not remain alive in the world, nor will the sun look on a city in which mothers eat their children; which the fathers should have done in front of the mothers, since they, looking on such suffering, remain at arms.

423, 2-4 Тит же рече имъ: Врѣмя прощениа минуло, поне же погибѣ зѣло, его же дѣля хранити **было** вас.
Titus said to them: «The time for forgiveness has past, because much has perished for the sake of which one would spare you.»

443, 30- 444, 1 И се мудрыи благополученъ отвѣтъ сътвори имъ, рек, яко отьчьство июдѣиско, идѣ же **было** преселитися имъ, плѣнено есть и опустело, [Istrin, Vol. опустѣ] а ино мѣсто никоторое не прииметь ихъ
And he gave them a wise, effective answer, saying that the Jewish land where they would have to have been resettled was captured and destroyed, and no other place would take them.

The counterfactual meaning is not surprising. One of the common pragmatic reasons for uttering a sentence like «You were (supposed) to finish your paper on time» is evidence that you did not do so. Obligations in the past then easily turn into counterfactuals, and can then become present counterfactuals, e.g. «You were supposed to have your paper here.» There is a similar use of *было* plus infinitive in birchbark letter no. 724, estimated to have been written between 1161 and 1167 (Zalizniak 1995:295):

да остать дани исправити было имъ досени
and they were supposed to send the rest of the tribute before autumn

The writer then proceeds to point out why they did not.   There is one doubtful possibility in the Primary Chronicle, under the year 1097, (Ostrowski 2003: 2041-2):

Се второе мьщенье створи, егоже бяше не лѣпо створити, дабы отместникъ Богъ былъ, и възложити было на Бога отмьщенье свое
Thus he performed a second revenge, which he should not have done, so that God should be the avenger, and his revenge should be left to God.

In this sentence *было* is probably governed by *дабы*, which determines both the l-form of the verb and the counterfactual meaning.   It is thus not a good example. There are several better examples from the Kievan Chronicle:

Ipat. 382 (1149) бы͡с лесть въ Переꙗславцехъ рекоуче Гюрги намъ кн͠зь и свои того было намъ искати и далече
There was deception among the Perejaslavlians, saying «Gjurgi is our prince, we should search for [?him?] farther away.

Ипат 537, лѣпо ны было братье възраче на Б͠ию помочь и на мл͠тву сто͡ѣ Б͠ци поискати ѡц͠ь своихъ и дѣдъ своихъ пути .
Brothers, it would behoove us, looking to the help of God and the prayer of the Holy Mother of God, to seek out the routes of our fathers and grandfathers.

Ипат 654 (1187) Ꙗрославоу же не любо бы дале поити . Ти поча молвити братоу С͠тославоу не могоу ити дале ѿ Днѣпра. земла моꙗ далече . а дроужина моꙗ

изнемоглаѧ. Рюрикъ же поча слати ко Стославоу поноуживаѧ єго . река ємоу брате и сватоу . намъ было . сего оу Ба просити . а вѣсть нъı єсть . а Половци восе лежать . за полъ дне .

Jaroslav did not want to go further. He began to say to his brother Svjatoslav «I cannot go farther from the Dnepr; my land is far away, and my druzhina is exhausted." Rjurik began to send to Svjatoslav, pressuring him, saying to him: "Brother and in-law, we should ask [help] of God. We have information that the Polovtsi are located a half-day away."

When the meaning is true possibility (or impossibility) at a specific point in the past, *бысть* is used. This is particularly obvious when there is a predicate adverb which indicates possibility or impossibility.

440, bottom, И **бысть** тогда очютити оскудѣние в Римѣ человѣкъ; иже бо осташа в немь, быша менѣ шедъших противу цесарю.
And it was possible to sense a decrease of people in Rome, for those who remained there were fewer than those who went to meet Caesar.

281, 27-9, И **бысть** видѣти исплънени гради непогребена трупиа. И старии с младенци лежаху, жены, не покрыты на срамных мѣстъ.
One could see the cities filled with unburried corpses. The old lay with the young, and women with their private part uncovered.

304, 20-21. И **бысть** видѣти падающа жиды, акы снопы, со забрал.
And one could see the Jews falling like sheaves from the ramparts.

407, Всея же силы не мощно **бысть** привести, зане тѣсно бѣ и не умѣстно.
It was not possible to bring up the whole force, because it was crowded and there was no room.

