

Talev, Ilija V.

Some problems of the second South Slavic influence in Russia

München 1973

Z 60.523-67

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00047407-7

SLAVISTISCHE BEITRÄGE

BEGRÜNDET VON ALOIS SCHMAUS

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON HENRIK BIRNBAUM UND JOHANNES HOLTHUSEN

REDAKTION: PETER REHDER

Band 67

ILYA TALEV

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE SECOND SOUTH SLAVIC
INFLUENCE IN RUSSIA



VERLAG OTTO SAGNER · MÜNCHEN

1973

A Ph. D. dissertation, originally entitled: "The Impact of Middle Bulgarian on the Russian Literary Language (Post-Kievan Period)", defended on January 5, 1972 at the University of California, Los Angeles before the following Committee:

Professor Dean S. Worth, Chairman
Professor Henrik Birnbaum
Professor Thomas Eekman
Professor Richard Hovannisian
Professor Raimo Anttila



ISBN 3 87690 076 X

Copyright by Verlag Otto Sagner, München 1973
Abteilung der Firma Kubon und Sagner, München
Druck: Alexander Großmann
8 München 19, Ysenburgstraße 7^I

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Table of Contents	V
Abbreviations	X
Chapter One: The Second South Slavic Influence on Russian	1
1.1.1. Study of the problem since A. I. Sobolevskij's report in 1894	2
1.1.2. Ties between the medieval Bulgarian and Serbian literatures and literary languages	4
1.2. Sobolevskij's concept of the revision of the Middle Bulgarian language	12
1.2.1. The second South Slavic influence on the Russian script	14
1.3. The second South Slavic influence on the Russian art of manuscript illumination ..	16
1.3.1. Survey of the surviving Middle Bulgarian illuminated manuscripts	19
1.3.2. The question of characteristic national features in the Bulgarian MS illuminations	25
1.3.3. The question of 14th-century Bulgarian influence on the Russian art of MS illumination	31
1.4. The new style in the Russian literature of the late 14th - 15th centuries	32
1.4.1. Criticism of Lixačev's view on styles in the Middle Bulgarian literature	33
1.4.2. Reasons for stylistic innovation in medieval Bulgarian literature	37
1.4.3. The style of the medieval Bulgarian literature	42
1.4.4. The role of the Hesychasts in the introduction of the new style in Bulgarian literature	58

Chapter Two: The Importation of the Middle Bulgarian Literary Language into Russia	60
2.1.1. Middle Bulgarian orthographic peculiarities in the Russian writings of late 14th - 15th centuries (Sobolevskij's view) ..	60
2.1.2. Reflections of the Middle Bulgarian phonological system in the Russian orthography (Sobolevskij's view)	62
2.1.3. The influence of the Middle Bulgarian grammatical system on Russian (Sobolevskij's view)	63
2.2. The medieval Bulgarian literature brought to Russia	66
2.3. Views on the ways in which Middle Bulgarian influenced Russian. Criticism	66
2.3.1. The connection between the Turkish conquest of Bulgaria and Serbia and the second South Slavic influence; the question of South Slavic "immigrants" in Russia	67
2.3.2. Kiprian's role, as Muscovite Metropolitan, in the reform of the Russian language	82
2.3.3. Camblak's role, as Russian - Lithuanian Metropolitan, in the reform of the Russian language	93
2.3.4. A revised view of the reasons for the second South Slavic influence, its mechanisms, and the role of the monasteries of Mt. Athos and Constantinople	97
2.4. Problems in establishing the national origin of a Church Slavic text	115
2.4.1. Sobolevskij's criteria for establishing the national origin of Church Slavic translations	117
2.4.2. New view on the national origin of the Slavic translation of <u>Akir the Wise</u> ; the use of combined diagnostic features	120
2.4.3. The impossibility of defining the exact extent of the second South Slavic influence in Russia	127
Chapter Three: On the So-Called Revision of the Middle Bulgarian Language and Literature	130
3.1. The term "Middle Bulgarian"; the national boundaries of the people who wrote in the Bulgarian literary language of the 14th century	130

3.1.1. The northern boundary of Bulgarian population in the 14th - 15th centuries	137
3.1.2. The southern boundary of Bulgarian population in the 14th - 15th centuries	140
3.1.3. The northwestern boundary of Bulgarian population in the 14th - 17th centuries; the problem of transitional dialects between Bulgarian and Serbian, and the status of the literature of the 14th - century Vidin kingdom	141
3.1.4. The southwestern boundary of Bulgarian population in the 14th century	148
3.1.5. The question of the existence of a "Middle Macedonian" language	151
3.2. The traditional view on the revision of the Middle Bulgarian language as a "reform" by Patriarch Euthymius	161
3.2.1. Camblak's testimony to a reform by Euthymius of Tǎrnovo	163
3.2.2. Examination of the reliability of Camblak's testimony	164
3.2.3. Interpretations, in the literature, of Konstantin Kostenečki's writing about Euthymius; analysis of Konstantin's text	165
3.2.4. The problem of the existence of a linguistic reform by Euthymius in Bulgaria ..	174
3.3. A re-examination of the role of the Hesychasts in Middle Bulgarian literature and in the normalization of the language	184
3.3.1. The question of the existence of a Slavic Pre-Renaissance	185
3.3.2. On the term "Slavia Orthodoxa"	189
3.3.3. The role of the international Balkan monasteries in the revival of the medieval Bulgarian and Serbian literatures	191
3.4. The grouping of medieval Bulgarian manuscripts according to their linguistic peculiarities; revisions of old translations from Greek	194
3.4.1. The revised translation of the <u>Four Gospels</u> in 1355/56 for King Ioan Aleksandǎr of Tǎrnovo	197
3.4.2. Studies of the language of King Ioan Aleksandǎr's <u>Four Gospels</u> (IAG)	203
Chapter Four: Spelling and Phonology, Grammatical and Lexical Innovations in the Revised Edition of the <u>Four Gospels</u> (IAG)	206

4.1.	On the traditional distinction of orthographic schools in medieval Bulgaria ...	206
4.1.1.	B. Conev's distinction of spelling schools	206
4.1.2.	The letters of the Slavic alphabet according to Černorizec Xrabər's treatise "On the Letters"	208
4.1.3.	On the relation between letters and phonemes in Middle Bulgarian	211
4.1.4.	The alphabet and the vowel phonemes in Middle Bulgarian	212
4.1.5.	An approach to the study of the relationship between the orthographic and phonological systems of Middle Bulgarian, as reflected in IAG	212
4.1.6.	Problems in the identification of the morphonemes of the literary language	213
4.2.	The graphic expression of voiced / unvoiced consonantal morphonemes in IAG	216
4.2.1.	Graphic expression of neutralization in voicing in word-final position	216
4.2.2.	Graphic expression of neutralization in voicing at morpheme boundaries	218
4.2.3.	On the morphonemic status of {θ}	249
4.2.4.	On the morphonemic status of {ʒ}	253
4.2.5.	Spellings with double consonant letters	259
4.2.6.	Use of single letters representing consonantal clusters	265
4.2.7.	Graphic expression of {v} in foreign borrowings	266
4.2.8.	Simplification of the cluster /-zdn-/ in the spelling	267
4.2.9.	The spelling of epenthetic /l,/	269
4.2.10.	Other peculiarities in the spelling of the consonants	271
4.2.11.	Later corrections in the spelling of some words in IAG	272
4.3.	On the phonemic softening of the consonants; the vowel system	273
4.3.1.	The morphoneme {i} and its graphic expression in IAG	274
4.3.2.	The morphoneme {u} and its graphic expression in IAG	283
4.3.3.	The morphoneme {o} and its graphic expression in IAG	289
4.3.4.	The morphoneme {a} and its graphic expression in IAG	301

4.3.5. The nasal-vowel morphoneme { \tilde{V} } and its graphic expression in IAG	322
4.3.6. The vowel/zero alternation and the graphic expression of the vocalized outcome of the morphoneme {#}; the function of the <u>jer</u> letters in IAG	338
4.4. On the grammatical archaism and innovation in IAG	343
4.4.1. Morphological innovations	346
4.4.2. Syntactic Balkanisms - double object	346
4.5. Lexical changes in IAG	354
4.5.1. Replacement of foreign borrowings ...	355
4.5.2. Replacement of Slavic archaisms and dialectisms	357
4.5.3. Other lexical changes in IAG	359
Conclusions	364
Appendices	372
Bibliography	379

A B B R E V I A T I O N S

- AfSlPh - Archiv für slavische Philologie, Vienna-Berlin.
- AIPHOS - Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves, Brussels-New York.
- Annals UAASUS - Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, Chicago.
- AN SSSR - Akademija Nauk, SSSR.
- BAI - Bəlgarski Arxeologičeski Institut.
- BAN - Bəlgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Bgrd. - Beograd Library copy of Akir the Wise.
- BəlgEz - Bəlgarski ezik. Organ na Instituta za bəlgarski ezik pri BAN, Sofia.
- BəlgIstBibl - Bəlgarska istoričeska biblioteka (S. Slavčev, ed.), Sofia.
- CSP - Canadian Slavonic Papers, Toronto.
- EL - Ezik i literatura. Organ i izdanie na družestvoto na filolozite-slavisti v Bəlgarija, Sofia.
- GB - Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina, Moscow.
- GodSU - Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, Sofia.
- GodSU, Filosof.ist.fak. - Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, filosofsko-istoričeski fakultet, Sofia.
- GodSU, Ist.fil.fak. - Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, istoriko-filologičeski fakultet, Sofia.
- GPB - Gosudarstvennaja publicnaja biblioteka, Leningrad.

IAG - King Ioan Aleksandər's Four Gospels of 1355-1356. A microfilm from the original manuscript, kept in the British Museum under the number 39627 (Parham Collection, MS XLV).

IBE - Institut po bəlgarski ezik, BAN.

IBL - Institut za bəlgarska literatura, BAN.

II - Institut za istorija, BAN.

IJa - Institut jazykoznanija, AN SSSR.

IJSLP - International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, Hague.

IS - Institut slavjanovedenija, AN SSSR.

ISSt - Indiana Slavic Studies, Bloomington.

IstPr - Istoričeski pregled, Sofia.

IzvBAI - Izvestija na Bəlgarskija arxeologičeski institut, BAN, Sofia.

IzvIBE - Izvestija na Instituta po bəlgarski ezik, BAN, Sofia.

IzvIBL - Izvestija na Instituta za bəlgarska literatura, BAN, Sofia.

IzvII - Izvestija na Instituta za istorija, BAN, Sofia.

IzvOLJa - Izvestija Otdelenija literatury i jazyka AN SSSR, Moscow.

IzvORJaS - Izvestija Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti AN SSSR (Russia), Leningrad (St. Petersburg, Petrograd).

JF - Južnoslovenski filolog, Beograd.

- Mar. - Codex Marianus. Published by V. Jagić as: Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae Codex Marianus glagoliticus (Mariinskoe četveroevangelie s primečanjami i priloženijami), Berlin - St. Petersburg, 1883 (Photoreprint: Graz, 1960), xxx + 607 pp.
- MSFL - Matica srpska za filologiju i lingvistiku, Novi Sad.
- ODRL - Otdel drevnerusskoj literatury Instituta russkoj literatury AN SSSR (Puškinskij dom).
- OLJa - Otdelenie literatury i jazyka AN SSSR.
- ORJaS - Otdelenie russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti AN SSSR (Russia).
- OSlP - Oxford Slavonic Papers, Oxford.
- Ostr. - Ostromir Gospel. Published by A. Vostokov as: Ostromirovo evangelie 1056-1057 g. S priloženiem grečeskogo teksta evangelij i s grammatičeskimi ob"jasnenijami, St. Petersburg, 1843 (Photoedition: Wiesbaden, 1964), viii + 294 + 320 pp.
- PamDPI - Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti i iskusstva, St. Petersburg.
- Period.SpBAN - Periodičesko spisanie na Bəlgarskata Akademija na Naukite, Sofia.
- RÉS - Revue des Études Slaves, Paris.
- RFV - Russkij filologičeskij vestnik, Warsaw.
- RJaŠ - Russkij jazyk v škole, Moscow.
- Sav. - Savvina kniga. Published by V. Ščepkin as:

- Savvina kniga (Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka, I, 2), St. Petersburg, 1903 (Photoreprint: Graz, 1959), vii + 235 pp.
- SbBAN - Sbornik na Bəlgarskata Akademija na Naukite, Sofia.
- SbNUNK - Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina, Sofia.
- SbORJaS - Sbornik Otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti AN SSSR (Russia), Leningrad (St. Petersburg, Petrograd).
- SEEJ - Slavic and East European Journal, Bloomington, Ind. and Madison, Wis.
- SEER - Slavic and East European Review, London.
- Slavia - Slavia. Časopis pro slovanskou filologii, Prague.
- SlMov - Slov'jans'ke movoznavstvo, Kiev.
- SRev - Slavic Review. American Quarterly of Soviet and East European Studies, Seattle.
- Solov. - Soloveckij Monastery copy of Akir the Wise.
- SpBAN - Spisanie na Bəlgarskata Akademija na Naukite, Sofia.
- Supr. - Codex Suprasliensis. Published by S. Sever'janov as: Suprasl'skaja rukopis' (= Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka, II), St. Petersburg, 1904 (Photoedition: Graz, 1956), iv + 570 pp.
- Trudy GPB - Trudy Gosudarstvennoj publičnoj biblioteki, Leningrad.
- Trudy IJa - Trudy Instituta jazykoznanija AN SSSR, Moscow.
- Trudy ODRL - Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury Instituta

- russkoj literatury AN SSSR (Puškinskij dom),
Leningrad.
- UčZapIS - Učenyje zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija AN SSSR,
Moscow-Leningrad.
- VJaz - Voprosy jazykoznanija, Moscow.
- Word - Word. Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York,
New York.
- ZbMSFL - Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku,
Novi Sad.
- Zogr. - Codex Zographensis. Published by V. Jagić as:
Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim
Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus, characteribus
cyrillicis transcriptum notis criticis prolego-
menis appendicibus auctum, Berlin, 1879 (Photo-
reprint: Graz, 1954), xlv + 175 + iii pp.
- ŽMNP - Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvješčenja, St.
Petersburg.

C h a p t e r O n e

THE SECOND SOUTH SLAVIC INFLUENCE ON RUSSIAN

1.1. In May, 1894, at the annual meeting of the Archeological Institute in Saint Petersburg, the Russian Slavist A. I. Sobolevskij delivered a report entitled: Južno-slavjanskoe vlijanie na rusSKUju pis'mennost' v XIV - XV vekax¹. Some sixty years later, in September, 1958, another famous Russian scholar, a literary historian, medievalist and philologist, D. S. Lixačev, delivered to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists in Moscow a report entitled Nekotorye zadači izučenija vtorogo južnoslavjanskogo vlijanija v Rossii². These two papers stand alone in the history of Slavistics, since no other works on the subject, before or after them, can approach them in scope and seriousness. Sobolevskij's work "in certain respects

1. This report was soon afterward published as a separate brochure, Južno-slavjanskoe vlijanie na rusSKUju pis'mennost' v XIV - XV vekax. Reč', čitannaja na godičnom akte Arxeologičeskogo instituta 8 maja 1894 goda prof. A. I. Sobolevskim,

Nine years later the text was incorporated (with new bibliographical materials on the subject) as Chapter One of Sobolevskij's book, Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV - XVII vekov (Bibliografičeskie materialy), St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 1-37.

2. D. S. Lixačev, Nekotorye zadači izučenija vtorogo južnoslavjanskogo vlijanija v Rossii, Issledovanija po slavjanskomu literaturovedeniju i fol'kloristike (Doklady Sovetskix učenyx na IV Meždunarodnom s"ezde slavistov), Moscow, 1960, p. 95-151.

merely stated this influence, rather than studied it"³.

Lixačev summarized the extant knowledge about changes in the Russian culture of the late 14th and entire 15th centuries, and attempted to explain these changes in terms of the influence of the two Balkan Slavic high cultures of the 14th century - the Bulgarian and the Serbian.

1.1.1. In comparing the reports of Sobolevskij and Lixačev, one remarks how little factual information on the subject of linguistic change in the Russian language was gained by Slavists over the sixty years separating them. Lixačev's final conclusions take the form of four broadly-defined tasks set for future Slavists:

First, to study the extent of the South Slavic influence, its depth of penetration in different cultural areas.

Second, to study the ideological content of that intellectual movement which we have tentatively identified as the Byzanto-Slavic Pre-Renaissance.

Third, to study precisely that style which was connected with the second South Slavic influence.

Fourth, to conduct textological analyses of literary works translated and brought to Russia. The textological study of 14th and 15th century literary monuments and their copies will shed light on the route of concrete penetration into Russia, of South Slavic and Byzantine influence, on the degree and character of artistic re-working; it will assist in the study of the origin of particular literary borrowings in style, contents, etc.⁴.

As far as the structural changes in the language

3. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 96.

4. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 150.

of late 14th- and 15th-century Muscovite Russia are concerned, the scholar of today must still rely mainly on observations made earlier by Sobolevskij:

a) a comparison of the Russian manuscripts of the first half of the 14th century with those of the middle of the 15th century reveals a significant difference with respect to the language⁵;

b) the language of the Russian manuscripts of the middle of the 15th century reflects particular features of the Middle Bulgarian literary language⁶;

c) between the middle of the 14th and the middle of the 15th century, the Russian language and literature came under the very strong influence of the South Slavic languages and literatures, and in the end became completely submerged by them⁷.

It is interesting to note that all Russian authors, discussing the problem of the overall cultural influence in 14th- and 15th-century Russia, refer to this as the South Slavic influence, and still emphasize the leading role of the Middle Bulgarian literary language. So far, no one has been able to distinguish clearly where the Bulgarian element ends and the Serbian begins, or vice versa. The reasons for this lie in the historical development of

5. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 1.

6. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 6.

7. A. I. Sobolevskij, ibid.

the Bulgarian and Serbian languages. The history of the literary languages of these two Balkan Slavic states is closely related to that of the two nations, involving the complex relationships between nationality and nation-state organization, and between regional dialects and literary languages, as well as the mutual influence of the Serbian and Bulgarian cultures of the 14th century.

1.1.2. The enormous territorial expansion of the Bulgarian state in the 13th century, during the reign of the Tarnovo king Ioan Asen II (1218-1241)⁸ did not immediately bring about the flowering of Bulgarian literature⁹. The Bulgarian culture reached the peak of its development in the time of Bulgaria's greatest territorial losses, during the reign of the Tarnovo king Ioan Alexandar (1331-1371)¹⁰. But the cultural expansion in Tarnovo had its roots in the enlarged empire of the 13th-century Bulgarian kings, who gave vast wealth to the Church and the monasteries all over their newly-acquired territories. The only surviving evidence from the time of King Ioan Asen II of such heavy in-

8. V. Zlatarski, Istorija na bəlgarskata dəržava prez srednite vekove, III, Sofia, 1940, p. 323-324.

I. Dujčev, Car Ivan-Asen II, Sofia, 1941, p. 1-53.

, Prinosi kəm istorijata na Ivan-Asenja II, SpBAN, LXVI, 1943, v. 3, p. 168-169.

9. P. Dinekov, Literaturnijat život prez XIII v., Istorija na bəlgarskata literatura, I, Sofia, 1963, p. 254.

10. Ju. Trifonov, Despot Ivan-Aleksandar i položenieto na Bəlgarija sled Velbəždskata bitka, SpBAN, XLIII, 1930, p. 61-91.

vestments in the cultural and spiritual life of Bulgaria is the Church of the Forty Holy Martyrs in Tǎrnovo. But, as can be seen from their gramoty, later kings, especially those of the 14th century, gave most generously to the Church and its institutions¹¹.

The two centuries (11th - 12th) of Byzantine secular administration in the Balkan peninsula deprived the Slavic culture of any sponsorship from the central authorities. Then, in the 13th century, when Bulgaria expanded again under the Second Empire to encompass almost the entire peninsula, Bulgarians and Serbians worked together in the monasteries and other centers of culture to reshape the Slavic literature and literary language. A similar unity appeared later, in the rise of the Serbian culture of the late 14th and early 15th centuries: from the battle of Velbǎžd (today's Kjustendil) on June 28, 1330, to the fatal defeat by the Turks at Černomen (near Adrianopolis) on September 26, 1371, half of the Bulgarian lands were part of the Serbian kingdom of Stefan Dečanski, his son Stefan

11. An example of such generosity to the Church is the "Virgino Gramota" of King Konstantin Asǎn (before 1277) to the monastery of St. George Gorgos. For details, see:

G. A. Il'inskij, Gramoty bolgarskix carej, Moscow, 1911 (photoreprint: London, 1970), pp. 7-8, 14-21.

G. Balasčev, Sǎštinski li e xrisovulǎt na car Konstantin Tix (1258-1277)?, Minalo, II, Sofia, v. 5-6, 1911, p. 178-179.

P. Petrov, Kǎm vǎprosa za avtentičnostta na Virginskata gramota i dostovernostta na sǎdǎržaštite se v neja svedenija, GSU Fil.-ist. fak., v. I, 2, Sofia, 1958, p. 171-175.

Dušan (1331-1351) and their heirs¹². In the centers of learning and literary production of King Dušan's Serbia, both Bulgarians and Serbians must have taken almost equal part. The favorable treatment of Bulgarian scholars in Serbia must have been assured after 1332 by the presence in the palace of a queen of Bulgarian royal origin - King Dušan's wife Elena was the sister of the Tarnovo king, Ioan Aleksander¹³. Of how little importance were national differences among the Balkan peoples of the second half of the 14th century, may be judged from an example in the Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle:

During the reign of this King Constantine [Constantine IV of Byzantium, 668-685], the Bulgarians crossed the Danube and, after defeating the Greeks, took from them the land where they are still living today. Earlier, the name of this land was Moesia. But because they were multiply numerous (sic!), they filled not only (the land on) this side of the Danube, but also (the land) all the way to Drač [today's Dures] and even further down, for the Wallachians, Serbians and the rest are all one and the same¹⁴.

While there must have been distinct structural differences between the spoken language of the Bulgarians

12. I. Dujčev, Bolgarskie licevye rukopisi XIV veka, Bolgarskaja miniatjura XIV veka (M. V. Ščepkina, ed.), Moscow, 1963, p. 8.

13. Balgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Balgarija, v. I, Sofia, 1961, p. 223.

14. I. Dujčev, ed., Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, p. 249.

and that of the Serbians¹⁵, the differences in the two literary languages are mostly reflected in the orthography (due to different phonological systems and to different schools and traditions), while the differences in the grammar are very small. The above statement may seem unexpected, since such a belief is not shared by those Slavists who work in the field of Bulgarian historical grammar. But these scholars have never offered any explanation for the most curious development in the nominal-declension system of Middle Bulgarian: on the one hand, the entire nominal declension moved rapidly toward analytism (a three-case system of nominative, accusative and dative) - a process first observed in the Classical OCS texts, and completely demonstrated in the gramoty of the 15th century¹⁶; on the other hand, all Middle Bulgarian texts give

15. The Serbian writer of Bulgarian origin, Konstantin Kostenečki, refers to two distinct languages, the Serbian and the Bulgarian, in his treatise On the Letters. See:

V. Jagić, Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum (photoreprint), Munich, 1968, p. 203.

16. I. Duridanov, Pětjat na bəlgarskija ezik ot sintetizəm kəm analitizəm, BəlgEz, VII, 1957, 1, p. 5-8. Kəm problemata za razvoja na bəlgarskija ezik ot sintetizəm kəm analitizəm, GSUFil.fak., v. LI, 1, 1955, p. 87-272.

K. Mirčev, Po vəprosa za naj-rannite primeri na analitičen datelen padež v bəlgarskite pametnici, Eziko-vedski izsledvanija v čest na akademik Stefan Mladenov, Sofia, 1957, p. 37-46.

S. B. Bernštejn, Razyskanija v oblasti bolgarskoj istoričeskoj dialektologii, v. 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, 368 pp.

E. V. Češko, Istorija bolgarskogo sklonenija, Moscow, 1970, 319 pp.

numerous examples of "new" case endings for the "dying" (or already "dead") cases, strikingly reflecting the actual historical development of the nominal flexion of the Serbo-Croatian language. These two processes are not mutually exclusive: the disappearance of certain grammatical categories in the living Bulgarian dialects helped determine the great influence of those same categories where they existed, in the neighboring living Serbian dialects. It is only regrettable that, apparently, no serious studies on the mutual influence of Serbian and Bulgarian have ever been conducted.

So far, it is almost impossible to use lexical items as diagnostic forms in determining the national origin of certain South Slavic texts. The fact that a word in a 14th-century writing is registered today only in a dictionary of modern Bulgarian dialects does not prove that the word does not exist in some unrecorded Serbo-Croatian dialect of today, nor does it prove that this word has always existed in Bulgarian or that it never existed elsewhere. The picture is further obscured by the existence of a wide belt of transitional Bulgaro-Serbian dialects: in modern South Slavic dialectology, the assignment of a certain dialect to either the Serbian or the Bulgarian language is made on the basis of extralinguistic and disputable linguistic factors -- the national identity of the dialect's speakers. It is quite reasonable to

believe that a similar situation has always obtained in the Balkans, although the belt of transitional dialects may have had different geographic distributions at different times. We do not reject a priori the necessity of searching for a large number of words which can be useful in determining the Bulgarian or Serbian provenance of a medieval text; at the present moment, however, such a list of diagnostic words does not exist, and its compilation will be possible only after the publication of complete dictionaries of Old and Middle Bulgarian and Old Serbian, and after a thorough investigation of the lexical wealth of the South Slavic dialects of today. Until then, any effort in this direction should be extremely cautious, and the results only tentative¹⁷.

The problem of the syntactic differences between Old Serbian and Middle Bulgarian is still an area untouched by Slavists. However, certain syntactic "Balkanisms" in the Bulgarian linguistic area, such as the "double object", the replacement of the infinitive by "да-constructions", the use of *ХОТѢТИ* for affirmative future and of *НЕ ИМѢТИ* for negative future, etc., could be successfully used as diagnostic features, provided they found their way into the

17. At the end of the last century, A. I. Sobolevskij prepared a short list of words, showing the national origins of Church Slavic texts. See:

A. I. Sobolevskij, Russkie zaimstvovannye slova (Litografirovannyj kurs), St. Petersburg, 1891, 401 pp.

Since then, this list has been widely used by textologists as a reliable set of diagnostic words (cf. 2.4. and 2.4.1.).

literary language¹⁸. The time of first penetration of such features into the Bulgarian literary language is considered to be much later than it actually was (see our discussion in 4.4.2.)

Practically, it is impossible to decide the Bulgarian or Serbian origin of a literary work of the period 11th - 14th centuries when certain phonetic, orthographic, lexical and syntactic features of both languages are present in the copies. In such cases, it seems that the best a researcher can do is to identify the manuscript as of mixed Bulgaro-Serbian recension. The number of such manuscripts in libraries and museums all over the world is substantial¹⁹. An interesting example of how difficult it is to decide the national origin of a text, is the history of the study of the Eremitical Homilies by Isaak the Syrian. In the description of the 16th-century Russian copy of these Homilies²⁰ (Sinod. # 131), Gorskiy and Nevostruev used for comparison a Serbian copy of the late 14th century (with

18. K. Mirčev, Za xronologijata na osnovnite balkanizmi v bəlgarskija ezik, BəlgEz, XVI, 1966, 4, p. 281-293.

19. In a letter to me, Mr. Manjo Stojanov of the Sofia National Library "Kiril i Metodij" stated that that library alone has 45 large manuscripts of mixed Bulgaro-Serbian recension.

20. A. V. Gorskiy, K. Nevostruev, Opisanie slavjanskix rukopisej Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj biblioteki, II, 2, Moscow, 1859, p. 156-177. See also:

A. N. Popov, Opisanie rukopisej i katalog knjig cerkovnoj pečati biblioteki A. I. Xludova, Moscow, 1872, p. 80-89.

corrections and additions from the early 15th century), which had been brought to Russia from Mt. Athos by A. N. Murav'ev. Since the Serbian copy was the oldest of the revised texts known at that time, the two textologists wrote:

The Athos manuscript represents the translation of the Homilies by Blessed Isaak the Syrian in its original shape; as shown by the later additions in the margins, the new word order and the changes in the language itself, the original translation was later edited. But even after the editorial work, traces of the Serbian origin of the translation are preserved in the copies kept in the Synod Library²¹.

Next in time was the description of a Serbian copy of the 14th-15th century, made by L. Stojanović²², kept in the National Library in Beograd as # 423. Since this copy was textologically very close to the Mt. Athos copy, determined by Gorskiy and Nevostruev to be an original Serbian translation, L. Stojanović simply repeated their findings. In 1905, A. I. Jacimirskij discovered, in the library of the Rumanian monastery of Niamțu, a Middle Bulgarian copy of the same edition of this work, without a trace of Serbian influence²³. This manuscript was assigned by Jacimirskij to the 14th century, although he was not

21. A. V. Gorskiy, K. Nevostruev, op. cit., p. 174.

22. L. Stojanović, Katalog Narodne biblioteke u Beogradu. Rukopisi i stare štampane knjige, IV, Beograd, 1903, p. 139-146.

23. A. I. Jacimirskij, Slavjanske i ruskie rukopisi rumynskix bibliotek, SbORJaS, v. 79, 1905, p. 721-723.

able to determine whether or not it was older than the Serbian copies.

The Bulgarian National Library has recently received from the Archeological Museum in Sofia, a Middle Bulgarian recension of the same text, written on paper, dating from the period 1297-1311²⁴. This is the oldest copy of the same edition known so far, and in the archaic shape of the letters and absolute Bulgarian character of the language, shows itself to be a copy from a much older Bulgarian original²⁵.

1.2. It is widely accepted, however, that the Middle Bulgarian language played the main role in the reshaping of the Russian literary language of the 15th century²⁶. The best of the 14th-century Bulgarian books which were deposited in the Balkan monasteries or taken to Russia soon after the fall of Tarnovo to the Turks (in the summer of 1393)²⁷ were written in a language which was easily accepted in Moscow as a sample of the correct Church Slavic,

24. M. Stojanov, Xr. Kodov, Opis na slavjanski-te rækopisi v Sofijskata narodna biblioteka, III, Sofia, 1964, p. 182-190.

25. M. Stojanov, Xr. Kodov, op. cit., pp. 182, 189.

26. A. I. Sobolevskij, Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV - XVII vekov, St. Petersburg, 1903, p.6.
D. S. Lixačev, op.cit., p. 106.

27. Bølgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bølgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 244.

and which, as such, served the Russians as a model for the purification and revision of their own older books. The linguistic reforms in Bulgaria (early 14th century) and in Serbia and Russia (late 14th - 15th centuries) were, by and large, movements towards normalization of the literary languages of these countries. In each country the process yielded different practical results; the normative rules gradually established in Serbia and Russia had to accommodate the new features of Middle Bulgarian to their own very strong literary traditions. Still, the reforms in Serbia and Russia followed the same principles as those applied in the revision of the Middle Bulgarian literary language. Sobolevskij generalizes these principles as follows²⁸:

- a) to separate the literary language from the spoken dialects;
- b) to bring the literary language closer to that of the oldest monuments - Old Church Slavic;
- c) to establish an orthography which would not reflect the phonological system of the particular national language, whenever this system conflicted with that of Old Church Slavic;
- d) to introduce the contemporary Byzantine script and some writing conventions applicable to Slavic - the use of superscripts, abbreviations, stress markings, etc.;
- e) to imitate as closely as possible the syn-

28. A. I. Sobolevskij, op.cit., p. 3-4.

tactic structure of Byzantine Greek, its rules of word-formation, and the style of the time of the Paleologues.

1.2.1. According to Sobolevskij, the most striking difference between the Russian texts of the first half of the 14th century and those of the end of the 14th and of the entire 15th centuries, is in the script. While the manuscripts of the mid-14th century are written in uncial script (ustav) or in the old semiuncial (staršij poluustav) typical for Russian, almost all of the manuscripts of the 15th century are written in the new semiuncial (mladšij poluustav) borrowed from the 14th-century Bulgarian and Serbian texts²⁹. V. N. Ščepkin studied in greater detail the problem of the South Slavic influence on the Russian script, and reached the same conclusion³⁰. Later, M. N. Speranskij was able to determine not only the South Slavic influence on the Russian script, but also the independent Russian borrowing of a new style of handwriting directly from the Byzantine school - the Greek minuscule script³¹.

Speranskij's contribution to the problem of this abrupt change in the Russian script³², with no transitional styles intervening, is of great importance, for it illustrates the

29. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 1.

30. V. N. Ščepkin, Učebnik rusckoj paleografii, Moscow, 1920, p. 55-58.

31. M. N. Speranskij, "Grečeskoe" i "ligaturnoe" pis'mo v russkix rukopisjax XV-XVI vekov, Byzantinoslavica, IV, 1932, p.58-64.

32. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 97.

search by the Russians of that time for innovation in their culture and literary production, even to the external form of the letters of the alphabet.

But not all contemporary scholars recognize the importance of the second South Slavic influence on the 15th-century Russian script. A typical representative of a certain group of Soviet scholars, who try to minimize any foreign influence over Russia, is L. V. Čerepnin³³. His attitude toward the second South Slavic influence in the development of the Russian scripts is best demonstrated by his classification of Russian paleography from the beginning of the 12th century to the end of the 15th into one unified period³⁴. His explanations of the appearance of the new semiuncial and of the cursive script (skoropis') are the following:

A number of new phenomena are observed in the Russian literature of the 12th - 15th centuries. More and more, the writing acquires practical application and a businesslike character. In connection with this, new types of script — the semiuncial (approximately from the 14th century) and the cursive (from the 15th century) spread and become dominant The ornamentation of the manuscripts also undergoes an endless evolution of artistic styles. All the above-mentioned phenomena were connected with the wider dissemination of literature, with the greater demands for books, with the appearance of scribes who worked not only on order but also for the

33. L. V. Čerepnin, Russkaja paleografija, Moscow, 1956, pp. 190, 213-215.

N. S. Čaev, L. V. Čerepnin, Russkaja paleografija, Moscow, 1946, p. 75.

34. L. V. Čerepnin, op. cit., p. 175-280.

market³⁵.

When a Marxist historian makes such blunders as: a) to talk about the 12th - 15th centuries when he means the late 14th and the 15th centuries; b) to apply the term "evolution" to the abrupt transition from teratological (monstrous) illuminations to those of purely geometrical type³⁶; and c) even to invent a "free market" of supply and demand for manuscripts in 15th-century Russia, he must feel sure that he can offer with impunity any argument, provided it avoids any allusion to a second South Slavic influence.

1.3. The South Slavic influence on Russian manuscript illumination is well documented³⁷, but which of the Bulgarian and Serbian manuscripts influenced the Russian style, and precisely in what features, remains an insufficiently studied problem³⁸. E. F. Karskij has emphasized the heavy dependence of the Russian art of ornamenting manuscripts on the Old and Middle Bulgarian tradition. The latter was itself either a reflection of the Byzantine art of the 9th-11th and again of the 13th-14th centuries, or of

35. L. V. Čerepnin, op. cit., p. 190-191.

36. D. S. Lixačev, ibid.

37. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 2-3.

D. S. Lixačev, ibid.

V. N. Ščepkin, ibid.

38. The most comprehensive study so far on the Bulgarian art of illumination is:

M. V. Ščepkina, ed., Bolgarskaja miniatura XIV veka, Moscow, 1963.

certain Western trends, such as the teratological style, which flourished in the Balkans in the 12th-13th centuries and was still alive in Russia (in Novgorod) even in the 15th³⁹. The miniature paintings on some Middle Bulgarian manuscripts may have influenced the later history of the Russian art of miniatures, which declined at the end of the Kievan period but was again well developed from the 15th century onward⁴⁰. Such an influence could only have occurred when Russian painters visited the Balkan or Moldavian monasteries which had Bulgarian books, for the few Bulgarian books with rich illuminations were brought to Russia, if at all, only centuries later⁴¹.

According to some specialists, there were two Bulgarian schools of manuscript illumination: the Popular School and the Palace (Tarnovo) school⁴². Such an aprioristic division, although seemingly correct, does not reflect the facts. The primitively illuminated Psalter of 1337 should, according to its style, belong to the Popular School,

39. E. F. Karskij, Slavjanskaja kirillovskaja paleografija, Leningrad, 1928, p. 135-157.

40. E. F. Karskij, op. cit., p. 137-139.

41. S. Belokurov, Arsenij Suxanov, v. I, Moscow, 1891, p. 408.

42. N. Mavrodinov, Starobolgarskata živopis, Sofia, 1946, p. 153.

B. Filov, Starobolgarskata živopis prez XIII i XIV vek, BolgIstBibl, III, 1930, 1, p. 87-89.

I. Dujčev, Bolgarskie licevye rukopisi XIV veka, Bolgarskaja miniatjura XIV veka (M. V. Ščepkina, ed.), Moscow, 1963, p. 10.

although it bears an inscription from which one learns that it was especially made for the Tarnovo king Ioan Aleksander⁴³. On the other hand, the beautiful illuminations in the Exegesis of the Four Gospels⁴⁴, made early in 1337 in the provincial town of Anchialo on the Black Sea (today's Pomorie), should be assigned to the Popular School, since they were not painted in the capital, Tarnovo; yet they are very close in style to the best of the King's own illuminated books.

An examination of the Popular School manuscripts⁴⁵

43. B. Conev, Slavjanski rækopisi na Bælgarskata akademija, SbBan, VI, 1916, p. 4-13.

44. The Middle Bulgarian text is a translation from the Exegesis by Theophylactus, Archbishop of Oxrid (11th - 12th centuries). It is bound inside a Greek anthology (284 leaflets), currently kept in the Leningrad State Public Library "Saltykov-Ščedrin" as # Greč-235. For more information see:

I. Dujčev, Iz starata bælgarska knižnina, Sofia, 1944 (2nd ed.), pp. xxxiii, 281, 419.

45. Acts of the Apostles (from Oxrid) of the 12th century. See:

S. M. Kul'bakin, Oxridskaja rukopis' Apostola konca XII veka, Sofia, 1907, p. vi-vii.

The Four Gospels by the priest Dobrejšo, from around the year 1221. See:

B. Conev, Dobrejšovoto četveroevangelie, Sofia, 1906, 264 + vi pp.

The Bologna Psalter, from between 1218 and 1241. See:

I. Dujčev, ed., Bolonski psaltir (photographic reproduction of the manuscript), Sofia, 1968, 530 pp.

The Radomir's Psalter of the 13th century. See:

V. Zaxariev, Ornamentalnata ukrasa na Radomirovija psaltir ot bibliotekata na Zografskija manastir, Rodina, II, 1939, 2, p. 154-158.

(with the exception of the above-mentioned Exegesis of the Gospels) shows that all of them belong to earlier times (12th - 13th centuries) and exhibit the teratological style of illumination. This group of manuscripts cannot have influenced the Russian art of the late 14th and 15th centuries, for the Russian teratological style was by that time dying out. All illuminated Bulgarian manuscripts of the 14th century belong to a new school, which had severed all ties with the teratological style of the previous centuries. Whether a manuscript was made for the King in the capital, or for a provincial archbishop, must have had little relation to its artistic merits. The style of the era was unified, reflecting contemporary Byzantine style, and all that counted was the talent, taste and experience of the artist. The only reasonable explanation of why the King's Psalter of 1337 is not "characteristic" of the "Tarnovo School"⁴⁶ is that the illuminator was a person of limited artistic abilities.

1.3.1. The very few extant illuminated Bulgarian manuscripts from the 14th century are fully representative of the artistic taste of the time. As for the limited number of surviving manuscripts, it is impossible to judge whether all the illuminations existing in the 14th century are known today, and if not, what percentage the remnants

46. I. Dujčev, Bolgarskie licevye rukopisi XIV veka, Bolgarskaja miniatjura XIV veka (M. V. Ščepkina, ed.), Moscow, 1963, p. 11.

represent of the total number of illuminated manuscripts which once existed.

The most remarkable of all Middle Bulgarian illuminated manuscripts is the British Museum's Four Gospels of King Ioan Aleksandər⁴⁷, which has 365 miniature paintings⁴⁸. Although most of the miniatures are copies from an older Byzantine gospel book, there are a few original portraits: of the Bulgarian king Ioan Aleksandər, his wife Theodora, his sons Ioan Asěn and Ioan Šišman, his daughters Keraca, Desislava and Kera Themar, and his son-in-law Konstantin, husband of Kera Themar⁴⁹.

Another exclusive example of Bulgarian illuminated manuscripts, although almost unknown, is the Tomić Psalter, kept in the State Historical Museum in Moscow, # Muz.2752⁵⁰.

47. We will discuss in detail this manuscript in the next chapters of the dissertation. For more information on the illuminations of the manuscript, see Chapter Three.

48. Ivan Dujčev gives the incorrect number of 352 miniatures in his article Bolgarskie licevye rukopisi XIV veka, p. 12. Most likely, he was misled by a misprint in the existing literature quoted in his bibliographical footnotes. I have a full microfilm copy of the manuscript, and counted 365 separate miniatures.

49. See the British Museum manuscript # 39627 (Parham Collection, MS XLV), pp. 2b, 3, 5b.

50. The only available description until recently of the miniatures in this manuscript is in a very hard-to-find book:

V. N. Ščepkin, Bolgarskij ornament epoxi Ioanna Aleksandra, Sbornik statej po slavjanovedeniju, posvjaščennyx prof. M. S. Drinovu, Kharkov, 1904, p. 153-158.

This manuscript was found in today's Macedonia by the Serbian philologist S. N. Tomić, who sent it to Moscow in September, 1902⁵¹.

The best-known and most-studied Bulgarian illuminations are those of the famous Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle⁵². It has 69 miniature paintings; 18 of them illustrate Bulgaro-Byzantine relations, and four — relations among Russians, Bulgarians and Byzantines⁵³. We can be almost certain that the Vatican's illuminated Manasses Chronicle had no influence on Russian art. The whereabouts of the book after the fall of Tarnovo (1393) until its first inventarization in the Vatican Library (1481) is unknown. But most likely, it was taken westward to Croatia or the Dalmatian coast, where two persons, writing in Latin⁵⁴

51. AN SSSR, Dokumenty k istorii slavjanovedenija v Rossii (1850-1912), Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, pp. 181, 183, 213, 218.

52. The manuscript was photo-reproduced by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences:

I. Dujčev, ed., Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, 415 pp.

Unfortunately, the photoreproduction is in black and white, thus contributing little to the study of its artistic features.

For bibliographic information on the studies of the miniatures and text of the Chronicle (until 1963), see the preface by I. Dujčev, op. cit., p. v - xxxvi.

53. I. Dujčev, Miniatjuri na Manasievata letopis, Sofia, 1962, 138 pp.

54. I. Dujčev, Latinskite nadpisi po Vatikan-skija prepis na Manasievata Xronika, Izvestija na Belg. arx. institut, VIII, 1934, p. 369-378.

, Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, pp. xii - xiii, 412-415.

strongly colored by Italian, explained on each page the content of the text and identity of the personages shown in the miniatures. In Croatia the manuscript formed part of the library of the bishop of Modros, Nikola Kataraski, although it is not known when he acquired it. Together with some other books belonging to the bishop, the Manasses Chronicle was given to the Vatican Library sometime between the years 1475 and 1481⁵⁵. But the Middle Bulgarian translation of the Manasses Chronicle was well known in Russia through a Serbian copy. In a passage on Roman history, both the Tale of the Founding of Moscow⁵⁶ and the so-called Chronograph (First Version)⁵⁷ contain the mysterious "Russian" word spelled ентинарий (in the former) and енътинирие (in the latter). Credit is due the Soviet scholar M. A. Salmina for first establishing that this word was a wrong translation, due to misreading, of a phrase from the Greek original of the Manasses Chronicle⁵⁸. The corresponding Greek ἐν Τυρρηνίῃς was written, in one of the Slavic copies, as one word, ентинарий or енътинирие, instead of the correct

55. I. Dujčev, op. cit., p. xiii.

56. M. N. Tixomirov, Skazanie o načale Moskvy, IZ, v, 32, Moscow, 1950, p. 233.

57. Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury, v. XXII, 1, St. Petersburg, 1911, p. 227.

58. M. A. Salmina, "Entinarij" v "Povesti o začale Moskvy", TODRL, v. XV, Moscow-Leningrad, 1958, p. 362-363.

*ВЪ ТИРИНИЙ³. Salmina found a 17th-century Serbian copy of the Manasses Chronicle⁵⁹ which must have been copied from the same original as the above-mentioned Chronograph (First Version). The Serbian copy from Novgorod has the spelling ентиририе, and the Chronograph — енътиририе. From the Chronograph to the Tale of the Founding of Moscow, the word was changed into ентинарий³. I. Dujčev⁶⁰ traced the story to the very end. The Bulgarian translator of the Chronicle failed to understand the phrase ἐν Τυρρηνοῖς as consisting of two words, and rendered it as энтирѣние: эже оувѣдѣвъ энтирѣние. искоусныи знамениомъ съмотритель, ре^ч. нако градъ съи глава многымъ ꙗзыкомъ бѣдетъ...⁶¹ (When Entirinie, the experienced seer of signs, learned about it, he said that this city will be head of many nations...). The correct translation would have been: "When an experienced seer of signs in (the city of) Tyrrenoīs learned about it, he said ...". All three⁶² known Middle Bulgarian

59. The manuscript # 1437 of the former library of the Novgorod Cathedral Church of St. Sophia, currently kept in the State Public Library in Leningrad.

60. I. Dujčev, *Odna citata iz Manassievoj Xroniki v srednebolgarskom perevode*, TODRL, v. XVI, Moscow - Leningrad, 1960, p. 647-649.

61. This quotation is from the photo-edition of the Vatican copy:

I. Dujčev, ed., Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, p. 138.

62. I. Bogdan, Cronica lui Constantin Manasses. Traducere mediobulgară făcută pe la 1350. Text și glosar de Ioan Bogdan. Cu prefața de prof. I. Bianu, București, 1922, p. 73.

texts of the Manasses Chronicle repeat the same mistake (ентири́ние) in the original from which they were copied. In an unknown copy dating somewhere between the 14th-century Bulgarian copies and the time of the First Version of the Russian Chronograph, a scribe misspelled ентири́ние into ентини́рие. This unknown copy must have been the source of both the Russian Chronograph (енѣтини́рие) and the Serbian Manasses Chronicle in the copy from Novgorod (ентини́рие); the spelling then became ентина́рий² in the Tale of the Founding of Moscow.

This excursus was necessary in order to clarify two points: first, in how complex a fashion the Bulgarian literature and language influenced those of 15th-century Russia (often through Serbian mediation); second, that it was not the beautifully illuminated Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle (for it contains the un-metathesized form ентири́ние) which was used as a prototype for the Russian Chronograph, but an unknown copy, containing the metathesized form ентини́рие from which both the Chronograph and the Serbian Manasses Chronicle from Novgorod were copied.

Another little-known illuminated 14th-century Bulgarian text is the Exegesis of the Four Gospels (cf. 1.3 and fn. 44), written in May of 1337 by the monk Metodij Gemist for the Archbishop of Anchialo⁶³.

63. I. Dujčev, Bolgarskie licevye rukopisi XIV veka, Bolgarskaja miniatjura XIV veka (M. V. Ščepkina, ed.), Moscow, 1963, p. 15-16.

The last of the 14th-century illuminations is King Ioan Aleksander's Psalter of 1337 (also known as Sofijski Pesnivec)⁶⁴. Bulgarian art historians consider the artistic merits of the illumination in the Psalter far below those of the other 14th-century manuscripts (cf. fn. 46).

1.3.2. A very important aspect of the Middle Bulgarian influence on the art of manuscript ornamentation in 15th-century Russia is the characterization of uniquely Bulgarian features in the style of the above-described 14th-century manuscripts. In this respect, I. Dujčev writes:

In addition, it is necessary to state that, while the Popular School still preserves relative originality, the official Търново School reflects a strong Byzantine influence⁶⁵.

As has been stated above the so-called Popular School was actually that of the Bulgarian decorative art of the 13th century. Its originality was a relative one, the style differing from that of its Byzantine counterpart because of the temporary severance of Bulgaria's ties with Eastern Orthodox culture. As is known, from 1199/1200 to 1235 the official Bulgarian Church accepted the spiritual leadership of the Pope of Rome⁶⁶. Even after 1235, the ties

64. A. S. Arxangel'skij, Bolgarskij "Pesnivec" 1337 goda. Poxvala i otryvok psaltyrnogo teksta, Izv. ORJaS, II, 1897, 3, p. 786-794.

65. I. Dujčev. op. cit., p. 10.

66. Bəlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bəlgarija, I, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), pp. 175, 184.

of Bulgaria with the Nicaean Patriarchate were weak, since Constantinople was retained by the Crusaders (Third Crusade) until the year 1261⁶⁷. The non-Byzantine features of the 13th-century Bulgarian ornamental style definitely represent a Catholic influence. The very teratological style was a western influence in Bulgaria. This style originated in the Catholic tradition, or more precisely, it corresponds to the early (7th-century) Roman Barbarian style. It flourished in the South Slavic area (13th century) and was further developed in Russia (end of 13th - 14th centuries)⁶⁸. A definite proof of the Catholic influence in it is the controversial tonsure (shaved top of the head) in the self-portrait of the priest Dobrejšo in a miniature of his Four Gospels (cf. fn. 45). The Russian art historian S. M. Dimitrievič has suggested that in the picture there was not a tonsure, but a head covering of some kind, perhaps a sort of priest's hat⁶⁹.

If one writes of strong Byzantine influence on the official Tarnovo School of the 14th century, the reader may

67. Bølgarska Akademija na Naukite, op. cit., p. 207.

68. E. F. Karskij, Slavjanskaja kirillovskaja paleografija, Leningrad, 1928, p. 148.

69. S. M. Dimitrievič, Est' li tonsury na golovax svjatitelej v starom vostočno-pravoslavnom ikonopisanii?, Izvestija na Bølgarskija arxeologičeski institut, X, 1936, p. 113-128.

Of course, Priest Dobrejšo must have had a tonsure, since he was a Catholic priest, not an Eastern-Orthodox one; the painting was made in about the year 1221, and the Bulgarian Church was under the Pope from 1199/1200 to 1235 (cf. fn. 66).

expect to find reference to those stylistic elements which remained uninfluenced. Such references, however, are never made by Bulgarian art historians. Further, a few obscure facts may shed copious light on the problem of the very existence of an artistic school in Tarnovo, as well as on the national character of the illuminations.

The scribe of the Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle did not originally plan to have miniatures in the book. He marked the lines for future writing on all leaflets except three which were added later: 145, 178 and 183. When the lines had already been made, something caused the scribe to change his mind, and the miniatures were painted over the marked parallel lines. Through the centuries, the paint has chipped from the scored lines, which are clearly seen in the photostatic edition⁷⁰. The answer does not seem to be very complicated: it may be surmised that when the scribe prepared his pages for writing, there was no artist present, and no illuminations were planned. But when the scribe reached the middle of page 14 (the back page of the seventh leaflet), a talented painter appeared and the first miniature was painted. Then, the next miniatures followed: after four pages, then after one, then after another four, etc. The initial leaflet has the images of Jesus Christ and the chronicler Manasses, as well as a

70. These lines are on pp. 1, 3, 4, 14, 19 etc. of the black-and-white photo-publication of 1963.

realistic full-length portrait of King Ioan Aleksandər. The King's portrait here very much resembles that in the British Museum's Four Gospels; we can expect them to be good likenesses, because, since both books were made for the personal library of the King, the royal portraits in them must have been drawn from life.

If the scribe Symon who wrote the texts of both the Manasses Chronicle and the Four Gospels for the King did indeed live in Tərnovo or in one of the nearby monasteries, the painters who illuminated the two manuscripts (from their styles, it is obvious that there was a different artist for each of the two) did not necessarily live in the same place — this is especially true for the illuminator of the Manasses Chronicle. Thus, considerable doubt is cast on the very existence of any set "Tərnovo School" of manuscript illumination.

The illuminations of the Tomic' Psalter (cf. fn. 50) reveal significant details as to both the nationality of its artist and the existence of an artistic school in Tərnovo. V. N. Ščepkin has emphasized the Byzantine character of the illuminations: "The head-pieces (of the manuscript), beautifully executed, represent the Byzantine style of the 13th-14th centuries, which had returned to the brilliant traditions of the 10th century"⁷¹. Additional, linguistic evidence confirms the non-Bulgarian nationality of the artist.

71. V. N. Ščepkin, op. cit., p. 154.

While the text was written in Middle Bulgarian by the monk Symon (the handwriting is identical with that of the British Museum's Four Gospels and the Athos Služebnik⁷²), the illuminations were made by an artist who did not know Bulgarian, but was able to read the Greek instructions in the lower or upper margins of the pages on which he was supposed to draw the miniatures⁷³. There are still traces of such cursive Greek instructions on many pages. A typical example, almost completely preserved, is on the back page of the 22nd leaflet. In translation it reads:⁷⁴ "Put David here, standing and holding a book, looking at the sky, and on the op-

72. This Služebnik, incorrectly dated to the 13th - 14th centuries, is kept in the State Public Library in Leningrad, Pogodin Collection # 37. A photocopy of leaflets 44 and 66 (the back side) is available in:

E. F. Karskij, op. cit., p. 406-407.

In addition to the name of the scribe on leaflet

44 (помѣните гр^ѣшнаг^ω симео̀на), which appears also in the British Museum's Four Gospels, and the general shape of the letters and type of spelling conventions (which might, however, merely indicate a calligraphic school), the cursive script of the Greek word ἀμύνη is absolutely identical to that of the same word on p. 125 in the photo-publication of the Manasses Chronicle; the ligature Ϡ (for -τρ-) has a very individual shape - and element of personal handwriting in the wavy line at the top of the letter τ (~); here and there at the end of a line the letter α is written cursively, with the final hook leaning downward: Ϛ, etc. These features of a very individual handwriting are definite evidence on which to attribute a number of Bulgarian manuscripts from the middle and late 14th century, most of them written for the King, to one person - Symon the Monk.

73. V. N. Ščepkin, op. cit., p. 218.

74. The full (or partially reconstructed) Greek instructions and their Russian translations are given in:

I. Dujčev, op. cit., p. 17-19.

posite side — the sky with rays streaming down from it".

The miniature on this page represents exactly such a scene.

The presence of a written instruction in Greek raises the following two questions: first, if the painter was a Bulgarian, why should the Bulgarian scribe have given him instructions in Greek; second, if the painter and the scribe lived at the same place, why should the scribe have damaged his beautiful manuscript with unnecessary Greek inscriptions, when he could have given the painter very detailed oral instructions in some language common to both of them. It would seem that the only reasonable answer to these questions is that the artist did not understand Bulgarian, either in spoken or in written form, and that he lived somewhere quite distant from the place of writing. Under these circumstances, it would have been more convenient to send the book to him with written instructions in a language he was able to read and understand. Yet, this is no proof that the painter was of Greek origin; the spelling mistakes and the wrong stresses in Greek inscriptions over some of the miniatures⁷⁵ may indeed show that he was not of Greek nationality. But the Greek Orthodox community of the 14th century was a multinational one. Since artistic ability is not confined to a particular national group, one cannot say anything more definite about the nationality of this painter than that: a) he was not a Bulgarian; and b) he was perhaps

75. I. Dujčev, op. cit., p. 19.

not Greek either (if it can be proven that his spelling and stress errors must have been made by a non-Greek).

It has been observed for two of the above-described 14th-century illuminated Bulgarian manuscripts, that the painter either arrived unexpectedly at the place where the manuscript was already being written (Manasses Chronicle) or received the book to be illustrated after the text had been written (Tomic Psalter). If these texts were written in the city of Tarnovo or in the surrounding monasteries, we definitely have no right to speak of a "Tarnovo School" of illumination. If the place of writing was the library of an Athos monastery (a possibility which should not be excluded) we have even less right to do so.

1.3.3. On the material evidence existing today, it has not been proven that there was in the 14th century a particular Bulgarian national style of manuscript illumination. And yet, one cannot exclude the possibility that some of the above-discussed illuminations may have contributed to the changes in the 15th-century Russian art of illumination. As long as the history of each individual manuscript after the destruction of the Bulgarian state is scarcely known, no firm conclusion in this direction can be drawn. One might guess that the most likely places for Russian artists to have seen these illuminations would have been the Athos monasteries (for the Tomic Psalter and the Exegesis of the Gospels), if indeed they were there in the late 14th and

throughout the 15th centuries. But science has no data on this. Most influential would have been the illuminations of the Four Gospels of King Ioan Aleksandər, which was kept in Moldavia and Wallachia until 1688-1714, when it was presented to the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul on Mt. Athos⁷⁶.

1.4. Most students of medieval Russian literature note the drastic changes in style brought about in Russia by the second South Slavic influence. But in general, they have too critical an attitude towards the new style, imposing modern criteria of artistic achievement on a still medieval literature. Common are characterizations of the new style as one of "artificial literary devices"⁷⁷, and "rhetorically grandiloquent and declamatory panegyrics"⁷⁸, and of the language of the literary works as "impossibly convoluted, full of verbal conceits"⁷⁹. D. S. Lixačev is one of the very few literary historians to place the stylistic studies on 14th-century South Slavic and 15th-century Russian literature in their correct historical perspective, especially emphasizing the dependence of the style on the "particular

76. B. Conev, Istorija na bėlgarskij ezik, v. 1, Sofia, 1940, p. 196-198.

77. V. O. Ključevskij, Drevnerusskie žitija svjatyx kak istoričeskij istočnik, Moscow, 1871, p. 79.

78. N. K. Gudzij, Istorija drevnej ruskoj literatury, Moscow, 1945 (3rd edition), p. 225.

79. M. N. Speranskij, Istorija drevnej ruskoj literatury. Moskovskij period, Moscow, 1921 (3rd edition), p. 101.

artistic method in the literature"⁸⁰ of the time. The usual explanation of the peculiarities of the new style, is that they arose out of the triumph and pride felt by the South Slavic writers at the rise and successes of their respective states — and subsequently by Russian writers at the advances of the Muscovite kingdom. Lixačev's criticism of this historically unmotivated view is most cogent:

A feeling by itself, no matter how strong, without ties to a philosophy, could not alone have determined all peculiarities of their style; moreover, the very solemnity of the style of the time is quite questionable... this style is too dynamic, too saturated with the authors' lyrical digressions and expressions of dissatisfaction, to have been solemn or predetermined for the glorification of the state.⁸¹

1.4.1. The new style of the South Slavic literature is best exemplified by original works and translations of the Hesychasts, along with new translations of the earlier writers whom they recommended⁸². But even if the new style spread only to the "high" literature of medieval Russia⁸³, it was typical of all literary genres (including gramoty) in 14th-century Bulgaria (cf. below). The claim of Soviet lit-

80. D. S. Lixačev, Nekotorye zadači izučenija vtorogo južnoslavjanskogo vlijanija v Rossii, Issledovanija po slavjanskomu literaturovedeniju i fol'kloristike, Moscow, 1960, p. 128.

81. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 116.

82. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 133-134.
A. I. Sobolevskij, Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV - XVII vekov, St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 15-24.

83. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 117.

erary historians (including Lixačev) that this style "achieved its highest development precisely in Russia"⁸⁴, where it was later referred to as the "weaving of words" (pletenie sloves), is of doubtful validity. But it is definitely incorrect to state that "the connection between the reform (of Euthymius)... and the new style of 'weaving of words', characteristic for the 14th-15th centuries, is beyond doubt"⁸⁵. Here is a typical counter-example, from the 14th-century Bulgarian literary language, to the assertion of Soviet scholars that the new South Slavic style:

- a) was confined to the "high" literature;
- b) reflected the "thirst for abstraction, the striving to render the world abstract and to destroy its concreteness and substantiality"⁸⁶;
- c) was created by the "reform" of the Bulgarian Patriarch Euthymius (which supposedly took place between the years 1371 and 1375 — cf. 2.6).

What follows is the first sentence of a gramota (Golden Bull) by the Bulgarian king Ioan Aleksandar (of a genre where one does not expect to find "high style"), to the Zograph Monastery on Mount Athos⁸⁷. It was written in the

84. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 142.

85. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 114.

86. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 117.

87. G. A. Il'inskij, Gramoty bolgarskix carej, Moscow, 1911 (photoreprint: London, 1970), p. 21-23.

year 1342 (30 years before the supposed reform of Euthymius), in the same general style as another Bulgarian gramota from before the year 1277⁸⁸. As is apparent from the full English translation of this overextended sentence, all peculiar features of the Russian style of "weaving of words" are present here, although there is little evidence of a "striving... to destroy the concreteness and substantiality" of the world:

This, then, was the wish of God the Father and of Our Lord Jesus Christ, by the intercession of our real and true, most immaculate and most blessed Lady and Mother of God, that there should be on the holy Mount of Athos a haven for the salvation of every Christian — and most of all, Orthodox — soul which should eagerly seek refuge there; even for this reason many righteous kings and devout princes and venerable hermits erected with loving labor holy houses, great and marvelous, and decorated and enriched them in every way: with precious stones and pearls and gold and silver, with possessions and much other property, movable and immovable, that those being and residing in those most noble and godly houses should have an abundance and plenitude, so that they might sing and praise the one God, glorified in the Trinity, and His most immaculate and universally praised Mother, and also that they might mention in prayer the Orthodox, Christ-loving and eternally remembered kings and other blessed donors, and every Christian nation, for the builders who are found in that holy place are not only of one nation, or of two, but because there is a common salvation in it for those who seek it, a common place has been given those who endowed it, and houses are to be found from every Orthodox nation and people, first and outstanding among them the Greeks and Bulgarians, then the Serbians, Russians, and Iberians, each of

88. This is the undated gramota (Golden Bull or chrysobull) of the Tarnovo King Konstantin Asen Tix (1257-1277), to the Monastery of St. George Gorgos, published by: G. A. Il'inskij, op. cit., p. 14-21.
See also fn. 11.

them having remembrance according to his labors, and even more, his zeal.
(For the full Middle Bulgarian original, see Appendix One.)

In the space of one sentence, the Middle Bulgarian author of this gramota uses such figures and tropes as:

a) Synonyms: сѡщимъ и прѣбываѡщимъ; быти въ довѣльство и изобѣлие; и иман'ми и инѣми правдами многыми; сѡщыѡ и истиньныѡ... бѣгородителницѡ.

b) Words expressing concepts in a relationship of genus and species: и православныѡ и хрїстолюбивыѡ црѣ; въсѣкой дѣши хрїстиан'стѣи паче же православнѣи.

c) Words which, although not synonyms, when used in a string all allude to a concept embracing all of them: и оукрасишѡ и ѡбѡгатишѡ въсѣко; пожшихъ и славашихъ; влѣчѡ и бѣгородителницѡ.

d) Epithets expressed by compound adjectives: црѣ блѡгочестивии. и ѡголюбивии вельмѡже. и прѣподобнии инѡци.

e) Series of epithets, usually in gradation, expressed by compound adjectives: православныѡ и хрїстолюбивыѡ и приснопамятныѡ црѣ; прѣчистыѡ и прѣблѡсловеныѡ... бѣгородителницѡ.

f) Apposition, expressed by short adjectives, to substantives with a long-adjective modifier: дѡмовы стѣѡ великы и дивны.

g) Paraphrase: дѡмовы стѣѡ = monasteries.

h) Antithesis: не ѿ единого рода тѣчиѣ или ѿ двою...

i) Lexical anaphora: нѣ понеже общее спсение въ немъ ест' ѣскажшиимъ ѣ. обще бѣ бысть ѣ мѣсто благовольтвоуѣшиимъ.

None of the above-mentioned tropes were new to medieval Bulgarian writers. The first detailed translation of an article on stylistics by Choïroboscus was included in King Symeon's Almanac (Izbornik Svjatoslava). What was new for the 14th century, in comparison with the 9th to 11th century, was the heavy use of tropes in the texts. This was not an original South Slavic feature, but merely reflected the style of the medieval Byzantine literature. Even the style of the Bulgarian and Serbian gramoty, with their formulae, shows them to be simply "copies from analogical works of Byzantine diplomacy"⁸⁹.

1.4.2. The difficult question arises, why did the early Church Slavic (or particularly - the Old Bulgarian) literature not reflect the Byzantine style contemporary to it? I. P. Eremin offers the most convincing explanation, in his report to the Fifth International Congress of Slavists

89. G. A. Il'inskij, op. cit., p. 88.

90. I. P. Eremin, O vizantijskom vlijanii v bolgarskoj i drevnerusskoj literaturax IX - XII vv., Slavjanskie literatury (Doklady sovetskoj delegacii. V Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov), Moscow, 1963, p. 5 - 13.

in Sofia, 1963⁹⁰. Comparing the Byzantine literature, especially of the 11th - 12th centuries, with that of Kiev in the same period, Eremin notes the huge production and the increasing volume of secular works in Byzantium, which "has no trace in ancient Russia of that time"⁹¹. Eremin is basically right in stating:

Even a cursory overview of the translated literature (of the 9th - 12th centuries) demonstrates that the Bulgarian and Russian bookmen of this time, in the selection of materials for translation, showed preference to authors from the 4th - 6th centuries, the classical writers of church literature⁹².

Eremin emphasized that the early Slavic translators had first to retrace the development of Byzantine literature before they could undertake the task of translating their Greek contemporaries, writers of a later stage, whose style was more difficult for the newly-baptized Slavs to comprehend⁹³. D. S. Lixačev's criticism of this view⁹⁴ is quite vague, and unsupported by evidence. His objection that the Slavic translators could not have been aware of the chronological development of Christian literature⁹⁵ can be

91. I. P. Eremin, op. cit., p. 5-6.

92. I. P. Eremin, op. cit., p. 8.

93. I. P. Eremin, ibid.

94. D. S. Lixačev, Drevneslavjanskije literatury kak sistema, Slavjanskije literatury (VI Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov. Doklady sovetskoj delegacii), Moscow, 1968, p. 15-19.

95. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 17.

neither sustained nor refuted; however, it overlooks the possibility that the Byzantine teachers of the early Slavic Christians took an active part in the selection of books and establishment of priorities for translation.

Only by accepting Eremin's explanation of the stages through which Slavic Christian literature had to pass in order to reach the level of its Greek contemporary, can one understand the great delay in stylistic innovation in medieval Slavic literature. The style of early Christian literature was determined by its content: the message, not the form, was of paramount importance. Byzantine Greek literature of the 9th - 14th centuries had essentially different goals: to dwell on the now-familiar biblical and historical tales, elaborating the form of the narrative while preserving the content unchanged. Variety and detail served the interest of generality, not particularization: objects were described by enumerating their immanent properties; actions and states, by listing their nuances in order of increasing or decreasing intensity. This view is borne out by observations⁹⁶ on the interrela-

96. All quotations given here are from the Manasses Chronicle - from the photoreproduction of the Vatican copy:

I. Dujčev, ed., Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, 415 pp.

The page numbers indicated here are those of the manuscript, not of the book. All quotations are compared with the texts of the Tulcea and Moscow copies of the Chronicle, published by I. Bogdan (op. cit.). However, Bogdan's references to the Vatican copy are often inaccurate, thus casting some doubt on his readings of the other texts which he uses.

tion of content and form in the Manasses Chronicle.

The Chronicle begins with the biblical story of the creation, which must have been well known to all Christians in 12th-century Byzantium. But the author uses this obligatory part of any medieval world history to reveal his poetic abilities. While Genesis I.16 simply says⁹⁷:

And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also;

in the Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle this episode is told in 51 lines⁹⁸ and includes the Greek names for the planets. At the end⁹⁹, the author expresses his exaltation at the fruit of God's labors:

Even such a flowery colorfulness adorned the sky. Even such a many-faced and joyful, fair - faced beauty fitted the heavenly countenance, and made the sky a new-planted garden. Its gardener (was) God; like fruit trees and shoots and multifarious flowers were the starry lights. Then when the sun began to shine and shone forth, and when the beauty of the heavens and the goodness of the day appeared, they for the first time submitted to the command of the Creator, and the fourth day, bowing down, ended. And thus was accomplished everything concerning the stars, and the sun-star ruling the day, was made. And the lunar brow illumined the night.

(For the full Middle Bulgarian text, see Appendix Two).

97. Since this quotation is for illustrative purposes only, it is taken from the Holy Bible (King James Version), London, 1949, p. 7.

98. The story begins on the last line of p. 4b (wrongly bound after page 3), continues on p. 3, 3b and ends on line 4 of p. 5.

99. cf. p. 3b (line 12-23) and p. 5 (line 1-4).

It would seem harsh and unjust to describe the style of the above passage as "convoluted", "pompous" or even "solemnly rhetorical". What we deal with here is poetic style, a tenuous concept, since people of every place and time tend to have their own interpretations of it.

Novelty of content and richness of form appear to be inversely proportional in the Manasses Chronicle. Comparative studies of the relationship between density of information and density of stylistic devices in chapters from Roman history (relatively unknown in Byzantium) and Byzantine history (much better known in the country) are most revealing. Here (in English translation) is a typical passage from the Manasses Chronicle on Roman history:¹⁰⁰

Tarquinius' reign, who was the fifth king in Rome after Romulus: Then reigned Tarquinius, fifth after Romulus: who took the kingdom which in no way belonged to him, for it was proper for the sons of King Marcius to reign.

Tullius' reign: Then reigned Tullius, the son-in-law of Tarquinius, who from childhood, as they say, and from the first age, was called Servius, for he was born of a Slave woman; "Servius" is interpreted as "slave" by the Romans. This (king) united his daughter in marriage with the son of the King, Lucius Tarquinius. Because of their common counsel and murderous intents, he, poor one, was deprived of both life and power, and by common agreement he was called Superbus; so they call, in their speech, "the proud one".

(For the full Middle Bulgarian text, see Appendix Three.)

While this style could hardly be called impoverished, the straightforward narrative contributes to a better

100. cf. p. 67b (line 6-15) and p. 68 (line 1-8).

understanding and remembering of events; it strikingly resembles in its simplicity the style of the Hamartolos Chronicle (9th century). In sharp contrast is the following passage from the Manasses Chronicle¹⁰¹, representative in style of the entire section on Byzantine history:

The reign of Basil the Macedonian: This (king) soon expelled Photius from the Church and gave the seat to Ignatius. When he wanted to give wealth to the people and found the gold-keeping houses, which earlier had contained multitudes of wealth, and saw them all empty and having nothing (within) he grieved, mourned, saddened, was downhearted, and could do nothing himself, he could find no (solution) anywhere. For a king without many rich possessions is like an eagle, most ancient and most old, having neither feathers, claws nor beak. This was why Basil saddened and mourned, since King Michael had spent all, giving it away to entertainers, together with his companions in play and feasting.
(For the full Middle Bulgarian text, see Appendix Four.)

1.4.3. The new style typical of South Slavic literature fully reflects the Byzantine style dominant after the firm establishment of Christianity. It is so far impossible to date the penetration of features of this style into South Slavic literature, because of inadequate dating of the translations. The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses, for example (born in the first half of the 12th century, died 1187) is believed to have been translated in Bulgaria between 1335 and 1340¹⁰². But the extremely correct

101. cf. p. 163b (line 7-12) and p. 164 (line 1-13).

102. Ju. Trifonov, Beležki kəm srednobelgarskija prevod na Manasievata xronika, Izvestija na Belgarskija arxeologičeski institut, II (1923-24), p. 159.

usage of the cases, even where two words in grammatical agreement are remote from each other within the sentence, suggests that the date of the Bulgarian translation was in fact considerably earlier¹⁰³.

The Bulgarian translation of the Manasses Chronicle exemplifies superbly the features of this Byzantine style, which later became known as that of the second South Slavic influence in Russia. The discussion which follows is based on the Manasses Chronicle, because it represents the 12th-century Byzantine style (antedating by some two centuries the works of the Hesychasts, by which it can thus safely be considered uninfluenced), and because, belonging to a historical genre, it is outside the realm of hagiography (to which some Soviet scholars limit the domain of this style, cf. 1.4.1.).

1.4.3.1. The author of the Manasses Chronicle exploits the richness of his lexicon, and the translator is obliged to do likewise, insofar as his language permits. He apparently follows firmly-established tradition in calquing from the Byzantine Greek. A variety of lexical devices are used:

a) Synonyms in the strict sense are not much used, but they do appear, either in parallel phrases or together as modifiers of one word: ѿ смѣриши льва и тигръ. оукротиши.

103. See also I. Dujčev's preface to the photo-edition of the Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle (op. cit., p. vi-vii).

(p. 8b) - 'and you will quiet the lion, and make quiet the tiger'; и оумъчи трудными и ташкыми дѣланми. (p. 10b) - 'and he made (them) suffer with difficult and heavy labors'; дрѣво... благовонно... и сладкоуханно (p. 6) - 'tree...good-odored...and sweet-smelling'; говада крѣмаши. кона питашина и воловы роснаа пажить. (p. 4b) - 'the dewy meadow, feeding cattle, feeding horses and oxen'; и всѣ потопаахъ глѣбокотъчными дѣжди, и въ водахъ издыхаахъ и лютъ помираахъ, и водами своа || дша издаваахъ. (p. 12b-13) - 'and all were drowned by "deep-large" rains, and expired in the waters, and bitterly died, and because of the waters, gave up their souls'; всѣ въ коупѣ сълиаша са и смѣсиша са всѣ. (p. 12b) - '(they) all together merged and mixed'; нако же оубо видѣ его и хзрѣ (p. 18b) - 'but when he saw him and saw (him)'.

b) Most frequently employed are words referring to concepts of which one is a more general case of the other: ѿ всѣхъ оубо насыщайта са и ѿ всѣхъ питаита са. (p. 9) - 'from all of them eat your fill, and from all feed yourselves'; надоста ѿба ѿ плода, и причастиста са овошию: (p. 10) - 'They both ate of the fruit and partook of the fruit'; нако ѿдежда бисриемь ѿбнизана и златотъканаа риза. (p. 3) - 'like a garment sewn with pearls and a robe woven in gold'; злотворивыа и нечѣстивыа тъшааше са оуцѣломъдрѣти. (p. 12) - 'he tried to make chaste the evil-doing and dishonorable ones'; боготворити начатъ и чѣсти стихіа. (p. 12) - '(he) began to deify and to honor the elements'.

c) Very commonly used, also, are strings of words denoting close but not identical concepts. The words in such a string delimit jointly one, more general, concept, for which there is often no corresponding word: ни весль ймѣа, ни крѣмилъ, ни вѣтриль. (р. 13) - 'having neither oars, nor rudders, nor sails'; и на ничьсо же ѡзлюбившааго ѣго ни ѡскрѣбивша, възложити мышлѣаше длани ѡбииствныа. (р. 11-11b) - 'and on (him who) had in no way provoked him or offended him, he thought to lay murderous hands'; рѣкы же ѡны гласѡмъ и ѡзыкомъ сирскимъ нарицаат са: фисѡнъ, и геѡнъ; (р. 7) - 'Those rivers are called in the Syrian voice and tongue Pison and Gihon'; ѣлико же частина ѡврѣзааше са листвию, въсиаваахъ шипкомъ доброты. и криномъ свѣтѣше са бѣлостъ. (р. 6b) - 'As soon as the fullness of the foliage had opened itself, the beauties of the brier roses shone forth and the whiteness of the lily shone'; кронъ модрѣше са ѣако ѣкинѡвъ зракъ. ѣако кринъ бѣлѣаше са зевсъ. ѣр же ѣако ѡгнь. ѣако шипокъ чрѣвленныи, слнце сиаше, ѣако бѣлоцвѣтнаа ѣгалида, свѣтѣше са денница. ѣако цвѣтъ чрѣмнозрачныи ѣрмие блѣщаше са. наркисъ добролиственъ, ѣавлѣаше са лоуна. (р. 3b) - 'Cronos gleamed pale like the image of a hyacinth; like a lily Zeus gleamed white; Aries (was) like fire; like a red brier rose the Sun shone; like a white-blossomed cowslip shone the Morning Star; like a red-showing flower Hermes blazed; like a good-leaved narcissus appeared the Moon'; злато же ѡно нескврѣнно, и свѣташе са и блѣщаше. (р. 7) - 'For that gold is pure, and shining and gleaming'.

Sometimes, however, the more general concept is represented by a separate word, the string of close words serving to concretize the concept: тигръ же нисхода ꙗко стрѣла съ шоумомъ и клопоты твора и роуанна ташкаа, въ селѣхъ сжщиихъ прѣмо земи асирїистѣи течеть. (р. 7b) - 'The Tigris, descending like an arrow with noise, and making gurglings and heavy rumblings, flows in the fields opposite the Assyrian land'.

In a few cases, this device is brought to the point of virtuosity: (таковое же селение красно насадивъ и наплънивъ дрѣвесь) създа и члѣка въседѣлательными дланма прѣстны и брены и каломъ съмѣшенны тэготы. (р. 7b) - 'He also created Man, by his all-doing hands, from earthy and clayey material mixed into mud.' The interplay of words and concepts in this sentence is complex. Clay (брение) and earth (прѣсть) have a species/genus relationship, since clay is earth but not all earth is clay; since any earth can be turned into mud by adding water, mud is a different state (not a different species) of earth.

Occasionally, almost all the words in one clause bear to those in another clause the relation of general to specific: тогда звѣдно ꙗко доброто просвѣти са ꙗко ѡдежда бисриемъ обнизана и златотъканаа риза и ꙗко тъканица оукрашенаа сиажиимъ камениемъ: (р. 3) - 'Then the heaven shone forth with starry beauty, like a garment sewn with pearls and a robe woven in gold, and like a fabric embellished with shining gems.'

d) Paraphrase is extensively used: коснѣ же сѧ сего реброу, спашоу. сиждитель ѿ възать ѣ. (p. 9) - 'The Creator (God) touched the rib of this sleeping one (Adam) and took it'; старыи ѿ злосъмрътныи рѡдоуначалникъ, (p. 10b) - 'the old and mortal ancestor of the race (Adam)'; ѿ поставль ѣдемсцѣи добротѣ прѣвожителѣ, ѿ всѣхъ нѣсти овошїи повелѣ дрѣвныхъ къ садоу же разоумномуу ни рѣкоу приложити (p. 8) - 'And having put the two first inhabitants (Adam and Eve) in the beauty of Eden, He commanded them to eat of the fruits of all the trees; but not even to reach out a hand to the tree of knowledge'; ѿ земнорѡднаа ѿ ѣдема сего прѣвожителѣ (p. 9) - 'O, earth-born and first inhabitants of this Eden (Adam and Eve)'; разоумѣ же сїа насадитель добросадныхъ дрѣвесъ, (p. 10b) - 'The Planter of "good-fruit-tree" trees (God) understood these things'; ѿ на... ѣго... възло||жити мышлѣаше длани ѡбииствныа. (p. 11 - 11b) - 'And he...thought to lay murderous hands on (to kill) him.'

e) Tautology appears in several forms. The simplest is the repetition of the verb as the corresponding verbal noun: аще бѡ сего тѣкм ѿ възкоусита, падение падета великѡ. (p. 9b) - 'For if you even taste this, you will (both) fall a great fall.'

When a certain word is repeated in the same form, an emotional effect is being sought: въ сїхъ оубѡ оуспѣ адѧмъ, нѣ горкымъ сѣномъ. сѣномъ, начатѣкмъ низврѣжению и всегоубителныа вражды (p. 9) - 'And soon Adam fell asleep,

but with a bitter sleep, a sleep (which was) the beginning of (his) down-casting and of all-destroying enmity'; видѣ же ѿна плодѣ, и бѣше плодѣ красенъ: радостенъ бѣ видѣниемъ. и добръ въ снѣдѣ. (p. 9b) - 'She saw the fruit, and the fruit was beautiful; it was gladdening to the sight and good to be eaten'.

When the same verb is repeated, it is in two different forms: раздѣлѣ раздѣли ѣсть виждитель дрѣжа || вѣ твоѣ. (p. 21-21b) - 'dividing, the Creator has divided your realm'.

It would seem that this was such an expected device that it even occasioned an error by the scribe of the Vatican copy: despite the resulting grammatical disagreements, he interpreted the verb помазааше as показааше, under the influence of the first verb in the sentence, показа: показа сего || сатана, и прѣльстнѣ чашѣ показааше [=помазааше] оуслаждающимъ медомъ прѣльстнымъ. (p. 9b) - 'Satan showed (her) this, and showed [=spread] the cup of temptation with tempting, sweetening honey.'

The same verbal root can be repeated in the same form (e.g. in the aorist), but with prefixes which make the respective meanings very different: и покры всѣ върхы глѣбокодолныхъ горъ. съкры же лице земное, и покры нивиа. (p. 12b) - 'and (the rain) covered all the peaks of the deep-glenned mountains, and hid the earth's face and covered the fields'; чрѣвооугодникъ мжѣ и пишолобивъ. блѣдникъ и женолюбивъ. иже ѿко женѣ сътворивъ себе и съ женами

затворивъ. пишаше лице свое и почрънѣаше вѣжда своа. (p. 18)

- 'a gourmand and a food-loving man, a rake and woman-loving, who having made himself like a woman and locked himself in with the women, painted his face and blackened his eyebrows'.

A frequently-used device is the repetition of a root in simple and compound words in the same sentence:

сладкосръднымъ и сладкымъ желаниемъ каплаще. (p. 9b) -

'dripping with sweet-hearted and sweet desire'.

A more complex instance of this type is the use of a simple root with prefix and its repetition in a compound

but unprefixed root: вѣсѣ сѣврѣшеноплодна, и прѣсѣврѣшена вѣсѣ. (p. 4b) - 'everything giving perfect fruit, and every-

thing most perfect'; зефиръ тиходыхателныи подыховааше ѿ

вѣсѣдоу, (p. 6b) - 'the soft-breathing Zephyr breathed (lightly) from all directions'.

For greater variety, the repeated element can

occupy any position within the compound root: тогда прѣвѣе начатъ свѣтити ношь луѣнныи бѣлосвѣтлыи и свѣтоносныи крѣгъ • скорѣѣбѣходныи • и вѣсесвѣтлыи, и многозрачныи, и сѣврѣшенныи.

