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This study provides a detailed description of the orthography of an East Slavic manuscript dated to the first quarter of the twelfth century. The manuscript is traditionally called Mstislavovo Evangelie (ME). The source of the data is a typeset edition of ME which was published under the editorship of L. P. Žukovskaja.

Chapter one contains background material on the manuscript itself. The dominant topics are the time and the place of origin of ME. The positions of various scholars on these subjects are described and assessed. In addition, a brief history of the manuscript is offered.

The second chapter is devoted to an examination of the literature on ME. Insofar as the majority of the literature uncovered does not address the kinds of topics which I consider, much of this discussion is simply a summary of the contents of the works which were examined, although some evaluation of the conclusions of other scholars is offered as well.
Since the manuscript itself was unavailable and, therefore, it was necessary to use a typeset edition, a critique of that edition is included in this dissertation. That critique is offered in chapter three, where I also address four other reviews of the typeset edition.

Chapters four through eight contain the description of the orthography. In chapter four the use of symbols is presented in orthographical terms, i.e., symbols are not related to segments in a linguistic system.

In chapters five and six the use of letters and digraphs is described as a function of the distribution of the reflexes of certain reconstructed segments and sequences. In chapter five, vowels are the focus and in chapter six I consider consonants and the reconstructed sequences containing a vowel and a liquid between two consonants.

In chapters seven and eight, the orthographical representation of the morphology is analyzed. Chapter seven covers nominals, while in chapter eight I treat verbal morphology.

In the conclusion I compare the orthographical patterns found in ME with those occurring in certain eleventh century manuscripts.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In their efforts to identify the stages in the linguistic development of the various Slavic languages, scholars rely heavily on the material found in manuscripts from the early historical period of Slavic. Unfortunately, manuscripts offer a record of linguistic reality which is imprecise at best. Their limitations in this regard have been discussed widely. Primary among them is the fact that, as a practical matter, systems of graphic symbols designed to convey languages do not reflect all of the phonetic details found in the languages. (cf. Lunt 1988:11-13, 16-17) In such systems, there often is not even a one-to-one correspondence between the phonemes of the language and the graphic symbols. (cf. Lunt 1988:11-13, 16-17)

The other principal complication results from the nature of the process by which the documents were prepared. In terms of their content, the early Slavic manuscripts which have survived do not contain original
compositions by the scribes who produced them. Rather, the scribes were essentially copyists who used existing Slavic versions of texts to create what might be termed new "editions" of those texts, although in some instances they might have had to translate from Greek sources part or all of the material.

Following Lunt [1988:15] and others, I assume that, as part of their training, the scribes who compiled these manuscripts learned a set of orthographical principles which they were expected to follow in their work. The principles could vary from one scriptorium to another. The important point is that a particular scribe working on a particular document was guided by a set of rules.

I further assume that each set of orthographical rules was devised with some concrete linguistic system in mind, in part because many of the manuscripts created in this manner were designed to be read aloud. However, there is no reason to presuppose that the underlying linguistic system was identical to the native speech of any scribe. (cf. Lunt 1988:15) Similarly, one cannot presume that the orthographical principles which a scribe was to follow matched those of his protograph(s). (cf. Lunt 1988:15-16)
In such an environment, one would expect that a reasonably well-trained scribe would observe the set of learned orthographical rules most of the time, but that occasionally, due to factors such as inattentiveness or misunderstanding, he would depart from them. The departures could be motivated or unmotivated. Motivated deviations would include instances in which the scribe adhered to the correlation between linguistic reality and graphic representation implicit in the rules, but substituted a feature from his native speech for the corresponding feature in the linguistic system which the orthographical rules were designed to convey. The other main type of motivated violation would be instances in which the scribe preserved the orthography of a protograph even though it did not conform to the orthographical prescriptions which he had learned. Unmotivated deviations would be errors in the true sense of the word, i.e., departures which are not a function of a discrepancy between two systems of rules, whether linguistic or orthographical.

As Lunt [1988:15-16] states, when one adopts the methodological assumptions just outlined, it is necessary to begin the analysis of a manuscript with the identification of the system of orthographical rules which guided each scribe who participated in its
compilation. The goal of this dissertation is to provide a description of that system for an early East Slavic manuscript and to relate the use of symbols to the distribution of the reflexes of reconstructed segments and sequences as well as to describe how the symbols are used to convey the morphology. The document selected for investigation is traditionally called Mstislavovo Evangelie (ME).