416, 27-9, на дружнѣ рамо въступив, досяже до златаго конца и до двѣрии, ими же възможно **бысть** възлазити къ храмом оцьркъвьным.
Standing on a comrade's shoulder, reached the gold-covered ledge and the door by which it was possible to get into the temple antechambers.

419, 2-3, И не **бысть** льзѣ видѣти земля, зане вся покрыта бысть трупиемь.
It was impossible to see the ground, because it was all covered with corpses.

460, 15-17, И убоялися есте избавлениа напасти великыя, им же достоино **бысть** не мѣдлити на то и ждати съвѣтники.
And you feared deliverance from great misfortune, when it was proper not to hesitate and wait for advisors.

The second clause of this sentence could be interpreted as counterfactual («you» did hesitate and wait), but a similar example for the Kievan Chronicle also has a finite nonperfect form of the verb *byti*:

Ипат 643 реⷱ Игорь "не достоино ми бѧшеть жити . и се нынѣ вижю ѿмѣстьє ѿ Гаⷭ Бⷶ моєго.»

Igor said «I did not deserve to live, and lo now I see the vengeance of the Lord my God."

There is one case which I hope is a mistake:

330, 4-7, Добрѣ ми **бысть** умрѣти преже дажде не видѣти храма божиа[97] осквернена и непроходимых мѣстъ святых, тѣснующеся ногами кровопиєць.
It would have been good for me to die before seeing God's Temple defiled and the forbidden holy places crowded with the feet of the bloodthirsty.

The Greek has an indicative past of *be* used in a counterfactual conditional here, but it would be surprising if the translator misunderstood the passage and translated the verb literally.

II. Improper use of the Aorist *бысть*

This leads naturally to the discussion of what I think is the overuse of *бысть* by someone who did not know 11th-12th century grammar.
Perhaps related to the use of *бысть* in the last example above, we find several examples of *бысть* used as the auxiliary of the conditional, one of which is confirmed in all cited sources:

181, 9-11. Иерусалимъскую стѣну поновляше и, сокрушеную Помпиемъ здавъше, и ускоре **бысть** разрушилъ Уркана, аще бы не приспѣлъ Гавинии, посланъ Цѣсаремь во Скавра мѣсто.

I generally agree with van Schooneveld's characterization of the function of *бысть* in narrative. It most often an event, which is obvious when it occurs with a past passive participle. It may specify the coming into being of a state, or a temporally defined state. What it should not be is a simple copula. There are one or two problematical examples in the Primary Chronicle. For example:

Os 1293-4 163,14-16. Се бысть первое зло на Руськую землю от поганыхъ безбожныхъ врагъ. Бысть же князь ихъ Сокалъ.
This was the first evil (committed) against the Rus Land by the pagan godless enemies. Their prince was Sokal.

Van Schooneveld's (1959: 76) explanation that «The events have passed; the limit is reached» hardly helps explain the last sentence. Perhaps it is illustrative to use an example from the Kievan Chronicle which contrasts бѣ and бъысть:

(340) В то же лѣто . постави Изѧславъ митрополитомъ Клима . Смолѧтича въведъ изъ Зароуба . бѣ бо черноризечь скимникъ и бъⷭ книжникъ . и философь . такъ ꙗкоже в Роускои земли не бѧшеть

In that year Iziaslav named Klim of Smolensk metropolitan, bringing him from Zarub. He was a monk of the order of Skimniks, and he turned out to be a scholar and philosopher such as never had been in the Russian Land.

I am assuming that in this sentence бѣ is a simple past tense copula, whereas бъсть represents what they found out about Klim after he came. Given that бысть is used in the sentence from the Primary Chronicle, I would be tempted to translate it (cumbersomely) as: «Their prince turned out to be Sokal.» The state was not new, but it was a new situation for the Rus'.

There are many instances in the text of Josephus where *бысть* seems to be a simple copula. They are distributed throughout the text. I found at least 38 suspicious instances. Good examples are:

180, 17-18 Тогда же плѣненъ бысть Аристоуловъ тесть, иже ему **бысть** стрѣи.
      Then Aristobulus' father-in-law was arrested, who was his uncle.

180, 29 Аристоулу же **быста** сына два, а двѣ дщери
      Aristobulus had two sons and two daughters

221, 22-4, Глаголаше же, яко прельщение есть Диофантово, иже **бысть** грамотникъ цесаревъ хитръ, муж мудръ.
He said that this was a deception (forgery) by Diophantus, who was the king's secretary, a clever and wise man.