(p.3) - 'Then first began to light the night the white - lighted and light-bearing lunar orb, fast-circling and all - lighted, and much-luminous, and perfect.'

In a very few instances, when the language allows the use of synonymous roots in compound-derivation, the

translator may employ a combination of tautology and pleo-

nasm. One observes in the text of the Manasses Chronicle

a considerable frequency of use of добро- for Greek ευ-,

where the older monuments use exclusively благо-; as yet I have not been able to date the beginning of this trend. Occasionally one may find a sentence containing tautological compound words, some with добро- and some with благо-:
 дъши бѣ оу црѣ ми^Дскаго астиагѣ доброобразна и доброличн^а.
благозрачна и благолѣпнѣши. (p. 21b) - 'The Median king Astiag had a daughter fair of image and fair of face, good of appearance and most goodly-beautiful.'

f) Neologism is intimately connected with the very process of translation from a language with a long literary tradition such as Byzantine Greek into a lexically less stable, younger literary language such as Middle Bulgarian. Before a thorough lexicographic study has been made of all Old and Middle Bulgarian texts, one can not with certainty identify a particular word as a neologism, nor as a borrowing from another Slavic language. Yet, certain compounds used in the Manasses Chronicle seem nonce words, derived to fit an unusual context. It may be presumed, until evidence is found to the contrary, that they were never used before or since. Such for example, are: птишоносїи заѣци (p. 5b) - 'bird-footed (=fleet-footed) hares' and їастрѣби соурѣвоуадци (p. 5b) - 'raw(-flesh)-eating hawks'.

The adjective свиножителна (neut. acc. pl.) is used to describe the actions of a degenerate king: нѣ гла^Т.
їако ъслышавше ближнии его халдеѣ свиножителна вьсѣчьскыи
сѣща и скотна асирїискаго црѣ пласаниа любѣща и їгры, и живѣща їако женѣ... нападошѣ. (p. 19) - 'But they say that the

Chaldees close to him, on hearing of the swinish-living and bestial (acts) of the Assyrian king, who loved dances and games and who lived like a woman, attacked (him)'.

The substantive своеплеменникъ, however, is most likely substituted for the existing съплеменникъ to indicate the unique status of Moses as a father of the Jewish people:

НѢ И БЖ^СТВНЫИ МОÛСИ ЖИТИЕ ѠСТАВИ* МНОГѢ Ѡ СЕБѢ ѠСТАВЛѢ
 жалость своеплеменникѡмъ. (р. 31b) - 'but even the godly Moses departed from life, leaving much sorrow in his own tribesmen'.

1.4.3.2. Many tropes are used in Middle Bulgarian literature, but there is a certain hierarchy in their frequency. Only those tropes which are most used will be discussed here, and in the order of their frequency.

a) Adjectival epithets occur with almost every substantive. The frequency of adverbial epithets is so low as to be negligible. Although it is true that most of the epithets refer to intrinsic, often characteristic properties of the objects denoted by the modified substantives, some of the epithets are very unusual and specific: накы корабникъ неѠбоуреванъ вьнатрѣ^Ѡдоу плавааше. (р. 13) - 'inside, like a boatman who has never seen a storm, (Noah) floated'.

The epithets denoting intrinsic, characteristic properties are in most instances compound adjectives; if not compound, they tend to be prefixed (прѣпѣстрии). They generally have two root components connected by epenthetic -o-, but they may have as many as three: росѡкапльными

цвѣтѣвъ и многоразличными добрѣзрачии. (зефиръ... подыхо-
вааше. (p. 6b) - (the Zephyr...breathed lightly) with the dew-
sprinkled blossoms and multifarious lovely sights'; и дрѣво
въсѣко прозабааше. доброплодно тамо. блговонно. добрѣсѣнѣ^ѣ-
нолиствно. добровѣтвно. и сладкожханно (p. 6) - 'And every
good-fruited tree sprang up there: good-odored, with good
shady leaves, good-branched and sweet-smelling.'

A peculiar type, very productive and thus charac-
teristic of this new style in Slavic literature, consists of
compound adjectives whose second root is that of a substan-
tive denoting an inseparable quality or body part (compare
CSR: девушка с голубыми глазами → голубоглазая девушка,
in the absence of *девушка с глазами or *глазая девушка).
In contemporary Bulgarian, such an adjective as грѣзнобѣк,
although not listed in the dictionaries, is a possible form-
ation. The adjective окѣт is listed in all dictionaries,
with the meaning 'having good eyes' or 'watchful'; there are
no examples of such adjectives in the Manasses Chronicle,
which may indicate that they were not valued as literary
epithets. Here are some typical examples of compound ad-
jectives used as epithets: тогда и свѣрие на земи навишѣ сѣ
страшнии. львоуе чѣстогривии. медвѣди. пардоси. тигри. козы
стрѣмозжбыѣ. птищоновїи зажци. и пси ѣстрозжбии. и тврѣдо-
прѣсьи ѣлефантинѣ. и въсѣка птица. и въсѣко плъзажшее,
ѣлико въ вѣдахѣ живеть, и ѣлико въ мори; и въ горахѣ въ
коупѣ елико. (p. 5b) - 'Then fearsome beasts appeared on
the earth: thick-maned lions, bears, leopards, tigers,

hungry-toothed goats, bird-footed (=fleet-footed) hares and sharp-toothed dogs, the hard-chested elephant, and every bird, and every crawling thing — whether it lives in the waters, whether in the seas, whether together in the mountains'; приводѣше сѧ лѣвъ зинаѣшъ, юнцемъ гоубительъ. медвѣди грозноѡци, и прѣпѣстрии пѣрдоси. елене пѣстрокожнии, и чѣстоѡпахыѧ лисица. елѣфандинъ тврѣдочелыи. ѡпа||шиѧ клата, и юнецъ роговы бижы. (р. 8) - 'There were brought (to Adam) the gaping lion, destroyer of calves, ugly-eyed bears and most spotted leopards, spotty-skinned deer and thick-tailed foxes, the firm-browed elephant — wagging his tail, and the calf butting with his horns.'

b) Metaphor is an intrinsic feature of the new style which was brought to Russia in the 14th century. It was not then a new feature in Slavic literature — the language of the Psalter and of the Codex Suprasliensis offers abundant examples of it — but in the newer texts this device is extended to many other genres, including the chronicle. Some of the metaphors seem to be fresh and poetic for their time: ѡвимелехъ же видѣвъ ѧ весь плѣнень бы еѧ. (р. 16b) - 'and Abimelech, having seen her (Sarah) was completely captivated by her'; others are suspiciously frequent, suggesting that they had already become cliches: егда же оубѡ испи камвисъ сѣмртнаѧ чашѧ, (р. 25b) - 'as soon as Cambyses had drunk the cup of death'.

Here are examples of various metaphors from the Manasses Chronicle, frequently combined with other tropes

and figures: нако да бждѣтъ сѣма ѿ ѿживленіе рѡдоу своемуу. (p. 12b) - 'so that they (the animals) may be the seed and revival of their own kind'; брата своего ѿдастъ смртнымъ нѣдромъ. (p. 11b) - 'to give his brother over to the bowels of death'; пожѣтъ начинаніа своего соуемждриа. (p. 20) - 'he harvested the deeds of his vain-thinking'; ѿ въ вънатрѣнѣа емоу вѣнзи весь ножъ. ѿ смртѣа напои ѿ надомъ погыбѣльнымъ, (p. 19) - 'and he thrust the whole knife into his entrails, and made him drink of death and mortal poison'; враждѣа бо пещь клокощѣа имѣше въ себѣ. (p. 11b) - 'For he had within himself a crackling oven of hate'; ѿ ѿбо съсѣдъ своемуу злокъзньствоу, зѣмѣа злонссааго ѿ стрѣптиваго ѿбрѣтаеть. (p. 9b) - 'And thus (Satan) finds a vessel for his evil intents — an evil-bearing and obstinate serpent'; аще ми са ѿ сего съхранита, избѣгнѣта жѣла смртнаго ѿ пространство наслѣдита живота бесконечнаго. (p. 9b) - 'If you two of mine keep yourselves from that, you will escape the sting of death and inherit the vastness of endless life'; ѿ поживе въ благыхъ, ѿ насыти са хлѣба въ сытость, ѿ ѿзбовѣ гладныхъ пагоубныхъ избѣже. (p. 29) - 'and he lived among the rich and always had plenty of bread, and escaped the fatal teeth of hunger'; сѣце живѣше слабѣ, сѣце оуклонил са бѣ. дондеже въ ровъ себе погыбелныи низведе. ѿ погоуби съ собож ѿ цр^ство. (p. 18b) - 'thus he lived badly, and thus he deviated (from the Law), until he led himself down into the pit of destruction and, together with himself, lost the kingdom'.

c) Personification, like metaphor, is not new to Slavic literature, but is new to the style of the chronicle genre. Here are a few examples: пакы земно лице невидимо бы[сть]. (р. 13) - 'the face of the earth was still invisible'; лоунное же брѣвно просвѣщааше ношь. (р. 5) - 'The brow of the Moon illumined the night'; и ꙗко пра^{хъ} плавааше на водныхъ плещохъ. (р. 13) - 'and like light dust it floated on the shoulders of the water'; зинѣти на нихъ земли молѣста са широккими оусты. (р. 10b) - 'They begged the earth to yawn on them with its broad mouth.'

d) Simile is also very common in this style, but one example here will suffice: вселѣтъ въ едемъ стѣмь добросаднѣмь селѣ ꙗко же въ чрьтошѣ бисерь друугы [=драгы?] и въ мирѣ мирѣ. (р. 8) - 'He set (Adam) in the good(-fruit)-treed field of Eden, like another (?= a costly) pearl in a palace and (like) peace in the world.'

e) Metonymy: и трапезами тлъстыми гостѣше ихъ. (р. 21) - 'and with fat tables he feasted them'.

f) Synecdoche: и вавулонскѣя покори жестокѣя выѣ. и мидѣстѣи сѣтвори дани даати крѣпости. (р. 21b) - 'and he humbled the stiff Babylonian neck, and made it give tribute to the Median power'.

1.4.3.3. Stylistic figures increase the expressiveness of the prose. Still, one syntactic device which for today's prose is considered a stylistic figure is, for the medieval Slavic literary languages, entirely neutral: the joining of several successive clauses by the conjunction и.

a) Rhetorical question, exclamation, and lyrical digression are figures by means of which the medieval author expressed his conventionalized attitude toward his story.

They do not increase in frequency from the older to the newer

period: и что многословити · ѡгна ихъ ѡ тядоу, и оумжчи тродными и ташкыми дѣланми. (p. 10b) - 'And why be verbose?

He chased them from there and made them suffer with dif-

ficult and heavy labors'; се же и дръзнъ сътворити, ѡле

безчлчнаго разума · и оуставъ не оустыдѣв са ихъ же бо жт са и звѣрие, брата своего ѡдасть съмртнымъ нѣдромъ. (p. 11b) -

'And this he dared to do, woe to inhuman judgment, having no shame of the commandments — even the beasts fear them — to give his brother over to the bowels of death.'

b) Gradation may be of increasing or decreasing intensity. An example of each, in that order, follows: и

ѡже ѡ си^х ни мала не боаше са напасти · лутаа бо и лжаваа и злотвориваа злоба, единаче не вселила са бѣ въ ср^дце

его. (p. 8b) - 'And he did not fear in the least the threat of them, for the fierce and cunning and evildoing evil,

however, had not yet settled in his heart'; и блжднивъ бѣ

и любодѣивъ, и слабъ и жѣнхаръ. (p. 18) - 'and he was lecherous and adulterous and weak; and a girlwatcher'.

c) Antithesis can be combined with other figures,

as, for example, gradation: и врьтоградъ добродрѣвень бѣ насаждааше · не мотыками раскопавъ ни рылми · ни разоравъ до-

бротж прѣкраснаа зема · ни же дланьми насадителными, нж

СЛОВОМЪ ЕДИНѢМЪ. (p. 6) - 'And God planted a good-treed orchard — not digging with hoes, nor with planting-sticks, nor plowing the goodness of the most beautiful earth, nor either with his planter's hands — but by the Word alone.'

In a few cases, a lexical antithesis can encompass not simply two words expressing opposing concepts, but two complete antonymous clauses: И ВЕЛИЧААШЕ СА БЪ, А МОИСИИ ВЪСПѢВААШЕ СА. И СВѢТЬ ВЪСИВААШЕ ЕВРЕОМЪ ВЕСЕЛИА. ЕГИПТѢНЫ ЖЕ ТЪМА ПОМРАЧААШЕ. (p. 31) - 'and God was glorified and Moses was hymned, and the light of the gladness of the Jews began to shine, and darkness obscured the Egyptians'.

A very interesting and original example is found in the following phrase, where the height of mountain peaks is described in terms of the depths of their valleys: ВЪРХЫ ГЛУБОКОДОЛНЫХЪ ГОРЪ. (p. 12b) - 'the peaks of the deep-glenned mountains'.

d) The use of a semantically "empty" verb with the verbal noun, instead of the related verb itself, increases in frequency in the new style. This device was most likely used to introduce additional modifiers, especially ones indicating the effect of the action on its object, which sometimes could not be expressed by adverbs: И ОУБѢ СТАРЫИ И ЗЛОСЪМРЪТНЫИ РѢДОУНАЧАЛНИКЪ, ИЗГНАНИЕ Ѡ ТЖДОУ ЛЮТОЕ ПОЛОУЧИВЪ, || ВЪСЕЛИ СА ПРѢМО ПІШНОМОУ СѢЛОУ. (p. 10b-11) - 'And thus the old and "ill-mortal" ancestor of the race, having received a bitter banishment from there, settled across from a flourishing field'; ИЛИ ДА ЦРѢ ОУБИЕТЪ И

наслѣдѣтъ ѡ власть ѡ женѣ самѣа, ѡли на оусѣчение сѣмрѣт-
 ное самѣ ѡведенѣ бѣдетѣ. (p. 24b) - 'either he will kill
 the king and inherit both (his) power and (his) very wife, or
 he himself will be led away to the deadly cutting-off'.

1.4.4. The new style of Middle Bulgarian literature reflects the dominant style of the contemporary Byzantine literature. Its characterization as a "new style" is purely conventional, in relation to the styles of the Old Bulgarian and of the Old Russian literature of the Kievan Period¹⁰⁴. As has been illustrated by the examples above, none of the stylistic devices utilized in the newer literature were in principle new to the Old Slavic literatures. But they were employed more heavily than ever before, by combining several tropes and figures within one, usually very long, sentence. Medieval Christian philosophy did not insist on strict separation of word and concept, but dwelt on the magic strength of the word and thus encouraged the writer to explore fully the combinatory possibilities of the words in the language. In this respect D. S. Lixačev writes:

If one is to speak only about the style of "word - weaving", one should note the extremely positive role this style played in the art of words, in the

104. It has been impossible, so far, to date most of the translations made in Bulgaria during the period 12th-14th centuries. A great part of those translations is known from much later Russian copies. In addition, Russian and Soviet philologists of this century are unwilling (or unable) to see the Bulgarian features in the late Russian copies, which they then label as Russian translations. Even such scrupulous Slavists as Durnovo have failed to perceive the underlying Bulgarian features of some works (cf. 2.4.2.).

development of rich and various forms of artistic expressiveness, in the enrichment of the Russian literary language¹⁰⁵.

Lixačev's characterization of the style of the Middle Bulgarian literature in connection with the Second South Slavic influence on Russian literature, is the most correct and complete so far¹⁰⁶, with the exception of two points: a) this style was not limited only to the hagiographic genre, but spread to all genres of newly-created literary works; and b) even though fully exploited by the Hesychasts, it was not created by them, nor were their writings the best samples of it. The importation of this style into Russia had absolutely nothing to do with any "reform" by the Bulgarian Patriarch Euthymius (the question of the existence of such a reform will be discussed in 2.3, 3.2 and 3.3). This style is dominant in the Middle Bulgarian literature of the entire 14th century, and most likely of the 13th century too.

105. D. S. Lixačev, Nekotorye zadači izučenija vtorogo južnoslavjanskogo vlijanija v Rossii, Issledovanija po slavjanskomu literaturovedeniju i fol'kloristike (Doklady sovetskix učenyx na IV Meždunarodnom s"ezde slavistov), Moscow, 1960, p. 149.

106. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 107-128.

Chapter Two

THE IMPORTATION OF THE MIDDLE BULGARIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE TO RUSSIA

2.1. Although, since the time of A. I. Sobolevskij's paper on the second South Slavic influence on Russian, the impact of the Middle Bulgarian language is a generally accepted fact, the most detailed description of the spheres of Bulgarian influence on Russian remains that of Sobolevskij himself. He devotes only one page in his article to the spheres of influence of the Middle Bulgarian literary language¹⁰⁷ on Russian, describing some of the features of the Middle Bulgarian literary language which penetrated into the Russian literary language of the late 14th and entire 15th centuries.

2.1.1. The following new features, according to Sobolevskij¹⁰⁸, penetrated into the Russian orthography:

- a) the letter ѣ was reintroduced;
- b) after a letter for a vowel, the letter а is

107. The term "Middle Bulgarian literary language" is not used by Sobolevskij. He uses the term Middle Bulgarian language (op. cit., p. 6). In connection with the Bulgarian influence on Russian, Sobolevskij uses such terms as: Bulgarisms (op. cit., pp. 4, 11 - fn. 4), Middle Bulgarian manuscripts (op. cit., p. 6), Bulgarian colony in Constantinople (op. cit., p. 10) and Bulgarians on Athos (op. cit., p. 11).

108. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 3, and also p. 1-2 for the shape of the letters.

written instead of ѡ (своа, добраа, спасеніа);

c) the letter ѣ appears at the end of a word instead of ѡ, while the letter ѡ appears inside a word instead of the letters ѣ or ѣ;

d) words formerly written вѣрхъ, торгъ, etc., are instead written врѣхъ, трѣгъ, etc.

e) the letters ѡ, ѡ, -ѣѣ- (instead of -ѣѣ-, as in аѣгѣлъ) are used more correctly (according to the Byzantine spelling).

f) consonantal clusters are given a new spelling, according to the Byzantine pronunciation of that day: -ѣѣ- instead of -ѣѣ- (олѡѣѣѣ); -ѣѣ- instead of -ѣѣ- (андоніи);

g) some letters and letter combinations take on a new shape, e.g.: the digraph -ѡѡ- or the ligature ѡѡ ("uk") is consistently used for /u/; the special letter ѡ ("ižica"), different from the letter ѡ in the combination ѡѡ, is used for /i/, generally representing ѡ in the spelling of Greek words; the letter ѡ is always replaced by ѡ with the first element the same as the letter "front jer" - ѡ; the letter ѡ is introduced not only as a numeral (previously expressed also by ѡ), but in the spelling of some words (no examples are given).

Sobolevskij's review of the orthographic changes is incomplete. He omits the reintroduction of the letter ѡ in both Greek names and Slavic words, of the letter ѡ ("ѡ očnoe") in Slavic words, of the letter ѡ (written with two dots), used mostly before a vowel or at the end of

a line, the reintroduction of the letter ψ for -πс- and of ξ for -кс- in Greek names, the far more frequent use of stress and other superscripts, and the complete absence of the ligatures Ѡ and Ѳ ¹⁰⁹.

2.1.2. As far as concerns the influence of the phonological system of the Middle Bulgarian language (its expression by the orthography) and its influence on the Russian spelling system, Sobolevskij's remarks are far from satisfactory. Besides the general effort to avoid Russisms, he notes only the following peculiarities:

a) increased use of жд instead of ж, and of ш instead of щ for the respective outcomes of *dj and *tj;

b) use of the letter ѣ instead of ѧ. In the older Russian writings, ѣ was used instead of е — an influence of the Galicio-Volhynian dialect;

c) interchanging of the letter ѧ with ю, and of Ѡ with Ѳ respectively, as a result of the Bulgarian orthography. In addition, ѧ continued to be interchanged with Ѡ in the Old Russian tradition, while the newly reintroduced Ѳ alternated with ю (since the ligature Ѳ was not used in late Middle Bulgarian) and with оу, as a consequence of Russian phonology.

Sobolevskij, unfortunately, does not study the orthography as a system of rules, and therefore he does not examine the evolution in the system or the general direc-

109. E. F. Karskij, Slavjanskaja kirillovskaja paleografija, Leningrad, 1928, pp. 172-173, 181-210.

tion of this evolution — toward more phonological or more morphonemic spelling. Nor does he speculate on the reasons for introducing changes in the Russian orthography — was it merely a foreign influence, or was it a necessary part of reorganizing the Russian orthographic system and creating a new national literary language?

2.1.3. Most unsatisfactory are Sobolevskij's remarks on the influence of the grammatical system of the Middle Bulgarian literary language on Russian. Here are those few features which Sobolevskij notices:

- a) new forms in -ije for nom. sing. of Greek masculine names (василіе);
- b) extension of the suffix -ov- in the plural paradigm of the old -*u- stems (сыновомъ, сыновѣхъ);
- c) new endings for genitive of the numerals (трієхъ, пятихъ, десятихъ instead of the older три, пять, десять).

In addition, Sobolevskij lists a few lexico-grammatical changes:

- a) introduction of the preposition прѣзь for чрезъ;
- b) introduction of new possessive adjectives еговъ, тоговъ for его, того;
- c) introduction of the newer Bulgarian form цѣфту for the older 1st sg. цвѣту.

The source of dissatisfaction is not the inadequacy of Sobolevskij's description of the features of the

Middle Bulgarian literary language which influenced the Russian literary language of the late 14th and entire 15th centuries. Sobolevskij's 14-page article was meant only as an introduction to a bibliographic study¹¹⁰. The real problem is that Sobolevskij's modest enumeration of some features of the Middle Bulgarian language has been virtually the only correct, even somewhat systematized list, known in Russian and Soviet literature for the greater part of our century¹¹¹. The three well-known historical grammars of the Bulgarian

110. The subtitle of Sobolevskij's book is Bibliografičeskie materialy, and the emphasis in the chapter on the Russian literature containing new South Slavic translations is on listing the relevant manuscripts (p. 15-37).

111. A Slavist might use the obsolete works:
P. A. Lavrov, Obzor zvukovyx i formal'nyx osobennostej bolgarskogo jazyka, Moscow, 1893, 109 pp.

S. M. Kul'bakin, Materialy dlja xarakteristiki srednebolgarskogo jazyka, v. 1, Bojanskoe Evangelie XII - XIII veka, IzvORJaS, IV, 3, p.800-868.

The excellent study of the Middle Bulgarian language of the Bologna Psalter by V. N. Ščepkin limits its interest to features expressed only in this 13th-century manuscript, and thus cannot be used as a manual of all diagnostic features of the whole Bulgarian literary language. See:

V. N. Ščepkin, Bolonskaja psalmyr'. S priloženiem semi fototipij i vos'mi cinkografii, Issledovanija po ruskomu jazyku, II, 4, St. Petersburg, 1906.

In recent times, however, the literature has been tremendously enriched by the work of the Soviet Slavist E.V. Češko. See:

E. V. Češko, Istorija bolgarskogo sklonenija, Moscow, 1970, 319 pp.

language¹¹² give exhaustive information (although with an old-fashioned approach) on the changes that occurred in the Bulgarian language throughout the centuries. But they are not written with the special aim of comparing the development of the Bulgarian literary language with that of the literary languages of the other Slavic nations, and thus do not systematize the specific Middle Bulgarian diagnostic features. All three historical grammars of the Bulgarian language (cf. fn. 112) fail to examine the orthographic systems applied in the Middle Bulgarian manuscripts, or to see development there. All three authors on numerous occasions state that the Bulgarian literary language is a "dead language" and thus close their eyes to the changes in this language and its slow development towards a more and more normalized system at all levels of the grammar and in the orthography; their main concern is actually to follow and study the appearance of "mistakes" from the living Bulgarian dialects. Their approach was justified by the general aim of their studies — to explain the creation of the present-day Bulgarian language and to date the major changes that took place in its history. Because of this specific goal, the historians of the Bulgarian language overlook the his-

112. St. Mladenov, Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache, Berlin - Leipzig, 1929, xiv + 354 pp.

B. Conev, Istorija na bəlgarskij ezik, Sofia, I, 1919, x + 529 pp.; II, 1934, xvi + 560 pp.; III, 1937, vi + 505 pp.

K. Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika na bəlgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1963 (2nd edition), 274 pp.

tory of the literary language in Bulgaria from the 9th to the 14th century.

2.2. The Middle Bulgarian literary language was introduced in Russia through the revised editions of the oldest Slavic religious literature in translation, newer translations of the more recent Byzantine literature, Middle Bulgarian versions of Old Bulgarian literature (for example, the treatise On the Letters by Černorizec Xrabər) and the works of some Bulgarian writers of the 12th - 14th centuries. Among the revised religious texts, Sobolevskij includes the Four Gospels, the Apostles (Acts and Epistles), the Psalter, and a long list of translations from the Old Testament, of the Church Fathers, and of Byzantine writers from the 6th - 14th centuries, including the Hesychasts, and the works of a few Bulgarian writers¹¹³.

2.3. In explaining the ways in which Middle Bulgarian literature was introduced in Russia, Sobolevskij is extremely cautious: he places the copying done by Russians from the South Slavic originals mainly on Mt. Athos and in Constantinople and its surrounding monasteries¹¹⁴, and carefully gives credit to the two Bulgarian church leaders in Muscovite Russia and Russian Lithuania, Kiprian and Grigorij Camblak, respectively¹¹⁵.

113. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., pp. 4-5, 15-37.

114. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., pp. 6-11, 24 - 26, 31-34.

115. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 12.

2.3.1. But in most of the other Russian and Soviet writings on the subject, the second South Slavic influence is attributed mainly to the fall of Bulgaria under Turkish domination (1293-1396) and the influx of "Bulgarian refugees" to Russia. This belief about the mechanism of the second South Slavic influence in Russia (and especially — that of the Middle Bulgarian language and literature) is exemplified in a recent typical statement by a Soviet scholar:

Both Serbia and Bulgaria, which literarily on the eve of their destruction were at the zenith of their might, were swallowed in a short time by the Turkish aggressors and ceased to exist as independent state unions. This was exactly the time when the mass emigration of the Southern Slavs began, in which first of all fled, of course, people of the intellectual and generally creative vocations, since under the conditions of the Turkish occupation their activity in their own country became unthinkable...¹¹⁶.

...Main centers of Russian-South Slavic communication, besides the cities of North-Western and North-Eastern Russia, were Athos and Constantinople. At the end of the 14th century the flow of South Slavic refugees to Russia went almost wholly through intermediate points, such as the Slavic monasteries of Athos and Constantinople...¹¹⁷

...How can one envision the concrete sources of the second South Slavic influence in the illuminations and graphics of the Russian manuscripts? Beyond doubt, a very important role was played by those South Slavic scribes and artists who immigrated to Russia and took up permanent residence in the Russian cities and monasteries. In this respect

116. G. I. Vzdornov, Rol' slavjanskix monastyrskix masterskix pis'ma Konstantinopolja i Afona v razvitii knigopisanija i xudožestvennogo oformlenija russkix rukopisej na rubeže XIV - XV vv., Literaturnye svjazi drevnix slavjan (Trudy ODRL, v. XXIII), Leningrad, 1968, p. 171.

117. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 172.

one could hardly argue that the most representative personality is the Metropolitan Kiprian¹¹⁸.
(All italics are mine. I. T.)

These statements must be seriously criticized as antihistorical in all points; it is regrettable that a philologist should write with such inadequate research in a field which is outside his specialty. The grave historic mistakes in it about Bulgaria will be enumerated since some appear in similar formulations by other Slavists¹¹⁹.

a) On the eve of its destruction by the Turks, Bulgaria was far from being at the "zenith of (its) might". Here are the more important developments in this regard:

The Bulgarian state, after reaching the peak of its political power under King Ioan Asen II (1218-1241)¹²⁰, declined, and was even temporarily conquered by the Tatars (1298-1300)¹²¹. While the Bulgarian Tarnovo kingdom was

118. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 173.

119. See, for instance:

L. A. Dmitriev, Rol' i značenie mitropolita Kipriana v istorii drevnerusskoj literatury (k russko-bolgarskim literaturnym svjazjam XIV - XV vv.), Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 210-216.

V. Mošin, O periodizaciji russko-južnoslavjanskix literaturnyx svjazej X - XV vekov, Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow - Leningrad, 1963, p. 103-105.

L. V. Čerepnin, Russkaja paleografija, Moscow, 1956, p. 213.

V. A. Desnickij, ed., Istorija ruskoj literatury, v. I, 1, Moscow, 1941, p. 127.

120. Bølgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bølgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 181-185.

121. Bølgarska Akademija na Naukite, op. cit., p. 218.

able to unite some lands north of the Danube — southern Bessarabia to the Dneŝtr River (1300)¹²² and part of Thrace along the Black Sea coast (1307)¹²³ — the northwestern region of Bulgaria around Vidin became an independent kingdom¹²⁴. Bulgaria was temporarily united (1323 to around 1345)¹²⁵ by the Vidin king Mixail Ŝiŝman. After its defeat by the Serbian armies of King Stefan Uroŝ III (Dečanski) in 1330 near Velbæžd (today's Kjustendil), Bulgaria lost most of its southwestern lands to Serbia¹²⁶. In the early 1340's Balik, a local ruler between the Black Sea and the lower reaches of the Danube, seceded from the Tærnovο kingdom. His son Dobrotica expanded the new country southward at the expense of Tærnovο: this land was later called Dobrudŝa¹²⁷. In the late 1340's the Tærnovο king Ioan Aleksandar divided his country in two and gave the western part (the Vidin kingdom) to his son Ioan Sracimir, retaining for himself only the regions around the city of Tærnovο¹²⁸. Thus it becomes clear that almost 50 years before the fall of Tærnovο, part of Bulgaria was divided into three kingdoms (Tærnovο, Vidin,

122. op. cit., p. 219.

123. ibid.

124. ibid.

125. op. cit., pp. 221, 228.

126. op. cit., p. 222.

127. op. cit., p. 228.

128. ibid.

Dobrudža) while the remaining southwestern parts of the former (13th-century) empire either were under the Serbian kings (between 1330 and 1355) or had become independent regions (after the death of Stefan Dušan in 1355), under local rulers like Vëlkašin and his son Marko (Prilep, Skopje and Prizren), Ioan Ugleša (around Serres and Drama), Ioan and Konstantin, sons of Despot Dejan (Velbëžd, Zletovo, Kratovo, Kumanovo and Štip), Xlapen (Ver, Kostur and Voden), Andrej Gropa (Oxrid) and Bogdan (Strumica)¹²⁹.

b) The Turkish conquest of the Balkan peninsula was a long historical process, taking approximately a century; the conquest of Bulgaria alone lasted about four decades. Here are the most important events in the fall of the Bulgarian states and regions:

In 1352 the Turks captured the fortress of Tsimpe on Gallipoli, and thus firmly set foot on the Balkan peninsula¹³⁰;

In 1361 the Turkish capital was transferred to Europe, to the city of Didimotike, and thus the Turks expressed their intention to conquer the neighboring states¹³¹;

In 1362 they captured the city of Adrianopolis¹³²,

129. op. cit., p. 229.

D. Angelov, Agrarnite otnošenija v Severna i Sredna Makedonija prez XIV v., Sofia, 1958, p. 9-15.

130. AN SSSR, Istorija Vizantii, v. 3, Moscow, 1967, p. 158.

131. op. cit., p. 162-163.

132. op. cit., p. 163.

and two years later - the Bulgarian cities of Plovdiv and Beroe (Stara Zagora)¹³³. But in 1364 King Ioan Aleksandar joined forces with the Turks: they attacked the Greek city of Mesembria and captured Anchialo¹³⁴. Meanwhile, the Turks resettled large populations from Asia Minor in the recently conquered Bulgarian territory.

Two independent rulers in the southwestern regions of Bulgaria, Vəlkašin of Prilep and Ioan Ugleša of Serres, decided to attack the Turks. They entered the region, at that time called Macedonia (today's Thrace), and met the Turks near the city Adrianopolis, by the village of Černomen on the Marica River¹³⁵. Most of the Bulgarian fighters, including the two leaders Vəlkašin and Ugleša, died there in the failure of the last serious active resistance by the Bulgarians. The Turks captured the fortified cities of Ixtiman and Samokov, most of today's Macedonia and the entire Rhodopa Mountains¹³⁶. Especially heroic was the defense of

133. Bəlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bəlgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961, p. 229.

134. ibid.

135. op. cit., p. 242; see also the account of this event in the contemporary chronographic note by the monk Isaja in:

D. Radojčić, Antologija stare srpske književnosti Beograd, 1960, pp. 99, 325.

The original text by Monk Isaja can also be found in:

B. Angelov, Iz starata bəlgarska, ruska i srəbska literatura, v. 2, Sofia, 1967, p. 148-161.

136. Bəlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bəlgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 242.

the city of Monastir (Bitola)¹³⁷.

But not all Balkan feudal rulers resisted the Turks. Many local leaders joined them, thus preserving their own privileged position and saving their cities and the lives and freedom of their people. The most famous rulers of southwest Bulgaria who submitted to the Turks in the invasion of 1371 were Ioan Dragaš and Konstantin of Velbėžd, as well as Marko of Prilep, the son of Vėlkašin who died at Černomen¹³⁸. The Tėrnovo king Ioan Šišman also became a vassal of the Turkish sultan Murad, and gave him as a wife his sister Kera Themar (between 1371 and 1382)¹³⁹.

In 1382 Sofia fell¹⁴⁰, and in 1386, with the fall of Niš (later only temporarily regained by the Serbians), the Turks approached the principality of Vidin and separated the Bulgarian from the Serbian lands¹⁴¹. In 1387 the Bosnian and Serbian troops defeated the Turks at Pločnik. However,

137. D. Angelov, Turskoto zavoevanie i borbata na balkanskite narodi protiv našestvenicite, Istoričeski pregled, IX, 1954, 4, p. 382.

138. AN SSSR, Istoriija Jugoslavii, Moscow, 1963, p. 123.

139. Bėlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istoriija na Bėlgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 243.

140. ibid.

141. AN SSSR, Istoriija Jugoslavii, Moscow, 1963, p. 109.

the Tǎrnovo king¹⁴² and the ruler of Dobrudža, Dobrotica¹⁴³, failed to raise and send armies to the aid of the Serbians and Bosnians, as they had promised.

After Pločnik (1387) the Turks reorganized their forces and increased their pressure on Bulgaria. In 1388 the Turkish army captured the important fortresses of the cities of Oveč (Provadija), Šumen and Madara, and unsuccessfully attacked Varna, which was part of Dobrotica's kingdom¹⁴⁴. By that time the Turks either possessed or controlled most of northern Bulgaria.

On June 15, 1389, at Kosovo Pole, the Turks defeated the combined Bosnian-Serbian armies led by the Serbian prince Lazar, who was captured and killed in revenge for the death of the Turkish sultan Murad¹⁴⁵.

Tǎrnovo fell in the summer of 1393, after three months' siege, and soon afterward the Danubian city of Nikopol, where the Tǎrnovo king Ioan Šišman was captured. The fate of the king is unknown, but this marked the end of the Tǎrnovo kingdom¹⁴⁶. In 1396 the city of Vidin was taken by

142. Bēlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bēlgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 243.

143. Șt. Pascu, ed., and others, Istoria Medie a României, v.1, Bucharest, 1966, p. 166.

144. Bēlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bēlgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 233

145. AN SSSR, Istorija Jugoslavii, Moscow, 1963, p. 110.

146. Bēlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bēlgarija, v. 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 144-145.

the Turks¹⁴⁷, and this date is considered the final one for the existence of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom.

However, in 1388-1389 the Wallachian king Mircea, who already controlled the former kingdom of Dobrotica and had added to his title "Despot of the land of Dobrotica and lord of Dræstær" lost his first battle with the Turks and became their vassal¹⁴⁸. He sought the help of Moldavia, Poland and Hungary in his fight against them¹⁴⁹, but after his death in 1418 his descendents continued to be vassals of the Sultan.

After Kosovo Pole (1389) the Serbian despot Stefan Lazarević also became a vassal of the Turks. The Serbians were even obliged to send troops to Ankara to help the Turks in their battle with Tamerlane (1402). Stefan Lazarević was involved in complicated diplomatic games with Hungary, Constantinople and different parties within the Turkish ruling groups¹⁵⁰. During his reign (1389-1427), Serbia was described by Western travellers as a prosperous country¹⁵¹. Serbia was finally conquered by the Turks during the reign of Despot Đorđe Branković in 1459, six years after the fall

147. op. cit., p. 245.

148. Şt. Pascu, ed., and others, Istoria Medie a României, v. 1, Bucharest, 1966, p. 167.

149. op. cit., p. 168-173.

150. AN SSSR, Istoriya Jugoslavii, Moscow, 1963, p. 111.

151. ibid.

of Constantinople¹⁵².

This lengthy, although very sketchy, review of the main events in the destruction of the Bulgarian states and their neighbors, reveals that the struggle for southeastern Europe was a long and complicated one. It lasted through several generations, and was not always clearly defined as a struggle of Christians against Moslems, Europeans against Turks. The Balkan nations obviously had accepted the Turkish presence in their lands as a fact, and were trying to do "business as usual", very often not foreseeing the tragic historical consequences.

In the light of the real, highly complex historical events in the Balkans during the century between the Turkish conquest of Gallipoli (1352) and the final battle of the Serbian army at Smederevo (1459), the statements by the Soviet scholar Vzdornov (similar to those of other poorly - informed philologists) that Serbia and Bulgaria "were swallowed in a short time", and that "this was exactly the time when the mass emigration of Southern Slavs (to Russia) began", is remarkably naive. For one thing, the assumption of any such mass emigration to Russia is unsupported by a single fact. For another, one may ask when, actually, was the time when this "emigration" began: after the fall of the Rhodopa Mountains or the fall of Monastir (Bitola), after the

152. op. cit., p. 114.
AN SSSR, Istorija Vizantii, v. 3, Moscow, 1967,
p. 190-198.

fall of Niš or the fall of Tarnovo, after the fall of Vidin or the fall of Beograd? Obviously, some people were running from the Turks (cf. the testimony of Monk Isaja of Serres, fn. 135). But why should they have gone all the way to Moscow or Novgorod when they could have gone to the next principality, the next town, the next monastery in their own land, or to neighboring Serbia, or to Wallachia or Moldavia, which had flourishing Slavic-language cultures throughout the 15th century? The Russian scholars' misunderstanding of the historical events connected with the Turkish conquest of the Balkans, and their invention of the myth of a "mass migration" of Southern Slavs to Russia, can perhaps be sought in the traditional concept of the mechanism of the second South Slavic influence, which entered 19th-century literature of the problem when there was little real information available on the subject. And yet, Sobolevskij never mentions the word "refugee, emigrant", while Lixačev uses it in quotation marks¹⁵³.

c) The statement that "under the conditions of the Turkish occupation, their (the "emigrants'") activity in their own country became unthinkable" cannot be taken seriously. The author seems unaware that it was precisely under the Turkish occupation that Konstantin Kostenečki went to a Bulgarian monastery to pursue his studies, or that the great activity of Russian copyists in the monasteries of Athos

153. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 149.

(which is the topic of his article!) was conducted under the Turkish occupation. Besides, this author has hardly asked himself the question, how did the Russian scribes from Moscow and Novgorod reach Mount Athos if not by being permitted to cross the Turkish-occupied territories. And where did the hundreds of 15th-century Bulgarian manuscripts come from, if all intellectual and cultural activity by the Balkan Christians had become "unthinkable"? The early Turkish administration of the South Slavic lands undoubtedly brought much suffering to some people; it definitely had a negative influence on the cultural and religious life of the Christian nations there, but it was not as severe as the Soviet scholars tend to portray it.

d) Yet the greatest error in all this mass of uncorroborated "information" is the statement that "in this respect (i.e., as concerns emigrants who took up permanent residence in Russia)...the most representative personality is the Metropolitan Kiprian." Kiprian was never an "emigrant"; he reached Moscow as the confirmed Metropolitan in the late spring of 1389, four years before the fall of Tarnovo¹⁵⁴. However, his first, unsuccessful stay as Metropolitan of Moscow was even earlier — from May 23, 1381 to sometime after October 7, 1382¹⁵⁵.

154. E. Golubinskij, Istorija ruskoj cerkvi, v. 2, 1, Moscow, 1900 (photoedition: The Hague, 1969), p. 300.

155, op. cit., p. 249-251.

Nor was Camblak an "emigrant" or "refugee" to Kiev and Russian Lithuania: he was officially invited from Moldavia by Prince Vytautas (or Vitovt) (Cf. our discussion on the contribution of these two Bulgarians, in 2.3.2 and 2.3.3.)

e) Still, one must distinguish strictly the concepts behind the two Russian words выходец and эмигрант. The former¹⁵⁶ is defined as "a new settler who has come from another country" or "one who has moved up from another social group"; there is no implication that the person was a refugee. In the totality of the concept expressed by the priority is on the decision by the person to change his place of residence or his social group for the better. Such a person is fully integrated into his new society. On the other hand, эмигрант¹⁵⁷ implies, in any case, a refugee, who has either been expelled from his own country or fled from it, legally or illegally, and then found some means of existence elsewhere. Such a person has never fully integrated into the new society, but has stayed on as a resident foreigner.

156. S. I. Ožegov, Slovar' russkogo jazyka, Moscow, 1960 (4th edition), p. 119.

The full definition in Russian is : Вýходец, -дца, м. 1. Пришелец, переселенец из другой страны. 2. Тот, кто перешел из одной социальной среды в другую (устар.)

157. op. cit, p. 892.

The full definition in Russian is: Эмигрант, -а, м. Человек, к-рый находится в эмиграции; where Эмиграция, -и, ж. 1. Вынужденное или добровольное переселение из своего отечества в другую страну по политическим, экономическим или иным причинам. 2. Перебывание в другой стране после такого переселения. 3. собир. Эмигранты.

In the Russian-English dictionary these two Russian words are translated, respectively, as "being of a certain nationality by birth, being of a certain extraction" (for выходец)¹⁵⁸ and as "emigrant; emigre; exile" (for эмигрант)¹⁵⁹. The word эмигрант can also be translated as "refugee" (cf. "refugee - 1) беженец; 2) эмигрант 160).

It becomes clear that the Russian term эмигрант always implies in its complexity a refugee, a person who is a stranger in the new land, who stays somehow out of society, etc., while выходец only stresses that he was foreign-born. A. I. Sobolevskij very correctly called Kiprian, Camblak and Paxomij Logofet "južno-slavjanske vyxodcy"¹⁶¹, thus saying nothing about their reasons for settling in Russia, and emphasizing their integration into the Russian society. Evidence for the fact that he had become truly Russian is the spiritual testament of Metropolitan Kiprian to the Russian clergy, in which he speaks as one Russian to others¹⁶².

158. See the translations and examples in:
A. I. Smirnickij, Russko-anglijskij slovar', Moscow, 1969 (8th edition), p. 116.

159. op. cit., p. 719.

160. V. K. Mjuller, Anglo-russkij slovar', Moscow, 1960 (7th edition), p. 827.

161. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 12.

162. This testament can be found in the chapter for September 16, 6915:

VIII letopisnyj sbornik, imenuemyj Patriaršeju ili Nikonovskoju letopis'ju, Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, v. XI, St. Petersburg, 1897 (photoedition: Moscow, 1965), p. 195-196.

History gives no indication that Bulgarian (or Serbian) scribes became refugees to Russia as a result of the Turkish conquest. The reason lies in the peculiar status of a scribe or writer in 14th - 15th-century Bulgaria or Serbia: his craft was not his main vocation. Translating, compiling and copying books was not a secular profession but a "soul-saving" activity, performed by monks and priests. While we do not know who worked in the Balkan kings' chancelleries of that time, the heavy Church Slavic language of the existing gramoty of the Bulgarian and Serbian kings definitely speaks for the hypothesis that the people who wrote them were the same people who wrote the "holy" books. Even after the Turkish conquest, the Balkan monasteries remained centers of literary activity. In my opinion, any claim that Bulgarian and Serbian scribes became "refugees" to Russia is arbitrary and antihistorical, since it has never been supported by any evidence - not by names mentioned in historical documents, or by the existence of books, written in Russia by South Slavic scribes other than Kiprian, Camblak and Paxomij (who can in no way be called refugees).

The problem of the South Slavic and Greek craftsmen in 14th - 15th-century Russia is a very different one. There is some historical evidence for the presence of such masters in Russian towns and monasteries. For instance, the Nikon Chronicle mentions (under the year 6912) that «лазарь чернец сербинъ, иже новопршель изъ сербскіа земли» built

a clock in the courtyard of the Muscovite grand prince, behind the Church of the Annunciation¹⁶³. In a different version of the same story¹⁶⁴ it is said that his (Lazar's) price was over 150 rubles. This statement, although ambiguous, would more likely suggest that Lazar charged the prince over 150 rubles, rather than that he was ransomed (from the Turks?) for this sum; the latter, however is not an impossible explanation. I. Zabelin has found evidence in the Russian chronicles¹⁶⁵ that a Roman (РИМЛЯНИНЪ could have meant either 'from Rome; or 'Roman Catholic') master Boris, in 1346, in Moscow, cast three large and two smaller church bells. Zabelin notes that the name Boris is unusual for an Italian, and suggests that he was of South Slavic origin¹⁶⁶.

Additional information and bibliographic reference on the problem of the works of Greek and Serbian craftsmen and artists in Russian cities, churches and monasteries can be found in D. S. Lixačev's article¹⁶⁷. However, in all of the existing works quoted by Lixačev, the participation of foreign-born craftsmen in the building and ornamentation of

163. op. cit., p. 190.

164. Simeonovskaja letopis'. Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej (Izdannoe po vysočajšemu povelenu Imperatorskoj Arheografičeskoju komissieju; A. E. Presnjakov, ed.), XVIII, St. Petersburg, 1913, p. 95.

165. op. cit., p. 95.

166. I. Zabelin, Istorija goroda Moskvy, I, Moscow, 1902, p. 86.

167. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 99-106.

Russian churches has been explained primarily by the need for experienced masters in the expanded construction programs in Russia after it had regained its independence from the Tatars. (Compare, for example, the above-mentioned "Roman Boris", who cast the bells in Moscow in 1346, six years before the Turks set foot on the Balkan peninsula.)

2.3.2. For 25 years, Kiprian's activities at the end of the 14th and the very beginning of the 15th centuries were connected with the Muscovite Russian Church and the revision of its literature and language. Thus Kiprian became the most influential Bulgarian in the process of reshaping the Russian culture of that time. In contemporary works on the history of Russian literature, his Bulgarian nationality is established beyond doubt¹⁶⁸. But for almost a century there was a dispute in the literature about Kiprian's national origin. The oldest information on the subject is a short reference in Stepennaja kniga (16th century) and in the Nikonian compilation of the Russian Chronicle (also 16th century). In both sources it is said that Kiprian was Serbian by birth (родомъ сербинъ)¹⁶⁹. The next data are given by

168. J. Ivanov, Balgarskoto knižovno vlijanie v Rusija pri mitropolit Kiprian (1375-1406), IzvIBL, VI, Sofia, 1958, p. 25-79.

169. Kniga Stepennaja carskogo rodoslovija, Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, XXI, 2, St. Petersburg, 1913, p. 441.

VIII letopisnyj sbornik, imenuemyj Patriaršeju ili Nikonovskoju letopis'ju, Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, v. XI, St. Petersburg, 1897 (photoedition: Moscow, 1965), p. 194.

Nil Kurljatev in 1552, in a preface to a copy of the translation of the Psalter by Maksim Grek. In praising the new translation, Nil Kurljatev compares it with the similar one by Kiprian. Since this is the first recorded negative attitude toward Kiprian (and toward the second South Slavic influence on Russian), the quote should be given in full¹⁷⁰:

But Metropolitan Kiprian did not understand much Greek, neither did he sufficiently know our language. While we speak in our language clearly and loudly, they speak with snuffling, and their words do not resemble ours in writing. But he thought he had corrected the Psalms according to our language, while he had put more nonsense into them, and in their discourses and words he wrote entirely in Serbian. Even today many among us spend their time writing books, but because of their lack of sense they write entirely in Serbian ... Whenever, according to our language, there should be a, according to Serbian, it is ѣ or ж; where, according to our language, it is ю, in Serbian it is а; in our language — ѡ, but in Serbian — ж; for us it is ы; in Serbian — и. Our words like не заме(д)ли in Serbian, or equally in Bulgarian, will be не замѡди; in our language it is кѡсно- or ме(д)ленноѡзыченъ, or гѡгни(в), but in Serbian it is мѡдноѡзыче(н); or other words unclear to us бохма, васнь, реснотивіе, цѣши, ашѡтъ, and many more similar ones which we do not understand, some Serbian, some Bulgarian. A year's time would not be enough for us to tell about these matters. (The Russian Church Slavic text is given in Appendix Five.)

A number of highly-respected authorities have repeated the 16th-century "testimonies" to the Serbian origin

170. Arximandrit Amfiloxij, Čto vnes Sv. Kiprian, mitropolit Kievskij i vseja Rossii, a potom Moskovskij i vseja Rossii, iz svoego rodnogo narečija i iz perevodov ego vremeni v naši bogoslužebnye knigi?, Trudy Tret'ego Arxeologičeskogo s"ezda v Rossii, byvšego v Kieve v avguste 1874 g., II, Kiev, 1878, p. 231-232.

of Kiprian. Among them are P. M. Stroev, Archbishop Makarij, E. Kažužniacki, and, in more recent times, V. I. Ščepkin and M. N. Tixomirov¹⁷¹. Another group of equally serious scholars have maintained that Kiprian was of Bulgarian origin, mainly by doubting the authenticity of the 16th-century evidence. Among them are E. Golubinskij, N. M. Glubokovskij, A. I. Jacimirskij, and most recently, L. A. Dmitriev¹⁷². First, A. I. Sobolevskij accepted Kiprian's Bulgarian origin¹⁷³, but seven years later, in the revised edition¹⁷⁴ of

171. Bibliologičeskij slovar' i černovye k nemu materialy P. M. Stroeva (a posthumous edition, A. F. Byčkov, ed.), Sbornik ORJaS, XXIX, 4, St. Petersburg, 1882 (photoedition: Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1966), p. 165.

Arxiepiskop Makarij, Istorija ruskoj cerkvi, V, 2, St. Petersburg, 1866, pp. 183, 213.

Em. Kažužniacki, Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius, Vienna, 1901, p. v.

V. I. Ščepkin, Učebnik ruskoj paleografii, Moscow, 1920, p. 116.

M. N. Tixomirov, Istoričeskie svjazi ruskogo naroda s južnymi slavjanami, Slavjanskij sbornik, Moscow, 1947, p. 177.

172. E. Golubinskij, Istorija ruskoj cerkvi, II 1, Moscow, 1900 (photoedition: The Hague, 1969), p. 297.

N. M. Glubokovskij, Sv. Kiprian, mitropolit vseja Rossii, kak pisatel', Čtenija v Obščestve ljubitelej duxovnogo prosveščeniya, 1, January 1892, p. 358-424.

A. I. Jacimirskij, Grigorij Camblak, St. Petersburg, 1904, p. 20-21.

L. A. Dmitriev, Rol' i značenie mitropolita Kipriana v istorii drevneruskoj literatury (K rusko-bolgarskim literaturnym svjazjam XIV - XV vv.), Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow - Leningrad, p. 216.

173. A. I. Sobolevskij, Južno-slavjanskoe vlijanie na ruskuju pis'mennost' v XIV - XV vekax..., St. Petersburg, 1894, p. 14.

174. A. I. Sobolevskij, Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV - XVII vekov (Bibliografičeskie materialy), St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 12.

his article, he called Kiprian "half-Greek, half-Bulgarian".

The Bulgarian literary historian J. Ivanov, in an unfinished study, published 11 years after his death¹⁷⁵, proves beyond doubt the Bulgarian origin of the Russian Metropolitan Kiprian. Ivanov dismissed Sobolevskij's allegation that Kiprian was half Greek, quoting a letter by Patriarch Matthew of Constantinople to Kiprian (1400), in which Kiprian is said to be "attached to the Greeks" and a "friend of theirs"¹⁷⁶; if he had been even part Greek, the Patriarch would surely have reminded him of it. The thorough analysis of Camblak's eulogy for Kiprian, as well as the language and the spelling of all texts positively identified as Kiprian's autographs, made by J. Ivanov, speak for his Bulgarian — not Serbian — origin¹⁷⁷.

2.3.2.1. The original writings of Kiprian, positively identified today, are negligible in number. In addition to his spiritual testament to the Russian clergy (cf. fn. 162), Kiprian also wrote a new version of the Vita of St. Peter, sometime between the years 1397 and 1404¹⁷⁸.

Basically, Kiprian used the biographical facts in the older

175. J. Ivanov, Bølgarskoto knižovno vlijanie v Rusija pri mitropolit Kiprian, Izvestija IBL, VI, 1958, p. 25-79.

176. op. cit., p. 35.

177. op. cit., p. 35-75.

178. K. Kuev, Kiprian, Istorija na bølgarskata literatura, 1, Sofia, 1963, p. 310-313.

vita by Proxor, but added new information: he names the native place of St. Peter as Volhynia, mentions the desire of the Volhynian prince to have his own metropolitan, and remarks on the economic and political situation in Volhynia¹⁷⁹. The style of his vita is new for Russia, very different from that of the older version by Proxor, which was strictly representative of the 14th-century South Slavic literature. The vita by Kiprian, in general, departs from the Balkan hagiographic tradition (followed, for instance, by the works of Euthymius) in that it gives abundant historically true facts from the life of the saint. Kiprian utilizes the Vita of St. Peter to affirm the future historic role of Moscow, and of the Muscovite grand princes, in the unification of Russia¹⁸⁰.

2.3.2.2. In the Soviet libraries there are three original autographs by Kiprian and a 14th - 15th-century Russian copy from a Služebnik translated by him. Before Jordan Ivanov's article on Kiprian (cf. fn. 175), it was believed that all these represented new translations from Greek, done by Kiprian partly in the Balkan monasteries and partly in Russia¹⁸¹. In his study, Ivanov proves these

179. op. cit., p. 311.

180. B. St. Angelov, ed., Žitie na mitropolit Petar ot Kiprijan, Iz starata belgarska, ruska i srabska literatura, I, Sofia, 1958, p. 159-176.

181. J. Ivanov, Belgarskoto knižovno vlijanie pri mitropolit Kiprian, IzvIBL, VI, Sofia, 1958, p. 38.

"translations" (with the exception of the Služebnik) to be another myth. For instance, in the postscript of his copy of the Lestvica ("Ladder") by John of Sinai (Climacos), Kiprian wrote: "In the year 1387, on April 24, these writings were completed in the Monastery of John Stoudites, by the humble Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia, Kiprian":

в лѣ^т ѿ .̄с̄.̄ω̄.̄ч̄.̄ѣ̄. а̄пріліа .̄кд: съврѣшиша^с сіа книги в сто-
дїискои обитѣли кипріано^м смѣреннѣмъ митрополито^м киев-
скимъ и всеа рѡсіа: 182

This has wrongly been interpreted as an indication that Kiprian was the translator. J. Ivanov compares Kiprian's copy of the same Lestvica, kept in the Museum of the Rila Monastery, # 3/10. Here are short parallel passages from both texts, taken from Ivanov's study¹⁸³ as the best illustration of Kiprian's ability scrupulously to copy the religious texts (clearly, both copies are from another original).

Rila Lestvica

Kiprian's Lestvica

о̄ безпристрасти. сло^в в:

ѣже истиноѡ га възлюбивыи.

ѣже истиноѡ бѣдѣщаго цр^ствіа

полочіти възыскавы. ѣже въ ис-

о̄ безпристрастіи слѡво в̄.

ѣже истинноа га възлюбивы. ѣже

истинноа бѣдѣщаго цр^ствіа

полочіти възыскавы. ѣже въ ис-

182. op. cit., p. 48.

183. op. cit., p. 49.

тинѣ болѣзнь о свои^х съгрѣ-
шени^х имѣѣ. ѿже въ истинѣ
памѣ^т мѣченіа стѣжавы ѿ сѣда
вѣчнаго. ѿже въ истинѣ стра^х
о своемъ исходѣ въспрїемы,
ктомѣ не възлюбить. ктомѣ
не попечет сѣ или поскрѣбитъ.
ни о имѣни^х. ни о стѣжанихъ.
ни о родителе^х. ни о слѣвѣ
житѣистѣи. ни о дрѣсѣ^х. ни
о братїи. ни о чьсомъ же зем-
ныи^х вѣсѣко. нѣ все свое
съдрѣжанїе...

тинѣ болѣзнь о свои^х съгрѣ-
шенихъ имѣѣи. ѿже въ истинѣ
памѣ^т мѣченіа стѣжавыи сѣди
вѣчнаго. ѿже въ истинѣ стра^х
о своемъ исходѣ въспрїемы,
ктомѣ не възлюбить, ктомѣ
не попечѣ сѣ или поскрѣбитъ.
ни о имѣни^х. ни о стѣжанихъ.
ни о родителехъ. ни о слѣвѣ
житѣистѣи. ни о дрѣсѣ^х. ни
о братїи. ни о чьсомъ же зем-
ныхъ вѣсѣко нѣ все свое
съдрѣжанїе...

Today, Kiprian's Lestvica is kept in the Lenin State Library of the USSR in Moscow, # ф. I73, Фунд., I52. The manuscript has been studied often¹⁸⁴.

Another copy by Kiprian is a 426-leaflet manuscript containing the Works of Dionysius Areopagites with a commentary. Today it is kept in the Lenin State Library of the USSR in Moscow, # ф. I73, Фунд., I44¹⁸⁵. According

184. For a detailed bibliography of paleographic, textological and theological studies on this manuscript, see: G. I. Vzdornov, Rol' slavjanskix monastyrskix masterskix pis'ma..., Literaturnye svjazi drevnix slavjan (Trudy ODRL, v. XXIII), Leningrad, 1968, p. 189.

185. L. A. Dmitriev, Rol' i značenie mitropolita Kipriana v istorii drevnerusskoj literatury (k russko-bolgarskim literaturnym svjazjam XIV - XV vv.), Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 223-224.

to P. M. Stroev, this manuscript is an "autograph translation" (собственноручный перевод) by Metropolitan Kiprian¹⁸⁶. Actually, Kiprian copied the new Middle Bulgarian translation of 1371 by Father Isaja of Serres¹⁸⁷. P. Stroev's wrong assignment of the translation is probably owing to the fact that Kiprian did not copy Isaja's preface (or, in some late manuscripts, postscript) to the translation, in which he tells of the defeat of Ugleša and Vəlkašin in 1371 near the village of Černomen (cf. fn. 135). Isaja explains that when he had reached "the evening of his sunny day" — that is, his '70's — and had learned "a little of the Greek language, enough to be able to understand its riches and the hardship of translation from that (language) into our language"¹⁸⁸, Metropolitan Theodosius of the city of Serres asked him to translate the Works of Dionysius Areopagites¹⁸⁹.

Very indicative for the Bulgarian origin of Kiprian, and for his thorough knowledge of the available revised copies of the religious writings in Bulgaria, is his copy of the Psalter (the one that was so sharply criticized for its

186. P. M. Stroev, Bibliologičeskij slovar' i černovye k nemu materialy, Sbornik ORJaS, XXIX (4), St. Petersburg, 1882 (photoedition: Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1966), p. 168.

187. J. Ivanov, op. cit., p. 51-52.

188. The Slavic text is known from a 15th-century Russian copy (the Rumjancev manuscript), published for the first time by B. Angelov (p. 157-161). See:

B. St. Angelov, Iz starata bəlgarska, ruska i srəbska literatura, II, Sofia, 1967, p. 157.

189. B. St. Angelov, op. cit., p. 158.

"Serbian" features by Nil Kurljatev in 1552; cf. fn. 170).

Ivanov has found that Kiprian copied his text very precisely from the Psalter of King Ioan Aleksandar of 1337¹⁹⁰. In addition, Kiprian included short passages praising the Bulgarian saints Petka (Paraskeva), Ioan Rilski, Ilarion Møglenski, Kiril Filosof and Ioakim¹⁹¹. Kiprian's copy of the Psalter is presently kept in the Lenin State Library of the USSR in Moscow, # ф. I73, Фунд., I42 I⁹².

2.3.2.3. Kiprian's work in introducing into Russia the revised Middle Bulgarian editions of the 14th-century religious literature has another aspect. In the fall of 1382, after October 7, when Kiprian was expelled from Moscow by Prince Dmitrij (Donskoj), he went back to the Monastery of John Stoudites, taking with him Afanasij Vysockij, the famous abbot of the Vysockij Monastery near the city of Serpuxov¹⁹³. The two friends stayed there together until Kiprian returned to Russia as the acknowledged Metropolitan of Kiev (and later of Moscow). But even before being expelled from Russia in 1382, Kiprian must have begun his long friendship with Afanasij Vysockij, and must have told him about the revised editions available in the Balkan monasteries, since in 1381 the abbot Afanasij especially sent the

190. J. Ivanov, op. cit., p. 38-45.

191. op. cit., p. 45-47.

192. L. A. Dmitriev, op. cit., p. 224-225.

193. J. Ivanov, op. cit., p. 27.

novice Vun'ko to the Zograph Monastery to copy the Pandects of Nikon Černogorec. The first 210 leaflets were copied by Vun'ko and were brought back to the Vysockij Monastery before August 10, 1382, when Abbot Afanasij added 18 more leaflets in his own handwriting, with items from the Paterikon and the Instruction to Monks¹⁹⁴. From the note by Vun'ko (front of leaflet 1) it is not clear exactly where the copy was made. But J. Ivanov implies that it was copied in the Zograph Monastery on Mt. Athos, from a Middle Bulgarian manuscript sent to this monastery as a present by the Tarnovo Patriarch Theodosius¹⁹⁵. From the description of Vun'ko's copy, given by Gorskij and Nevostruev¹⁹⁶, it becomes obvious that Vun'ko used a Bulgarian original. Although he does not use the letter ѣ (which is a significant indication that the second South Slavic influence did not begin in the orthography), his use of ѡ and Ѣ (for the correct Russian ю) reflects the so-called Middle Bulgarian confusion of the nasal vowels (cf. требуѡ on p. 81 for the 1st person singular, which should be требую; твориѡ on p. 92 for the correct творю). In addition, Vun'ko copies in the margins the Bulgarian glosses to some Greek words: кориды . древанѡи вошькы именуѡтсѡ (p. 53b), хиновоскиѡ

194. A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, Opisanie slavjanskix rukopisej Moskovskoj sinodal'noj biblioteki, II, 3, Moscow, 1862, p. 10.

195. J. Ivanov, ibid.

196. A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, op. cit., p.10-11.

именует са по болгарьскому ѡзыку гуска^М паша (p. 94b), etc.

2.3.2.4. The only known original translation from Greek made by Kiprian while in Russia is the Služebnik, translated in 1397. The original has been lost, but a Russian copy is kept today in the State Historical Museum in Moscow, # Син. 601¹⁹⁷. From the note on p. 132b one learns the name of the Russian copyist — Ilarij — who testifies on p. 72 that this Služebnik "was copied from the Greek book into Russian by the hand of the humble Kiprian, Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia"¹⁹⁸.

A note in Manuscript # 7 from the Cathedral Church of the Assumption (Успенский Собор) from 1403, says that the Russian land now "shines more than the dawn of the sun because of his (Kiprian's) revision of the books and teachings"¹⁹⁹.

2.3.2.5. Kiprian's revision of the books in Russia, thus, proceeded in three different ways:

a) He brought with him his own copies from the revised Middle Bulgarian editions of religious books (the Psalter, the Lestvica of John Climacos, and the Works of Dionysius Areopagites) already in existence;

b) While residing in Moscow as the Russian metro-

197. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 174.

198. A. Gorskij, K. Nevostruev, Opisanie slavjanskix rukopisej Moskovskoj sinodal'noj biblioteki, III, 1, Moscow, 1869, p. 11-12.

199. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 12-13 (fn. 3 on p. 12).

politan he also translated from Greek into Church Slavic. He was a good connoisseur of Middle Bulgarian, but perhaps by 1397 (after eight years among the Russians) his language was somewhat influenced by Russian. Since the original of his only translation from Greek made in Russia has been lost, the question, into which variant of Church Slavic he translated it (middle Bulgarian or Russian influenced by Middle Bulgarian) is an open one;

c) Kiprian directly or indirectly encouraged Russians to travel to the Balkan monasteries and to copy from the Bulgarian revised editions of religious books (as evidenced by Vun'ko's copy).

Kiprian as metropolitan must have had scribes who copied, from the revised editions, books to be disseminated throughout Russia. In a letter to the clergy of Pskov, Kiprian announced that he had sent them copies of the liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great, as well as texts for many other church services²⁰⁰.

2.3.3. In contrast to that on the Muscovite metropolitan Kiprian, Russian research on the activities, in the East Slavic territories, of the Kievan metropolitan Grigorij Camblak is inadequate, and confined mainly to his eulogy to Kiprian²⁰¹. At the beginning of this century,

200. J. Ivanov, op. cit., p. 53.

201. Arximandrit Leonid, Nadgrobnoe slovo Grigorija Camblaka rossijskomu arxiepiskopu Kiprianu, Čtenija Moskovskogo universiteta, I, 1872, p.

A. I. Jacimirskij wrote three monographs on Camblak, studying mostly his impact on the Slavic literature of Wallachia and Moldavia, before his becoming Metropolitan of Kiev²⁰². It would seem that the anathemas pronounced on Camblak by Metropolitan Photius of Moscow and by Patriarch Euthymius of Constantinople²⁰³ are still hanging over him in otherwise antireligious Russia.

Grigorij Camblak probably came from a prominent Tarnovo feudal family²⁰⁴ and in 1379 still lived in Tarnovo, close to his teacher Patriarch Euthymius²⁰⁵. The next information on his life comes from lyrical digressions in his later writings, from which one may conclude that he spent some time in the Athos monasteries and in the Constantinople monasteries of Studites and Pantocrator²⁰⁶. It is difficult to believe that he was in Tarnovo when the city was taken by

202. A. I. Jacimirskij, Grigorij Camblak. Očerkego žizni, administrativnoj i kniževnoj dejatel'nosti, St. Petersburg, 1904, 480 pp.

, Iz istorii slavjanskoj pis'mennosti v Moldavii i Valaxii XV - XVII vv., Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti i iskusstva, CLXII, CLXIII, 1906.
Iz istorii slavjanskoj propovedi v Moldavii, St. Petersburg, 1906.

203. E. Golubinskij, op. cit., p. 380-381.

204. The Palauzov copy of King Boril's Synodikon mentions, in the listing of dead boljars of Tarnovo, the name of a "Camblak, the great primikjur". See:

M. G. Popruženko, Sinodik carja Borila (Bølgarski starini, VIII), Sofia, 1928, p. 90.

205. V. Sl. Kiselkov, Prouki i očerti po staro-bølgarskata literatura, Sofia, 1956, p. 234.

206. V. Velčev, Grigorij Camblak, Istorija na bølgarskata literatura, 1, Sofia, 1963, p. 327.

the Turks in 1393, because of the legendary character of his description of the events. I. Dujčev has found the prototype of Camblak's text both in the Old Testament and in the works of many Byzantine writers²⁰⁷. By the end of the 14th century, Camblak was an abbot in the Dečanski Monastery in Serbia, and in 1402 (or 1403) he was preaching in the Cathedral Church of St. John the Baptist in the Moldavian capital, Suceava²⁰⁸. On his way to Moscow in 1406 to visit his uncle, the metropolitan Kiprian, he learned of the latter's death²⁰⁹ and swiftly returned to Constantinople as a pretender to the vacant Moscow See²¹⁰.

With the increase of hostilities between the Muscovite and the Russian-Lithuanian principalities after Kiprian's death, the Lithuanian Grand Prince Vitovt (Vytautas) in 1414 selected Camblak as Metropolitan of Russian Lithuania, and sent him to Constantinople for the appointment and blessings of the Patriarch²¹¹. The Patriarch, who was already dependent on the financial support of the Muscovite prince in the war against the Turks, and who had even arranged the

207. I. Dujčev, Legendarnyj motiv u Grigorija Camblaka, Slavia XXI, 1952-53, p. 345-349.

208. V. Velčev, op. cit., p. 327-328.

209. The text of Camblak's eulogy of Kiprian says, "and we...were trying to reach your land in order to see the pastor who was guarding his flock" when the arrow of the news of his death touched Camblak's heart. See:

B. St. Angelov, ed., op. cit., p. 181.

210. V. Velčev, op. cit., p. 328.

211. E. Golubinskij, op. cit., pp. 374, 377.

marriage of the 10-year-old daughter of that prince (Vasilij Dmitrievič) to the equally young son of the Emperor in Constantinople, refused to create a separate Lithuanian Church with Camblak as its metropolitan²¹². As a result, Vitovt asked the bishops of Lithuania to elect Camblak metropolitan, according to an old church practice. Thus on November 15, 1415 the bishops formally consecrated Grigorij Camblak as Metropolitan of "Kiev, of Galicia and of All Russia", with his seat in Vilna²¹³. After he was anathematized by the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Metropolitan of Moscow, Camblak turned to the Pope of Rome. Between 1414 and 1418, Camblak, leading an imposing delegation of about 300 Lithuanian clergymen and nobles²¹⁴, took an active part in the Council of Constance, which under the Roman Pope John XXII ended the Great Schism in 1417. Camblak died in 1420²¹⁵.

We know nothing about Camblak's work in Russian Lithuania on the revision of the Church books and their language, because of the negative attitude of Russian officialdom towards this fruitful and talented writer and religious leader. Research on this aspect of his work can be conducted even today only in the Soviet museums and archives, where it has not been pursued up to now. Camblak

212. op. cit., pp. 367, 377.

213. op. cit., pp. 378, 384.

214. V. Velčev, op. cit., p. 328.

215. L. Stojanović, Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi, Beograd, 1905, # 495.

committed great "sins" against Moscow by actively supporting the struggle of the Ukrainians and Belorussians for cultural and political independence in the years when Moscow's aggressive unification policy towards the neighboring cities and states had just begun. That he is still being punished for them is unfortunate, since Grigorij Camblak must have played an important and integral part in the history of the Ukrainian and Belorussian languages and culture. One can only surmise that Camblak had a similar influence in Russian Lithuania to that of Kiprian in Moscow: features of the Church Slavic language used in Russian Lithuania before "South-West Russia" became attached to Moscow in the 17th century point in this direction. His activities also may have triggered the changes in the literary language which later influenced Muscovite Russian, sometimes referred to as the "third South Slavic influence" (Shevelov). In the absence of serious studies of Grigorij Camblak's activities in Vilna between 1414 and 1420 related to the revision of the literary language and of the religious texts, anything said in this connection must remain speculative.

2.3.4. A critical examination of all the well-established facts about the penetration of South Slavic (and particularly Bulgarian) books into Russia in the 14th and 15th centuries indicates that the most important factor was the copying of texts in the Balkans. This process started in the 13th century, but reached its highest point at the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th centuries.

Persons like Kiprian and Camblak must have done much to accelerate the process, but did not cause it. Nor was the Turkish conquest of the Balkan Slavic countries the direct cause of the second South Slavic influence.

2.3.4.1. The earliest record of the Russian demand for new Church Slavic translations, previously made in Bulgaria, is from 1262 (or 1270 — texts disagree), when the metropolitan of Kiev, Kiril III (approximately 1242-1281) ordered a copy of the Kormčaja kniga (Nomokanon)²¹⁶. The letter of the Kievan metropolitan, asking for this book, has not yet been found, but the answer of the Bulgarian despot of Russian origin, Jakov Svjatislav, to Kiril III has been known to Slavists since 1842²¹⁷. All known Russian copies of Jakov Svjatislav's letter include a note by the chief Bulgarian copyist Ioan Dragoslav; both letter and note give interesting information on the cultural relations between

216. B. St. Angelov, Pismo na Jakov Svetoslav do Ruskija mitropolit Kiril III, Iz starata bēlgarska, ruska i srēbska literatura, II, Sofia, 1967, p. 139.

V. N. Zlatarski, Istorija na bēlgarskata dēržava, III, Sofia, 1940, pp. 322-323, 456-457, 499-519.

217. A. Vostokov, Opisanie russkix i slovenskix rukopisej Rumjancovskogo muzeuma, St. Petersburg, 1842, # CCXXXII, p. 290-291.

Vostokov began the practice of calling this Bulgarian feudal lord of Russian extraction Jakov Svjatoslav, although his name is spelled (in the genitive) as ѦВА СВАТИСЛАВА in MS # 232, and ѦКОВА СВАТИСЛАВА MS # 233 (both manuscripts studied by him). In all other copies the name is written (in the genitive) as СВАТИСЛАВА (cf. the Kievan MS in B. St. Angelov, op. cit., p. 143). The form Svjatoslav is an arbitrary Russism, and should be avoided.

Russia and Bulgaria in the second half of the 13th century.²¹⁸

The Russian metropolitan asked Jakov Svjatislav to sponsor the copying of the Nomokanon (known in Bulgaria as Zonara). Jakov Svjatislav states in his letter that he has asked the Patriarch of Tarnovo for permission to copy this book, in memory of his parents and for the good of his own soul. He reminds the metropolitan that "by no means should this Zonara be re-copied, because it is accepted that there should be only one Zonara in the cathedral church of each kingdom, as the holy fathers had commanded and passed this commandment

218. The oldest Russian copies of this Kormčaja are from the 13th century: Sofijskaja (Novgorodskaja) kormčaja (of 1282) and Rjazanskaja kormčaja (or 1284); but they do not include Jakov Svjatislav's letter. See:

A. I. Sobolevskij, *Osobennosti russkix perevodov domongol'skogo perioda*, Sbornik ORJaS, 88, 3, St. Petersburg, 1910, p. 162-177.

The letter is included in several later copies of the Kormčaja kniga:

a) The oldest copy is in the 15th-century Kormčaja # 375 of the manuscript collection of the former Kiev Seminary (leaflets 144-145), presently kept in the Central Scientific Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, # Дух. акад., No.375, published in:

B. St. Angelov, *op. cit.*, p. 142-144;

b) A 16th-century Kormčaja, published by A. Vostokov in 1842 (cf. fn. 217);

c) A 16th-century Kormčaja, kept in the Lenin State Library in Moscow, # CCXXIII (leaflet 85), published in:

B. St. Angelov, *op. cit.*, p. 145-147;

d) A 16th-century Kormčaja, kept in the Lenin State Library in Moscow, # CCXXXIV, unpublished;

e) A Kormčaja dated 1552, a manuscript of the former Petersburg Seminary (I was not able to discover its present location), published by Sreznevskij. See:

I. I. Sreznevskij, *Obozrenie drevnix russkix spiskov Kormčej knigi*, Sbornik ORJaS, 65, 1899, p. 60-61.

on to us"²¹⁹. Ioan Dragoslav, who in his own words was "not that good a scribe"²²⁰ and two other scribes divided the text into three parts and copied it in 50 days, beginning on November 10 and finishing on January 7.

A. I. Sobolevskij tried to prove that, actually, this translation was originally made by a Russian on Mount Athos, and then taken to Bulgaria²²¹. He reached this conclusion while studying the language of the 13th-century Serbian Ilovačka krmčica (1262), whose translation has been traditionally assigned to St. Savva. The text shows indisputable Russisms. In the orthography, for example: a is frequently used for Ѧ (Ѧ (Ѧыша)); pleophony occurs in a few instances (чѣрѣнь for чрѣнь), and ж is often found in place of the traditional So. Slavic -жд- (from *dj). The rest of the orthographic features listed by Sobolevskij are not diagnostically Russian (for instance, confusion of the letters ѣ and е could also be either Serbian or dialectal Bulgarian). Among the lexical Russisms only руга and върсть (for поприще) seem convincing, while others, like пожаръ,

219. The quotation is an English translation from the 15th-century Kiev copy, published in:

B. St. Angelov, op. cit., p. 143.

220. This is expressed by a very typical syntactic Bulgarianism, preserved in all three Russian copies published by Angelov: понеже не бѣх до тамо писецъ (cf. B. St. Angelov, op. cit., pp. 143, 145).

221. A. I. Sobolevskij, Materialy i izsledovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arheologii, Sbornik ORJaS, 88, 3, St. Petersburg, 1910, p. 178-180.

сѣно (сухая трава) are still known in all of the Bulgarian dialects and in many Serbian dialects. Sobolevskij admits that words like свѣнь, свѣнѣ [=кромѣ], прѣзѣ [=черезѣ], село [=поле], перпира, срѣдъць (the early Bulgarian name of the city of Sofia, in Greek Σαρδική) are typical South Slavisms, but maintains that "they do not add coloring to the text"²²². He further maintains: "As regards the data quoted, we may conclude that the translation (sic) of this edition of the Kormčaja came from the pen of a Russian"²²³.

Sobolevskij's conclusion, however, is incorrect; it does not explain why none of the rest of the Serbian krmčice have even a trace of the heavy Russian orthographic and sporadic lexical features of the Ilovačka krmčica. And Sobolevskij's understanding of the penetration of Russian phonological and orthographic features is unacceptable for a non-Russian. While the Russian spelling with жд represented the higher, literary norm of Church Slavic, the spelling with ж reflected the native phonology. Such an alternative spelling would have been possible only in Russia, where both вижду and вижу were meaningful words (perhaps representing different styles). For a South Slavic scribe, a form like вижу would have been unexpected and considered incorrect; he would have sought to avoid it as a dialectism,

222. op. cit., p. 179.

223. op. cit., p. 180.

correcting it where it occurred. This can be shown by examination of the types of Russisms in the 14th-century Bulgarian Four Gospels text, copied from a Russian original, which was published by B. Conev²²⁴. With respect to the phonology and orthography, the Bulgarian scribe did not spot (and thus re-copied) forms confusing ѣ with ѳ (ѳома, Іосифѳ), and ѣ with оу (тѳжити, ѣже for оуже); but the latter feature is not a diagnostic Russism, for it reflects the development of the nasal vowel in both Bulgarian and Serbian dialects. Within one word, the only occurrence for each, -оло- stands in place of -ла- and -ѣ- for -шт- (толочи for тлашти). Again, ѣ for шт could as well be a West Bulgarian feature as a Russian one. The scribe in a few instances uses typically Russian interpretations of the Church Slavic imperfect tense forms, with final -тъ, -ть (молѣшетъ, хоулаѣхътъ) and the sole certain Russism — семь for седмь²²⁵. If one compares these types of Russisms (acceptable to the Bulgarian scribe of the Four Gospels with the abundant number of orthographic Russisms in Ilovačka krmčica (many of them being of types inadmissible by a South Slavic scribe, since they represent neither a dialect he might have known nor his literary norm), there is only one possible conclusion — the Ilovačka krmčica is a

224. B. Conev, ed., Vračansko evangelie (Balgarski starini, IV), Sofia, 1914, 236 + x pp.

225. op. cit., p. 6-7.

copy made by a Russian monk, perhaps well known on Mt. Athos for his calligraphic abilities.

M. N. Speranskij showed some doubt about the lexical Russisms in the 13th-century South Slavic text, calling them "not glaring" (не яркие)²²⁶. And still, he agreed with Sobolevskij that the Serbian Ilovačka krmčica (1262) was copied from a Russian original. But he also stated that "the Russian Rjazanskaja kormčaja of 1284, which overlaps textually with the Ilovačka krmčica swarms (кишит) with Bulgarisms, or better, Middle-Bulgarisms"²²⁷. This appears to mean that Speranskij agreed with Sobolevskij that there are some Russian features in this particular Serbian copy; he explained this by the presence of Russian monks on Mount Athos when the Serbian St. Savva was there (1218-1219)²²⁸. However, Speranskij did not even suggest that the earliest translation of the Nomokanon, which was copied in Tarnovo for Metropolitan Kiril, was made by Russians. That is why it is so strikingly unexpected to find in M. N. Tixomirov (who cites only this one article by Speranskij, first published in 1921) a statement like the following: "The Metropolitan of a devastated Russia asked for a manu-

226. M. N. Speranskij, K istorii vzaimno-otnošenij rusškoj i jugoslavjanskix literatur (Russkie pamjatniki pis'mennosti na juge slavjanstva), Iz istorii rusško-slavjanskix literaturnyx svjazej, Moscow, 1960, p. 31.

227. ibid.

228. op. cit., p. 31-33.

script from far-away Bulgaria, which had suffered relatively little from the Tatar pogroms. It is no less significant, that the Kormčaja which was sent to him, as has been proven now (sic) was not from a South Slavic, but originally from a Russian translation"²²⁹. The Bulgarian scholar I. Snegarov suggests that the Middle Bulgarian translation was made on Mt. Athos at the end of the 12th or the beginning of the 13th century²³⁰.

The history of the early 13th-century copy from a Middle Bulgarian translation of the Nomokanon, made in Tarnovo for the Kievan Metropolitan, reveals two important aspects of the second South Slavic influence in Russia:

a) While new Slavic translations from Greek appeared in the Balkans, Russian literature had slowed down significantly because of the Tatar political domination; but the Russians either were aware of the existence of particular new books, or were making inquiries. (Since Kiril's letter to Jakov Svjatislav has not been found, both possibilities exist);

b) For the Russians it was more convenient to order a copy of an already existing Middle Bulgarian translation than to duplicate the work of translating the mater-

229. M. N. Tixomirov, Istoričeskie svjazi russkogo naroda s južnymi slavjanami, Slavjanskij sbornik, Moscow, 1947, p. 167.

230. I. Snegarov, Duxovno-kulturni vrězki meždu Bəlgarija i Rusija prez srednite vekove (X - XV v.), Sofia, 1950, p. 50-54.

ial over again. In this particular case, the fact that Jakov Svjatislav paid for the manuscript (повеленіемъ же и по цѣнѣ великагъ гдѣна ѡкова свѣтислава деспота болгарскаго)²³¹ may also indicate the financial difficulties faced by the Kievan Church in the 13th century.