Mstislavovo Evangelie is a long lectionary, which means that passages from the gospels are arranged according to the date on which they are to be read.¹ The characterization "long" provides information about the composition of the first part of the manuscript. In that first part readings are ordered on the basis of the schedule of movable feasts within the church calendar, starting with Easter and ending with the Saturday before Easter. This section is further subdivided into several cycles. At the start of each such cycle, the numeration of the weeks begins anew.

The first cycle, occupying 2a-29v, covers the period from Easter through the Friday after Pentecost, although the last five days in this cycle (Monday through Friday) appear to be numbered based on the concept of Pentecost, rather than following the pattern for the weeks which preceded them. They are at 26g-29b.
and all are identified with "X" (50), rather than with "H" (8). Alternatively, this discrepancy might reflect an error in the typeset edition. In this cycle Sunday is treated as the first day of the week, in terms of numeration. The readings are primarily from John.

The second cycle, covering 29v-68a, starts with the Saturday after Pentecost and contains fifteen full weeks of readings, with each new week beginning on Saturday. In addition, there are Saturday and Sunday readings for the weeks numbered sixteen and seventeen. Matthew and Mark supply the passages.

This is followed by the cycle of the new year, to which columns 70a-112v are allocated and which contains seventeen full weeks of readings. The first day of each new week is Monday and the assigned passages are almost all from Luke. The attachment of the label "long" to Mstislavovo Evangelie is connected with the presence of weekday readings in this cycle and the preceding one. (cf. Žukovskaja 1968:213 and Lunt 1984:40)

The next seven pericopae, consuming 112v-117g and encompassing Monday through Sunday, are for Meat Fast Week. Then there are readings for Monday, Tuesday,
Thursday, Saturday and Sunday of Cheese Fast Week on 117g-123b. No number is attached to either of these weeks.

This part of the manuscript ends with the pericopae for Lent, which are found in columns 124a-163v. In the period prior to Holy Week, readings are given only for Saturday and Sunday. In the numeration, Saturday and the Sunday immediately following it belong to the same week. Holy Week does not have a number assigned to it.

The second major part of Mstislavovo Evangelie, filling 163v-206g, is the menologion where pericopae are arranged according to the month and the day on which they are to be read. The listing starts with September 1 and ends with August 31. The only date which is not listed at all is October 23, although that does not mean that all other dates are accompanied by an overt assignment of a reading, whether written at the appropriate point in the menologion or indicated through a cross-reference.

After the menologion there are eleven pericopae, occupying 206g-212b, which, according to Lunt [1984:55] are "morning resurrection lections". After that, several readings are designated for special occasions. They cover 212b-212g. (cf. Yukovskaja 1984:90) All but
one of them are identified through a cross-reference. Finally, there is the colophon, filling 212g-213b, to which three individuals contributed, Aleksa, žaděn" and Naslav". Aleksa was the primary copyist, although Žukovskaja thinks that a small portion of the manuscript was written by a second scribe. [1983:9 and 1984:90] (see below) žaděn" apparently was the "млотовиц" for the manuscript. [Ščepkina, et al. 1965:142; Protas'eva 1970:42; Žukovskaja 1984:90] Naslav" was responsible for the preparation of the binding for Mstislavovo Evangelie.

The manuscript is held in the State Historical Museum (ГИМ) and is part of the Synodal Collection (Синодальное собрание, no. 1203).

As for its history, scholars who address the origins of Mstislavovo Evangelie seem to agree that it was written for the Church of the Annunciation in Novgorod. [Filimonov 1859:183, Nevostruiev 1860-1861:65, Sreznevskij 1861-1863:88, Voskresenskij 1896:31-32, Il'ina 1978:10, Žukovskaja 1983:5 and others] This conclusion is based on the presence of the manuscript in that church in the sixteenth century; the following material at 213a7-8 in the colophon by Aleksa, as given in the typeset edition, "иже съвърши сяхе сяя(г) же на
Eventually, Mstislavovo Evangelie was placed in the Archangel Cathedral (Архангельский собор) in the Kremlin. In 1893 it was transferred to the Patriarchal Vestry (Патриаршая ризница). In 1917 it entered the Synodal Library (Синодальная библиотека) in Moscow. Since 1920 it has been housed in ГИМ.