228, 26-8, Оному же зѣло **бысть** мила жена, и рече: Яко удобь ми есть живота лишитися, неже жены своея.
His wife was very dear to him, and he said I would rather lose my life than my wife.

242, 8-9 Одръ же **бысть**, на немь же лежаше, злата[56] суха весь и с камениемь драгым.
The bier on which he lay was of solid gold with precious stones.

250, 9-11 Тогда же нѣкыи мужь хождаше по Июдѣи в чюдных ризах, возъвлеклъ [прилѣпив *Вол*] на ся власы скотиныа къ тѣлу своему, на немь же мѣсте не покрыто **бысть** от власъ его.
Then a certain man went about Judea in strange clothing, having covered with the hair of cattle those parts of his body which were not covered by his own hair.
(Here the passive seems to be stative, rather than eventive.)

280, 15-7, И потом, наставшю празднику дрѣвонесению, в немь же обычаи[29] **бысть** всемъ носити древа[30] къ жертовнику, егда [еда Вол.] когда оскудѣеть пища огневи, и да пребываеть неугасим.
And then came the festival of the bringing of wood, in which the custom was for everyone to bring wood to the altar, lest the fire lack fuel, so that it would never go out.

282, 2-3 и просяху у Нора, иже **бысть** строитель цесаревъ, да вдасть имъ стража
They asked of Noarus, who was the king's steward, that he give them guards

288, 22-3 , И положи вся принесеная у Енѣя, иже **бысть** силнѣи всѣх тарахиянъ,
  and he left all that they had brought with Annaeus, who was the most powerful citizen of Tarichaeae.

294, 12-14. Двѣма же сущима Галилѣема: и Горнии, и Долнии. Обходита Финикию и Сурию, от запада сълнчьнаго Птоломаиду и Кармил, иже **бысть** преже Холмъ Галилѣискыи.
There being two Galilees, upper and lower, they surround Phoenicia and Syria, from the west Ptolomais and Carmel, which earlier was a mountain of Galilee.

301, bottom Онем же обилие **бысть** всякого   брашна.   Оскудѣ в них соль и вода, зане [94]не **бысть** [94] [нѣсть *Вол.*]источника, ни кладезя внутрь   града.
They had an abundance of all kinds of food.   They lacked salt and water, because there was no spring and no well within the city.

303, 24. Се **бысть** *Саломѣинъ сынъ.*
    This was Salome's son.

319, 5-6. над озѣром стоя, иже **бысть** *копие цесарева [кончание царства *Вол*.] Агрипова,*
     located on a lake which was the end of the kingdom of Agrippa

329, 11-12, Пославше къ единому роду от колѣна Елиакимова, иже **бысть** святительско племя, и назнаменаша святителя.
They sent to the clan of Eliakim, which was a priestly tribe, and named a priest.

334, 12-3, Исусъ же, иже **бысть** вторыи от Иоана, и ставъ на сыну, и рече:
Jesus, who was second to John, climbed the tower and said:

369, 7-9. В западнѣи же странѣ не **бысть** вратъ, но от краа и до краа огражено бысть стѣнами.
On the western side there was no gate, but from one end to the other it was fortified with walls.

388, 26, **Бысть** же самъ храбръ, но не съвръшенъ умом.
He himself was brave, but not very bright.

391 И **бысть** присопныи град[76] 30 и 9 връстъ.
The earthwork barrier was 39 versts long.

436, 5-6, И не посла его[3] [4]на Ефраты,[4] иде же и дрѣвле **бысть**.
He did not send it (a legion) to the Euphrates, where it was before.

447, 18-24, **Бысть** бо имъ дрѣвнии законъ отьчьскыи дождати въ томъ мѣсте, донде же възвѣстять убьена воеводу супостатнаго. Се же **бысть** Симонъ, Гиоринъ сынъ, его же тогда сквозѣ люди ведоша с плѣнеными въ приелипсись
It was their ancient ancestral law to wait at that place until they announced that the enemy general was killed. This was Simon, the son of Gioras, whom they at that time led through the people with the captives in the procession

450, 1, над нею **быста** двѣ горцѣ, акы сосца противу себѣ
  Over it were two hills, like breasts across from each other.