2.3.4.2. The Russian Four Gospels of 1355, copied in Constantinople, reveal another facet of the complex phenomenon of the second South Slavic influence. This revised edition of the New Testament was traditionally attributed to the hand of the Russian metropolitan St. Aleksij (1354-1378)²³². Until the Revolution, the manuscript was kept in the Čudov Monastery of the Kremlin in Moscow, but it has since been lost²³³. There are two photoeditions of the manuscript, however, and thus this interesting document is not completely lost to historians of the Russian language²³⁴. The text of this manuscript is extremely correct

231. B. St. Angelov, op. cit., p. 143.

232. Sobolevskij believes that St. Aleksij's authorship is purely a legend. See:

A. I. Sobolevskij, Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV - XVII vekov, St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 29.

233. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 186.

234. Novyj zavet gospoda našego Iisusa Xrista, pisannyj rukoju svjatitelja Aleksija mitropolita, sfotografirovannyj v 8-m' dneju v načale avgusta 1887 g. fotografom Aleksandrom Andreevičem Bagnerovskim pod neposredstvennym nabljudeniem danilovskogo arximandrita Amfiloxija (photoedition).

Novyj zavet gospoda našego Iisusa Xrista. Trud svjatitelja Aleksija, mitropolita moskovskogo i vseja Rusi. Fototipičeskoe izdanie Leontija, mitropolita moskovskogo, Moscow, 1892.

in comparison with other Russian Four Gospels texts of the mid-14th century²³⁵; the entire text must have been thoroughly compared with the Greek original and corrected according to it. It generally follows the Russian 14th-century version of the New Testament, but sentences from the 12th-century Bulgarian Exegesis of the Gospel by Theophylaktes have replaced the traditional Russian ones here and there, although in these passages some Bulgarian words have been replaced by Russian equivalents (верста for поприще, погостъ for вѣси, etc.)²³⁶. The orthography of the manuscript is of particular interest: while new letters from the Greek alphabet are boldly introduced (ϝ, ϗ, Ϙ and ϙ, increased use of ї), along with many Greek ligatures and all types of Greek stress marks, there is a complete absence of Middle Bulgarian orthographic features (ѡ; рѣ, лѣ for ор, ер and ол, and — in Slavic words only — а for the Russian я after vowels)²³⁷.

When the orthographic features of this early and independent Russian revised edition of the Four Gospels are compared with those of Vun'ko's copy (1382) from a Middle Bulgarian text (cf. 2.3.2.3.), it is apparent that the Rus-

235. G. Voskresenskij, Xarakterističeskie čerty četirex redakcii slavjanskogo perevoda Evangelija ot Marka po sto dvenadcati rukopisjam Evangelija XI - XVI vv., Moscow, 1896, pp. 48-54, 258-291.

236. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 29.

237. M. Korneeva-Petoulan, K istorii russkogo jazyka, Osobennosti pis'ma i jazyka moskovskix vladyk XIV v., Slavia, XV, 1937, 1, p. 1-23.

sian orthographic traditions — Muscovite and Novgorodian— still hold their own against the Middle Bulgarian orthography, while the spirit of the South Slavic revision of the holy books, and even the somewhat different language of the new South Slavic translations, are freely accepted by the Russian bookmen. By the early 15th century, however, the Middle Bulgarian orthography had completely triumphed in the works of the Russian copiers and writers. The Russian scribe Evsevij-Efrem, working in a Constantinople monastery, introduced into his copy of the Lestvica (1420-1421) not only the letters from his Middle Bulgarian prototype but also the confusion of the letters ⲁ and Ⲃ (cf. ⲠⲮⲧⲨⲀ ⲪⲠⲨⲒⲘⲒⲘⲒⲘ ⲛⲀⲨⲀ ⲑⲘⲒ)²³⁸.

The drastic change in Russian orthography at the end of the 14th century, and especially in the early 15th century, is very hard to explain. It would have been quite possible for the Russians, while using South Slavic revised texts of older translations or of new translations, to copy them and send them to Russia, following all the rules of the established local Russian orthographies (as did Vun'ko), or to innovate the Russian alphabet only by introducing the contemporary Greek shapes and variety of letters, ligatures and superscripts (as did Evsevij-Efrem). But as we know, this

238. See the photoreproduction of Evsevij-Efrem's postscript to Lestvica (leaflet 324 b) in:

G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., Illustration 2 (between pp. 176 and 177).

practice was followed only temporarily and in isolated cases. It seems that the answers can be sought only in the totality of factors which finally determined the new trend, the importation of certain Middle Bulgarian orthographic features into Russian writing:

a) The Russian spiritual leaders of Bulgarian origin, Kiprian and Camblak, must have insisted with all the weight of their authority that the Middle Bulgarian spelling system was closer to that used in the oldest Church Slavic books, while the Russian system had deviated, reflecting phonological features of the spoken Russian language. Such an argument would have been difficult to oppose because there were older Russian manuscripts from the Kievan period which had been only marginally russified;

b) At the end of the 14th century there were various Russian orthographic and literary schools, created as a result of the feudal fragmentation of the country, the Tatar domination and the lack of an authoritative center of culture. In the new tendencies toward national unification (expressed in the expansion of both Russian Lithuania and Muscovite Russia) the need arose for a national graphic system, purged of features based on the phonology of particular Russian dialects. Although we do not have explicit testimony to such a need in the Russian historical sources, it may still be inferred by analogy with the similar situation in the South Slavic countries in the 13th and early 14th centuries, which called forth the newer Bulgarian and

Serbian orthographic systems. It must be pointed out, however, that Russia had two options: either to develop its own supradialectal orthographic system by searching for models in the oldest Russian Church Slavic literature, or to borrow an already established orthography which very much resembled that of the oldest Church Slavic texts and still did not come into irreconcilable conflict with the Russian concept of the Church Slavic language. In this respect, both the Serbian and the Bulgarian orthographic systems were borrowed from, but the influence of the Bulgarian system was definitely predominant²³⁹;

c) The role of the Balkan monasteries as rich repositories of Bulgarian and Serbian Church Slavic books is of tremendous importance. Russian monks who lived in these monasteries for many years must have been impressed by the language, orthography and artistic merits of the South Slavic books there, and from long exposure must have come to accept all their features as superior. We should not for a moment forget that both Bulgarian and Serbian books were written in a language which was first of all Church Slavic,²⁴⁰

239. M. N. Speranskij, *K istorii vzaimootnošenij russkoj i jugoslavjanskix literatur* (Russkie pamjatniki pis'mennosti na juze slavjanstva), Iz istorii rusko-slavjanskix literaturnyx svjazej, Moscow, 1960, p. 13-14.

240. In this respect the term "Middle Bulgarian literary language" is unfortunate and misleading, since it overemphasizes the national characteristics of the language (cf. our discussion from Chapter Three to the end of this dissertation).

supranational, and in which certain national features were of only secondary importance.

The combination of these three major factors must have caused the rapid change in the Russian language and literature under the influence of their South Slavic counterparts, which took place around the year 1400. But while the reasons for the choice of the Bulgarian (and partially the Serbian) versions of Church Slavic as models for imitation are not entirely clear, the place where this cultural transfer occurred was, beyond doubt, not Russia, but the international communities of the Balkan monasteries, and specifically those in Constantinople and on Mount Athos. Not only did Russian monks go to these monasteries on pilgrimage, but many of them remained as members for short or long periods, and performed much fruitful work in transferring the accumulated Church Slavic literature from the Balkan monasteries to the main cultural centers of Russia.

An illustrative example is the activity of the Russian scribe and monk, Evsevij-Efrem (cf. fn. 238). His first copy, from a known Middle Bulgarian antecedent which was also completely influenced by the Bulgarian orthography, is from the year 1420²⁴¹, made in the Constantinople Monas-

241. The manuscript is dated by the water-marks on the paper. See:

N. P. Lixačev, Paleografičeskoe značenie bumažnyx vodjanyx znakov, II, St. Petersburg, 1899, pp. 58, 267.

tery of Our Lady of Perivlepti; it is a Mineja for November-May. The present location of the manuscript by Evsevij-Efrem is unknown²⁴², but another Russian copy made from Evsevij's manuscript in 1432-1433 (Lenin State Library of the USSR in Moscow, # ф. 304, Ho. 669) has Russian orthography²⁴³. Between Dec. 7, 1420 and March 18, 1421, in the same Constantinople monastery, Evsevij-Efrem copied the Lestvica, now kept in the Lenin State Library in Moscow, # ф. II3, Волокол, 462 (cf. fn. 228). There are three known 15th-century Russian copies from this manuscript by Evsevij-Efrem²⁴⁴. Two years later, on Dec. 10, 1423, the monk Evsevij-Efrem began another copy of the same book in the same monastery, but after completing leaflet 64 he apparently moved to Mt. Athos, where in the Vatopedi Monastery another Russian scribe, Mitrofan, finished the copying (leaflets 65 through 329). But as can be concluded from the handwriting, it was Evsevij - Efrem who wrote the short postscript on p. 329, from which we learn that the manuscript was finished on March 15,

242. G. I. Vzdornov, op.cit., p. 193. See also: A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 25, point 8.

243. A. I. Sobolevskij, ibid.

244. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 193-194.

1424²⁴⁵. It is kept today in the State Historical Museum in Moscow, # Усп. I8 - 6ym.

The last information on the literary activities of Evsevij-Efrem in a Balkan monastery is from a Sbornik of eremitic homilies, copied by him in 1425, translated especially for him by the Serbian monk Iakov Dobropisec. The translation and copying were done in the Monastery of St. Paul on Mt. Athos. The original copy by Evsevij-Efrem is lost, but two other Russian copies made from it by other scribes, in 1431 and in the second half of the 15th century, are known, as are many others from later times²⁴⁶.

We have an idea, although only an incomplete one, of what kinds of literature were copied or, in a few cases,

245. G. I. Istomin, Opis' knig biblioteki Moskovskogo Uspenskogo sobora, Čtenija v Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom Universitete, Moscow, 1895, 3, # 18.

A. I. Sobolevskij, ed., Novyj sbornik paleografičeskix snimkov s russkix rukopisej XI - XVIII vv., St. Petersburg, 1906, Tables 22, 23.

A. I. Sobolevskij, Slavjano-russkaja paleografija. S 20 paleografičeskimi snimkami, St. Petersburg, 1908 (2nd edition), Table 8.

I. F. Kolesnikov, ed., Sbornik snimkov s russkogo pis'ma XI - XVIII vv., I, Moscow, 1913 (2nd edition), Table 15.

G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 194-195.

246. P. Stroev, Bibliologičeskij slovar'..., p. 121-122.

Ilarij i Arsenij, ieromonaxi, Opisanie slavjanskix rukopisej biblioteki Svjato-Troickoj Sergievoj lavry, I, Moscow, 1878, # 175; III, Moscow, 1879, # 756.

T. B. Uxova, Katalog miniatjur, ornamenta i gravjur sobranij Troice-Sergievoj lavry i Moskovskoj duxovnoj akademii, Zapiski Otdela rukopisej (GB SSSR im. V. I. Lenina) 22, Moscow, 1960, pp. 104-105, 145.

G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 195-196.

especially translated, by Russian monks in the Balkan monasteries. According to the preliminary count by Sobolevskij, at the turn of the 14th/15th century the Russian literature was enriched by not less than 56 major literary works previously unknown or almost unknown in Russia²⁴⁷. Since the oldest Russian copy has not been found for each of them, it is impossible to state that all, without exception, were copied in the Balkan monasteries by Russian scribes. However, the relatively small number of available Russian copies of these works from the late 14th and early 15th centuries contain notes by the scribes definitely stating that the copies were made in the monasteries of Constantinople or Mt. Athos (cf. below). These were the two unique locations on the Balkan peninsula where such an activity is known to have taken place; this can be explained by the fame of those monasteries situated in Constantinople and on Athos in their capacity as international cultural centers. G. I. Vzdornov, in his recent study on the role played by those monasteries in the development of the Russian literature, has noticed an interesting phenomenon: the literary production in Constantinople was mostly directed toward Moscow and its monasteries, while the literary production on Athos had as its final destination Novgorod and Tver²⁴⁸. This can be explained by the increased connections between the Patri-

247. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 15-37.

248. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 180-181.

archate in Constantinople and the Metropolitans in Moscow, as well as the desire of the Greek Patriarch to involve Muscovite Russia in the struggle against the Turks (cf. 2.3.3.). But as Vzdornov notes, this difference in origin between the new Muscovite books and those of Novgorod and Tver' did not place Moscow in any advantageous position, because there was no basic difference whatsoever between the South Slavic originals kept in Constantinople and those of Mt. Athos²⁴⁹.

Vzdornov lists after his study 17 new books definitely copied in these monasteries at the end of the 14th and in the first half of the 15th centuries and taken to Russia. Two of them, the New Testament (of 1355) and the Aprakos (of 1383), are practically uninfluenced by the language or spelling of the South Slavic revised editions of the Gospel text²⁵⁰. Another two from this list are Middle Bulgarian books, copied in these monasteries and taken to Russia: Kiprian's Lestvica (cf. 2.3.2.2.)²⁵¹ and an Aprakos (undated) bought by the Russian monk Afanasij in 1430 at the Mount Athos Monastery of Pantokrator, for a monastery in Tver'²⁵². Of the total number of 17 books studied by Vzdornov, all of

249. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 181.

250. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., pp. 176, 186-188.

251. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., pp. 173-174, 189.

252. P. Stroev, Bibliologičeskij slovar'..., p. 27.

V. N. Ščepkin, Učebnik rusškoj paleografii, Moscow, 1920, p. 35.

G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., pp. 180, 196-197.

which were made in Constantinople or on Mt. Athos, 12 were made by Russian scribes from either Middle Bulgarian or Serbian manuscripts (the latter with strong Middle Bulgarian features)²⁵³, and another, the Sbornik (of 1425), was translated especially on the order of Evsevij-Efrem by the Serbian monk Iakov Dobropisec (cf. fn. 246). All of these manuscripts were unknown in Russia before being copied for Russia in the Balkans²⁵⁴. Although this ratio does not have statistical value, being founded on only 17 manuscripts out of a total possibly numbering in the hundreds, it is still indicative of the predominance of Middle Bulgarian features even when transmitted through Serbian copies.

2.4. Establishing the national origin of the translator of a certain literary work is not an easy task. The Middle Bulgarian features in the language of the immediate Russian copies, discussed above, are readily apparent, mainly because the Russian scribes who lived in the Balkan monasteries regarded their prototypes with considerable respect; having been heavily exposed to the lexicon and grammar of the Middle Bulgarian language (whose authority as a model of Church Slavic they had accepted), they did not find

253. G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit. p. 181-182.

254. See the list of most of these manuscripts in: A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., pp. 24-26, 31-32.

G. I. Vzdornov gives an exhaustive bibliography of the available studies on these Russian manuscripts. However, his bibliographic references are full of mistakes, which unfortunately sharply decreases the value of his otherwise impressive research. See:

G. I. Vzdornov, op. cit., p. 189-198.

it necessary to russify the language of the books they copied. But with each successive copy of these works, the most striking features of Middle Bulgarian were gradually eliminated. The mere use of the new Russian orthography, reshaped under the second South Slavic influence, does not in itself indicate that the prototype of a certain copy was of South Slavic origin, but rather shows the spelling habits of the scribe. A most striking example of the gradual russification of a Middle Bulgarian text is the evolutionary development of Černorizec Xrabər's treatise On the Letters²⁵⁵. Of the 73 copies of the text (all of which can be related textually to one Middle Bulgarian prototype), 63 are Russian²⁵⁶. By the 17th century, however, the Russian texts are so perfectly russified at all levels of the language, that it would be virtually impossible from a linguistic point of view to identify the prototypes of all Russian copies as Middle Bulgarian, if the transitional copies with steadily decreasing numbers of Bulgarisms (or the Middle Bulgarian copies themselves) were unknown today²⁵⁷. It seems that textual identification of an Old Russian copy

255. K. Kuev, ed., Černorizec Xrabər, Sofia, 1967, 454 pp.

256. K. Kuev, ed., op. cit., p. 165.

257. Compare, for instance, the language of the Kostroma copy, which has no traces of the diagnostic peculiarities of the Middle Bulgarian prototype (cf. K. Kuev, ed., op. cit., p. 355-359). But it adds references from Russian history, and the phrase: сѣи ко(н)стянти(н) вилософъ... и мѣво(д) братъ его. состависта азбѣку грамоты рѣ(с)ския. (p. 358).

from the Kievan period (11th and early 12th centuries) as an original Russian translation or as a Russian copy from an Old Bulgarian or, perhaps, West Slavic text, is easier than textual identification of a 16th-century Russian copy of a Middle Bulgarian, Serbian or original Russian translation (cf. below).

2.4.1. In his discussion on criteria for the national origin of a certain translation, known only in Russian copies beginning with the pre-Mongol period, Sobolevskij definitely rejects the orthographic, phonological and even morphological features of the language in a certain copy as diagnostic²⁵⁸. From his personal experience, he concluded that the only possible basis for determining national origin is the presence of lexical items whose exclusive national character can be identified beyond any doubt²⁵⁹. This conclusion has two serious weaknesses: in the first place, it is not that easy to make a list of exclusively language-specific words. In the study quoted, Sobolevskij offers three groups of lexical items, exclusively Russian²⁶⁰:

a) Names of objects and of the surrounding reality, officers, weights and measures, vessels, clothing.

Even in the carefully-selected words he lists in this group,

258. A. I. Sobolevskij, *Materialy i izsledovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arxeologii. Osobennosti russkix perevodov domongol'skogo perioda*, Sbornik ORJaS, 88, 3, St. Petersburg, 1910, p. 162-163.

259. A. I. Sobolevskij, ibid.

260. A. I. Sobolevskij, op. cit., p. 162-166.

one can spot кожух, which is by no means exclusively Russian, since it is known all over the Balkan Slavic dialects (as well as in West Slavic).

b) Borrowings from non-Slavic tongues into Russian.

c) Names of countries, states, nations known mainly to the Russians.

The idea of compiling such a list is admirable, but the practical results are of little value. The very conservative list offered by Sobolevskij in this particular paper consists of only a few dozen words, yet includes such obvious misfits as кожухъ, сѣно, думати [=советоваться], which can as well be Bulgarian or Serbian as Russian. But a like effort becomes a disaster in Istrin's own account of his publication of the Hamartolos Chronicle²⁶¹. Here he lists as absolutely diagnostic Russian words, items such as болѣсть, быль, дружина, корста, ловъ, наговорити, намлѣвити, неговорливъ, недѣля [=седмица], одверие, пополошиться, пристроити, слоняться, съльба, съмълвиться, сѣни, чинъ²⁶². Of these, сѣни is attested in the oldest Gospel texts (cf. the glossary to Mar.), while all the rest are widespread in modern Bulgarian dialects. (I have not checked the other words from Istrin's list with available dictionaries of those modern Bulgarian dialects unknown to me, nor of dia-

261. V. M. Istrin, Xronika Georgija Amartola v drevnem slavjano-russkom perevode, Slavia, II, 1923, 2/3, p. 460-467.

262. V. M. Istrin, op. cit., p. 463-465.

lects of the other Slavic languages.) As has already been discussed, preliminary lists like Istrin's have little scientific value because they are not based on thorough examination of the lexical wealth of all the Slavic dialects (the requisite data collection will hardly be accomplished in our generation). Such a list, even when it can be made, will represent only modern Slavic dialects; it could not take into account the steady lexical loss in the languages, nor the lexical innovations reaching them from the surrounding dialects and literary languages.

The second weakness of Sobolevskij's reliance upon lexical items as a criterion for the nationality of a Slavic translator lies in the minimal number of words that are really terminological for only one Slavic country. Since one deals with established terms (e.g. the Russian върста as a measure of distance, погостъ for a small unfortified settlement), one can understand why the Russian copyist, as long as he understood the meaning of the original terms in his prototype (in this case, поприше and въси), would automatically replace them with their Russian equivalents so as to make the content clear to his Russian readers. As has been pointed out, such a replacement was made by the scribe who revised the Russian Four Gospels in Constantinople in 1355, using in part the Middle Bulgarian work by Theophylaktes (cf. 2.3.4.2.). In my opinion, similar lexical replacements were made in the Old Russian Pčela, generally believed to be a Russian original translation. As long as

the scribe understood the meanings of the South Slavic terms, he replaced them with their Russian counterparts. But when he came to the word *мѣжъца he left it with only slightly altered shape (моужика). The publisher, who did not understand it either, put a question mark after it²⁶³. The word мѣжец in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian and some dialects, with further dialectal variants мажец, можец, мужец means 'uvula'; the Russian equivalent is язычок. Here we face the absence of a general Slavic word for an insignificant anatomical term; the isogloss *mqzъсь vs. *języ-čъkъ could be very old, perhaps reflecting semantic influences of the different substrata in Bulgaria and Russia.

2.4.2. If, as Sobolevskij states, orthographical, phonological and morphological features are unreliable criteria for establishing the national origin of a Slavic translation of the earlier period, and if the lexical items are so far not very reliable either, each of these is even less trustworthy in the later periods, when certain national traditions and local schools in the Slavic literary languages were well established and the replacement of striking foreign dialectal features by domestic traditional grammatical norms and lexical terms should be expected in a greater degree than before. Throughout its entire history

²⁶³, Чувство сластьное предѣль имѣеть до моужика (?) и до гортани, прешедъше же предѣль, нѣ разньства надомо||моу, но вса равна ѣствоу на гнои премѣнѣющи. This quotation is from:

V. Semenov, *Drevnjaja russkaja Pčela*, Sbornik ORJaS, 54, 4, St. Petersburg, 1893 (photoedition: Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1966), p. 247-248.

Church Slavonic was by function an international language and thus the number of local features in it was consciously kept to a minimum. The international monasteries in Constantinople and on Mt. Athos, where most of the Russian copying of South Slavic texts took place, was an excellent location, for example, for learning the meanings of local Bulgarian and Serbian words which were then and there replaced by Russian words, either dialectal or national.

One should not exclude another possibility: Russian copies from South Slavic prototypes could have been revised later in Russia by comparison with the Greek texts, and certain typically Russian features introduced at that point. Such seems to have been the situation with the "Russian" translation of Akir the Wise (Povest' ob Akire Premudrom)²⁶⁴. N. Durnovo, studying the lexical differences between the 16th-century Russian copy # 46 of the Soloveckij Monastery (Solov.) and the 16th-century Serbian copy # 828 of the Beograd Library (Bgrd.), noted that certain Russian words, presumably hard for the Serbian copyists to understand, are completely missing from the Serbian version, and states that "all copies of the (Serbian) first redaction have their origin in a Russian copy"²⁶⁵. In this particular

264. My study of the Russian and Serbian copies, representing two different versions of the translation, is based on Durnovo's publication:

N. Durnovo, K istorii povesti ob Akire, Materialy i izsledovanija po starinnoj literature, I, Moscow, 1915, 131 pp.

265. N. Durnovo, op. cit., p. 131.

study he is careful not to join fully A. I. Sobolevskij and A. D. Grigor'ev in their identification of the Russian copies as original Russian translations. Although he calls their opinion "very probable", he does not accept that it has been "completely proven"²⁶⁶. Durnovo's mistakes in identifying the Serbian copy as from a Russian prototype can be explained by his absolute reliance upon tentative considerations of the national character of lexical items and by his disregard of all other features in the language. In addition he cites the lexical differences one-sidedly. He lists бeбромъ, хоудобы, боголишивою, синьць, небылое дѣло, ореве, etc. as Russian words missing from the Serbian copies, and adds that коноплянь портъ and порты свѣтлы are completely absent from some Serbian copies, while in others they are replaced by конопно предено and новие ризи, respectively²⁶⁷. But he fails to note typical South Slavic words like гиздавѣ ('handsome, well-groomed'), срѣщати ('to meet'), строувати ('to destroy, waste'), etc., which are not present in the Russian texts. Here are the parallel phrases: не коупи раба гиз^дава ни крадлива (Bgrd., p. 38)²⁶⁸ vs. не кѣпи раба величава ни рабѣ величавѣ (Solov., p. 22); аще те кто срѣщеть ѿ р^четь к' тебѣ (Bgrd., p. 38) vs. аще к'то оусрѣтъ възмолви к' тебѣ (Solov., p. 22); не строуваи

266. N. Durnovo, ibid.

267. N. Durnovo, op. cit., p. 130-131.

268. The page numbers quoted here refer to Durnovo's publication.

именіа моего (Bgrd., p. 39) vs. не порти скота моего (Solov., p. 27). It is an impossible task to try to establish the priority of the South Slavic or the Russian lexical variants without taking into consideration other linguistic evidence.

In addition to the overwhelming Church Slavic vocabulary of both texts (most of the words used in Akir the Wise are found in the New Testament, the Manasses Chronicle (including the Tale of Troy), the Serbian (Bgrd.) and the Russian (Solov.) copies contain striking Bulgarianisms which Durnovo was unable to identify as such. In 1915, when he published his study, little was known to students of comparative Slavic linguistics about the structural peculiarities shared by the modern Bulgarian dialects, or about the historical development of Bulgarian, especially as a participant in the common processes within the Balkan convergence area. For example, in Bgrd. there are forms of the "double object", a Balkan feature rare but characteristic for middle Bulgarian: в'са ти прошеніа исплне и^x (p. 37 'I will fulfill them all your demands'); наоучи^x юго сестрїичика своєго ана^п на сїи^x (p. 39 'I taught him the son of my sister, Anadan, these things'); of the genitive singular masculine in -e instead of -a (caused by the usual Serbian rendering of etymological 'jat', applied to the Middle Bulgarian ending — especially common with foreign words — which was written ѣ, representing phonological /ja/ or /a/ after a soft consonant): м^с ца

марѠе (p. 39); instead of the usual Serbian conjunction нѣ, the form ноу twice (pp. 41, 42), this being another diagnostic Middle Bulgarian word — (cf. 4.3.5.4.). These and other less exclusive features of the Serbian copy (Bgrd.) definitely indicate a Middle Bulgarian prototype rather than a Russian one.

The Middle Bulgarian features of the Russian copy (Solov.) are as arresting as those of the Serbian one, with two cases of "double object": снѣ оу богата мѡжа. снѣ з'мию с^нѣль. ю е^с. и и оубога мѡжа снѣ з'мию снѣль (p. 21 'Son, the son of a rich man ate her the snake, and the son of a poor man ate a snake'); и азъ тѡ оудрѣ^жхъ тѡ. и исправихъ тѡ — the second тѡ, however, could be merely a copying error by the Russian scribe — (p. 30 'I you preserved you and fixed (helped) you'). Other Bulgarianisms are: негли (p. 25, for не же ли); бор'зо (p. 27 'fast'); брачнины (p. 25 'fancy clothes'); пер'сть (p. 26 'earth'); вретитише (sic) for the correct вретише (p. 31 '(poor) garment made of hemp'); ѡсоудѣ instead of ѡсудѣ (p. 32), reflecting the Middle Bulgarian change of the adverbials сѣмо > само, сѣдоу > сѣдоу (cf. 4.3.4.5.); locative after a verb of motion²⁶⁹: едѣ в' домѣ ѡца своего (p. 31); consistent use of the verb имѣти to express forms of the future

269. A detailed discussion on this peculiarity of the Bulgarian texts can be found in:

I. Duridanov, *Kъм problemata za razvoja na belgarskija ezik ot sintetizem към analitizem*, Godišnik SU, LI, 1955, 3, p. 185-191.

negative: не има^М поустити та ни пожалоуоу та (p. 36), etc., which could, however, be a reflection of the Greek original if indeed the translation was made from Greek rather than from a Semitic language. In addition to these various diagnostic Bulgarian features, one must consider the peculiar correctness (from the point of view of the Bulgarian language) in the use of the past tenses, even in cases involving difficult tense agreements²⁷⁰. But while different tenses were used correctly in their proper places, the wrong personal endings indicate that the scribe did not actually understand the meaning of the forms he copied and reinterpreted: ты оупо^Пбих, са (for оупо^Пби са) мцю (p. 33); ты оупо^Пбих, са (for оупо^Пби са) цвѣтѹ днѣвномѹ (p. 33), etc. Still, there are new, Middle Bulgarian verbal forms, like the newer Middle Bulgarian aorist form of the verb жити: нако дрѹ^Жбою живаховѣ [=живѣховѣ] въ многы дни. (p. 30). All of these features, if studied in their totality, give sufficient evidence that the prototype of the Russian Solov. copy was a Middle Bulgarian text. Of course, there are Russisms in this text too (for instance жем'чюгѹ, p. 35), but this is, after all, a Russian copy, dated approximately

270. My personal experience with Russian students as an instructor of Bulgarian as a second language in the Institute for Foreign Students in Sofia (1963-to 1964) has convinced me that the category of past tenses and, particularly, the agreement of different past tenses in Modern Bulgarian (which principally is no different from that in Church Slavic: cf. K. Mirčev, *Istoričeska gramatika...*, pp. 185-186, 191-213), is beyond the intuition of a native Russian.

300 years after the Bulgarian translation was made²⁷¹.

On the other hand, according to Istrin²⁷², the rendering of the Greek -μβ- as -мб- in the Slavic texts is a Russian feature. He mentions this peculiarity in connection with the Russian copies of Akir the Wise (it actually appears there only in the name амбекамъ or амбакоумъ) but Durnovo is skeptical about the translation from Greek and rather suggests translation from a Semitic language²⁷³. The form with -мб- is, indeed, strange for a South Slavic translation from Greek, where one might expect either -bb- or -mb-²⁷⁴, and may also be considered a late Russism.

The most surprising fact about Durnovo's inadequately motivated conclusions on the origin of the Serbian and Russian versions of Akir the Wise is that, although he himself did not categorically identify the Russian version as an original Russian translation (cf. fn. 266), it is commonly accepted in the literature²⁷⁵ that Durnovo "proved"

271. Durnovo agrees with Grigor'ev and Sobolevskij that the translation was made before or at the beginning of the 13th century. See:

N. Durnovo, op. cit., p. 128-129.

272. V. M. Istrin, op. cit., p. 461.

273. N. Durnovo, op. cit., p. 102-103.

274. N. Durnovo, op. cit., p. 100-102.

275. See, for example:

V. M. Istrin, ibid.

V. N. Peretc, K istorii teksta Povesti ob Akire Premudrom, Izvestija ORJaS, 21, 1916, 1, p. 3-6.

N. A. Meščerskij, Iskusstvo perevoda Kievskoj Rusi, Trudy ODRL, 15, Moscow-Leningrad, 1958, p. 58.

nationality of the original translator. There are, however, scholars who still doubt the East Slavic origin of the translation²⁷⁶.

2.4.3. The problem of incorrect identification of the national origin of translations in the Church Slavic literature is a serious one, since not all Russian and Soviet scholars are as scrupulous as Durnovo (whose only fault was unawareness of certain definite Middle Bulgarian features). Because of wrongly identified translations, the extent of the second South Slavic (and particularly Middle Bulgarian) influence on the Russian language is unclear. One must emphasize that what we know today about medieval (Church) Slavic literature, original and translated, is only some fragments of the fantastic wealth of this literature kept in libraries and museums all over the world. According to the incomplete data collected by N. K. Nikol'skij and his students, in Russian libraries and museums alone there are about 1560 different works translated from the Greek²⁷⁷. In addition to this huge number of Greek and non-Russian

276. D. Čiževskij, Comparative History of Slavic Literatures, Baltimore, 1971, pp. 31, 36.

While Čiževskij questions the national origin of Akir the Wise, Bulgarian literary historians are unanimous in considering it an early Middle Bulgarian translation. I am not, however, aware of any studies by linguists, Bulgarian or of other nationality, which would definitely prove the Middle Bulgarian character of the translation.

277. V. F. Pokrovskaja, Kartoteka akademika N. K. Nikol'skogo, Trudy Biblioteki Akademii nauk SSSR, 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, p. 142-150.

Slavic titles, there are about 11,580 different works by known and unknown Russian writers²⁷⁸. All these figures represent works in manuscripts dated from the 11th through 18th centuries. Nikol'skij's data, assembled before 1904 and only for the major Russian centers, show that these are represented by between 80,000 and 100,000 separate manuscripts, containing between 1,200,000 to 2,000,000 copies of the above-listed individual works²⁷⁹. Of course, these figures are obsolete, since in the last 60 years or so many additional manuscripts have been discovered in Russia and preserved for eventual study by the major Soviet institutions²⁸⁰.

In the light of such figures one feels very humble attempting to rediscover past trends in inter-Slavic cultural transfer and to examine their manifestations. The study of a few selected Russian manuscripts from the period of the so-called second South Slavic influence might produce conclusions of limited validity with respect to the rest of the Russian literature — translated, imported or original — of the same period. One can only trust the judgment of serious and very knowledgeable workers in the field, such as Sobolevskij and Lixačev, who having examined hundreds or

278. V. F. Pokrovskaja, ibid.

279. V. N. Peretc, K voprosu o racional'nom opisanii drevnix rukopisej, Tver', 1905, p. 3.

280. D. S. Lixačev, Tekstologija, p. 97-102.

thousands of the manuscripts kept in Russia, concluded that there was a change in the entire Russian literary production at the end of the 14th - beginning of the 15th centuries, and that this change was caused by a second wave of South Slavic (especially Middle Bulgarian) influence.

C h a p t e r T h r e e

ON THE SO-CALLED REVISION OF THE MIDDLE BULGARIAN
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

3.1. The term "Middle Bulgarian" is applied both to the literary language of Bulgaria, and to the spoken Slavic dialects in that country, during the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries²⁸¹. This term is an unfortunate one, since it implies the existence of a language very different from OCS (or Old Bulgarian). This was clearly singled out by N. van Wijk in his comparison of the relationships between, on the one hand, OCS and its Russian, Serbian and Croatian recensions, and, on the other hand, OCS and Middle Bulgarian: "The relations between the Middle Bulgarian language and the Old Bulgarian language are very different, because here are present only different periods in the development of the same language" (italics mine, I. T.)²⁸². By and large, the difference between the language of a 13th-century copy from an OCS text and that of the oldest known OCS texts is often insignificant, appearing mainly in the phonology and spelling. Such is the case with the Tarnovsko Evangelie

281. K. Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika na bēlgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1963 (2nd edition), pp. 8, 12-20, 30-32, 52-56.

282. N. van Wijk, Istorija staroslavjanskogo jazyka (translated from German), Moscow, 1957, p. 37.

(1273), kept in Zagreb²⁸³. The usual striking peculiarity of the Middle Bulgarian language, the redistribution of the letters for the nasal vowels (compared to the situation in OCS), sometimes has limited manifestation, as for example in the 12th-century Dobromirovo Evangelie, Grigorovič Parimejnik, Bologna Psalter²⁸⁴, etc. Even a cursory glance at the newer 12th-century copies of the OCS texts causes a serious doubt as to the wisdom of calling their language (separated by about 300 years from the time of the translations) by a different name from the language of the 11th-century "classical" texts, separated from the time of the translations by about 200 years. In addition, there is the mere theoretical chance that a "Middle" Bulgarian copy could have been made directly from a 9th-century prototype and thus, except in the phonology, would better reflect the morphological and syntactic structure, as well as the lexicon, of the OCS language of

283. M. Valjavec, Trnovsko tetrajevandĕlije XIII vieka, Starine, XX, Zagreb, 1888, p. 157-241; Starine, XXI, Zagreb, 1889, p. 1-68.

284. For a short review of the peculiarities of these manuscripts, see:

K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 12-13.

For lengthy discussions on the peculiarities of two of these manuscripts, as well as for their texts, see:

V. Jagić, Evangelium Dobromiri; ein altmacedonisches Denkmal der kirchenslavischen Sprache des XII. Jahrhunderts, Vienna, v. 1, 1898, 138 + ii pp.; v. 2, 1899, 140 +iii pp.

V. N. Ščepkin, Bolonskaja psaltyr'. S priloženiem semi fototipij i vos'mi cinkografij, Issledovanija po ruskomu jazyku, II, 4, St. Petersburg, 1906.

V. Jagić, Slověn'skaja psal'tyr'. Psalterium Bono-niense, St. Petersburg, 1907.

I. Dujčev, ed., Bolonski psaltir (photopublication of the manuscript), Sofia, 1968, 530 pp.

the 9th century, while an 11th-century glagolitic text might have been copied from other 11th-century prototypes and thus have more grammatical and lexical innovations. It is a well-established fact that in the 12th century some Bulgarian copyists made use of old glagolitic manuscripts, and even used the glagolitic letters marginally in their own writings (such as, for instance, the linguistically very archaic Šafarikov triod)²⁸⁵.

The term "Middle Bulgarian language" is justified only when applied to the Slavic dialects of the population which called itself Bulgarian. From the sporadic new grammatical forms penetrating into the literature as "mistakes", one can judge that serious structural changes had occurred in the dialects, the spoken Bulgarian language (as a totality of all its dialects) having moved towards analytism. In this respect, Bulgarian gradually diverged from the rest of the Slavic languages, participating in common processes with the non-Slavic languages of the area — Albanian, Rumanian and some dialects of Greek. This development is known as the Balkanization of the Bulgarian language (referring to its changes within the Balkan convergence area)²⁸⁶, but the earliest penetration of Balkan features into the Bulgarian literary language are already to be seen in most of the glagol-

285. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 13.

286. The Balkan features of the Middle Bulgarian language, with basic bibliography on the Balkan convergence phenomenon, will be discussed in Chapter Four.

itic texts of the 11th century²⁸⁷. In this respect, the

287. The earliest occurrence of the Balkan "double object" has been found by me in Mar. (11th century). I have found the same feature in the 11th - 12th-century Russian copy of Sinajskij paterik. These examples will be given (and discussed) in 4.4.2.

Other Balkan processes, like the development of the post-positive article, replacement of the infinitive by да-clauses, non-distinction of direction and location with the verbs of motion (as part of the reduction of the cases to three: subjective, objective and dative), establishment of the dative possessive, expression of affirmative future by a combination of ХОТѢТИ + verb and of negative future by НЕ ИМѢТИ + verb, are studied in detail by many Slavists and Balkanologists. Among the most important are:

M. Małeckı, Zagadnienia sporne lingwistyki bałkańskiej, Zbirka odgovora na pitanja 1 (III Međunarodni kongres slavista), Beograd, 1939, p. 216-217.

J. Kurz, K otázce členu v jazycích slovanských se zvláštním zřetelom k staroslověněštině, Byzantinoslavica 7, 1937-1938, p. 212-340; 8, 1939-1946, p. 172-288.

K. H. Meyer, Altkirchenslavische Studien II. Das Supinum. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung, Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft 18. Jahr., geisteswis. Kl., 3, Halle, 1944, p. 284-285.

K. Mirčev, Koga vǝznikva člennata forma v bǝlgarskija ezik, BǝlgEz, 3, 1953, p. 45-50.

Z. Gołǝb, Funkcja syntaktyczna partykuły da w językach pd.-słowiańskich (bułgarskim, macedońskim i serbo-chorwackim), Biuletyn polskiego Towarzystwa językoznawczego, XIII, Cracow, 1954, p. 67-92.

K. Horálek, K otázce staroslověnského infinitivu, Posta Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmanovi, Brno, 1948, p. 159 - 165.

_____, Evangeliáře a čtveroevangelia, Prague, 1954, p. 159-176.

I. Duridanov, Kǝm problemata za razvoja na bǝlgarskija ezik ot sintetizǝm kǝm analitizǝm, Godišnik SU, 51 Sofia, 1955, p. 85-272 (Photoreprint, Sofia, 1956).

_____, Za načenkite na analitizma v bǝlgarskija ezik, Rocznik slawistyczny, 20, 1958, p. 16-26.

H. Birnbaum, Untersuchungen zu den Zukunftsumschreibungen mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen, Stockholm, 1958, pp. 25-26, 213-232, 253-260, 276.

_____, Balkanslavisch und Südslavisch, Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, III, 1965, 1-2, pp. 31-38, 61-62.

J. Sedláček, Sintaksis staroslavjanskogo jazyka v svete balkanistiki, Slavia, XXXII, 1963, 3, p. 385-394.

A. Minčeva, Razvoj na datelnija pritežatelen padež v bǝlgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1964, 175 pp.

Bulgarian literature of the 12th - 14th centuries does not reflect the beginning, but only the continuation of structural changes in the language which had started earlier. Although we have indirect evidence (the Wallachian and Moldavian gramoty written in Bulgarian dialects)²⁸⁸ that by the mid-15th century most of the features of the Modern Bulgarian language were completely established, the language of Church Slavic literature in Bulgarian even at that time was extremely conservative. In this connection, K. Mirčev writes:

Unfortunately, we must emphasize, that we do not know of literary monuments from the most important epoch, when the decisive turn of the Bulgarian language from synthetism towards analytism took place, which might reflect better the language of the people. Almost all monuments connected with this epoch have a Church character and strictly follow tradition, and give no place at all to the peculiarities of the popular language²⁸⁹.

Another serious weakness of designating the Bulgarian literary language of the 12th - 14th centuries as Middle Bulgarian, while calling that from the 15th century onward New Bulgarian, is that it virtually excludes from the history of the Bulgarian literary language the entire traditional Church Slavic literature created after the 14th century. The Bulgarian, Serbian, Wallacho-Moldavian and

288. S. B. Bernštejn, Razyskanija v oblasti bolgarskoj istoričeskoj dialektologii, 1, Moscow-Leningrad 1948, 370 pp.

289. K. Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika..., p. 144.

Russian Church Slavic texts were diligently copied in Bulgaria all the way to the mid-19th century, at the end paralleling the creation and development of the modern Bulgarian literary language.

While "Middle Bulgarian" is the appropriate term for the Bulgarian dialects between the 11th and the end of the 14th centuries²⁹⁰, it has little if any justification when applied to the literary language. The time between the 12th and the 14th centuries is only a period in the history of the literary language in Bulgaria. And although the flow of Russian Church Slavic books in the mid-18th century seriously reshaped the Church Slavic language in Bulgaria²⁹¹, some Middle Bulgarian texts were still being copied later. An example will suffice to illustrate this point: the 16th-century Tulcea copy of the Manasses Chronicle reflects a more archaic language than the mid-14th-century

290. The beginning of this period is connected with the destruction of the independent Bulgarian state of Samuil (1018), which turned the country into a Byzantine province, and the waves of mass invasions by Turkic populations into Bulgarian territory (in the 1030's, 1048, 1064 and the last two decades of the 11th century). See:

Belgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Belgarija, I, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), pp. 146-149, 155-156.

The end of the period is connected with the final Turkish conquest of Bulgaria (1396). The Turks virtually destroyed the Bulgarian nation as it had existed until their advent, through mass relocation of the population of the Balkan territories and Asia Minor, as well as through intensive Turkish colonization of Bulgaria.

291. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 85.

Moscow copy of the same text, made by the priest Filip²⁹².

In this study, the term "Middle Bulgarian literary language" is used because of the already-established tradition in historical studies of the Bulgarian language, but with the explicit reservation that it simply refers to a period in the development of the Church Slavic language in Bulgaria. For the practical purpose of the present study — the impact of this language on the Russian literary language of the end of the 14th - beginning of the 15th centuries — developments in the Church Slavic of Bulgaria after the Turkish conquest are of no interest.

The Middle Bulgarian literary language (until 1396) is a version of Old Church Slavic (in this context it is therefore also appropriate to speak of the Old Bulgarian literary language) which reflects only certain features of the spoken Bulgarian dialects of the 12th - 14th centuries. Nevertheless, these dialectal features are present in varying degree in all texts and are very useful diagnostic tools in determining the national origin of a certain translation or original Slavic literary work. Inasmuch as the search for these features is essential, one must outline the territorial boundaries of the Bulgarian dialects spoken at that time.

292. I. Bogdan published the Tulcea copy, comparing it with both the Vatican and the Moscow copies. The numerous spelling and grammatical variants from the Moscow copy, given by Bogdan, demonstrate the more conservative character of the Tulcea copy. Cf.:

I. Bogdan, Cronica lui Constantin Manasses..., p. 3-222.

3.1.1. Today the northern boundary of the Bulgarian dialects is the Danube River, but this cannot be projected backward to the period of the Bulgarian language under consideration in this study. The most exhaustive investigation of the Bulgarian dialects north of the Danube was conducted by S. B. Bernštejn on the extremely rich linguistic material of the Wallachian and Moldavian gramoty (before 1508)²⁹³. But Rumanian scholars have, with very few exceptions (e.g. I. Bogdan) always had a strongly negative attitude towards any suggestion that large masses of Bulgarians in Wallachia and Moldavia could, through assimilation, have been among the "ancestors" of the modern Rumanian and Moldavian nations. Here is a curious item from the end of the last century, recounted by Bernštejn:

Some most precious Slavic gramoty from the city of Brashov came into the hands of the Rumanian historian Tocilescu, who was unable to read them. The Rumanian historian did not know the language in which most of the Rumanian monuments up to the 17th century were written. One can hardly imagine a Polish historian who would not know Latin! But everything Slavic caused the Rumanian historians and philologists such emotions as did not allow any objective studies. In the well-known work on the history of the Rumanian language and literature by Prof. A. Densusieanu, one reads: "One of the most unhappy coincidences for the language, the culture and even for the

293. S. B. Bernštejn, Razyskanija..., 370 pp. More recent papers, contributing to Bernštejn's study with additional data and observations, are:

O. Stojkovič, Srednobelgarski morfoložičeski osobenosti v ezika na vlaxo-belgarskite gramoti (XIV - XV v.), BelgEz, XIV, 1964, 2-3, p. 149-159.

A. Stančeva-Daskalova, Za njakoi dialektni osobenosti vov vlaxo-belgarskite gramoti, BelgEz, XVI, 1966, 6, p. 556-563.

substance of the Rumanian element was the contact of the Rumanians with Slavs and the introduction of the Slavic language in the Church and state"²⁹⁴.

In the mid-14th century there certainly was a Slavic Church in Wallachia, and in 1370 both of the Metropolitan sees in Wallachia were under the control of the Slavic archbishop of Oxrid²⁹⁵. But the number of Wallachian - Moldavian gramoty written in 15th-century Bulgarian dialects reaches a few thousand (there are twice as many Moldavian gramoty as Wallachian)²⁹⁶.

In his serious examination of the contradictory theories in Rumanian historiography from before World War II, in their relationship to historic facts known to contemporary science but only partially used by those Rumanian scholars who disregarded the Slavic background of the Rumanian nation²⁹⁷, Bernštejn comes to the following conclusion:

Thus, the Slavic population of Wallachia (and also Moldavia) is more ancient than the population

294. S. B. Bernštejn, op. cit., p. 44.

But the situation today is different. Contemporary Rumanian scholars acknowledge the participation of the Slavic (Bulgarian) ethnic element in the formation of their nation and the importance of the Church Slavic culture in the history of the country. For basic reference to such major Rumanian works, see the bibliographical notes in:

Șt. Pascu, ed., and others, Istoriya Medie a României, v. 1, Bucharest, 1966, p. 111-112.

295. Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, II, p. 230. This work was unaccessible to me, and the reference is from: S. B. Bernštejn, op. cit., p. 57.

296. S. B. Bernštejn, op. cit., p. 67.

297. S. B. Bernštejn, op. cit., p. 80-127.

which carried the Roman linguistic tradition. The intensive interrelations between them began from the 13th century. As a result of this process, a new language with multiple Slavic and Romance elements was created on the Wallachian territory. The Slavic tribes of Wallachia belonged to a group of tribes which is known under the name Bulgarian. This is confirmed by the analysis of the language of the Slavic gramoty,²⁹⁸ and above all, of the Serbian elements in it.

The following three phrases will suffice to demonstrate the nature of the language of the Wallachian gramoty of the 15th century: КУПИЛ ТИЯ ОВНИ ЛЕТОСКА - 'he bought these rams last summer'; а вие да га оставите да отиде дома си - 'you should let him go home'; наидете един кон велик и хубав - 'find a big and handsome horse'²⁹⁹. These phrases, which could be from a modern Bulgarian dialect, show beyond any doubt that the persons who wrote them were native Bulgarians, and not Wallachians who had learned the Church Slavic literary language. Nothing like them is registered in the territory of today's Bulgaria until the mid-16th century; thus foreigners could not have learned such a language from books.

But the presence of native Bulgarians on Wallachian and Moldavian territory in the period under study (12th-14th centuries) is related to the characterization of the literary, Church Slavic language known as Middle Bulgarian. Books, known today, written in Church Slavic, might well

298. S. B. Bernštejn, op. cit., p. 127.

299. S. B. Bernštejn, op. cit., p. 78.

have been written in Wallachia or Moldavia and still have had all the peculiarly Middle Bulgarian features.

3.1.2. The southern boundaries of the Bulgarian linguistic area are unclear. In the mid-16th century, the easternmost point of this boundary appears to have been immediately north of Adrianopolis. A German traveller of 1553-1555 testifies: "From Adrianopolis begins Bulgaria. In all the villages they speak the Bulgarian language"³⁰⁰. Such evidence, however, is too late to be absolutely reliable for the earlier period. There is earlier historical evidence (14th century) of Bulgarians' living in today's Greece, but it is not clear whether they were minority groups within Greek settlements, or residents of scattered Bulgarian villages on Greek territory. From the archives (in the Italian language) belonging to the Cretan notary Manoli Bresciano, who documented the slave trade in the city of Candia, one learns that on Sept. 14, 1382 "a slave Maria, Bulgarian by nationality, from the township of Livadia" (in Epirus) was sold for 115 perpers³⁰¹. On Dec. 5, 1382 another slave was sold, "Mixail, Bulgarian by birth, from the region of Thessalonike, from the village called Phylokarna"³⁰². While

300. Fr. Babinger, ed., Hans Dernschwamms Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel u. Kleinasien (1553-5), Munich-Leipzig, 1923, p. 245-246.

301. I. Sakəzov, Novootkriti dokumenti ot kraja na XIV v. za bəlgari ot Makedonija, prodavani kato robi, Makedonski pregled, VII, 1932, 2-3, p. 23-62 (entry # 63).

302. I. Sakəzov, op. cit., entry # 85.

Bulgarian settlements (or neighborhoods in Greek towns and villages) on Greek territory might have penetrated far to the south, a considerable number of Greeks lived on the territory of the Bulgarian kingdom, especially on the Black Sea coast and in the larger Bulgarian cities. This was always used by the Bulgarian kings to justify their claim to the title "King of all Bulgarians and Greeks".

3.1.3. The north-west boundary of the Bulgarian dialects in the past has been disputed between some Serbian and Bulgarian linguists. A. Belić seriously claimed the modern West Bulgarian dialects as Serbian, part of the Prizren-Timok dialect group³⁰³. As far as the Prizren-Timok dialects on Serbian territory are concerned, he suggested them to be "fundamentally Serbian dialects"³⁰⁴, which borrowed certain Bulgarian features in the 17th - 18th centuries³⁰⁵. But there is historic evidence which seems absolutely to contradict such a theory. At the end of March,

303. A. Belić, Dialektologičeskaja karta serbskogo jazyka, Stat'i po slavjanovedeniju, II, St. Petersburg, 1906, p. 58-59.

Serious Yugoslav dialectologists today do not repeat Belić's erroneous statements. Cf.:

P. Ivić, Die serbokroatischen Dialekte. Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung, Hague, 1958, p. 93-95.

For further Yugoslav bibliography on this problem see:

P. Ivić, op. cit., p. 47-48.
_____, Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika. Uvod i štokavsko narečije, Novi Sad, 1956, p. 124-129.

304. A. Belić, O srpskim ili hrvatskim dijalektima, Beograd, 1908, p. 100.

305. A. Belić, op. cit., p. 102-103.

1433, the French nobleman Bertrandon de la Broquière crossed the Morava River west of Niš. He wrote:

Et vins en une ville que l'on nomme Corsebech [Kruševac] et furent X journées depuis Adrenopoly. Ceste dite ville est à un mile près de la rivyere de la Morave qui vient de Bossene et est une grosse rivyere qui depart la Vulgairie et la Rascie ou Servie, qui est une mesme chose³⁰⁶.

The same statement: the River Morava separates Bulgaria from Serbia (which at that time can only be geographic and ethnic — not political — terms) is repeated two centuries later, in 1671, by the Englishman John Burbury (Gent.) in his account of a journey from Vienna to Constantinople:

From Jogada, on a fine and strong wooden Bridge, we passed the River Morava, which separates Servia || Servia (sic) from Bulgaria. The next place was Baraizin, then Pellacderesi and afterwards Aleschinti, where in a little Brook, and on the Grass thereabout, we saw many Tortoises..³⁰⁷

306. Ch. Schefer, ed., Le voyage d'outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière, premier écuyer tranchant et conseiller de Philippe le Bon, Duc de Bourgogne, Paris, 1892, p. 205.

307. J. Burbury, A Relation of a Journey of the Right Honourable My Lord Henry Howard, (From London to Vienna, and thence to Constantinople; In the Company of his Excellency Count Lesley, Knight of the Order of the Golden Fleece, Councillour of State to his Imperial Majesty, etc., And Extraordinary Ambassadour from Leopoldus Emperour of Germany to the Grand Signior, Sultan Mahomet Han the Forth. Written by John Burbury Gent.), London, 1671, p. 124-125.

I would like to express my special gratitude to the staff of the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library in Los Angeles, who were able to direct me to this source of information and to provide the original edition of this extremely rare miniature book of 1671.

3.1.3.1. Both testimonies are reliable with respect to correct ethnic identification of the territories, because neither Bertrandon de la Broquière nor John Burbury shows any special sympathy with the Bulgarians, which might have prompted them to "locate" the ethnic boundary farther to the west. The literature on the status of the Torlak dialects since Belić does not give a precise nor universally accepted explanation of their origin. Their Balkan (and Bulgarian) features have been explained by early (9th-13th century) Bulgarian influence³⁰⁸, by the early influence

308. A. Marguliés believes that the Torlak dialects were bulgarized over the period 9th - 13th centuries, since their territory was successively within the domain of the Bulgarian kings of the First Empire (Boris, Symeon and Samuil) and of the Second (Asenid) Empire. See:

A. Marguliés, Historische Grundlagen der süd-slavischen Sprachgliederung, Archiv für slavische Philologie, XL, 1926, 3-4, p. 203-208.

There is historic evidence that around the year 680 the Protobulgarians resettled the seven Moesian Slavic tribes (which were the Slavic element in the future Bulgarian nation north of the Balkan Mountains) westward around the rivers Timok and Morava, with the task of guarding the newly-formed Bulgaro-Slavic federation from the Avars on the north-west. Two of the original seven Slavic tribes (from the later Bulgarian group) received their names from the new territory - Timočane and Moravjane. See:

Bəlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bəlgarija, I, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 60-61.

V. Zlatarski, Istorija na bəlgarskata dəržava prez srednite vekove, I, 1, Sofia, 1918, pp. 142-143. 146.

K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 42.

If it could be proven that there were in the 6th-7th centuries tribes of the Serbo-Croatian Slavic group already settled in the Prizren-Timok area, one might in a certain sense place the start of their "Bulgarization" even earlier than does Marguliés. Undeniably, the dialects of the area were involved in the Balkan convergence processes, parallel with the Slavic dialects of present-day Bulgaria and Macedonia.

However, on the basis of available historical evi-

of the Romance substratum³⁰⁹, and according to the most recent theories, by independent (from Bulgarian) participation in the Balkan convergence phenomena, in which no other Serbo-Croatian dialects took part³¹⁰. One can only agree with the theoretical premise of some contemporary linguists, that whatever forces affected the historical development of the Torlak dialects are of little relevance to the present position of these dialects, within the Serbo-Croatian language and within the Balkan convergence area³¹¹.

dence, it seems that the creation of the transitional Bulgarian-Serbian dialects was a much more complicated phenomenon than a simple "Bulgarization" as a result of political domination. It is possible (although I could find no reference to this in Serbian history) that the penetration of Slavs into the Timok-Prizren area came simultaneously, from the end of the 7th century on, in two directions: westward from Bulgaria and north-eastward from Serbia, and thus that the dialects there had from the beginning a transitional character. This area must have been quite sparsely populated even in the 11th century, since it was there that the Byzantine authorities chose to settle the defeated Pechenegs, sometime after 1048. See:

V. Vasil'evskij, Vizantija i Pečenegi, Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvešćenija, 164, 1872, II, p. 116-165, 243-332.

309. N. van Wijk, Taalkundige en historische gegevens betreffende de oudste betrekkingen tussen Serven en Bulgaren, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, 55, A, 3, Amsterdam, 1923, p. 55-76.

310. P. Ivić, Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika..., p. 108-129. More recently, P. Ivić does not classify the Torlak dialects as part of the Štokavian group, but rather as an independent group among the Serbo-Croatian dialects, on an equal footing with the Štokavian and Čakavian groups. See:

P. Ivić, O klasifikaciji srpskohrvatskih dijalekata, Književnost i jezik, X, 1963, 1, p. 27-28.

311. H. Birnbaum, On Typology, Affinity, and Balkan Linguistics, Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku, IX, Novi Sad, 1966, pp. 27, 30.

3.1.3.2. There is no question at all that today the people in eastern Serbia (with the exception of the officially recognized Bulgarian minority in the area around Dimitrovgrad and Pirot) think of themselves as Serbians and call their dialects Serbian. But this is not a sufficient reason to project that national consciousness back some 600 - 900 years into the past. Yugoslav linguists (both Serbian and Macedonian) appear not to be aware of the extremely complex situation in the undisputedly Bulgarian dialects³¹²: whenever they speak of isoglosses between the South Slavic dialects, they quote as Bulgarian features only those features shared by the Bulgarian literary language³¹³, which is built on the grammatical structure of two numerically insignificant dialects of the central Balkan Mountains³¹⁴. As a result, the "Serbian" dialectal isoglosses are projected eastward into the territory of the modern Bulgarian state over an area where approximately three out of the eight million Bulgarians live³¹⁵.

312. In addition to St. Stojkov's Bølgarska dialektologija, one can find numerous monographs on the peculiarities of dialects, published in the series 'Bølgarska dialektologija'; they best reveal the tremendous difficulties in singling out a definite number of "Bulgarian features".

313. P. Ivić, Die serbokroatischen Dialekte..., p. 35-41.

314. St. Stojkov, Literaturen ezik i dialekti, Izvestija na Instituta za bølgarski ezik, II, 1952, p. 129-171.

315. P. Ivić, op. cit., fig. 1 (p. 31), fig. 2 (p. 32), fn. 2 (p. 39-40).

The problem of the north-western boundary of the Bulgarian dialects in the 11th - 14th centuries is not solved at all. It can be solved only in a spirit of cooperation between South Slavic linguists (which seems to be still far in the future) and on the basis of two major principles: first, the national identification and belonging of a certain Slavic population in medieval times has no bearing on the ethnic and political borders between the Balkan Slavic states of today, and vice versa; second, in the national identification of the dialects of two neighboring Slavic peoples, allowance should definitely be made for a belt of transitional dialects which include features of both languages (this has not been done yet, either in Bulgarian or in Yugoslav dialectology, which is itself a very strange "Balkan" phenomenon).

3.1.3.3. Transitional dialects between the Serbian and Bulgarian languages exist and must have existed from the very formation of Bulgarian and Serbian as two different Slavic languages. Without such an understanding, Slavists would search in vain for the "Bosnian" dialectal origin of the Codex Marianus on the sole grounds of the realization of *q as [u] when all other typically Bulgarian (including Balkan) features are present in the language of that manuscript³¹⁶. Without accepting the existence of such

316. V. Jagić, ed., Codex Marianus Glagoliticus (photoedition), Graz, 1960, p. 410.

V. Jagić explains the confusion of the letters ⲗ

transitional dialects in South Slavic dialectology, one is unable to explain many phonetic peculiarities in the literature of the Bulgarian kingdom of Vidin (14th century)³¹⁷.

An examination of some 14th - 16th century manuscripts written in Western Bulgaria, gives abundant evidence that in some of the dialects on this territory the etymological *q yielded [u], which is not true for most of these dialects today. Evidence for the mid-14th century is the literary production in Vidin; for the 16th century the best illustration is the impressive literary activity of Vladislav Grama-

and oy by the influence of the spoken language of the scribe (Serbian or Croatian), while the representation of ъ as o and of ь as e (with no single occurrence of the Serbo-Croatian a for either of them) he explains as the result of "a conventionalized pronunciation of these sounds on non-national grounds" (V. Jagić, op. cit., p. 427-428).

317. A very interesting document (although the sole surviving sample) from the 14th-century Vidin language is the gramota of King Ioan Sracimir, written between 1363 and 1396. It reveals many phonetic features of the modern transitional dialects between Bulgarian and Serbian: *q > [u] - (порѣчали); preposition and prefix *въ > [u] - (ѣ гра(д); на (instead of азъ) for the pronoun of the first person singular; but no vocalization of ъ/ь into a. See:

G. A. Il'inskij, Gramoty bolgarskix carej, p. 30.

Similar phonetic, morphological and lexical peculiarities, indicating a north-west Bulgarian dialectal basis (transitional to Serbian), are shared by the Sbornik of Vitae of female saints (of 1360), kept in the University library of Ghent; as well as by the writings of the Vidin metropolitan Ioasaf Bdinski. See:

I. Martynov, Bdinskij sbornik 1360 g., rukopis' Gentskoj biblioteki, Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti i iskusstva, XIV, St. Petersburg, 1882.

E. Kałużniacki, Aus der panegyrischen Literatur der Südslaven, Vienna, 1901, p. 97-115.

tik³¹⁸. Unfortunately, most of these works have received little attention from historians of the Bulgarian language³¹⁹.

3.1.4. The south-western boundary of the Bulgarian dialects³²⁰ of the 13th - 14th centuries was in today's eastern and south-eastern Albania. According to Seliščev, the earliest contacts between the Slavic and Albanian popu-

318. There are four extant manuscripts originally written by Vladislav Gramatik in 1456, 1469, 1473 and 1479, totalling 4300 pages and including 260 works by about 50 Byzantine and Bulgarian writers. His language, although reflecting Serbian phonetic features, also reflects Bulgarian morphological and syntactic features. Most of Vladislav's writing activities took place in the West Bulgarian Rila Monastery, which would indicate that his language was fully accepted by his contemporaries as adequate Church Slavic.

For a very comprehensive bibliography and samples of Vladislav Gramatik's writings, see:

G. Dančev, Vladislav Gramatik — knižovnik i pisatelj, Sofia, 1969, 147 pp.

319. The only study (and a marginal one) of the peculiarities of the language of Vladislav Gramatik is in connection with textological considerations. See:

G. Dančev, Rilskata povest na Vladislav Gramatik i sporovete okolo dvete ñ redakcii, Trudove na VPI "Bratja Kiril i Metodij", Veliko Tarnovo, III, Sofia, 1966, 1, p. 49-88.

The linguistic peculiarities of the works of Vladislav Gramatik, as well as of the remnants of the literary production of the Vidin kingdom of the 14th century, have been outside the interest of Bulgarian linguists. K. Mirčev does not include any of those works (cf. fn. 316, 317) in his review of important works in Middle Bulgarian literature (op. cit., p. 17-23). He mentions the development of *q to /u/ in the north-western dialects, without referring to manuscripts in which it was reflected (op. cit., p. 103).

320. The south-western Bulgarian dialects of the 12th - 14th centuries (also referred to as the Macedonian (Slavic) dialects) will be discussed in 3.1.5.

lations on the territory of modern Albania began in the 6th - 7th centuries. A. V. Desnickaja identifies the modern Albanian dialects which were influenced most heavily by the Macedono-Bulgarian population in the area, as the following five: Central Geg, Southern Geg, a transitional belt south of the River Shkumbin, Northern Tosk and Southern Tosk³²¹. The problem of the interrelationship of Bulgarian and Albanian dialects, not only in Albania but on the entire Bulgarian (and present-day Macedonian) territory, is very complex; but beyond any doubt the Albanians (or their Thracio-Illyrian ancestors) played a very important role in the processes of mutual influence that took place in the Balkan convergence area³²². The problem of Alban-

321. A. M. Seliščev, Slavjanskoe naselenie v Albanii, Sofia, 1931, p. 7-35.

A. V. Desnickaja, Slavjanskije zaimstvovanija v albanskom jazyke, Doklady sovetskoj delegacii na V Meždunarodnom s"ezde slavistov, Moscow, 1963, p. 27.

A. V. Desnickaja, Slavjano-albanskije jazykovye otnošenija i albanskaja dialektologija, Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie (VI Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov), Moscow, 1968, p. 136.

A. Desnickaja cites a number of pertinent articles by Albanian linguists, but since they are all in Albanian I was unable to make use of them. However, her report on the problem of the Albanization of an older Bulgarian population is well documented by lexical evidence, both from the Albanian dialects and from the literary language (cf. op. cit., p. 120-147).

M. Camaj, Zur Entwicklung der Nasalvokale der slavischen Lehnwörter im Albanischen, in: Die Kultur Südosteuropas, ihre Geschichte und ihre Ausdrucksformen, Wiesbaden, 1964, p. 18-25.

322. Z. Gołęb, Conditionalis typu bałkańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem macedońskiego, Wrocław-Cracow-Warsaw, 1964, p. 172-174.

E. Çabej, Ältere Stufen des Albanischen im

ian participation at least in the copying of the Middle Bulgarian literature, before the time of their conversion to the Moslem religion, has never been considered in the history of the Bulgarian language. Yet, the type of mistakes in some Middle Bulgarian manuscripts raises serious doubts as to the Slavic origin of the copyist. One such manuscript is the Aprakos Apostle of the 13th century (kept in the Sofia National Library "Kiril i Metodij", under # 880)³²³. The scribe of this Apostle writes: нарицаемое добраа [=добро(ю)] пристанище (p. 54 a)³²⁴; "vocalizes jers" in a strange fashion: тогода (p. 12b), тъкомо (p. 21 b), кото (p. 22 a), or inserts jers in most unexpected places: зънамению (p. 20 b, 14 a), възвратисътасъ (p. 30 b), сълишати and исъкаше (both on p. 37 b); confuses

Lichte der Nachbarsprachen, Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, II, 1964, p. 6-32.

V. Polák, Die Beziehungen des Albanischen zu den europäischen Substratsprachen mit Rücksicht auf die balkanische Situation, in: Die Kultur Südosteuropas, ihre Geschichte und ihre Ausdrucksformen, Wiesbaden, 1964, p. 207-217.

323. M. Stojanov, Xr. Kodov, Opis na slavjanskite rękopisi v Sofijskata Narodna biblioteka, III, Sofia, 1964, p. 52-53.

See also the Ph.D. dissertation of K. Steinke, in which the author studies the language of this manuscript, but does not mention the possibility of a copyist of non-Slavic origin. This factor would have additionally complicated the already complex picture of the disintegration of the Bulgarian nominal declension:

K. Steinke, Studien über den Verfall der bulgarischen Deklination (Slavistische Beiträge, 29), Munich, 1968, 133 pp.

324. K. Steinke, op. cit., p. 54.

both ѡ and ѣ for etymological *o: сѣдь (p. 22 a), мѣжи (p. 20 b), vs. рекѡть (p. 83 b); inexplicably uses the letter ѣ: слишитѣ (p. 8 a), рѣкоста (p. 42 b), сѣго (p. 49 a); confuses the letters оу and оѣ (spelled reversed, as in many 13th-century Bulgarian manuscripts): нашемоѣ (p. 8 a), разомоѣ (p. 69 a), etc., vs. лоудѣстии, лѡдемѣ (both on p. 12 b), etc.³²⁵. Some of the spelling mistakes might indicate a certain pattern (as, for instance, non-distinction of [l] and [l,] or [m] and [m,], prothetic iotation of initial /u/, etc., but the examples quoted, for illustration only, by M. Stojanov and Xr. Kodov are too few to draw conclusions from.

It might be an interesting task for specialists in the non-Slavic Balkan languages to examine the types of mistakes and to try to relate them to a specific Balkan phonological system.

3.1.5. The geographic distribution of the dialects of Middle Bulgarian is connected with a relatively new problem in Slavistics — the existence of a "Middle Macedonian" language. A. Vaillant was the first to write quite seriously about the "Old Macedonian" language, created by Kliment of Oxrid as a language distinct from the Old Bulgarian language in Preslav; he even goes further, claiming that "when the center of the Bulgarian (sic) state moved

325. M. Stojanov, Xr. Kodov, op. cit., p. 53.

to Oxrid, the Old Macedonian language took over"³²⁶. Approximately 20 years before Vaillant, in 1931, N. van Wijk wrote in relation to the two schools (Eastern and Western) in the Old Bulgarian language:

One, however, should not oppose the East and the West to each other, because there were many various interrelations and mutual influences between them, while there were no sharp distinctions among the various dialects. For certain texts, it is difficult to say of what origin they are: Eastern or Western³²⁷.

B. Koneski, in his Istorija na makedonskiot jazik, does not use such terms as "Old Macedonian", "Middle Macedonian", "New Macedonian"³²⁸. However, he first suggests that "the language of the Macedonian Slavs", after the second half of the 9th century, "like the Bulgarian language and, in a lesser degree, the South-East Serbian dialects, underwent many radical structural changes under the influence of the Balkan linguistic milieu"³²⁹. But the term

326. A. Vaillant, Manuel du vieux slave, Paris, 1948. This quotation is from the Russian edition of the book:

A. Vajan, Rukovodstvo po staroslavjanskomu jazyku, Moscow, 1952, p. 17-18.

For detailed analysis of this theory of Vaillant's see:

D. Ivanova-Mirčeva, Starobølgarski, staroslavjanski i srednobølgarska redakcija na staroslavjanski (In: Konstantin-Kiril Filosof), Sofia, 1969, p. 45-62.

327. N. Van-Vejk, Istorija staroslavjanskogo jazyka (the Russian translation), Moscow, 1957, p. 31.

328. B. Koneski, Istorija na makedonskiot jazik, Skopje-Beograd, 1965, 203 pp.

329. B. Koneski, op. cit., p. 7.

"Macedonian language" soon appears in a statement about its "immediate contact with the neighboring South Slavic languages - Bulgarian and Serbian"³³⁰, and the mechanism of these "contacts" is spelled out:

The temporary close contact with the Bulgarian (respectively, Serbian) language was yet, naturally, in medieval times dependent on which of the created state centers - the Bulgarian or the Serbian - in different periods achieved power in Macedonia³³¹.

If one compares the changes in the "Macedonian" language from the mid-9th century to modern times, as described by B. Koneski in his historical grammar, one will find them identical with the changes in the Bulgarian language during the same period, as described by K. Mirčev³³². Most of the specific features of the Macedonian dialects, not attested in medieval writings, exist in modern Bulgarian dialects too, as can be seen from the description by St. Stojkov in his short university textbook on the contemporary Bulgarian dialects (Stojkov did not study any Slavic dialect on Yugoslavian territory)³³³.

330. B. Koneski, op. cit., p. 8-9.

331. B. Koneski, op. cit., p. 9.

332. For a detailed comparison of Koneski's historical grammar (1965) and Mirčev's Istoričeska gramatika na bəlgarskija ezik, 1958, 1963 (2nd edition), see:

P. Penkova, P. Ilčev, K voprosu o makedonskom jazyke i ego istorii, Balkansko ezikoznanie, XII, Sofia, 1967, p. 5-37.

333. St. Stojkov, Bəlgarska dialektologija,

For the entire period from the 9th through the 19th centuries, B. Koneski, in his search for national identity, boldly introduces such terms as "Macedonia" (as a national territory coinciding with the geographical area called Macedonia today), "Macedonians" (as a separate Slavic nation), "Macedonian language" (spoken by this nation and having its own literary form, different from that of the neighboring Bulgarian literary language) as if they were self-evident and undisputed in history and slavistics. He makes no effort to justify them, either by offering serious linguistic considerations (such as a list of grammatical features present exclusively in the Macedonian writings and dialects but absent from their Bulgarian counterparts) or by citing any historical records, testifying to the reality of his terms in all the periods to which he applies them. This is just as well, because they are unjustifiable.

3.1.5.1. To begin with, the geographic region called Macedonia in medieval times (9th - 15th centuries) was located between the city of Adrianopolis on the east, the city of Philipopolis (Plovdiv) on the west, and the Aegean coast at the mouth of the Marica River on the south. The western boundary of the medieval geographic region of Macedonia lay approximately where the eastern boundary of today's region of Macedonia lies³³⁴. After the Turkish

Sofia, 1968 (2nd edition), 296 pp. + maps.

334. The Byzantine historian Leo Grammaticus (10th - 11th century) describes how the Bulgarian khan Krum in 813 captured Adrianopolis and took as prisoners 12,000

conquest in the mid-15th century, the geographic region of Macedonia shifted westward: with Plovdiv as an administrative center, it included Thessalonike, Skopje and Vardar. Yet today's western Macedonia was called Illyria³³⁵.

3.1.5.2. Then the question is, if today's Macedonia was not even called Macedonia until the middle of the 15th century, how could there have been a Macedonian nation and a Macedonian language there? The answer is, that there were not. In the period 9th - 19th centuries the ethnic

Macedonians, who later returned to their country, Macedonia. See:

Leonis Grammatici Chronographia, Bonn, 1842, pp. 208, 231, 233; in the same work this author states that the Byzantine emperor Basil I (867-886) was born "in Macedonia, in a village near Adrianopolis" (op. cit., p. 228).

The 11th-century Byzantine historian Michael Psellus writes that the Emperor's second cousin Leo "lived in Adrianopolis and was imbued with Macedonian haughtiness". See:

E. Renault, ed., Michel Psellos, Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976-1077), II, Paris, 1928, p. 14. Further in his discourse on the events of 1047, the chronicler writes that the rebels "reached Macedonia, seized Adrianopolis as a fortress and immediately set to work" (op. cit., p. 17).

Compare also the historical testimony of the Slav-ic monk Isaja (1371) on the defeat of Vëlkašin and Ugleša at Černomen, near Adrianopolis, in Macedonia (cf. 2.3.1.b and fn. 135).

335. The Byzantine historian Leonicus Chalcocondyles (15th century) writes that the Turkish ruler Bayazid (1389-1402) signed a peace treaty with the princes in Macedonia, settled Skopje, then penetrated into Illyria and even sent troops to the land of the Albanians. See:

Leonici Chalcocondylae De Rebus Turcicis, Bonn, 1843, p. 60.

The French nobleman Bertrandon de la Broquière reports that soon after March 12, 1433, "je arrivay à Philippopolis [= Plovdiv] qui est le chief de Macedoine et est ceste dicte ville en ceste belle plaine sur ladite rivyere de la Maresche...". (Cf. Ch. Scheffer, ed., op. cit., p. 200).

name of the Slavic people living in today's Macedonia was Bulgarian, and the language they spoke was called Bulgarian also³³⁶. One of the earliest books in a contemporary Bulgar-

336. The earliest historic record is from the 7th century, when the Protobulgarian chieftains Maurus and Kuber settled their tribe among the Slavs in the valley of Bitolja. See:

Miracula Sancti Demetrii, Græcki izvori za bēlgarskata istorija, III, Sofia, p. 158.

In the 10th century, St. Kliment, the creator of the Oxrid School, is called "Bulgarian Bishop of Oxrid". See:

H. Delehaye, Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantino-politanae, Brussels, 1902, col. 255-256.

In 1019-1020 the Byzantine emperor Basil II ("Bulgaroctonus") issued charters with regulations for the conquered western Bulgarian kingdom of Samuil. In the First Charter (1019) it is written that "the Byzantine state expanded and the state of the Bulgarians passed into yoke with it". See:

J. Ivanov, Bēlgarski starini iz Makedonija, Sofia, 1931 (2nd edition), p. 547.

Theophylactus, the 11th -12th century Greek bishop of Oxrid, in his numerous letters calls the local inhabitants Bulgarians, and the language spoken by them — Bulgarian. See:

Simeon Mitropolit, Pismata na Teofilakt Oxridski, prevel ot græcki Mitropolit Simeon, SbBan, XXVII, Sofia, 1931, pp. 18, 71, 72, 128, 181. This same Theophylactus wrote the Vita of St. Kliment of Oxrid, in which he calls him the Bulgarian Bishop; the people of Kliment's see (the same as his own) he calls Bulgarians, and their language, Bulgarian. See:

Al. Milev, Græckite žitija na Kliment Oxridski, Sofia, 1966, pp. 79, 81, 129, 133, 135.

In a letter of June 30th, 1502, the Dubrovnik merchants Vladislav de Sorgo and Luca de Bona report to the hospital administration of Dubrovnik that the plague "began to appear in many places in Skopje, penetrating chiefly in small places, and affected good people in the homes of Bulgarians and in the homes of Turks...". The letter is published in Italian in Diversa notarie, v. 81, p. 138-139; it is quoted here from the English translation in:

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Documents and Materials on the History of the Bulgarian People, Sofia, 1969 p. 63.

In the Zograph Pomenik (Dead-Roll) from 1527 to 1728, the names of the deceased from today's Macedonia, with

ian dialect from Macedonia was published in 1814 in Budapest under the following title: *Повѣсть ради страшнаго и втораго пришествіа хрїстова собраннаа ѿ различныхъ стѣхъ писанїахъ, и преведѣнна на простѣйшіи назыкъ болгарскїи, ползова- нїа ради простѣишыхъ члвѣковъ и некнижнихъ. Списаннаа ѿ Хаджи Іоакїма даскала и преведѣса на тѹпъ потщанїемъ господа кѹръ Хаджи Пѣца ѿ Щип, и кѹръ Хаджи Станко ѿ Кратово, и кѹръ Димїтрїи Фїліпповичъ ѿ Егри Дерѣ Паланка за дѹшев- ное ихъ спасенїе. Настоятель бысть Димїтрїи Іоанновичъ Зѹзбра ѿ Сѣчища. Въ Бѹдинѣ градѣ, писмены кралеви Все- бѹчилища Оунгарскаго, 1814. (Italics mine, I. T.)³³⁷.*

A significant testimony on the Bulgarian national identity of the people in today's Greek and Yugoslav Macedonia in 1850-1860 is given by the Bosnian folklorist Stefan Verković³³⁸. In his preface he writes:

But I called these songs Bulgarian rather than Slavic, because if one were to ask today a Macedonian Slav: "What are you?", he would answer at once: "I am a Bulgarian, and I call my language Bulgarian..."³³⁹.

indication of their town or village, are listed on pages entitled *пѣфлагонїа (Bitolja) блѣгарска земла* or *блѣгар'ска земла, градъ бѣтола*. See the publication of this list in:

J. Ivanov, *Bѣlgarski starini iz Makedonija*, Sofia, 1908, pp. 281, 284-287.

337. The complete title is taken from the photo-reproduction of the front page of the original publication in:

J. Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

338. St. Verković, *Narodne pesme makedonski bugara. Knjiga prva. Ženske pesme*, Beograd, 1860, 337 pp.

339. The original text is as follows: «Но я самъ ове песме назвао бугарскимѣ, а не словенскимѣ, збогъ

Volumes could be written on the Bulgarian national consciousness of the Slavic population in today's Macedonia until the end of the last century. The conditions for the creation of a new, Macedonian nation — and later, of a Macedonian literary language — were generated by the intervention of the European powers after the liberation of all Bulgaria from the Turkish yoke in 1878; the European powers, keeping their commitment to Turkey, returned Macedonia for 34 more years to Turkish colonial administration. This is when the histories, as well as the languages, of the Bulgarians and the Macedonians really separated.

3.1.5.3. Today the existence of a new Macedonian nation on the territory of Yugoslavia is a fact which cannot be disputed³⁴⁰. Nor can one dispute the existence of a young Macedonian literary language, as artificial a creation as the Bulgarian literary language is. But this does

тога, ер данасъ кадь бы когодъ македонскогъ Словенина запито: што си ты? съ места бы му одговорю: я самъ Болгаринъ, а свои языкъ зову болгарскимъ...» The quotation is from:
St. Verković, op. cit., p. xiii.

340. This cannot be claimed for the people who live in Bulgarian Macedonia, since they took part in all the modern history of the Bulgarian nation as equal participants. It is true that in 1947 many of the inhabitants of western Bulgaria were forced by the Communist authorities in Bulgaria to declare themselves Macedonians by nationality, as a first step toward the formation of the Balkan Federation planned by Tito and G. Dimitrov. (The latter, by the way, although born in Greek Macedonia, never thought of himself as Macedonian rather than Bulgarian in origin.) In that year the government authorities in Sofia came a few times to our house, unsuccessfully pressing us to change our nationality to Macedonian because my father's side of the family came from Prilep.

not entitle anyone to project the facts of today backward into history. Such projections are not naiveté, but intentional falsification of historical fact. B. Koneski, while solemnly discussing the "contact" of the "Macedonian" language with the "neighboring Bulgarian", slips, quoting examples demonstrating the development of the "Macedonian" comparative degree of adjectives from the Tarnovo copy of the Manasses Chronicle³⁴¹. In his study of a 16th-century Bulgarian dialect from the village of Bogorsko, district of Kostur (in today's Greece), represented in a brief Bulgarian-Greek dictionary written with Greek letters³⁴², A. Vaillant writes about the author of the dictionary: "C'était un Grec curieux du slave macédonien", (italics mine, I. T.)³⁴³. In fact, however, the author was curious not about "Macedonian Slavic", as claimed by Vaillant, but about Bulgarian, for he entitled his dictionary: "Beginning. Bulgarian words and their correspondence in the popular (Greek) language" (italics mine, I. T.)³⁴⁴. The dialect of

341. B. Koneski, op. cit., p. 120.

342. G. Gianelli, A. Vaillant, Un lexique macédonien du XVI^e siècle, Paris, 1958, 69 pp.

343. A. Vaillant, in his study on the grammar, published together with the 16th-century dictionary (G. Gianelli, A. Vaillant, op. cit., p. 46).

344. The front page with this title is given in photoreproduction between pp. 44 and 45 of the French publication. In addition, the title is printed in Greek (with reconstructions) on p. 23. However, this is the only Greek sentence in the entire book which has not been translated into French! Here is the Greek title from the photoreproduction of the original: ἀρχὴ ἐν βουλγαρίοις ῥιμάτων,

the village of Bogorsko was extinct before the creation of the Macedonian nation³⁴⁵; the dialect was Bulgarian, and its study is part of Bulgarian historical dialectology. One is hardly convinced by Vaillant's assertion that: "Ce macédonien du XVI siècle est très semblable au macédonien moderne,"³⁴⁶ especially when one sees the features which he adduces to prove his point. Here are a few of them: *ǣ > [ja] (vjáter, vjáždi); systematic preservation of initial *x (xljáb-o); *tj > [št] (nóštvi , ovóštje) and *dj > [žd] (vjáždi). While it is true that all of these features exist in modern Macedonian dialects, it is also true that they are among the most frequently cited characteristic features of Bulgarian³⁴⁷, and that as such they have been selectively purged from the Macedonian literary language.