In discussions of the origin of Mstislavovo Evangelie the two central issues are the time and the place at which it was compiled. Insofar as the manuscript itself contains no statement about the year or the years in which the copying was performed (cf. Filimonov 1859:180), opinions about the time of origin vary, but I will not give an exhaustive list of the dates assigned in each of the works consulted for this dissertation because I regard the figure itself as less important than the justification for the selection of that figure and a number of authors simply indicate a date, offering no rationale for their decisions. Therefore, I will limit the discussion to positions accompanied by an explanation of the considerations.
which led to them. For information on the dates ascribed by a variety of scholars, see Filimonov [1859:179-180] and Il'ina [1978:11].

The differing conclusions described below concerning the time of completion of Mstislavovo Evangelie all reflect general agreement regarding one fact. All of them are predicated on the proposition that the manuscript was prepared for Mstislav Vladimirović/Volodimirović, a proposition based on the following from Aleksa's colophon, "съподобивъ ма гръщна/аго рабъ своего алексоу написати сиже еу/ангелиже... кна/эю вееорую. а миръскъ мьстисла/воу. въноукоу съцду въсеволожо а Эноу володимирьо", which is at 212q25-213a6. (cf., e.g., Keppen 1822:31; Filimonov 1859:182; Nevostruev 1860-1861:65; Sreznevskij 1861-1863:87; Durnovo 1927:35; Il'ina 1978:10; Žukovskaja 1983:4; Lunt 1984:35; Žukovskaja 1984:90; and elsewhere) Obviously, that has implications for the dating, i.e., it places the creation of the manuscript during the life of Mstislav Vladimirović/Volodimirović. He died in 1132. [Protas'eva 1970:42; Žukovskaja 1983:4; Lunt 1984:35]

The investigators who place the completion of the text earliest in the life of Mstislav are Filimonov and Žukovskaja. Furthermore, in their arguments they
adduce some of the same points. Both base their positions on the assertion that the manuscript was written for the Church of the Annunciation in Novgorod and that the manuscript would have been ready by the time the church was finished. [Filimonov 1859:183; Žukovskaja 1983:5-6] (cf. also Nevostruev 1865:211 and Volkov 1897:30-31) However, at that point they part company.

Filimonov accepts 6611 (1103) as the year in which the church was completed. [1859:183-184, 185] That is the date given in the majority of the chronicles. [Filimonov 1859:183; Lunt 1984:46-47] (cf. Žukovskaja 1983:6) Žukovskaja cites 1099, the year assigned in the Sofia chronicle ("Софийский временник"), alongside 1103. [1983:6] Furthermore, she adds the propositions that it generally took a long time to copy books and that books could even be "readdressed" in the process of copying. [1983:6] Her conclusion is that "наиболее вероятной датой (for Mstislavovo Evangelie - M.T.) является время построения Благовещенской церкви, т. е. рубеж XI-XII вв." [1983:6]

Ševyrev directly rejects Filimonov's dating. [1860:202-203]. Unfortunately, he does not detail his objections to Filimonov's position.
In contrast, in his criticism of Žukovskaja's dating, Lunt responds to the specific premises which Žukovskaja adopts, disputing all three. [1984:46-47] He states that the date of 1099 is found in a "later and derivative" chronicle which "contrasts with the unanimous witness of the older Novgorod chronicles." [1984:46-47] His objection to the other two is, in essence, that their validity is not self-evident. [1984:47]