  Many of these examples might be explained away, but the sheer number of troublesome examples is striking. In a computer search of the Primary Chronicle, the Kievan Chronicle, and the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle, I found only four problematical examples. I think that this phenomenon in Josephus is the result of someone "correcting" the text. We know that the past tense of *быти* was one of the earliest areas of spread of l-forms. I am willing to posit an earlier version of the text in which *был-* had spread— primarily at the expense of бѣ and бяше.   Someone perhaps decided to improve the Church Slavic grammar of the text by replacing all the *был-* by *бысть*.
  Unfortunately, we do not know whether the same person might have changed other l-forms to aorists.

III. Perfective Imperfects

  Last year at this conference I argued that practically all perfective imperfects are either in a negative context or are weakly modal, implying an «any» quantifier (whenever, whoever, wherever, if any, etc.) or «if».   The sequences of completed acts cited by Maslov and van Schooneveld also have this modal nuance, at least in the texts I looked at.
  In Josephus there are a substantial number of examples of perfective imperfects with negation (14), e. g.

177, 28-30, Ни же ни Аристоулъ **ослабяше**, надѣяся на Скаврово мьздоимание, украсив же ся цесарьскою одѣжею, приидѣ, не могыи прѣтерпѣти яко рабъ стояти, разидѣся от Диосполии.

178, 13-14, Но ни **сьмедляше**, ни **дадяше** врѣмени скупити ему воя, но воскорѣ идѣ по немъ.

216, 11-13, Таку горесть приемъ[89] Иродъ, яко ни на безвинныя **призряшеть** кротостию *и мнозѣм возбрани вход от своего двора.*

319, 13-14 Гамала же не **вдадяшеся**, надѣяше бо ся на твердость, зане бысть камена земля.

320, 10-11, Идѣ к Гамалу, не мощно же ему бысть обсѣсти весь град, зане пропасти страшны не **дадяху**.

430, 8, И на тѣх жалостно зряще, живущих не **пощадяху**.

One can discern a few residues of the mildly modal use, primarily as perfectives mixed with imperfectives, or perfectives as variants in one or more manuscripts. The examples I found were:

264, 17-19, Аще же кто от законна словесе отступаше [Vol. **отступяша**] и обличьно бысть от⁴ законоучитьлемъ, то, мучаще, **прогнаху** или къ цесареви⁴³ посылаху.

281, 26-7 Тои бысть славенъ, иже болѣ **возмяше**.
?Whoever? took the most was praised.

398, 34-6, Аще бо и на стѣнную твердость надѣяхутся, и овны **приобидяху**, и обаче боряхуся с ними свыше, браняще, да быша не поставили огня [Vol овна].
Even if they relied on the strength of the walls and scorned the battering ram, they still fought with them from above, tying to prevent them from setting up the ram.

427, 16-8, Аще же и кто от горящих прибѣгаху к пещерамъ, то убиваху, и **раздробяху [**разграбляху Istrin,В*ол.***],**⁸ и пищу смѣшану с кровию пожираху. .

This is not too surprising. Even through there are examples of properly used perfective imperfects into the thirteenth century in the Kiev and Galician/Volhynian Chronicles, there is also evidence of replacement of perfective by imperfect imperfects in the Hypatian version of the Primary Chronicle, compared to the Laurentian version.
However, there are almost as many examples in Josephus where the imperfect of a prefixed verb has no such justification:

220, 7-8, Евруклии же творяшеся [творяся *Вол*], яко милуя ею, прослезяшеть [просльзися *Вол*] пред нима [нама   *Вол*]

290, 26-7, Иоанъ, пославъ рѣчистыя мужа по градам, размолвяше люди, да оставять Иосифа и к нему ся приложать.
John, sending eloquent speakers through the town, persuaded the people to leave Josephus and join him.

326, 27-30, . Мятежники же грозою укротяше, негли мукою,
    He subdued the rebels with threats rather than punishment

There are few enough examples that they certainly could be due to copying errors. The same could be said of the four examples that I interpret as residues of a regular pattern. We are left with negatives as the only clear environment for the use of perfective imperfects in this text.

Conclusion

If we ignore the early part of the text, we can certainly say that the use of l-forms and the use of perfective imperfects in Josephus could represent a 12th century translation, overlaid with copying errors. The only phenomenon touched on here which argues for 12th rather than 11th century origin is the use of *bylo* plus infinitive for contrary-to-fact modality. Parallel forms do not show up until the Kievan Chronicle.