3.1.5.4. The term "Middle Macedonian" was first used by the Macedonian linguist R. Ugrinova, but with no definition of its chronological boundaries, nor of the geographic area in which it was written³⁴⁸. The basic charac-

εις κινῆ γλῶττα ἐρχομένη:

345. Bl. Šklifov, Edin trud vǎrxu "makedonskata" leksika ot XVI v., BalgEz, XVII, 1967, 4, p. 380-381.

346. A. Vaillant, in his study on the grammar, published together with the 16th-century dictionary (G. Gianelli, A. Vaillant, op. cit., p. 45).

347. P. Ivić, Die serbokroatischen Dialekte, pp. 36, 38.

348. R. Ugrinova, Spomenici na staromakedonskata pismenost, Slovenska pismenost — 1050-godišnina na Kliment Oxridski, Oxrid, 1966, p. 65.

teristic of the manuscripts singled out by Ugrinova as Middle Macedonian is the vocalization of ѣ > о and ѣ > е, which, since it even today exists in some of the Rupski dialects of south-eastern Bulgaria, is rather to be considered a South Bulgarian feature. Other characteristic features of the language she calls "Middle Macedonian" are the use of the letters ѕ and ѣ; the confusion in the use of the letters ѣ and ѣ; the use of е and ѣ for the third person singular, affirmative and negative respectively, of the verb 'to be'; the use of the grammatical ending -ме for the first person plural of the present tense; the sporadic use of the post-positive article; and the wrong usage of grammatical cases, indicating the existence, in the dialects, of a generalized objective case³⁴⁹. Reading Ugrinova's article, one is saddened by the total ignorance of the history of the Bulgarian language, as well as of the present situation in its dialects, on the part of an author who has made it her specialty to investigate the history of one of the former dialectal subgroups of Bulgarian. By contrast, B. Koneski in his historical grammar scrupulously lists many (though not all) of those developments in Bulgaria which coincided with those in Macedonia, and does not use the term "Middle Macedonian" at all.

3.2. It is accepted in Slavic philology

349. See also the criticism on Ugrinova's article by D. Ivanova-Mirčeva:

D. Ivanova-Mirčeva, op. cit., p. 61-62.

and in the historical studies of the Bulgarian language that the texts from the classical Church Slavic period in Bulgaria were revised during the second half of the 14th century. The credit for this revision is universally attributed to the Bulgarian Patriarch of the last quarter of the 14th century — Euthymius of Tarnovo.

A typical expression of this opinion is given by K. S. Mirčev (rendered here in English translation)³⁵⁰:

It must be emphasized that the Middle Bulgarian literature was deprived of graphic unity by the unfavorable conditions under which it developed, the greater difference between the literary and the spoken language giving rise to large discrepancies or errors even in the liturgical books. Departure from the norms of a given epoch was possible at all levels. This encouraged Patriarch Euthymius, in the second half of the 14th century, to undertake his reforms, whose main goal was to establish order and homogeneity in the spelling of Middle Bulgarian monuments and to canonize a number of dead linguistic norms; meanwhile, there was a conscious resistance to any innovation in the literary language and to its rapprochement with the spoken language. Thus, for example, Euthymius, this "great artist of Slavic letters" as his pupils called him, severely criticized the omission of the epenthetic -l- in the texts. Concerning the use of the nasal vowels and jers, he recommended the following: at the beginning of a word one should write only ѣ (e.g. ѣЗЫКЪ, instead of the OBulg. ѣЗЫКЪ), the back jers should be written only in the middle of a word and in prepositions, while the front jer should be written only at word end (for example: ВЛЪКЪ, ВЪНЪ, ВРЪХЪ); wherever two nasal vowels follow each other, one should first write ѣ, then ѣ (for instance: ДОБРѣѣ instead of the OBulg. ДОБРѣѣ). In general, the reforms of the Bulgarian Patriarch aimed to preserve fully the archaic aspect of the literary language

350. K. Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika..., p. 54-55.

which had really become an artificial and dead language.

This is a typical statement of the role attributed to Patriarch Euthymius in the archaization and standardization of the Bulgarian literary language. The tradition which assigns this important role to Euthymius goes back as far as the early 15th c., when two prominent writers, Grigorij Camblak and Konstantin Kostenečki, testified to the merits of Euthymius.

3.2.1. The first, and more reliable, of them is the Slavic writer and religious leader Grigorij Camblak (1360's to 1420). In his Vita of Patriarch Euthymius he writes about Euthymius' activities after the year 1371 at the monastery of the Holy Trinity near Tarnovo (before his becoming Patriarch in 1375)³⁵¹:

What were his activities? The translation of the liturgical books from Greek into Bulgarian. And nobody who hears me say this should think that I shrink from the truth, because the Bulgarian books are very old due to their many years of existence, and because they have been in existence since the Christianization of the people, and even because it was those books, which this man, who reached all the way to our days, great amongst the saints, had studied. This is what I know, and there is no other truth. But be it because the first translators did not know fluently the language and the dogma of the Greeks, be it because they used an unpolished language, their books differed in words and meaning from the Greek books and were rough and unharmonious in respect to expression. They were believed to be exact only because they were called holy books. They concealed many mistakes and dis-

351. Bēlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bēlgarija, 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 236.

agreed with the true dogmas. That is why many heresies originated from them. After destroying all old books, this new legislator, carrying the new ones in his working hands, descended from the mountain of his erudition and surrendered to the Church a true heavenly treasure, like scripture written by God, and all of it new, all exact, agreeing with the Gospel, not deviating from the dogma..."³⁵²

3.2.2. In this testimony one must try to separate the usual legendary exaggeration in the Vitae, from the facts. First of all, Camblak does not mention the New Testament as one of the books Euthymius translated; on the contrary, Euthymius tried to bring the other books into accord with its text. That he destroyed the old books must be doubted. At that time Euthymius possessed no particular power within the Church hierarchy; he was a very prominent monk, with some connections with the Palace and the Patriarch, but was still not in a position to decide which books could be "destroyed". The only books which he might have surrendered to the authorities would have been those already forbidden by the Church, and listed in the numerous indices of heretical books. Even if he had been able to suggest to the authorities the destruction of a few liturgical books on account of their gross deviations from orthodox dogma, these must have been the books of that one particular monastery and thus of no importance amid the bulk of distorted copies available even today in great

352. P. Dinekov, Evtimij Tarnovski, in: Istorijska na Bølgarskata literatura, 1, Sofia, 1962, p. 287-288.

numbers in the Bulgarian and Yugoslav museums and libraries.

Grigorij Camblak is definite in dating the literary reform of Euthymius: it took place in the monastery of the Holy Trinity between the years 1371 and 1375, before Euthymius became Patriarch. We must question the freedom of even a prominent monk to promulgate such a significant reform. Within the social conventions of the epoch, the only freedom a particular person could have had would have been one of choice among different already-existing norms and schools.

3.2.3. The second of the earliest historical allusions to Euthymius' literary activities is by the Serbian writer of Bulgarian origin, Konstantin Kostenečki, who mentions a few times the name of Euthymius in his treatise On the Letters, written before 1418 in the Serbian state of Despot Stefan Lazarević³⁵³. The treatise is known in two versions: the full, preserved only in one 15th-century copy³⁵⁴, and the abbreviated, known in numerous Serbian, Bulgarian, Russian and Wallacho-Moldavian copies from after the 16th century.

The entire problem of the existence of a "testi-

353. K. Kujew, Konstantyn Kostenecki w literaturze bułgarskiej i serbskiej, Cracow, 1950, p. 11-30.

354. The full version is published by V. Jagić in his Razsuždenija stariny o cerkovno-slavjanskom jazyke, 1, St. Petersburg, 1885-1895. I used the German photoedition of Jagić's work, which has a different order of the articles and a different pagination:

V. Jagić, ed., Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum (Slavische Propylaen, 25), Munich, 1968, 782 pp.

mony" by Konstantin Kostenečki about a revision of the books and the language in Bulgaria by Euthymius, is connected with Jagić's interpretation of what K. Kostenečki really wrote. Here is how Jagić states it:

Konstantin considers Euthymius of Bulgaria the highest authority on different problems of Slavic literature. He talks of him as "a great artist of the Slavic letters", calls him the light of those (Bulgarian) countries "all the way to the Marica River, and the Scythian lands, and in Zagora". Obviously he was not personally acquainted with Euthymius, did not consider himself his immediate student, but as a student of one of his students — named Andronik from the Romanian regions — he bowed before the glory of the Tarnovo Patriarch. And this teacher of his, according to his testimony, belonged to that number of outstanding persons, who knew well the Slavic literature and maintained in it the traditions of the old Tarnovo school. According to Konstantin's opinion, in his own time there were very few such knowledgeable people: "the lights of the letters faded out from the Marica to Thessalonike and Beograd". Even in the Tarnovo countries the Slavic literature was about to decline, but "the King and the Patriarch" elevated it again. As the King one must understand either Ioan Šišman alone, the closest contemporary of Euthymius, or together with him also his ancestor, Ioan Aleksandør; the Patriarch, of course, is Euthymius himself. Unfortunately, Konstantin does not touch all of the activities and merits of Euthymius, but only by allusions gives us to understand that Euthymius had influenced considerably that side of Slavic literature which was dearest of all to our author, i.e., he contributed to the stabilization of certain orthographic norms. Since, in the main, only this problem interested Konstantin, he tells in relation to Euthymius, that the latter did not have time (не успел) to formulate precisely his graphic system, that he did not leave behind any spelling manual, where he would have stated his theory: «не потщася списати утвърждение симъ». According to Konstantin's words, which are not altogether understandable, Euthymius was satisfied with some kind of «изъявленія». It is hard to

define what was the nature of these «ИЗЪЯВЛЕНІЯ» — whether they were his orders or practical regulations³⁵⁵.

This very long quotation from Jagić was necessary in order to see the different stages of the evolution in the understanding of Konstantin Kostenečki's "testimony" on Euthymius' reform. In an article on K. Kostenečki, the Bulgarian literary historian K. Kuev writes:

If Despot Stefan Lazarević wills it, Konstantin is ready to write such a manual, as will have as a basis the spelling of Cyril and Methodius as well as the orthographo-linguistic reform of Euthymius....

His grammatical treatise ... gives such an array of information (редица сведения) about the reform of Euthymius as cannot be found anywhere else (italics mine, I. T.)³⁵⁶.

In Lixačev, this line of thought goes even further:

In order to establish the essence of the second South Slavic influence in Russia, it would be of great importance to clarify the philosophical sense of the literary reform of Euthymius, which penetrated into Russia: a reform of the literary language, orthography and graphics.... We can only partially judge the sense of Euthymius' reform from a single work by a student of one of his students, Konstantin the Philosopher Kostenečki (italics mine, I. T.)³⁵⁷

355. V. Jagić, ed., op. cit., p. 81-82.

356. K. Kuev, Konstantin Kostenečki, in: Istorija na bēlgarskata literatura, 1, Sofia, 1963, pp. 317, 324-325.

357. D. S. Lixačev, Nekotorye zadači ..., (1960), p. 107.

The most "advanced" stage of the evolution in the interpretation of Konstantin Kostenečki's testimony on Euthymius is represented by Mirčev's statement already quoted (cf. 3.2.; fn. 350), where even individual points of his supposed spelling reform are listed.

Konstantin Kostenečki's testimony on Euthymius has been interpreted in the literature to a degree which has already made it unrecognizable in the interpretations. Here is exactly what Konstantin himself wrote:

And still, this artist is imperfect, because I did not reach that great artist of Slavic letters, and as I would say, the father of Tarnovo Kyr Euthymius, who truly appeared, and who is still today, like a light for those lands from the river called Marica even to the Scythian lands and Zagore. But I will give a warm portrait with a godly love which will fill even the non-gifted. To this man, marvelous in his words, a certain Andronik from the Romanian (=east Thracian) regions was a student for a while; and when he was our teacher in writing, he explained thus: no matter how heavy and strong the things you build on firm ground (which is, at the beginning of learning), they will stay there. And only he who will teach the children these things in this way at the beginning is perfect in the letters and in his philosophy (ВЪ МНОГИ(Х) рас'соуж(д)ѣнии(х)). Having explained this, I will now speak boldly: that the lights of literature faded away, beginning from the Marica, all the way to Salonike and Beograd, with the exception of a few, and those who can still be found are from the Tarnovo lands or taught by such....

In the same way the letters were destroyed in the Tarnovo lands, but the King and the Patriarch enlightened (the people), and behold, how much good they did by this, and not only then and in their own region, but their plantings and foundation remain forever, and even until now enlighten the surrounding kingdoms. If this is not so, let him who has an objection tell me about it.

And Kyr Euthymius was the most artistic one in these lands, although many others appeared who

were very prominent in the word of the teachings and fear of the Lord, but not on the basis of the letters, as he was. But even he did not make an effort to write down an affirmation of this, such as one can find in the Greek writings, or even some sort of partial exposition. For he who rules, has no fear of anything, and whatever he orders, happens; thus he, having taught precisely, or having laid down the fundamentals of learning, uprooted evil and no one stood against him, while this poor slave, in the grip of fear ... cannot in this way...³⁵⁸.

As one can see, Konstantin Kostenečki does not even mention the word "reform" in his original writing.

His statement can be broken down into several points:

a) Konstantin studied with Andronik, who was for a while a pupil of Euthymius. From Andronik, Konstantin learned that a perfect teacher of the language (as well as a superb thinker) is one who teaches properly from the beginning. Such a perfect teacher was the father of Tarnovo, Euthymius, whose level Konstantin Kostenečki has not yet reached (since he has not formulated for his students the fundamentals of learning; this becomes evident from his further exposition in the treatise, where he tries to set them forth).

b) The few in the Balkans (after the death of Euthymius?) who are still competent in the Slavic writings are either from Bulgaria or have been taught by teachers from Bulgaria. In this way Konstantin emphasizes the worth

358. V. Jagić, ed., op. cit., p. 102-103.

of his own credentials, although he suspects that someone might argue with him.

c) The Balkan Slavic literature has faded away (with few exceptions, among whom Konstantin himself must be numbered) in the same way as, long ago, it had been destroyed in the Tarnovo lands, but the King and the Patriarch enlightened the people. Jagić's translation of this passage is unacceptable; he writes that "the Slavic literature was about to decline" (пришла было в упадок), while in the original it is said писмена тако погыбла была соуть. The Church Slavic (and especially, Bulgarian) pluperfect can by no means be translated as Jagić does here. Its main function as a tense is to indicate action which had occurred long ago, and whose results were visible in the past, to which the author refers in the aorist. The pluperfect has the same relation to the aorist as the perfect has to the present tense³⁵⁹. Konstantin Kostenečki here uses a rare form of the pluperfect — the conjugated verb 'to be' in the present tense plus the 1-participle of the verb 'to be', plus the 1-participle of the lexical verb, instead of the more usual form бѣша погыбла. But the same formation of the pluperfect is observed by

359. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 199.

Cf. also the discussion and numerous examples of agreement of the past tenses throughout the history of the Bulgarian language, in:

I. K. Bunina, Istorija glagol'nyx vremen v bolgarskom jazyke, Moscow, 1970, p. 88-97.

S. B. Bernštejn in Wallachian gramoty from the 15th century: смо били послали³⁶⁰. It existed as a variant formation for the pluperfect until it came to be utilized to express the category of reported speech in the pluperfect. But Mirčev, for instance, believes that reported speech is a new category in Bulgarian (though he does not date it), introduced under Osman Turkish influence³⁶¹.

There was indeed a time when Church Slavic literature had been destroyed in Bulgaria: this was the time of the Byzantine administration of the country, from the fall of Samuil's kingdom in the 11th century to the creation of the Second Bulgarian Empire in the late 12th century³⁶². Konstantin Kostenečki does not know the names of the King and Patriarch who reintroduced the Church Slavic language in the service; otherwise he would have given them.

There is no positive record in Bulgarian history of when the Church Slavic liturgy was reintroduced in the

360. S. B. Bernštejn, Razyskanija v oblasti bolgarskoj istoričeskoj dialektologii, 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, p. 214.

361. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 208-210.

362. The desperate position of Bulgarian Church Slavic literature under the Byzantine domination is reflected in the so-called "Second Apology of the Bulgarian Book", whose oldest copy dates from the 13th century. Cf.:

N. Dragova, Vtorata apologija na bēlgarskata kniga i nejnite izvory, in: Konstantin-Kiril Filosof, Sofia, 1969, p. 315-347.

Church, but it could hardly have been before 1235, when the Bulgarian Patriarchate was reinstated; from 1199 until that year the Bulgarian Church of the early Second Empire had been under the Church of Rome, which insisted on the Latin liturgy (cf. fn. 66). The continuation (after 1211) of the Synodikon of King Boril includes the story of the reinstatement of the Bulgarian Patriarchate:

Іѡаннь асѣнь црѣ великыи ѡ бла
 гочѣстивыи снѣ старого асѣнѣ
 црѣ. ѡже многъ любовь ѡмѣхъ.
 къ боу. прослѣвивъ ѡ просвѣти[въ]
блѣгарское цр(с)тво. паче вѣсѣхъ'
 цреи блѣгарскыихъ бывшѣихъ'
 прѣжде его...

... ѡ вѣса
 стѣхъ ѡ бж(с)твнѣхъ црквы,
 многыи дарми ѡдаривъ...
 ѡ свободѣ чистѣ на нихъ ѡбыа
вивъ. ѡ вѣсѣкъ сщенничѣскыи
чинѣ...

... ѡбно
вивъ патриаршѣство блѣгар'ск(а)
го цр(с)тва. тѣмже оубо ѡбновле
 нѣе сице бы(с)³⁶³.

The year 1235 is the earliest possible time when both the King and the Patriarch could have "enlightened the people". But it is possible, too, that Konstantin Kostenečki is referring to an earlier time, when the King, together with the Bishop of Tǝrnovo, partially reinstated the Church Slavic books (although not in the liturgy).

Konstantin Kostenečki definitely did not have in

363. M. G. Popruženko, Sinodik carja Borila (Bēlgarski starini, VIII), Sofia, 1928, p. 82-84.

mind King Ioan Šišman, King Ioan Aleksandər or Patriarch Euthymius as these enlighteners of the people. We know (and he must have known too) that during Ioan Aleksandər's time (1331-1371) the Bulgarian Church Slavic literature was in its second "Golden Age"³⁶⁴, while Konstantin talks of a time when "the letters were destroyed in Tərnovo". Jagić's identification of Euthymius with the Patriarch-enlightener was quite unmotivated, yet because of his great authority as a linguist (but hardly as a historian) this interpretation started travelling from book to book as an "established" fact.

d) In the last point of Konstantin Kostenečki's testimony, the only one that says anything concrete about the activities of Euthymius, the author hardly alludes to a reform by the Tərnovo Patriarch. The phrase НЪ НЕ ВЪ ПИСМЕНЕ^Х ѿСНОВАНІА (with misused cases) can be interpreted either as 'not on the basis of the letters' or as 'not on the basis of the literature', since the word ПИСМЕНА in Middle Bulgarian has the same ambiguity as the Greek grammata (cf. English letters). The second interpretation is the more likely, however, in the light of the introductory phrase: "And Кыр Euthymius was the most artistic one (ХОДОЖНѢЙШИИ) in these lands". Konstantin Kostenečki speaks of Euthymius' ability as a teacher rather than as a

364. I. Dujčev, K. Kuev, Bəlgarskata literatura prez XIV v., in: Istorija na bəlgarskata literatura, 1, Sofia, 1963, p. 267-284.

reformer. But he emphasizes that Euthymius, as Patriarch, had the power (which he himself did not have) "to lay down the fundamentals of learning". As far as Euthymius' prominence in the field of letters is concerned, Konstantin states plainly that "he did not make the effort" (and not не успел, as Jagić interpreted it) to leave even a partial instruction to future generations.

3.2.4. There was no spelling reform carried out by the 14th-century Bulgarian Patriarch, Euthymius of Tarnovo. His "orthographic" and "grammatical" reform of the Bulgarian literary language is one of those 19th-century myths, created in the literature at a time when very little was yet known about the entire epoch. Undoubtedly, Patriarch Euthymius was a prominent Bulgarian religious writer, translator and leader. We know many of his original writings and some of his translations (or revised editions of older translations) from Greek³⁶⁵. But there is considerable evidence that the Church Slavic language in Bulgaria had acquired a normalized orthography, grammar and lexicon long before Euthymius became patriarch, as will be shown.

365. E. Kažužniacki, Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius, Vienna, 1901, cxxiii + 450 pp.

P. A. Syrku, K istorii ispravlenija knjig v Bolgarii. II. Liturgičeskie trudy patriarxa Evtimija Ternovskogo, St. Petersburg, 1890, xcvi + 231 pp.

Evtimija patriarxa Ternovskogo služba prepodobnoj carice Teofane, St. Petersburg, 1900, 2 + xxvii + 15 pp.

V. Čorović, Poslanica bugarskog patrijarha Jevtimija Tismenskomu arhimandritu Nikodimu, Južnoslovenski filolog, XII, 1932-1934.

3.2.4.1. In the year 1370 Euthymius, not yet the Patriarch, translated from Greek some liturgies, rites and prayers, which he included in a book later known as the Služebnik of Patriarch Euthymius of Tǎrnovo³⁶⁶. Within the liturgies were short quotations from the Four Gospels which, most likely, Euthymius had translated afresh together with the rest of the texts. It would be fruitful to compare the language of Euthymius' translation of these short New Testament passages with the language of a previously existing Middle Bulgarian edition of the Four Gospels. A highly suitable text is that of King Ioan Aleksandǎr's Four Gospels of 1355-1356 (which will henceforth be referred to as IAG)³⁶⁷. IAG was selected for comparison with Euthymius' translation for two reasons: first, IAG was a new, revised edition, made for the King of Tǎrnovo, and thus must be one

366. This manuscript is kept today in the library of the Zograph Monastery on Mt. Athos, as MS # 1. In 1890 it was published by the Russian Slavist P. Syrku. Cf.:

P. Syrku, K istorii ispravlenija knig v Bolgarii. II. Liturgiĉeskie trudy patriarxa Evtimija Tǎrnovskogo, St. Petersburg, 1890, p. 1-109.

Someone wrote, with Arabic numerals, "lěto 1370" on the first page of the manuscript; Syrku, a recognized authority, accepted this date as correct (p. xiii).

367. The manuscript is kept today in the British Museum under the number 39627 (Parham Collection, MS XLV). Detailed information on the history of the manuscript and of the translation, ordered by King Ioan Aleksandǎr of Tǎrnovo, along with a discussion of the grammatical, lexical and orthographic peculiarities of the text, can be found in the present study under 3.4. and in Chapter 4. See also:

R. Scholvin, Einleitung in das Johann-Alexander - Evangelium, Archiv für slavische Philologie, 7, Berlin, 1884, pp. 1-56, 161-221.

of the best examples, for its time, of a Church Slavic language so correct as to be fit for a king; second, the scribe in his postscript dates the translation and copying of the manuscript to 1355-1356, which indicates that the language and the orthographic system employed in it are 15 years older than those of Euthymius' translation of 1370; thus the norms of IAG were the ideal of between 15 and 20 years before the time Euthymius supposedly introduced his reform (cf. 3.2.1. and 3.2.2.).

EUTHYMIUS³⁶⁸IAG³⁶⁹

ѣу^Г ѿ іѿ. (V, I - 4)

в' врѣ^М ѿ^Н. възыде іу^С въ
іер^Слмѣ. е^С же въ іер^Слмѣ^Х на
ѿвчі кѣпѣли. ѿже глѣ(тсѧ) ев-
реиски вивездѧ. пѧ^Т притворѣ
имаши. въ неи сълѣжаше мно^Ж-
ство мноѡго болаши^Х. слѣпы^Х.
хрѡмы^Х. соухы^Х. чаѣши^Х движе-
ніа воды. ѧггль бо бѣи по
всѣ врѣмена съхож^Даше въ
кѣпѣль, и възмѣщаше водѣ. и
ѿже оубо прѣвѣ вълѣзь по

възыде іѿ въ іер^Слмѣ.
ѣсть же въ іер^Слмѣ оу ѿвчѧ
кѣпѣли ѿже нарицает сѧ ев-
реиски вивездѧ. пѧть при-
творѣ имаши. въ тѣхъ сълежа-
ше множество болашихъ. слѣпы.
хромы. соухы. чаѣшихъ възмѣ-
щение водѣ. ѧггль бо гнѣ. по
всѣ лѣта съхож^Даше въ
кѣпѣль. и възмѣщаше водѣ. и
ѿже прѣвѣ вълазѣше по

368. P. Syrku, op. cit., p. 99-100.

369. The quotation is from a microfilm of the IAG original, kept in the British Museum (cf. fn. 367), p. 224-224 b.

възмѣщени <u>воды</u> зъ ^п равъ бѣваа- ше. ꙗцѣ ^м же недѣго ^м одрѣ- жи ^м бѣвааше +		възмѣщени <u>водѣ</u> . здравъ бѣваа- ше. ꙗцѣм же недѣгомъ одрѣ- жимъ бѣвааше.
---	--	--

At first glance, the differences in the two texts seem to be significant: they involve the use of different grammatical forms, often where the two forms had been in free alternation even in OCS (possessive genitive and possessive dative); choice of different prepositions expressing location (на vs. оу); alternative use of the past active participle or a past tense of the verb (dependent on another verb conjugated in the past tense, within the same compound sentence); and also grammatical agreement with different lexical items. Examples are:

въ ^ѣр^слмѣ ^х - въ ^ѣр^слмѣ

въ нѣи [=кѣпѣли] - въ тѣхъ [=пѣть притворъ]

чаѣщи ^х движеніа - чаѣшихъ възмѣщение

движеніа воды - възмѣщение водѣ

вълѣзь - вълазѣаше

по възмѣщени воды - по възмѣщени водѣ

на овчї кѣпѣли - оу овча кѣпѣли

In these two short parallel passages, the two translators use different Slavic words to render the Greek text. But the lexical differences are less numerous than the grammatical; they represent either full synonyms (бѣжи ~ гнѣ), or, in some instances, may reflect lexical differ-

ences in the Greek originals (cf. the numerous examples of Greek lexical differences in the texts of the New Testament, quoted by V. Jagić in the footnotes of his publication of the Codex Marianus):

г̃лѣ(тсѧ) - нарицает сѧ

мнѡ^жство мнѡго бѡла^шїи^х - множество болашихъ

бжїи - г̃нѣ

врѣмена - лѣта

оубо - —

In addition to these grammatical and lexical differences, one observes in IAG a case of disagreement in apposition, found sporadically throughout the Middle Bulgarian literary monuments including the original writings of Patriarch Euthymius (cf. his Vita of St. Ioan Rilski). In the text quoted above, the grammatically correct syntagma is found in Euthymius: бѡла^шїи^х. слѣпы^х. хромы^х. соухы^х. IAG has the incorrect apposition: болашихъ. слѣпы. хромы. соухы.

The more closely one compares parallel passages from Euthymius' translation and IAG, the better one comes to understand that, no matter how different their wording may appear, they actually represent the same literary language, allowing the same kinds of alternative lexical and grammatical forms, and applying the same orthographic principles:

eu^Гліе ѿ лоу^К: (X, I6 - 2I)

ре^Ч гъ своимь оученикѡ^М.

слошажи ва^С мене слоушае^Т.

и ѿмѣтажи са

васъ, мене са ѿмѣтае^Т. а

ѿметаѣ са мене, ѿметае са

пославшаго ма. възвратишѣ^С

.ѡ. съ радостиѣ

глаголюще. ги, и бѣси пови-

ноуѣт са намь о имени твоємь

ре^Ч же имь, видѣ^Х сатанѣ

нако мльнїѣ съ нѡсе^С падша.

се даа вамь вла^С настѣпати

на зьмїѣ и скорпїѣ.

и на вса силѣ вражіѣ. и

ничто же ва^С не врѣди^Т.

ѡбаче ѡ семь не ра^Пуйте са на-

ко доуси вамь повиноуѣт' са

ра^Пуйте же са како имена ва-

ша написана сѣтъ на нѡсе^Х.

въ тѣ ча^С възра^Пува са

слоушаѣ васъ, мене слоушае^Т.

и слошажи мене, слоушае^Т

пославшааго ма. и ѿмѣтажи са

васъ, мене са ѿмѣтае^Т. а

ѿметажи са мене, ѿметае са

пославшааго ма. възвратишѣ

же са седмь десѣтъ съ ра[до]-

стиѣ глаголюще. ги и бѣси пови-

ноуѣт са намь ѡ имени твоємь.

ре^Ч же имь Іс^С. видѣхѣ сатанѣ

нако мльнїѣ съ нѡсе^С падша:

се дахѣ вамь вла^С настѣпати

на зьмїѣ, и на скорпїѣ.

и на вса силѣ вражіѣ. и

ничто же васъ не врѣдитѣ.

ѡбаче ѡ семь не радоуйте са.

ра^Пуйте же са, како имена ва-

ша написана сѣтъ на нѡсе^Х.

въ тѣ часѣ възрадова са

370. P. Syrku, op. cit., p. 103.

371. From the manuscript of IAG, p. 169-169 b.

дѣхѡмь Іс̄ ӣ ре^ч. исповѣдоуа
ти сѧ ѡче̄ гѣи нѣси ӣ земли.
 нѧко оутайль еси сѧ ѡ прѣмжд-
ры^х ӣ разоумны^х. ӣ ѡкрыль
 еси младенцемь. еи ѡче̄. нѧко
 тако бы^с благоволеніе прѣ^д
 тобож: +

дѣхѡмь Іс̄, и ре^ч. исповѣда
 сѧ тебѣ ѡче̄. гѣи нѣси ӣ земли.
 нѧко оутайль еси сѣ; ѡ мжд-
рыхъ ӣ разоумныхъ. ӣ ѡкрыль
 еси младенцемь. еи ѡче̄ нѧко
 тако бы^с благоволение прѣ^д
 тобож.

The same sort of oscillations in the spelling of certain words are found in both texts. The ѡ of OCS is represented by а or ѡ (in free alternation). Euthymius has мльнѣѡ and даа, while IAG has мльнѣа and исповѣдаа сѧ (cf. мльнѣѡ, даѡ and исповѣдаѡ in Mar.). Both authors use in free alternation (although in different sentences) the long and short forms of the nominative singular masculine of the active participles. Euthymius has слоушаѣи, ѡмѣтаѣи сѧ, but also ѡметаѡ сѧ. IAG has слѡшаѣи, ѡметаѣи сѧ, but also слоушаѡ.

In one respect, the orthography of IAG is more consistent (and hence more regulated) than that of Euthymius: while Euthymius uses both spellings — мене сѧ ѡмѣтаѣ^т and ѡметаѣт сѧ, alternating ѣ and е in the same word form, the scribe of IAG is consistent in the use of the letter е in all forms of this verb in the passage quoted (for oscillations in other prefixed forms, cf. 4.3.4.11).

There is hardly anything in Euthymius' translation which would make his language, as a whole, stand out

as "more correct" Church Slavic than the language of IAG. While the scribe of IAG uses the correct OCS forms (spelled according to the Middle Bulgarian conventions) възрадова сѧ, ѡсповѣда сѧ, Euthymius uses newer, Middle Bulgarian dialectal forms such as възра^ѡува сѧ (influenced by the present tense), ѡсповѣдоуѧ ти сѧ (the classical Gospel texts have only ѡсповѣдаѧ or ѡсповѣмь (cf. the glossary and the variants cited in the footnotes of Mar.). This comparison of two passages from Euthymius and from an older Middle Bulgarian revised text should serve to show that Euthymius had no different (much less, better) grammatical and orthographic system to offer as a "reform" of the Middle Bulgarian literary language.

3.2.4.2. Against any possibility that Euthymius initiated a spelling and linguistic reform in the Church Slavic language in Bulgaria is the evidence of the Psalter of Kiprian³⁷². Until 1958, it was believed that the text of this Psalter was an original translation from Greek (or a revised copy from an older translation), done by Kiprian

372. Cf. our discussion in 2.3.2.2.; for more details on Kiprian's manuscript, kept today in the Lenin State Library of the USSR in Moscow, # ф. I37, Фунд. I42, see:

Arximandrit Amfiloxij, Čto vnes svjatoj Kiprian ..., Kiev, 1878, p. 238-241.

I. Mansvetov, Mitropolit Kiprian v ego liturgi-českoj dejatel'nosti, Moscow, 1882, p. 66-100.

J. Ivanov, Belgarskoto vlijanie v Rusija pri mitropolit Kiprian, Izvestija IBL, VI, Sofia, 1958, p. 37-47.

G. I. Vzdornov, Rol' slavjanskix monastyrskix masterskix pis'ma..., Literaturnye svjazi drevnix slavjan (Trudy ODRL, v. XXIII), Leningrad, 1968, p. 173-174.

himself; but J. Ivanov proved that Kiprian simply copied his Psalter from the Psalter of King Ioan Aleksandər (of 1337) or, which is less likely, from some unknown copy of the King's Psalter. Here, for illustration, are two very short parallel passages from the King's Psalter and from Kiprian's³⁷³.

KING'S PSALTER

KIPRIAN'S PSALTER

блажѣнь мѣжъ ѿже не ѿде на
сѣвѣтъ нечѣстивыхъ. ѿ на пѣ-
ти грѣшныхъ не ста. и на сѣ-
далищи гоубитель не сѣде. нѣ
въ законѣ гни волѣ его, ѿ въ
законѣ его поучит сѣ днь ѿ
нощъ. ѿ бѣдетъ ѿко дрѣво
саженоѣ при ѿсходищихъ во-
дамъ. ѿже плодъ сѣби дастъ
въ врѣмѣ своеѣ. ѿ листь его
не ѿпадетъ.

блаженъ мѣжъ ѿже не ѿде на
сѣвѣтъ нечѣстивыхъ. ѿ на пѣ-
ти грѣшныхъ не ста. ѿ на сѣ-
далищи гѣбитель не сѣде. нѣ
въ законѣ г^сни волѣ его. ѿ въ
законѣ его по^зучит сѣ днь ѿ
нощъ. ѿ бѣдетъ ѿко древо
саженно при исходищи во^д.
ѿже пло^д свои да^с
въ врѣмѣ свое. ѿ листь его
не ѿпаде^т.

The differences in the two texts are very few and extremely insignificant; without exception, they represent permissible alternative spellings and grammatical forms in the Middle Bulgarian Church Slavic of the 14th and 15th centuries — both before and after Euthymius. If

373. These passages are taken from the lengthy comparison made by J. Ivanov in his article:

J. Ivanov, op. cit., p. 38.

there had been a reform initiated and carried out in the years 1371-1375 by Euthymius, the Russian Metropolitan Kiprian, who is supposed to have been one of his most ardent followers, would not have taken to Russia in 1379 a Psalter copied from a "pre-reform" original dated positively to 1337. Some 40 years would have elapsed from the writing of King Ioan Aleksandər's Psalter to the alleged reform of Euthymius.

The reform of the religious writings in Bulgaria was a process, not the doing of a single person. It started at the very dawn of the literature: each new copy of a manuscript was either an improvement or a corruption compared with its original, depending on the knowledge of the copyist and the facilities of the library where he worked. Many scribes took part in this process, and it is impossible to list the names of the most decisive and influential of them. Almost the entire list of spelling reforms — rules and suggestions — ascribed by K. S. Mirčev to Euthymius, can be traced back to the beginning of the 14th century. These spelling rules, with the sole exception of that for the distribution of the two jer letters, and with some fluctuation in the treatment of the nasal vowel in word initial position, were consistently employed in many earlier manuscripts. One of these is the Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle, written for the Bulgarian king sometime after 1355-56 but before 1371 (though incorrectly iden-

tified in the literature as dating from 1345)³⁷⁴.

3.3. In the existing literature on the second South Slavic influence in the Russian culture and language, the "reform" of the Tarnovo Patriarch Euthymius is closely connected with the philosophy of the Hesychasts — Byzantine and Slavic. D. S. Lixačev links the Hesychasts' preoccupation with the word to their "reforming" activities: "To recognize a phenomenon means to express it by a word,

374. The date 1345 was established by the literary historian Jurdan Trifonov in his article "Beležki kəm srednobelgarskija prevod na Manasievata letopis", in Izvestija na Belgarskija Arxeologičeski Institut, II, 1923-24, p. 137-173. It has been accepted by other scholars, recently by Ivan Dujčev in his preface to the publication Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963. p. xxxv. Dujčev's reasoning is the following: "If we accept that the Moscow copy of the Chronicle was made in the last three months of 1344 and not earlier than the spring of 1345, we can presume with great probability that King Ivan Alexander's copy, which has traces of editorial changes, was copied and ornamented with miniatures at approximately the same time — most likely, at the end of the spring or during the summer of 1345."

However, neither author takes into consideration these very important data: page 2 of the Vatican copy is ornamented with a scene from the funeral of the King's son Ioan Asen, with an inscription above it: "The souls of the righteous are in the Lord's hands. The powers of heaven opened the heavenly gates to receive the soul of King Ioan Asen, son of the Great King Ioan Aleksander, being carried by angels." The original text reads as follows: дѣша праведны(х) въ рѣцѣ гни. нбснаа врат(а) ѡ силы нбсны ѡ(т)врѣзош(ж) приѣти дѣша носимѣ аггломъ Іѡана асѣнѣ црѣ. сѣна великаг(о) Іѡа. александра црѣ.

But the Four Gospels, written in 1355-56, **contain** on page 3, in the rightmost corner, a full-length portrait of that same Ioan Asen, which could only indicate that he was still living at that time, with the inscription: "King Ioan Asen, son of the King" - Іѡ. асѣ(н) црѣ. сѣнѣ. црѣвь. Therefore, the date 1345 is incorrect. The earliest that the Vatican copy of the Chronicle could have been written would be sometime after 1355-56.

to name it. Here is the source of their intolerant attitude toward any kind of errors, toward variants in the copies, toward corruptions in the translations. Here is the source of their exclusive attachment to literal translations"³⁷⁵. In the Church Slavic literature of the late 14th and 15th centuries, the religious concepts of Hesychasm were reflected in the writings of its creator, Gregory Sinaites, and his Byzantine and Slavic followers: the Patriarchs Callistes and Phylotheus of Constantinople, the Patriarch Euthymius of Tarnovo, and Camblak³⁷⁶. Lixačev, in his report to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists, gave a new interpretation of the second South Slavic influence, connecting it with Hesychasm as part of a supra-national pre-Renaissance. According to his concept, this pre-Renaissance, beginning in the second half of the 14th century, embraced the Slavic cultures in the Balkans and in Russia, the Byzantine culture on the European continent and partially also that in Asia Minor, as well as those Christian cultures in the Caucasus³⁷⁷.

3.3.1. It appears that the effort to call the revival of the South Slavic literatures in the 14th century, and of the Russian literature toward the end of that cen-

375. D. S. Lixačev, *Nekotorye zadači...*, p. 113.

376. I. Dujčev, *Centry vizantijsko-slavjanskogo obščeniya i sotrudničestva*, Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 127-128.

377. D. S. Lixačev, op. cit., p. 107-150.

tury, a "Renaissance" leads to misuse of the term. Lixačev's interpretation of the new South and East Slavic literary productivity and its relation to the Hesychast movement is met with reservations by H. Birnbaum:

Throughout the entire Byzantine period there were scholars and writers intimately familiar with the classical tradition. Since the role of this spiritual heritage in Byzantine intellectual history has not yet been fully identified, it may be somewhat premature to generalize and even tentatively to define anything like a "revival of classical antiquity" in Byzantium. There was never any need for the Byzantines to "discover" classical antiquity as something entirely new... This, among other things, explains one of the fundamental differences in the history of Byzantine civilization as compared to that of Western Europe in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance period ...³⁷⁸

The concept of Renaissance (and pre-Renaissance) is primarily connected with the philosophical interpretation of the Universe and Man's place in it. The first period in late Byzantine philosophy (until about 1340) is usually characterized by the feeling of superiority toward Westerners on the part of the Byzantine philosophers, as expressed particularly by Theodoros Metochites³⁷⁹. In the early 13th century some Byzantine writers and philosophers tried to write in the Attic dialect of the 5th - 4th centuries B. C., while there appeared in the chronicles the ancient Greek

378. H. Birnbaum, Some Aspects of the Slavonic Renaissance, The Slavonic and East European Review, XLVII, 1969, 108, p. 41.

379. F. Fuchs, Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter, Leipzig-Berlin, 1926, p. 53-54.

names for the months. At the same time philosophers like Metochites complained that after the ancients nothing new could be created in philosophy; the educated Byzantine readers were familiar with the ideas of pre-Christian thinkers, and had only contempt for the pseudo-philosophy of later times³⁸⁰. By mid-13th century Aristotle, once anathematized by the Church as a pagan, had become, in the eyes of the Byzantines, something close to a Christian prophet³⁸¹. And throughout the entire period of late Byzantine philosophy, the subject of philosophy was intertwined with that of rhetoric, never once outstepping the framework set by the ancients; as in ancient times, man continued very close to the center of the philosophical universe. The continuity with ancient Greece never ceased in Byzantine philosophy, although in different times the emphasis was placed on different questions: if in the ancient period a central problem was that of the origin and nature of matter, in the Byzantine philosophy of the 13th - 15th centuries a central problem was that of absolute causality in the development of societies - the problem of regularity and chance³⁸².

380. R. Guiland, Correspondance de Nicéphore Grégoras, Paris, 1927, p. 63.

381. F. Schultze, Georgios Gemistos Plethon und seine reformatischen Bestrebungen, Jena, 1874, p. 12.

382. F. Schultze, op. cit., p. 254-258.
E. Bréhier, Histoire de la philosophie, II, Paris, 1949, p. 232-261.

H. G. Beck, Theodoros Metochites. Die Krise des byzantinischen Weltbildes im XIV. Jh., Munich, 1952. p.15-42,

The South Slavic philosophers and religious leaders must have been aware of the developments in Byzantine philosophy, and especially so in Bulgaria after the break with the Roman Church in 1235. But from our inadequate knowledge of medieval Slavic literature in its entirety (cf. 2.4.3.) we do not today have reason to believe that the rationalistic and humanistic elements in Byzantine culture were in the mainstream of South Slavic spiritual life. What we know of 14th-century South Slavic literature represents, indeed, the opposite trend - mysticism - especially as reflected in the teachings of Gregory Palamas and Gregory Sinaites³⁸³. A telling piece of evidence is

p. 61-198.

Fr. Masai, Pléthon et la platonisme de Mistra. Les classiques de l'humanisme, Paris, 1956, p. 161-240.

I. Sevcenko, Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Chumnos. La vie intellectuelle et politique à Byzance sous les premiers Paléologues, Brussels, 1962, p. 191-245.

D. J. Geanakoplos, Byzantine East and Latin West, New York-Evanston, 1967, p. 124-125.

383. V. Sl. Kiselkov, Prouki i očerti po staro-bølgarska literatura, Sofia, 1956, p. 178-180.

J. Meyendorff, Introduction à l'étude de Gregoire Palamas, Paris, 1959, pp. 25-32, 55-58.

H.-G. Beck, Humanismus und Palamismus, Actes du XII-e Congrès International d'Études byzantines, I, Beograd, 1963, p. 78.

I. Dujčev, Centry ..., p. 127-128.

I. Dujčev, K. Kuev, Bølgarskata literatura prez XIV vek, in: Istorija na bølgarskata literatura, I, Sofia, 1963, p. 270-275.

S. Vryonis, Byzantium and Europe, London, 1967, p. 170.

G. M. Proxorov, Isixazm i obščestvennaja mysl' v vostočnoj Evrope, in: Literaturnye svjazi drevnix slavjan, Trudy ODRL, XXIII, Leningrad, 1968, p. 86-108.

the anathema of 1351, pronounced by both the Byzantine and the Bulgarian Church on the leaders of the reformist, pro-Western movement in the Balkans: Barlaam, Akintynos and the priest Proxor: акиндина варлаама. ѿ по̀па про̀хора кидѡнѣ, ѿже паче вѣсѣхъ ѣретикъ хоулнаа на ба ѿзглавші^х ... ѿ тѣмь единомждръны^х, анаѳема: ✕³⁸⁴.

3.3.2. In connection with the cultural interchange among the Slavic Orthodox nations (and, in a narrower sense, with the second South Slavic influence in Russia) a new concept has been propagated lately in the history of Slavic literatures - "Slavia Orthodoxa". It was first suggested by R. Picchio³⁸⁵. Even before formulating his term "Slavia ortodossa", in his study on the second South Slavic influence in Russia, R. Picchio writes that "the unity of the Orthodox Slavic culture throughout the entire Middle Ages was not based on government or national principles", and that one thus cannot speak of "the influence of one literature over another; one should rather speak of different phases of the same process of development"³⁸⁶.

384. M. G. Popruženko, ed., Sinodik carja Borila (Bēlgarski starini, VIII), Sofia, 1928, p. 95.

385. R. Picchio, Die historisch-philologische Bedeutung der kirchen-slavischen Tradition, Die Welt der Slaven, VII, Wiesbaden, 1962, p. 1-27.
_____, A proposito della Slavia ortodossa e della comunità linguistica slava ecclesiastica, Ricerche slavistiche, XI, Rome, 1963, p. 105-127.

386. R. Picchio, Storia della letteratura russa antica (in the series: Storia delle letterature di tutto il mondo), Milan, 1959, p. 142.

Such a concept as Slavia Orthodoxa presents three basic obstacles to a truly unified view of Church Slavic culture:

a) It excludes from what we know to be Church Slavic literature the old Moravo-Pannonian literature, the entire Croatian literature created in Church Slavic, and both the Bulgarian and the Russian Lithuanian literatures during their periods of union with the Roman Church. It disregards the existence of some ties between the literatures of the Catholic Slavic and the Orthodox Slavic nations (cf. the Vita of St. Václav in Russian literature).

b) It does not take into account that the Church Slavic literature and language were used by the Wallachian and Moldavian societies through the end of the 17th century, and that, perhaps, those Albanians living in the medieval Bulgarian and Serbian states also used them before their conversion to the Moslem religion.

c) It fails to see medieval Church Slavic literature as an integral part of the Byzantine one (although every national literature has its own national peculiarities). But throughout the Middle Ages, the local characteristics of the national Slavic cultures (including those of their literatures) are of secondary importance. R. Picchio is right in stressing the unity of the Slavic national cultures; but this unity can be understood only within the framework of the larger, multi-national Byzantine

cultural community, where the Greek literature and language played an undisputably major role³⁸⁷.

3.3.3. In analyzing the processes in the South Slavic literatures immediately before the beginning of the second South Slavic influence in Russia, an understanding of the role of the Balkan monasteries as centers of international exchange within the Byzantine supra-national communities is of extreme importance. In 1963 I. Dujčev published an interesting paper, with exhaustive bibliography, on the role of the monasteries of Constantinople and Mt. Athos in the process of disseminating Byzantine culture in the Slavic lands, depicting the true international spirit in these monastic communities³⁸⁸.

387. D. S. Lixačev, Drevneslavjanske literatury kak sistema, Slavjanske literatury (Doklady sovetskoj delegacii. VI Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov), Moscow, 1968, p. 5-48.

388. I. Dujčev, Centry vizantijsko-slavjanskogo sotrudničestva, Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 107-129.

See also these previously published important contributions to the problem of the international exchange and cooperation in the Balkan monasteries:

E. Kažužniacki, Aus der panegyrischen Literatur der Südslaven, Vienna, 1901, p. 35.

A. I. Sobolevskij, Južno-slavjanskoe vlijanie na rusSKUju pis'mennost' v XIV - XV vekax, Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV - XVII vekov, St. Petersburg, 1903, pp. 8-12, 24-34.

G. A. Il'inskij, Značenie Afona v istorii slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, ŽMNP, XI, St. Petersburg, 1908, p. 1-41.

A. Protič, Sveta Gora i bəlgarskoto izkustvo, Bəlgarski pregled, I, Sofia, 1929, 2, p. 249-276.

A. Solovjev, Histoire du monastère russe au Mont Athos, Byzantion, VIII, Brussels, 1933, p. 213-238.

R. Janin, Constantinople byzantine, Paris, 1950, p. 34-46.

And yet, in these international centers too, Greek monks played the leading role in the creation of the Byzantine culture and literature, while the Slavic monasteries and the Slavic monks in the Greek monasteries had as their main task, to follow closely the developments in the Byzantine centers and to translate into Church Slavic whatever seemed to them most important for the enlightenment and salvation of the Slavic reading public. Efforts to magnify the role of the Slavs in the Byzantine religious life and culture³⁸⁹ have put some scholars in awkward situations. I. Dujčev, for example, in his eagerness to demonstrate the active participation of Bulgarians in Byzantine Church affairs, discovered a Bulgarian on the Patriarch's throne in Constantinople³⁹⁰. According to Dujčev, in the second half of the 14th century Ioan Asěn, son of King Ioan Aleksander of Těrnovo, became a monk on Mt. Athos and, early in the 15th century, was elected Patriarch of Constantinople (1416-1439). The embarrassment arises from another, almost simultaneous publication by Dujčev: in 1962 he published a study on the miniatures of the Vatican copy of the Manas-

389. Cf., for instance, the statement by C. Korolevskij, that the Byzantine Church was "incorrectly called Greek", since it was predominantly Slavic:

C. Korolevskij, *Liturgie en langue vivante*, in: Orient et Occident, Paris, 1955, pp. 18, 25-26.

390. I. Dujčev, *Obrazi na bėlgarin ot XV v. vėv Florencija*, Izkustvo, 1, Sofia, 1961, p. 22-24.
_____, A propos de la biographie de Joseph II patriarche de Constantinople, Revue des études byzantines, XIX, Paris, 1961, p. 333-339.

ses Chronicle with color reproductions of the miniatures; in 1963 he published, in photocopy, the entire Manasses Chronicle with a 34-page preface³⁹¹. Yet he failed to notice the picture and accompanying text for the funeral of Ioan Asēn, who must have died before the book was finished, between 1355 and 1371 - at least 45 years before his supposed elevation to the Patriarchate (cf. fn. 374).

An interesting problem, involving the role of the monasteries on Mt. Athos in the second South Slavic influence in Russia, is the alternation of Bulgarian and Serbian leadership in the Slavic monastic communities during the 13th - 15th centuries. Until the mid-14th century the Bulgarians played the primary role in most of the monasteries, and the majority of the Slavic books of that time are of Bulgarian origin; but from the second half of the 14th century onward, the Serbians became the leading element in the Slavic communities, and the number of manuscripts of purely Serbian or of mixed Bulgarian-Serbian recension sharply increased, until by the early 15th century the Serbians dominated in all spheres of the cultural and religious life of these monasteries³⁹².

In connection with the literary activity in the

391. I. Dujčev, ed., Miniatjuri na Manasieva-ta letopis, Sofia, 1962, 138 pp.
 _____, ed., Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, xxxiv + 415 pp.

392. G. I. Vzdornov, Rol' slavjanskix masterskix pis'ma Konstantinopolja i Afona ..., p. 181-183.

Balkan monasteries before the second South Slavic influence began, it seems that the entire problem of the importance of Hesychasm in creating a new style in the hagiographic genre should be re-examined. A positive step in this direction is the paper by H. Birnbaum, 'Byzantine Tradition Transformed: the Old Serbian Vita'³⁹³. H. Birnbaum establishes the evolutionary development in the Serbian hagiographic genre from early 13th to early 15th century, and the corresponding Serbian impact on Slavic literature. The insistence on a very special role of the Hesychasts in the evolution of the "new" hagiographic style of 15th-century Russia de facto denies any purely Slavic developments in this genre, since the South Slavic Hesychasts are known to have been primarily followers of their contemporary Byzantine teachers.

3.4. The Church Slavic language of the 14th-century Bulgarian manuscripts, although having specific features which characterize it as Middle Bulgarian, is not the same in all literary monuments. The type of language in different works may, from the limited data available in publications and accessible manuscripts, be broken into three subgroups: a) revised OCS translations of the New Testament, Psalter, various Paterika, sections of the Old Testament, and books translated during the time of King Symeon; b) new-

393. H. Birnbaum, Byzantine Tradition Transformed: the Old Serbian Vita, in: Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change, H. Birnbaum and S. Vryonis, Jr., ed's., Hague: Mouton p. 243-284.

er translations of Byzantine (and perhaps other) authors, made after the 12th century. Here the most representative work is the Manasses Chronicle (translated between the early 13th and mid-14th centuries). In the same group should be included also the few known original works by Bulgarian writers, such as the works of Patriarch Euthymius, Grigorij Camblak, etc.; c) works of early secular literature, of which so far only one is known - the Tale of Troy (included in the Vatican copy of the Manasses Chronicle).

Samples of the spoken dialects, represented by the pripiski (notes) of semi-literate scribes in certain copies, cannot seriously be considered part of the literary language. Even today we do not study the speech of the ignorant in contemporary novels as part of our modern literary language, nor do normative grammars of the standard languages describe the grammatical structure of such speech. The notes of the scribes, although yielding most valuable data for historical dialectology, are, for the student of the history of the literary language, mostly indicators of how different that language was from the spoken dialects.

The language of the early secular literary works in Bulgaria, e.g. the Tale of Troy, is irrelevant to the problem of the second South Slavic influence in Russia. The language, representative not of the spoken dialects but of the colloquial language of the ruling classes in 14th-century Bulgaria, lacks the properties of a supra-national medium of communication.

The Middle Bulgarian literature which was understandable for the Russians (and thus suitable for copying by them) was that which followed as closely as possible the norms of Old Church Slavic.

It is extremely difficult to identify the literary works which were translated in Bulgaria between the 12th and the 14th century. Almost all of them are preserved in later Russian copies; the Russian copyists, beginning with those who first copied from the Middle Bulgarian prototypes, tried to replace new Middle Bulgarian grammatical forms, unfamiliar to Russian readers, with Russian Church Slavic forms. The same was done with characteristic Bulgarian or South Slavic lexical items (cf. 2.3.4.2. and 2.4.).

The most important role in the influence of the Middle Bulgarian literary language on the Russian literary language of the late 14th and early 15th centuries, was undoubtedly played by the most frequently used Church books - the New Testament and the Psalter. The text of the New Testament is the best for studying the developments in the Bulgarian literary language from late 10th - early 11th to mid-14th century in connection with the revising of the books in Bulgaria. One can best compare the evolution from the earliest known classical OCS texts (and also the Russian Ostromir Gospel) towards a well established, artificial but normalized literary language in mid-14th-century Bulgaria, by an examination of the peculiarities of the Ioan Aleksander Gospel (IAG).

3.4.1. The New Testament is the pivotal text of the Christian Church, the one that was most carefully preserved in copying and most scrupulously compared with the Greek originals. And still, as B. Conev notes in his Opis, there are no two single surviving manuscripts whose texts are fully identical³⁹⁴. It seems that every scribe tried to improve his own copy, to make it a more truthful translation of the available good Greek originals and to reconcile the translation with the then-existing dogmas of the Orthodox Church.

The most typical example of this process is the new "translation" of the Gospel in the year 1355/56, ordered by the Bulgarian king Ioan Aleksandør (1331-1371). We will give a full translation of the postscript to the manuscript, since this text is not readily available to American scholars:

Glory to God glorified in the Trinity, to him who fulfills every good beginning, which was begun in him, and who also gives an end after the beginning. This life-giving source of new virtue, of the sweetest teaching of Christ and of his godly witnesses, pupils and apostles, which is called the Four Gospels, was written not only with external color or gold, or decorated with well-spun linen or gems and pearls, but by the outpouring from within the Word of God, thus fulfilling the secret providence which is in the lordly and godly incarnation and miracle-making, which he did for us, due to his mercy and kindness, even to the Cross and burial and the glorious resurrection on the third day and the ascension. And who is content to count or to narrate in order all the things in it which are

394. B. Conev, ed., Opis na røkopisite i staropečatnite knigi na Narodnata biblioteka v Sofija, Sofia, 1910, p. vii-ix.

a reflection of Christ's deeds, which truly are like a spring in waterless land, that whoever drinks from it in his thirst will never thirst again. Because its stream runs and gives pleasure to the soul, gives joy to both the heart and the mind, and it is like a hidden treasure in the field of the heart.

When the devout and Christ-loving, supreme and God-ordained King Ioan Aleksandər sought this (Gospel), lying as it were like a lamp in a dark place, forgotten and placed aside in carelessness by the ancient kings, he found it. This Christ-loving King Ioan Alexandər found it by the will of the Lord, and after he translated it from the Greek words into our Slavic language he copied it and displayed it openly. He wrought it on the outside with gold plates and decorated it on the inside by the labor of painters with life-bringing images of the Lord and His glorious disciples (painted) in bright colors and gold, for the strengthening of his kingdom.

Just as the emperor Constantine, great amongst the saints, and his mother Helene took from the earth the lifegiving cross of the Lord, thus did this King with these Four Gospels. Then he held the scepter of the Bulgarian and Greek kingdom with his devout, glory-crowned and newly-enlightened Queen, the Lady Theodora - which means 'the Lord's Gift' - and with his first-born and much beloved son King Ioan Šišman, to the glory of the Creator of all and His evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. May he, through their prayers, receive victory from God over the enemies who fight against him, and (may he) break their heads under his feet. Amen.

The current year is 6864 (1355/56), indict 9, and the slave of the Lord my king, who wrote this book, is called Symon the Monk. (see Appendix Six).

The manuscript, kept today in the British Museum (cf. fn. 367), is written on fine parchment; it consists of 284 leaves, generally in gatherings of eight, with text on both sides of each leaf. The average plain page has from 21 to 33 lines. The manuscript includes 365

miniatures, comprising scenes from the New Testament and portraits of the Bulgarian king and his family. The illustrations from the New Testaments are from the same series as that of the Greek manuscript numbered # 74 in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, described by H. Bordier³⁹⁵. The British Museum has prepared a comparison with this manuscript based on the publication by H. Omont: Evangelies avec peintures byzantines du XI^e siècle, 2 vol's., 1908³⁹⁶. Eight miniatures from Omont's manuscript are not included in the Slavic copy, which is also missing the original page 75 (containing Matthew XXV. 39-46) which might have had a picture of the Last Judgment. On the other hand, the Slavic manuscript contains, at the end of the book of Luke, four miniatures not known in the Greek copy. On page 3 the Slavic manuscript represents the King's family, from left to right: the queen ("Theodora, faithful to Christ our Lord, and newly enlightened queen and sovereign of all Bulgarians and Greeks"), the crown prince ("King Ioan Šišman, son of the Great King Ioan Aleksandər"), the king ("King Ioan Aleksandər, faithful to Christ our Lord, and

395. H. Bordier, Peintures et autres ornements dans les MMS grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1883, p. 133.

396. For more information on this subject, see: B. Filov, Die Miniaturen des Ev. Iwan Alexanders in London, Byzantion, IV, 1927-1928, p. 313-319. _____, Londonskoto evangelie na Ivan Aleksandər i negovite miniatjuri, Spisanie BAN, XXXVIII, Sofia, 1929, p. 1-32.

_____, Les miniatures de l'Evangile du roi Ivan Alexandre à Londres, in: Monumenta Artis Bulgariae, 3, Sofia, 1934.

Sovereign of all Bulgarians and Greeks") and the other son ("King Ioan Asǎn, son of the king"). On page 2b are portraits (also full-length) of the king's daughters and son-in-law (from left to right): "Despot Konstantin, son-in-law of the Great King Ioan Aleksandǎr; the Despot's wife Kera Themar, daughter of the King; Keraca, daughter of the King; Desislava, daughter of the king."

This manuscript had an interesting history in the last decades of the 14th century. Being hard pressed, perhaps in the difficult months of the last defense of the Bulgarian capital against the victorious Turks, or, possibly, in exile after the fall of Tǎrnovo (summer 1393)³⁹⁷ the Bulgarian royal family deposited their Gospel as security on a loan. They were never able to repay that loan, and the Moldavian king Alexander the Good (1402-1432) paid the money to the lender and became the new owner of the Gospel. Thus a scribe wrote on page five of the manuscript: "The son of Stefan Voevoda, Ioan Alexander, faithful to Christ our God, Voevoda and lord of the entire Moldavian land, bought these Four Gospels, which had been kept as security; may God forgive his sins and give him eternal life, and many years of life here (below)"³⁹⁸ The book was most

397. Bǎlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bǎlgarija, 1, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), p. 244.

398. Here follows the original text from p. 5 of the MS in Moldavian Church Slavonic of the 15th century:

+ снѣ стѣѣ[a](н)а воѣводе
+ Іѡанѣ алеѣ(а)нд(рѣ) въ х(с)а ба вѣрны воѣ-

likely kept in Moldavia or Wallachia until the late 17th or early 18th century, when the Wallachian Voevoda Konstantin Bankobano (1688-1714) established the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul on Mt. Athos. In the early 19th century, Sir Robert Curzon received the Gospel as a gift from the Greek administration of the monastery, in recognition of his involvement in the Greek liberation movement and of his financial aid to the monastery. After Lord Curzon's death (1873), the manuscript was inherited by the British Lord Zouche³⁹⁹, and in the 1920's the last private owner of the manuscript, the widow of Lord Parham, donated it to the British Museum, where it is preserved today.

This translation was prepared for the King's library and made available to the reading public. According to the postscript, the king "found it by the will of the Lord, and having translated it, he copied it from the Greek into our Slavic language and displayed it openly." Our studies of the manuscript will show that the new translation created virtually a different version of the Four Gospels, although at first glance the text seems to be very close to the already-known "classical" and mid-Bulgarian texts⁴⁰⁰.

вода ѿ г(с)нь. вьсей земли мльдоуской ѿткоупи сѣ тетро-
 еугль. що є бѣль ѿ залогѣ. бѣ да га прости. ѿ да моу дарѣ
 живо(т) вѣчны ѿ здѣ мно(г)[о]лѣтны живо(т).

399. B. Conev, Istorija na bēlgarskij ezik, 1 Sofia, 1940 (2nd edition), p. 196-197.

400. There is a rich collection of Middle Bulgarian gospels from the 12th to the 15th century (as well as from later periods) in the Bulgarian National Library "Kiril i Metodij" (for bibliography cf. fn. 403).

Since we are dealing with the most sacred of all sacred books of the Christian Church, we may ask ourselves about the role of the official Church authorities in the revision. The Postscript emphasizes the role of the monarch in the translation and mentions the name of the scribe "who wrote this book" - Symon the Monk. This, however, is an ambiguous statement: did Symon merely copy the drafts of the revised edition, or was he the head of a group of translators, or did he translate the book all by himself and then have someone else do the mechanical copying?

A careful examination of other books belonging to King Ioan Aleksandər reveals a striking similarity of handwriting in five famous manuscripts: the Služebnik from Mt. Athos (cf. fn. 72), the Sbornik of 1348⁴⁰¹, the so-called Tomic΄ Psalter (cf. fn. 50), the Manasses Chronicle (Vatican

401. After the fall of Tarnovo (1393) the Sbornik might have been taken to Moldavia or Wallachia, and sometime between 1649 and 1655, taken to Russia (together with 700 other old Greek and Slavic manuscripts) by the envoy of the Muscovite Patriarch Nikon, Arsenij Suxanov. (See: S. Belokurov, Arsenij Suxanov, v. I, Moscow, 1891, p. 408). In 1863 the book became part of the I.P. Saxarov collection of the Public Library in Petersburg (Leningrad Public Library, Number F.I.376).

A brief discussion on the language can be found in: B.M. Ljapunov, "Neskol'ko zamečanj o jazyke i v osobennosti o slovare bolgarskogo sbornika 1348 g.", Sbornik Miletič, Sofia, 1933, p. 95-107. See also: I.I. Sreznevskij, Svedenija i zametki, XXXVI, p. 43-45; P. Syrku, K istorii ispravlenija knig v Bolgarii v XIV veke, v. I, pt. 1, St. P., 1896, p. 430-432.

Eight pages of the manuscript, precisely those of the treatise On the Letters by Černorizec Xrabər, are given in photoreproduction by K. Kuev in Černorizec Xrabər, Sofia, 1967, p. 421-428.

copy) from the second half of the 14th century, and IAG. Similarities include the shape of the letters, the shape and character of the ligatures and of the superscripts used for abbreviation, as well as the spelling and grammar (cf. fn. 72). Still, a difficulty arises from the fact that the King's Sbornik of 1348 is believed to have been copied by the monk Lavrentij, whose name appears in the postscript to the manuscript. But on close examination the statement in the postscript is seen to be by no means a reference by the copyist to himself. It calls this book the "burden and pain of the most sinful, as is usually said, hermit Lavrentij"⁴⁰². The tone of the postscript is one of praise for the work of Lavrentij; expressions such as "burden and pain" and "most sinful, as is usually said" indicate a reverence toward Lavrentij and his work which could only have been expressed by someone else. The peculiarities of Symon's handwriting are so typically his, that there can be no doubt that it was Symon the Monk who was the King's copyist.

3.4.2. The language of IAG was thoroughly studied in the last century (1884) by the Slavist R. Scholvin (cf. fn. 367), but has been outside the interest of Bulgarian students of the history of their language. Such neglect has doubtless been motivated by the extreme correctness of the language of IAG, which gives little evidence of developments

402. The entire postscript is published in:
 P. Lavrov, Obzor zvukovyx i formal'nyx osoben-
nostej bolgarskogo jazyka, Moscow, 1893. p. 13.

in the Bulgarian dialects of the 14th century. For just that reason, however, this new translation of the text of the Four Gospels is of extreme importance for the study of developments in the Bulgarian literary language, especially in relation to the second South Slavic influence in Russia. The Russian copyists in the Balkan monasteries must have been interested only in perfect Church Slavic manuscripts, whose texts were correct translations from the Greek originals and whose language was a correct Church Slavic, as free as possible from local features.

Scholvin's study of the language of IAG concentrates mainly on the morphological peculiarities, paying little attention to the phonology and none at all to the lexical features. And yet, his monograph is an excellent introduction (as he himself entitles it - 'Einleitung') to this manuscript.

In my own study of the language of IAG, I have concentrated on two aspects: first, the orthographic system followed in the manuscript, and its relationship to the Church Slavic phonology of 14th-century Bulgaria (and partially to the phonology of the Bulgarian dialects of the time); second, the systematic lexical changes found in the text by a comparison with the classical OCS Gospel texts. In studying the grammatical structure, my findings largely coincided with Scholvin's, and I will report here only on those morphological and syntactic innovations which are not dealt with in Scholvin's monograph.

As far as lexical changes are concerned, I discovered that in more than 1500 cases there was some kind of lexical innovation in comparison with the classical Gospel texts. The results of my study in this respect cannot be fully reported here because of a lack of space; I will summarize in brief the major types of lexical innovations only.

In regard to the orthography of IAG, my presentation will be very detailed: thorough study of the text has convinced me that the literary language of 14th-century Bulgaria in its best instances had strict spelling rules, and by no means represented all features of the Bulgarian dialects of the time; on the contrary, its orthography was much less influenced by the speech of the scribe than was that of the known OCS texts. I hope my findings on the orthographic regularities of this manuscript will convincingly support my contention that the Bulgarian orthography of 1355 did not need a "reform" by the Patriarch of Tarnovo in 1371-1375. Having proved that such a reform was not needed, and having searched in vain for any positive historical evidence that it occurred, we may with some confidence assert that, indeed, it never did.

C h a p t e r F o u r

SPELLING AND PHONOLOGY, GRAMMATICAL AND LEXICAL INNOVATIONS
IN THE REVISED EDITION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS (IAG)

4.1. All of the existing monographs on Middle Bulgarian manuscripts examine the spelling of the texts and try to relate the spelling mistakes to the phonology of the scribe's dialect. Bulgarian scholars usually assign the manuscripts to certain orthographic schools. Such a tradition was set up by Benjo Conev, and employed by him in his publication of literary monuments in Bəlgarski starini and the first two volumes of his Opis⁴⁰³. A detailed outline of the spelling schools can be found in the preface to Vračansko Evangelie⁴⁰⁴.

4.1.1. A traditional distinguishing principle in determining the orthographic school is the use of the jers. According to some obvious rules of their use, the schools are divided into those with regulated and those with unregu-

403. B. Conev, Opis na rəkopisite i staropečatnite knigi na Narodnata biblioteka v Sofija, I, Sofia, 1910, 555 + xviii pp.

B. Conev, Opis na slavjanskite rəkopisi v Sofijskata narodna biblioteka, II, Sofia, 1923, 552 + lii pp.

M. Stojanov, Xr. Kodov, Opis na slavjanskite rəkopisi v Sofijskata narodna biblioteka, III, Sofia, 1964, 497 + xi pp.

In volume I of his Opis (p. ix), B. Conev simply lists six orthographic schools without elaboration.

404. B. Conev, Vračansko Evangelie (Bəlgarski starini, 4), Sofia, 1914, p. 13-15.

lated spelling. B. Conev distinguished four schools with regulated spelling:

Schools (West Bulgarian) using only one jer:

- a) The Oxrid School, using only ѣ.
- b) The Zletovo School, using only ѣ.

Schools using two jers:

a) The East Bulgarian (perhaps Tarnovo) Etymological School, which "actually maintained the Old Bulgarian etymological tradition, as much as it could be supported by the living language"⁴⁰⁵.

b) The East Bulgarian (perhaps Tarnovo) Two-jer School, which implemented "a mechanical, stereotyped (šablonna) differentiation between ѣ and ѣ, where ѣ is used in such positions (root syllables) where both ѣ and ѣ have an indefinite sound (tamen zvuk), and ѣ in all positions (roots, suffixes, endings) where neither ѣ nor ѣ has any sound value"⁴⁰⁶.

In addition to these four regulated schools, Benjo Conev establishes the existence of two more unregulated ones:

a) The Oxrid-Zletovo School, using ѣ and ѣ "without a rule, but with some traces of the West Bulgarian School"⁴⁰⁷.

405. op. cit., p, 14.

406. ibid.

407. ibid.

b) A continuation of the old tradition (?) - "those monuments where there are traces of the Eastern (Tarnovo) School"⁴⁰⁸.

Such a division of the orthographic schools cannot possibly be accepted today. We do not see any significant distinction among the four schools using both jers. In our opinion, the only reasonable (but hardly essential) division would be into two schools, one using one jer, the other using two.

King Ioan Aleksander's Gospels use both jers, and since this text was specially written for the Tarnovo king, it should be considered representative of the Tarnovo orthographic school of the second half of the 14th century. However, in order to establish the principles of its spelling, one must study in detail more than just the rules of usage for the jers. We shall try to outline the basic principles of the spelling system, as well as variations of, or deviations from them, and whenever possible to draw some conclusions as to the phonological system of the literary language.

4.1.2. Students of Church Slavic possess a valuable monument of the Slavic alphabet - the treatise on the letters by Černorizec Xrabər (of the 10th or 11th century). The oldest preserved manuscripts⁴⁰⁹ are from the

408. ibid.

409. K. Kuev, Černorizec Xrabər, Sofia, 1967, pp. 166, 187-210.

14th and 15th centuries. This work is of extreme importance in determining the number and character of the letters in the mid-14th century, since even the reformer of the Serbian spelling - Konstantin Kostenečki (15th century) - establishes the number of the letters in the Serbian alphabet as 38, the very number laid down by Xrabər⁴¹⁰.

The existing copies of Xrabər's article fall into two groups: those which simply give the number of the letters in the Slavic alphabet as 38, and those which both give the number 38 and list the letters. We shall take into consideration only the four oldest copies with Middle Bulgarian features: Sava's copy (Bulgarian-Serbian of the 15th century)⁴¹¹, the Moscow copy (Bulgarian-Russian of the 15th century)⁴¹², the Moldavian copy (Bulgarian of the 16th century)⁴¹³, and the Wrocław copy (Bulgarian-Russian of the 16th century)⁴¹⁴.

Unfortunately, considerations of which alphabet - glagolitic or cyrillic - the author had in mind, and of whether the listing of the letters was part of the author's text, although very interesting in themselves, are outside

410. V. Jagić, Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum (photo-reprint), Munich, 1968, pp. 111, 204-205.

411. K. Kuev, op. cit., p. 195-197.

412. op. cit., p. 191-194.

413. op. cit., p. 210-214.

414. op. cit., p. 214-217.

the scope of this study⁴¹⁵. The important fact for us is that Bulgarian writers of the 14th - 15th centuries believed that the Slavic alphabet had 38 letters, and that some of them perhaps compiled their own lists of the complete alphabet. The text of the Moscow copy is obviously unreliable: after stating that 24 of the Slavic letters are taken from Greek, the scribe proceeds to illustrate with 28 letters, some of which are repetitions and some, like хль (!), pure inventions. The final count comes to 43, although the scribe asserts more than once that the alphabet has 38 letters.

The other three texts are completely identical in their listing of the alphabet. We shall quote the passage from the Moldavian copy (16th century), since this monument contains many archaic features⁴¹⁶:

«4. - сѣ^ж сж^т писмена словѣнскаа сѣце и^х по^дбае^т
 писати и глашати. а̃. б̃. в̃. да^ж до а̃⁴¹⁷ и ѿ си^х сж^т
 четыре меж^ду деса^тма по^дбна гръ^чскы^м писмен^ω. сж^т же сѣ.
 а̃. в̃. г̃. д̃. е̃. з̃. и̃. ѿ̃. і̃. к̃. л̃. м̃. н̃. љ̃. о̃. п̃. р̃. с̃. т̃. у̃.
 ф̃. х̃. ѱ̃. ѿ̃. ѧ четыринадеса^т по словѣнскомѣ азѣкоу и^ж сж^т
 сѣ̃. ѿ̃. ж̃. в̃. ц̃. ч̃. ш̃. щ̃. ѣ̃. ы̃. ъ̃. ѣ̃. ю̃. ѧ̃. Ѧ̃.»

415. op. cit., p. 47-48.

416. op. cit., pp. 54, 211.

417. In the other two copies the letter is given, correctly, as ѧ̃.

In their effort to present an alphabet of exactly 38 letters, the scribes ignore the ligatures ia, ie, oy or o and render the Greek upsilon as y instead of u (which also occurs in the classical texts), although all three manuscripts use these ligatures as well as the upsilon of the form u. It is noteworthy, however, that they list the two jers as two separate letters, and the u and iu as letters rather than ligatures. The only conclusion one can draw from the list is that in the minds of those men y and u were only variants of the same letter, upsilon; while the ligatures represented not letters, but combinations of letters, and thus, in the Greek tradition, had no place in the alphabet.

4.1.3. In determining the orthographic system of a time one must raise the question: what was the relation between the letters and the phonemes or morphonemes of the literary language? In this respect there are almost insurmountable difficulties. In the consonantal phonemes there is no clear indication from the alphabet as to whether the consonants were paired on the basis of palatalization. One might draw certain conclusions from the distribution of the letters h and iu about the character of the preceding consonant, but nothing definite can be said concerning the neutralization of palatalization in consonantal clusters or at word end. The present-day Bulgarian dialects give contradictory data on the subject, and even if they were uniform, one could hardly accept their evidence

in question⁴¹⁹. Their only clue to the grammar must have been the existing copies of the holy books. Thus, we may assume that the better those copies were, the better chance the scribes had to generate an adequate Church Slavic grammar.

The text under consideration - the Four Gospels of King Ioan Aleksandər - represents without any doubt a superb implementation of the 14th-century idea of Church Slavic (and an excellent example of the Middle Bulgarian literary language). If the grammatical properties and stylistic norms of this language could be determined, it would be possible to describe the ideal system of the 14th-century literary language in Bulgaria, and then to establish the changes that had occurred in it over the previous centuries.

The following approach to the spelling is proposed: to postulate a tentative set of morphonemes and to examine their relationship to the letters used to represent them.

4.1.6. In determining the morphonemic status of certain items we must outline a broader theoretical framework. As has already been mentioned, the identifica-

419. It was believed in the mid-19th century that the treatise "On the eight parts of speech" was written by John Damascene and translated into OCS by John the Exarch (10th century). V. Jagić rejected this identification of both author and translator, and derived the numerous 17th - 18th-century Russian copies from a much later Serbian translation.

tion of phonemes in Jakobsonian terms⁴²⁰ in the 14th-century Church Slavonic used in Bulgaria, is an impossible task. We must seek a more abstract level of representation for the underlying segments, since we cannot identify either the vowel alternations due to stress shifts, or neutralizations in voicing at morpheme boundaries. The real problem is how abstract the representation should be and what quantitative relationship will obtain between items and rules. One possible stand, advocated in its extreme by T. Lightner⁴²¹, is to reduce the number of items to the absolute minimum and to expand the number of rules. Thus, one must discard as useless to the abstract representation items such as {ʒ}, {c}, {ž}, {š}, and {č}, as well as the soft counterparts of the rest of the consonants, since they are predictable provided the number of vocalic items is drastically increased. Just this happens in Lightner's system, where he expands the number of units again (e.g. tense vs. lax vowel series). Counting the overall number of items, consonantal and vocalic, one would hardly find a significant reduction. But as a result one must increase the number of rules necessary to yield the final phonetic string. Such a method may be useful in linking derivation

420. R. Jakobson, Remarques sur l'évolution phonologique du russe comparée à celle des autres langues slaves, Prague, 1929, 188 pp.

_____, On Slavic Diphthongs Ending in a Liquid, Word, 8, 1952, p. 2-6.

421. T. M. Lightner, On the Phonology of Old Church Slavonic Conjugation, IJSLP, X, 1966, p. 1-28.

with flexional morphology, but may also obliterate the morphonemic alternations in the language at a given stage, since they will simply be listed as consecutive rules for the terminal phonetic representation. Most objectionable of all, such an approach completely disregards the conscious awareness of the users of a language, which is a powerful force in creating microsystems based on not-so-deep structure analogies. A linguistic description must be able to account for this factor. If the underlying representation of польса were {pol'ig-}, one could never explain the existence of the adjective полéзный instead of *полéжный.

In this study we follow approximately the system outlined in M. Halle's Sound Pattern of Russian⁴²², with slight modifications. The palatal consonants, anywhere else but at a morpheme boundary with suffixes or desinences, are treated as morphonemes, with the exception of {c} and {ʒ}. When {c} and {ʒ} immediately precede such a morpheme boundary, they are morphonemes, while [č], [ž], [š], [žd] and [št] are predictable outcomes of the velar consonants and the dental stops plus jod. The phonetic outcome of the ending {...k-i_{Nom.pl.masc.}} is [...c-i], while that of the ending {...k-i_{Acc.pl.}} is [...k-i]; this alternation is not phonologically, but morphologically, motivated. But if the suffix {-#c-} is represented as {-#k-}, one needs complicated and highly artificial rules not merely to turn {k}

422. M. Halle, The Sound Pattern of Russian, The Hague, 1959, 206 pp.

into [c] throughout the nominal paradigm, but to associate that paradigm with that of the soft declensions.

For the purposes of derivational morphology, only two rules need be introduced:

Rule 1: Before a morpheme boundary which turns hard consonants into soft, {c} > [č] and {3} > [ž].

Rule 2: Before the suffix {-in,-}, which forms substantives denoting female persons, {c} > [k] and {3} > [g].

4.2. The consonantal morphonemes. Most of the consonantal morphonemes are paired by voicing: {b} ~ {p}; {d} ~ {t}; {3} ~ {c}; {z} ~ {s}; {ž} ~ {š}; {g} ~ {k}. Unpaired are: {č}, {x} and {θ} and the sonorants {m}, {n}, {l}, {r}.

It is likely that {f} was at that time already established as a morphoneme in both the dialects and the literary language, as evidenced by the numerous Greek borrowings containing it. It is clear that the obstruent {f} was paired with the glide {v} in a voicing opposition: власѢИМИѢ (Mar.) → власВИМИ (p. 79). The possible morphonemic status of {θ} in the literary language will be discussed later.

Since the text of IAG has very few new words compared with the known glagolitic texts, we shall omit the problem of the distribution of the consonantal phonemes, which belongs rather to the description of "classical" Church Slavic.

4.2.1. In word-final position, except in prepo-

sitions, the spelling always represents the underlying morphoneme, and no neutralization in voicing is expressed. The only exception is the word кладѣсь (Zogr.) → бѣ же тоу́ кладѣць іаковль. (p. 221, John IV.6). In this case, however, we may be dealing with a reinterpretation of the final consonant on the model of the suffix {-#c-}⁴²³ (see the parallel studenec ~ kladec): in some modern Bulgarian dialects, as well as in the standard language, the word exists as kladenec. Nor does the spelling express any neutralization in voicing at the enclitic boundary with бо and же, although the presence of же as an enclitic makes the use of a jer optional as a word-end marker: дасть же прѣдажи е́го знамение (p. 127b, Mark XIV.44); іс же ставъ прѣдъ ігемѡномъ (p. 80b, Matth. XXVII.11); свѣт же створше (p. 80b, Matth. XXVII.7); дхъ бс бѣдръ, а́ плть немощна (p. 127, Mark XIV.38); свазѣтъ бо брѣмена тажка (p. 66b, Matth. XXIII.4).

While discussing these problems of consonantal neutralization in different positions within the word, we do not necessarily imply that this phenomenon occurred in all positions discussed. The situation in today's Slavic dialects, in particular those of Ukrainian and Serbocroatian,

423. The marker {#} represents a morphoneme which will be called in this dissertation "the fleeting vowel {#}". For detailed discussion cf. 4.3.6.

should make us very cautious in our approach to the entire problem. (Since, as will be seen, the spelling rarely reflects neutralization, one may with equal plausibility assert mutually incompatible hypotheses: that neutralization at morpheme boundaries, as a morphonological phenomenon, existed consistently, partially, or not at all, with or without concomitant compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel.)