A different view on the age of the manuscript relies upon the title used by Aleksa for Mstislav. He calls him "Prince of Novgorod", "СЪПОДОБИЯЩИЯ МА ГРЪШКА/АГО РАБА СВОЕ ЧЕЛО АЛЕКСУ НАПИСАТИ СИЖ ЕУ/АНГЕЛИЯ ... КНА/ЗИ ЕЕНДОРОУ. А МИРЪСКИ МЪСТИСЛА/ВОУ. ВЪНЮКУОУ СОУПУ ВЪСЕВОЛОЖУ А СНОУ ВОЛОДМИРЮ. КНАЗЮ НОВГЬРОДЪСКОУ/СМОУ." That passage stands at 212g25-213a7. Mstislav held that position during the period 1095-1117. [Nevostreuev 1860-1861:72-73; Protas'eva 1970:42; Žukovskaja 1983:5-6; Lunt 1984:35; and elsewhere] That leads to the dating "до 1117." This analysis is implicit in Sreznevskij's listing. [1861-1863:87-88] Il'ina agrees with it. [1978:11] It is also advanced in СВОДНЫЙ КАТАЛОГ. [Žukovskaja 1984:90] (cf. also Voskresenskij 1896:31; Svirin 1964:61)
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Using the same fact, the title applied to Mstislav by Aleksa, Ševyrev offers a slightly different perspective. When Mstislav left Novgorod in 1117, he went to Belgorod, where he remained until he ascended to the throne in Kiev in 1125. [Filimonov 1859:180; Ševyrev 1860:169, 203; and elsewhere] From this Ševyrev concludes that Mstislav "сохранял до самого 1125 года свой титул Князя Новгородского, какъ старшій сынъ Владимира Мономаха, потому что Князей Бѣлгородскихъ мы не знаемь." [1860:203] Consequently, he places Mstislavovo Evangelie in the period before 1125. [1860:169, 203] Incidentally, Filimonov states that Mstislav "Князь" in Belgorod, which suggests that he would not have concurred with the preceding statement by Ševyrev. [1859:180] Similarly, Sreznevskij indicates that Mstislav "получилъ отъ отца княжение Бѣлгородское." [1885:144]

There is one other issue surrounding the dating, but it relates to the preparation of the binding, not to the copying. Filimonov [1859:180, 182], "О. Б." [Filimonov 1859:185, 186] and Sreznevskij [1861-1863:90; 1885:144] all assert that in his contribution to the colophon Naslav" attaches to Mstislav the title, using a standardized nominative singular form for the word in question, "царь", which, in Sreznevskij's
words, "Могъ въ то время считаться только великий князь Киевский" [1861-1863:90]. (cf. also Nevostruev 1860-1861:78-79) On that basis and from the fact that Naslav" returned with the manuscript to Kiev, not to Novgorod, "О. Б." [Filimonov 1859:185, 186] and Sreznevskij [1861-1863:90-91] conclude that Naslav" must have written his text after 1125, the year in which Mstislav ascended to the throne in Kiev. That is also the implication of Nevostruev's discussion, although he seems to place more emphasis on the latter consideration, i.e., the fact the Naslav" returned to Kiev. [1860-1861:78-79]

I question that conclusion because, having examined the pertinent passages, I do not consider it self-evident that the referent for the title is Mstislav. The passages are, in the orthography of the typeset edition, "Съпсахъ памяти дѣла. Петр/нашему и людемъ о съкончаны еуа(р)" at 213a23-24 and "обращи честь и милость въ бъ и въ свое/его ц(с)ра и въ брати же" at 213b18-19. As one can see, in neither instance is Mstislav's name directly attached to the title.

Moreover, if, as Žukovskaja [1983:4] suggests, in this period Rus' was united under Kiev, Naslav" might have had some allegiance to Kiev, even if he was a resident
of Novgorod and directly served the prince of Novgorod. That would explain the use of "нашему" and "своему".

Alternatively, if one accepts the proposition that Mstislavovo Evangelie was copied in Kiev (see below), it is possible that Naslav" was a resident of Kiev and his statement that Mstislav directed him to see to the completion of the manuscript, "нужно бышеть казал" мъстиславъ къ/нась. хоудомоу наславоу" at 213a25-213b1, might not reflect reality literally. This analysis would account for the absence of such possessives as "my", "my own", "our" and "our own" when Naslav" uses the title "prince" or references Mstislav by name.

The position which I adopt with respect to the dating is fairly conservative. I accept the period 1103-1117 as the best determination which the facts allow, based on the title used by Aleksa for Mstislav and the likely intended destination of the manuscript. This is the stance taken by Il'ina. [1978:11] Nekrasov accepts this time frame, but without elaboration. [1969:49] Lazarev also adopts it. [1947:24; 1954:76] Svirin advances it as well. [1950:31] The early dating proposed by Filimonov and Žukovskaja is based on a gratuitous assumption about the need to complete the manuscript by the time construction of the church was finished. As for Ševyrev's argument, it is vitiated
somewhat by Filimonov and Sreznevskij and, in general, it seems to represent an argument from silence.

Direct information on the place of copying is even sparser in Mstislavovo Evangelie than direct information on the time. In fact, the only possible clue is found in the contribution of Naslav" to the colophon. He writes at 213bl-6 that, after he took the manuscript to Constantinople, he returned to Kiev to complete his work. However, it does not obligatorily follow that he started his journey in Kiev. Moreover, even if it did, that would not necessarily mean that Aleksa performed his work in Kiev.