If it is a 12th century translation, then the instances of lack of morphophonemic alternations in the imperfect (отступяша, размолвяше, укротяше) argue for a southern origin. Last year I pointed out that such alternations started in the south and were not found in the *starshii izvod* of the Novgorod Chronicle.

The main problem in dealing with the text is the question of the relationship of the longer to the shorter version. The younger l-form narrative pasts might argue for a younger long version, but it is hard to find a scenario that makes this agree with what I argue is an intrusion of unjustified uses of *byst'*. These uses of *byst'* are in the prototext for both the long and short version, and seem to go back to a unified long version. If **all** our extant short versions go back to this unified long version, we have a problem arguing that the long version was secondarily produced in the thirteenth century. It is hard to believe that a person who used narrative perfects in producing the chronograph-only of the translation would also overuse *byst'* in favor of *bylo,* and would just happen to edit the short version along with the creation of the long version. One immediate solution would be to say that I am wrong in arguing that the instances of *byst'* are distortions, but I will not consider that here.

There are two scenarios that might work. We could assume that Meshcherskii is right, and that the short version was created from the long version late in the fourteenth century. The l-forms in the early part of the text must then be due to a quirk in the history of the text of the long version. Perhaps there was a sloppy copyist who copied on the first part, and distorted it.

We might be able to demonstrate this if the sloppy copyist was copying the chronograph from which the long version is taken. We know that a good part of Book One is not contiguous with the rest of the text in the chronograph.   We could look at the texts of the Malallas and Hamartolus Chronicles which are interspersed with Josephus, to see if they show narrative perfects in the same area of the text of the chronograph.

The second scenario is, I think, less likely. Let us assume that the short version was created in the twelfth century. An extant short version (perhaps the only one) was then used to extend the translation to form the long version. While the two versions were still in the same place, both versions were subject to an editing process which replaced most *bylo* by *byst'*. It is the edited copies that survived and served as the model for all subsequent copies.   If this were the case, we might expect to find differences between the two versions which could be traced to inconsistencies in the editing.

Particularly to examine the second scenario, but just in general to approach the problem properly, we need a careful reconstruction of the long version and the short version as separate texts.   We need to carefully compare the "shared" sections to look for inconsistencies that might cast doubt on the claim that they share a precise textual ancestor. We also need to look carefully at all the parts that belong only to the long version, to look for more differences in the language from the rest of the text.   Some of

the latter could be done from Meshsherskii's and Istrin's texts, but we do need a better reconstruction of the short version.

Bibliography

Darden, Bill J. 1995. "The Contextual Uses of the Present Perfect in the Primary Chronicle." in S. Karlinsky, J. L. Rice, and B. P. Scherr, eds, *O Rus! Studia litteraria slavica in honorem Hugh McLean.* Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 129-141.

Darden, Bill J. 2004, "A History of the East Slavic Imperfect" AAASS talk, Dec. 2004

Josephus, 1927-8, *The Jewish War,* Translated by H. St. J. Thackery, Loeb Classical Library, Vols. 203, 210, 487, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Istrin, V. M, 1922, "'Iudeiskaia voina' Iosifa Flaviia v drevnem slavianorusskom perevode," *Uchenye zapiski vysshei skoly goroda Odessy,* II, pp. 27-40.

_____1934-8, *La prise de Jérusalem de Joséphe le Juif,* Paris: Institut d'etudes Slavs.

Leeming, H. and K. Leeming, 2003, *Josephus' Jewish War and its Slavonic Version,* Leiden: Brill.

Maslov, Ju. S. 1954, "Imperfekt glagolov soveršennogo vida v slavjanskix jazykax." *Voprosy Slavjanskogo Jazykoznanija* 1: 68-138.

Meshcherskii, N. A., 1958, *Istoriia iudeiskoi voiny Iosifa Flaviia v drevnerusskom perevode.* Moscow, ANSSSR.

Ostrowski, Donald, 2003, *The Povest' vremennykh let,* Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

Polnoe Sobranie Russkix Letopisej, Vol I, *Lavrentovskaja Letopis'.*

Polnoe Sobranie Russkix Letopisej, Vol II, *Ipatev'skaja Letopis'.*

Polnoe Sobranie Russkix Letopisej, Vol III *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis',*

Zalizniak, A. A., 1995, *Drevnenovgorodskii dialect,* Moscow: Shkola "Iazyki russkoi kul'tury."