4.2.2. The problem of voicing neutralization within a word is more complex. At different types of morpheme boundaries, the spelling represents it differently:

4.2.2.1. No voicing or devoicing occurs at suffix boundaries. A few examples will illustrate:

a) Suffix {-#b-}: татбы. оби́ды. лжкѣвства.
(p. 106, Mark VII.22).

b) Suffix {-#k-}: что азкаа врата ѥ тѣсныи пѣть.
(p. 22b, Matth. VII.14); ѥ острии въ пѣти гладкыж.
(p. 145, Luke III.5); ѥ брѣма мое лѣгкое ѥсть: (p. 35b, Matth. XI.30).

c) Suffix {-#c-}: ѥ сѣтворѣ ва ловца члкомь.
(p. 89b, Mark I.17).

d) Suffix {-#č-#n-}: бѣхж отагчени сѣномь.
(p. 166, Luke IX.32); бѣствъ бо очи ихъ отагченѣ. (p. 77b, Matth. XXVI.43).

e) Suffix {-#sk-}: кнѣжники лю^дскыѣ. (p. 9, Matth. II.4).

f) Suffix {-#stv-}: молитѣ же сѧ да не бѣдетъ бѣгство ваше зимѣ ни въ сѣботѣ. (р. 70b, Matth. XXIV.20); разоумѣв же ꙗко лжкавство ихъ. рече. (р. 65, Matth. XXII.18); ꙗко множества рыбъ. (р. 270b, John XXI.6); и множество много людий. (р. 154, Luke VI.17); ꙗко сѣво же рождство сѣце бѣ. (р. 8, Matth. I.18). Of the last few cases only бѣгство offers definite proof that the neutralization was not expressed at this morpheme boundary. There is a strong possibility (cf. details below) that in cases such as множество and рождство there was an inserted vowel. (As far as лжкавство is concerned, the glide {v} must have been paired in voicing with the obstruent {f}; compare also власвими, (in 4.2.).

g) The word ковчегъ is always spelled with в although it is hard to imagine that the speakers treated the segment -ѣег- as a suffix: въниде нбе въ ковчегъ. (р. 71b, Matth. XXIV.38); въниде ное въ ковчегъ. (р. 190, Luke XVII.27).

4.2.2.2. At a boundary with grammatical endings, devoicing occurs only before the infinitive ending {-ti}: и абие оубѣди ꙗко оученики своѣ вълѣсти въ корабль. (р. 44b, Matth. XIV.22).

But compare the situation before the past active participle ending: и вълѣшоу ꙗкоу въ корабль. (р. 26, Matth. VIII.23); гжбѣ же наплънивше оца на трѣсть възнѣше, придѣшѣ къ оустомъ него. (р. 226b, John XIX.29);

и ѡшедше скоро ѡ гроба. (p. 85b, Matth. XXVIII.8).

4.2.2.3. The spelling is very complex at the prefix or preposition boundary. Only prefixes and prepositions ending in a consonant or the fleeting vowel {#} will be treated here. The major distinction in the orthography is made on the basis of the initial morphoneme of the word (or morpheme) following the preposition (or prefix).

I) Prepositions or prefixes before consonants.

a) Preposition or prefix ending in an obstruent stop or the fleeting vowel {#}. No neutralization in voicing is reflected by the spelling (thus the spelling is morphonemic). In almost all cases, making this the rule, the preposition (or prefix) is separated from the following morphemes by a jer, either front or back⁴²⁴.

{k#}, preposition only: йдѣ ѡ приидѣ къ вамѣ

(p. 254b, John XIV.28); сѣбралѣ сѣ къ дверемѣ (p. 90b,

Mark I.33); ѡ сѣвъпрашаахѣ сѣ друзѣ къ другоу (p. 149,

Luke IV.36).

{nad#-}, not registered as a prefix in IAG: на^д

челѣди^с своѣ. (p. 178, Luke XII.42).

{pod#-}, both preposition and prefix: сѣбираетѣ

къ кошѣ птенца своѣ подѣ крилѣ (p. 69b, Matth. XXIII.37);

не иматѣ где главы подѣ клонити (p. 25b, Matth. VIII.20).

{pr,ad,#-}, both preposition and prefix: ѡже

424. The problem of the distribution of the jers will be discussed below in relation to more general rules.

оу̀готовитѣ пѣтъ твои прѣдѣ тобож (р. 158, Luke VII.27);

и прѣдѣстожшимъ рече́: (р. 194b, Luke XIX.24).

{ob-}, both preposition and prefix: и бѣ ѡб ношь
въ молитвѣ бжїи (р. 153b, Luke VI.12); ѡбстоимъ вби
Іерсѣлмъ. (р. 199b, Luke XXI.20); и ѡбьхождааше вессѣ
окрѣтныж оуча: (р. 101, Mark VI.6).

In IAG, the spelling of the prefix {ob=} follows exactly the rules of the classical texts. This spelling principle was phonological in the 9th century, as well as morphonemic. In IAG (14th century), however, such a spelling as ѡбьхождааше (р. 101) no longer has a phonological basis. The Manasses Chronicle, written by the same scribe at approximately the same time (cf. 3.4.1., fn. 72) applies the 14th-century phonological principle, which leads to such forms as: источникъ... садовнаа ѡптичаше коренна (Manas. Chron., р. 7) 'The spring flowed around the tree roots'; нїл же бѣлостроуинни ѡпходитъ еѳїопїа, и тльстобразѣныа нивы егїпетскыа. (Manas. Chron., р. 7) 'The white-streamed Nile encompasses Ethiopia and the fertile - furrowed fields of Egypt.' (cf. fn. 391).

This discrepancy may be explained by the assumption that in his revision of the Gospel texts, the monk Symon had at his disposal older copies of the Gospels embodying the older spelling tradition. The Manasses Chronicle, being a recent translation, reflected in its spelling the contemporary phonological norms. At first glance it

may seem contradictory to state that in the spelling of prefixes ending in obstruent stops or the fleeting vowel {#}, the scribe applied the morphonemic principle - both in IAG and in the Manasses Chronicle - while to {ob=} in the Manasses Chronicle he applied the phonological principle. It should be recalled, however, that the morpheme {ob-} had a very low frequency as a prefix and, as a preposition, existed only in the two fixed phrases $\overset{\circ}{\omega}\overset{\circ}{\text{б}}\overset{\circ}{\text{ь}}$ $\overset{\circ}{\text{о}}\overset{\circ}{\text{н}}\overset{\circ}{\text{ь}}$ $\overset{\circ}{\text{п}}\overset{\circ}{\text{о}}\overset{\circ}{\text{л}}\overset{\circ}{\text{ь}}$ 'on the other side' and $\overset{\circ}{\omega}\overset{\circ}{\text{б}}\overset{\circ}{\text{ь}}$ $\overset{\circ}{\text{н}}\overset{\circ}{\text{о}}\overset{\circ}{\text{щ}}\overset{\circ}{\text{ь}}$ 'during the night' (see below). It might thus have been difficult for the scribe, while copying the Manasses Chronicle, to recognize the prefix {ob=} in the spelling $\overset{\circ}{\text{о}}\overset{\circ}{\text{п}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}$ of the Slavic original, so as to re-introduce the morphonemic principle. He faced a similar situation in IAG with the cluster {-zd, #n-} > [zn] in $\overset{\circ}{\text{п}}\overset{\circ}{\text{р}}\overset{\circ}{\text{а}}\overset{\circ}{\text{з}}\overset{\circ}{\text{н}}\overset{\circ}{\text{и}}\overset{\circ}{\text{к}}\overset{\circ}{\text{ы}}$ (p. 206b) and $\overset{\circ}{\text{н}}\overset{\circ}{\text{е}}\overset{\circ}{\text{п}}\overset{\circ}{\text{р}}\overset{\circ}{\text{а}}\overset{\circ}{\text{з}}\overset{\circ}{\text{н}}\overset{\circ}{\text{о}}\overset{\circ}{\text{ж}}$ (p. 141b), where the morphonemic shape was obscured by the absence of alternations (see below).

Such an assumption is in accord with the evidence of contemporary Bulgarian, which tends to reinterpret the prefix {ob=} as a prefix {o=}, the {b} being understood as the first phoneme of the following lexical morpheme. The verb * $\overset{\circ}{\text{o}}\overset{\circ}{\text{b}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}\overset{\circ}{\text{v}}\overset{\circ}{\text{l}}\overset{\circ}{\text{e}}\overset{\circ}{\text{k}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}\overset{\circ}{\text{t}}\overset{\circ}{\text{i}}$ 'to dress, clothe' was reinterpreted as {o=blěk-}, which then paired with a new derivation {sə=blěk-} 'to undress'; * $\overset{\circ}{\text{o}}\overset{\circ}{\text{b}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}\overset{\circ}{\text{o}}\overset{\circ}{\text{u}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}\overset{\circ}{\text{t}}\overset{\circ}{\text{i}}$ 'to put shoes, socks, pants, etc. on', was correspondingly reinterpreted as {o=buj-}, then paired with {sə=buj-} 'to take shoes, socks, pants, etc. off'; * $\overset{\circ}{\text{o}}\overset{\circ}{\text{b}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}\overset{\circ}{\text{v}}\overset{\circ}{\text{e}}\overset{\circ}{\text{s}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}\overset{\circ}{\text{i}}\overset{\circ}{\text{-}}\overset{\circ}{\text{t}}\overset{\circ}{\text{i}}$ became {o=běs,-i-}, with subsequent

derivations {běs,-i-} 'to hang s.o.', {běs,-i-l-o} 'gallows'.

Since the Manasses Chronicle must have been written after IAG (cf. 3.2.4. and fn. 374), it is most improbable that the scribe should have recognized the morphonemic shape of {ob=} while revising the New Testament, and then have failed to recognize the same morphonemic entity a little later, in his copying of the Manasses Chronicle. It must be concluded that in his spelling of this morpheme, the scribe was guided neither by the mophonemic principle nor by the phonological norm of his time, but by some third principle. This is the "traditional" principle⁴²⁵, which is referred to in the Russian grammars as "tradicionnye napisanija".

The traditional principle reflects the phonology of a much earlier period of the language, and most likely of a particular dialect, highly-valued in that period. This so-called "principle" actually has two areas of application: the spelling of a limited number of words, learned as exceptions (ишѣдѣа < [iščṽd,ia] < {j#z=čṽd,-#j-a})⁴²⁶ and the verbatim copying of a text considered authoritative.

{ot#-}, both preposition and prefix. In most

425. V. V. Vinogradov, ed., Obzor predloženíj po usoveršenstvovaniju ruskoj orfografii, Moscow, 1965, 450 pp.

426. The symbol ṽ in morphonemic, phonemic and phonetic transcription, represents the single nasal-vowel morphoneme of Middle Bulgarian (resulting from the merging of *o and *e) and its phonemic and phonetic outcomes. For further details, cf. 4.3.5.

cases it is spelled as $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{O}}$. There are a few instances where the prefix alternates with O- ; this is also known from the older Slavic texts: cf., e.g., исходаше отътждоу отътрасѣте прахъ (Ostr.); исходаше $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{O}}$ тждѣ. $\overset{\text{C}}{\text{O}}$ трасѣте прахъ. (p. 101b, Mark VI.11); ошедѣ съкры сѧ отъ нихъ (Mar.); $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{O}}$ шедѣ съкры сѧ $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{O}}$ нихъ. (p. 249b, John XII.36); да не би отъшелъ отъ нихъ (Mar.); да не би $\overset{\text{O}}{\text{O}}$ шелъ $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{O}}$ нихъ (p. 149-150, Luke IV.42).

We can offer a few examples with the preposition (and prefix) въ, although {v} should be treated as a glide paired with {j} rather than as an obstruent⁴²⁷: въ тѣ ношѣ бѣдетѧ двѣ (p. 190b, Luke XVII.34); и въ разбоиникы въпаде (p. 170, Luke X.30); въстѣ скоро (p. 245b, John XI.29).

b) Preposition or prefix ending in a voiced continuant obstruent {z}: {j#z-}, {b,oz-} - as both prepositions and prefixes - and {bl,iz-}, {v#z-}, {n,iz-}, {raz-} - only as prefixes. Here the orthographic rules are different depending on the following consonant, although generally neither the prefixes nor the prepositions are separated by jers.

1) Before voiced stops no changes occur: бѣвахѣ же жены изъ далече зрѣшѣ. (p. 132b, Mark XV.40); нѣ избранныхъ ради ѧже избра (p. 123, Mark XIII.20); ѧже въ

427. In this I follow:

H. Andersen, The Phonological Status of the Russian "Labial Fricatives", Journal of Linguistics, 5, 1969, p. 121-127.

васъ без грѣха ѱ^с. (р. 235, John VIII.7); да не повелитъ
имъ въ безднѣ ѱти (р. 162, Luke VIII.31); на възглавници
спѣ^а (р. 98, Mark IV.38); раздра сѣ на двою (р. 83b,
Matth. XXVII.51).

2) Before the sonorants {n}, {m}, {l}, and the glide {v}, these prefixes and prepositions are spelled without change. The phonetic change {z} > [ʒ] observed in the older texts, as in ѡж неѡже (Mar.); ѡ без неѡго (Zogr.) is not found in IAG: ѡз неѡ же (р. 133b, Mark XVI.9); ѡко не ѡзнеможетъ (р. 139b, Luke I.37); ѡ без неѡго (р. 213, John I.3); ѡ възношааше сѣ на нѡ^о (р. 212, Luke XXIV.51); ѡзмрѣшѡ бо (р. 11, Matth. II.20); не възмогѡтъ (р. 188, Luke XVI.26); ѡни же ѡз лиха дивлѣахѡ сѣ. (р. 114b, Mark X.26); ѡ ѡзлѣзъ ѡс кораблѣ (р. 45b, Matth. XIV.29); ѡ ѡзъ възлюбих вы (р. 255b, John XV.9); члѣкъ да не разлѣчаетъ (р. 113b, Mark X.9); ѡволи сѣ ѡ мнѣ (р. 137, Luke I.3); и безъ врѣтища (р. 203, Luke XXII.35); прѣходить сквозѣ безводнаа мѣста (р. 173, Luke XI.24); ѡ възврѣгше рѣзы своѡ. (р. 195, Luke XIX.35); видѣ разводаща сѣ нѡ^{са} (р. 89, Mark I.10).

3) In IAG there are two coexisting orthographic principles in the spelling of these prefixes before {r}. The prefixes {j#z=}, {b,oz=}, and {v#z=} are always spelled according to the morphonemic principle, which is different from the situation in the classical texts, where the combination -z=r- phonetically yielded [zdr]. The following

examples are from IAG: изрече (p. 43b, Matth. XIV.7); и въ без разоума ъсте (p. 47, Matth. XV.16); възрадова са (p. 140, Luke I.47); възрасте (p. 180b, Luke XIII.19); възрыдаете (p. 157b, Luke VI.25).

However, IAG treats differently the prefix {raz=}; with no exception, when {raz=} precedes a lexical morpheme beginning with {r}, the spelling indicates the same cluster [zdr] as in classical Church Slavic: раздроушение (p. 23b, Matth. VII.27), and p. 156, Luke VI.49); раздрѣшити (p. 88b, Mark I.7, and p. 180, Luke XIII.16); раздрѣшиши (p. 50, Matth. XVI.19); раздрѣшите (p. 54b, Matth. XVIII.18); раздрѣши са (p. 107, Mark VII.35); раздрѣшено (p. 50, Matth. XVI.19).

This absolute consistency in the different treatments of {raz=} raises the question, whether or not it is only a spelling rule which is at work here. {raz=} differs from the other prefixes ending in {z}, in that it never appears as a preposition. The preposition {v#z}, although not registered in IAG, definitely existed in the literary language of the 14th century; even today it is found in the northeastern Bulgarian dialects. The preposition {v#z}, governing the accusative case, is often used in the Bulgarian gramoty, with the meaning 'around, near' (cf. Russian возле). Example: ѿ низ рѣлѣ. въ стрѣмѣ ѿ въз стрѣмѣ. до гѣрманщицѣ. и въз гѣрманщицѣ. до блѣгарина⁴²⁸.

Most likely the spelling of IAG reflects the phonological norm of its time; the cluster [zdr] was retained (as an archaism) only with the "pure" prefix {raz=}, while it was eliminated for the other prefixes, which occur also as prepositions. This seems to be a result of the following sequence of events: stage one - (classical OCS) both prefixes and prepositions ending in {-z-} before an {r} caused insertion of the dental stop {d}: [zdr]; stage two - (between the 11th and 14th centuries) the prefixes ending in {z} before an {r} still caused the insertion of the dental stop {d}, while at the preposition boundary there was an innovation - no {d} was inserted: *издрече but *без разоума (this is a hypothetical stage); stage three (14th century, IAG) attests to the tendency in the language to treat the prefix boundary and the prepositional boundary in the same fashion; as long as the morpheme is utilized as both prefix and preposition, the rules should be the same: из рѣкы and изрече but раздроушение; stage four - (after 14th century) - here the morpheme {raz=} follows the rules which govern the prepositional boundary, although it itself is never a preposition. This process of morphonemic leveling at the prefix boundary was complete only after the 14th

428. G. A. Il'inskij, Gramoty bolgarskix carej, p. 27. The quotation is from the Golden Bull of King Ioan Šišman to the Rila Monastery, dated September 21, 1373.

century.

4) Before the voiceless stops and the unpaired voiceless {x} a regressive neutralization in voicing takes place, which is always reflected by the spelling: ис тебе бѡ изыдетъ, вѡждь. (р. 9, Matth. II.6); видѣшѡ سموковницѡ исъхшѡ ис корениа (р. 117b, Mark XI.20); каженици иже искашишѡ са (р. 56b, Matth. XIX.12); глѡста же исходь егѡ (р. 166, Luke IX.31); бес порока (р. 137b, Luke I.6); и васъ бес печали створимь (р. 86, Matth. XXVIII.14); вскысошѡ вьсѣ (р. 180b, Luke XIII.21); и не всхотѣсте (р. 181, Luke XIII.34); кнѣгы распоустныхѡ написати (р. 113, Mark X.4); и влькь расхытъть (sic) (р. 242, John X.12).

However, there is one exception to the rule: the prefix {v#z=} is always spelled morphonemically throughout the paradigm of the verb възпити (in IAG, a jer never separates the prefix from the lexical morpheme): възпи къ немуу глѡши (р. 47, Matth. XV.22); и възпѣвъ народь начѡть просити (р. 130, Mark XV.8); възпишѡ же вьси глѡше (р. 263b, John XVIII.40).

5) Full assimilation in voicing occurs before {s} and {z} at the prefix boundary; the spelling always simplifies the geminated sibilants /z=z/ and /s=s/ as з and с respectively: дѣлашѡеи безаконие (р. 23b, Matth. VII.23); и творѡшѡ безаконие (р. 42, Matth. XIII.41); и съ безаконникома причътенъ бы^с (р. 131b, Mark XV.28); и исъше абине سموковница (р. 62, Matth. XXI.19); иже бѣ

ѣсѣче^Н въ камени (р. 132b, Mark XV.46); вънъ ѣсыплать ѣ
 (р. 183b, Luke XIV.35); ѣсакнѣ ѣсточникъ крѣве ѣѣ
 (р. 100, Mark V.29); лице оубо нѣси оумѣете расѣждати
 (р. 49, Matth. XVI.3).

The prefix {v#z=} before {s} and {z} becomes {v#s}, thus homographous with the prefix {v#s}. Although its shape has been obliterated by the spelling, the prefix in the words listed below is most likely {v#z=}; this conclusion rests on that prefix's connotation of upward movement, increasing degree or sudden onset of a state or action, a connotation not shared by the prefix {v#s} but present in these examples: възва (р. 214, John I.15); възвашѣ (р. 104, Mark VI.49); възовѣтъ (р. 182, Luke XIV.12); възрѣвыи (р. 17b, Matth. V.28); възрѣтъ (р. 267, John XIX.37); въсиѣ (р. 146, Matth. IV.16); въсмѣете сѣ (р. 154, Luke VI.21); въстание (р. 143b, Luke II.34); въставѣ (р. 25, Matth. VIII.14); въсѣдѣ (р. 61, Matth. XXI.5).

6) At the preposition boundary before {s}, however, the preposition {j#z} is always spelled without assimilation (with or without the word-end marker jer): ѣ
ѣбине ѣзде ѣзѣ сѣнмиша (р. 90b, Mark I.29); въстав же ѣзѣ сѣнмиша (р. 149, Luke IV.38).

7) The only occurrence of the sequence {z=š} across a prefix boundary, registered in IAG, is in the stem {j#z=š#d-}. On the basis of these limited data it would appear that the orthographic rules for these prefixes before

a stem beginning in {š}, at the time of the writing of the manuscript, allowed the application of two alternative principles: the phonological, expressing a complete regressive assimilation (as is the situation in all the glagolitic texts which I have thoroughly compared with IAG): ишед же рабъ тѣи (p. 55, Matth. XVIII.28); ишедь молѣше ѿ (p. 186, Luke XV.28); and, appearing much more frequently, the morphonemic, which demands the spelling-out of the prefix (as из-) regardless of the phonological rules of neutralization in voicing ($\{z=š\} > /s=š/$) and assimilation in articulation ($/s=š/ > [š]$ or, quite possibly, $[š̄]$): ишедь ѿ видѣ многъ народъ (p. 44, Matth. XIV.14); въ единни же на десѣте ча изшедь (p. 58b, Matth. XX.6).

Since the original scribe was not entirely consistent in introducing the morphonemic spelling in this instance, someone else, perhaps much later, in some cases inserted -з- or -зѣ- over the word with phonological spelling. This is a very indicative fact, illustrating the general tendency in Church Slavic spelling towards overall establishment of the morphonemic principle in orthography: ишедше проповѣдаахъ (p. 101, Mark VI.12).

8) The text does not have examples of the prepositions {j#z} and {b,oz} before a word beginning with {ž}. There are only a few examples of the corresponding prefixes in an analogous position. Here, the orthography usually expresses dissimilation at the morpheme boundary: иждившоу же ѿмоу въсѣ. бы гладъ крѣпокъ (p. 184b, Luke XV.14);

нѣгда поносѣть вамъ, и ѿждѣнѣтъ вы (р. 16, Matth. V.11);
 въждѣлѣшѣ видѣти (р. 40, Matth. XIII.17); въждѣдахъ сѣ, и
 напоисте мѣ (р. 74b, Matth. XXV.35).

Against the only such example, on p. 74b (въждѣдахъ сѣ), there are two other examples where the spelling expresses full assimilation of {z} in a very common word: 'to become thirsty': въжждѣтъ сѣ паки (р. 221b, John IV.13); не въжждѣтъ сѣ никогда же (р. 229b, John VI.35).

9) Only {j#z=} the prefix and {j#z} the preposition are registered before {c}. In the OCS texts, as can be seen, for instance, from the glossaries in Mar. and Sav., the spelling indicates this type of assimilation of {z} in the preposition {j#z} in most cases, but shows only a few instances of assimilation of {z} in the prefix {j#z=}.

In IAG, however, no simplification of the type и црѣкве is reflected in the spelling of the preposition. There is some hesitation as to how to spell it - morphemically, as из, or phonologically, as ис (indicating regressive neutralization in voicing): ѿ ѿзъгна из црѣкве (р. 217b, John II.15); ѿ ѿзде ис црѣкве (р. 238b, John VIII.59); ѿ ѿшедь ѿ ѿсѣ ис црѣкве ѿдѣаше (р. 69b, Matth. XXIV.1). As a prefix, {j#z=} is spelled in most cases as ис-: глѣхѣ же ѿ ѿудѣи исцѣлѣвшому (р. 224b, John V.10).

There are still, however, a few words where elimination of {z} before {c} is reflected by the spelling. We may presume that here the Tarnovo orthographic school simply accepts the tradition: ѿ трѣбоужшихъ ицѣлѣнїа, цѣлѣаше

(p. 164b, Luke IX.11).

10) At a boundary before {č} the OCS texts usually employ the ligature щ or the digraph шт in order to reflect more closely the phonological processes which take place there. In our text this rule is followed in the spelling of only one word - йщѣдина. Compare йщѣдіа ѹѣхиднова (p. 37b, Matth. XII.34); йщѣдіа ѣхиднова (p. 145, Luke III.7). It seems that this word alone was spelled traditionally. It must have become de-etymologized and, for the writers, completely separated from the word чѣдо.

There is a strong indication that whenever the scribe was able to etymologize, he wrote the prefix as ис-. On p. 211 he first wrote йщезе, then erased the щ and wrote сч: й тѣ [йщезе>] исчезе Ѡ нею (p. 211, Luke XXIV.31).

On the other hand, the hesitation between the letters з and с before the voiceless {č} may constitute additional evidence that the phonological process at this boundary actually yielded [šč], which the scribe did not know how to represent: й бѣ^с йдѣшемъ имъ йзчистишѣ сѣ (p. 189, Luke XVII.14); вѣси исчѣтени сѣтъ (p. 175b, Luke XII.7); нѣ^с прѣ^с ркѣ безѣ чѣсти (p. 101, Mark VI.4); и послѣшѣ й бесчѣстна (p. 119, Mark XII.4); й тѣ бесчѣденѣ оумреть (p. 197b, Luke X.28); расчитаютѣ ймѣніе ѣще иматѣ (p. 183, Luke XIV.28).

c) The preposition {s#} and the prefix сѣ-/с-. The spelling of the preposition as сѣ (always with a jer) does not give any information on neutralization in voicing

before voiced obstruents or on other phonological processes which might take place at this boundary: ѣ възрѣвъ || на на съ гнѣвомъ (р. 93b-94, Mark III.5); съ силожъ ѣ славожъ велиеа (р. 71, Matth. XXIV.30); ѣ пришедши въ народѣ съ зади (р. 100, Mark V.27).

The prefix съ-/с- is used in these two alternate forms following specific rules. No neutralization in voicing, assimilation or dissimilation is expressed by the orthography - opposite to what was already observed with the prefixes из-, без-, раз- and въз-. An examination of all forms in the text having the prefix съ-/с- brings conclusive evidence concerning the orthographic rules governing the literary language of the 14th century.

1) Before a morpheme beginning in a voiced obstruent the prefix is always spelled with a jer: сѣ глахъ вамъ, да не съблзните са (р. 256b, John XVI.1); ѣ събиражтъ ѣ въ ѡгнь въметажтъ, ѣ съгараѣтъ (р. 255b, John XV.6) съзираахъ же са междуо собожъ оученици (р. 252, John XIII.22).

2) Before a morpheme beginning in a voiceless stop, the prefix is usually spelled without a jer. The few cases where the prefix is spelled as съ- are either at the end of a line, and thus comply with a general rule on the use of the back jer as a marker of this orthographic boundary (cf. 4.3.6), or they represent remnants of a tradition of always spelling this prefix as съ-: ѡ толи начатъ сказати іс оученикомъ своимъ (р. 50, Matth. XVI.21); до скончаниа вѣка, амѣнъ + (р. 86b, Matth. XXVIII.20);

по^дбае^ть да скончае^т сѧ ѿ мнѣ (р. 203, Luke XXII.37);
 не скривае^т себѣ скровища на земли (р. 20b, Matth. VI.19);
 ѿ свѣздѣ спаджѣ съ нѡсе (р. 71, Matth. XXIV.29); да
сподѣбите сѧ оубѣжати всего того (р. 201, Luke XXI.36);
сѣтвори сѣ, ѿ сѣтвори (р. 157, Luke VII.8).

The word сѣкроушаѣ (р. 166b) and сѣкрѡшит сѧ (р. 267) are individual exceptions to this new rule.

3) Before voiceless obstruents other than stops, the prefix is spelled as сѣ-/сѣ-: вѣсѣ сина сѣхранихѣ (р. 191b, Luke XVIII.21); ѿ неже оубѡ бѣ || сѣчеталѣ е^сть (р. 113-113b, Mark X.9); азѣ е^смѣ хлѣбѣ сѣше^дыи съ нѡсе (р. 230, John VI.41).

4) If the prefix сѣ- alternates with сѣ- it is always spelled with a jer, independent of the environment: сѣпрѣгѣ: сѣпрѣгѣ воловныхѣ коупихѣ пѣть (р. 182b, Luke XIV.19); сѣсѣдѣ: сѣсѣди же ѿже бѣхѣ видѣли е^сго прѣжде (р. 239, John IX.8).

5) The prefix is usually spelled without a jer (as с-) if the following morpheme begins with a sonorant (or the glide {v}), immediately followed by a vowel: нѣ ѡсобѣ сѣвить на е^диномѣ мѣстѣ (р. 268, John XX.7); ѿ раскопавше сѣсишѣ ѡдрѣ (р. 91b, Mark II.4); сѣзаноу сѣшоу (р. 98b, Mark V.4); никто же не можаеше е^сго сѣзати (р. 98b, Mark V.3); ѿ ѿже на || кровѣ, да не сѣзати въ домѣ (р. 122b-123, Mark XIII.15); ѡ сѣложеніа всего мира (р. 41b, Matth. XIII.35); ѿ сѣломивѣ, дааше оученикомѣ свѣсимѣ (р. 165, Luke IX.16); сѣмотрите врановѣ (р. 176b, Luke XII.24); ни сѣ кто

Ѡ дне того, въпросити ѳго (р. 66b, Matth. XXII. 46); ѳ ѡчи свои смѣжишѡ (р. 40, Matth. XIII.15); ѳко призрѣ на смѣрение рабы своѡ (р. 140, Luke I.48); ѳх же крѣви пилать смѣси съ жрѣтвами ихѡ (р. 179, Luke XIII. 1); ѳбие срѣте ѳго члѣкъ (р. 98 b, Mark V.2.)

The word свѣдѣтель and its derivatives, which are registered in a large number of grammatical forms, are never spelled with съ-: ѳще свѣдѣтельствоуѡ ѡ мнѣ, свѣдѣтельство мое нѣ истинно (р. 226, John V.31); вы же есте свѣдѣтеле симѡ (р. 212, Luke XXIV. 48).

In contrast, the word сѣвѣтъ is always spelled with a jer. A possible explanation may be the existence of a minimum pair сѣвѣтъ ('council') vs. сѣвѣтъ ('light, world'): сѣи не бѣ присталь сѣвѣтъѣ ѳ дѣлѣ ихѡ (р. 209, Luke XXIII.51). A further possibility is the attempt to keep the same number of syllables within the derivational group: сѣвѣтъ, ѡвѣтъ, завѣтъ. This is not a Middle Bulgarian spelling innovation, however, since the same convention is registered in the older texts (cf. Supr.).

6) If the prefix precedes two sonorants (or the glide {v} followed by a sonorant), it is always spelled as съ-: ѳко бѣдетѡ сѣврѣшение гланым' || ѳи Ѡ га (р. 139 b - 140, Luke I.45); сѣвлѣкошѡ съ него хламидѡ (р. 82, Matth. XXVII.31); коеѡ сѣмрѣтиѡ хотѣаше оумрѣти (р. 249 b, John XII.33).

II) Prepositions and prefixes before vowels.

a) All prepositions ending in a consonant, when they precede a word beginning in a vowel, may be spelled either with a jer (front or back) or without a jer. Thus it seems that the jer was used as an optional marker of this boundary (see the chapter on the jers): ѿ ѡбрѣтше ѣго ѡб онь поль морѣ (p. 229, John VI.25); ѿже стоаше ѡбѣ онь поль морѣ (p. 228 b, John VI.22). There is never a jer after the preposition {ot#} spelled as the ligature ѡ (which is the situation in most cases): ѿ ни ѣдина же ѡ нею падеть на земли, безь ѡца вашего (p. 32, Matth. X.29); гла емоу ѣдинь ѡ оученикъ ѣго (p. 122, Mark XIII.1).

There is a distinction between the prepositions ѡбѣ and ѡ in the language of IAG. The preposition ѡбѣ is used only in two idiomatic word combinations: ѡб онь поль (p. 229) 'on the other side (of a sea, river, lake)' and ѡб ношь 'throughout the night': ѿ бѣ ѡб ношь вѣ молитвѣ бжїи (p. 153 b, Luke VI. 12).

In all other instances before a word beginning in a vowel, only the preposition ѡ is used (the same as in the classical texts): слышавши же ѡ ѿсѣ (p. 100, Mark V.27); архиереи же вьпроси ѿса ѡ оученицѣхъ ѣго ѿ ѡ сучени ѣго (p. 262, John XVIII.19).

b) Prefixes before non-front vowels ({a}, {o}, {u}) are not separated by jers, nor are any phonetic changes expressed by the orthography. Only a few prefixes are registered in this position in IAG, all of them ending in the

voiced continuant {z} : изшедшемъ имъ ѿ виѳаниа, възѣлка
 (р. 117, Mark XI.12); нѣ за безѣчство ѣго (р. 272, Luke
 XI.8); хоула. грѣдны. безоумиѣ (р. 106, Mark VII.22);
ѣако възѣсте ключъ разоумѣнию. (р. 175, Luke XI.52).

c) Prefixes before morphemes beginning in front vowels or the glide {j} are spelled according to more complex rules. The initial glide {j} must be treated together with the front vowels because of its prothetic character. The spelling gives abundant evidence of optional jotation before initial *e. In addition, the *ě reconstructed on comparative Slavic evidence merged with the sequence *j-ā in the Bulgarian linguistic area and yielded in initial position {ja} (for details, cf. 4.3.4.).

More complicated is the situation with the initial nasal vowel. The alphabet possesses only two letters for the nasal vowel: ѣ and ѣ̣, which in IAG never have the jotted forms: *ѣ̣ѣ, *ѣ̣ѣ̣. The rules of distribution for these two letters will be discussed in the appropriate section (cf. 4.3.5.). The following rule can be formulated: in word-initial position and at some prefixal morpheme boundaries, the nasal vowel is represented by the letter ѣ (on the premise that the nasal vowels merged); the letter ѣ̣ expresses the same nasal vowel, implying palatalization of the preceding consonant.

Thus, depending on the final consonant of the prefix and the initial vowel of the following morpheme, the prefixes are spelled in various ways:

1) Prefixes ending in an obstruent stop before initial {i} or {ji} are followed by a jer with the exception of the prefix $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ - (a few times written от-): прѣдѣидеши бѡ прѣд лицемъ гнѣимъ (р. 141, Luke I.76); ѡбѣидошѣ него $\overset{\circ}{\text{I}}$ оудеи глѣще немоу (р. 243, John X.24); и ѡбѣидѣт тѣ и ѡбѣимѣт тѣ въ сѣдоу (р. 195 b, Luke XIX.43); ВУТ: и ѡиметь слово (р. 96 b, Mark IV.15); $\overset{\circ}{\text{I}}$ нѣмъ пътемъ ѡтидошѣ въ странѣ своя. (р. 10, Matth. II.12).

2) Prefixes ending in voiced continuant obstruent {z} before initial {i} or {ji} are spelled without indication of the palatalization of the final {z}, and the initial vowel of the root becomes phonetically [y]. In all examples attested in IAG except one, the fact that the prefixes change the initial vowel of the following morpheme into [y] creates a new morphonemic alternation at this boundary: [i] versus [y]. Here the evidence shows that, for the scribe, the prefixes were not separable entities: ѣ after the prefix is not a combination of a jer and the letter ѣ, but the 14th-century Bulgarian grapheme jerу (never ѣ): възыгра сѣ младенец. (р. 139 b, Luke I.44); прииде... възыскати и сѣсти погыбшаго (р. 54, Matth. XVIII.11); възыде въ виѡанѣ. (р. 117, Mark XI.11); $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ нѣдоу же ѣзыдохѣ (р. 38 b, Matth. XII.44); много и ѣзыщет сѣ $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ него (р. 178 b, Luke XII.48); и разыдѣт сѣ $\overset{\circ}{\omega}$ вца стада (р. 77, Matth. XXVI.31).

The sole exception to this practice, възыщѣтъ, can be regarded as a spelling mistake, caused by the inter-

ruption of the prefix by the end of the line: въ||зъишѣтъ
вънити и не възмогѣтъ. (p. 180 b, Luke XIII.24).

3) Prefixes ending in an obstruent stop before initial {jo} > [e] are followed by a jer (except when the prefix is written as a ligature). This environment is registered in IAG only with the prefixes объ- and ѡ-, and in various forms of the verbal stem *-(j)ę-ti: ѣ ѡбъемъ ѣ рече ѣмъ; (p. 112, Mark IX.36); еда ѡбъемлатъ ѡ тръниа гроз^ды. (p. 23, Matth. VII.16); ѣко ѣ мои, ѡѣмлетъ ѡ строенію ѡ домоу ѡ мене. (p. 186 b, Luke XVI.3).

There are only two examples in the entire IAG where the morphemes which follow the prefixes begin in {jo} without graphic expression of the jotation of [e]. The jer is spelled only after the prefix {ob=}, but not after the ligature ѡ: ни ѡ кѣпины гроздь ѡбъемлатъ (p. 155 b. Luke VI.44); ѣ ѡѣмлащаго твоя, не ѣстаси (p. 155, Luke VI.30).

4) Prefixes ending in voiced continuant obstruent {z} before initial {jo} > [e] are not separated from the root by jers. The examples from IAG are restricted to the same verbal stem *-(j)ę-ti and to the prefixes {j#z=} and {v#z=}. In these words {jo} after the prefix is never expressed by ѣ, but only by the letter ѣ: ѣ въставъ послѣдоу ими въземъ кр^стъ (p. 114, Mark X.21); ничьсо же не въземлѣте на пѣтъ. (p. 164, Luke IX.3); ѣ ѣземъ два пѣнаса, дасть гостыньникоу. (p. 170 b, Luke X.35).

5) Prefixes ending in an obstruent stop before initial nasal vowel are always followed by a jer (except, as a

general rule, the prefix $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ -, due to the ligature). Three different prefixes are attested in IAG: $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ бъ-, $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{п}}\text{одъ-}$, and $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ -. The verbal stem $*(j)q-ti$ always begins with the letter ж: $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{и}}$ тѣма ѳго не $\overset{\text{I}}{\omega}$ бъжтъ. (p. 213, John I.5); нж не можете $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{п}}\text{одъжти}$ нинѣ (p. 257 b, John XVI.12); $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{е}}$ гда $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ жтъ бждеть $\overset{\text{T}}{\omega}$ нихъ женихъ. (p. 152 b, Luke V.35).

6) Prefixes ending in the voiced continuant {-z} when followed by a nasal vowel (only the prefixes {v#z=} and {j#z=} are registered in IAG in this environment) are never followed by a jer, and the nasal vowel is always spelled as $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{а}}$: не достоинъ тѣ $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{в}}$ зати ѳдра своею (p. 224 b, John V.10); како хлѣбы не $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{в}}$ захомъ (p. 49, Matth. XVI.7); $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{в}}$ зашж трoupъ $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{е}}$ го. $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{и}}$ положишж и въ гробѣ (p. 103, Mark VI.29); $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{и}}$ тогда оузриши $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{из}}$ ати сжчець. (p. 155 b, Luke VI.42); и тогда оузриши $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{и}}$ зати сжчець. (p. 22, Matth. VII.5).

7) The two prefixes {ob=} and {j#z=}, which followed different orthographic rules in the previous examples, are written according to the same rule before initial $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{а}}$ t' (reconstructed from comparative Slavic data). Only derivatives from the stem $*\check{e}d-$ 'to eat' are found with the prefixes {ob=} and {j#z=} in IAG. The derivatives of the verb stem $*-\check{e}xa-ti$, registered in the glagolitic Gospels, are consistently replaced in IAG by derivatives of the verb $*iti$. (In all modern Bulgarian dialects, as well as the standard language, the verb $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{я}}$ хам/ $\overset{\text{I}}{\text{я}}$ зджа exists, but only with the meaning 'to ride on horseback or "piggyback"'. It is possible that this semantic narrowing took place before the 14th cen-

tury, causing the replacement of the stem *-ěxā-tī in the sense of 'locomotion by conveyance'.)

The prefix {ob=} is not, except in one case, separated by a jer from the initial vowel of the stem nor is the morpheme boundary marked by the spelling, in contrast to all previously described situations. Here are a few examples:

сѣ обѣдѣ мои оуготовахъ (р. 64b, Matth. XXII.4); гла
имъ Іс, прїидѣте обѣдоуите (р. 271, John XXI.12); егда же
обѣдовашъ. гла сѣмѣноу пѣтроу (р. 271b, John XXI.15); ѣгда
же снѣ твои сѣи, изѣдѣ имѣние твое. (р. 186, Luke XV.30).

The one exception to this spelling rule is significant because it follows the general rules of spelling for the prefix {ob=} before a vowel, as described: a jer should be written after the prefix, and the initial vowel of the stem should be spelled as in most cases when in absolute initial position: нѣ (for etymological jat'), нѣ, жѣ: да некогда отагчажѣ срѣца ваша объядѣнїемъ и пианствомъ. (р. 200b, Luke XXI.34).

The prefixes {s#=} and {v#=} before a morpheme beginning in a vowel or prothetic jod are realized in their variants {s#n=} and {v#n=}. The texts of the New Testament do not offer examples with these prefixes before vowels other than {jo}, {i}, {ṽ} and etymological jat'. (The only exception with respect to the realization of {v#=} as {v#n=} is in the glagolitic Mar.: ѿ въѣдѣ ѣдѣштемъ же имъ (Luke VIII.23). But the other OCS texts and Ostr. dif-

fer in this passage: against the въѣдѣ of Mar., Ostr. has вънидоша, while Zogr. has прѣѣдѣ and Assem. - прѣидѣ. IAG follows Assem.: и прѣидоша. и идѣщим же ѿмъ, (p. 161 b, Luke VIII.23).)

The orthographic rules on this particular boundary of {s#=} and {v#=} before initial {jo} are very similar to those for the prefixes ending in {z}: и плата вънѣмша са не оугасить (p. 36 b, Matth. XII.20); вънемлите ѿ лѣжнихъ прѣркѣ. (p. 22 b, Matth. VII.15); ѿ них же сънемшем са тъмамъ народа (p. 175, Luke XII.1); и сънемъ иѣ ѿбвитель пла[ше]ницеѣ. (p. 209, Luke XXIII.53).

Before initial {i} there is never a jer, but neither does the {i} turn into [y] (as in the case of the prefixes ending in {z}): нако не ѿ хлѣбѣхъ вамъ внимати рѣх (p. 49 - 49 b, Matth. XVI.11); съ едѣнѣмъ окомъ внити въ цр҃твине бж҃ие (p. 112 b, Mark IX.47); и вниде іс҃ъ въ капернаоумъ. (p. 149, Luke IV.31); и внидетъ и изыдетъ и пажить ѿбраще^т (p. 242, John X.9); и тѣ капернаоуме. възнеси са до нѣсъ. до ѿда сънидеша. (p. 34 b, Matth. XI.23); нако сънидохъ съ нѣсе, да не творѣ вола моѣ (p. 229 b, John VI.38).

In the numerous examples with the words вънатрѣ, вънатрѣадоу and вънатрѣнее, the initial nasal vowel after the prefix вн- is always spelled as ѣ: и петръ ... иде. до вѣнатрѣ въ дворѣ архіерешѣ. (p. 128, Mark XIV.54); вънатрѣадоу же плени сѣтъ кости мрътвнихъ. (p. 68 b, Matth. XXIII.27); и вѣнатрѣнее сѣтвори (p. 174, Luke XI.40).

The developments in some present-day Bulgarian dialects indicate that such spelling in IAG actually followed a phonological rule and not just an orthographic convention. In the West Bulgarian dialects this word is [vnétre] or [unétre], showing an origin *vъn=ętrě rather than *vъn=ǫtrě. The Standard Bulgarian /vǣtre/ has a different origin - it is a petrified locative *ǫtrě with prothetic *v- before an initial back vowel (compare /vǣžé/ 'rope', /vǣsi/ (arch.) 'mustaches', /vǣzel/ 'knot', /vǣglen/ 'coal', etc.).

Parallel with the prefixes ending in {z}, one might expect that the prefix сѡн- too would be followed by the letter ѡ. However, the only such example in IAG does not follow such a rule: ѡше приидеть ѡлиа сѡнѡти ѡго. (p. 132, Mark XV.36). This very contradictory, yet isolated example does not disprove the existence of such a rule, which would require writing only ѡ after сѡн-, вѡн- and all prefixes ending in {z}. Thus the word сѡнѡти can be considered a mistake, together with such spellings as пѡть for пѡть 'road' (cf. 4.3.5.6.).

Etymological јат' is registered in IAG only after the prefix сѡн-, and is always spelled as ѣ: ѡдеже пасхѡ сѡ оѡченикы моими сѡнѣмѡ (p. 125 b, Mark XIV.14); ѡмате ли что сѡнѣдно зде; (p. 211 b, Luke XXIV.41).

c) The prefix {ob=} before the initial glide {v} is spelled according to the same rule as in classical OCS: initial {v} is truncated. If the lexical morpheme has ini-

tial {v} before a vowel, the spelling never separates the prefix from the truncated morpheme by a jer. Here are a few minimum pairs: {ob=j \tilde{v} -t- \emptyset } > ѡбѣжѣтъ (p. 213). BUT: {ob=v, \tilde{v} z-aj- \emptyset } > ѡбѣза: и пристѣплѣ ѡбѣза строупы ѿго (p. 170 b, Luke X.34); {ob=id- \tilde{v} t- \emptyset } > ѡбѣидѣтъ (p. 195 b). BUT: {ob=v,in-uj- \tilde{v} } > ѡбѣноуѣ: ѿ не ѡбѣноуѣ сѣ слово глааше. (p. 109, Mark VIII.32) and {ob=v,id,-j- \tilde{v} } > ѡбѣидѣ: друже не ѡбѣидѣ тебе (p. 59, Matth. XX.13).

This orthographical, and most likely phonological, rule applies to all words except the derivatives of the lexical morpheme {v,ij-} 'to wrap'. In all three existing examples in IAG the word ѡбѣтъ (as spelled in Mar. and Zogr.) is written ѡбѣвить: ѿ сѣнемъ ѿ, ѡбѣвить въ плашаницѣ. (p. 132 b, Mark XV.46). On page 267 b, the scribe first wrote ѡбѣста but later he, or someone else, put a small letter ѡ over the line: ѡвѣста же тѣло ѿсво. и [ѡбѣста >] ѡбѣ^ѡиста ѿ рѣзами. (p. 267 b, John XIX.40).

4.2.2.4. This detailed examination of suffix, morphological ending and prefix boundaries shows that the pairing of the consonants according to voicing shown by neutralizations in voicing, is very little reflected by the spelling. The only conclusive evidence so far has been demonstrated in two respects: first, the final consonant in the prefixes ending in the voiced {z} becomes /s/ before voiceless obstruents (IAG lacks examples only for initial {s}, {š}, {f}); second, the following pairs are established:

<u>Voiced Obstruents</u>		<u>Voiceless Obstruents</u>	
{b}	ѣзбавити (p. 210 b)	{p}	распѣдитъ (p. 242)
{d}	въздѣхнѣ (p. 107)	{t}	ѣстрѣгнетъ (p. 137 b)
{z}	no examples in IAG	{c}	исцѣлѣвшомоу (p. 224 b)
{g}	ѣзгнании (p. 114 b)	{k}	въскысошѣ (p. 180 b)
----		{ç}	расчитаетъ (p. 183)
----		{x}	исходъ (p. 166)

4.2.2.5. Although trivial, additional evidence is needed to prove not only that {b} was a voiced obstruent and {p} a voiceless one, but also that they were paired (yielded the same phonetic results in environments demanding neutralization) in respect to voicing. Such an environment is provided by the "newly formed" consonantal clusters other than those at morpheme boundaries, where the orthography expresses only the devoicing of {z}. By "newly formed" in this context we understand "attested after the period of classical OCS", that is, after the glagolitic texts of the 10th and 11th centuries. The data are not abundant, but are consistent and reliable:

{b} ~ {p}: Both Mar. and Zogr. in Luke XXIV.42 have the word бѣчель. In IAG (p. 211) it is written: ѡни же дашѣ ёмоу рыбы печёны часть. и ѡ пчель сътъ.

{z} ~ {s}: In addition to the neutralization of the prefixes and prepositions, the word съде (from the classical texts) in IAG is spelled as зде without exception.

{g} ~ {k}: The OCS texts always spell кѣде with voiceless k, usually with a back jer following it. In IAG this word, like зде, is written with the voiced counterpart

of the initial consonant: где (with no exception).

{v} ~ {f}: The morphoneme {f} must have been firmly established in the language because of the numerous borrowings from Greek. For example, the word фарисеи, used 95 times in different cases, was never written with substitution of some other letter for the initial {f}. No mistakes are made in the spelling of фалёковъ (p. 146 b), фаноуїлева (p. 143 b), фаресъ (p. 6 b), фарёсовъ (p. 146 b), филипъ (used 21 times in different cases), финикъ (p. 248), Ѳωсифъ (used 24 times in different cases), etc., etc. Church Slavic must have had a phonological restriction on the distribution of this phoneme, as of a newly borrowed one, not well established yet. In such cases {f} and {v} are paired, and often в is substituted for {f}. The glagolitic texts know this type of substitution (for example власвимлѣать in Mar., Matth. IX.3). Two such spellings of this word are found in IAG: ѡко власвимиа рече. (p. 79, Matth. XXVI.65); сѣгрѣшение ѡ власвимиа (p. 95, Mark III.28).

In the other three cases, the substantive is written correctly as власѣимиѡ (p. 79; p. 128 b) and власѣимиѡ (p. 47); in four other cases it is replaced by хоула (p. 106), хоулѡ (p. 92; p. 151 b) and о хоулѣ (p. 243 b). The verb is always spelled correctly as власѣимисоуетъ (p. 27), власѣимисаетъ (p. 95 b) and власѣимисаѡтъ (p. 95 b), or else replaced by хоулиши (p. 243 b) or похоулитъ (p. 176).

This same restriction on the distribution of {f} still operates in Modern Bulgarian (see [svérə] for сѣра, [əsvált] for асѣлт, etc.). It is demonstrated in Russian by the name Матвей (from Μαθθαῖος).

4.2.2.6. The orthography of IAG reflects another type of pairing of voiced and voiceless continuant obstruents in the environment before the sonorant {m} and before the voiced stop {d}. A Byzantine sigma is represented in Slavic by strict rules as either с or з. When the Byzantine pronunciation of voiceless continuants before the sonorant {m} or the voiced stop {d} as their voiced paired counterparts, did not violate Slavic phonology, they were spelled in IAG as voiced, with very few exceptions. Thus the Greek cluster {sm}, pronounced as [zm]: и ѿ мáтизмѣ (< ιματισμός) моѿи мѣташѣ жрѣбиѣ. (р. 266, John XIX.24); и сѣ катапетазма (< καταπέτασμα) црѣквнаа раздра сѣ (р. 83b, Matth. XXVII.51); смѣшение змирно (< Σμύρνης) и ѿлои (р. 267b, John XIX.39).

But in one instance in IAG this word is spelled with -см-: принесошѣ юмоу дары. злато и ливанѣ. и смирнѣ (< Σμύρνα) (р. 10, Matth. II.11).

The phonological rendering of foreign (and in particular Greek) words according to the norms of 14th-century Byzantine Greek is a spelling rule in IAG, insofar as the voicing of a voiceless obstruent continuant before the sonorant {m} does not violate the phonological system of

Slavic. In Byzantine Greek {γ} is paired with {x} in respect to voicing, while in literary Bulgarian of the 14th century {g} is paired with {k} (къде > гдѣ). Still, Mar., Zogr. and Sav. always spell the Greek word δραχμή as драгма, and δίδραχμον as дидрагмъ. Obviously, the scribe of IAG must have found such a spelling, dictated by Greek phonology, to be in violation of the phonology of Church Slavic. He writes these words as дра́хмъ (p. 184), драхмѣ (twice on p. 184 b), дидрахма (p. 52 b), and only once with г (according to the strong tradition of the Classical texts): оу̀чи-тель вашъ не даѣт ли дидрагма (p. 52b, Matth. XVII.24).

4.2.2.7. The Greek cluster {sd}, pronounced as [zd]: ѡже нарицаѣт сѧ ѣврейскыи виѣздѧ (< Βηθεσδα) (p. 224, John V.2), is spelled phonetically in IAG.

4.2.2.8. The classical OCS texts also include voicing of {s} before {r}, but in most cases offer doublets - words, spelled through application of the principle of transliteration of the Greek words (or Hebrew words which had passed through Greek): есромовъ (< τοῦ Ἑσρόμ) (Mar., Luke III.33), or else according to the Byzantine pronunciation - phonetically: излѣвъ (< τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) (Sav., p. 75). The latter principle is applied more frequently in the classical texts.

As far as the Byzantine Greek cluster {sr} is concerned, IAG consistently represents it as -ср-. (The text from Dečansko Evangelije, however, published by Jagić in lieu of the missing initial pages of Mar., uses the forms

изром, изрома (Matth. I.3).) Here is an example from IAG: ѿарѣсъ же рѣди, ѿсрома. ѿсром (< 'Εσρώμ) же рѣди ѿрама (р. 6 b, Matth. I.3). Without exception, the forms of the word for Israel and its derivatives are spelled with -ср-: ѿсраилѣ (рр. 9, 140, 143, 210 b), ѿсраилю (р. 141b), ѿсраилеви (р. 215), ѿсраили (р. 24), ѿсраилевѣ (р. 216), ѿсраилтѣнинѣ (р. 216), etc.

4.2.2.9. The previous examples represent how IAG reflects regressive assimilation. The corresponding progressive assimilation is registered in IAG only for the Greek cluster {nt}, pronounced [nd]: великыи въ стѣхъ кѡнстандинѣ ѿрѣ (IAG, Postscript, р. 275); кѡнстандинѣ десро^Т, за^Т велика^Г ѿрѣ (IAG, р. 2 b).

4.2.3. On the morphonemic status of {θ}.⁴²⁹ The orthographic rules applied in IAG cause serious problems in determining the morphonemic status of the obstruent {θ}, written θ. The rules follow the Byzantine norm of pronunciation for the sound represented by the Greek letter θ: this is obvious from the non-translitative method used by Slavic to render the Greek double theta: тθ (applied also in Latin: -tth-). This must express a certain Greek phonological rule of dissimilation. There are two personal names spelled in the Greek New Testament with double theta: Μαθ-

429. Cf. the brief discussion of the spelling alternations in IAG, in:

R. Scholvin, Einleitung in das Johann-Alexander - Evangelium, mit drei photolithographischen Tafeln, Archiv für slavische Philologie, VII, 1884, p. 53.

θαῖος and Μαθηάιν. In IAG they are spelled as: матθѣи мытарь (p. 30), матθѣа (pp. 27b, 94b, 153b); and матθана (p. 7b), матθан же (p. 7b), матθάνов^В (p. 146), матθάνов (p. 146b).

4.2.3.1. In addition, 26 different Greek words, biblical personal and place names and Hebrew phrases are spelled with the letter θ in place of the Greek theta; their frequency varies between one and eleven cases of occurrence. Used only once: при авиáθарѣ (p. 93b), виθездà (p. 224), далманоуθѣ||скиж (p. 108), еффаθá (p. 107), лиθострато^Н (p. 265), мааθóвъ (p. 146b), марθины (p. 244), на́θановъ (p. 146b), ссѣθовъ (sic) (p. 146b), талиθà. коúми (p. 100b), θ θамары (p. 6b), годъ θемїана (p. 137b), θеофиле (p. 137b). Used twice (for convenience, some of those used more than once will be given only in one of the forms used): Ἰωάθαμ (twice on p. 7), ма^Ттаθїевъ (p. 146) and маттаθóвъ (p. 146b), θадеи (pp. 30, 94b). Used three times: варθω-ломей (pp. 30, 94b, 153b), голгоθá (pp. 82b, 131, 265), салаθїиль (pp. 7b (twice), 146b). Used four times: θ áриматhea (pp. 84, 132b, 209, 267). Used six times: виθ-леємъ (pp. 8b, 9 (twice), 9b, 10b, 141b), наθанайль (pp. 216 (4 times), 216b, 270). Used seven times: виθсаида (pp. 34b, 104, 108b, 164b, 169, 216, 248b). Used eight times: θωма^á (pp. 30, 94b, 153b, 253) and also as θомá (pp. 94b, 244b, 269b (twice)). Used eleven times: въ виθанїа (pp. 62, 116b, 117 (twice), 124b, 194b, 212, 214b, 245 (twice), 247b) and мáрθа (pp. 171 (four times), 244,

245 (four times), 245b, 246, 247b).

4.2.3.2. Against those numerous words always spelled with the letter θ, there are only five Hebrew words and names where one should expect the letter θ, but finds one or another kind of substitution: τοῦ θάρα - фарáновъ (p. 146b), τοῦ Μαθουσαλά - матоусалáн' (p. 146b), σαβαχθανί - савахтани (p. 132, but on p. 83 written correctly as савахθани), Γεθσημανῆ - гетсимании (p. 77, but on p. 126b written correctly as геθсимани) and finally, the Hebrew place name Βηθφαγῆ, written in three different ways: въ ВИТсФΑΓÍA (p. 60b), въ ВИТφΑΓΙΑ (p. 116b), and - correctly - въ ВИθ^сφΑΓÍA (p. 194b).

The last five words may be explained as indicating that the Greek text according to which IAG was revised, substituted phi and tau in these Hebrew words and names. But there are strong arguments against a presumption that the spelling oscillation in these few words in IAG reflects the scribe's own pronunciation:

First, the consistency in the spelling of the Greek sequence -θθ- as -τθ- (ματθει and ματθαν) suggests that the orthography reflects a Greek phonological rule of dissimilation; therefore, a phonological principle is being applied.

Second, all previously-given examples of the voicing of {s} before {m} and {d} in the Greek words, as well as the voicing of the cluster {nt} as -нд- reflected

by the Slavic spelling, strongly suggest an application of the phonological principle rather than a simple transliteration of the Greek words.

Third, the Greek diphthongs are rendered in Slavic phonologically, according to their Byzantine pronunciation, which also implies a phonological spelling principle.

Fourth, an extralinguistic consideration may be borne in mind: the educated clergy and members of the court in 14th-century Bulgaria were bilingual, or at least had a good command of Byzantine Greek, which is easy to explain by historical and geographic factors⁴³⁰.

4.2.3.3. It seems that the educated people of the 14th-century Tarnovo Kingdom who were fully competent in both literary Bulgarian (Church Slavic) and Byzantine Greek tried to establish in the Slavic literary language a norm of orthoepy and orthography for foreign words in accordance with Byzantine orthoepic norms. The fact that this attempt did not make itself felt in the Bulgarian dialects is no evidence against such an assumption. The literary language could have possessed a number of features which did not exist in any of the spoken dialects of the time.

430. A. F. Višnjakova, K voprosu o kul'ture i prosveščanii bolgar v XIV v., Vizantijskij sbornik, Moscow - Leningrad, 1945, p. 256-259.

4.2.4. On the morphonemic status of {з} 431. The Church Slavic alphabets, in addition to the letter з, use two other graphemes, з and з, indicating a sound different from that represented by the letter з, yet occurring in a largely predictable environment parallel to the environment where {c} appears. In fact, the letter з occurs either in word-initial position or at morpheme boundaries with suffixes and desinences.

4.2.4.1. In word-initial position the letter з is found in a limited number of words. Most typical is the word зѣло or зѣло, which appears over 20 times in IAG and is always written with the letter з (the letter itself was called "dzělo"). The word звѣзда appears 7 times and is also always spelled with з: звѣзда (p. 9b), звѣзды (pp. 9b, 71, 123b), звѣзѡ (pp. 9, 10) and звѣздахъ (p. 200). The word звѣрь is found only once, in the phrase ѣ бѣ съ звѣрми (p. 89, Mark I.13).

But in certain lexical stems, the initial з alternates with the letter з in a fashion which makes it difficult to state rules for the alternation. The infinitive form здати (p. 183b), the imperfect зидаахъ (p. 190) and the substantive зданіе (p. 122), зданіа (pp. 69b, 122), all spelled with з, are opposed to зидете (pp. 68b, 174b), зидѡщоу (p. 156) and зидѡщеи (pp. 64, 119, 197). The

431. Cf. the extensive comparison of spelling variants in IAG in:

R. Scholvin, op. cit., p. 24-30.

prefixed stem shows a similar alternation: създѣ (p. 156b), създати (p. 79), създавшоу (p. 148b), създана (p. 218), създанию (p. 123) versus съвиждѣ (p. 49b) and съсида (p. 131b). The forms of the prefixed verb просѣбати are written seven times with с, as in просѣбнеть (p. 123b) and once with з: прозѣбошѣ (p. 39b).

If all these spellings in IAG are compared with the corresponding words in the glagolitic texts, one observes immediately that IAG is far more consistent in the usage of the letter с. But the words which appear in Mar. as сърѣти, оусърѣти, съсърѣти, while often written with с (or ѣ) in all the glagolitic texts, are always spelled with з in IAG: не зрѣши бо на лице члкомъ (p. 119b, Mark XII. 14); нѣко да оузрѣ^Т дѣла ваша добраа (p. 16b, Matth. V. 16); съзираахѣ же сѣ междуо собоѣ оученици (p. 252, John XIII.22).

4.2.4.2. At a suffix or desinence boundary in lexical morphemes, the letter с may represent the phonological outcome of the so-called Third Slavic Palatalization of *g. It may occur after the reconstructed Common Slavic *i̯ or a front nasal vowel, resulting from *iN. In this environment, it seems that the writer of IAG is consistent in the use of the letter с only in certain words.

The word кнѣсь is used 18 times in different grammatical forms, always spelled with с; пѣнѣсь is written in all 14 occurrences with с, and once is replaced by the word цѣты (p. 217b). The word склѣсь from the classical texts

(Matth. XXII.19) does not occur in IAG, which has instead образъ (p. 65). And the word кладасъ, registered in some of the classical texts (e.g. Zogr.), appears on p. 221 of IAG as кладациъ. The word *jezā 'wound' is used three times in IAG (pp. 15, 29b, 90b) and is consistently written with с, e.g.: и всѣхъ жъсхъ въ людѣхъ (p. 29b, Matth. IX.35). The word *stīzā 'path' appears three times (pp. 12, 88-88b, 145), and is always written with с: правы творите сътъса его. (p. 145, Luke III.4).

But there are oscillations in the spelling of *polīza 'use, benefit': three times its forms are written with с (pp. 50b, 99b, 109b): кака бѡ полса е члѣкоу. (p. 109b, Mark VIII.36); and three times with з (pp. 165b, 231, 248b): нако никоуа ж полза е. (p. 248b, John XII.19). The verb ползевалъ (pp. 46, 105b) is written only with the letter з.

4.2.4.3. The so-called Third Slavic Palatalization may occur at a suffix boundary of a lexical morpheme ending in Common Slavic *g preceded by *ī̃, *iN or *r̃ and followed by the imperfective suffix *āj. The examples found in IAG give contradictory data. Again, it seems that the scribe used different rules for different individual words. Forms of the verb стасати са 'to question' are used 11 times and always spelled with the letter с: начашъ стасати са съ нимъ (p. 108, Mark VIII.11). The substantive стасание 'conflict, disagreement', is also spelled with с: бѣ же стасание о оученикъ Іωάνовѣ (p. 220, John III.25). But

another derivative of the same lexical stem, ИСТАСАТИ (СА) 'to settle a question', although written three times with с (pp. 155, 176b, 194b) has two forms with з: ИСТАЗАВЪ (p. 206b) and ИСТАЗАТИ СА СЪ НИМИ О СЛОВЕСИ. (p. 73b, Matth. XXV.19).

The verb ПОДВИСАТИ СА 'to attempt', used twice (pp. 180b, 263b), is spelled with с: ПОДВИСАИТЕ СА ВЪНИТИ (p. 180b, Luke XIII.24).

The root *-tr'g- with different prefixes shows an even larger variety of forms. It is spelled with с in: ПРОТЪСААХЪ же мрѣжъ ихъ (p. 150, Luke V.6); тогда архіереи растръса ризы своя гла. (p. 79, Matth. XXVI.65) and растръсавъ (p. 128b). But it is spelled with з in: ВЪС-тръсаахъ оученици его (p. 153, Luke VI.1). It is even spelled with г, without a trace of the Third Palatalization, in: растръгахъ ѡзы. (p. 162, Luke VIII.29).

The root *-žīg-/*-žĕg- before the imperfective suffix *-āj- was usually spelled as жис- in the OCS texts⁴³², but in IAG it is consistently rendered with г, with no in-

432. A different opinion is offered by Diels in his reference grammar of OCS. See:

P. Diels, Altkirchenslavische Grammatik mit einer Auswahl von Texten und einem Wörterbuch, Heidelberg, 1963 (2nd edition), I, xvi + 309 pp.; II, 116 pp.

In the brief vocabulary at the end of part II, Diels pairs the attested verb ВЪЖЕШТИ, ВЪЖЕГЪ, s-aor. ВЪЖАХЪ - 'anzünden' (p. 65) with an obviously reconstructed form, ВЪЖАГАТИ, -жагаж- 'anzünden' (p. 64). He refers to part I, paragraphs 23,5; 51,3 (should be 50,3) and 121,1-2, where no forms indicating the existence of *-žĕg-āj- (for *ВЪЖАГАТИ) are offered (cf. pp. 94, 134, 246). Such a reconstruction of the imperfective stem as in *ВЪЖАГАТИ is incorrect. The different stems of the verb are as follows:

dication of palatalization in the final stem consonant: ѣ
ѡгнемь съжигашь (p. 42, Matth. XIII.40); ни въжигашь
 свѣтилника (p. 16, Matth. V.15); въжигает (p. 184b).

4.2.4.4. The letter ѣ is also found as an alternate form of the morphoneme {g} at particular morpheme boundaries as a result of the Second Slavic Palatalization. On all such morpheme boundaries, listed below, it is written with the letter ѣ (there is only one exception with ѣ):

a) The nominative plural of the masculine substantives and adjectives: {bog-} > ѣко азъ рѣхъ ѣси нѣсте (p. 243b, John X.34); {vrag-} > ѣ ѡбложашь ѣраси твои ѣстрогъ ѣ тебѣ (p. 195b, Luke XIX.43); {drug-} > ѣроусии бо мнѣхъ, ѣм же ковчежець ѣмѣше ѣоуды. (p. 252b, John XIII.29); {mnog-} > ѣко ѣси ѣноси ѣнидошъ въ нѣ. (p. 162, Luke VIII.30).

b) The nominative-accusative of feminine substantives: {nog-} > неже двѣ рѣщѣ ѣ двѣ ѣносѣ ѣмашоу. (p. 53b, Matth. XVIII.8).

*-ѣг- (attested as -жешти, -жеръ) is the perfective stem (infinitive and future); *-ѣг- (attested as -жахъ) is the s-aorist stem, parallel to that of решти, рекъ, рѣхъ; *-ѣг- is the imperative stem, attested in Supr. and Sav. as -жѣси, parallel to рѣци.

The imperfectivization of this verb is also parallel to that of решти: (нарешти > нарицати), -жешти > -жисати. The latter form is attested (cf. the glossary of Mar.). Diels's mistake obviously arises from his assumption that the imperfectivization would be realized by lengthening of the vowel of the infinitive stem (*-ѣг- > *-ѣг-), while what actually occurs here is a lengthening of the *i of the imperative stem (*-ѣг- > *-ѣг-), along with the change of the following *g > *ѣ (according to the Third Palatalization) and the addition of the imperfectivizing suffix *-ѣг-.

c) Dative singular of feminine and masculine substantives of the hard *-a-stem declension: {slug-} > ѣ
 СЪГНѢВЪ КНИГЫ, ВЪДАСТЪ СЛОУСѢ ѣ СЪДЕ. (р. 148, Luke IV.20).

d) Locative singular of substantives of the hard declensions - masculine, feminine (no examples in IAG) and neuter - as well as locative singular of the hard adjectives in masculine and neuter (no examples of neuter in IAG):

{bog-} > да ꙗвѡт сѧ дѣла е҃го ꙗко ѡ бсѣ сѡтъ сѡдѣлана.

(р. 219b, John III.21); {n,odṽg-} > .ли. лѣтъ ѣмыи въ

недѡсѣ своємѣ. (р. 224b, John V.5); {po=dv,ig-} > ѣ бы^с

въ подвисѣ, прилежнѣе молѣше сѧ. (р. 203b, Luke XXII.44);

{mnog-} > можааше бо сѣ продано быти, на мносѣ (р. 75,

Matth. XXVI.9). But the locative case of the word брѣгъ on

р. 270b is written with з: стѧ ꙗко при брѣзѣ (John XXI.4);

{drug-} > въ дроусѣмѣ корѧбли (р. 150b, Luke V.7).

e) Genitive, dative, instrumental and locative plural (all genders) of the new adjectival declension, different from that of OCS, were remodelled according to the

pattern of the hard pronouns. The only existing example of

the Second Palatalization in this environment is for the

feminine genitive plural: {mnog-} > не оубоите сѧ оубо

мносѣхѣ птицѣ. лоучѣши е҃сте вѣѣ. (р. 175b, Luke XII.7).

f) In all previously-described cases (1-5), the Second Palatalization was caused historically by the following vowel, the result of the monophthongization of a diphthong. IAG, however, offers in addition one significant

example of a substitution of the Second Palatalization for the expected First Palatalization (caused by $*\underline{\text{y}}_1 < *e$) in the comparative adjective мъножаишихъ (Mar.), rendered in IAG as мноѡишихъ: начашъ ... прѣстаати и ѡ мноѡишихъ ' (they) began ... to provoke him (to speak) about many (things)' (p. 175, Luke XI.53).

g) In the verbal system, the Second Palatalization of velars is observed in the imperative (only the 2nd person singular is attested in IAG) for verbal stems ending in {g}: {vr'g-} 'to throw down' and {po=mog-} 'to help'. For both verbs, the letters з and с oscillate in the imperatives: врѣси ѡ себе (p. 17b, Matth. V.29) vs. врѣси с низоу (p. 13b, Matth. IV.6); нъ ѡше что можеш помози намъ (p. 111, Mark IX.22) vs. вѣроуѡ ѡи, помози моемоу невѣриѡ (p. 111, Mark IX.24).

h) The only example of prepositions and adverbials representing etymologically petrified locative case forms, attested in IAG, is the very high-frequency preposition скосѣ 'through, across' (note the difference from the OCS сквосѣ), which is spelled only with с: хождааше ѡ въ сботѡ скосѣ сѡаниа (p. 35b, Matth. XII.1).

The Bulgarian literary language of the 14th century, as has been demonstrated on the preceding pages (253 - 259), tries to preserve {з} as a morphoneme. This was the ideal toward which the scribe of IAG aimed.

4.2.5. The occurrence of double consonants. In

IAG, double consonants are written in both Slavic words and biblical names.

4.2.5.1. In Slavic words only the letter н can appear as a geminate at suffixal morpheme boundaries. There are two types of boundaries where this can occur:

a) Where the derivational stem ends in the sonorant {n}, and the suffix is either the substantival {-#n,ik-} or the adjectival {-#n-}: in either case IAG offers a small spelling innovation, resulting from new rules for the vocalization of the formerly phonemic jers, which have become fleeting vowels. In the classical OCS texts the two letters н were separated by a letter jer.

The substantival suffix {-#n,ik-} after stems ending in {n}: безаконъникама (Mar.) → и съ безаконникама причътенъ бы^с (p. 131b, Mark XV.28); законъникомъ (Zogr.) → и вамъ законникомъ горе. (p. 174b, Luke XI.46); инс-племенъникъ (Sav.) → тъкмо иноплеменникъ съи^и (p. 189b, Luke XVII.18).

The adjectival suffix {-#n-} after a stem ending in {n}: врѣменьни (Mar.) → нѣ врѣменни сѣтъ (p. 96b, Mark IV.17); законъноумоу (Mar.) → по ѡбычаю законномуу (p. 143, Luke II.27); истинъны (Zogr.) → нѣ ѡцъ мои даеть вамъ хлѣбъ истинны съ нѡсе. (p. 229b, John VI.32); каменьнѣемъ (Mar.) → а дрогоуе паде на каменныхъ (p. 96, Mark IV.5); многоценъны (Zogr.) → нарды пистикѣ многоценны (p. 247b, John XII.3); неповинъныхъ (Mar.) → николи же бисте ѡсѣдили неповинныхъ (p. 35b-36, Matth. XII.7)

Whenever the morpheme boundary coincides with the end of a line, a letter ъ or ь is written according to the general rule for the use of the jers: ѿ съберѣтъ ѿ цр^ствиѧ ѿго всѧ съблзнь||ники. (р. 42, Matth. XIII.41).

b) Past passive participles in {-n-}, when used as substantives, are, in most of the cases observed, written with double -нн-. Compared with the situation in the classical texts, this is a new phenomenon, very consistently carried out in IAG. There are only a few examples where these past passive participles used as subject or predicate, or in direct address, are spelled with a single -н-. Examples are: мнози бо сѣтъ званни, мало же ѿбранныхъ (р. 65, Matth. XXII.14); бракъ ѿбо готовъ естъ, а званнии не бишѣ достойни. (р. 64b, Matth. XXII.8); ра^дуй сѧ ѿбраваннаа гь с тобоѣ. (р. 139, Luke I.28); ни посланныи, болѣи пославшаго ѿ. (р. 251b, John XIII.16); рожденное ѿ плъти, плъть естъ, ѿ рожд^денное ѿ дѣха, дѣхъ естъ. (р. 218b, John III.6); слово сѣанное въ ср^дцихъ ихъ. (р. 96b, Mark IV.15); сѣ ѿбѣдъ мои оуготовахъ ѿ юнци мои ѿ оупитаннаа ѿсколена, ѿ всѣ готова приидѣте на бракъ. (р. 64b, Matth. XXII.4).

4.2.5.2. In addition to the rules for writing a double -нн- at these morpheme boundaries, in three instances a double -сс- is written in the forms for genitive singular and accusative plural of the Slavic word весь 'small town, village': ѿ немъ за рѣкѣ слѣпааго ѿведе ѿ вѣнь ѿз весси. (р. 108b, Mark VIII.23); ѿ диви сѧ за невѣрие ихъ. ѿ

ѡбхождаше вессѣ ѡкр^стныѣ оуча: (р. 101, Mark VI.6); идѣмъ
въ ближнѣя вэсси ѣ грады (р. 91, Mark I.38). No reasonable
explanation for this spelling can be offered. On the other
hand, in 25 instances when this word is used, it is always
written with a single -с-: ѣже бѣхѣ приишли, ѡ всѣхъ весси
галилеискихъ ѣ ѣоудеискихъ (р. 151, Luke V.17).

4.2.5.3. In rendering the biblical personal and
place names, the translator tries to follow the Greek spel-
ling as far as double consonants are concerned. The follow-
ing are among the words, some of them very frequent, which
are usually written with a double consonant as in Greek:
авва, варавва, равви, еѳѳаѳѣ, аддиевъ, маттаѳѳѡвъ, ма^ттаѳѳіевъ,
Іеммаѳѳоусъ, ѣмманоуиль, гененна, Іѡѡанна, Іѡѡаннъ, Іѡаннѣевъ,
манна, осанна, ѣссей.

The use of a double consonant in biblical names
and words so as to comply with the Greek norm represents, in
IAG, a more advanced stage than that of the known texts of
the classical period (up to the 11th century). In glagolit-
ic writings double consonants are used sporadically; Sav.
is more influenced by the Greek orthography, while IAG re-
presents an even further development in this direction.
Here, however, the scribe of IAG makes the most numerous
mistakes and allows inconsistencies. Approximately three
quarters of the biblical names are spelled according to the
Byzantine orthographic rules, while the others are either
spelled with a single consonant, or - in a few instances -
with a double consonant unmotivated by the Greek spelling.

There is no clue to the orthoepic norm of the words written with a double consonant, except the fact that some well-known words, although having a double consonant in the Greek spelling, are in IAG always written with a single one (coinciding with the Church Slavic tradition). This list includes such words and names as: садоукѣи (Σαδδοθαῖος), used 11 times; ѣлини (Ἑλλεν) - 4 times; генисаретскыи (Γεννησαρέτ) - 3 times; гоморуу and гоморсцѣи (τὰ Γόμορρα); месѣа (Μεσσίας) - twice; манасина (Μανασσῆς) - twice; θαдеи (Θαδδαῖος) - twice; гаваθα (Γαββαθα); сосана (Σουσάννα); сирофиникиса (Συροφονίκησσα). The word сѣбота (Σάββατον), used 53 times, is of course a much older borrowing in Slavic, so altered in shape that one would hardly expect it to mirror the Greek form.

The following words have a double consonant, while the Greek orthography does not require it: ссѣθoвѣ (p. 146b) - (τοῦ Σσθ); ссѣмoвѣ (p. 146b) - (τοσ Σσμ); асаррѣи (p. 32) - (ἀσσάριον); ѳаррисеисцѣи (p. 214) - (φαρρισαῖος). The spelling mistake in асаррѣи may have been caused by the scribe's awareness that one of the consonants in the Greek form is indeed doubled - the correct spelling would be accarѣи. The misspelling of ѳаррисеисцѣи occurs only once out of 95 occurrences of this word in IAG.

It is quite possible that the scribe who wrote IAG followed, in many instances, the spellings in his Greek original. Since most of the words in which he failed (from

our point of view) to use the double consonant correctly are of Hebrew origin, we cannot rule out the possibility that his "errors" were also those of his Greek original. Our authority for the Greek spelling is the glossary of the Codex Marianus, compiled by V. Jagić from normalized Greek editions of the 19th century; the orthography in this glossary may not, in every case, be that of Byzantine manuscripts in the 14th century. Such a hypothesis, if correct, would only show how great must have been the dependence of the medieval Slavic translator upon the quality of his Greek original.

4.2.5.4. A correct use (according to the Byzantine rules) of double consonants also involved the double gamma, representing the cluster {ng}. The glagolitic texts render this consonantal combination with the letters -нѣ- (in cyrillic transliteration), while Ostr. always uses -нѣ-, н'ѣ or нѣѣ: анѣгели, арѣханѣгела, еван'гелие. But the cyrillic Sav. uses only аѣггелѣ and евѣа, hence the latter spelling does not indicate how the cluster {ng} would have been written if it were not abbreviated.

In this respect, IAG follows consistently the tradition established by Sav.: the cluster {ng} in the Greek words is always spelled with a double -γγ-, in accordance with the norms of Byzantine orthography: аѣггелѣ (ἄγγελος); арѣхаггелѣ (ἀρχάγγελος); евѣаггелѣ, евѣаггелѣ or евѣаггелѣ (εὐαγγέλιον); ѣаггелѣ (sic) (p. 146b) (τοῦ Παγγαί).

4.2.6. Single letters representing consonantal clusters.

4.2.6.1. The Slavic alphabet, as listed in Xrabər's treatise, has the Greek letter ψ (psi) for the cluster {ps}. IAG, however, follows the tradition established in the glagolitic writings: it uses only the combination of letters -пс-. The number of words where ψ should appear is very limited. While the glagolitic texts twice use the locative singular form паропсидѣ (Παροψίς), in IAG it has been replaced by the word блюдоу (pp. 68, 68b). But the Greek word Ψαλμός is still used twice in IAG: ѿ пр^орцѣхъ ѿ пса||лмѣхъ ѿ мнѣ. (p. 211b-212, Luke XXIV.44); сам бо дѣдъ глѣтъ въ книгахъ псаломскихъ (p. 198, Luke XX.42).

4.2.6.2. The classical texts do not use the letter ξ for the cluster {ks} in Greek words. Xrabər's list of the alphabet includes the letter ξ, and it is used twice in the IAG text. The classical texts (glagolitic) and the cyrillic Sav. show certain peculiarities in representing the Greek word φοίνιξ as ѿиникъ. Most likely, the phonological restrictions in the language did not allow for a final cluster {ks}. IAG, in the only instance where this word occurs, follows the same established tradition: приѡшѡ въ^т вѣѣ ѿ ѿ^т ѿиникъ, (p. 248, John XII.13).

But if between two vowels not at the morpheme boundary, the cluster {ks} is preserved and expressed in IAG

by the letter ξ : ἀρφαξάδῳ (τοῦ Ἀρφαξάδ) (p. 146b);
 ὠϊοῦ ἀλεξάνδρου ἢ ρουφῶνοῦ (p. 130b, Mark XV.21). Also,
 in the postscript, as well as in the initial two pages of
 dedication to the Bulgarian king, the scribe writes the
 king's name as црѣ. ѿ. александрѣ.

4.2.7. Sometimes the phoneme {v} in foreign words,
 if rendered in Greek by the letter upsilon, is expressed in
 the same way (that is, by the letter υ) in IAG⁴³³. Except
 when immediately followed by the phoneme {i} (graphically
 expressed in Greek by either ι or ει), this upsilon is ex-
 pressed in the OCS texts by either в or у. The more fre-
 quently used of the two is в: Mar. has августа, Assem. -
авгоста, while Ostr. has авгоста. For this word IAG also
 uses the letter в: ἰζυδε повелѣние ὁ κέσαρ ἄβγυστα
 (p. 141, Luke II.1). On the other hand, IAG continues the
 tradition of orthographic duality in the spelling of the
 word εὐαγγέλιον: whereas when abbreviated it is always
 written with υ (εὐγλιε, εὐγλιε, εὐγλιε or εὐγλιε), in
 the title pages of the four gospels, where the word is not
 abbreviated, there are ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΕ (Matth., p. 6 and Mark,
 p. 88), but ΕΒΑΓΓΕΛΙΕ (Luke, p. 137) and ΕΒΑΓΓΕΛΙΕ (John,
 p. 213).