This issue receives less attention than the dating in the literature which I consulted as well. Nekrasov believed that Mstislavovo Evangelie was compiled in Novgorod, but he did not identify the reasons for that view. [1969:49] The same applies to Rozov. [1977:107] Il'ina seems to vacillate somewhat. At one point she states, "[М]но связываем Мстиславово Евангелие с Новгородом," primarily because of artistic elements which she considers to be Novgorodian. [1978:14] However, shortly thereafter she asserts, "Как и в случае с Остромировым и Мстиславовым евангелиями, опять одним из нерешенных вопросов остается место написания Ярвевой рукописи" [1978:14], which suggests that any
assignment to Novgorod implicit in the preceding discussion is probably provisional. In addition, she notes that the miniature of Matthew contains a depiction of Archangel Michael, the patron of Kiev, "что лишний раз связывает Мстиславово Евангелие с искусством Киевской Руси" [1978:13-14], although the formulation of this latter statement is such that no specific claim is made regarding the place of origin of the manuscript. It is entirely possible that the contents of that miniature simply reflect the use of a Kievan model. Džurova also mentions the presence of an image of Archangel Michael in the miniature in question and his significance in relation to Kiev. [1981:24]

According to Nekrasov, Sobolevskij concluded that Mstislavovo Evangelie was written in Kiev because "в нем нет новгородизмов в языке." [1983:40] Based on comparable criteria, Lunt also reaches the judgment that Kiev is the most likely source. [1984:47] Voskresenskij observes, "Правописание русское, отличающееся отсутствием черт специально новгородских и галицко-волынских" [1896:32], although he does not explicitly label Kiev as the place of origin.

Žukovskaja agrees that Kiev is the most likely place in which Mstislavovo Evangelie was copied, in
part because of the considerations listed in the preceding paragraph. [1983:6] In addition, she attempts to buttress that position with the claim that Novgorodian long lectionaries appeared later than the time when Mstislavovo Evangelie was copied. [1983:6] This claim seems to be based on the proposition that Jur'evskoe Evangelie, which was compiled later than ME, was constructed from a tetra. [1983:6] I agree with Lunt [1984:47] that this latter line of reasoning is unconvincing.

Volkov adopts a somewhat unique view. He states, "[K]ъ киевскимъ памятникамъ, ..., писаннымъ кievлянами, но не въ самомъ Киевѣ, слѣдуеъ отнести также Мстиславово Евангелие." [1897:30] Unfortunately, no specific rationale is offered in support of this position. Nonetheless, that statement and Volkov's subsequent discussion raise an important point.

When one uses orthographical features which putatively reflect a scribe's speech patterns in order to identify the place in which a manuscript was compiled, one must assume that scribes worked where they were born and raised. Similarly, when systematic spelling conventions, whether or not they have linguistic significance, are used to the same end, it is necessary to assume that scribes worked where they
received their training. While those might not be unreasonable operational principles, a more cautious approach would be to treat such features as sources of information about the scribe. An analogous argument would seem to apply to the features of artistic elements of manuscripts.

I take a rather agnostic stand with respect to the place of copying. The "negative factors", in Lunt's [1984:47] terminology, which are used by Lunt, Žukovskaja and, it seems, Sobolevskij, essentially represent an argument from silence. Moreover, Volkov's discussion casts some doubt on the validity of the axioms cited above and, without those axioms, orthographical features, whether linguistically significant or not, cease to be reliable indicators.

For the study whose results are presented in this dissertation, I did not have access to the actual manuscript. Therefore, I used a typeset edition of ME which was prepared under the editorship of L. P. Žukovskaja. The discussion itself is organized in the following manner. Chapter two consists of a discussion of the literature on Mstislavovo Evangeli. Chapter three is an assessment of the typeset edition which was used for this study. In chapters four through eight I present the results of the analysis. Chapter four
contains an overview of the orthography. Chapters five and six are devoted to the manner in which the reflexes of reconstructed segments are conveyed. In chapters seven and eight the representation of the morphology is treated. Some conclusions are offered in chapter nine.

Issues relating to the physical condition of Mstislavovo Evangelie, the shapes of individual symbols and other topics which require an examination of the manuscript itself will not be addressed because I used a typeset edition. Readers interested in those aspects of Mstislavovo Evangelie are directed to Karskij's article [1962] and to Žukovsky's introduction to the edition. Sources for photographs of and discussions of the artistic elements of the manuscript are given in the overview of the literature on Mstislavovo Evangelie.