The classical texts accord different treatment to
 the Greek upsilon (υ) when followed by the letter ι or the

433. Scholvin mentions Greek "consonantal υ":
 R. Scholvin, op. cit., p. 53.

diphthong ει. All glagolitic texts have a cluster [vg,] (transliterated in cyrillic as -вѣ- or -въѣ-). For example, Mar. has ниневъѣитомъ for Νινευίτης, параскевъѣи for παρασκευή, левыѣии for Λευείς or Λευίς, левыѣитъ for Λευείτης. Ostr. uses various means to express this combination, obviously difficult phonetically for the ancient Slavs: левъгиты, параскеѣги (both with an epenthetic /g/), but also леѣитъ and леуиѣ without the epenthetic /g/. Sav. uses either въ or оу for the Slavic equivalent of the sound rendered in Greek by upsilon, but always adds the epenthetic /g/: параскевъгина, левыгинаѣ, леоугитъ. Compared with all this, the spelling of these words in IAG is perhaps much closer to the Byzantine pronunciation of the 14th century: the epenthetic /g/ is never used, and the upsilon is replaced by the letter в: нако же бо бы^с ѿѡна^а знамение ниневи^тѡ^м (р. 173b, Luke IX.30); и с^ѣтвори чрѣждение веліе леви^и емоу; въ домоу своемъ. (р. 152, Luke V.29); такожде и левити^ѣ, бывъ на томъ мѣстѣ. (р. 170b, Luke X.32). The word παρασκευή, however, is always translated as пѣтокъ or пѣтъкъ: понеже бѣ пѣтъкъ, еже естъ къ сѣботѣ: (р. 132b, Mark XV.42).

4.2.8. Simplification of the cluster /zdn/. IAG uses a simplified spelling for the word праздникъ (written this way in all the classical texts): празникъ. This word is used 23 times in IAG, always with omission of the letter д: потрѣбѣ же имѣаше на всѣ празники ѡпоущати имъ ѣдиногѡ.

(р. 206b, Luke XXIII.17). The same orthographic principle is employed in the substantivized adjective непразнаа 'pregnant', which is used three times in IAG: възѣде же ѿ ѿсифѣ ... написати сѧ съ маріею. обрѣченоу емоу женоу, същюу непразноу + + (р. 141b, Luke II.4-5).

In Luke XXI.23, as against непраздѣнымъ in the glagolitic texts, IAG uses the synonymous expression ИМАЩИМЪ ВЪ ЖТРОБѢ (р. 200). In празникъ and непразнаа, /zdn/ is a cluster which does not alternate with /zden/ in any paradigmatic form (since непразнаа 'pregnant' is a substantivization restricted to the feminine gender). But if the same cluster /zdn/ in one of the paradigmatic forms of the word alternates with /zden/ (as in праздѣнь 'empty, idle'), then the morphonemic principle is followed in the spelling, and the nominative masculine plural adjective is written as праздни, despite the phonological rules for simplification of the cluster: что зде стоите весь днь праздни (р. 58b, Matth. XX.6); ѿ пришедь обрати ѿ праздѣнь (р. 38b, Matth. XII.44). This is a very significant example of the application of the morphonemic principle in the spelling of IAG: as long as obvious semantic links between the meanings 'empty' and 'idle' exist, due to the polysemy of the word праздѣнь, the writer follows the morphonemic principle. But when the concept of the word празникъ came to involve first of all a 'celebration, feast' and last of all a 'day when one is idle', the scribe failed to recognize the mor-

pheme structure of the word. The same applies to непразнаа 'pregnant', which must have meant to the scribe «ИМАЩАА ВЪ ЖТРОБѢ» and not a 'woman who is not empty'. When the scribe was not able to reconstruct the morpheme structure of a word, the phonological principle was applied. In this case it is realized through a simplification of the cluster /zdn/ into [zn].

No examples are provided by the spelling for the phonetic simplification of the cluster /stn/. But the phonological rule should have applied in both cases.

4.2.9. The epenthetic /l,/. None of the classical glagolitic texts is absolutely consistent in the use of the epenthetic /l,/ at a morpheme boundary between a labial and a jod. Sav. is especially consistent in using the epenthetic /l,/. Ostr. is an exception, but its correct use is reinforced by the East Slavic phonological rules. In the eastern South Slavic area (and particularly on the territory of Bulgaria and Macedonia), this phonological rule must have ceased to exist by the time the classical texts were copied.

The scribe of IAG is very conscious about consistency in writing the epenthetic /l,/ in the proper position. If compared with the older texts from Bulgaria, the 14th - century gospel completely disregards the contemporary phonological rules in the living dialects and tries to reconstruct a correct literary language as far as the usage of

the epenthetic /l,/ is concerned. Any older, strictly Bulgarian copy of the gospel, used for reference by the scribe of IAG, could hardly have had consistent use of epenthetic /l,/⁴³⁴. Still, this would not have been a hard task for an experienced grammarian, since the rules for insertion of the epenthetic /l,/ are relatively simple.

A statistical comparison of the spelling of the word корабль 'a ship' in the glagolitic Mar., cyrillic Sav. (both exemplifying the situation in the classical OCS with strong Bulgarian features from the 11th century) and with IAG shows the following: in Mar., the word is written with an epenthetic /l,/, as корабль, кораблѣ, кораблю, кораблемь, корабли and кораблѣ altogether 17 times; without the epenthetic /l,/, as корабь, корабѣ, кораби - 23 times; in Sav., a shorter version of the gospels, this word is used only in 12 places: three times with the epenthetic /l,/, as корабль, кораблѣ and 9 times without the epenthetic /l,/, as корабь, корабѣ, кораби. So here the forms without the epenthetic /l,/ are exactly three times as frequent as those with it.

In IAG the same word is used 32 times, and, without a single exception, with epenthetic /l,/. As an additional proof of the fact that the epenthetic /l,/ was not only an orthographic, but also an orthoepic norm in the

434. H. Birnbaum, *The Dialects of Common Slavic*, in: H. Birnbaum, J. Puhvel, ed's., *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1966, pp. 168, 176, 187, 191.

literary language, there is the example on p. 228: ѣ не оу^а бѣ пришель к нимъ ꙗ^с въ корабѣль (John VI.17). The insertion of the letter ѣ for a vowel after an obstruent and before a final liquid was caused by a phonological rule of the living Bulgarian dialects of that time, and represented the actual pronunciation of the word according to the rules of phonological restriction in the language.

Although there are a few isolated words in which the scribe forgot to write the epenthetic /l,/, they represent an insignificant fraction of the total number in which he used it: (Mar.) на землѣ~~ж~~ → сѣ рекъ, плюнѣ на зема. (p. 239, John IX.6); (Ostr.) ѣмлете → аше ли ни, за тѣ дѣла вѣрѣ ѣмете ми. (p. 253 b, John XIV.11); (Mar.) покѣпѣтъ сѣ → ѣ ѡ коуплѣ аше не покѣпѣтъ сѣ, не нѣдѣтъ. (p. 105, Mark VII.4).

4.2.10. Other peculiarities in the spelling of the consonants. The word for 'gall', зльчѣ~~ж~~ (Mar.), зльчи~~ж~~ (in all other classical texts and Ostr.) is replaced in IAG by жльчи (p. 82 b): ѣ дашѣ емоу пити ѡцетъ съ жльчи смѣшенъ. (Matth. XXVII.34). In this case the word registered in IAG represents the more common old Slavic dialectal variant because of the palatalized syllabic *l' in the first syllable.

There are two instances - сѣребро (and its derivatives) and сѣдравъ (and its derivatives) - where the glagolitic texts and Ostr. insert a jer after the initial с.

In Sav., however, сребро and its derivatives are never spelled with a jer, although съдравъ and its derivatives are spelled as in the other classical texts. The text of IAG not only follows Sav. as far as сребро is concerned, but further eliminates the jer in съдравъ (and its derivatives) from the consonantal cluster здр-, in which the voicing is expressed by the spelling: и по что не въдаде сребро мое трѣжникомъ^Ѣ (p. 194 b, Luke XIX.23); и ѡбие здравъ бы^Ѣ члкъ (p. 224 b, John V.9); не трѣбоужтъ здравїи врача. (p. 152, Luke V.31).

4.2.11. Later corrections in the spelling of some words. Three words in IAG were consistently corrected by another hand, most likely a Serbian reader of the manuscript.

4.2.11.1. The word скосѣ 'through' was changed to ск^росѣ by adding a small р over the line: this occurred 16 times, while the word was left unchanged only once (on p. 114 b): оудобѣе естъ вельбждоу скосѣ иглѣнѣ оуши проити. (Mark X.25). The form originally written as скосѣ is the Middle Bulgarian variant of сквосѣ. While both forms are used in Mar. - 10 times сквосѣ and only 7 times скосѣ, Sav. knows only the form скосѣ. The latter, however, is not registered in Ostr.

4.2.11.2. The word трѣва 'grass' was five times corrected into трава, by erasing the letter ѣ and writing instead an а. It was left uncorrected only on p. 41: негда же просабе трѣва, и плодъ сътвори. (Matth. XIII.26). This correction reflects old Slavic dialectal variants of

the word. The older Church Slavic writings from Bulgaria know only the form трѣва, but Ostr. uses трѣва only once, and the form трава twice.

4.2.11.3. The word всѣ was changed in 6 instances to вса̂; всѣкъ or вѣсѣ^к in four cases to всакъ; and всѣка - four times to всака. The change of ѣ into а is attributable to the existence of dialectal variants: Ostr. uses in free variation всакъ, вѣсѣкъ, вѣсакъ and вѣсакъ.

4.3. On the phonemic softening of the consonants: the vowel system. While the voiced/voiceless pairing of the consonants is expressed in the Slavic alphabet by the use of different graphic symbols, the pairing of soft/hard consonants is not reflected graphically by separate letters. This fact alone says nothing about the existence of such pairing (or the existence of phonemic softening of the consonants) at the time when the Slavic alphabet was created. The Slavic alphabet is too closely patterned after the Greek one, for us to expect such revolutionarily new features as special graphemes for both hard and soft consonants. However, it supplies a reasonable method for expressing the feature softness/hardness of the consonant: the character of the following vowel.

The spelling rules applied in IAG and in all other Middle Bulgarian writings do not provide proof for the existence of phonetic softening of the consonants in a position other than before a vowel. Yet, through the morphone-

mic alternations - vowel/zero alternation, the alternations at a morpheme boundary - one could successfully establish phonemically soft consonants. The only position for which one has no means of examination is a consonantal cluster in which no vowel/zero alternation is observed (for instance the {s} in the cluster /st,-n-/.

Thus, the phonemically soft consonants cannot be determined through the spelling without a detailed study of the vowels and their graphic symbols.

The vowel system of the 14th-century Bulgarian literary language, as it is revealed by the application of the complicated spelling rules in IAG, consists of six vocalic morphonemes. They are as follows:

{i}

{u}

{o}

{#}

{ṽ}

{a}

The alphabet provides 19 letters with which to express them:

4.3.1. The morphoneme {i}⁴³⁵ can be expressed by five different letters, depending on its distribution and

435. Various spelling alternations of this morphoneme are treated in:

R. Scholvin, op. cit., pp. 24, 30-31, 40-41, 53-54.

the presence or absence of phonemic softness in the preceding consonant. The letters и and ї are used after a soft consonant, while ы is used after a hard consonant. The letter ы never occurs in absolute word-initial position, but alternates with и at the beginning of some lexical stems, depending on the preceding prefix: иСКАТИ ~ вЗЫСКАТИ. This fact might help us draw a conclusion, that perhaps in absolute word-initial position the morphoneme {i} was always jotated, and that this was expressed by the exclusive employment of the letter и in that position.

The use of both letters и and ї after consonants, opposed to that of the letter ы, could be an indicator of the pairing according to softness of the preceding consonants.

It is possible to make a list of words in which the letters и and ы are never used in alternation.

{b} ~ {b,} бЫТИ - 'to be' vs. бИТИ - 'to beat':
 добро ѿѣсть намъ зде бЫТИ (p. 51, Matth. XVII.4); ѿ
 начнетъ бИТИ клеврѣти своѣ. (p. 72, Matth. XXIV.49).

In a few words, however, the scribe shows hesitation in the choice between и and ы after the consonants {b} and {b,}. The nominative singular form of the word for 'love' in the classical texts is always written as ЛЮБЫ. On pp. 17b and 70 of IAG this word is spelled as in the older texts, while on p. 260b it is written with и, which does not necessarily indicate softening of the preceding

consonant, but rather a phonetic process of eliminating the opposition [i] ~ [y]: да люби ²аже ма ²еси възлюбилъ, въ нихъ бждеть. (John XVII.26). In this particular case the problem also seems to involve the very existence of this word in the spoken language, where we might expect a generalized stem like {l,ubov-} for the nominative singular. The form люби could have been an artificial remnant in the literary language and then, the rare morphonemic alternation of {i} vs. {ov} would have been meaningless to the scribe.

Another instance of oscillation in the use of the letters и and ы after {b,} is in the paradigm of the verb быти in the conditional. The same confusion (or alternate spelling?) is known in the classical texts; for instance, both forms быша and биша are registered in Mar. IAG has examples like: ²аще ли бысте вѣдѣли. (p. 35b, Matth. XII. 7); ²аще бисте имѣли вѣрѣ ²ако зръно горчично. (p. 188b, Luke XVII.6). Again, this kind of spelling alternation most likely implies a morphological change in the language. On the one hand, aorist forms like быхъ, бы, etc. were fully replaced by the forms бѣхъ, бѣ, etc. Thus, the old aorist forms would have continued to exist but with a new function - replacing the old conditional paradigm бимъ, би, etc. The period of coexistence of the older and newer forms of the conditional would have yielded contaminated forms like бихъ and быхъ, би and бы, etc. This coexistence might have continued in the living dialects for a long time. If analogy throughout the paradigm of the verb 'to be' had taken

place (as in Russian), eventually the form /bix/, spelled with ы, would have taken over completely; but there was also the possibility that the language would try to distinguish the conditional (through palatalization of /b/ into /b,/) from the rest of the conjugation. This force most likely prevented Middle Bulgarian from establishing a single form.

{p} ~ {p,} снопы - 'bundles, sheaves' vs. пиръ - 'feast': и сважате на въ снопы (p. 41, Matth. XIII.30); нж егда твориши пиръ, зови нищааа. (p. 182, Luke XIV.13).

{d} ~ {d,} грады - 'towns' vs. дира - 'rent, rip': идъмъ въ ближнааа вѣсси и грады. (p. 91, Mark I.38); и горши дира бждеть. (p. 93, Mark II.21).

{t} ~ {t,} ты - (nom.sg.) 'you' vs. ти - (dat.sg.) 'you': рече емѸ іс̄, иди и ты сътвори такожде (p. 170b, Luke X.37); азъ нѣгда възвраща са въздам ти (p. 170b, Luke X.35).

{z} ~ {z,} жзы - 'bonds' vs. жзилище - 'prison': не по^дбааше ли раздрѣшити ж ѿ жзы сеж. (p. 180, Luke XIII.16); Іѡаннь же оуслышавъ, въ жзилищи дѣла х^сва, (p. 33b, Matth. XI.2).

{s} ~ {s,} бѣсы - (acc.pl.) 'devils' vs. бѣси - (nom.pl.) 'devils': мжжъ ... иже имѣ бѣсы ѿ лѣтъ многъ. (p. 161b, Luke VIII.27); и^збшедше же бѣси ѿ члка вънидошж въ свиніаа. (p. 162, Luke VIII.33).

{m} ~ {m,} мытаръ - 'publican' vs. миль - 'dear': и мнози мытаре и грѣшници (p. 92b, Mark II.15); и миль нѣмоу бы^с. (p. 185, Luke XV.20).

$\{n\} \sim \{n,\}$ ВИНЫ - (gen.sg.) 'guilt' vs. НИВА -
 'lot, ground': никое же ВИНЫ не о́брѣтаж до члѣка сего:
 (p. 205b, Luke XXIII.4); члѣкоу нѣкоямоу богатоу, оугобзи
 сѧ НИВА. (p. 176, Luke XII.16). But the word for 'now',
 always spelled in the classical texts as НЫНѢ or НЫНІА
 (Sav.), is, in IAG, written without exception with И: НИНѢ
 or НИНІА. A possible explanation is the fact that this word
 does not take part in any morphonemic alternation, nor has
 it a minimum pair for contrast. This indicates that the
 process of merging of the soft and hard consonants of a
 pair before $\{i\}$ went in the direction of the soft member.
 The words НИНѢ and ЛЮБИ are a good indication of this.

$\{l\} \sim \{l,\}$ ЗЛЫЖ - (acc.pl.masc.) 'bad' vs. ЗЛИ -
 (nom.pl.masc.) 'bad': а ЗЛЫЖ вѣнѣ и́зврѣгошѣ. (p. 42b,
 Matth. XIII.48); а́ше оубо вы ЗЛИ сѣще . (p. 172, Luke XI.
 13). The only oscillation between $\{l\}$ and $\{l,\}$, indicated
 by a fluctuation between Ы and И after the consonant, is in
 the spelling of the personal name Magdalene: бѣ же тоу
 ма́рїа магда́лыни. и́ дру́гаа ма́рїа. (p. 84b, Matth. XXVII.
 61); в них же бѣ ма́рїа магда́лини. и́ ма́рїа Іа́ковль.
 (p. 83b, Matth. XXVII.56). This dual spelling of the name
 is known also in the classical texts. The reason should be
 found in the shape of the segment after the $\{l,\}$ - it very
 much resembles the Slavic suffix -in,- (which is never found
 after a soft consonant), as in $\{bog-in,-i\}$, $\{rab-in,-i\}$,
 etc. IAG shows predominant spelling with И (11 times) and

only once with и (on p. 84b), in contrast to the classical texts, in which this word is spelled with ы in many instances.

{r} ~ {r,} рыбъ - (gen.pl.) 'fish' vs. ризы-(gen. sg.) 'garment': Объѡмножество рыбъ, много (p. 150, Luke V.6); да не възвратит сѧ възпѧть възати ризы своѧ. (p. 123, Mark XIII.16). But the verb stem {=rid-aj-} 'to weep' is written once with the letter и after a hard {r}: нако възплачете сѧ и възридаете вы. (p. 258, John XVI.20). In all other cases it is spelled with an ы: рыдаахъ же вси и плакаахъ сѧ ѡ. (p. 163b, Luke VIII.52). This spelling mistake, if connected with the numerous mistakes in the spelling of {a} as a instead of ѧ in the grammatical endings after {r,}, indicates a phonetic hardening of {r,}, erasing the difference between [r] and [r,] (especially in consonantal clusters like [kr], [zr], [tr]). Some modern dialects of the Christian population in the Phodopa Mountains in Bulgaria also show a hardening of the {r,} in all positions⁴³⁶. And still, the literary language of the 14th century tries to preserve the historically correct spelling as much as possible.

436. St. Stojkov offers examples from the speech of Moslems vs. Christians in the city of Smoljan and the village of Kremene near Smoljan: /sr,ed,é/ vs. /srad,e'/ < *srěd-ъj-o; /r,ōt/ vs. /rōt/ < *rěd-ъ in Smoljan; /r,úka-m/ vs. /rúka-m/ < *rjuk-aj-o 'to call, cry out' in Kremene. See:

St. Stojkov, Akan'e v bolgarskom jazyke, Obščeslavjanskoe značenie problemy akan'ja, Sofia, 1968, p. 113-114.

Before a vowel, the glide {v} is paired with {v,}:
 и текъ нападе на выж ѹго, и ѡблѡбыза и. (р. 185, Luke XV.
 20); и бѣ написаніе вины его написано, (р. 131, Mark XV.
 26).

The letters for the consonants ѣ and ѡ in borrowed words and names, always represent palatalized /f,/ and /θ,/, if they precede an {i}. The letter ы is never written after them. This rule applies absolutely for those ѣ and ѡ which are not at the end of the lexical morpheme, at the boundary with the grammatical endings (such as nominative and accusative plural masculine). In this position, the nominative plural masculine must be marked through palatalization of the final consonant of the stem. Theoretically, in the plural paradigm there must be an opposition like *{..f,i Nom.pl.masc.} vs. *{...fi Acc.pl.masc.}. Such forms happen not to be registered in IAG, but from the indirect evidence of forms like the dative singular /ios,if-u/ (Ѡѡсѣѣ ѡу, р. 221) and the vocative /iós,if,-o/ (Ѡѡсѣѣ, р. 8), one sees clearly that at a morpheme boundary with the grammatical endings the alternation /f/ ~ /f,/ appears at the same places where any Slavic hard consonant would have had such an alternation.

Thus hypothetically we may generalize: the morphemes {f} and {θ} when followed by an {i} inside a lexical morpheme exist only as soft phonetic variants [f,] and [θ,], but at the morpheme boundary with the case endings before {i}, they are paired as *[f] ~ *[f,] and *[θ,] ~ *[θ]

in accusative and nominative plural masculine, respectively.

The velars {k}, {g}, {x} in Slavic words do not have soft pairs in any position, and can be followed only by the letter и (never ь). But in Greek borrowings, inside the lexical morpheme, all three of the velars appear before {i} only as soft phonetic variants ([k,], [g,], [x,]) and are never followed by the letter и: ѡко же бо бѣ Ѡна въ чрѣвѣ китовѣ (р. 38, Matth. XII.40); и бы^с ѡко приближи са въ виѠфагѣ. (р. 194b, Luke XIX.29); бѣ же хитонь нешъвень. || нѣ съ выше истъкань (р. 265b, John XIX.23).

IAG does not offer masculine substantives of Greek origin with {k}, {g}, {x} before paradigmatic morpheme boundaries of the nominative or accusative plural. It is known, however, from other texts, that a word like {m#n,ix-} 'monk' has a nominative plural /m#n,ix,-i/ with a /x/ vs. /s,/ alternation, and an accusative plural /m#n,ix-i/ with no alternation of the final consonant. Such a restriction in the distribution of the soft/hard variants of the velars before {i} in Greek borrowings, indicated by the use of the letters и and ь - only the soft velar inside the lexical morpheme, only the hard velar at a morpheme boundary - in effect rules out any independent phonemic status for the soft velars. One must bear in mind a further possibility: that the spelling и inside the lexical morpheme of a Greek borrowing is determined by the Greek orthography, and does not express phonetic softening of the velars.

In a position other than before the grammatical endings, {з}, {с}, {ж}, {ш} and {щ} can be followed only by the letter и (never by ы). At a morpheme boundary with the grammatical endings, the same spelling rule applies for all of the above, except {з}. Only once in IAG, where an etymological *з was to be expected but the scribe wrote з, the latter was followed by an ы: польса (Mar.) 'profit' vs. ѿ плъти нѣ^с никоеа же пользы. (p. 231, John VI.63). This must have been caused by the phonetic merging of the phonemes /з/ and /з/. Not only does the letter ы follow the substitute letter з for {з}, but a deeper morphological change is observed in this case: the entire paradigm of the word has shifted from the soft to the hard declension. However, this is a single "mistake" in the entire book; the orthographic rules of the language prohibited writing ы after з in any position, while no such rule applied for the letter з. This is a significant indication of the tremendous importance of the symbol-letter for the medieval writer: he tried to follow the orthographic rules as closely as possible.

4.3.1.1. The use of the letter і for the morpheme {i} after a soft consonant is of low frequency. Graphically, it represents an abbreviated version of и, the two parallel strokes being represented by the two dots over a single stroke. Here and there this letter is used between two consonants or at absolute word end in order to save

space: ѥ испльнишѣ сѧ вси нѣрѣсти на сѣбѣрѣши ихъ.

(р. 148b, Luke IV.28). But in most cases, the letter ѥ is used after a soft consonant before {j} followed by another vowel. Since the jod in this case is never indicated by a letter, graphically the letter ѥ precedes another letter standing for a vowel: {pr,i-j#d,-o}: ѥ ѡбине ѥзде ѥзъ сѣнмища, прѣиде въ домъ ... (р. 90b, Mark I.29);

{mar,-ij-am-∅}: ѥ ѥма двѣ и маріамъ (р. 139, Luke I.27).

4.3.1.2. The letter ѥ (usually written with the Greek "smooth-breathing" sign) can exist only in initial position in biblical names. Only in a few cases does ѥ occur in this position.

4.3.1.3. The letter ѥ (or ѥ), indicating {i} after soft consonants, appears only in Greek borrowings, where it represents the Greek upsilon. But it is used very rarely: въставъ поими ѡтроца ѥ мѣтръ ѥго ѥ бѣжи въ ѥгупеть (р. 10b, Matth. II.13). Just a few lines later the scribe wrote: ѡ ѥгипта призвахъ сѣна моего: (р. 10b, Matth. II.15).

4.3.2. The morphoneme {u}⁴³⁷ is expressed by two letters: ou after hard paired consonants and velars; ю after soft paired consonants (after palatal consonants and the clusters /žd/, /št/ special orthographic rules are applied). Inside a lexical morpheme, this is the most restricted vow-

437. Some spelling variants are treated in: R. Scholvin, op. cit., pp. 33, 41-42.

el in Church Slavic. But the sequential restrictions inside a lexical morpheme and at a morpheme boundary are different.

Within a lexical morpheme, {u} never occurs after {ʒ} or {c}, nor, in IAG, is it represented after /z/; it can occur after hard paired consonants, jod and, among the soft paired consonants, /l,/ and /r,/. (It is possible that the epenthetic -l-, which replaces a {j} after the labials, was first triggered before {u} as an assimilative process: {j} → /l/ after rounded consonant before rounded vowel. The feature of rounding in the Slavic -l- can be seen in the Polish realization of {l} as [w], the Serbocroatian - of {l} as [o] and [u] in certain positions, the East Slavic - of *TELT as tolot, and the Ukrainian - of {l} as [w] in certain positions.)

The morphoneme {u} is written ю in the following environments in IAG:

a) after {l,}: ЛЮБИТИ (p. 121), КЛЮЧЬ (p. 175), etc.

b) after the morphoneme {j} following a labial; {j} changes into /l,/: {bjud-} > /bl,ud-/: ѣ принесе главу ѣго на блудѣ (p. 102b, Mark VI.28); {pju-n-} > /pl,u-n-/: сѣ рекъ, плюнѣ на земѣ, ѣ сътвори брение ѣ плюновениа. (p. 239, John IX.6).

c) after initial {j}: {jug-}: ЮГЪ (p. 179).

4.3.2.1. Classical OCS shows a great oscillation between the letters oy and ю in initial position. This

represents a Slavic isogloss which not only separates East Slavic from the rest of the Slavic dialects, but passes across neighboring dialects in the same linguistic group (South Slavic). The classical texts clearly indicate the optional character of the initial jotation of some words: оуже and юже in Mar., for instance. What is worth noting is the fact that no initial original Common Slavic *u < *ou could take prothetic jotation in two cases: in words whose morphological structure reveals that the initial {u} is a prefix, and in a limited number of words, for example оуши, оуста, оудъ, оучити, оумъ, etc. (This is true for all Church Slavic texts, including IAG.)

The difference between the classical texts and IAG is that in IAG a given word is consistently spelled either with ou or with ю, whereas in the classical texts there is considerable oscillation in the spelling of those forms which may be said to have an original prothetic jod⁴³⁸. In the classical texts the particle ou 'yet' is written with either ю or ou. In Mar. it appears twice as ю and once as ou. IAG in the same paragraphs has only оу: не оу ли слышите ни разоумѣете. (p. 108, Mark VIII.17). Mar. also uses the form юже (34 times), while the form оуже is used

438. The Rila Glagolitic Leaflets have оуже (V4, 27) and юже (II4, 1).

Codex Clozianus also has оуже (p. 5a) vs. юже (pp. 1b, 7a, 7b, 8a).

Psalterium Sinaiticum has ютрю (p. 165) vs. оутро (p. 78), ютръневати (p. 171) vs. оутрѣ(н)ѣжж (p. 75b), etc.

only 8 times. In IAG it appears only as оуже: оуже вы чисти есте. (p. 225, John XV.3). But all classical texts and IAG spell the word оубо with оу. While Mar. uses only оу in the spelling of оутрѣ, оутрѣи, оутрѣни днь, оутрина, the substantive оутро 'morrow' is written with either ю or оу. The word appears as оутро 8 times, and as ютро 7 times; Sav. has each form once. IAG again uses only the form without jototation: обаце по^дбаѣт ми дне^с и ѡтрѣ (p. 181, Luke XIII.33). In IAG, as in the classical texts, words like югѣ (p. 179), южъска (p. 173b), юности (p. 114), юноше (p. 157b), юнци (p. 64b) are always written with the letter ю. Only these words in IAG have initial {ju} rather than {u}.

4.3.2.2. The Hebrew name of Judas in IAG is never written with the letter ю (as it is in the classical texts, alongside the more frequent spelling иуда). The spelling in IAG resembles the Greek - this word is always written as Ѳоуда (p. 76b). The same principle applies to words like Ѳоудинѣ (p. 146b), Ѳоудовѣ (p. 139b), Ѳоудѣи (p. 224b), Ѳоудѣиска (p. 130) and Ѳоудѣа (p. 12).

4.3.2.3. As has been noted on p. 284, inside a lexical morpheme the morphoneme {u} appears after no paired soft consonant except /l,/ and /r,/. This fact, although of exclusive significance, has, to the best of my knowledge, gone unnoticed in previous studies of the phonological system of Church Slavic, as well as in Common Slavic reconstructions.

The same phonological restriction does not, however, apply at morpheme boundaries. There, {u} can follow not only the hard paired consonants, /j/, and /š/, /ž/, /č/, but also /c/, /z/, /št/, /žd/ and the soft paired consonants. IAG is no different in this respect from the classical texts. The only difference is in the orthographic representation of {u} as either ю or оу after soft or palatal consonants or /j/. It is very interesting that while in some instances, as we shall show later, the spelling rules require the choice of a different vowel letter after a palatal consonant inside a lexical morpheme than at a morpheme boundary, the morphoneme {u} is not affected:

a) After {ž} and {š} inside a lexical morpheme, only оу is written in IAG: одѣжди жоупелѣ и огнь съ нѣсе. (p. 190, Luke XVII.29); и поставитѣ овца о деснѣа себе. а козлища о шоужа. (p. 74b, Matth. XXV.33); да не чюють шоуица твоя, что творитѣ десница твоя. (p. 19, Matth. VI. 3); о неначааніа шоума морскаго. (p. 200b, Luke XXI.25). All these words were written with ю in the classical texts, but with оу in Ostr.

The clusters /št/ and /žd/ do not occur except at the morpheme boundary. The word шоуждѣ is not registered in IAG.

At the morpheme boundary, IAG offers examples for only /ž/, /š/ and /št/. In all cases the classical texts use the letter ю. But the orthographic rules of IAG require

оу: аще достоитъ мжжоу женѣ поустити. (р. 113, Mark X.2);
вѣсивашоу слнцоу (р. 133, Mark XVI.2); непъшоуж ѿко
 ѿмоу же множае ѿдасть. (р. 159, Luke VII.43).

b) Inside a lexical morpheme, the letter ю is always used after {ѣ}. There are no examples in IAG for /ѣ/ at a morpheme boundary: и чюждаахѣ сѣ ѿко съ женоѣ глааше. (р. 222, John IV.27). The situation is the following in the classical texts: Sav. uses only чю-; the glagolitic texts use mostly чк-, but also sporadically чоу- (see, in Mar., чюдиша сѣ and чоуждаахѣ сѣ); Ostr. uses mostly чоу-, but has one example with чю-: чюдотворьца.

c) As already stated, {с} and {з} do not occur before {u} inside a lexical morpheme. But they occur at the morpheme boundary of the masculine dative singular, where the spelling rules applied in IAG demand the letter оу:
 егда бо градеши ... къ кнашоу (р. 179, Luke XII.58);
 приидошѣ на гробѣ вѣсивашоу слнцоу. (р. 133, Mark XVI.2).
 At this boundary, the classical texts use the letter оу more frequently, but a spelling with ю is also possible (see, in Mar., слньцю and слньцоу).

4.3.2.4. After a soft paired consonant at the morpheme boundary of masculine dative and vocative singular, both the classical texts and IAG use only ю: и запрѣти
 ѿгню и ѿстави ж. (р. 149b, Luke IV.39); оучителю. вѣмы
 ѿко право глѣши. (р. 197, Luke XX.21); ра^дуи сѣ црю
 Иоудейскыи. (р. 264, John XIX.3).

4.3.2.5. At a morpheme boundary after {j}, the spelling requires only ю. In the entire IAG there is only one example where the letter Ѹ stands in this position - {n, o=v, ár, -#j-u}: помози моему невѣриѸ || (p. 111, Mark IX.24). But in this peculiar case, at the end of a line, the use of an Ѹ (very narrow and long) was probably dictated by lack of space.

4.3.2.6. The morphoneme {u} in initial position and after hard consonants is usually expressed graphically by the digraph оу, as in Greek and classical OCS. Sometimes in initial or final position it is expressed by the ligature Ѹ (uk). This letter does not occur between two consonants. But when the consonant before {u} is written above the line, and a vowel letter stands in the line before the grapheme for {u}, then usually the {u} is expressed only by the letter у (without the preceding о), while the front part of the letter у overlaps the letter for the vowel on the line:

рѸу Ѹт сѸ (p. 54), рѸу итѣ сѸ (p. 85b), etc.

4.3.3. The morphoneme {o}⁴³⁹ can follow any non-vocalic morphoneme, either inside a lexical morpheme or at a morpheme boundary; in Slavic words, it can stand in word initial position or follow a vowel, provided a prefixal morpheme boundary separates the two vowels (as in приобрѣсти). The latter restriction does not apply to Greek words.

439. The spellings of the outcomes of this morphoneme are discussed in:

R. Scholvin, op. cit., pp. 24, 31-33, 42.

Depending on the environment - the preceding consonant, sonorant or glide - {o} has two phonetic realizations: a rounded middle vowel after hard consonants ([o]) and an unrounded middle vowel after soft and palatal consonants and the glide /j/ ([e]). The same restriction as for {u} applies here too: the feature [+SOFT] of non-vocalic phonemes (which, following Chomsky and Halle⁴⁴⁰, can be determined as [+HIGH]) is incompatible with the feature [+ROUNDED] of the following vocalic morphoneme.

4.3.3.1. Graphically, the morphoneme {o} is expressed in IAG by the following letters: o, ω, ϕ, ⊙, e, je, ĕ. In Slavic words, the letters o, ω, ϕ and ⊙ stand for the phoneme /o/ in word-initial position or after a vowel across the prefix boundary, as well as after hard consonants (in the latter environment, written only as o or ω). In Greek words, the environment also includes "after a vowel within a lexical morpheme". The letter e represents the segment [e], which, since it does not have morphonemic justification, is represented by {o}. The morphoneme {j} is usually omitted by the spelling, which doubtless indicates a phonological fact: its phonemic redundancy after having changed the feature [+ROUNDED] of {o} into [-ROUNDED] - i.e., {o} > [e]. But in many cases after {j} in initial position or at a morpheme boundary, the ligature je stands

440. N. Chomsky, M. Halle, The Sound Pattern of English, New York, 1968, p. 301-329.

for the combination of {j} and {o}. In a few instances the letter ѣ is used for the morphoneme {o} after a soft consonant (cf. below).

4.3.3.2. All consonants paired for softness/hardness may be followed by the morphoneme {o}, represented graphically as е or о, expressing the phonetic outcomes [e] and [o], respectively. The palatal consonants /ʒ/, /c/, /ʒ̣/, /š/, /č/ and the clusters /ʒd/ and /št/ can never be followed by the [+ROUNDED] phonemic variant of this morphoneme (and thus, by the letters о and ω). This rule holds for both inside a lexical morpheme and at a morpheme boundary.

In Mar. and Zogr. the word for 'ashes' is registered in the phrase въ попельѣ. This word does not occur in the Aprakos versions. In IAG it is written with е, indicating a soft initial /p, / (resulting from IE ablaut).

These two variants represent an old Common Slavic isogloss:

*репельѣ ~ *ропельѣ: древле оубо въ врѣтищи ѿ пепельѣ,
покаали сѧ быша. (p. 34b, Matth. XI.21).

4.3.3.3. The velars {k}, {g} and {x} are always hard in Slavic words. Before {i} within lexical morphemes in Greek or Hebrew borrowings, they appear only in their soft allophones. But before {o} in these borrowings they are paired as /k/ ~ /k, /, /g/ ~ /g, /, /x/ ~ /x, /: ѿ ѿзде
... на ѿнѣ полѣ потока кедрѣскаго (p. 260b, John XVIII.1);
въврѣже двѣ лептѣ. еже ю^с кондратѣ. (p. 121b, Mark XII.42);
оубоите же сѧ ... дѣша и тѣло погоубити въ геѣнѣ: (p. 31b,

Matth. X.28); ѿрадьнѣ бѣдетъ содомоу ѡли гомороу ...
 (р. 101b, Mark VI.11); ѡко архелае цр^с твоуетъ въ їоудѣи.
 (р. 11b, Matth. II.22); горе тебѣ хобразинъ. (р. 169, Luke
 X.13).

While some of the glagolitic texts use a special letter ℓ (in cyrillic transliteration - ћ) for the Greek phoneme /g,/ inside lexical morphemes, IAG follows the tradition already established in Sav. and the rest of the older Bulgarian Church Slavic texts: it uses only the cyrillic letter г. The phonetic palatalization of the soft velars inside the lexical morphemes of foreign borrowings, expressed graphically by the letter е, is best illustrated by the use of the ligature је, which in all other instances in IAG always denotes the combination {jo} either in word-initial position or at a morpheme boundary after a vowel. Thus, the only exception to this consistent spelling in IAG is: ѡ вина ѡ сикера не ѡматъ пѣти. (р. 138, Luke I.15).

4.3.3.4. In IAG, despite an older phonological restriction on the occurrence of two vowels in a row, the morphoneme {o} as a [+ROUNDED] vowel may follow another vowel in foreign words, where it is usually written with ѡ: {(j)ios,if-∅} > їѡсифъ, {(j)ioann-∅} > їѡаннъ, etc. The classical OCS texts and Ostr. often have the letter е in such an environment: ерданѣ (Mar., р. 116), ѣрданьсцѣ (Sav., р. 145b), ерданьсцѣи (Ostr., р. 254c), иерданьсцѣи (Ostr., р. 255d). The letters е and је in word-initial position may represent initial {j} followed by {o}, or

initial {j} followed by the fleeting vowel {#}. In both cases the spelling utilizes more or less alternate forms with e or je.

The only Slavic words registered in IAG which have initial {j} followed by {o} are the derivatives of the stem {jod,in-} and the forms of the word {joz,or-}. These words in the East Slavic dialects are without initial {j}, but in South Slavic and in the Church Slavic writings from the South they never appear without initial jotation. These two stems and almost all Greek borrowings which, in Greek, are written with the letter η (eta) and are morphonemically understood in Slavic as having initial {jo}, have alternate spellings with e and je: ѣДИНѦ (p. 56) and ѣДИНО (p.16b); ѣЗЕРА and ѣЗЕРО (both on p. 161b); ѣЗЕКИА (p. 7); ѣЛЕАЗАРЪ (p. 7b); ѣЛИНСКОЕ and ѣЛИНЫ (both on p. 234).

4.3.3.5. In only one morphonological environment do the orthographic and phonological rules reflected in IAG allow the phonetic feature [+ROUNDED] in the morphoneme {o} after {j}; the following two conditions must be present:

- a) The morphonemes {j} and {o} are separated by a morpheme boundary;
- b) Before the morpheme boundary not only a final {j} is present, but the entire sequence {Soft Consonant+oj-}.

There is no exception to this rule in the spelling of IAG: {alf,oj-ov- \emptyset } > алѣѡвѣ (p. 30); {andr,oj-ov-a} > андрѡва (p. 216); {z,ov,od,oj-om} > съ зеведѡмѣ

(p. 15). In this environment the glagolitic texts, Sav. and Ostr. often use the letter o, but alternate spelling with e is not unusual. In addition, the classical texts have гeωнѣ (Mar., p. 11), виθлеωмѣ (p. 5). Such spellings are unknown in IAG. The literary language of the 14th century in the version of IAG distinguishes absolutely clearly the phonological (and orthographic) rules within a lexical morpheme from those applied at a morpheme boundary. So far it has been demonstrated that phonetic innovations occur first within the lexical morpheme, while the rules of Slavic morphonology are extremely conservative at boundaries.

Even in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian, the same rule (preservation of rounding in {o} after a {j} at a morpheme boundary) governs the plural-formation of monosyllabic masculine substantives ending in {oj}, {ej}: {brój-ove} > брóеве 'issues (of a periodical)' versus {zméj-ove} > змéйове 'dragons', {béj-ove} > бéйове 'Turkish overlords'.

4.3.3.6. The word for 'oil' in Church Slavic is a Greek borrowing - ἔλαιον. In the glagolitic texts and Sav. it is represented as олѣи, always with the letter jat' and initial {o} without jotation. In Ostr. it appears as олея (p. 148c). In IAG the Greek word for 'oil' is translated five times with масло, while the Greek borrowing is used only three times, in one of them - as the instrumental singular ѣлеемь (p. 101b). This seems to contradict the absolute character of the phonological and orthographic rule

for the rounding of {o} at a morpheme boundary after {Soft Consonant + oj-}; *{jól,oj-om} should give the unattested (in IAG) form *ѣлеωмь. But the morphonemic representation of this word as *{jol,oj-om} does not seem to be justified. The glagolitic texts and Sav., with no oscillation, write the word with the letter ѣ (олѣи); this would rather suggest for IAG such a morphonemic representation as {jol,aj-om}. In this environment the {o} in the morphological ending {-om} should become phonetically unrounded - [e]. The representation of the morphoneme {a}, which follows the soft consonant, before a soft consonant or {j} in unstressed position, does not cause problems⁴⁴¹.

Bearing in mind the shape of this word in the Bulgarian dialects and standard language of today, one might be tempted to offer another possible representation for this word - {jól,#j-om}. The Contemporary Standard Bulgarian word for 'cooking oil' is ѣлио, which can only be derived from an underlying *{ol,#j-}. However, such a representation for the 14th-century form attested in IAG is untenable, because the fleeting vowel in *{(j)ol,#j-} should have been expressed in IAG by means of the letter ѣ (for tense jer), which, however, did not happen in any of the three forms

441. Phonetically, this unstressed /a/ after a soft consonant should yield a [-LOW], [-ROUNDED] vowel, which may be expressed graphically by the letters ѣ, e, or even и. For further discussion see 4.3.4.11.

registered in IAG. The modern Bulgarian word is most likely a new borrowing, whose phonetic expression as [ól,ið] < {ól,#j-o} follows rules not attested in the classical texts nor in IAG. Thus, for instance, in Mar. (and the rest of the OCS texts) words like илиевъ (p. 204) and краниево (p. 108) are attested only with -ев-. In IAG, as in the classical OCS texts, rounding of the {o} in this environment is not allowed at all. By contrast, many modern Bulgarian dialects have such forms as [ilíof], [ilíuf]⁴⁴².

4.3.3.7. The glagolitic texts show a phonetic alternation of [e] and [o] at a morpheme boundary after a final {r,}, expressed in the spelling by the use of either e or o: кесареви and кесарови (Mar.). It seems that here the problem is a general tendency to harden {r,} into /r/. IAG has only кесарéви (p. 65) for the dative singular, and кéсаревъ (p. 197b) for the possessive adjective.

4.3.3.8. The rules for distribution of the letters o, ω, ⊙ and ϕ are very tentative. The letters ϕ and ⊙ are rarely used, most likely for decorative purposes, and appear only in initial position: ϕсѣма (p. 33b), ⊙чи (p. 239) or for the preposition: ϕ НИХ же (p. 175). The most frequent use of the letter ω is in the preposition and prefix {ot#-}, usually written as a ligature ⊙, but in a few

442. St. Stojkov, Bølgarska dialektologija, Sofia, 1962, pp. 66, 126.

cases, both as prefix and as preposition, written instead as отъ. In addition, ω is written in Greek names, where the letter omega stands in the Greek originals; in many cases, however, when we find the letter ω in the Slavic text, there should be an omicron in the Greek original, and vice versa (cf. below). In Slavic words the letter ω is most often written in word-initial position. Some words are always written with omega: ωставка (5 times, on pp. 76b, 88b, 141, 144b, 212); in others the scribe uses either o or ω: обрѣте (p. 25) and ωбрѣте (p. 55). The tendency in IAG is to use the omega in initial position in Slavic words much more frequently than in the older Church Slavic texts. In a few instances omega may even be found in word-final position: егω (p. 81). It may also appear inside a Slavic lexical morpheme: похωти (p. 97). At a morpheme boundary omega is used very frequently to render the first phoneme of the suffix {-ov-} (with [+ROUNDING]): алфэωва (p. 92b), бѣсωвъсцѣмъ (p. 29b), and in the grammatical endings, especially if they follow a velar: идохωмъ (p. 57b), трѣжнихωмъ (p. 61b), etc.

Sometimes the initial letter for {o} in the word очи is decorated with a dot in the center: ⊙ is known as "o очное"⁴⁴³ (it even appears once with two dots, like a

443. E. F. Karskij, Slavjanskaja kirillovskaja paleografija, Leningrad, 1928, p. 196-197. Karskij states that "o очное" can appear also in positions other than word-initial (for instance, as in Pskovskij Apostol of 1309). However, no such case is registered in IAG.

pair of eyes - о, p. 210): и помаза њему оци брениемъ.
 (p. 239, John IX.6). But this type of ornamentation can hardly have made "о очное" a different letter; it occurs mostly in the forms of the word оци, yet its frequency even there is much lower than that of the conventional letter о.

4.3.3.9. There is a case where the morphoneme {o} after a soft consonant is represented by the letter ѣ:
 {bVd,-a-t,o}: бждетѣ [=бждѣте] въ коупѣ двѣ мелѣши.
 (p. 190b, Luke XVII.35). The reason for this mistake is the phonetic change of {a} into [e], [ə], or even [i] between two soft consonants (including {j}) or in absolute word-final position after a soft consonant. This change of a [+LOW] vowel into a [-LOW] ([-LOW][-HIGH] or even [+HIGH]) vowel is caused by the phonological restriction, according to which no [+LOW] vowel can occur in the environment between two [+HIGH] (i.e. soft) consonants, nor, when unstressed, between a [+HIGH] consonant and word end. In this particular case the rendering of final {o} after a soft consonant as ѣ is a hypercorrection, since final unstressed {o} and {a} have merged into the same phonetic outcome - a [-LOW] (perhaps even [+HIGH]), [-ROUNDED], unstressed vowel. There are two more examples in IAG of the rendering of a final unstressed {o} after a soft consonant as ѣ in the verbal ending of the third person dual aorist: ѡврѣзостѣ сѧ ѡчи ѡма (p. 29, Matth. IX.30); ѡчи же ѡю оудрѣжастѣ сѧ. (p. 210, Luke XXIV.16).

4.3.3.10. The letter ѣ always stands for the morphoneme {o} after {n,} in the negative particle {n,o} (which in isolation is graphically expressed as не) when it precedes the present tense forms of the verb 'to be'. But the initial morphonemic sequence of the verb, {j#-}, is always truncated if it follows the particle {n,o}. Here what is involved is a phonemic change due to the stress rule: syntactically, the forms of the present tense of the verb 'to be' behave as clitics and change their position in the syntagma. They are always found after a word with emphatic stress, or if there is none, after the first stressed word of the syntagma. (If the same syntagma contains other clitics such as ли, бо, же, ти, etc., and the particles да, не, the rules for ordering the clitics become extremely complex, as in modern Bulgarian, and cannot be adequately treated except in a special study.) Examples are: а́зь я́смь бъ а́враа́мовъ (p. 66, Matth. XXII.32); нѣ а́зь благъ я́смь. (p. 59, Matth. XX.15); я́ко о́тцъ вашъ нѣбсннн сѣврѣшенъ я́сть. (p. 19, Matth. V.48); о́унѣе ти я́сть да погыбнетъ я́динъ о́удъ твоихъ. (p. 17b, Matth. V.30).

Thus the combination of the two unstressed morphemes {n,o} and {j#s-m,} causes the appearance of stress on the first one, namely {n,ó-}. The morphonemic sequence {n,ó + j#s-m,} behaves as one word with its own stress, and its phonemic outcome is /n,ásm,/ (first person singular). In addition, for example, {n,ó + j#s-mi} becomes /n,ásmi/

(first person plural), and $\{n, \acute{o} + j\#s, -i\}$ becomes $/n, \acute{a}s, i/$ (second person singular). What one observes in these forms is a reduction of $\{j\}$ to \emptyset with a subsequent change in the new sequence: $\underline{n, \acute{o}-\emptyset\#-}$ into $\underline{n, \acute{a}-}$. This must represent a change which had occurred in the Common Slavic dialects when $*\underline{e}$ and $*\underline{\check{e}}$ (the reconstructed forms are $*\underline{ne}$ and $*\underline{n\check{e}}$ rather than $\underline{n, o}$ and $\underline{n, a}$) were opposed only by length. But in the 14th century one cannot express synchronically this change as the lengthening of $\{o\}$ into $/a/$, or of $/e/$ into $/a/$ after a soft consonant, because it is impossible to prove that the distinctive phonemic feature in these pairs was length. Since the change of $\{o\}$ to $/a/$ in this environment ($\{n, \acute{o} + j\#s-\}$) is connected with the reduction of $\{j\}$ to \emptyset , the combination of $\{n, o\}$ and the form of the third person plural of the present tense of the verb 'to be' ($\{s-\tilde{v}t\}$), where initial $\{j\}$ is absent, should simply have stayed unchanged - $\{n, \acute{o} + s-\tilde{v}t\} > /n, \acute{o}s\tilde{v}t/$, which would be written НЕ СЖТЬ. The classical texts and Ostr. always have НѢСМЬ, etc., but never a third person plural in $*\underline{нѣ}$: НЕ СЖТЬ (Mar., p. 358), НЕ СЖТЬ (Sav., p. 125b). In IAG, however, all forms of the present tense of the verb 'to be' with the particle $\{n, o\}$ are spelled with нѣ, including the third person plural: а наемникъ ѣже нѣ^с пастыр. ѣмоу же нѣсжть. (p. 242, John X.12). This seems to be a result of morpho-
nemic levelling of the entire paradigm of this verb in the negative form.

The environment {j#-} after the morpheme boundary following the negative particle {n,o} is not sufficient to create /n,a/ < {n,o-j#...}; it must be combined with assignment of stress on the negative particle. Proof of this is furnished by the negative forms {n,o + j#m, -Vt} > ѿ НЕ ИМАТЪ чьсо нѧсти. (p. 48, Matth. XV.32) and {n,o + j#mj-o-t,o} > семоу вѣ вѣрѧ НЕ нѣмлете. (p. 226b, John V.38).

It is interesting to compare the situation in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian, where the verb 'to be' has its own stress (and thus ceases to be a clitic) only if it immediately follows the negative particle не: не ѣ ѿдвал 'he has not been here' (but compare: не щѣ (да) е ѿдвал 'he most likely has not been here'). When followed by forms of the present tense of the verb 'to be' in the standard language, the negative particle is never stressed. But contrary to what is observed in IAG, the verb 'to have' now behaves the way the verb 'to be' used to behave in the literary language of the 14th century: ѿмам 'I have', but нѧмам (/n,ámam/ < {n,ó + j#m-aj-m}) 'I do not have'.

4.3.4. The literary language of 14th-century Bulgaria, as represented in IAG, has a morphoneme {a}⁴⁴⁴ - a [+LOW], [-ROUNDED], [-FRONT] vowel, which can follow either a hard or a soft consonant, either inside a lexical

444. Spellings with and without expressed jotation are mentioned in:

R. Scholvin, op. cit., pp. 41, 42.

morpheme or after a morpheme boundary. In addition, like the morphonemes {i}, {o} and {u}, it may be found in absolute word-initial position. But as will be shown later, by the time of the writing of IAG the phonological rules of the language produced a phonemic and phonetic outcome of this morphoneme, in the environment after a soft consonant, different from that in the environment after a hard consonant or in word-initial position.

4.3.4.1. No modern Slavic dialect in present-day Bulgaria, Macedonia, Greece or European Turkey distinguishes an original jat' (*ě₁ or *ě₂), reconstructed on comparative Slavic evidence, from an original combination *jā⁴⁴⁵, nor was such a distinction made explicit in the known cyrillic - much less, glagolitic - texts of classical OCS, written in the Bulgarian linguistic area or copied from a Bulgarian original⁴⁴⁶. And yet, the cyrillic Slavic alphabet, although without strict graphic distinction, has even in the

445. N. van Wijk, Le développement des voyelles ě, a, ja en bulgare, Revue des études slaves, 7, Paris, 1927, p. 7-21.

Xr. Kodov, Ezikot na trakijskite i maloazijskite bəlgari, Sofia, 1935, p. 35-37.

B. Conev, Istorija na bəlgarskij ezik, I, Sofia, 1919, p. 303-333.

St. Mladenov, Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache, Berlin-Leipzig, 1929, p. 89-99.

K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 105-109.

Bl. Koneski, Istorija na makedonskiot jazik, Skopje, 1967, p. 50-52.

446. P. Diels, Altkirchenslavische Grammatik, Heidelberg, 1963 (2nd edition), p. 31-36.

older texts two letters for *ě and the combination *jā: ě and the ligature ja. On the other hand, the glagolitic alphabet utilizes only one graphic symbol, Ɑ for both etymological *ě and *jā. This very fact gives evidence that the glagolitic alphabet was originally designed for a linguistic system which did not know such phonetic distinction, while the cyrillic was created for a linguistic system which phonetically distinguished original *ě and *jā. From the oldest preserved records of cyrillic literature in Bulgaria, Codex Suprasliensis and Savvina kniga, it is clear that the existence of two graphemes for one phoneme created serious orthographic problems. The medieval men's reverence for written symbols made it impossible for them to eliminate either of the two letters. As the Bulgarian dialects further developed their own structural peculiarities, different from Church Slavic (under the influence of the Balkan convergence area), increasing efforts were made by the grammarians to standardize the literary language, and above all its graphic system. If here and there the orthography shows oscillation under the pressure of the living language, the forms influenced by the spoken language were undoubtedly spelling mistakes, and had no chance of becoming the norm. The conscious efforts of grammarians to disregard completely the changes in the living Bulgarian dialects and to purge out of the literary writings mistakes introduced under the influence of the dialects, are exactly what made the Middle

Bulgarian literary language not only a supradialectal but also a supranational medium of written communication. This fact, of which modern linguists complain most in their efforts to unveil the history of the Bulgarian language⁴⁴⁷, was the greatest asset of the Bulgarian literary language, making possible the transfer of the Byzantine literature translated into this language, as well as some literary works originally written in it, into 14th-century Serbia and 15th-century Moldavia, Wallachia, Russian Lithuania and Russia.

4.3.4.2. The efforts to normalize the use of the graphemes ѣ and ѡ must have been seriously upset by the fact that none of the cyrillic texts existing in Bulgaria offered consistent data upon which a scribe might build a firm set of orthographic rules. Moreover, some of the oldest Bulgarian cyrillic texts are direct copies from glagolitic originals⁴⁴⁸, and even when both letters are used, the letter ѡ has a very insignificant frequency. In the extant fragments of Eninski Apostol⁴⁴⁹, ѡ appears only eight times as against hundreds of occurrences of ѣ. But the amazing fact is that even in the 11th century, the

447. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 144.

448. E. F. Karskij, op. cit., p. 211-219.

449. K. Mirčev, Xr. Kodov, ed's., Eninski Apostol. Starobelgarski pametnik ot XI vek, Sofia, 1965, 263pp. (Reviewed by: A. Minčeva, Izdanie na nov originalen starobelgarski pametnik, BelgEz, XVI, 1966, 5, p. 520-522.)

scribe of this book tried to make some system for the use of the two letters: in the extant fragment of the manuscript, the letter ѡ is, in six of its eight occurrences, written after ѣ, as in ЛЮБОДѢЯНИѢ (p. 2b). The scribe did not use this principle consistently, and forms like СТОУДОДѢЪНИИ (p. 5b) exist too⁴⁵⁰.

When one compares the situation in Eninski Apostol with that in Sav. - another very old Bulgarian copy from the 11th century - it becomes clear that the scribe of Sav. also follows some basic rules in the distribution of the two letters: generally stated, the letter ѣ was written most of the time after a consonant, and the ligature ѡ - after a vowel or in word-initial position. Such a tendency must have been created not by chance: the reason behind it is the different distribution of etymological *ě and *jā within the word. According to ancient phonological rules of the syllable structure in Slavic dialects, *jā cannot follow a consonant inside a morpheme, but can occur in word-initial position or immediately after a morpheme boundary. On the other hand, *ě (from *ě₁ or *ě₂) inside a morpheme occurs only after consonants; it appears very rarely in word-initial position (*ěxa-ti, *ěs-ti), and its most frequent usage as a desinence is after morpheme boundaries of the hard nominal declension (where the stems must end in consonants).

450. K. Mirčev, Xr. Kodov, ed's., Eninski Apostol. ..., p. 183.

Thus, in the prototype of Sav., the phonetic distinction between *ě and *jā must have been made, reflecting a dialect different from those of the writers of the glagolitic texts. The letter ѣ must have occurred in most instances after a consonant, and the ligature ѣа - after vowels or in word-initial position. Remnants of the etymologically correct spelling of ѣ and ѣа in Sav., despite such a general tendency in their distribution after consonants or vowels and in initial position, are forms such as ближъняго (3 times with the correct ѣа, although graphically following a letter for a consonant), different forms of the verb ѣсти (written 6 times with initial ѣ), and the complete absence of the letter ѣ in word-initial position for the original sequence *jā. But still, as I have counted, other forms of the verb *ěsti appear 28 times written with initial ѣа, following the general tendency in the distribution of *ě and *jā. The original combination *j-ā across a morpheme boundary (in *mōrj-ā) is expressed as морѣ (p. 40b), because the letter required should immediately follow a consonant letter.

4.3.4.3. The scribe of IAG applies very strict mechanical rules for the distribution of the letter ѣ and the ligature ѣа. In his original text, the letter ѣ never appears in word-initial position or after a consonant. In the only example where the ligature ѣа is written after a prefixal morpheme boundary when the prefix ends in a consonant ({b}), the ѣа is actually written not after the б,

but after a letter which expresses either a vowel or a word boundary - ь: обьядѣніемь (p. 200b). A letter ѡ written by the original scribe in the final version of the book follows the letter н in only two instances: пад же оубо рабь тѣ клан ѡше сѡ емоу глѡ. (p. 55, Matth. XVIII.26); ѡ блажн ѡхж сѡ ѡ нѣмь. (p. 101, Mark VI.3). But here someone has erased the letter ѡ which was written between the letters н and ѡ, traces of which are still visible. The words originally were written by the hand of Monk Symon as кланѡше сѡ and блажнѡхж сѡ. Similar corrections were made in the original spelling of the word нинѡ; the letter ѡ was erased and ѡ was written instead (p. 140, 114b, etc.). The person who corrected those few words, not understanding the system applied by Monk Symon, for some reason tried to improve on the spelling.

In a few instances, in grammatical endings, the letter ѡ, originally written after the letter р, was erased and replaced by the letter а. (We have previously described - on p. 272-273 - corrections in the spelling of the word трѡва > трава, where this change takes place in the root.) Examples are: бѡ корабль по срѣдѣ мора (p. 104, Mark VI. 47); ѡ бы^с боура вѣтрѣна велиа. (p. 98, Mark IV.37); бы^с же и || прѡ вѣ нихъ. (p. 202-202b, Luke XXII.24); бѡста бо рыбара (p. 89b, Mark I.16); не ѡмамы цара, тѣкмо кесара. (p. 265, John XIX.15). The same kind of substitution of the letter а for ѡ after the letter р is attested in the cyril-

lic Sav. and Supr.⁴⁵¹. There is no way to identify the place and time of "corrections" of the original spelling of these words. One thing is clear: although before {i} within a lexical morpheme, the language of the original scribe seems to have lost the opposition [r,] ~ [r]⁴⁵², his spelling of the sequence r,-a across the flexional morpheme boundary is determined not by the phonological rules, but by the morphological type of the word: forms like accusative singular мопе (p. 89b), dative singular мопю (p. 92b) and especially the locative singular мопи (p. 95b) - which otherwise should have been *морѣ - must have indicated to the scribe that this word morphologically belonged to the soft declension type.

4.3.4.4. The only word whose final {r,} the scribe Symon treats as [r] in the spelling of the genitive and accusative singular in all three existing examples, is the word кесара (pp. 141b, 144b, 265): ѣзде повелѣние ѿ кесара ѡвгоуста. (p. 141b, Luke II.1). The genitive - accusative singular of this word is written also with -a in Sav., but in Mar. it appears twice with ѣ and once with a. Comparison of the spelling of the other registered forms and derivatives of this word in Mar. and IAG reveals the

451. Savvina kniga has forms like мора [=морѣ], распѣра [=распрѣ], сѣмѣраеть сѣ [=сѣмѣрѣеть сѣ], etc. Codex Suprasliensis has forms like боура [=боурѣ], сакелароу [=сакеларю], сѣтворѣ [=сѣтворѣ], покараемѣ [=покарѣемѣ], etc.

452. See the paragraph on {r} ~ {r,} under 4.3.1.

following: while in Mar. the dative singular is spelled three times as кесареви and four times as кесарови, the only form registered in IAG is кѣсаревѣ < {k, ósar, -ov-i} (pp. 65, 119b, 120, 197, 197b, 205b, 264b twice); while in Mar. the possessive adjectives are spelled twice as кесарев- and four times as кесаров-, the only registered forms in IAG are кесáрев- ({k, osár, ov-}) (pp. 65b twice, 120 twice, 197b twice). Since there is no oscillation in the spelling of the same grammatical forms - only кесара (as of the hard declension) and only кѣсаревѣ, кесáрев- (as of the soft declension, or derived from a word ending in a soft {r,}), it may be concluded that this word was treated like a word of "mixed" morphological type; but because of the lack of other case forms, such as the instrumental or locative singular, in IAG, it is unclear exactly which cases in addition to the genitive-accusative were from the hard, and which from the soft, declension. In derivation, however, the word appears to be of the soft declension. Such words of "mixed" type are not unusual for Church Slavonic (compare the declension of some substantives with the suffix {-stv-}, such as црѣтво, црѣтвѣ which can have two forms, e.g., for gen. sg. ({-stv-a} and {-stv-#j-a}), but which have only one registered form ({-stv-#j-i}) for the loc. sg.⁴⁵³.)

453. I was not able to find reference in the literature to this peculiarity in the declension of the words црѣтво, црѣтвѣ. P. Diels, for instance, in paragraph 70,1 discusses the variant spellings of instrumental singular and dative plural of substantives ending in -stv-, but no exam-

Yet words of "mixed type" could hardly have had support in the Bulgarian dialects of the 14th century, since the nominal flexion was seriously altered by that time⁴⁵⁴.

4.3.4.5. A word which is always written with the letter a instead of ѣ in all Middle Bulgarian texts, including IAG, is самс < сѣмо 'here'. B. Conev⁴⁵⁵ believes this spelling to represent a general tendency towards phonetic hardening of {s,}, {з} and {c}. K. Mirčev neither accepts

ple of locative singular is given. (P. Diels, op. cit., p. 168-169). In paragraph 73,1 there are numerous references to the occurrence of the locative singular form цѣсарѣвствѣ (P. Diels, op. cit., p. 172-173). I looked very thoroughly through the glossaries of Mar. and Sav., as well as through the abundant textual variants cited by Jagić in the footnotes of Mar., but I did not find a single example of the locative form *црствѣ.

In IAG the number of occurrences of forms like црства, црствоу has considerably increased at the expense of црствина, црствию, yet there is no single example of *црствѣ.

B. von Arnim, in his monograph on the origin of the alternation of the suffixes -je, -stvo, -stviје in the biblical texts, gives many examples of alternating forms derived from the same lexical morphemes, in {-stv-} and {-stv-#j-}. But, since he does not list the registered locative singular forms, one cannot tell from his data whether or not a whole class of alternating words shares the peculiarity of црство, црствие. See:

B. von Arnim, Beiträge zum Studium der altbulgarischen und altkirchenslavischen Wortbildung und Übersetzungskunst. Ursachen des Wechsels zwischen den Suffixen -je, -stvo, -stviје in Evangelium, Apostolus, Psalter und einigen anderen Übersetzungen, Sitzungsberichte der phil. - hist. Klasse, 22 October 1931, Berlin, 1932, p. 952-1024.

454. K. Mirčev, Po vѣprosa za sklonenieto v bѣlgarskija ezik, BѣlgEz, IV, 1954, 1, p. 61-64.

455. B. Conev, ed., Vračansko evangelie (Bѣlgarski starini, IV), Sofia, 1914, p. 48.

nor categorically rejects this explanation⁴⁵⁶. It seems erroneous to link the phonetic hardening of {ʒ} and {c} in some modern West Bulgarian dialects (yielding [calúvam] < ЦѢЛОВАТИ) with the hardening of the {s,} in сѢМО, which happened in all Bulgarian dialects (the existing form is НАСАМ 'hither, towards me'). Besides this difference - a narrow dialectal change versus an all-area change - it does not seem very convincing to link the phonetic outcome of the Second and Third Slavic Palatalizations with phonetic changes in a phoneme which never resulted from the palatalization of a velar. By its origin the word сѢМО is a composite of the demonstrative pronoun *сѢ and the adverbial morpheme *-амо, which appears also in КАМО 'whither', ОВАМО 'here', ТАМО 'there', ОНАМО 'over there', ИНАМО 'elsewhere' and НАМО 'here'⁴⁵⁷. All these words form a microsystem in which the morpheme {-амо} follows a hard consonant in five cases, and a soft consonant in only one ({s,-амо}). The force of analogical levelling within the microsystem must have been the only decisive one, which changes {s,} into /s/. It is also possible that this process was sped up by the hardening

456. Although K. Mirčev expresses reservations by writing, "It is not certain, though, that we deal with a phonetic development ...", he lists the change of /s,amo/ to /samo/ in the paragraph on the phonetic hardening of /c/. But, on the other hand, he also accepts the possibility of the influence of the word /tamo/. See:

K. Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika na bēlgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1963 (2nd edition), p. 107.

457. L. Sadnik, R. Aitzetmüller, Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten, Hague-Hdlbg., 1955, p. 197.

of the {s,} in the fossilized demonstrative enclitic, as in днесъ, 'today'; this hardening, however, is difficult to date.

4.3.4.6. In one instance the letter ѣ seems to be replaced by an a in the form имали (which, according to all the classical texts, should be имѣли): да бишѣ имали на нь что глѣти. (p. 235, John VIII.6). However, here the problem is not phonetic hardening of {m,}, but deeper morphological changes: the stem from the present paradigm of the verb имѣти - имамъ, имаши becomes also the derivational stem for the -l-participle.

4.3.4.7. The spelling of two words in IAG with ѣ (instead of ь or и, as in all classical texts) likewise had little to do with phonological change: стъклѣници ← стъклъници (Mar.), иглѣнѣ ← игълинѣ (Mar.). The forms with ѣ registered in IAG have a different derivation - with the Common Slavic suffix represented in Russian by -jan-, used in the formation of some relative adjectives.

4.3.4.8. The archaic first person singular of the athematic verb вѣдѣти, вѣдѣ, a remnant of the old perfect tense⁴⁵⁸, appears only once in IAG (p. 237), as against the form вѣмь in the same sentence in all other classical texts. But in Mar., for instance, the form вѣдѣ is not registered at all⁴⁵⁹. IAG has a new form - вѣда - instead of the

458. N. Trubeckoj, O nekotoryx ostatkax isčeznuvšix grammatičeskix kategorij v obščeslavjanskom prajazyke, Slavia, 1, 1922-23, p. 12-21.

459. P. Diels, op. cit., p. 280.

regular first person singular present ВѢМЪ or ВѢМЪ of the classical texts. The word ВѢДА appears in IAG 11 times (pp. 73, 180b twice, 233, 235b, 238b three times, 240b, 250b, 251b). An explanation that the letter Ѡ in this instance stands for a correct Ѣ (as in ВѢДѢ) is unlikely; the substitution of Ѡ for Ѣ and vice versa, although known in some other Middle Bulgarian texts⁴⁶⁰, is unusual for IAG. But it is more likely that such a substitution might have taken place in one of the older Slavic Gospel texts which Symon the Monk had at his disposal while preparing his revised edition. He was not able to see the relation between ВѢДА and the obscure correct form ВѢДѢ, and misinterpreted ВѢДА as either the first person singular from the extended stem {v,ad-} (as in the third person plural of the present, in the infinitive and in the -l-participle), or as a new form for the short present active participle in the nominative singular masculine: ВѢДЫ and ВѢДА, parallel to СЫИ and САИ. The latter misinterpretation would not have been prevented by the syntactic structure of some of the sentences, since very often the participles were used incorrectly, in place of a conjugated verb: Ѣ не познасте Ѣго. Ѡз же ВѢДА Ѣго. Ѣ Ѡше рекъ не ВѢДА Ѣго, бѠдъ подобень вамъ лъжь. нъ ВѢДА Ѣго, Ѣ слово Ѣго съблюдаж. (p. 238b, John VIII.55).

460. A typical example is the 13th-century Aprakos Gospel #849 in the Bulgarian National Library (Sofia). It has forms like ВѢЩЕ [=вѠще] (p. 45b); прозра [=прозьрѢ] (p. 7b); and others. See:
M. Stojanov, Xr. Kodov, Opis ..., III, Sofia, 1964, p. 21-22.

4.3.4.9. The words КОКОТЬ, КОУРЪ, known from the classical texts, are not registered in IAG; neither is the word ПЪТЕЛЪ with the letter Ѣ. When this latter word is written in the original hand, it always has the letter А instead of Ѣ: И П^оАТЕЛЪ ВЪЗГЛАСИ. (p. 129, Mark XIV.68). In a few instances someone erased the letter А and wrote an е, but these spellings are not by the hand of the original scribe. In the case of ПАТЕЛЪ, the letter for the nasal vowel, А, is not a substitution for the letter Ѣ in the form {p,at,-#1-}. The underlying form of this word in the IAG scribe's language must be {p,~vt,-#1-}⁴⁶¹.

4.3.4.10. The verb прѣѣде (Mar., Zogr.) or прѣюде (Ostr., Sav.) is always rendered in IAG, as in Assem., by прѣиде. As has already been discussed, the question here is not one of phonetic change of {ja} to [i], but rather of semantic changes in the meaning of some verbs of motion. The verbal pair {jax-aj-t,i} ~ {jazd,-i-t,i} meant only 'to ride horseback', while the verb {j#d-t,i} had expanded its meaning into 'to pass over, cross; to arrive'. There is no doubt that the verb {jax-aj-t,i} ~ {jazd,-i-t,i} existed with the meaning 'to ride horseback' in the 14th century Bulgarian literary language. In the Tale of Troy⁴⁶² the aorist of the verb {na=jazd,-i-t,i} 'to draw abreast

461. This word will be discussed in 4.3.5.5.

462. I. Dujčev, ed., Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, p. 83-125.

with (someone) on horseback, overtake (someone) on horseback', is registered twice: и наазадиста са, и ѓрва менелае александра фарижа, и лежаше || въ троискомъ прасѣ ...

(p. 55b) 'And they drew abreast on their horses, and Menelaos attacked Alexander/Paris, and (Alexander) lay in the dust of Troy ...'; и възѧ аѧакшь каме^н, коѧо не можѧтъ два витеза двигнѧти, || и наазади и оудари ектора кралѣ ... (p. 55-55b) 'And Ajax picked up a stone, which two knights could not move, and on horseback overtook and struck King Hector'.

4.3.4.11. In a few instances the letter ѣ in classical texts is replaced by е in IAG. The imperfectivized form of the verb въмести ~ въмѣтати 'to throw into' should be spelled with ѣ because of the regular morphonemic alternation {o} ~ {a} (historically caused by lengthening of the stem vowel): {v#=m,ot-t,i} ~ {v#=m,at-aj-t,i} (въмѣтати, въмѣтаѧ). The third person singular present of this imperfective verb, however, is in one instance spelled with е instead of ѣ in IAG, although in the rest of its occurrences it has ѣ: нако же члкъ въметаеѧ сѣма въ земла. (p. 97, Mark IV.26).

Similar oscillation is known in the classical texts. Mar. has the forms въмѣтаема (p. 157) and въметаемоу (p. 107). In contrast to the latter, Zogr. has the correct въмѣтаемѧ. The alternation /e/ ~ /ja/ in the different aspects of this verb exists in modern Bulgarian too:

да мѣтна (perfective) versus мѣтам (imperfective). The spelling with e, in both IAG and Mar., of an imperfective form which should definitely have {a} after {m,} in its underlying morphoneme, suggests a phonetic outcome for this {a} of [e], [i] or [ə] in unstressed position - generally, a [-LOW] vowel. This phonological rule must have been in operation already at the time when the glagolitic texts from Bulgaria were written, the late 10th or 11th century (cf. the above quoted example from Mar.). Yet only in a few places did the writer of IAG write the letter e for the underlying morphoneme {a} after a soft consonant in either stressed or unstressed position before a soft consonant or the glide {j}, or in absolute word-end position. Such mistakes involve the verbal endings (e.g. the third person dual бѣдетѣ < {bVd, -át, o} (p. 190b)) and the comparative degree of some adjectives (e.g. оуниѣ < {ún, a-jo} (p. 17b)).

4.3.4.12. Recapitulating the above, the following orthographic rules can be formulated for the original text of IAG, as regards the representation of the morphoneme {a} after hard and soft consonants:

a) After hard (paired) consonants, {a} is represented by the letter a.

b) After soft (paired) consonants, {a} is represented in most words by the letter ѣ (never by the ligature ѣа). The spelling of the genitive singular кесапа with a is an orthographic rule, although in the rest of its para-

digm this word has a soft /r,/. But there are a few orthographic errors, made by the writer in representing the underlying {a} after a soft consonant by means of the letter e in the following environments: first, where {a} is unstressed; second, where {á} is stressed, before a soft consonant or {j} or in absolute word-final position. The number of misspelled words is minimal, which shows the overall importance of the morphonemic principle in the spelling.

c) After /ž/, /š/, /žd/ and /št/, both within a lexical morpheme and at a morpheme boundary, the morphoneme {a} is represented only by the letter a (the same rule was applied in classical OCS): видѣвше же оубо клеврѣти нѣго, бывшеиѣ. съжалишѣ си сѣло. (p. 55b, Matth. XVIII.31); придѣте ѡ видите мѣсто ѡдеже лѣжа гѣ. (p. 85b, Matth. XXVIII.6); жестоко нѣ^с слово сѣ, кто можетъ ѣго слышати. (p. 231, John VI.60); по немѣ хѡждаахѣ ѡ слоужаахѣ ѣмоу. (p. 132b, Mark XV.41); ѡко к томоу не вѣмѣшаахѣ сѣ ни прѣдѣ дверми. (p. 91b, Mark II.2).

d) After /č/ both within a lexical morpheme and at a morpheme boundary, the morphoneme {a} is represented only by the letter a. In a few cases the letter ѣ may be found in the same environment in the classical texts (чѣсѣ in Mar., p. 85b, vs. часѣ in IAG in the same sentence): въ часѣ врѣменнѣ (p. 147, Luke IV.5); ѡ страха, ѡ чааниа (p. 200b, Luke XXI.26); не трѣбоужть здравїи врача нѣ болѣщїи. (p. 27b, Matth. IX.12).

e) After {ʒ} and {c} within a lexical morpheme, the morphoneme {a} is represented by the letter ѣ, while at a morpheme boundary - by the letter a or the letter ѣ, depending on the type of morphonemic alternation. This complicated spelling rule is inherited from classical OCS, whose orthography distinguished /ʒ/ and /c/ of the Second Slavic Palatalization (by writing ѣ for a following {a}) from {ʒ} and {c} of the Third Slavic Palatalization (by writing a for a following {a}). (I have compared the situation in the various OCS texts and come to this conclusion.) It is very tempting to believe that, as S. B. Bernštejn⁴⁶³ and R. Nahtigal⁴⁶⁴ suggest, there were two different phonetic outcomes for the phonemes /ʒ/ and /c/: [ʒ] and [c] (for the results of the Second Palatalization) versus [ʒ,] and [c,] (for the results of the Third Palatalization). The Slavist ought to take into account a very important detail: lexical and grammatical morphemes ending in /ʒ/ and /c/ from the Third Slavic Palatalization were morphologically interpreted as belonging to the soft paradigms (*stār-ĭk-ŭ > *star-ьc-ь), and in derivation are followed only by the phonetic outcomes of the vowels that follow soft consonants (*pǒ=liq-ǒv-āj-tei > польсевати). The phonetic hardening of /c/ and /ʒ/ in the South Slavic dialects before an orig-

463. S. B. Bernštejn, Očerk sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov, Moscow, 1961, pp. 201, 208-209.

464. R. Nahtigal, Die slavischen Sprachen, Wiesbaden, 1961, p. 32.

inal *ā is expressed by the spelling in OCS in the same fashion as the Common Slavic change of original *ě₁, after the results of the First Slavic Palatalization, into *ā (*čě > *čā; *žě > *žā; *šě > *šā).

Thus the spelling rule of classical OCS for rendering the morphoneme {a} after /c/ and /ʒ/, applied by the writer of IAG, is the following: first, when not at a morpheme boundary with a suffix or grammatical ending, only the letter ѣ is written after the letters ц and ж; second, at a morpheme boundary with the grammatical ending of the dative or locative singular or the nominative-accusative dual of the hard declensions (which are morphologically marked through softening of the last consonant in the stem), only ѣ is written after the letters ц, ж (and occasionally ш) when they represent the soft allophones of the velars {k} and {g}; third, at a morpheme boundary with a suffix or with any other grammatical ending, only the letter а is written after the letters ц and ж.

However, there is one word in IAG which marks the beginning of the opposition /c/ ~ /c, / within the lexical morpheme: цара (corrected later from the originally-written царѣ (p. 265)). The word цѣсарь (written also as цѣрѣ) in the classical texts is not registered in IAG; the only abbreviation is црѣ, without the letter ц). The Bulgarian language of today distinguishes /c/ from /c, / within a lexical morpheme - /car/ 'king' vs. /c,ar/ 'medicine'.

The spelling царѣ is the earliest indication of this distinction. It must have been triggered by the merging of /ʒ/ and /z, / in the dialects, thus establishing a symmetry: /z/ ~ /z, / and /c/ ~ /c, /.

4.3.4.13. The phonological rules of reconstructed Common Slavic did not allow a word to begin with {a} except the conjunction a 'and, but'. The oldest OCS texts offer a long list of words whose spelling throughout centuries of Church Slavic literature oscillates between initial a and ѧ. Words which always had initial a are foreign borrowings, as well as the forms алкати, алдии, in which it is difficult to explain why the liquid metathesis did not take place⁴⁶⁵.

IAG indicates a development in the phonological system of the language: some words are always spelled with initial a, the rest always with initial ѧ, while the number of words having alternate spelling with initial a or ѧ as in the classical texts has decreased to zero. Slavic words which are always spelled with initial a in IAG are the following: the conjunction а (numerous examples, the same as in the classical texts); агнецъ (pp. 168, 215,

465. One explanation for this alternation, accepted by many scholars, is based on the accentual peculiarities of these words. Cf.:

H. Birnbaum, *The Dialects of Common Slavic*, p. 170.

215b, 271b); азъ (scores of examples); ѡлчаш- (pp. 74b, 140, 154); аше (numerous examples). Slavic words which are always spelled with initial на in IAG are: навити са (numerous examples); навление (pp. 97, 141b, 161, 210b); навѣ (pp. 19, 19b, 80, 94b, 247); all grammatical forms of the verb насти (numerous examples); назв- (pp. 170b, 269b); наица (p. 172); нако (numerous examples); нама (pp. 36, 46b, 155b); наможе (numerous examples); нарем-нича (p. 61); нарости (p. 148b); наръ (p. 194); насли (pp. 142, 142b, 180).

The word агодичинѣ (for сикаминѣ in the classical texts) was written by the hand of the original writer on p. 188b (Luke XVII.6), but another scribe erased the word сикомориѡ on p. 193 (Luke XIX.4) and wrote агодичинѣ. Since the latter spelling does not belong to the original scribe, we can conclude that the spelling rules of IAG exclude alternate spelling of initial а and на in the same word. The word алдии-ладии, registered in OCS texts, is completely absent from IAG, which instead has корабль; the word агода (Sav.) is represented in IAG, as in the rest of the OCS texts, by плодъ (p. 37b).

4.3.4.14. As has already been stated, the morpheme {a} has no sequential restrictions in the language of IAG except after a vowel within a Slavic lexical morpheme. But in biblical names, {a} can follow {i}, {o}, {u} and {a}: ѣлиакѣм (p. 7b); ѣаѣръ (p. 163); ѣѡанѣ (p. 215b);

силоуáмла (p. 239b) and наáссбн (p. 6b). Although this violates older rules of Slavic syllable structure, intervocalic {j} need not be inserted before the vowel {a} when it follows another vowel within a lexical morpheme, since such a {j} is not inserted before {o} either: otherwise it would have changed this {o} into an [e]⁴⁶⁶.

4.3.5. Traditionally, students of the history of the Bulgarian language and its dialects - most prominent among them St. Mladenov⁴⁶⁷, B. Conev⁴⁶⁸, K. Mirčev⁴⁶⁹ and B. Koneski⁴⁷⁰ - discuss the nasal vowels (in the plural) or the question of the redistribution, exchange, etc. of the nasal vowels in Middle Bulgarian literature⁴⁷¹.

For the language of those dialects which exhibit oscillation in the use of the letters ѡ and Ѡ, one should

466. Cf. the discussion of the problem, 4.3.3.4.

467. St. Mladenov, Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache, Berlin-Leipzig, 1929, xiv + 354 pp.

468. B. Conev, Istorija na bəlgarskij ezik, Sofia, I, 1919, x + 529 pp.; II, 1934, xvi + 560 pp.; III, 1937, vi + 505 pp.

469. For a bibliographic survey of relevant works of K. S. Mirčev up to 1962 (in addition to his historical grammar), see:

M. Sl. Mladenov, Naučni trudove na Kiril Mirčev, IzvIBE, VIII, Sofia, 1962, p. 13-23.

470. B. Koneski, Istorija na makedonskiot jazik, Skopje-Beograd, 1965, 103 pp.; Skopje, 1967 (2nd edition), 241 pp.

471. The problem of the distribution of the nasal vowel letters, of their oscillation with each other and with letters representing non-nasal vowels, is discussed in:

R. Scholvin, op. cit., p. 42-53.

rather speak of a single nasal vowel morphoneme, whose phonetic outcome as back or front vowel is predictable in the environment after, respectively, a phonetically hard or soft consonant. The situation of this morphoneme { \tilde{v} } is thus similar to that of {o}, which has two different outcomes - [e] and [o] - similarly motivated. But in word-initial position (with optional prothetic jotation) and at a morpheme boundary after {j}, the two nasal-vowel letters oscillate in their use, very much like the letters a and ia in OCS and many Middle Bulgarian texts (though not in IAG). The merging of the two distinct etymological nasal vowels in the Middle Bulgarian period roughly parallels the merging of the nasal vowels in Polish, although the results were different in the two languages⁴⁷².

4.3.5.1. It should be stated plainly, that the term "nasal vowel" is absolutely conventional, and does not refer to the articulatory or auditory character of the vowel, but to its origin. There are reliable indications

472. T. Lehr-Spławiński, *Les voyelles nasales dans les langues lechites*, Revue des études slaves, VI-VII, Paris, 1926, p. 54-66.

Z. Stieber, *Dwa problemy z fonologii słowiańskiej*, Lingua Posnanensis, 1, Poznań, 1949, p. 81-86.
 _____, Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1952, 95 pp.

Z. Klemensiewicz, T. Lehr-Spławiński, S. Urbanczyk, Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1964, p. 102-111.

that as late as the 13th century some Bulgarian dialects⁴⁷³ had a phonologically nasal vowel; as late as the 19th century a peripheral dialect in Macedonia and southern Bulgaria⁴⁷⁴ had a nasal vowel too; and some scholars believe that several Bulgarian dialects in today's Rumania had nasal vowels in the 15th century⁴⁷⁵, which are represented by an oral vowel plus /n/ in the Slavic borrowings in the Rumanian language from that period⁴⁷⁶. On the other hand, many Bulgarian texts from the Middle Bulgarian period show that the "nasal" vowel was already denasalized.

There were a few Bulgarian dialects which preserved distinct outcomes of the etymological *e and *o:

473. L. Miletič, *Sedmogradskite bēlgari i texnijat ezik*, SpBAN, 33, 1936, p. 1-181.

The Bulgarians of the Sedmogradsko region were captured by the Hungarians in the second half of the 13th century and settled as workers in Hungary. A number of hymns were translated from German into their dialect in the 16th century.

474. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 104.

P. Draganov, *Nosovye glasnye zvuki v sovremennyx makedonoslavjanskix i bolgarskix govorax*, Russkij filologičeskij vestnik, 19, Warsaw, 1888, p. 1-27.

St. Kabasanov, *Star i nov nasalizem v neproučen dosega bēlgarski govor*, Slavistični studii, Sofia, 1963, p. 173-184.

R. Ekblom, *Le développement des voyelles originellement nasalisées dans le moyen bulgare*, Le Monde Oriental, 12, Uppsala, 1918, p. 177-225.

475. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 71-72.

476. K. Mirčev, ibid., gives as examples: Rum. dumbrava < дѣбрава; rind < рѣдѣ; grinda < града, etc. Cf. too:

I. Gələbov, *Stari bēlgarski ezikovi areali na dakorumənskata ezikova teritorija*, Ezik i literatura, 16, Sofia, 1961, p. 39-48.

these were the dialects in which etymological *q yielded {u}. In the other Bulgarian dialects of the 14th century there was only one nasal vowel morphoneme, which we shall represent as { \tilde{v} }. The feature of nasality was not necessarily present in the dialect of any particular scribe.

4.3.5.2. The following phonological developments - different in different dialects - caused the graphic chaos in the use of the letters \underline{x} and \underline{a} in the Middle Bulgarian period for the historically nasal vowel:

a) the merging of the nasal vowel { \tilde{v} } with the vocalic realization of the fleeting vowel {#}, which was phonetically, after hard consonants, a mid-central, [-ROUNDED] vowel ([ə]), but, after soft consonants and {j}, either this same [ə] or a mid-front [-ROUNDED] vowel ([e]). Graphically, this development is expressed by the indiscriminate use of the letters \underline{x} and \underline{a} , $\underline{ь}$ and $\underline{е}$ for the phonetic outcome of the morphonemes { \tilde{v} } and {#}⁴⁷⁷.

b) the merging of the nasal vowel { \tilde{v} } with the morphoneme {a}, whose phonetic outcome was a [-HIGH], [-ROUNDED] vowel. Orthographically, this is expressed by substitution of the letters \underline{x} and \underline{a} (and also $\underline{ь}$, cf. point a) for either { \tilde{v} } or {a} after phonetically hard consonants,

477. The earliest example is from Codex Suprasliensis: и ти сѣло вѣтры и вльнами мьчими [=мжчими] възвращаахъ сѧ въспать. (p. 151).

and of the letters а, ѣ, ѡ, е (and also ѡ) for either {ṽ} or {a} after soft consonants or {j}⁴⁷⁸.

c) the optional phonetic reduction of intervocalic and prothetic {j} to ∅ before {ṽ}, similar to the reduction of {j} to ∅ before the morphoneme {a} and before the phonetic realization [e] of the morphonemes {o} and {#}. This phenomenon made it difficult to distinguish graphically ѣ from а, the latter standing in place of the letters а, ѡ, ѡ and ѡ of the classical texts.

d) the change in the morphonemic alternations in two consonant-stem verbs expressing movement, which were originally paired as *tręs- vs. *tręs-i- and *męt- vs. *męt-i-. Here one can see morphological changes, rather than mere confusion in the use of the letters for the nasal vowel (cf. below).

e) the phonetic hardening of the palatal consonants. This affected the spelling rules for distribution of the letters ѣ and а in a fashion similar to that for the letters а and ѣ.

The authority of the spelling of the older Church Slavonic texts, in which different rules governed the use of

478. There are numerous examples in Vračansko Evangelie from the 14th century: слоушаѡ [= слоушаѣ] (p. 10b); дѡѡ моѡ въз'мѡти сѡ [= дѡѡ моѡ] (p. 34); ис кораблѡ [= кораблѣ] (p. 57b); честь [= часть] (p. 61b); пѡндико(с) [= пендикость] (p. 200b), etc. For more examples see the text:

B. Conev, ed., Vračansko Evangelie (Bēlgarski starini, IV), Sofia, 1914, ix + 236 pp.

the letters ж and ѡ, caused inconsistencies in the scribe's application of his contemporary norms; although the new norms demanded the letter ж after /š/, a spelling like ѡѡѡѡ could appear sporadically, as a residue of an older phonological and orthographic tradition.

In general, one deals with the lack, over a 300-year period, of national orthographic rules for expressing unambiguously the different phonetic outcomes of the single morphoneme {ǃ} in all possible environments: in word-initial position, after prothetic or intervocalic {j}, after a paired hard or soft consonant, after a palatal consonant, either within the lexical morpheme or at the morpheme boundary - all by means of the two graphic symbols ж and ѡ. The difficulties of the scribes were multiplied when, in the dialects, the phonetic outcomes of the morphoneme {ǃ} had already merged with the phonetic outcomes of {a} and vocalized {#}. What is peculiar to most of the Middle Bulgarian manuscripts, with the exception of those written in the northwestern territories⁴⁷⁹ (such as the Vidin kingdom), is the presence of at least one of the letters ж or ѡ. This separates graphically most of the Bulgarian literary monuments of the 13th - 14th centuries from the corresponding

479. Dialects with *q > /u/ are still found in the northwest regions of today's Bulgaria, in the counties of Belogradčik, Berkovica, Træn, Breznik, and partially Vidin. See:

M. Mladenov, Govoræt na Novo Selo Vidinsko, Sofia, 1969, p. 192-193.

Russian and Serbian ones, where different orthographic systems of Church Slavic were originally applied.

4.3.5.3. The original scribe of IAG uses correctly at least one of the letters for the nasal vowel wherever a nasal vowel should appear. There are only a few examples of spelling mistakes in this respect: десете for десате (p. 101) and чѣтыри for четыри (p. 265b): ѣ призвавъ ѡба на десете ... (p. 101, Mark VI.7); ѣ створишѣ чѣтыри чѣсти (p. 265b, John XIX.23). In the latter example, however, the letter ѣ in чѣтыри may have been triggered by the first syllable of the next word, чѣ-сти, (other examples will be discussed below).

4.3.5.4. There is one word in IAG which is always spelled with the letter ѣ, contrary to the situation in all of the classical texts: нѣ (vs. нѣ in the classical OCS texts). K. Mirčev⁴⁸⁰ suggests that нѣ represents a case of emphatic duplication of the *nǔ which became нѣ of the classical texts: *nǔ-nǔ > *nǔ. Such an explanation meets a serious obstacle - the monophthongization of the diphthongs occurred before the fall of the jers in weak position, and never took place before a vowel (e.g. the final *ǔ of *nǔnǔ). If there had been reduplication of the particle *nǔ, the result would have been *нѣнѣ or *нонѣ - forms which were never registered. The Middle Bulgarian form нѣ

480. K. Mirčev, op. cit., p. 104.

has the Russian parallel нѹ. It would seem that some Common Slavic dialects had two particles: *nǔ and *nq. Without apparent reason, in the Middle Bulgarian period the latter completely replaced the particle нѢ used in the classical texts, while in Russian both particles survived (as но and нѹ), but with different syntactic functions. The presence of the particle нѢ in a given text is an absolute graphical indication that such a Church Slavic text is either of Bulgarian origin or copied from a Bulgarian original.

4.3.5.5. As already mentioned, the word for 'rooster' used in IAG is always written by the original scribe of IAG as пѦТЕЛЬ (numerous examples): ѿ ѡбине ѣще глашоу ѿмоу възгласи пѦТЕЛЬ. (p. 205, Luke XXII.60). But in a few cases, the original word in the text was erased and rewritten with the letter е instead of Ѧ. For instance, on p. 203 everything after the first letter п of the word was erased, and the word changed by a different hand to петѢль. The consistent spelling of this word with a letter for the nasal vowel instead of Ѣ (пѢТЕЛЬ) should not be treated as a spelling mistake. The word /p, int, él/ exists even today in a peripheral Bulgarian dialect, together with /mænglá/ for *mǔglā and a few other such items⁴⁸¹. These are cases of secondary nasalization inside the lexical morpheme, restricted to a very few dialects in the Bulgarian linguistic

481. K. Mirčev, ibid.
P. Draganov, op. cit., p. 1-27.

area, which are difficult to explain. The exclusive use of the form ПАТЕЛЬ by Symon the Monk indicates only that he himself was a native speaker of a dialect with such a feature, or else that he got his education in a center other than Tarnovo, and that the dialect of that center, having such a feature, determined his orthographical norm. He had no opportunity to check the spelling of this word in older texts with correct usage of the letters for the nasal vowel, since the word пѣтель is a lexical innovation, compared to the words кокооть and коурь, which were used in the classical period.

The secondary nasalization of the vowel in ПАТЕЛЬ cannot have been a feature of the Tarnovo dialect from the end of the 14th century. We possess a short text with a drawing of the city of Tarnovo by the king's beekeeper: азъ димитръ писхъ ѿ мѡсина п^челарь црѡвь 482. This semi-literate native of the village of Musina near Tarnovo, although using the letter Ѡ correctly in the form братнаѠ (accusative singular) or братнѣ, substitutes the letter Ѣ for the expected Ѡ: ... понеже имѣхъ братнаѠ и ѡлмрѣхъ

482. The drawing of 14th-century Tarnovo is on p. 78v (sic), and the few lines follow, as a postscript, the text of a Bulgarian Mineja for September, #34 in the library of the Orthodox Church of "St. Nicolae din Ţcheii" in Braşov, Rumania. Detailed information and photocopies of both the drawing and the text by the beekeeper Dimitar can be found in the article:

St. Maslev, Neizvestni u nas bəlgarski rəkopisi v Braşov, Izvestija na Instituta za istorija, 19, Sofia, 1967, p. 195-217.

(=ѡмрѣхѡ, new aorist form) два азъ единъ ѡсхъ (=ѡстахъ) и ѡкъ (= ѡгъ) да прости въ || бѣдѣшемъ (= бѣдѡшемъ) въцѣ⁴⁸³.

A comparison of the spelling used by the beekeeper Dimitar of Musina and the scribe of IAG shows how little of the phonological peculiarity of the Tarnovo dialect is part of the literary language. For from the few lines of Dimitar and other contemporary writings of 14th-century Tarnovo⁴⁸⁴ it is clear that there was no nasality whatsoever in that dialect, not to speak of secondary nasalization.

4.3.5.6. The scribe of IAG uses only the two letters ѡ and ѡ for the morphoneme { \tilde{V} }. When following a consonant, they have the following distribution:

a) After hard paired consonants and the velars, the letter ѡ is used. There are only a few spelling mistakes in the entire text: тогда приидошѡ к ѡсоу, иже ѡхѡ (= ѡхѡ) ѡ ѡерѡлма ... (p. 46, Matth. XV.1); направи ноги нашѡ на ѡтъ (= ѡтъ) съмирениа. (p. 141b, Luke I. 79); и ѡѡ ѡѡка (= ѡѡка), немогѡши въсклонити сѡ ѡнѡдѡ ... (p. 180, Luke XIII.11). The adjective ѡѡка 'bowed together' should be spelled with ѡ, as it is in the classical texts. Softening of the consonant {l} into [l,] before { \tilde{V} } is impossible, since it comes in regular alterna-

483. St. Maslev, op. cit., p. 206-207.

484. Typical for the replacement of the nasal - vowel letters by letters denoting oral vowels is the Moscow copy of the Manasses Chronicle, written by the priest Filip. It is kept in the State Historical Museum in Moscow, under #Sinod. 20-38.

tion with the verb {kl, ṽk-} 'to squat down' (the same alternation as in слоучити сА (/sl/) vs. ключити сА (/kl,/) ⁴⁸⁵. One possible explanation for this misspelled word is that it had already disappeared from the living language, while the scribe was influenced by the existing verb клякнѣти 'to squat', registered in the Tale of Troy ⁴⁸⁶: поклякна ѣкторъ (p. 55b).

The verbal form блѣдите (second person plural, present tense) from the classical texts is always spelled with А in IAG: блѣдите [блѣдите] не вѣдаше писаниа ни сѣлы бжѣхъ. (p. 66, Matth. XXII.29). Here the problem seems to lie in a different derivation of the verb. It is not derived from the same stem as that of the substantive *блѣдѣ 'sin' (unregistered in IAG) and of the adverb блѣдно 'sinfully': ѿ тоу расточи ѿмѣние свое живы блѣдно (p. 184b, Luke XV.13). The verb form блѣдите is rather derived from the same stem as the adjective блѣдѣ (spelled the same way in the classical OCS texts): ѿ навѣшѣ сА прѣд ними нако блѣди глѣ ѿхъ, (p. 210, Luke XXIV.11).

b) After a paired soft consonant, the letter А is used. There are a few spelling mistakes in the entire text: ѿ ты бжѣди надѣ пѣтиѣ (= пѣтиѣ) градѣ. (p. 194, Luke

485. P. Ilčev, *Iz bəlgarskata istoričeska leksikologija. Starobəlgarskoto KLJUČITI SE, IzvIBE*, VIII, Sofia, 1962, p. 117-129.

486. I. Dujčev, ed., *Letopista na Konstantin Manasi*, Sofia, 1963, p. 110.

XIX.19). A similar mistake is made in Mar. (Luke II.44):
 придете пѣть (= пѣть) дѣне. 'they went a day's journey'.

The word тѣгота 'burden' of the classical texts appears only once in IAG, where it is spelled with ѣ:
 принесшимъ тѣготѣ дѣне ѡ варѣ (р. 59, Matth. XX.12). But other derivatives from the same stem are written with ѣ:
 бѣстѣ бо ѡчи ихъ тѣготнѣ (р. 127b, Mark XIV.40); бѣстѣ бо ѡчи ихъ отѣгченѣ (р. 77b, Matth. XXVI.43).

The word мѣта 'mint' (Latin mentha) was spelled correctly on р. 68: ѡко ѡдесѣтствоуете мѣтѣ ѡ пѣганѣ и киминѣ. (р. 68, Matth. XXIII.23). But on р. 174, where it was originally written мѣтѣ, someone later erased the letter ѣ (but not the stress over it) and wrote мѣ: ѡко десѣтинѣ даете ѡ мѣтѣ (< мѣтѣ) и пѣгана, и всѣкого зѣліа. (р. 174, Luke XI.42).

c) There are changes in the distribution of the letters ѣ and ѣ in different grammatical forms of the two pairs of verbs expressing movement: { -m[̃]t, i- } vs. { -m, [̃]t- } 'to move (of emotions), change shape' and { -tr[̃]s, i- } vs. { -tr, [̃]s- } 'to shake'. On р. 139b, Sav. has the phrase: оуслѣшавѣ же ѡродѣ ѣрѣ сѣмѣте сѣ. (Matth. II.3). The same paragraph in IAG (р. 9) reads as follows: слышавѣ же ѡродѣ ѣрѣ, сѣмѣти сѣ. ѡ весь ѡроусалимѣ съ нимѣ. Here, obviously, the scribe did not simply substitute the letter ѣ for the ѣ of the classical text: he replaced the aorist of the stem ending in a hard consonant with the aorist of the corres-

ponding stem, ending in a soft consonant. A similar change was made in the passive past participle потрѣсенѣ 'shaken' (in the classical OCS texts). In IAG the passage reads: мѣрѣ || добрѣ натканѣ и потрѣсенѣ дадатъ на лоно ваше. (p. 155-155b, Luke VI.38). While forms like смѣти сѣ (p. 9) and смѣте сѣ (p. 138), възмѣти сѣ (p. 224b) and възмѣтошѣ (p. 104) are registered in IAG, indicating aspectual differences in the prefixed verbs with the prefixes {s#=} and {v#z=}, it is impossible to determine whether aspectual pairing of the verb потрѣсти ~ потрѣсити was achieved by use of the different stems ({po=tr, \tilde{v} s-t, i} vs. {po=tr \tilde{v} s, i-t, i}), or whether the prefix {po=} (with inceptive meaning) formed only a perfective verb with no corresponding imperfective.

4.3.5.7. Like the OCS texts, IAG has alternating forms with ѣ versus е or ѣ for the non-past and imperative stems of the verbs of body position *lęg- and *sęd-. While Mar. has сѣдѣштемѣ (Matth. XI.16), IAG in the same phrase has сѣдашемѣ (p. 34), but in Luke XX.42 both Zogr. and IAG (p. 198) have сѣди (2nd person singular imperative) versus сѣди in Mar. The 2nd person plural of the imperative of the same verb, however, is сѣдѣте in both Mar. and Zogr. (Luke XXIV.49), while IAG has сѣдѣте in the same sentence (p. 212).

The verb 'to deteriorate' in 3rd person plural future, is in all OCS texts просѣдѣтъ сѣ (Matth. IX.17); in the same verse IAG has the letter а instead of ѣ (or even ѣ or е, as might be expected): НИ ВЛИВАЖЪ ВИНА НОВА ВЪ МѢХЫ ВЕТХЫ. аще ли же нѣ, просѣдат сѣ мѣси, и вино пролѣет

с . (p. 28). This probably represents not a phonological development, but the realization of a distinct root shape: *sād- instead of *sed-.

In most occurrences, the outcome of *leg- is spelled with e in IAG, versus а in the classical OCS texts: и възлегѣтъ въ цр^ствий б^жии. (p. 181, Luke XIII.29). But in one phrase, where all OCS texts have the form with e - възлежаштемъ (Mark XVI.14) - IAG has а instead: по слѣди же възлажшемъ имъ единомуу на дѣс^ате іави с^а. (p. 134).

4.3.5.8. The morphoneme {ṽ} after /ž/, /š/, /žd/ and /št/ is expressed by the letter ж (as after a hard consonant): въсѣкъ пижи ^тѡ воды се^а, въжждет с^а пакы (p. 221b, John IV.13); аз же послах вы жѣти (p. 223, John IV.38); жѣтва оубо многа, а жѣтелеи мало (p. 168, Luke X.2); аз же по срѣдѣ васъ нѣсмь слоужжи (p. 202b, Luke XXII.27).

Thus the ending for 3rd person plural aorist, OCS -ш^а, becomes -ш^ж, with only isolated exceptions, such as възаш^а, which are a manifestation of the strength of tradition: и пристѣплше оученици нѣго, възаш^а тѣло нѣго и погребош^ж нѣ. (p. 44, Matth. XIV.12). Parallel to these few oscillating archaisms, the genitive singular and nominative/accusative plural feminine and the accusative plural masculine adjectival endings after /š/, which in OCS are written -ш^а, are in IAG usually written -ш^ж, though there are still remnants of the traditional spelling: и ѡстави намъ длѣгы наш^а (p. 171b, Luke XI.4).

In most cases, the letter ж is written after жд: отрокъ мой || лежить ... нако страждѣ (p. 24 - 24b, Matth. VIII.6); блажени ѡлчѣшеи || и жѣждѣшеи правдѣ. (p. 15b - 16, Matth. V.6). After the ligature ш, representing either the combinations {z=щ}, as in {j#z=щѣд, -#j-}, or {sk-j}, ж is usually written: ищѣдіа нѣхиднова (p. 37b, Matth. XII.34); а ищѣи славы пославѣшаго и, сѣ истиненъ естъ (p. 232b, John VII.18). But in a few cases the letter ѣ is written after the letter ш, as in the older texts.

After /щ/, represented by ц, either within a lexical morpheme or at a morpheme boundary, the letter ѣ is written: нѣсте ли чѣли нако сѣтвори въ началѣ мѣжъскыи полѣ ... (p. 56, Matth. XIX.4); блажени ѡлчѣшеи (p. 15b, Matth. V.6).

While only ѣ occurs after the letter ц, representing /c/, within the lexical morpheme (cf. цѣта), both ѣ and ж occur after ц at a morpheme boundary, with a certain tendency to distinguish different case endings: -цѣ for genitive and accusative singular feminine, but -цѣ for accusative plural masculine and nominative/accusative plural feminine: и срачицѣ (gen. sing. fem.) не възбранѣ (p. 155, Luke VI.29); ѡпоусти нѣмѣ и срачицѣ (acc. sing. fem.) твоѣ (p. 18b, Matth. V.40); нако ѡбрѣтохѣ ѡвцѣ (acc. sing. fem.) моѣ погыбѣша (p. 184, Luke XV.6); и ѡвца (nom. pl. fem.) гла его слышѣтъ, и своѣ ѡвца (acc. pl. fem.) зовѣтъ по имени (p. 241 b, John X.3); нако на

НОВЫ МѢСАЦА (acc. pl. masc.) бѣсноует сѧ (p. 51b, Matth. XVII.15).

4.3.5.9. In word-initial position, the letters ѧ and ѡ are used in free alternation to express *q and *(j)q. Such a spelling alternation must represent the normative Church Slavonic pronunciation in 14th-century Bulgaria, based on a southwestern dialect, since in all modern Bulgarian dialects initial etymological *(j)q and *q are kept distinct by the presence of prothetic /v/ before etymological *q: въже (Bulg.) ~ ѡже (Mac.) < *qže. The scribe of IAG treats initial etymological *q in the same fashion as *(j)q: ѡ ѡзаахѡ ѡго ѡжи желѣзны (p. 162, Luke VIII.29); ѡ ни ѡжемь желѣзномь, никто же не можааше ѡго свѡзати (p. 98b, Mark V.3). The forms of the word ѡзѣкъ (as spelled in OCS) are in most instances written with initial ѡ, but spellings with ѧ also occur: въ свѣдѣнїе ѡмь. ѡ ѧзѣкомь. (p. 31, Matth. X.18).

At morpheme boundaries after {j} the morphoneme {ṽ} is in most instances represented by the letter ѡ: тѣ недѣгы нашѧ приѡтъ (p. 25b, Matth. VIII.17); гѡре же непразнымъ ѡ доѡщимь въ тѣ дни (p. 70b, Matth. XXIV.19). The use of the letters ѡ and ѧ for the nasal vowel {ṽ} in word-initial position (with or without prothetic -j-) and at morpheme boundaries after {j} is parallel to the use of the letters ѡ and ѧ for {jo} in word-initial position and at morpheme boundaries. This must be related to certain phonetic properties, common to both [e] and /ṽ/:

[- BACK], [- LOW], [- HIGH], [- ROUNDED] vowels.

4.3.6. The letters ɣ and ɥ⁴⁸⁷ are used in free alternation, without any distinction, for marking boundaries after words ending in consonants, as well as for marking the end of a line after a consonant within a word - all orthographic boundaries; when they can be vocalized within a morpheme they represent the morphoneme {#}, but they may also appear between two consonants in an unexpected position; they usually follow the letters ɸ and ɹ before a consonant, thus expressing syllabic {r} and {l}.

4.3.6.1. A line ends either in a letter for a vowel or in a jer (ɣ or ɥ), or, extremely rarely, in a paer-cik ('), which is an abbreviated jer. Although the letter ɣ is used more often for marking the end of a line, the letter ɥ is also used in numerous cases where it is unjustified etymologically, so that no special rules can be observed. The only letters for consonants which can occur at the end of a line are c in the abbreviation ĩc̃ (which in all positions is spelled in this same fashion, in imitation of the Greek shape of the name) and the letter ɥ in the abbreviation pe^ɥ (for peɥe); in the latter case, however, the ɥ most often is superscribed between the letters ɸ and e (ɸ^ɥe), giving the graphic impression that the line ends in e. When the letter ɣ is used at the end of a line, it is usually taller than the rest of the letters in that line: идеже

487. Scholvin includes examples of various vocalizations of the jers. See:

R. Scholvin, op. cit., p. 36-38.

чрѣ || вѣ ни тлѣ тлитѣ (р. 20b).

The two letters ѣ and ѡ are written interchangeably after prepositions ending in an obstruent stop, as well as after words ending in a consonant, thus marking preposition- and word- boundaries. Sometimes it seems that the scribe wrote only ѡ in one line, and only ѣ in another, without respect to their etymological origins from *ѡ or *ѣ, reflected in OCS: ѣже || приходѣтъ къ вамъ вѡ одежда || хъ овчинахъ. (р. 22b, Matth. VII.15). However, before the monosyllabic enclitics же and сѧ, the jers are in most instances absent: онъ же (р. 65); да сѡбѣдет сѧ (р. 61); боимъ сѧ (р. 63).

4.3.6.2. After prefixes and prepositions, the letters ѣ and ѡ, in free alternation, are used (or not used) according to rules, stated in 4.2.2.3. In this respect, besides a tendency to establish strict rules for the use of a jer, IAG differs from the glagolitic texts in not using the letter о instead of *ѡ; here IAG follows the tradition of the cyrillic Sav. and Supr., representing the normative Church Slavic pronunciation in Bulgaria.

In no instance in IAG are the articles -отѣ or -осѣ found, while the demonstrative pronouns тѣ/тѣ and сѣ/сѣ should be treated as enclitics rather than articles, since no unusual phonetic changes are observed at the end of the preceding word (cf. зливотѣ рабѣ in Dobrejšovo Evangelie).

4.3.6.3. Within lexical morphemes, the letters ѣ and ѡ (in free alternation) express the vocalic phonetic

outcome of the fleeting vowel {#}. In most instances the morphoneme {#} appears in the environment before or after the sonorants {m}, {m,}, {n}, {n,} or the glides {v}, {v,}: нако сътворить мьсть ихъ въ скорѣ (p. 191, Luke XVIII.8); и изгнашъ же ѿ вѣнь, (p. 241, John IX.35). However, since the morphoneme {#} in a number of lexical morphemes appears between two obstruents, one cannot eliminate the morphoneme {#} altogether from the morphonemic representation simply by introducing syllabic sonorants (similar to the syllabic liquids {r̥} and {l̥}): и дьскы трѣжникомъ испроврѣже (p. 61b, Matth. XXI.12); дръзай дѣши (p. 163b, Luke VII.48). There might still be a possibility of avoiding the use of the morphoneme {#} in the abstract representation of 14th century literary Bulgarian: if one could derive a complete set of rules for the insertion of a vowel in certain consonantal clusters (for instance *{dsk-}; such an approach, although intriguing, has not been followed in this study, because the Four Gospels text alone provides insufficient material.

4.3.6.4. In the OCS texts, the imperative stems of the verbs решти, пешти сѧ have ь: ръци, ръцѣте, and пѣцѣте сѧ. In IAG, all attested imperative forms of the verb пешти have /e/ as the vowel in the lexical morpheme, while the change of the stem final /k/ to /c/ is preserved. However, in its many occurrences throughout IAG, the imperative of решти stays ръци, ръцѣте: иди же || къ брати моеи

и ръци ѿмъ (р. 268b - 269, John XX.17); ѿзшедше на распятїа е҃го, ръцѣте. (р. 168b, Luke X.10); не пецѣте сѧ како ѿли что ѿмате гл҃ати (р. 31, Matth. X.19). The form of the 2nd person singular does not occur in the Gospel text but пецѣте сѧ occurs in IAG 7 times, and only in this one shape. The conjugation of the verb решти preserves another archaic feature as well: the forms of the root aorist in the first person singular and the 3rd person plural, рѣхъ and рѣшѡ. It is possible that the conjugation of this verb was learned by the scribe of IAG as an exception to the rule for the new spoken forms, represented by the imperative пецѣте сѧ (vs. пцѣте сѧ, пѣцѣте сѧ in OCS), with morphological levelling of the imperative to the rest of the paradigm (no root aorist *пѣшѡ - or any other aorist form of this verb - occurs in the text of the New Testament).

4.3.6.5. The letter ѣ (only in a few cases ѣ) is written in all words containing the suffix {-stv-} preceded by a consonant. The rule is consistently employed, most likely indicating not only an orthographic but a phonological Church Slavonic norm. Examples are: вы сами мнѣ послоушѣствоуете, ꙗко рѣхъ нѣсмъ азъ хс̄, (р. 220, John III.28); ѿ не створи тоу силы многы. за невѣръствиѣ ихъ: (р. 43, Matth. XIII.58); разоумѣв же іс̄ лжавъство ихъ, ре^ѣ. (р. 65, Matth. XXII.18).

4.3.6.6. The morphoneme {#} in the suffixes {-#n-}, {-#l-}, {-#c-}, {-#k-} is either realized as ∅ or,

when vocalized, is expressed by the letters e (in -ель, -ень, -ецъ) or o (in -окъ). The spelling ѣк/ьк appears in free alternation with -окъ, while for the other suffixes, the spellings -ьнъ, -ьцъ are seldom used in IAG and the spelling -ьль is rare and most likely a correction by later scribes. It is definitely a later correction in the forms пѣтъль from earlier патель, where it is easy to see on the microfilm copy the traces of the previous letters. Examples of the vowel/zero alternation in these suffixes are: котораго ^Тѡ васъ ѡсель, или во^ѡль. въ студенецъ выпадеть (р. 181b, Luke XIV.5); се ^ѡѣръ твои градетъ тебѣ кротокъ и въсѣдъ на ѡсла и жрѣба... (р. 61, Matth. XXI.5); понеже бѣ пѣтъкъ (р. 132b, Mark XV.42); оубо пѣ^Тка ради (р. 267b, John XIX.42); аще сильень естъ (р. 183b, Luke XIV.31); на^ѡко сътвори мнѣ величье силнии (р. 140, Luke I.49); и ^Тѡкрыль еси сина младенцемъ (р. 35, Matth. XI.25).

The graphic expression of the vowel/zero alternation in these suffixes in IAG is a spelling norm - an orthographic innovation compared with the situation in the classical OCS texts. The classical texts of the late 10th and 11th centuries from Bulgaria, both glagolitic and cyrillic, rarely omit the letters ѣ and ь from their etymological positions; such omissions as do occur are in positions where the jer's phonetic outcome would be \emptyset , indicating that the vowel/zero alternation was already established in the language. That so few jers were omitted shows that the scribes

were attempting to reflect an older Church Slavonic phonology and spelling.

4.3.6.7. The very consistent spellings -рѣ-/-рѣ- and -лѣ-/-лѣ- in IAG, together with the further development in the Macedono-Bulgarian dialects suggest that these letter combinations represented syllabic liquids {r̥} and {l̥}. Both letters р and л are, in most cases, followed by ѣ and ь in free alternation, but the spellings -рѣ- and -лѣ- somewhat predominate: сѣ^с крѣвь моа, новааго завѣта (p. 126, Mark XIV.24); ѡ сѣде мрѣвѣ ѡ начатъ глѣти (p. 157b, Luke VII.15); ѡ плодъ ѡго злѣ. (p. 37b, Matth. XII.33); егда исплѣни сѣ ѡсмь днѣи (p. 142b, Luke II.21).

In a very few cases, the letter р alone represents the syllable {r̥}: ѡ бышѣ ѡко мрѣ: (p. 85, Matth. XXVIII.4). There are a very few instances where the letters р and л are surrounded by two yers: народъ же запрѣти ѡма да оумѣльчатъ (p. 60, Matth. XX.31). The syllabic liquid morphonemes do not form a syllable when followed by a vowel; in such cases, the yers are usually not written: ѡ недѣгъ ѡ ранъ ѡ доухъ злѣхъ (p. 157b, Luke VII.21).

4.4. On grammatical archaism and innovation in IAG. The morphology of the Middle Bulgarian literary language, reflected in IAG, is thoroughly studied by R. Scholvin⁴⁸⁸. The morphological structure is generally the

488. R. Scholvin, op. cit., p. 161-219.

same as that of the OCS texts of the 10th - 11th centuries, with the same alternation of archaic and newer Church Slavonic forms⁴⁸⁹. Grammatical forms representing further developments of the Middle Bulgarian period (12th - 14th centuries) are either very limited in number (cf. below) or not attested at all in IAG, in contrast to most of the other Middle Bulgarian texts⁴⁹⁰. The archaism of the grammar and the lim-

489. P. Diels, Altkirchenslavische Grammatik, part I, Heidelberg, 1963 (2nd edition), p. 148-282.

K. Mirčev, Istoričeska gramatika na bəlgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1963 (2nd edition), p. 47-52

I. Duridanov, Kəm problemata za razvoja na bəlgarskija ezik ot sintetizəm kəm analitizəm, Godišnik SU, LI, Sofia, 1955, 3, p. 156-249.

490. K. Mirčev, op. cit., pp. 52-56, 144-265. _____, Analitični formi za sravnitelna stepen v dva srednobəlgarski pametnika ot XIV v., BəlgEz, I, 1951, 3-4, p. 215-217.

_____, Za smesvaneto na okončanijata v minalo-svəršeno i minalo-nesvəršeno vreme na glagolite v bəlgarskija ezik, BəlgEz, II, 1952, 1-2, p. 36-45.

_____, za člennite formi v Dobrejšovoto evangelie, srednobəlgarski pametnik ot XIII v., BəlgEz, IV, 1956, 3, p. 223-228.

_____, Po vəprosa za naj-rannite primeri na analitičen datelen padež v bəlgarskite pametnici, Ezikovedski izsledvanija v čest na akademik Stefan Mladenov, Sofia, 1957, p. 37-46.

_____, Za člennite formi v srednobəlgarskite pametnici, IzvIBE, XI, Sofia, 1964, p. 231-234.

B. Koneski, Istorija na makedonskiot jazik, Skopje-Beograd, 1965, p. 99-173.

I. Duridanov, Edin slučaj na ranna upotreba na predloga na za izrazjavane na datelno otnošenje, BəlgEz, III, 1953, 1, p. 58-60.

A. Minčeva, Kəm vəprosa za pojavata na pritežatelnoto značenje na predloga na v bəlgarskija ezik, IzvIBE, VIII, Sofia, 1962, p. 93-110.

_____, Razvoj na datelnija pritežatelen padež v bəlgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1964, p. 21-114.

S. Bojadžiev, Kəm istoričeskija razvoj na predloga na v bəlgarskija ezik, IzvIBE, IX, Sofia, 1962,

ited number of morphological innovations seems to be the main reason that scholars in the historical development of Bulgarian have tended to ignore IAG. But this linguistic feature of the revised edition of the New Testament from 14th-century Bulgaria is very indicative of the direction taken by revisions in the language of the OCS translations from Greek. The fact that all attested grammatical forms from the cyrillic Sav. and Supr. are used in IAG suggests that the revision of the translation was made according to copies as old as Sav. and Supr. (the root aorist forms found in the glagolitic texts, except those of the verb решти, are not attested in IAG).

p. 211-296.

D. Ivanova-Mirčeva, Razvoj na badešte vreme (Futurum) v bēlgarskija ezik ot X do XVIII vek, Sofia, 1962, p. 28-191.

J. Rusek, Za srednobēlgarskite vinitelni formi na anaforičното mestoimenie v ženski rod еж, еже, неж, BēlgEz, 1-2, 1962, p. 100-103.

triodzie Chŭdowa, Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow, 1964, p. 9-194.

Beleški vərxu razvoja na pričastijata v bēlgarski ezik, BēlgEz, XVI, 1966, 5, p. 477-490.

I. Bojukliev, Šopov psaltir, BēlgEz, XIII, 1963, 3, p. 234-254.

Srednobēlgarski psaltiren otkās ot XIV v. (Šopov psaltir), Trudove na Visšija pedagogičeski institut "Bratja Kiril i Metodi" vov Veliko Tərnovo, II, Sofia, 1965, p. 49-94.

N. Dilevski, Kəm vəprosa za proizxoda na "Germanovija sbornik" ot 1359, BēlgEz, XVII, 1967, 4, p. 307-322.

K. Steinke, Studien über den Verfall der bulgarischen Deklination, Munich, 1968, p. 35-117.

I. K. Bunina, Istorija glagol'nyx vremen v bolgarskom jazyke, Moscow, 1970, p. 45-219.

E. V. Češko, Istorija bolgarskogo sklonenija, Moscow, 1970, p. 67-301.

4.4.1. Certain systematic morphological innovations are introduced in IAG:

a) new genitive and locative forms in $\{- (i)x\}$ of the numerals from three to ten: да въ оустѣхъ двою ѿли трехъ свѣдѣтель (р. 54, Matth. XVIII.16) and кто оубо тѣхъ трѣихъ (р. 170b, Luke X.36); ѿ събержть ѿбранныжъ его. ѿ четырехъ вѣтръ (р. 71, Matth. XXIV.31) and ѿ пяти хлѣбѣ (р. 87, Table of Contents to Mark); ѿ бы по шестихъ днехъ (р. 50b, Matth. XVII.1); котормѣ || ѿ седмихъ бждеть жена (р. 65b - 66, Matth. XXII.28); по немъ ѿдошжъ нѣроди мнѣси ѿ галилѣа ѿ десатихъ градъ (р. 15b, Matth. IV.25).

b) the ending for the first person plural of the non-past tense of the athematic verbs, always $\{-mi\}$, spelled -мы: ѿко зде на поустѣ мѣстѣ есмы (р. 164b, Luke IX.12); что намы ѿли что пижемъ (р. 21b, Matth. VI.31); дамы ли, ѿли не дамы (р. 119b, Mark XII.14); мы вѣмы ѿко члкъ сѣ грѣшенъ естъ (р. 240b, John IX.24).

4.4.2. The syntactic structure represented in IAG reveals no significant changes in comparison with the classical OCS texts; the differences are in the use of different grammatical forms in the same verse of the New Testament. For instance, when in one phrase all the classical texts have the possessive genitive, IAG has the possessive dative, but in one where the classical texts have the possessive dative, IAG has the genitive.

Even the occurrence of double object in IAG is not

an innovation, as one might be led to believe by the dating of the earliest attested occurrences to the 14th century⁴⁹¹. While comparing the text of IAG with those of Mar., Sav., and the Russian Ostr., I found a few instances of the double object in mar. which have remained unnoticed by students of this text. Here are the occurrences of duplicated accusative object in Mar.: зълъ зълѣ погоубитъ ѡ (Matth. XXI.41) 'He will miserably destroy them the wicked men'. On the duplication of the object through the use of the pronoun form ѡ, Jagić notes in the fn. on p. 77 of Mar.: "ѡ is a spelling error"; егоже азъ оусѣкнѣхъ иоана (Mark VI.16) 'I beheaded him John'; дѣла бо (ѣже дастъ мѣнѣ отъць) да сѣврѣшѣ ѣ (John V.36) 'the works (which the Father gave me) to finish them'; всѣкѣ разгѣ не творѣштѣѣ плода. ѡзъметъ ѡ. ѡ всѣкѣ тво[тво]рѣштѣѣ плодѣ отрѣбитъ ѡ (John XV.2) 'Every branch not bearing fruit. He will take it away, and every (branch) bearing fruit, He will prune it'.

In Mar. there is one instance of a possible double dative: елисавети же испльни сѣ врѣмѣ родити ей (Luke I. 57) 'The time for Elizabeth to give birth came for her'. However, this phrase may be explained also in a different

491. J. Rusek, Po vĕprosa za xronologijata na udvojavane na dopĕlnenijata v bĕlgarskija ezik, BĕlgEz, XIII, 1963, 2, p. 141-143.

K. Mirĉev, Za xronologijata na osnovnite balkanizmi v bĕlgarskija ezik, BĕlgEz, XVI, 1966, 4, p. 281 - 293.

_____, Istoriĉeska gramatika ..., p. 60.

way: родити ей might represent dative plus infinitive, a purposive construction - 'so that she would give birth' - while елисавети is linked with врѣмѣ - 'the time for Elizabeth'; in this case the translation would be: 'Elizabeth's time came that she should give birth'. It seems that either interpretation is correct and possible.

The double dative is clearly expressed in Mar. in one instance of a dative absolute construction: въшедьшоу же емоу исви въ каперѣнаоумѣ (Matth. VIII.5) 'When Jesus he entered Capernaum'. In this phrase the insertion of the enclitic же between the past active participle in the dative case (въшедьшоу) and the duplicating dative personal pronoun (емоу) makes the interpretation unambiguous. However, there are many similar cases in OCS (including Mar.) where the enclitic же is absent; because of the spelling tradition of non-separation of words, scholars prefer to see in such cases not duplication of a participial by a pronominal form, but simply a long form of the participle, for example, in Mar.: пришедьшоуемоу исви (Matth. VIII.28), мимоходѣштюемоу исоу (Mark II.23). These phrases are ambiguous, for the words in them can be separated either way: пришедьшоуемоу исви or пришедьшоу емоу исви; мимоходѣштюемоу исоу or мимоходѣштю емоу исоу. If the second approach is accepted, the duplication of the dative through the addition of a personal pronoun will be additional evidence that the temporal dative absolute was a living syntactic feature of the spoken Balkan

Slavic language at the time Mar. was written. But such an altered view can be accepted only when more supporting data from the classical texts has been collected.

An indirect proof that the double object, both accusative and dative, was an established syntactic Balkanism in the Bulgarian language of the 10th - 11th centuries, is found in the Russian copy of Sinajskij Paterik⁴⁹². The occurrences of double accusative and double dative objects in this manuscript of the 11th or early 12th century have gone unnoticed, both by the publishers of the newest Soviet edition of the manuscript and by slavists who have studied the text⁴⁹³, perhaps because they were unaware of the existence of such a Balkan syntactic feature. In a casual reading of Sinajskij Paterik I found two clear cases of double object; double accusative: ТОГДА ВЪСТАВЪ ИДОХЪ К'НИГЪ ДАВЪШЮ МИ Я И РЕКОХЪ ЕМОУ. (p. 32b of the MS, p. 100 of the publication) 'then, after I got up, I went to (the person) who had given me them the books and told him'; and double dative: ЯВИ ЖЕ СЯ ЕМЪ [=ЕМОУ] ПАКЪ БЪСЪ. ЗАТВОРЬНИКОУ И ГЛА ЕМЪ [=ЕМОУ]. (p. 31b of the MS, p. 98 of the publica-

492. V. S. Golyšenko, V. F. Dubrovina, ed's., Sinajskij paterik, Moscow, 1967, 400 pp. + xi tables.

493. An exhaustive bibliography on the studies of this manuscript, and review of the major findings by scholars who have studied it, can be found in the preface to the 1967 Soviet publication of the manuscript (cf. fn. 492), pp. 5-9, 16-36.

tion) 'and the devil appeared again to him the hermit, and told him'.

The text of IAG also reflects the same Balkan syntactic feature of reduplication of the accusative and dative objects, as does the text of Mar., in some of the same phrases and in a few different ones. Examples of duplicated accusative are: всѣкс дръво, не творѣщее плода добра, посѣкажть ѱ, и въ ѿгнь вьметажть (p. 23, Matth. VII.19) 'they cut it down every tree, not bringing forth good fruit, and cast into the fire'. In this phrase the classical texts do not have the accusative pronoun ѱ. The other five instances (in four sentences) of double accusative in IAG occur in the same verses as in Mar.: злыж злѣ погоубить ѱ (p. 64, Matth. XXI.41); ѳгоже азъ оусѣкнжхъ Іѿанна (p. 102, Mark VI.16); дѣла ... да съврѣшж ѱ (p. 226b, John V.36); всѣкж розгж ... изметъ ж. и всѣкж... отрѣбитъ ѱ. (p. 255, John XV.2). What is new in the orthography of IAG is that in three of the six occurrences, the duplicating anaphoric pronoun in the accusative has been stressed with the sign " or "": ѱ (p. 64), ѱ (p. 226b), ж (p. 255).

IAG does not offer examples of the double dative in the dative absolute construction. But it has an indisputable double dative object at the beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel for which we possess no parallel text in the classical glagolitic Mar. and Zogr. The double dative object in Matth. IV.16 appears only in IAG; it does not exist in the

14th-century Bulgarian Dečansko Evangelie, published by Jagić in Mar. in lieu of the lost initial pages of Mar. and Zogr.. IAG has: людине сѣдашеи въ тъмѣ видѣшѣ свѣтъ великъ. || ѿ сѣдашимъ въ странѣ ѿ сѣни смрътнѣи, свѣтъ въсиа имъ. (p. 14-14b) 'The people sitting in darkness saw a great light, and to those sitting in the region and shadow of death light sprang up to them'. In the same verse (Matth. IV.16) both Dečansko Evangelie and Sav. have a nominative plural сѣдашеи instead of the dative plural сѣдашимъ, thus showing syntactic disagreement in the sentence. Sav. has the following phrase: ѿ сѣдашеи въ странѣ. ѿ сѣни смрътнѣи свѣтъ въсиа имъ (p. 149b). The lack of grammatical agreement between сѣдашеи and имъ in Sav. is not an argument against the existence of a double dative object in its prototype. In modern Bulgarian, phrases like на Петър му говоря and Петър му говоря are in free alternation in colloquial speech and in the dialects, due to the inversion; but *говоря му Петър is an impossible phrase. There is a syntactic parallel between сѣдашеи... свѣтъ въсиа имъ — сѣдашимъ... свѣтъ въсиа имъ on the one hand and Петър му говоря — на Петър му говоря on the other. Without duplication of the object (имъ in Sav., му in the modern Bulgarian example), both phrases (*сѣдашеи свѣтъ въсиа, and *Петър говоря) would be meaningless.

The above quoted examples of double accusative and dative objects from Mar. and from the Russian copy of Sinaj-

skij Paterik, and even the one definite double dative in the dative absolute construction in Mar., indicate that the six instances of double accusative object and one of double dative object, attested in the text of IAG, are not syntactic innovations but rather archaisms in the language of IAG compared to that of some classical OCS texts from Bulgaria, both known (Mar.) and unknown (the prototype of the Russian Sinajskij Paterik). Thus all typical Balkan grammatical features, with the exception of the article, are present in the language of the 14th-century Bulgarian revised edition of the Four Gospels, in the same general quantity as in the classical OCS texts from 10th- and 11th-century Bulgaria (cf. fn. 287). It seems that the only Balkan grammatical feature which the 14th-century Bulgarians purged from their literary language as being foreign to Church Slavic, was the article, which definitely existed in the Bulgarian dialects of that time⁴⁹⁴.

Balkanisms in OCS and in the Middle Bulgarian literary language, such as non-distinction of direction and location with the verbs of motion, establishment of only three cases - subjective, objective and dative - demonstrated by the incorrect use of the other cases and by generalization of the objective (accusative) case as a prepositional case,

494. K. Mirčev, Za člennite formi v Dobrejšovo evangelie, BəlgEz, VII, 1957, p. 223-228.

and duplication of the accusative and dative objects, seriously violate the grammatical structure of both literary Russian and Serbian. Although the Serbian and Russian copyists of Old and Middle Bulgarian texts must have tried to correct and interpret these "mistakes", a few of them penetrated into the Serbian and Russian literary monuments (cf., for example, 2.4.2.). The presence of such anomalies is extremely useful as an indicator of an Old or Middle Bulgarian prototype for the Serbian and Russian copies. The Balkan features in the Bulgarian language have come to the attention of linguists relatively recently⁴⁹⁵. The most detailed studies on the structural similarities of Bulgarian, Macedonian, the Serbian Torlak dialects, Rumanian, the Romance dialects in Macedonia, Albanian and some North Greek dialects have been made at the synchronic level⁴⁹⁶. A

495. K. Sandfeld, Linguistique balkanique; problèmes et résultats ("2^e édition, un peu remaniée et notablement augmentée de mon livre danois Balkanfilologien, paru en 1929"), Paris, 1930, 242 pp.

K. Sandfeld, P. Skok, Balkanski jezici, in: Knjiga o Balkanu, I, Beograd, 1936, p. 260-275.

496. T. V. Civ'jan, Opyt opisanija form novo-grečeskogo suščestvitel'nogo metodom analiza i sinteza, VJaz, 1963, 6, p. 57-68.

Imja suščestvitel'noe v balkanskix jazykax, Moscow, 1965, 194 pp.

H. Birnbaum, Balkanslavisch und Südslavisch. Zur Reichweite der Balkanismen im südslavischem Sprachraum, Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, III, 1965, p. 12-63.

Exhaustive bibliography on the subject is given in the above-mentioned works. Cf. also:

P. Ivić, Liens phonologiques entre les langues balkaniques, Actes du 1^{er} Congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes, VI, Sofia, 1968, p. 133-141.

diachronic comparative study is impossible, since the only early attested language of the group is Bulgarian. Nevertheless it would be incorrect to presume that it was the Bulgarian language which influenced Rumanian, Albanian and the North Greek dialects. The term "Balkan convergence area" is a most appropriate one for the territory on which, historically, the Daco-Thracian, Vulgar Latin, Greek and Slavic languages interacted, creating as a result a unique structural unity of languages and dialects different by origin⁴⁹⁷.

4.5. When compared with the classical OCS Gospel texts, IAG reflects deep and serious lexical changes; in my study of these changes I discovered more than 1500 instances where a word was changed in IAG relative to the classical

497. T. V. Civ'jan, op. cit., pp. 15-16, 22, 183-189, 191-192.

B. A. Uspenskij, Tipologičeskaja klassifikacija jazykov kak osnova jazykovyx sootvetstvij (Struktura jazyka-ètalona pri tipologičeskoj klassifikacii jazykov), VJaz, 1961, 6, p. 51-64.

H. Birnbaum, On Typology, Affinity and Balkan Linguistics, Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku, IX, 1966, p. 17-30.

_____, Slavjanske jazyki na Balkanax i ponjatie tak nazyvaemyx jazykovyx sojuzov, Glossa, II, 1968, p. 70-92.

G. Reichenkron, Der Typus der Balkansprachen, Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, I, 1962, p. 91-122.

J. Matl, Das romanische Element am Balkan mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der italo-romanischen Kultur-ausstrahlung, in: III. Grazer Balkanologen -Tagung 1968, Munich, 1968, p. 33-52.

See also the bibliography in fn. 287.

texts. Many of these lexical changes occurred in the text of the Psalter and in other Church Slavonic texts as well⁴⁹⁸. For a better understanding of the change of the Church Slavonic lexicon in Bulgaria from the 10th - 11th centuries until the end of the 14th century, one must study in detail all texts available in old and newer variants. My study of the lexical changes in the Four Gospels text (IAG) indicates that they are significant and should be reported in detail in a separate work. Below will be given, in brief, as they pertain to the theme of this dissertation, the general types of lexical changes in the Middle Bulgarian literary language.

4.5.1. Although the revision of the text of the Four Gospels must have been made so as to bring the Slavic translation closer to the Greek original, Greek and Hebrew lexical borrowings in OCS have been systematically purged from the language of IAG. Here are examples: ароматы → воньми благоуханными (p. 267b); аромать ꙗ муро → вонѧ ѡ помазание (p. 209); архиереи → старѣишины жрътѣски (p. 197); власѣимиѧ → хоулѧ (p. 92); гнаѣи → бѣлѣилникѣ (p. 110); еѡкениѣ (in Mar.) is свѣштениѧ (in the other OCS texts) → ѡбновлениѧ (p. 242b); ѡпокрѣти → лицемѣриѧ (p. 65); катапетазма → завѣса (p. 208b); кентуриона → сѣтника (p. 132b); мисѣ → блюдѣ (p. 44); мироѧ → мастиѧ (p. 159b); муромѣ → мастиѧ (p. 159); олѣи → масла (p. 72b); олокав-

498. L. S. Kovtun, Russkaja leksikografija èpoxi Srednevekov'ja, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 155-215.

томать → съжигаемыхъ (р. 121); пαραклитъ → оутѣшитель
 (р. 256b); параскевъѣи → пѣтъкъ (р. 132); паропсидѣ →
 блюдоу (р. 68); пирѣ → вѣртище (р. 203); пирѣ → вѣлага-
 лица (р. 101b); хризмы наредѣны пистики драгы (Mar.)
 → масти нарды вѣрныѣ многоцѣнны (р. 124b); преторѣ →
 сѣдище (р. 262b); раввѣи → оучителю (р. 218), but
раввоуни is twice replaced by равви (pp. 116, 268b);
сукаминѣ → агодичинѣ (р. 188b); сукомориѣ → нагоди-
 чинѣ (р. 193, in a different hand); скандалѣ → съ-
 блазнь (р. 53b); сканьдѣлы (Mar.) is съблазны in all
 other OCS texts → съблазньники (р. 42); скандалисаетъ → съ-
 блазнить (р. 53); скиниѣ → сѣни (р. 166); скинопигийѣ →
 пѣтьчѣнїе кѣщѣ (р. 231b, in a different hand); прѣмѣ
спирѣ → поемѣ войны (р. 260b); спира → воины (р. 261);
 стадиѣ → пыпришь (р. 245); стратигомѣ → воєводамѣ (р. 204);
тетрархѣ → четвѣртовластьцѣ (р. 43b); отъ вонѣ хризмѣ-
нѣ → ѿ ма^сти благобѣнныѣ (р. 248); литрѣ хризмы →
 стѣклѣницѣ мира (р. 247b); похризмити → помазати (р. 125);
хризма → масть (р. 124b); хризмнаѣ → мастнаа (р. 124b).

In the process of replacing the Greek and Hebrew words with Slavic equivalents, the scribe once even translated a place name - that of the town of Decapolis: по немѣ йдошѣ народи мнози ѿ галилѣѣ и десѣтихѣ градѣ (р. 15b, Matth. IV.25). Later in the text, however, he left the Greek name for the town unchanged: и йде и начѣть проповѣдати въ декаполи велико створи емоу ѿсѣ (р. 99b, Mark V.20).

This replacement process is well attested in the classical OCS texts, where most of the above listed Slavic substitutions occur in alternation with the foreign borrowings. In IAG it is almost completed; while a few doublets such as равви /оучителю, ипокрити/лицемѣрии still exist, most of the above listed foreign words are not attested at all in IAG (гнаѣи, енкениѣ, кентурионѣ, миса, олокавтоматѣ, параклитѣ, параскевѣѣи, паропсида, сукамина, сканделѣ, etc.).

4.5.2. Another large group of words, attested in most of the classical OCS texts but systematically avoided in IAG, consists mostly of words unknown in today's Bulgarian dialects. Only a few of these words survived in Bulgarian, either with a somewhat different meaning (вратѣникѣ - 'gate' vs., in OCS, 'doorman'; заклепе - 'strike a bell' vs., in OCS, 'lock in') or with the same meaning as in OCS, but in only a few dialects (мѣдѣна, наваждена, скриницѣ). Here given in their basic dictionary form, are words found in OCS texts but consistently replaced in IAG, most likely as archaisms or dialectisms; they are followed by their replacements in IAG and the page number of each: балии - врачѣ, (p. 92b) 'doctor'; вратѣникѣ - дверникѣ, (p. 124) 'doorman'; врѣтъ - врѣтоградѣ, (p. 260b) 'orchard'; гороушѣнѣ, горюшѣнѣ - гороушиченѣ (pp. 52, 41b), горчиченѣ (pp. 180b, 188b) 'mustard', adj.; доволь - ѣмѣнѣ, (p. 183) 'cost, expense'; драхлѣ (Mar.) or драселѣ (Zogr.) — печаленѣ, (p. 114) 'sad'; жалии (Mar.) — гробѣ, (p. 26b) 'tombs';

засѣдъникъ — прѣлогатаи (p. 197) 'spy'; ѹспѣ — горѣ,
 (p. 246) 'up there'; клепѣти — назнаменовати, (p. 263)
 'signify'; кѣнигчи — книжникъ, (p. 67b) 'bookman'; за-
клепе (Mar.) or заклучи (Zogr.) — затвори, (p. 146) 'lock
 in'; кокотѣ, коурѣ — пателѣ, (p. 77) 'rooster'; ладѣа —
корабль, (p. 89b) 'boat'; маломошѣ — бѣдникъ, (p. 182)
 or бѣденѣ, (p. 112b) 'maimed, crippled'; мошѣна — пира,
 (p. 30b) 'skin for holding water'; мѣнити — понижати,
 (p. 220b) 'to shorten, make smaller'; мѣдѣнѣ — кѣсенѣ,
 (p. 210b) 'slow, late'; натроути — накрѣмити, (p. 74b)
 'to feed'; неврѣдоу сътвориша — не брѣгошѣ (pp. 64, 197),
не въсхотѣшѣ, (p. 119) 'reject'; подѣпѣга, подѣбѣга —
поушеница, (p. 18), поушена, (p. 56b) 'divorced woman';
прапрѣдѣнѣ, прѣпрѣдѣнѣ — багрѣнѣ, (p. 263b) 'red'; пѣнажѣ-
никъ — трѣжникъ, (p. 194b) 'banker, usurer'; рыбытѣва —
рыбарѣ (p. 150) 'fisherman'; склаѣѣ, дѣло — ѡбразѣ, (p. 65)
 'relief, portrait'; скриница, рачица — ковчежецѣ, (p. 252b)
 'box'; соулѣе — оуне, (p. 224) 'better'; соулѣиши — лоучѣ-
ши, (p. 175b) 'best'; сударѣ — оуброусѣ, (p. 268) 'ker-
 chief'; ѣдро — скоро (p. 182b) 'soon'.

Some of the words in this list had already been replaced in some of the OCS texts, which indicates the existence of dialectal lexical variants in the oldest preserved OCS texts. In this respect IAG shows a further development in this evolutionary process of removing from the language obsolete and strictly dialectal words.

4.5.3. The bulk of the lexical replacements in IAG represent true or near synonyms, used in some instances in free alternation (ложе - одръ; печаленъ - скръбенъ), and in others interchanged to achieve a better, more precise translation (въ огнь въметомо - въ пещь въмѣтаемо, р. 21). This is the most interesting type of lexical change in IAG, for it shows the slow but steady improvement of the OCS translations. The type of lexical replacement by synonymous or closely related words involved the following groups:

a) Words with different lexical morphemes, denoting identical or close concepts. Here are a few examples of these contextually-based changes: възрасть (all OCS) - іако съмыслъ имать (р. 240b, John IX.23) 'he is of age'; глашаетъ (all OCS) - и своѣ ѡвца зоветъ по имени (р. 241b, John X.3) 'call by name'; възгласитъ кокотъ (Mar.), коуръ (Zogr., Ostr.) - іако прѣжде даже не въспоеть патель, три краты (р. 205, Luke XXII.61) 'the cock crows'; пригласи (all OCS) - призвав же жениха архитриклинь и гла ямоу. (р. 217, John II.10) 'call (someone)'; не зови (all OCS) - не глашай другъ своихъ (р. 182, Luke XIV.12) 'invite, call'; исповѣдѣ (all OCS) - и обѣща са, и искаше подобна врѣмене да него прѣдасть без народа. (р. 201-201b, Luke XXII.6) 'commit oneself'; кънигъ (all OCS) - или сего писаніа нѣсте чѣли (р. 119, Mark XII.10) 'scripture'; льсть (all OCS) - разоумѣв же лжав'ство ихъ, рече имъ. (р. 197, Luke XX.23) 'craftiness'; а знамениѣ врѣменемъ не можете

(all OCS) - не разоумѣете (p. 49, Matth. XVI.3) 'understand, conceive'; недостойни (all OCS) - ѡко раби непо-
трѣбни ѣсмы (p. 189, Luke XVII.10) 'worthless'; золь,
зълѣи (all OCS) - родъ лжавъ ѡ прѣлюбодѣивъ, знаменина
ѡщетъ (p. 49, Matth. XVI.4) 'wicked, cunning'; свѣдѣтель-
ствоуете (all OCS) - вы сами мнѣ послоушьствоуете. ѡко
рѣхъ нѣсмъ ѡзъ хс. (p. 220, John III.28) 'to witness one's
words'; сътворатъ (и) црѣ (all OCS) - и поставаты ѡ црѣ
(p. 228, John VI.15) 'to make (one) a king'; вскрѣситъ
сѣма (all OCS) - вѣставитъ плема брата своего (p. 197b,
Luke XX.28) 'to resurrect the seed, reestablish the kin of';
тѣло (all OCS) - ѡдеже троупъ, тоу ѡ орли сѣберѣтъ са:
(p. 190b, Luke XVII.36) 'corpse'; оужасаахѣ са (all OCS)
- ѡ дивлѣахѣ са, ѡ послѣдоужше, боахѣ са (p. 115, Mark
X.32) 'be amazed'; хоташте (all OCS) - сѣ мѣти твоя ѡ
братина твоя внѣ стоѣтъ ѡскѣше глати тебѣ (p. 39, Matth.
XII.47) 'wanting, desiring'; шюмъ (all OCS) - ѡ ѡсхождаа-
ше слоухъ ѡ немъ въ всѣко мѣсто ѡ странѣ. (p. 149, Luke
IV.37) 'rumor'.

b) Some of these changes, involving the use of words with different lexical morphemes, are interesting in that they occur within a group of words denoting the same concept or object, from which the contextually-based choices are different in IAG than in the OCS texts although no lexical morpheme is lost. Here are two examples of this kind of slight shift in the semantics of words: иночадѣ - едино-

родень (p. 166b), while бештадь is preserved, but with a different suffix, бесчадень (p. 197b); however, не оставльше чадъ is changed to не оставльше сѣмене (p. 197b) and не възненавидить ... чадъ becomes не възненавидить ... дѣти (p. 183). In addition, дѣтищемъ is changed to отроцищемъ (p. 34), while отрокы becomes дѣти (p. 10b). The second example: воеводами → влѣками (p. 122b), while влкоуж → властиа (p. 24b) but влѣка → вождь (p. 9); власть → ѡбласть (pp. 213b, 242b), yet область → власть (pp. 118b, 196).

c) A great number of lexical changes involve only a change of the prefixes, which is both a lexical and a morphological innovation. Here are a few examples: възмѣти сѧ → смѣти сѧ (p. 24b); възвѣси сѧ → обѣси сѧ (p. 80b); възвахъ → призвахъ (p. 10b); ищистити → очистити (p. 24); положишѧ → възложишѧ (p. 82b); прогнѣвавъ сѧ → разгнѣвавъ сѧ (p. 55b); пропѣть → распѣть (p. 81b); пропѣтиѣ → распѣтиѣ (p. 82); прокопавъше → раскопавше (p. 91b); оусѣци → ѡсѣци (p. 17b); оустани → прѣстани (p. 98); снѣдажтъ → изѣдажтъ (p. 198b). Some unprefixed words become prefixed: дѣлителѣ → раздѣлителѣ (p. 176); зѣданию → сѣзданию (p. 123); ѣдь → снѣдь (p. 88b); in other words the prefix is introduced either after the first lexical morpheme in a compound (благо-волихъ → блго-из-волихъ, p. 146) or after the negative morpheme не (не-чааниѣ → не-на-чааніа, p. 200b; не-оумѣхѧ → не-до-оумѣхѧ, p. 127b).

d) A relatively smaller group represents derivations from the same lexical morphemes as the words in the parallel OCS phrases, but with different suffixes, which sometimes cause phonological changes in the lexical morphemes as, for example: четвѣртовластьникъ → четвѣртовластець (p. 146); сѣпрѣ → сѣперника, (p. 190b); невѣръство → невѣръствине, (p. 43); невѣръствию → невѣриѡ, (p. 111); невѣръство → невѣрие, (p. 101); обѣданиимъ → обыадѣнїемъ, (p. 200b); слоухъ → слышанїа, (p. 122); призракъ → призрѣнїе, (p. 104); прокажениѣ → проказы, (p. 150b).

e) There are many other kinds of lexico-grammatical changes in IAG, which will be united in this group for brevity of exposition. Substantives are replaced by substantivized adjectives (слѣпецъ → слѣпыи, p. 116; грѣшникъ → грѣшень, p. 240b; недѣжъникъ → недѣжныѣ, p. 101); combinations of substantive with 'empty' verb are replaced by verbs (сѣвѣтъ сѣтвориша → сѣвѣщашѣ сѣ, p. 75) and vice versa (трождаате женѣ → троуды даете женѣ, p. 75b); the verbs творити and дѣати are exchanged in combination with different substantives (прѣлюбѣи творити → прѣлюбѣи дѣати, p. 56b, while молитвѣ дѣаше → молитвѣ творѣаше, p. 90b), etc.

In one instance the change in the text is purely ideological, reflecting a changed interpretation of the Christian ideal of poverty, and may have been triggered by a like change in the Greek original. In Mark X.23, all OCS

texts read as in Mar.: ꙗ възърѣвъ ѿсъ гла оученикомъ
 своимъ. како не оудобъ имѣщеи богатъство. въ црѣствие бѣже
 вѣнидѣтъ. In IAG the phrase имѣщеи богатъство 'those who
 have wealth' has been replaced by оуповаѣщимъ на богатъство
 'those who rely on (their) wealth' (p. 114).

The extensive lexical changes in the text of IAG greatly improved the quality of the translation. Compared with the lexicon of the classical OCS Gospel texts, the lexicon of IAG is much more stabilized, with fewer foreign borrowings and fewer words used in free alternation, and with a more precise contextual usage of those words attested in the classical texts. There are almost no neologisms in IAG; on the contrary, a great number of perhaps dialectal words in the classical OCS texts has been systematically purged from the language of IAG. There is no doubt, from the lexicological point of view, that the language of IAG is far superior to that of any of the classical OCS Gospel texts.

C O N C L U S I O N S

There have been many misconceptions in the traditional understanding of the causes of the second South Slavic influence on the Russian literary language and literature of the late 14th - 15th centuries, as well as of the extent of that influence and of the mechanisms behind it. In this dissertation, the prevailing authoritative opinions and arguments on the problem have been examined, and in many cases revised, with the aid of historical counter-arguments and data from the medieval Slavic literatures.

The Turkish conquest of the South Slavic countries - Bulgaria and Serbia - did not cause, nor even accelerate, the second South Slavic influence in Russia, but rather created obstacles to the cultural interchange among the Christian nations in the area and destroyed some prominent Slavic cultural centers in the Balkans. The historically unjustified linking of the Turkish conquest of Bulgaria and Serbia (which was accomplished from 1364 to 1459) with the second South Slavic influence in Russia was brought about by the assumption that there were Bulgarian and Serbian "refugees" in Russia in the late 14th - early 15th centuries. There is no historical evidence that such "refugees" existed; the appointment of two Bulgarians - Kiprian and Camblak - as Metropolitans of Muscovite Russia and Russian Lithuania, respectively, is in no way related to the Turkish

invasion of the Balkans. Only a very few Bulgarian manuscripts were brought to Russia before 1649 - 1655, when, in connection with Nikon's reform, Arsenij Suxanov brought to Moscow 700 Greek and South Slavic manuscripts.

The beginning of the second South Slavic influence on Russian is connected with the efforts of the Russians themselves to renovate their literature after two centuries of Tatar domination, and to create a national Russian literary language devoid of narrow dialectal grammatical and lexical features. In the initial efforts by Russians in this direction, South Slavic revised editions of Church Slavic texts were used as models, but their characteristic orthographic, grammatical and lexical features were carefully avoided in the Russian copies. The establishment of the Middle Bulgarian orthography - and, partially, grammar and lexicon - as normative for the Russian literary language at the end of the 14th and in the early 15th century, must have been caused by two factors: the authority of the Russian Metropolitans of Bulgarian origin, Kiprian and Camblak, who doubtless regarded the Middle Bulgarian language of the second half of the 14th century as the best, most truly supranational Church Slavic; and the prestige of the 14th century Bulgarian revised editions in the monasteries of Constantinople and Mt. Athos. Almost all of the Middle Bulgarian manuscripts were copied by Russians in these centers of Church Slavic literature. This gave Russian copy-

ists the opportunity to learn the meanings of various South Slavic words unknown in Russia, and then to replace them by Russian or OCS synonyms in their own copies. In the same way many morphological and syntactic innovations in the South Slavic prototypes were replaced either by Russian or by OCS forms. Thus even in the first Russian copies from South Slavic manuscripts, many local features of the language were eliminated, making it a very difficult task to establish the national origin of a certain Church Slavic text from the early period - and all the more from later periods.

By the first half of the 14th century, the Middle Bulgarian literary language had acquired the characteristics of a supradialectal and, in great measure, a supranational medium of communication. Most of the OCS translations from Greek were corrected and reconciled with the texts of the originals. The revision of the Middle Bulgarian texts and language was a process which must have begun with the political unification of Bulgaria under Ioan Asǎn II (1218-1241) and the re-establishment of the Church Slavic liturgy in connection with the restoration of the Tǎrnovo Patriarchate in 1235. This process of revision of the Church Slavic books continued through the entire 14th century; by 1337 and 1355/56, when King Ioan Aleksandǎr's Psalter and Four Gospels (IAG) were written, the orthographic, grammatical and lexical norms of the 14th-century Middle Bulgarian lit-

erary language were firmly established. There is no single historical or linguistic evidence that there was ever an orthographic and linguistic reform initiated by the Tarnovo Patriarch Euthymius, or by the Hesychasts. Patriarch Euthymius was a very prolific Bulgarian writer, one of the many translators who participated in the revision of Church Slavic texts (the Služebnik, for instance), but his role in the development of the Bulgarian literary language was modest, and in the second South Slavic influence - negligible, since he wrote mostly vitae of Bulgarian saints not celebrated by the Russian Church. The role of the Bulgarian Hesychasts in the creation of a new South Slavic hagiographic genre has been much overstated, while the contribution of the 13th - 14th century Serbian hagiographic tradition has been underestimated by many scholars. The belief that the new South Slavic style was devised by the Hesychasts, and that it was confined to the vitae, is incorrect. It was actually the predominant style in the South Slavic literature of the 13th - 14th centuries, borrowed from contemporaneous Byzantine literature, and is to be found even in the language of Golden Bulls and chronicles.

Hesychasm was a mystical philosophical-religious movement, confined to the last decades of the existence of Bulgaria and Byzantium; it had nothing in common with the humanism of the Renaissance. Hesychasm never spread in Russia as a trend in the spiritual life of the country. The

Metropolitan Kiprian was never known as a Hesychast, while the Metropolitan Camblak, at the time when he became head of the Russian-Lithuanian Church, severed all ties with the Byzantine Church and accepted the leadership of Rome, thus bringing Russian Lithuania temporarily into the Western cultural sphere.

The Middle Bulgarian literary language of the 14th century, in its best samples - books made for the King, manuscripts in the prosperous monasteries in Constantinople and on Mt. Athos - was a highly normalized system. Most of the innovations in the orthography (relative to that of the known OCS texts of the 10th and 11th centuries) are in the direction of the firm establishment of morphonemic spelling rules and the avoidance, as much as possible, of phonological spellings reflecting typically Bulgarian features. The only two instances in which the scribe failed to rise above the Bulgarian phonological system were in the confusion of the letters denoting the two OCS nasal vowels, and in the use of the letters Ѡ and ѡ to represent both etymological *ě and *ja. But in the latter respect, the Middle Bulgarian texts are not very different from the OCS cyrillic texts, with the exception that a new mechanical principle of distribution is consistently applied to these letters: ѡ after a letter denoting a consonant, Ѡ in word initial position or after a letter denoting a vowel. In their orthographical devices, the good Middle Bulgarian texts of

the 14th century strikingly resemble both the classical cyrillic OCS texts and the contemporaneous Byzantine texts; this made them attractive models for imitation by Russians seeking to revive the Church Slavic literature of the older period and to bring it up to the level of the Byzantine literature of their own time.

The grammar of the best Middle Bulgarian texts is little different from the grammar of the OCS texts from Bulgaria. There are very few instances of systematic grammatical innovation in the literary language, and most of the archaic and newer alternating forms are already registered in the OCS texts. The drastic grammatical changes in the structure of the Bulgarian dialects by the 14th century are very seldom represented in the literary language; they were easily avoidable, in copying, as "mistakes". But most of the Balkan structural features of Bulgarian, appearing sporadically as freely alternating forms in the literary language, cannot be considered innovations, since they are attested in the OCS texts from Bulgaria. Moreover, they are valuable tools in determining the Bulgarian origin of a Russian or Serbian copy, when a Bulgarian copy is lacking for comparison.

The Middle Bulgarian texts differ from OCS mostly in the lexicon. While there are few neologisms in the revised OCS translations, many archaic and dialectal words, as well as foreign borrowings, have been purged from the

language, and the attested OCS words are used more precisely in different contexts, and less in free alternation, than in OCS. Thus the old translations were brought closer to the Greek originals, made more correct and improved stylistically. In the newer translations from Byzantine Greek, many neologisms, especially compound words, were created, following Greek derivational models and OCS tradition. But the problem of Middle Bulgarian word formation should be treated separately in a special study.

With all its orthographic, grammatical and lexical peculiarities, the language of the revised OCS translations, newer translations and original Slavic writings in 14th - century Bulgaria had unique qualities which made it acceptable, with slight modifications, as a supranational literary language. This is the main reason it played such a major part in the second South Slavic influence on Russian.

So far it has been impossible fully to determine the extent of the second South Slavic influence on the Russian literature of the late 14th and 15th centuries, because of the enormous number of manuscripts of the period, kept in Soviet libraries and museums. But while the influence of the Middle Bulgarian language - orthography, grammar, lexicon - has been established earlier by Sobolevskij and Lixačev, and the causes and mechanisms of this influence have been re-examined in this dissertation, any real influence of Bulgarian manuscript illumination in Russia is most

improbable, as is the very existence of a Bulgarian school of manuscript illumination.

Bulgarian art and literature of the 14th century, in their best exemplars, definitely lack national characteristics: they were part of the Byzantine culture, and were prized by the Russians exactly for that reason. Thus the second South Slavic influence in Russia, generally speaking, served as a shortcut in raising the Russian literature and cultural and spiritual life to the level of their Byzantine counterparts.

A P P E N D I C E S

A p p e n d i x O n e:

Ёлма оубо бысть мановение ба ѿца и га нашего
 Иисоу хрїста. ходатаиствомъ сжшыхъ и истинныхъ прѣчистыхъ и
 прѣблгословеныхъ вл^дчцъ и бгородителницъ, на стѣи горѣ ѿѿн-
 стѣи еже быти въ ней пристанище спсениюу въсѣкой дши хрїс-
 тиан'стѣи паче же православнѣи. и съ оусрѣдиемъ прѣбѣгающои
 въ ней. еже ради вины, и въздвигошъ трудолюбезнѣ мнози.
 домовы стѣи велики и дивны. црїе блгочестивии. и бѿголюбивии
 вельмъже. и прѣподобнии инѿци. и оукрасішъ и ѿбогатишъ въсѣ-
 ко. каменiemъ мноѿоцѣннымъ и бисѣромъ златомъ же. и сребромъ
 и иман'ми и инѣми правдами многыми. движимыми и недвижимыми.
 еже быти въ довѣльство и изобіілие сжшимъ и прѣбывающимъ въ
 таковыхъ въсечестныхъ и бжествъныи[x] домовохъ. пощихъ и
 славашихъ едіного бга въ тройци славимаго. и прѣчистяхъ и
 въсепѣтѣхъ его матере. поминати же и православныхъ и хрїсто-
 любивыхъ и приснопаматныхъ црѣа. и прочахъ блаженыхъ ктитори и
 въсѣкъ рѣдъ хрїстианскы. ибо. не ѿ едіного рѣда тѣчихъ или ѿ
 двою. обрѣтаѣт са въ томъ стѣмъ мѣстѣ здателе, нѣ понеже
 обшче спсение въ немъ ест' искажшимъ нѣ. об'ше бѿ бысть
 и мѣсто благовољствоушимъ. тѣго ради. и обрѣтаѣт са зда-
 ния ѿ въсѣкого рѣда и ѿзыка православнаго. еже сѣтъ прѣвѣе
 и израднѣишее. грѣци. блъгаре. по томъ же. сръбѣе. роусси.
 и вере. въсѣкъ же имать паматъ прѣтивъ своему потроуждениѿ.

паче же рѣвению.

G. A. Il'inskij, Gramoty bolgarskix carej
(Drevnosti. Trudy Slavjanskoj kommissii Imperator-
skogo Moskovskogo arheologičeskogo obščestva, V.),
Moscow, 1911 (Photoedition: London, 1970), p.21-22.

А р р е н д і х Т в о :

таковаа нѣкаа цвѣтнаа пѣстрога нѣбо оукрашаше.
такова нѣкаа належаше нѣсномуу лицу. многозрачнаа ѣ радост-
наа ѣ доброзрачна красота. ѣ врьтоградъ новонасажденъ нѣбо
творѣше, ѣмоу же врьтоградаръ бѣ. ѣко садовиа же ѣ ѣрасли,
ѣ ѣко цвѣтиа многоразличнаа, свѣздныхъ свѣтлости. тогда прѣ-
вѣе сѣнцоу вѣсиавшоу ѣ просвѣтѣвъшоу сѣ. ѣвльши же сѣ кра-
сотѣ нѣснѣи ѣ добротѣ дневнѣи, послужишѣ повелѣнїю сѣтвор-
шаго. и прѣклонишѣ вѣ свѣрѣши днѣ четвѣртьи. сѣце оубо свѣрѣ-
шишѣ сѣ ѣже ѣ свѣздахъ. ѣ оучинено бы сѣ сѣнце свѣзда днѣ
сѣдрѣжашиа: лоунное же брѣвно просвѣщаше ношѣ.

I. Dujčev (ed.), Letopista na Konstantin
Manasi (Fototipno izdanie na Vatikanskija prepis
na srednobelgarskija prevod), Sofia, 1963, pp.6,9.

А р р е н д і х Т в о :

црѣтво таркинїево, ѣже пѣтїи бы црѣ по ромилѣ
въ римѣ. ѣ по томъ црѣтвѣова таркинїе, пѣтїи по ромилѣ, ни-
чим же ѣмоу прилежѣще прїемъ црѣтво. ѣбо сѣнвомъ достоино бѣ
црѣтвѣовати, маркиа црѣ.

црѣтво тилїево.

ѣ по томъ зѣтъ таркинїевъ, тилие црѣтвѣова. ѣже ѣзъ
детѣства ѣко же глѣтъ ѣ ѣ прѣваго вѣзраста, нареченъ бы

сервие, ꙗко рѡдив сѧ ѿ рабы. тлькоует бѡ сѧ || сервие, рабѣ римлѣны. сѧи припраже дѣщерь своѧ на бракъ съ црѣвѣмъ сыномъ • левкіа таркиниа. ею же единѣмъ свѣтомъ и разоумомъ оубииствнымъ • и живота и власти ѡкаанныи лишень бы^с. и свѣтомъ ѡпшимъ, соупервѣ наре^ч сѧ • грѣдаго же по тлькоу ихъ сице нарицаѣтъ.

I. Dujčev (ed.), Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, p. 136-137.

А р р е н д і х F o u r :

црство василиа македонѣнина :

сѧи абие фѡтїа изгна ѿ цркве. и паки ѿдасть прѣ-
 столъ игнатїеви. || всхотѣв же и народоу имѣние ѿдати. и
 изыскавѣ домовы златохранища. иже прѣвѣе сътазаахъ имѣ-
 нїѡмъ множества. и видѣвѣ всѧ празны и ничьсѡ же имащѣ.
 скрѣбѣше : тѣжаше . печаловааше . оунывааше . не имѣше что сътво-
 рити си . ѿ всѣдоу недоѡмѣаше сѧ . црѣ бѡ не имѣхѣ имѣниа
 многобогатнаго , подобенъ естъ ѡрлоу прѣветхоу и прѣстароу не
 имащоу перїа . и ноктїа и клюна . сего ради и василїе печало-
 вааше и тѣжаше . ибѡ црѣ михаиль всѣ истѣщивѣ и глоумцемъ
 раздавѣ , съ игрѣцемъ своимъ и съпирникѡмъ .

I. Dujčev (ed.), Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, p. 328-329.

А р р е н д і х F i v e :

а кипрїанъ мѣтрополитъ по гречески гораздо не
 разѡмѣлъ и нашего язѣка довольно не знѣлъ же . ѡще и съ на-

ми единъ нашъ ꙗзыкъ сирѣчь славенски. да мѣ говори мѣ по
 своѣмъ ꙗзыкъ чисто и шѣтко. а онъ гвора тѣ моложено . . . ,
 и в писаніи рѣчи наші с ними не схѣдѣтса. ѡ онъ мнѣл'са что
 поправи лѣ фалмов по нашемъ. а болши неразѣмїе в ни хѣ напи-
 са лѣ в рѣче хѣ ѡ слоѣ хѣ все по сербски написа лѣ. и нынѣ
 многа оу нас и всѣ время на кнѣгы пишѣт. а пишѣтъ ѡ нера-
 зѣмїа все по сербски . . . гдѣ надобѣ тѣ по нашемъ а, а по
 сербски ѣ, ѡ ли ж, по нашему ю, а по сербски ѡ, по нашемъ
 ѣ, а сербски ж, оу на сѣ ы, а сербски и, а рѣчи по нашемъ
 не замѣ ли, а сербски, ѡ ли бѣде болгарски не замѣди. по на-
 шемъ кѣсно ме лѣленноꙗзыченъ, или гѣгни вѣ, а сербски мѣдноꙗзы-
 че нѣ. и прѣча рѣчи намъ неразѣмны. бохма, васнѣ, реснотивїе,
 цѣщи, ашѣтъ. и много таковыхъ мы не разѣмѣемъ ѣно сербски,
 а ѡно болгарски. ѡ сїѣ доселѣ не достанѣ тѣ. на мѣ лѣто на
 повѣствованїе.