For obvious reasons, I also will not consider the orthography of the note at the beginning of Mstislavovo Evangelie concerning the rebinding which occurred in the sixteenth century.

I will end the introduction with an explanation of three conventions which have been adopted for citations of material taken from the text of Mstislavovo Evangelie. The specification of the location of such passages includes the folio, the column and, in most
instances, the line or lines. The columns on a folio are identified with the letters "a", "b", "v" and "g", a transliteration of the labels used in the typeset edition. Column "a" is the left column on the front side of a folio. Column "g" is the right column on the back side. Arabic numerals are used for folia and lines. An example would be 10v4-5, which means folio 10, the left column on the back side, lines four and five.

Within the citation itself, the symbol "/" is used to denote a line break. Thus, material immediately after "/" starts on a new line.

Finally, the symbol "*" preceding a form between quotation marks, e.g., "*хътати", indicates that the material standing between the quotation marks is not what is found at a particular point in the manuscript. This contrasts with the meaning of "*" when it is followed by a form which is not between quotation marks, e.g., *byti. In the latter usage, "*" denotes that the form in question is reconstructed.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1 I prefer Lunt's term "long", rather than "full" (Russian "полни-") based on his discussion of the structure of the lectionary. Lunt describes a lectionary as "a schema of slots when a lection might be required" [1984:38] which comprises "an elastic framework for the selection of lessons a specific scribe or editor wishes to provide for a specific codex destined for use in a specific church or monastery" [1984:39]. He then argues that "full" suggests a document in which all potential slots have an assigned reading, but that no single codex meets that requirement. [1984:40]

2 The information about the location of the manuscript in the sixteenth century is taken from a note in it, presumably from that period, describing a rebinding which was performed in the year 7059 (1551).

3 The significance of the statement by Aleksa was considered in a note appended to Filimonov's article from 1859, whose author is indicated only with the initials "O. B.". "O. B." concluded that Filimonov based his interpretation of the phrase "на сл(с) вни/ же престъя вл[д] чии намеи би" on an identification of that phrase with the designation for the church in question found in the note from the sixteenth century contained in Mstislovovo Evangelie and described above. [Filimonov 1859:186] That designation is, as presented in the typeset edition, "[ева(г)л]ев... ч[с]тнаго храма прч[с]тнаго би и славнаго богоявленіа на городище". [1983:290] "O. B." argues that, in order to accept the identity of those two, one must admit the following: "сл(с) вни/ же" should have been "сл[н]и ж" (= "благословеніе ж"); the correlate to "на городище" should be taken as understood in Aleksa's formulation; and the government of the two noun phrases in apposition to each other and subordinated to "сл(с) вни/ же" is exceptional given the syntactic relationship which is conveyed. [Filimonov 1859:186]

In his article from 1861, Filimonov contradicts, at least in part, the claims of "O. B." regarding the basis for his determination of the intended referent of "на сл(с) вни/ же престъя вл[д] чии намеи би" and the positions which putatively follow from that basis, although Filimonov does not specifically address his comments to "O. B." He states, "Благословение
4 Nevostruev [1860-1861:80] and Voskresenskij [1896:32] suggest that the move to Moscow probably occurred in the sixteenth century by order of Ivan IV. Il'ina is less tentative, adding that the Archangel Cathedral was its destination in Moscow. [1978:11]

5 Voskresenskij states that the destination in 1893 was the Synodal Library. [1896:31]

6 Without any indication of the year of transfer Svirin states that from the Patriarchal Vestry the manuscript went to the Synodal Vestry (Синодальная ризница). [1964:62] Il'ina does the same. [1978:11]

7 The information on the places in which the manuscript has been held was taken from Nevostruev [1860-1861:80], Karskij [1962:11, 12], Voskresenskij [1896:31-32], Svirin [1964:62], Il'ina [1978:11], Popova [1984:text facing plate 3] and Zukovskaja [1984:91].