Arximandrit Amfiloxij, Čto vnes Sv. Kiprian, mitropolit Kievskij i vseja Rossii, a potom Moskovskij i vseja Rossii, iz svoego rodnogo narečija i iz perevodov ego vremeni v naši bogoslužebnye knigi?, Trudy Tret'ego Arхеologičeskogo s'ezda v Rossii, byvšego v Kieve v avguste 1874 g., II, Kiev, 1878, p. 231-232.

А р р е н д і х С і х :

слава въ трѣци, славимому боу. съврѣшащому
 въсѣко начинанїе блго. ѡже ѡ немъ начинаемому. ѡ дащому,
 по началѣ ѡ конецъ:

писа са сии животоchnыи ѡсточникъ новыѣ блгѣти.
 прѣсла лѣго оученїа хѣва, ѡ того бжѣтвныхъ самовидецъ, оуче-

ник же, и ап^сль. глѣмыи четвороблговѣстникъ. не вѣнѣшимъ
 тъкмо шаромъ. или златомъ. или вѣсомъ прѣсоуканнымъ, или ка-
 меніемъ и бѣсромъ оукрашаемъ, нж вѣнѣримъ бж^стнаго сло-
 ва, излианіемъ и таинѣствнаго сѣмотреніа исплѣнение. иже
 въ немъ вл^дчнѣго и бж^стнаго вѣлченіа. и чюдодѣиства. иже
 свѣрши на^с ради. мл^срдїа же, и мл^сти. даже до кр^ста и по-
 грѣбеніа. и славнаго тридневнаго вѣскр^ссеніа. и вѣзнесеніа.
 и кто доволенъ порадоу и счѣсти или и згл^дати иже въ немъ
 вѣображеніе дѣиств^х вѣхъ. по истинѣ иако же и источникоу
 иавльшоу сѣ въ земли безводнѣи, и жж^ди кто пиетъ ѿ него,
 не вѣжж^дет сѣ к томоу. точить бо строуж, и наслаждаетъ
 дш^ж. веселить ср^дце, въ коупѣ и помышленіа. или иакоже
 скровишоу сѣкрвеноу, на селѣ ср^ддечномъ. сїе вѣзыскавѣ ѿб-
 рѣте, блговѣрнии, и х^столюбивии. прѣвысшкыи, и бговѣнчанныи
 самодржець іѡанъ александ^рь цр^ь. иакоже свѣтилникоу положе-
 ноу въ темнѣ мѣстѣ. и забвеноу и въ нерадение положеноу
 древними цр^и. его же бж^ствнымъ желаниемъ и зѣбрѣте сѣи
 хр^столюбивии цр^ь .іѡ. александ^р. и и зложивѣ прѣписа. и зѣ
 еллиньскы^х словесъ, въ наш^х словѣнскж^а слогнж, и въ иавле-
 ние положи. сего и зѣвноу златыи дѣсками поков^а, и вѣн-
 атрѣдоу, животворными ѿбразы вл^дчными, и того славныхъ
 оученикъ. шары и свѣтлыми и златомъ. живѣписцы хж^дожнѣ оукра-
 сивѣ. на отврѣждение своемуу цр^ствоу. иакоже великыи въ стѣхъ
 констандинѣ цр^ь сѣ мтр^иж еленож, и знесѣ и з боукоу земноу
 животворивии кр^сть гнѣ, сїце и сѣ, сего четвороблговѣс^тника:
 сѣдржж^жшоу тогда скиптра блгарскаго, и грѣчькаго

цр^ства. съ благовѣрнож ѿ бг^овѣнчаннож ѿ новопросвѣ^шнож
 цр^цеж своеа кира тео^прож. тьзойметнож бж^не^моу дароу. ѿ съ
 приснымъ ѿ прѣвъзлюбленнымъ сн^{омъ} своимъ і^ов^аномъ шишманомъ
 цр^емъ: въ славѣ творцоу всѣ^{хъ}, ѿ того бл^гговѣстник^ом^ъ. мат^тею.
 м^ар^коу. лоуцѣ. ѿ і^ов^аноу. ѿ ихъ же молитвами. побѣдѣ да пріиме^т.
 ѿ ба, на врагы ратующихъ того. ѿ главы ихъ съкр^ѹши^т по^д
 носѣ сво^и, а^ми^н +

лѣтоу текѣшоу, ѿ^сѿ^д. индѣкта ѿ: ~

+ рабъ же г^на моего цр^ѣ, писавыи сѣж книгѣ, сѣмонъ
 мни^{хъ} нарицаетъ сѣ: ~

IAG (microfilm copy of the manuscript), p.275-276. This text is easily available only in modern Bulgarian, in the translation by I. Dujčev in Starobalgarski stranici. Antologija, Sofia, 1968, p. 456-457. The original was published by F. Uspenskij in Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvěščeniija, 199, St. Petersburg, 1878. Since Dujčev's translation is extremely free, I have made the English translation from the original, which is quoted in this dissertation.

This text is extremely faint and largely illegible. It appears to be a list of references or a preface section, but the specific details are obscured by the quality of the scan.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

The text in this section is also very faint. It likely contains the main body of the bibliography, listing various sources used in the work. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Of the Most Important Works Consulted for this Dissertation

- AN SSSR (B. D. Grekov, ed.), Dokumenty k istorii slavjano-vedenija v Rossii (1850-1912), Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, 407 pp.
- AN SSSR (Ju. V. Bromlej, I. S. Dostjan, V. G. Karasaev, S. A. Nikitin, ed's.), Istorija Jugoslavii, 1, Moscow, 1963, 736 pp.
- AN SSSR, Istorija Vizantii, 3, Moscow, 1967, 507 pp.
- Adrianova-Peretc, V. P., Drevnerusskie literaturnye pamjatniki v jugoslavjanskoj pis'mennosti, Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 5-27.
- Aleksandrov, F., O značenijax i funkcijax mestoimenij "kotoryj", "iže" i "kyj" v osnovnyx pamjatnikax drevnebolgarskogo jazyka, Slavističen sbornik, I, Sofia, 1958, p. 145-163.
- Andersen, H., The Phonological Status of the Russian "Labial Fricatives", Journal of Linguistics, 5, 1969, p. 121-127.
- Andreev, M., Kəm vəprosa za sključvaneto i səderžanieto na dogovora na dobrudžanskija vladetel Ivanko s genuvezite ot 1387 g., Pravna misəl, 1961, 3., p. 79-93.
- Andriotes, N. P., The Confederate State of Skopje and its Language, Athens, 1957, 68 pp.
- Angelov, B. St., K voprosu o načale rusko-bolgarskix lite-

raturnyx svjazej, Trudy ODRL, XIV, Moscow - Leningrad, 1958, p. 132-138.

_____, ed., Iz starata bēlgarska, ruska i srēbska literatura, 1, Sofia, 1958, 238 pp. + viii plates; 2, Sofia, 1967, 279 pp.

_____, Apokrifi (in: Istorija na bēlgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 178-192.

Angelov, D., Agrarnite otnošenija v Severna i Sredna Makedonija prez XIV v., Sofia, 1958, p. 9-15.

_____, Kəm vēprosa za srednovekovnija bēlgarski grad, Arxeologija, 1960, 3, p. 9-22.

_____, Vēprosi na feodalizma v bēlgarskite zemi prez XIII - XIV v., IstPr, 1960, 6, p. 61-90.

_____, Svetogledēt na gospodstvuvaštata klasa v srednovekovna Bēlgarija, otrazen v žitijnata literatura, IzvII, 14-15, 1964, p. 263-294.

Arxangel'skij, A. S., Bolgarskij "pesnivec" 1337 goda.

"Poxvala" i otryvok psaltyrnogo teksta, IzvORJaS, II, 3, St. Petersburg, 1897 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 786-794.

_____, K istorii južnoslavjanskoj i drevne-russkoj apokrifičeskoj literatury. Dva ljubopytnyx sbornika Sofijskoj Narodnoj biblioteki v Bolgarii, IzvORJaS, IV, 1, St. Petersburg (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 101-147.

Atanasov, P., Slavjanski kirilski inkunabuli v Bēlgarija,

- BalgEz, XIV, 1964, 2-3, p. 160-172.
- Babinger, Fr. C. H., ed., Hans Dernschwamms Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel u. Kleinasien (1553-55), Munich-Leipzig, 1923, 314 pp.
- Bakalov, I., Materiali iz oblasti na bəlgarskata narodna medicina, SbNUNK, XII, Sofia, 1895, p. 349-358.
- Balasčev, G., Seštinski li e xrisovulət na car Konstantin Tix (1258-1277)?, Minalo, II, Sofia, 1911, 5-6, p. 178-179.
- Beck, H. G., Theodoros Metochites. Die Krise des byzantinischen Weltbildes im XIV. Jh., Munich, 1952, 149 pp.
- Begunov, Ju. K., Bolgarskij pisatel' X v. Kozma Presviter v russkoj pis'mennosti konca XV - XVI vv., Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 289-302.
- Belić, A., Zametki o slavjanskom žitii sv. Pjatki-Petki (s priloženiem), IzvORJaS, II, 4, St. Petersburg, 1897 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 1045-1057.
- _____, Dialektologičeskaja karta serbskogo jazyka, Stat'i po slavjanovedeniju, II, St. Petersburg, 1906, p. 58-59.
- _____, O srpskim ili hrvatskim dijalektima, Beograd, 1908, 164 pp.
- _____, Istorija srpskohrvatskog jezika (mimeographed publication), Beograd, 1962 (2nd edition), II, 1, 271 pp.; II, 2, 212 pp.

- Beneševič, V. N., Dva spiska slavjanskogo perevoda Sintagmy Matfeja Vlastarja, xranjaščiesja v Spb. Sino-
dal'noj Biblioteke, IzvORJaS, VI, 4, St. Peters-
burg, 1901 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 150-227
- Bernštejn, S. B., Razyskanija v oblasti bolgarskoj istori-
českoj dialektologii, 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948,
368 pp.
- _____, K voprosu o periodizacii istorii bolgar-
skogo jazyka, IzvOLJa, 9, Moscow, 1950, 2,
p. 108-118.
- _____, Ůcerk sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjan-
skix jazykov, Moscow, 1961, 350 pp.
- Bicilli, P. N., Glagolnata forma s -le v istorijata na
ruskija ezik, GodSU, 31, 7, Sofia, 1935, p. 1-15.
- Birnbaum, H., Untersuchungen zu den Zukunftsumschreibungen
mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen (= Acta
Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Études de philo-
logie slave, 6), Stockholm, 1958, 326 pp.
- _____, Balkanslavisch und Südslavisch. Zur Reich-
weite der Balkanismen im südslavischen Sprachraum,
Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, III, Wiesbaden,
1965, 1-2, p. 12-63.
- _____, The Dialects of Common Slavic (in: H. Birn-
baum, J. Puhvel, ed's., Ancient Indo-European
Dialects), Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1966, p. 153-197.
- _____, On Typology, Affinity and Balkan Linguistics,

ZbMSFL, IX, 1966, p. 17-30.

_____, Grundkonzept und Aufgabenkreis einer vergleichenden kirchenslavischen Literaturforschung (in: Das heidnische und christliche Slaventum (= Acta II Congressus internationalis historiae Slavicae Salisburgo-Ratisbonensis anno 1967 celebrati)), Wiesbaden, 1967, p. 127-147.

_____, Slavjanske jazyki na Balkanax i ponjatje tak nazyvaemyx jazykovyx sojuzov, Glossa, II, Burnaby, B.C., 1968, p. 70-92.

_____, Some Aspects of the Slavonic Renaissance, SEER, XLVII, London, 1969, 108, p. 37-56.

_____, Byzantine Tradition Transformed: the Old Serbian Vita (in: Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change, H. Birnbaum, S. Vryonis, Jr., ed's.), Hague: Mouton p. 243 - 284.

Bogdan, I., Ein Beitrag zur bulgarischen und serbischen Geschichtschreibung, AfSlPh, XIII, 1891, p. 481 - 543.

_____, Cronica lui Constantin Manasses. Traducere mediobulgară făcută pe la 1350. Text și glosar de Ioan Bogdan. Cu prefața de prof. I. Bianu, Bucharest, 1922 (Photoedition = Slavische Propyläen, 12, Munich, 1966), xx + 222 pp.

Boissin, H., La Manassès moyen bulgare: étude linguistique, Paris, 1946, ii + 124 pp.

- Bojadžiev, S., Kəm istoričeskija razvoj na predloga na v bəlgarskija ezik, IzvIBE, IX, 1962, p. 211-296.
- Bojukliev, I., Šopov psaltir, BəlgEz, XIII, 1963, 3, p. 234-254.
- _____, Srednobəlgarski psaltiren otkəs ot XIV v. (Šopov psaltir), Trudove na Visšija pedagogičeski institut "Bratja Kiril i Metodi" vəv Veliko Tərnovo, II, Sofia, 1965, p. 49-94.
- Bordier, H. L., Déscription des peintures et autres ornements contenus dans les MMS grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, 1883, viii + 336 pp.
- Bräuer, H., Der persönliche Agens beim Passiv im Altbulgarischen. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung, Wiesbaden, 1952, 95 pp.
- Budovnic, I. U., Slovar' ruskok, ukrainskok, belorusskok pis'mennosti i literatury do XVIII veka, Moscow, 1962, 398 pp.
- Budziszewska, W., Zapożyczenia greckie w historii języka bułgarskiego, Warsaw, 1969, 188 pp.
- Bulaxovskij, L. A., Istoričeskij kommentarij k ruskomu literaturnomu jazyku, Kiev, 1958 (5th edition), 488 pp.
- Burbury, J., A Relation of a Journey of the Right Honourable My Lord Henry Howard From London to Vienna, and thence to Constantinople; In the Company of his Excellency Count Lesley, Knight of the Order

of the Golden Fleece, Councillour of State to his Imperial Majesty, etc., And Extraordinary Ambassadour from Leopoldus Emperour of Germany to the Grand Signior, Sultan Mahomet Han the Forth.

Written by John Burbury Gent. London, 1671,
225 pp.

Bunina, I. K., Istorija glagol'nyx vremen v bolgarskom jazyke, Moscow, 1970, 299 pp.

Bəlgarska Akademija na Naukite, Istorija na Bəlgarija, I, Sofia, 1961 (2nd edition), 551 pp.

Bəlgarska Akademija na Naukite (V. Velčev, E. Georgiev, P. Dinekov, ed's.), Istorija na bəlgarskata literatura, 1. Starobəlgarska literatura, Sofia, 1963, 451 pp.

Çabej, E., Altere Stufen des Albanischen im Lichte der Nachbarsprachen, Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, II, Wiesbaden, 1964, p. 6-32.

Camaj, M., Zur Entwicklung der Nasalvokale der slavischen Lehnwörter im Albanischen (in: Die Kultur Südosteuropas, ihre Geschichte und ihre Ausdrucksformen), Wiesbaden, 1964, p. 18-25.

Chomsky, N., Halle, M., The Sound Pattern of English, New York, 1968, xiv + 470 pp.

Civ'jan, T. V., Opyt opisanija form novogrečeskogo suščestvitel'nogo metodom analiza i sinteza, VJaz, 1963, 6, p. 57-68.

- _____, Imja suščestvitel'noe v balkanskix jazykax.
K strukturno-tipologičeskoj xarakteristike balkan-
skogo jazykovogo sojuza, Moscow, 1965, 194 pp.
- Conev, B., Kjustendilsko četveroevangelie - srednobəlgarski
prototip na šesta pravopisna škola, PeriodSpBAN,
 LXVI, 1905-06, p. 536-561.
- _____, Dobrejšovo evangelie, srednobəlgarski pametnik
ot XIII v. (= Bəlgarski starini, I), Sofia, 1906,
 264 + vi pp.
- _____, Opis na rəkopisite i staropečatnite knigi na
Narodnata biblioteka v Sofija, I, Sofia, 1910,
 555 + xviii pp.; II (under the title Opis na
slavjanskite rəkopisi v Sofijskata narodna biblio-
teka), Sofia, 1923, 552 + lii pp.
- _____, ed., Vračansko Evangelie (= Bəlgarski starini,
 IV), Sofia, 1914, ix + 236 pp.
- _____, Slavjanski rəkopisi na Bəlgarskata akademija,
SbBAN, VI, 1916, p. 4-13.
- _____, Istorija na bəlgarskij ezik, Sofia, I, 1919, x
 + 529 pp.; II, 1934, xvi + 560 pp.; III, 1937,
 vi + 505 pp.
- _____, Slavjanski rəkopisi vəv Viena, GodSU, XXV,
 Sofia, 1929, p. 1-27.
- _____, Edin srednobəlgarski pametnik ot 13 vek, GodSU,
 XXVII, II, 1, 1931, p. 1-50.
- Cvetkova, B. A., Novye dannye o xristianax-spaxijax na Bal-

- kanskom poluostrove v period tureckogo gospodstva, Vizantijskij vremennik, XIII, Moscow, 1958, p. 184-197.
- Čaev, N. S., Čerepnin, L. V., Russkaja paleografija, Moscow, 1946, 212 pp. + 19 plates.
- Čerepnin, L. V., Russkaja paleografija, Moscow, 1956, 616 pp.
- _____, Iz istorii eretičeskix dviženij na Rusi v XIV - XV vv. (in: Voprosy istorii religii i ateizma, VII), Moscow, 1959, p. 257-283.
- Česko, E. V., Istorija bolgarskogo sklonenija, Moscow, 1970, 319 pp.
- Čizevskij, D., History of Russian Literature from the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque, Hague, 1960, 451 pp. + 34 plates.
- _____, Comparative History of Slavic Literatures (Translation of: Vergleichende Geschichte der slavischen Literaturen), Baltimore, 1971, 225 pp.
- Čorović, V., Poslanica bugarskog patrijarha Jevtimija Tismenskomu arhimandritu Nikodimu, JF, XIII, 1933-34, p. 162-165.
- Dančev, G., Rilskata povest na Vladislav Gramatik i sporovete okolo dvete ò redakcii, Trudove na VPI "Bratja Kiril i Metodij" vev Veliko Tarnovo, III, Sofia, 1966, 1, p. 49-88.
- _____, Vladislav Gramatik - knižovnik i pisatel,

Sofia, 1969, 147 pp.

Desnickaja, A. V., Slavjano-albanske jazykovye otnošenija i albanskaja dialektologija, Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie (VI Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov), Moscow, 1968, p. 120-147.

Diels, P., Altkirchenslavische Grammatik mit einer Auswahl von Texten und einem Wörterbuch, Heidelberg, 1963 (2nd edition), I, xvi + 309 pp.; II, 116 pp.

Dilevski, N., Kəm vəprosa za proixoda na "Germanovija sbornik" ot 1359, BəlgEz, XVII, 1967, 4, p. 302 - 322.

Dimitrievič, S. M., Est' li tonsury na golovax svjatitelej v starom vostočno-pravoslavnom ikonopisanii?, IzvBAI, X, 1936, p. 113-128.

Dinekov, P., Stara bəlgarska literatura, II, Sofia, 1953, 206 pp.

_____, Evtimij Tərnovski (in: Istorija na bəlgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 285-306.

_____, Iz istorii rusko-bolgarskix literaturnyx svjazej XVI - XVIII vv., Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow - Leningrad, 1963, p. 318-329.

_____, Literaturnijat život prez XIII v. (in: Istorija na bəlgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 254-266.

_____, Razkazi i povesti (in: Istorija na bəlgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 164-177.

- Dmitriev, L. A., Rol' i značenie mitropolita Kipriana v istorii drevnerusskoj literatury (k rusško-bolgarskim literaturnym svjazjam XIV - XV vv.), Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 215-254.
- Dmitrieva, R. P., Svetskaja literatura v sostave monastyrskix bibliotek XV i XVI vv. (Kirillo-Belozerskogo, Volokolamskogo monastyrej i Troice-Sergievoj lavry), Trudy ODRL, Leningrad, 1968, p. 143-170.
- Dobrev, I., Kəm istorijata na starobəlgarskata morfema že, IzvIBE, VIII, 1962, p. 111-116.
- _____, Nepodkrepeno ot grėckija original povtarjane na predlozi v starobəlgarskite tekstove, BəlgEz, XVII, 1967, 6, p. 522-530.
- Draganov, P., Nosovye glasnye zvuki v sovremennyx makedonoslavjanskix i bolgarskix govorax, RFV, 19, Warsaw, 1888, p. 1-27.
- Dragomanov, M. P., Slavjanskite prepravki v Edipovata istorija, SbNUNK, 1891, 5, p. 267-310; 6, p. 239 - 310.
- Dragova, N., Vtorata apologija na bəlgarskata kniga i nejnite izvory (in: Konstantin-Kiril Filosof), Sofia, 1969, p. 315-347.
- Drovnikova, L. N., Istorija čislitel'nyx dva, tri, četvye v russkom jazyke (in: Voprosy istorii russkogo jazyka. Sbornik statej), Moscow, 1959, p. 183-207.
- Dubrovina, V. F., O leksičeskix grecizmax v original'nyx

i perevodnyx žitijnyx tekstax po ruskim spiskam
(in: Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti, V. V.
Vinogradov, ed.), Moscow, 1968, p. 117-136.

Dujčev, I., Latinskite nadpisi po Vatikanskija prepis na
Manasievata xronika, IzvBAI, VIII, 1934, p. 369 -
378.

_____, Car Ivan-Asen II, 1218-1241, po slučaj sedem-
stotin godini ot negovata smert, Sofia, 1941,
53 pp.

_____, Prinosi kəm istorijata na Ivan-Asenja II,
SpBAN, LXVI, 1943, 3, p. 168-169.

_____, Iz starata bəlgarska knižnina. II. Knižovni i
istoričeski pametnici ot Vtoroto bəlgarsko car-
stvo, Sofia, 1944, xxxvi + 436 pp.

_____, Rilskijat svetec (Sv. Ivan Rilski) i negovata
obitel, Sofia, 1947, viii + 432 pp.

_____, Legendarnyj motiv u Grigorija Camblaka, Slavia,
XXI, 1952-53, p. 345-349.

_____, Edno nejasno mjasto ot Camblakovata vəzxvala za
Evtimij, BəlgEz, IV, 1954, 2, p. 171-172.

_____, Estestvoznanieto v srednovekovna Bəlgarija.
Sbornik ot istoričeski izvori, Sofia, 1954, 626
+ 4 pp.

_____, Za knižovnoto tvorčestvo na Konstantin Koste-
nečki, IzvIBL, II, Sofia, 1954, p. 223-231.

_____, Odnā citata iz Manassievoj Xroniki v sredne-

- bolgarskom perevode, Trudy ODRL, XVI, Moscow - Leningrad, 1960, p. 647-649.
- , À propos de la biographie de Joseph II patriarche de Constantinople, Revue des études byzantines, XIX, Paris, 1961, p. 333-339.
- , Il problema delle lingue nazionali nel Medio Evo e gli Slavi, Ricerche slavistiche, VIII, Rome, 1961, p. 39-60.
- , Obrazi na bəlgarin ot XV v. vəv Florencija, Izkustvo, I, Sofia, 1961, p. 22-24.
- , ed., Miniatjurate na Manasievata letopis (= Pametnici na starata bəlgarska živopis, I), Sofia, 1962, 138 pp.
- , Bolgarskie licevye rukopisi XIV veka (in: Bolgarskaja miniatjura XIV veka, M. V. Ščepkina, ed.), Moscow, 1963, p. 7-19.
- , Centry vizantijsko-slavjanskogo sotrudničestva, Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 107 - 129.
- , ed., Letopista na Konstantin Manasi, Sofia, 1963, xxxiv + 415 pp.
- , Racionalističeski probljasəci v slavjanskoto Srednovekovie, IstPr, 1963, 5, p. 86-100.
- , Vrəzki meždu čexi, slovaci i bəlgari prez Srednovekovieto (in: Čexoslovakija i Bəlgarija prez vekovete), Sofia, 1963, p. 7-41.

- _____, Zaraždane na naučnata misel v srednovekovna Bəlgarija, Arxeologija, 1963, 2, p. 10-15.
- _____, ed., Bolonski psaltir (Photopublication of the manuscript), Sofia, 1968, 530 pp.
- _____, Kuev, K., Bəlgarskata literatura prez XIV v. (in: Istorija na bəlgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 267-284.
- Duridanov, I., Edin slučaj na ranna upotreba na predloga na za izrazjavane na datelno otnošenje, BəlgEz, III, 1953, 1, p. 58-60.
- _____, Kəm problemata za razvoja na bəlgarskija ezik ot sintetizəm kəm analitizəm, GodSU, LI, Sofia, 1955, 3, p. 87-272.
- _____, Iz istorijata na pričastijata v bəlgarskija ezik, BəlgEz, VI, 1956, 2, p. 148-152.
- _____, Beležki vəruxu starobəlgarskija prevod na evangelieto s ogled na vlijanieto na græckija sintaksis (in: Ezikovedski izsledvanija v čest na akad. St. Mladenov), Sofia, 1957, p. 225-235.
- _____, Pətjat na bəlgarskija ezik ot sintetizəm kəm analitizəm, BəlgEz, VII, 1957, 1, p. 5-8.
- _____, Za načenkite na analitizma v bəlgarskija ezik, Rocznik slawistyczny, 20, Cracow, 1958, p. 16-26.
- Durnovo, N., K istorii povesti ob Akire. Materialy i izsledovanija po starinnoj literature, 1, Moscow, 1915, ii + 131 pp.

- _____, Slavjanskoe pravopisanie X - XI vv., Slavia, 12, 1933-34, p. 45-82.
- D'jačenko, G., Polnyj cerkovno-slavjanskij slovar', Moscow, 1900, xxxviii + 1120 pp.
- Ekblom, R., Le développement des voyelles originairement nasalisées dans le moyen bulgare, Le Monde Oriental, 12, Uppsala, 1918, p. 177-225.
- Eremin, I. P., O vizantijskom vlijanii v bolgarskoj i drevnerusskoj literaturax IX - XII vv., Slavjanskije literatury (Doklady sovetskoj delegacii. V Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov), Moscow, 1963, p. 5-13.
- Evseev, I., Kniga proroka Isaji v drevne-slavjanskom perevode, St. Petersburg, 1897, 1, ii + 168 pp.; 2, 145 + iii pp.
- _____, Zametki po drevneslavjanskomu perevodu Sv. Pisanija, IV, Izvorjas, V, 3, St. Petersburg, 1900 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 788-823.
- Filkova, P., Ranni svedenija za bəlgarskija ezik v Rusija, BəlgEz, XII, Sofia, 3, 1962, p. 231-239.
- Filov, B., Die Miniaturen des Ev. Iwan Alexanders in London, Byzantion, IV, 1927-28, p. 313-319.
- _____, Londonskoto evangelie na Ivan Aleksandər i negovite miniatjuri, SpBAN, XXXVIII, Sofia, 1929, p. 1-32.
- _____, Starobəlgarskata živopis prez XIII i XIV vek,

- BəlgIstBibl, III, 1930, 1, p. 87-89.
- _____, Les miniatures de l'Évangile du roi Ivan Alexandre à Londres (in: Monumenta Artis Bulgariae, 3), Sofia, 1934.
- Fuchs, F., Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter, Leipzig-Berlin, 1926, vi + 79 pp.
- Gadolina, M. A., K istorii nekotoryx form ličnyx i vozvratnyx mestoimenij v russkom jazyke XIII - XVII vv., Trudy IJa, 5, Moscow, 1954, p. 34-80.
- Geanakoplos, D. J., Byzantine East and Latin West, New York - Evanston, 1967, x + 206 pp.
- Gečev, St. A., Kəm vəprosa za slavjanskija Fiziolog, Sofia, 1938, 127 + xxvii pp.
- Georgieva, S., Po vəprosa za karaktera na rannosrednovekovnata bəlgarska kultura, Arxeologija, 3, p. 1-5.
- Gerov, B., Die griechischen, semitischen und lateinischen Nomina im Altbulgarischen, GodSU, XXXIX, Sofia, 1943, p. 1-36.
- Gianelli, G., Vaillant, A., Un lexique Macédonien du XVI^e siècle, Paris, 1958, 69 pp.
- Glubokovskij, N. M., Sv. Kiprian, mitropolit vseja Rossii, kak pisatel', Čtenija v Obščestve ljubitelej duxovnogo prosveščenija, 1, Jan. 1892, p. 358-424.
- Görner, F., Za nadrednite znaci v starobəlgarskite pametnici do XIII v., EL, 6, 1967, p. 53-58.
- Gołęb, Z., Funkcja syntaktyczna partykuły da w językach

- pd.-słowiańskich (bułgarskim, macedońskim i serbochorwackim), Biuletyn polskiego Towarzystwa językoznawczego, XIII, Cracow, 1954, p. 67-92.
- _____, Conditionalis typu bałkańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem macedońskiego, Wrocław-Cracow-Warsaw, 1964, 202pp.
- Golubinskij, E. E., Istorija ruskoj cerkvi, II, 1, Moscow, 1900 (Photoedition: Hague, 1969), 919 pp.
- Golyšenko, V. S., Dubrovina, V. F., ed's., Sinajskij paterik, Moscow, 1967, 400 pp. + xi tables.
- Gorskij, A. V., Nevostuev, K., Opisanie slavjanskix rukopisej Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj biblioteki, Moscow, II.2, 1859, 637 pp.; II.3, 1862, 841 pp.; III.1, 1869, 584 pp.
- Gošev, I., Car-Asenovijat nadpis nad krepostta Kričim, SpBAN, 33, 1945, p. 65-85.
- Gudzij, N. K., Istorija drevnej ruskoj literatury, Moscow, 1945 (3rd edition), 510 pp.
- Guilland, R. J., Correspondance de Nicéphore Grégoras, Paris, 1927, xxii + 391 pp.
- Gələbov, I. P., Stari bəlgarski ezikovi areali na dako-rumənskata ezikova teritorija, EL, 16, 1961, p. 39-48.
- _____, Nadpisi kəm Bojanskite stenopisi, Sofia, 1963, 111 pp.
- _____, Nastavkata -telь i vəprosət za starite

ezikovi vrəzki na praslavjanski, IzvIBE, 16, 1968,
p. 55-63.

Halle, M., The Sound Pattern of Russian, Hague, 1959,
206 pp.

Haltzidakis, G. N., Zur Wortbildungslehre des Mittel- und
Neugriechischen, Byzantinische Zeitschrift, II,
Leipzig, 1893, p. 235-286.

Horálek, K., K otázce staroslověnského infinitivu, Pocta
Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmanovi, Brno, 1948,
p. 159-165.

_____, Evangeliáře a čtveroevangelia, Prague, 1954,
313 pp.

Hüttl-Worth, G., Problemy mežslavjanskix i slavjano -
neslavjanskix leksičeskix otnošenij (in: American
Contributions to the Fifth International Congress
of Slavists, 1), Hague, 1963, p. 133-152.

_____, K issledovaniju proisxoždenija ruskogo
jazyka (Leksičeskie materijaly iz drevnix pere-
vodov psaltyri), ZbMSFL, IX, 1966, p. 31-40.

_____, Rol' cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka v raz-
vitii ruskogo literaturnogo jazyka. K istoričes-
komu analizu i klassifikacii slavjanizmov (in:
American Contributions to the Sixth International
Congress of Slavists, 1), Hague, 1968, p. 1-30.

Ilčev, P. St., Iz bəlgarskata istoričeska leksikologija.
Starobəlgarskoto KLJUČITI SE, IzvIBE, VIII, 1962,
p. 117-129.

- _____, Za specifikata na starobølgarskija "Dativus Absolutus", BølgEz, XIII, 1963, 3, p. 211-233.
- _____, Køm razpredelenieto na dølgite i kratkite pronominalni formi v starobølgarski, IzvIBE, X, 1964, p. 235-248.
- Il'inskij, G. A., Sofijskij Oktoix XIII veka, IzvORJaS, X, 4, St. Petersburg, 1905 (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), p. 204-228.
- _____, Mittelbulgarisch "čьtomu = čemu", AfSlPh, XXVIII, 1906, p. 460-464.
- _____, Manujlovskij Apostol XIII veka, IzvORJaS, XIII, 1, St. Petersburg, 1908 (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), p. 366-379.
- _____, Značenie Afona v istorii slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, ŽMNP, XI, St. Petersburg, 1908, p. 1-41.
- _____, Gramoty bolgarskix carej (= Drevnosti. Trudy Slavjanskoj kommissii Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo Arxeologičeskogo Obščestva, V), Moscow, 1911 (Photoedition: London, 1970), 159 pp. + 7 tables.
- Isserlin, E. M., Leksika russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XVII v., Moscow, 1961, 80 pp.
- Istomin, K. K., K voprosu o redakcijax Tolkovoju Palei, IzvORJaS, X, 1, St. Petersburg, 1905 (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), p. 147-184.

Istrin, V. M., Aleksandrija russkix xronografov. Izsledovanie i tekst, Moscow, 1893, 378 pp.

_____, Odin tol'ko perevod Psevdokallisfena, a drevnebolgarskaja enciklopedija X veka - mnimaja, Vizantijskij vremennik, 1903, p. 1-30.

_____, Xronika Georgija Amartola v drevnem slavjano-russkom perevode, Slavia, II, 1923, 2-3, p. 460-467.

Ivanov, J., Severna Makedonija, Sofia, 1906, 420 pp.

_____, Belgarski starini iz Makedonija, Sofia, 1908, 310 pp.; 1931 (2nd edition), 659 pp. + 10 plates.

_____, Belgarite v Makedonija. Izdirvanija i dokumenti za tjaxnoto poteklo, ezik i narodnost, s etnografska karta i statistika, Sofia, 1917, v + 381 pp.

_____, Sv. Ivan Rilski i negovijat manastir. S prilozhenie na pametnici i fotografski snimki, Sofia, 1917, vi + 164 pp. + xix plates.

_____, Bogomilski knigi i legendi, Sofia, 1925, 387pp.

_____, Starobelgarski razkazi. Tekstove, novobelgarski prevod i belezki, Sofia, 1935, vi + 322 pp.

_____, Zhitija na sv. Ivana Rilski, GodSU, Ist.fil.fak., 32, 1936, p. 1-108.

_____, Belgarskoto knizovno vlijanie v Rusija pri mitropolit Kiprian, IzvIBL, VI, 1958, p. 25-79.

Ivanova-Konstantinova, Kl., Ob odnoj rukopisi konca XIV v.

Pogodinskogo sobranija, Trudy ODRL, XXV, Moscow -

- Leningrad, 1970, p. 294-308.
- Ivanova-Mirčeva, D., Razvoj na badešte vreme ("Futurum") v bəlgarskija ezik ot X do XVIII vek, Sofia, 1962, 197 pp.
- _____, Starobəlgarski, staroslavjanski i srednobəlgarska redakcija na staroslavjanski (in: Konstantin-Kiril Filosof), Sofia, 1969, p. 45-62.
- Ivić, M., Iz problematike padežnih konstrukcija, JF, XXI, 1955-56, p. 165-214.
- Ivić, P., Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika. Uvod i štokavsko narečije, Novi Sad, 1956, 218 pp.
- _____, Die serbokroatischen Dialekte. Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung, Hague, 1958, 325 pp.
- _____, O klasifikaciji srpskohrvatskih dijalekata, Književnost i jezik, X, Beograd, 1963, 1, p.27-28.
- _____, Liens phonologiques entre les langues balkaniques, Actes du 1^{er} Congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes, VI, Sofia, 1968, p. 133-141.
- Jacimirskij, A. I., Iz slavjanskix rukopisej. Teksty i zametki, Moscow, 1899, 166 pp.
- _____, Grigorij Camblak. Očerk ego žizni, administrativnoj i kniževnoj dejatel'nosti, St. Petersburg, 1904, 480 pp.
- _____, Slavjanske i russkie rukopisi rumynskix bibliotek, SBORJaS, 79, 1905, p. 721-723.

_____, Iz lingvističeskix i paleografičeskix nabljudenij nad slavjanskimi nadpisjami rumynskogo proisxoždenija, IzvORJaS, X, 3, St. Petersburg, 1906, p. 24-68.

_____, K istorii apokrifov i legend v južno-slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, IzvORJaS, St. Petersburg, 1910 (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), XIV, 2, p. 267-322; XIV, 3, p. 103-159; XV, 1, p. 1-62.

_____, K istorii ložnyx molitv v južno-slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, IzvORJaS, St. Petersburg, 1913 (Photoedition: Graz, 1967), XVIII, 3, p. 1-102; XVIII, 4, p. 16-126.

Jagić, V., ed., Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitani, characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum notis criticis prolegomenis appendicibus auctum, Berlin, 1879 (Photoreprint: Graz, 1954), XLV + 175 + iii pp.

_____, Wie lautete q bei den Bulgaren, AfSlPh, III, 1879, p. 312-357.

_____, ed., Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae Codex Marianus glagoliticus (Mariinskoe četveroevangeliie s primečanijami i priloženijami), Berlin-St. Petersburg, 1883 (Photoreprint: Graz, 1960), XXX = 607 pp.

_____, Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum (Razuždenija južnoslavjanskoj i ruskoj starini o

- _____ cerkovno-slavjanskom jazyke, Izsledovanija po ruskomu jazyku, I, St. Petersburg, 1885-1895) (Photoedition: Slavische Propyläen, 25, Munich, 1968, 782 pp.).
- _____, Kritičeskie zametki po istorii russkogo jazyka, IzvORJaS, XLVI, 4, St. Petersburg, 1889 (Photo-reprint: Graz, 1964), 171 pp.
- _____, Bericht über einen mittelbulgarischen Zlatoust des 13. - 14. Jahrhunderts, Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 139, Vienna, 1898, p. 1-72.
- _____, Die slavischen Composita in ihrem sprachgeschichtlichen Auftreten, AfSlPh, XX, 1898, p. 519-556.
- _____, Kritičeskie zametki k slavjanskomu perevodu dvux apokrifičeskix skazanij (Apokrifičeskoe Pervoevan-gelie Iakova, Apokrifičeskoe Poslanie Pilata v Rim), IzvORJaS, St. Petersburg, 1898 (Photoedi-tion: Graz, 1964), III, 2, p. 315-338; III, 3, p. 793-822.
- _____, Evangelium Dobromiri; ein altmacedonisches Denkmal der kirchenslavischen Sprache des XII. Jahr-hunderts, Vienna, I, 1898, 138 + ii pp.; II, 1899, 140 + iii pp.
- Jakobson, R., Remarques sur l'évolution phonologique du russe comparée à celle des autres langues slaves, Prague, 1929, 188 pp.

- , On Slavic Diphthongs Ending in a Liquid,
Word, 8, 1952, p. 2-6.
- Janin, R., Constantinople byzantine (= Archives de l'Orient
chrétien, 4), Paris, 1950, xxvii + 482 pp.,
15 maps.
- Kabasanov, St., Star i nov nasalizem v neproučen dosega
bølgarski govor, Slavistični studii (Sbornik po
slučaj v Meždunaroden slavističen kongres v
Sofija), Sofia, 1963, p. 173-184.
- Kažužniacki, Em., Aus der panegyrischen Literatur der Süd-
slaven, Vienna, 1901, 132 pp.
- , Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien
Euthymius (1375-93), Vienna, 1901, cxxviii+450 pp.
- Karskij, E. F., Očerok slavjanskoj kirillovskij paleografii,
Warsaw, 1915 (3rd edition), xvi + 518 pp.
- , Slavjanskaja kirillovskaja paleografija,
Leningrad, 1928, xi + 494 pp.
- Kazakova, N. A., Lur'e, Ja. S., Antifeodal'nye eretičeskie
dviženija na Rusi XIV - načala XVI v., Moscow -
Leningrad, 1955, 544 pp.
- Kiselkov, V. Sl., Žitieto na sv. Teodosij Tørnovski kato
istoričeski pametnik, Sofia, 1926, lii + 32 pp.
- , Sveti Teodosij Tørnovski, Sofia, 1926,
53 pp.
- , Grigorij Sinait, predstavitel na misti-
cizma vøv Vizantija prez XIV v., Sofia, 1928,
32 pp.

- _____, ed., Žitie na Sv. Paraskeva (ot patriarx Evtimij) (in: Bəlgarska istoričeska biblioteka, S. Slavčev, ed., III, 1), Sofia, 1930, p. 190-217.
- _____, Mitropolit Joasaf Bđinski i slovoto mu za Sv. Filoteja (in: Bəlgarska istoričeska biblioteka, S. Slavčev, ed., IV, 1), Sofia, 1931, p. 167-206.
- _____, Patriarx Evtimij, Sofia, 1938, 316 pp.
- _____, Sv. Ivan Rilski. Žitija, Sofia, 1940, 88 pp.
- _____, Prouki i očerti po starobəlgarskata literatura, Sofia, 1956, 400 pp.
- Klemensiewicz, Z., Lehr-Spławiński, T., Urbančzyk, St., Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego, Warsaw, 1964 (2nd edition), 596 pp.
- Kniga Stepennaja carskogo rodoslovija; Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, XXI, 2, St. Petersburg, 1913, p. 343-708.
- Kočin, G. E., Materialy dlja terminologičeskogo slovarja drevnej Rossii, Moscow-Leningrad, 1937 (Photoedition: Düsseldorf-Vaduz, 1969), 487 pp.
- Kolesnikov, I. F., ed., Sbornik snimkov s russkogo pis'ma XI - XVIII vv., I, Moscow, 1913 (2nd edition), Table 15.
- Koneski, Bl., Edna odlomka od XIII vek, spomenik od oxridskata skola, Godišen zbornik na filozofskiot

fakultet na Universitetot vo Skopje, Istorisko -
filološki oddel, III, Skopje, 1950, p. 1-15.

_____, Istorija na makedonskiot jazik, Skopje-Beograd, 1965, 203 pp.; Skopje, 1967 (2nd edition), 241 pp.

Korneeva-Petoulan, M., K istorii russkogo jazyka. Osobnosti pis'ma' i jazyka moskovskix vladyk XIV v., Slavia, XV, 1937, 1, p. 1-23.

Korolevskij, C., Liturgie en langue vivante (in: Orient et Occident), Paris, 1955, pp. 18, 25-26.

Kristanov, Cv., Dujčev, I., Estestvoznaniето v srednovekovna Bølgarija. Sbornik ot istoričeski izvori, Sofia, 1954, 631 pp.

Kujew, K. M., Konstantyn Kostenecki w literaturze bułgarskiej i serbskiej, Cracow, 1950, 128 pp.

Kuev, K. M., Joasaf Bdinski (in: Istorija na bølgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 345-348.

_____, Kiprian (in: Istorija na bølgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 307-316.

_____, Konstantin Kostenečki (in: Istorija na bølgarskata literatura, 1), Sofia, 1963, p. 315-325.

_____, Klimentovi səčinenija v njakoi səvetski knigo-xranilišta, BølgEz, XVI, 1966, 5, p. 522-526.

_____, ed., Černorizec Xrabər, Sofia, 1967, 454 pp.

_____, Sud'ba sbornika Ivana Aleksandra 1348 g., Trudy ODRL, XXIV, Leningrad, 1969, p. 117-121.

- Kul'bakin, S. M., Materialy dlja charakteristiki srednebolgarskogo jazyka. I. Bojanskoe Evangelie XII - XIII veka, IzvORJaS, IV, 3, St. Petersburg, 1899 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), pp. 800-868; II. Otryvok Četveroevangelija Grigoroviča XIII - XIV veka, IzvORJaS, V, 3, St. Petersburg, 1900 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 877-920.
- _____, Oxridskaja rukopis' apostola konca XII veka (= Bølgarski starini, III), Sofia, 1907, cxxxvi + 141 + viii pp.
- Kurz, J., K otázce členu v jazycích slovanských se zvláštním zřetelém k staroslověnině, Byzantinoslavica, 7, 1937-38, p. 212-340; 8, 1939-46, p. 172-288.
- _____, and others, ed's., Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae, Prague, 1959 following.
- Lascaris, M., Vatopedskata gramota na car Ivan Asenja II, Sofia, 1930, 61 pp. + 1 plate.
- _____, Influences byzantines dans la diplomatie bulgare, serbe et slavo-roumaine, Byzantinoslavica, III, 2, Prague, 1931, p. 500-510.
- Lavrov, P. A., Obzor zvukovyx i formal'nyx osobennostej bolgarskogo jazyka, Moscow, 1893, 109 pp.
- _____, Zapis' v evangeliu 1322 g. biblioteki Xilandarskogo Afonskogo monastyrja, IzvORJaS, I, 1, St. Petersburg, 1896 (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), p. 110-113.

- _____, Oxridskij spisok pervoevangelija Iakova, IzvORJaS, VI, 1, St. Petersburg, 1901 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 9-36.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T., Les voyelles nasales dans les langues lechites, RÉS, VI-VII, 1926, p. 54-66.
- Leskien, A., Grammatik der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache, Heidelberg, 1919 (3rd edition), lii + 260 pp.
- _____, Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache; Grammatik, Texte, Glossar, Heidelberg, 1962 (8th edition), xxiv + 364 pp.
- VIII letopisnyj sbornik, imenuemyj Patriaršeju ili Nikonovskoju letopis'ju, Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, XI, St. Petersburg, 1897 (Photoedition: Moscow, 1965), 254 pp.
- Lightner, T. M., On the Phonology of Old Church Slavonic Conjugation, IJSLP, X, 1966, p. 1-28.
- Lixačev, D. S., Kul'tura Rusi èpoxi obrazovanija russkogo nacional'nogo gosudarstva; konec XIV - načalo XVI v., Leningrad, 1946, 159 pp. + 1 plate.
- _____, O istoričeskoj i formal'noj klassifikacijax spisokov drevneslavjanskix pamjatnikov (in: Slavjanskaja filologija. Sbornik statej, 1), Moscow, 1958, p. 264-274.
- _____, Nekotorye zadači izučenija vtorogo južno-slavjanskogo vlijanija v Rossii, Issledovanija po

slavjanskomu literaturovedeniju i fol'kloristike
(Doklady sovetskix učenyx na IV Meždunarodnom
s"ezde slavistov), Moscow, 1960, p. 95-151.

_____, Die Kultur Russlands während der osteuro-
päischen Frührenaissance von 14. bis zum Beginn
des 15. Jahrhunderts, Dresden, 1962, 181 pp.

_____, Kul'tura Rusi vremeni Andreja Rubleva i
Epifanija Premudrogo; konec XIV - načalo XV v.,
Moscow, 1962, 171 pp.

_____, Tekstologija. Na materiale russkoj litera-
tury X - XVII vv., Moscow-Leningrad, 1962, 605 pp.

_____, Drevneslavjanske literatury kak sistema,
Slavjanske literatury (Doklady sovetskoj delega-
cii. VI Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov), Moscow,
1968, p. 5-48.

Lixačev, N. P., Rukopis', prinadležavšaja patriarxu Feodo-
siju Tyrnovskomu, IzvORJaS, X, 4, St. Petersburg,
1905 (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), p. 312-319.

_____, Paleografičeskoe značenie bumažnyx vodjanyx
znakov, II, St, Petersburg, 1899, 424+248+iv pp.

Ljapunov, B. M., Neskol'ko zamečanij o jazyke i v osoben-
nosti o slovare bolgarskogo sbornika 1348 g.,
Sbornik Miletič, Sofia, 1933, p. 95-107.

Lur'e, Ja. S., "Mirovye sjužety" srednevekovej belletris-
tiki v russkoj i južnoslavjanskix literaturax
("Aleksandrija" i "Stefanit i Ixnilat"), Trudy

- ODRL, XXIII, Leningrad, 1968, p. 16-26.
- Makarova, S., Roditel'nyj padež prinalležnosti v ruskom jazyke XI - XVII vv., Trudy IJaANSSSR, III, Moscow, 1954, p. 7-31.
- Małeckı, M., Zagadnienia sporne lingwistyki bałkańskiej, Zbirka odgovora na pitanja 1 (III Međunarodni kongres slavista), Beograd, 1939, p. 216-217.
- Mansvetov, I., Mitropolit Kiprian v ego liturgičeskoj dejatel'nosti, Moscow, 1882, p. 66-100.
- Margulıés, A., Historische Grundlagen der südslavischen Sprachgliederung, AfSlPh, XL, 1926, 3-4, p. 203 - 208.
- Masai, Fr., Pléthon et la platonisme de Mistra. Les classiques de l'humanisme, Paris, 1956, 419 pp.
- Maslev, St., Neizvestni u nas bəlgarski rəkopisi v Brašov, IzvII, 19, 1967, p. 195-217.
- Matl, J., Das romanische Element am Balkan mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der itoloromanischen Kulturausstrahlung (in: III. Grazer Balkanologen-Tagung 1968), Munich, 1968, p. 33-52.
- Matthews, W. K., Russian Historical Grammar, London, 1960, xiv + 362 pp.
- Mavrodinov, N., Starobəlgarskata živopis, Sofia, 1946, 196 pp.
- Mazon, A., Les Dits de Troie et la Parabole des Rois, RÉS, XV, 1935, p. 12-52.

_____, Le Dit d'Alexandre le Viel, RÉS, XX, 1942,
p. 13-40.

Meščerskij, N. A., Iskusstvo perevoda Kievskoj Rusi, Trudy
ODRL, XV, Moscow-Leningrad, 1958, p. 54-72.

Meyendorff, J., Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas,
Paris, 1959, p. 25-58.

Meyer, K. H., Der Untergang der Deklination im Bulgarischen,
Heidelberg, 1920, 75 pp.

_____, Altkirchenslawisch-griechisches Wörterbuch
des Codex Suprasliensis, Glückstadt-Hamburg, 1935,
ix + 302 pp.

Mičev, M., Beležki vǎrxu imeto i stopanstvoto na edno iz-
čeznalo selište ot epoxata na feudalizma (XIII -
XIV v.), Sbornik v čest na Jordan Zaxariev, Sofia,
1964, p. 141-150.

Miklosich, F., Monumenta linguae palaeoslovenicae e Codice
Suprasliensi, Vienna, 1851, 456 pp.

_____, Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum;
emendatum auctum, Vienna, 1862-65, xxii + 1171 pp.

Miletič, L., Dako-romānite i tjaxnata slavjanska pismenost,
SbNUNK, IX, Sofia, 1893, p. 211-390.

_____, Novi vlaxo-bəlgarski gramoti ot Brašov, SbNUNK,
XIII, Sofia, 1896, p. 3-152.

_____, Kəm istorijata na bəlgarskoto analitično sklo-
nenie, Makedonski pregled, IX, Sofia, 1935, 3-4,
p. 59-76.

- _____, Sedmogradskite bəlgari i texnijat ezik, SpBAN, 33, 1936, p. 1-181.
- Milev, Al., Datelen samostojatelen v græckija tekst na evangelijata i negovoto predavane v starobəlgarskite tekstove, IzvIBE, XI, 1961, 1, p. 67-75.
- _____, Græckite žitija na Kliment Oxridski, Sofia, 1966, 189 pp.
- Minčeva, A., Kam vəprosa za pojavata na pritežatelnoto značenje na predloga na v bəlgarskija ezik, IzvIBE, VIII, 1962, p. 93-110.
- _____, Razvoj na datelnija pritežatelen padež v bəlgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1964, 175 pp.
- _____, ГЪ НА ВСЕМОУ ДОМОУ v Xludovija triod, BəlgEz, XVI, 1966, 2, p. 142-145.
- Mirčev, K. S., Nešto za græckite zaemki v bəlgarskija ezik (po povod na statijata na d-r. P. Skorčev), EL, II, 1947, 2, p. 23-27.
- _____, Problemət za člena v starobəlgarski ezik (po povod trudovete na prof. J. Kurz), EL, II, 1947, 3-4, p. 82-84.
- _____, Analitični formi za sravnitelna stepen v dva srednobəlgarski pametnika ot XIV v., BəlgEz, I, 1951, 3-4, p. 215-217.
- _____, Za smesvaneto na okončanijata v minalo-svəršeno i minalonesvəršeno vreme na glagolite v bəlgarskija ezik, BəlgEz, II, 1952, 1-2, p. 36-45.

- _____, Koga v̅znikva člennata forma v b̅lgarskija ezik, B̅lgEz, III, 1953, 4, p. 309-328.
- _____, Po v̅prosa za sklonenieto v b̅lgarskija ezik, B̅lgEz, IV, 1954, 1, p. 61-64.
- _____, Za njakoi leksikalni osobenosti na b̅lgarskija fiziolog ot XVI v., Sbornik v čest na akademik Aleksand̅r Teodorov-Balan ..., Sofia, 1955, p. 319-323.
- _____, Za člennite formi v Dobrejšovoto evangelie, srednob̅lgarski pametnik ot XIII v., B̅lgEz, IV, 1956, 3, p. 223-228.
- _____, Za osmisljaneto na edin g̅rcizam v srednob̅lgarskite pametnici, B̅lgEz, VII, 1957, 6, p. 540-541.
- _____, Po v̅prosa za naj-rannite primeri na analitičen datelen padež v b̅lgarskite pametnici, Ezikovedski izsledvanija v čest na akademik Stefan Mladenov, Sofia, 1957, p. 37-46.
- _____, Za edna rusko-b̅lgarska usporedica v razvoja na mestoimenijata, Slavističen sbornik, I, Sofia, 1958, p. 73-78.
- _____, Istoričeska gramatika na b̅lgarskija ezik, Sofia, 1958, 275 pp.; 1963 (2nd edition), 274 pp.
- _____, Za novite morfologičeski čerti v Pražkoto evangelie - srednob̅lgarski pametnik ot XV vek (in: Ezikovedsko-etnografski izsledvanija v pamet

na akademik Stojan Romanski), Sofia, 1960, p. 231-237.

_____, Za člennite formi v srednobəlgarskite pametnici, IzvIBE, XI, 1964, p. 231-234.

_____, Za xronologijata na osnovnite balkanizmi v bəlgarskija ezik, BəlgEz, XVI, 1966, 4, p. 281-293.

_____, Kodov, Xr., ed's., Eninski apostol. Starobəlgarski pametnik ot XI vek, Sofia, 1965, 263 pp.

Mladenov, St., K voprosu o granice meždū bolgarskim i serbskim jazykom, RFV, 57, Warsaw, 1914, p. 383-403.

_____, Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache, Berlin - Leipzig, 1929, xiv + 354 pp.

_____, Kodov, Xr., Vakarelski, Xr., Bit i ezik na trakijskite i maloaziatskite bəlgari, Sofia, I, 1935, viii + 496 pp. + 6 plates; II, 1936, 127pp.

Molnár, N., The Calques of Greek Origin in the Most Ancient Old Slavic Gospel Texts, Studia Slavica, X, Budapest, 1964, p. 99-146.

Mošin, Vl., K istorii vzaimootnošenij russkoj i južnoslavjanskoj pis'mennosti, Slavjane, Moscow, 1958, 1, p. 40-42.

_____, O periodizacii rusko-južnoslavjanskix literaturnyx svjazej X - XV vv., Trudy ODRL, XIX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1963, p. 28-106.

Mulić, M. I., Pletenije sloves i heziham, ZbRZSF, 7, 1965, p. 141-156.

- , Serbskie agiografy XIII - XIV vv. i osobenosti ix stilja, Trudy ODRL, Leningrad, 1968, p. 127-142.
- Mur'janov, M. F., Aleksej Čelovek Božij v slavjanskoj recenzii vizantijskoj kul'tury, Trudy ODR, XXIII, Leningrad, p. 109-126.
- Načov, N. A., Tikveški rękopis, SbNUNK, VIII, Sofia, 1892, p. 369-418.
- Nahtigal, R., Slovanski jeziki, Ljubljana, 1952 (2nd edition), 335 pp.; in German translation: Die slavischen Sprachen, Wiesbaden, 1961, 270 pp.; in Russian translation: Slavjanske jazyki, Moscow, 1963, 341 pp.
- Nasonov, A. N., Moskovskij svod 1479 g. i ego južnoruskij istočnik, Problemy istočnikovedenija, IX, Moscow, 1961, p. 350-385.
- Nazarevskij, A. A., Bibliografija drevnerusskoj povesti, Moscow-Leningrad, 1955, 192 pp.
- Nešev, G., K voprosu o sostojanii bolgarskix cerkvej i monastyrej v pervye stoletija Osmanskogo vladučestva (in: Études historiques. V. À l'occasion du XIII^e Congrès international des Sciences historiques, Moscou, août 1970), Sofia, 1970, p. 273 - 290.
- Nikolaeva, T. V., K voprosu o svjazej drevnej Rusi s južnymi slavjanami (in: Soobščeniya Zagorskogo gos-

darstvennogo istoriko-xudožestvennogo muzeja-zapovednika, 2), Zagorsk, 1958, p. 19-24.

- Ohienko, I., Język cerkiewno-słowiański na Litwie i w Polsce w wiekach XV - XVIII, Prace filologiczne, 14, Warsaw, 1929, p. 525-543.
- Orlov, A. S., Bibliografija russkix nadpisej XI - XV vv., Moscow-Leningrad, 1936, 180 pp.
- Orlova, V. G., Izmenenija v karaktere razvitija russkogo jazyka v svjazi s istorii naroda, VJa, II, 1953, 1, p. 52-70.
- Pascu, Șt., Ionașcu, I., Cihodaru, C., Georgescu, Gh., Istoria Medie a României. Partea întâi, Bucharest, 1966, 405 pp.
- Penev, B., Istorija na novata bēlgarska literatura, Sofia, I, 1930, 456 pp.; II, 1932, 411 pp.
- Penkova, P., Sintaktični funkcii na starobēlgarskoto ŗko, IzvIBE, X, 1964, p. 249-279.
- _____, Ilčev, P., K voprosu o makedonskom jazyke i ego istorii, Balkansko ezikoznanie, XII, Sofia, 1967, p. 5-37.
- Peretc, V. N., K istorii apokrifa i legendy. K istorii Gromnika i Lunnika, IzvORJaS, VI, 4, St. Petersburg, 1901 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p.103-131.
- _____, Materialy k istorii apokrifa i legendy. K istorii Lunnika, IzvORJaS, VI, 3, St. Petersburg, 1901 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 1-126.

- _____, K istorii teksta "Povesti ob Akire Premudrom", IzvORJaS, XXI, 1, Petrograd, 1916 (Photoedition: Graz, 1967), p. 262-278.
- Petrov, P., Kəm vəprosa za avtentičnostta na Virginskata gramota i dostovernostta na səderžaštite se v neja svedenija, GodSU, Filolog.Ist.Fak, I, 2, 1958, p. 171-175.
- _____, Kəm vəprosa za bəlgaro-vizantijskite otnošenija prez vtorata polovina na XIII v., IstPr, 1960, 1, p. 83-90.
- Picchio, R., "Prerinascimento esteuropeo" e "Rinascita slava ortodossa" (A proposito di una tesi di D. S. Lichačëv), Ricerche slavistiche, VI, Rome, 1958, p. 185-199.
- _____, Storia della letteratura russa antica (in the series: Storia delle letterature di tutto il mondo), Milan, 1959, 414 pp. + 1 map.
- _____, Die historisch-philologische Bedeutung der kirchenslavischen Tradition, Die Welt der Slaven, VII, Wiesbaden, 1962, p. 1-27.
- _____, A proposito della Slavia ortodossa e della comunità linguistica slava ecclesiastica, Ricerche slavistiche, XI, Rome, 1963, p. 105-127.
- Pokrovskaja, V. F., Kartoteka akademika N. K. Nikol'skogo, Trudy Biblioteki Akademii nauk SSSR, I, Moscow - Leningrad, 1948, p. 142-150.

- Polák, V., Die Beziehungen des Albanischen zu den europäischen Substratsprachen mit Rücksicht auf die balkanische Situation (in: Die Kultur Südosteuropas, ihre Geschichte und ihre Ausdrucksformen), Wiesbaden, 1964, p. 207-217.
- Polívka, G., Paleographische, grammatische, und kritische Eigenthümlichkeiten in dem Makedonischen Praxapostolus, AfSlPh, X, Berlin, 1887, pp. 106-132, 417 - 483.
- _____, Srednjobugarsko jevanđelje Srećkovićevo i njegov odnošaj prema ostalim crkveno-slovenskim versijama jevanđelja, Starine, XXIX, Zagreb, 1898, p. 95-256.
- Popov, Xr. I., Evtimij, posleden Tarnovski i trapezicki patriarx (1375-1394). Po slučaj 500-godišnjata ot smertta mu (1402-1902), Plovdiv, 1901, 296 pp.
- Popruženko, M. G., Sinodik carja Borila (= Bølgarski stari-ni, VIII), Sofia, 1928, clxxix + 96 pp. + iv tabl.
- _____, Iz istorii religioznogo dviženija v Bolgarii v XIV veke, Slavia, VII, 1928-29, p. 536 - 548.
- Poroxova, O. G., Zametki o novyx slovox v russkom jazyke XV - XVII vv. (in: Issledovanija po leksikologii i grammatike ruskogo jazyka), Moscow, 1961, p. 145-167.
- Potapov, P. O., Sud'ba xroniki Zonary v slavjano-ruskoj

- literature, IzvORJaS, XXII, 2, Petrograd, 1917
(Photoedition: Graz, 1967), p. 141-186.
- Pravdin, A. B., Datel'nyj priglagoľ'nyj v staroslavjanskom i drevnerusskom jazykax, UčZapIS, XIII, Moscow, 1956, p. 3-120.
- Protič, A., Sveta Gora i bəlgarskoto izkustvo, Bəlgarski pregled, I, Sofia, 1929, 2, p. 249-276.
- Proxorov, G. M., Isixazm i obščestvennaja mysl' v vostočnoj Evrope (in: Literaturnye svjazi drevnix slavjan), Trudy ODRL, XXIII, Leningrad, 1968, p. 86-108.
- Rabinovič, M. G., Tixomirov, M. N., Srednevekovnaja Moskva v XIV - XV vekax, Moscow, 1957, 317 pp.
- Radčenko, K. F., Zametki o pergamentnom Sbornike XIV veka Venskoj Pridvornoj Biblioteki, IzvORJaS, VIII, 4, St. Petersburg, 1903 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 175-211.
- Radčuk-Pavlenko, S. T., O nekotoryx osobennostjax razvitija drevnerusskoj literatury XIV - XV vv. (in: Naukovy zapysky Žytomyrs'koho derž. pedahohičnoho instytutu im. I. Franka, VIII), Žytomyr, 1958, p. 267-280.
- Radojčić, Đ. Sp., Antologija stare srpske književnosti, Beograd, 1960, 374 pp.
- Reichenkron, G., Der Typus der Balkansprachen, Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, I, Wiesbaden, 1962, p. 91-122.
- Ringheim, A., Eine altserbische Trojasage (= Publications

de l'Institut slave d'Upsal, IV), Prague-Uppsala, 1951, 383 pp.

Romanova, N. P., Iz istorii otglagol'nyx suščestvitel'nyx na -nie, -enie, -tie v russkom jazyke XVI v., SlMov, 2, 1958, p. 54-88.

Rozanov, S. P., Žitie serbskogo despota Stefana Lazareviča i russkij Xronograf, IzvORJaS, XI, 2, St. Petersburg (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), p. 65-97.

Rozov, N. N., Južnoslavjanske rukopisi Gosudarstvennoj Publičnoj biblioteki, Trudy GPB, V, 8, Leningrad, 1958, p. 105-118.

Rusek, J., Za srednobəlgarskite vinitelni formi na anaforič-
noto mestoimenie v ženski rod eq, eqže, neq,
BəlgEz, 1-2, 1962, p. 100-103.

_____, Po vəprosa za xronologijata na udvojavane na
dopəlnenijata v bəlgarskija ezik, BəlgEz, XIII,
1963, 2, p. 141-143.

_____, Deklinacija i užycie przypadków w Triodzie ChXu-
dowa. Studium nad rozwojem analityzmu w języku
bułgarskim, Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow, 1964, 209 pp.

_____, Beležki vərxu razvoja na pričastijata v bəlgar-
ski ezik, BəlgEz, XVI, 1966, 5, p. 477-490.

Sadnik, L., Aitzetmüller, R., Handwörterbuch zu den alt-
kirchenslavischen Texten, Hague-Heidelberg, 1955,
xx + 341 pp.

Sakəzov, I., Novootkriti dokumenti ot kraja na XIV v. za

- bəlgari ot Makedonija, prodavani kato robi, Make-
donski pregled, VII, 1932, 2-3, p. 23-62 (#63).
- Salmina, M. A., "Entinarij" v "Povesti o začale Moskvy",
Trudy ODRL, XV, Moscow-Leningrad, 1958, p.362-363.
- Sandfeld, K., Linguistique balkanique; problèmes et résul-
tats (2nd edition, augmented, of his Balkanfilo-
logien, 1929), Paris, 1930, 242 pp.
- _____, Skok, P., Balkanski jezici (in: Knjiga o
Balkanu, I), Beograd, 1936, p. 260-275.
- Schefer, Ch. H. A., ed., Le voyage d'outremer de Bertrandon
de la Broquière, premier écuyer tranchant et con-
seiller de Philippe le Bon, Duc de Bourgogne,
 Paris, 1892, lxxviii + 323 pp.
- Scholvin, R., Einleitung in das Johann-Alexander-Evangelium,
AfSlPh, VII, 1884, pp. 1-56, 161-221.
- Schultze, F., Georgios Gemistos Plethon und seine reforma-
tischen Bestrebungen (= Geschichte der Philosophie
 der Renaissance, I), Jena, 1874, xii + 320 pp.
- Schultze, H., Untersuchungen zum Aufbau des Skazanie o
pismenehъ von Konstantin von Kostenec (Doctoral
 dissertation, Georg-August University, Göttingen),
 Göttingen, 1964, 263 pp.
- Schultze, W., Zur kirchenslavischen Orthographie, Fest-
schrift A. Bezenberger zum 14. April 1921,
 Göttingen, 1921, p. 144-147.
- Sedláček, J., Sintaksis staroslavjanskogo jazyka v svete

- balkanistiki, Slavia, XXXII, 1963, 3, p. 385-394.
- Seliščev, A. M., Slavjanskoe naselenie v Albanii (with illustrations and a map), Sofia, 1931, iv + 352 pp.
- Semenov, V., Drevnjaja russkaja Pčela po pergamennomu spisku, SbORJaS, LIV, 4, St. Petersburg, 1893 (Photoedition: Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1966), p. 1-444.
- Sever'janov, S., Suprasl'skaja rukopis' (Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka, II), St. Petersburg, 1904 (Photoreprint: Graz, 1956), iv + 570 pp.
- Simeonovskaja letopis'. Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej (Izdannoe po vysočajšemu povelenu Imperatorskoj Arxeografičeskoju komissieju; A. E. Presnjakov, ed.), XVIII, St. Petersburg, 1913, 316 pp.
- Simoni, P. K., Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj leksikografii po rukopisjam XV - XVII stoletij, IzvORJaS, XIII, 1, St. Petersburg, 1908 (Photoedition: Graz, 1965), p. 175-212.
- Sinicyna, N. V., Poslanie konstantinopol'skogo patriarxa Fotija knjazju Mixailu Bolgarskomu v spiskax XVI v., Trudy ODRL, XXI, Moscow-Leningrad, 1965, p. 96-125.
- Skok, P., O bugarskom jeziku v svetlosti balkanistike, JF, XII, 1933, p. 72-146.
- Slijepčević, Đ., Istorija Srpske pravoslavne crkve, I, Munich, 1962, 528 pp.

Snegarov, I., Duxovno-kulturni vrözki meždu Bəlgarija i Rusija prez srednite vekove (X - XV v.), Sofia, 1950, 96 pp.

Sobolevskij, A. I., Russkie zaimstvovannye slova (Litografirovannyj kurs), St. Petersburg, 1891, 401 pp.

_____, Južno-slavjanskoe vlijanie na russkuju pis'mennost' v XIV - XV vekax. Reč', čitannaja na godičnom akte Arxeologičeskogo instituta 8 maja 1894 goda prof. A. I. Sobolevskim, St. Petersburg, 1894, 30 pp.; the second, revised edition of this work appeared as: Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi XIV - XVII vekov (Bibliografičeskie materialy), St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 1-37.

_____, Lekcii po istorii russkogo jazyka, Moscow, 1907 (4th edition), 309 pp.

_____, Materialy i izsledovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arxeologii, SbORJaS, LXXXVIII, 3, St. Petersburg, 1910, vi + 287 pp.

_____, Osobennosti russkix perevodov domongol'skogo perioda, SbORJaS, LXXXVIII, 3, St. Petersburg, 1910, p. 162-177.

Solovjev, A., Histoire du monastère russe au Mont Athos, Byzantion, VIII, Brussels, 1933, p. 213-238.

Speranskij, M. N., Delenie russkoj literatury na periody i vlijanie russkoj literatury na jugoslavskuju, RFV, XXXVI, 3-4, Warsaw, 1896, p. 193-223.

- _____, K istorii slavjanskogo perevoda evange-
lija, RFV, XLI, 1900, 1-2, p. 198-219; XLIII,
1902, 1, p. 9-28.
- _____, Istorija drevnej ruskoj literatury.
Moskovskij period, Moscow, 1921 (3rd edition),
I, 380 pp.; II, 225 pp.
- _____, Devgenievo dejanie. K istorii ego teksta
v starinnoj ruskoj pis'mennosti, SbORJaS, XCIX,
7, Petrograd, 1923, i + 165 pp.
- _____, "Grečeskoe" i "ligaturnoe" pis'mo v
russkix rukopisjax XV - XVI vekov, Byzantino-
slavica, IV, Prague, 1932, p. 58-64.
- _____, Iz istorii rusko-slavjanskix literatur-
nyx svjazej, Moscow, 1960, 234 pp.
- Sreznevskij, I. I., Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo
jazyka, I-III, Supplement, St. Petersburg, 1893 -
1912 (Photoreprint: Moscow, 1958-59), I, 1420 pp.;
II, 1802 pp.; III, 1684 pp.; Suppl., 272 pp.
- _____, Obozrenie drevnix russkix spiskov Korm-
čej knigi, SbORJaS, LXV, 2, 1899, vi + 1 + 154 pp.
and 1 + 207 + 1 pp.
- _____, Mysli ob istorii russkogo jazyka,
Moscow, 1959 (5th edition), 78 pp.
- Stančeva-Daskalova, A., Kəm vəprosa za načaloto na ekaviz-
ma v bəlgarskija ezik, BəlgEz, XIII, 1963, 4-5,
p. 333-344.

- _____, Za njakoi dialektni osobenosti vov
vlaxo-belgarskite gramoti, BalgEz, XVI, 1966, 6,
p. 556-563.
- Stankiewicz, E., Worth, D. S., A Selected Bibliography of
Slavic Linguistics, Hague-Paris, I, 1966, 316 pp.;
II, 1970, 530 pp.
- Stanojević, St., Die Biographie Stefan Lazarević's von
Konstantin dem Philosophen als Geschichtsquelle,
AfSlPh, XVIII, 1896, p. 409-472.
- Steinke, K., Studien über den Verfall der bulgarischen
Deklination (= Slavistische Beiträge, 29), Munich,
1968, 133 pp.
- Stieber, Z., Dwa problemy z fonologii słowiańskiej, Lingua
Posnanensis, I, Poznan, 1949, p. 81-86.
- _____, Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego, Warsaw,
1952, 95 pp.
- Stojanov, M., Kodov, Xr., Opis na slavjanskite rækopisi v
Sofijskata narodna biblioteka, III, Sofia, 1964,
497 + xi pp.
- Stojkov, St., Literaturen ezik i dialekti, IzvIBE, II,
1952, p. 129-171.
- _____, Palatalnite səglasni v belgarskija ezik,
IzvIBE, I, 1952, p. 5-65.
- _____, Akan'e v bolgarskom jazyke (in: Obščesla-
vjanskoe značenie' problemy akan'ja, V. I. Georgiev,
ed.), Sofia, 1968, p. 93-116.

- _____, Bəlgarska dialektologija, Sofia, 1968 (2nd edition), 296 pp. + maps.
- Stojkovič, O., Srednobəlgarski morfoložiški osobnosti v ezika na vlaxo-bəlgarskite gramoti (XIV - XV v.), BəlgEz, XIV, 1964, 2-3, p. 149-159.
- Stroev, P. M., Biblioložiški slovar' i černovye k nemu materialy (A. F. Byčkov, ed.), SbORJaS, XXIX, St. Petersburg (Photoedition: Nendeln, Liechtenstein, 1966), 4, 531 + 8 pp.
- Syrku, P. A., Zur mittelalterlichen Erzählungsliteratur aus dem Bulgarischen, AfSlPh, VII, 1884, p. 78-98.
- _____, K istorii ispravlenija knig v Bolgarii. I, 1. Vremja i žizn' patriarxa Evfimija ternovskogo, St. Petersburg, 1899, xxxii + 609 pp.
- _____, Evfimija patriarxa ternovskogo služba prepodobnoj carice Feofane. (Po rukopisi XIV - XV veka Xilandarskogo monastyrja na Afone), St. Petersburg, 1900, 2 + xxvii + 15 pp.
- _____, Liturgički trudy patriarxa Evfimija ternovskogo. K istorii ispravlenija knig v Bolgarii v XIV veke, II, 2, St. Petersburg, 1890, xcvi + 231 pp. + 1 plate.
- _____, Monaxa Grigorija žitie prepodobnogo Romila, Pamjatniki DPI, CXXXVI, St. Petersburg, 1900, xxxiii + 54 pp.
- _____, K istorii ispravlenija knig u serbov v XV v.,

IzvORJaS, VII, 4, St. Petersburg, 1902 (Photoedition: Graz, 1964), p. 321-323.

Šaxmatov, A., Drevnebolgarskaja enciklopedija X veka, Vizantijskij vremennik, VII, 1900, p. 1-35.

Ščepkin, V. N., Cryillische Ligaturschrift, AfSlPh, XXV, 1903, p. 109-129.

_____, Savvina kniga (= Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka, I, 2), St. Petersburg, 1903 (Photoreprint: Graz, 1959), vii + 235 pp.

_____, Bolgarskij ornament èpoxi Ioanna Aleksandra, Sbornik statej po slavjanovedeniju, posvjaščennyx prof. M. S. Drinovu, Kharkov, 1904, p. 153-158.

_____, Učebnik russkoj paleografii, Moscow, 1918 (1920), 182 pp.

Ševčenko, I., Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Chumnos. La vie intellectuelle et politique à Byzance sous les premiers Paléologues, Brussels, 1963, viii + 330 pp.

Šklifov, Bl., Edin trud vərxu "makedonskata" leksika ot XVI v., BəlgEz, XVII, 1967, 4, p. 380-381.

Tal'berg, N., Istorija Russkoj Cerkvi, Jordanville, N. Y., 1959, 927 pp.

Tixomirov, M. N., Istoričeskie svjazi ruskogo naroda s južnymi slavjanami s drevnejšix vremen do poloviny XVII v., Slavjanskij sbornik, Moscow, 1947, p. 125-201.

- _____, Srednevekovnaja Moskva v XIV - XV vekax, Moscow, 1957, 318 pp.
- Trifonov, Ju., Despot Ivan-Aleksandər i položenieto na Bəlgarija sled Velbəždkata bitka, SpBAN, XLIII, 1930, p. 61-91.
- Trifunović, Đ., ed., Stara književnost, Beograd, 1965, 572 pp.
- Trubeckoj, N. S., O nekotoryx ostatkax isčeznuvšix grammatičeskix kategorij v obščeslavjanskom prajazyke, Slavia, I, 1922-23, p. 12-21.
- _____, Altkirchenslavische Grammatik. Schrift-, Laut- und Formensystem, Graz-Vienna-Cologne, 1968 (2nd edition), 197 pp.
- Turdeanu, Em., Grégoire Camblak: Faux arguments d'une biographie, RÉS, XXII, 1946, p. 46-81.
- _____, La littérature bulgare du XIV^e siècle et sa diffusion dans les Pays Roumains (= Institut d'Études slaves, Travaux, 22), Paris, 1947, 188pp.
- Uluxanov, I. S., O sud'be slavjanizmov v drevnerusskom literaturnom jazyke (Na materiale glagolov s pristavkoj "pre-") (in: Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti, V. V. Vinogradov, ed.), Moscow, 1968, p. 19-71.
- Uspenskij, B. A., Tipologičeskaja klassifikacija jazykov kak osnova jazykovyx sootvetstvij (Struktura jazyka-ètalona pri tipologičeskoj klassifikacii jazykov), VJaz, 1961, 6, p. 51-64.

- Uxova, T. B., Katalog miniatjur, ornamenta i gravjur sobranij Troice-Sergievoj lavry i Moskovskoj duxovnoj akademii, Zapiski Otdela rukopisej (GB SSSR im. V. I. Lenina), XXII, Moscow, 1960, p. 104-145.
- Vaillant, A., Manuel du vieux slave, Paris, 1948, I, 375 pp.; II, 125 pp. Russian translation, in one volume, by V. V. Borodič, Rukovodstvo po staroslavjanskomu jazyku, Moscow, 1952, 446 pp.
- Valjavec, M., Trnovsko tetrajevandĕlije XIII vieka, Starine, XX, Zagreb, 1888, p. 157-241; XXI, 1889, p. 1-68.
- van Wijk, N., Taalkundige en historische gegevens betreffende de oudste betrekkingen tussen Serven en Bulgaren, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, 55, A, 3, Amsterdam, 1923, p. 55-76.
- _____, Le développement des voyelles ě, a, ja en bulgare, RÉS, VII, 1927, p. 7-21.
- _____, Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache, I. Laut- und Formenlehre, Berlin-Leipzig, 1931, v + 254 pp; Russian translation with supplementary bibliography: Istorija staroslavjanskogo jazyka, Moscow, 1957, 368 pp.
- Vasil'evskij, V., Vizantija i Pečenegi, ŽMNP, CLXIV, 1872, 2, p. 116-332.
- Velčev, V., Grigorij Camblak (in: Istorija na bĕlgarskata literatura, I), Sofia, 1963, p. 326-344.

- Verković, St., Narodne pesme makedonski bugara. Knjiga prva. Ženske pesme, Beograd, 1860, 337 pp.
- Vinogradov, V. V., Osnovnye ètapy istorii russkogo jazyka, RJaŠ, 1940, 3, p. 1-15; 4, p. 1-18; 5, p. 1-9.
- _____, ed., Obzor predloženiĭ po usoveršenstvovaniju russkoj orfografii, Moscow, 1965, 450 pp.
- Višnjakova, A. F., K voprosu o kul'ture i prosveščeniĭ bolgar v XIV v., Vizantijskij sbornik, Moscow - Leningrad, 1945, p. 256-259.
- von Arnim, B., Beiträge zum Studium der altbulgarischen und altkirchenslavischen Wortbildung und Übersetzungskunst. Ursachen des Wechsels zwischen den Suffixen -je, -stvo, -stviĭe in Evangelium, Apostolus, Psalter und einigen anderen Übersetzungen, Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Klasse, 22 Oct. 1931, Berlin, 1932, p. 952-1024.
- Voskresenskij, G., Xarakterističeskie čerty četyrex redakcii slavjanskogo perevoda Evangelija ot Marka po sto dvenadcati rukopisjam Evangelija XI - XVI vv., Moscow, 1896, pp. 48-54, 258-291.
- Vostokov, A. X., ed., Ostromirovo evangelie 1056-1057 g. S priloženiem grečeskogo teksta evangelij i s grammatičeskimi ob"jasnenijami, St. Petersburg, 1843 (Photoedition: Wiesbaden, 1964), viii + 294 + 320 pp.
- Vryonis, S., Byzantium and Europe, London, 1967, 260 pp.

- Vzdornov, G. I., Rol' slavjanskix monastyrskix masterskix pis'ma Konstantinopolja i Afona v razvitii knigopisanija i xudožestvennogo oformlenija russkix rukopisej na rubeže XIV - XV vv. (in: Literaturnye svjazi drevnix slavjan), Trudy ODRL, XXIII, Leningrad, 1968, p. 171-198.
- Worth, D. S., Phraseology in the Galician-Volynian Chronicle, Annals UAASUS, VIII, 1960, 1-2 (25-26), p. 55-69.
- Xodova, K. I., K voprosu o vyjavlenii leksičeskoj normy v ruskom literaturnom jazyke drevnego perioda (in: Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti, V. V. Vinogradov, ed.), Moscow, 1968, p. 95-116.
- Zaxariev, V., Ornamentalnata ukrasa na Radomirovija psaltir ot bibliotekata na Zografskija manastir, Rodina, II, Sofia, 1939, 2, p. 154-158.
- Zlatarski, V. N., Žitie i žizn' prepodobnogo otca našego Feodosija, SbNUNK, XX, p. 1-41.
- _____, Istorija na bəlgarskata dəržava prez srednite vekove, I, 1, Sofia, 1918, 479 pp.
- _____, Tərnovskijat nadpis na Ivan Asenja II (in: Bəlgarska istoričeska biblioteka, S. Slavčev ed., III, 3), Sofia, 1930, p. 56-64.
- _____, Istorija na bəlgarskata dəržava prez srednite vekove, III, Sofia, 1940, xvi + 637 pp.
- Žukovskaja, L. P., Tipologija rukopisej drevnerusskogo

polnogo aprakosa XI - XIV vv. v svjazi s lingvis-
tičeskim izučenim ix (in: Pamjatniki drevnerus-
skoj pis'mennosti, V. V. Vinogradov, ed.), Moscow,
1968, p. 199-332.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München