8 Filimonov lists 1101 as the date appearing in a document which he calls "Софийская летопись". [1859:184] I presume that "Софийская летопись" and "Софийский временник" denote the same manuscript. If they do, then obviously either Filimonov or Zukovskaja is wrong. (cf. Nevostruev 1860-1861:73) However, this apparent discrepancy is not crucial to the current discussion. The important point is that the manuscript in question does not contain the figure 1103.
LITERATURE ON MSTISLAVOVO EVANGELIE

An examination of the literature relating to Mstislavovo Evangelie reveals that there are comparatively few studies which focus exclusively on that manuscript. (cf. Lunt 1984:35) More often one finds material from ME adduced in the context of a broader discussion which includes data from other documents as well. Furthermore, many of the references to ME treat aspects of the manuscript which are beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Several works address the artistic elements in ME, i.e., the binding; the miniatures of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; the initials; etc. They include Filimonov [1861], Stasov [1887], Nekrasov [1969], Lazarev [1947], Rybakov [1953], Svirin [1964], Protas'eva [1974], Il'ina [1978], Popova [1984] and Džurova [1981]. Other works could be cited as well,
but, since the artistic elements of the manuscript are
not pertinent to this study, the preceding list will
suffice.

In some textological studies, material from ME
occupies a prominent position. One such study is
Voskresenskij's monograph Характеристические черты
четырех редакций славянского перевода Евангелия от
Марка, which is, in effect, a companion to an earlier
work by him.2 I will not offer an assessment of the
methodology which Voskresenskij used in
Характеристические черты or of his results because the
aims of his research do not coincide with the
objectives of this dissertation. It was not his goal
to provide a description of the orthographical system
of individual manuscripts, nor did he seek to present
in any systematic manner the means used to convey the
morphology in individual manuscripts.

Another textological study which draws material
from ME is Horálek's Evangeliiře a čtveroevangelia,
which offers the results of his investigation into
variation in the representation of the text of the
gospels in Slavic manuscripts. As the title suggests,
Horálek took data from lectionaries, both long and
short, as well as tetras. Mstislavovo Evangelie was
among the long lectionaries which served as sources.
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For his study, Horálek compared the Slavic manuscripts with each other and with the corresponding Greek texts. His discussion concentrates on variation in lexicon, syntax and phraseology. He does not concern himself with the orthographical system of individual manuscripts nor does he address in a systematic manner the orthographical shape of individual morphological markers. Those issues are simply not the focus of his work.3

In the last century K. I. Nevostruev undertook an investigation of Mstislavovo Evangelie. A portion of his work appeared in an article entitled "Описание евангелия, писанного для новгородского князя Мстислава Владимировича, в начале XII века", whose contents are summarized quite well by Karskij. Karskij states that in Nevostruev's article "дано описание переплета, пергамена, заставок и заглавных букв, а также порядка евангельских чтений" and "рассмотрены записи в конце евангелия и в начале его об обновлении переплета в 1551 г." [1962:11-12]

Another part of Nevostruev's study appeared under the title "Составъ и мѣсяцословъ Мстиславова списка евангелия." The article consists of a comparison of the menologions of Mstislavovo Evangelie and Ostromirovo Evangelie in terms of the individual(s)
and/or events celebrated and the specific dates assigned as the feast days for them. The data are presented in the form of a list which starts with September 1 and ends with August 31.5

The references to Mstislavovo Evangelie in "Записка о переводе евангелия на славянский язык" appear in the context of a summary of the results of Nevostruev's comparison of several gospel manuscripts. The parameters for the comparison were textological. More specifically, Nevostruev identified instances in which the manuscripts differed either in terms of the likely content of the Greek source text from which they were derived or in terms of the translation chosen for specific Greek words or phrases. Thus, he considered primarily lexicon, phraseology and syntax.

The question of the age of the manuscript is at the center of attention in the article "Дополнительные свидетельства к истории Мстиславово евангелия".6 Thus, it does not bear upon the topics of interest in this dissertation.

The scholar who, in recent times, has worked most extensively with the manuscript is L. P. Žukovskaja and material from ME has been an important component of a
number of her studies. However, she has been concerned
chiefly with issues which are not within the purview of
this dissertation.

In the articles "О переводах евангелия на
славянский язык и о 'древнерусской редакции'
славянского евангелия", "Об объеме первой славянской
книги, переведенной с греческого Кириллом и Мефодием"
and "Памятники письменности традиционного содержания
как лингвистический источник" Zukovskaja mentions
Mstislavovo Evangelie, although it is not the focus of
any of the three. Furthermore, her discussions are not
about the orthography or the representation of the
morphology.

"Типология рукописей древнерусского полного
апракоса XI-XIV вв. в связи с лингвистическим изучением
их" contains the results of a typological study of a
number of manuscripts which constitute, in Zukovskaja's
terminology, "full aprakos" gospels. Since the goals
of Zukovskaja's investigation differ from the aims of
this dissertation and since her conclusions depend on
material found in manuscripts other than Mstislavovo
Evangelie, I will not offer a critique of her
conclusions.

Zukovskaja seems to have three objectives in her
monograph Текстология и язык древнейших славянских
памятников, to illustrate the range of linguistic variation within and between Slavic gospel manuscripts, to describe some of the kinds of "textological" distinctions which are present in them and to expand the typological classification scheme which she elaborated in her article "Типология рукописей древнерусского полного апракоса XI-XIV вв."¹⁰ (cf. 1976:5-6, 208-209) None of these topics bear directly upon the analysis offered in this dissertation.

Zukovskaja devotes a section of "Гипотезы и факти про давньоруську писемність до XII ст." to Mstislavovo Evangelie. Her comments concentrate on the origins of the manuscript. The contents of that section are essentially incorporated into the introduction to the published edition.¹¹ An assessment of her positions on the time and the place of origin of the manuscript is included in the general discussion of those two issues.

For "Текстология и лексикология памятников письменности" Žukovskaja examined the representations of two different gospel passages, Matthew 9:18-26 and Matthew 21:1-9, in a number of manuscripts. For each passage Žukovskaja catalogs differences, primarily lexical, phraseological and syntactical, between the various texts. She also indicates where the passages are found within the overall structure of the
individual manuscripts. However, Žukovskaja explicitly excludes from consideration orthographical differences and "certain" (not fully specified) grammatical differences. [1981:68]

In "Еще о текстологии месячеслова Евангелия" she proposes a classification system for the types of contrasts which occur in the structure of menologions. Her system references such factors as the specific person, people or event commemorated on a particular date; the presence or absence of a reading for a particular day; the nature of the citation of the reading, either through a cross-reference or through the physical placement of the reading itself at the point in the manuscript when it is to be read; and the actual reading selected for a given day.

In 1979, i.e., prior to the appearance of the edition of Mstislavovo Evangelie, the two individuals who assisted Žukovskaja in the preparation of that edition each published an article on an aspect of the manuscript.

N. P. Pankratova addresses the constructions which mean "from East ... to West", "from East and West", "from the East" and "from the West". The topic of L. A. Vladimirova's article relates directly to her work on the edition of Mstislavovo Evangelie. She discusses
several questions regarding the proper categorization of certain items in the index which accompanies the text of the manuscript.13

Josip Vrana's study from 1985 in Slavia addresses the lexicon and the phraseology in Mstislavovo Evangelie. However, in his article Vrana is primarily interested in the time and the place of origin of what he terms the "newer redaction" ("novija redakcija") of the long lectionary and the path leading from the first long lectionaries of that "newer redaction" to Vukanovo Evangelie.14 The majority of the article is devoted to a presentation of the results of Vrana's comparison of the representations of a number of gospel passages in Mstislavovo Evangelie, Vukanovo Evangelie, Miroslavovo Evangelie, four canonical OCS gospel manuscripts and two other manuscripts identified as "Nikoljska evangeliya".15

Toth's article "К анализу Апракоса Мстислава Великого" is really less about the manuscript itself, than it is about two topics in Slavic cultural history and the individual who compiled the menologion, although Toth claims that his objective is "обратить внимание специалистов на источниковедческое и историко-культурное значение [Мстиславова евангелия]."16

[1988:3]
There are two studies addressing the topics of primary interest in this dissertation, i.e., the orthography of ME and its linguistic interpretation, which will be discussed.

In 1924 the first part of an article by Durnovo appeared in issue 4 of Južnoslovenski filolog. The second and third parts were published in issues 5 and 6, respectively. For the article, Durnovo examined a number of East Slavic texts from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. One of them was Mstislavovo Evangelie.

The purpose of his investigation was to glean from the East Slavic material information "о фонетике и морфологии ст.-сл. языка и ю.-сл. говоров X и XII вв." [1924:73] However, a substantial portion of his presentation consists of a description of various features of the texts which he selected. It is the accuracy of the material relating to Mstislavovo Evangelie in those descriptions which is of interest here.17

The basis for Durnovo's observations was an inspection of the manuscript itself, although he admits that he was less thorough with the second half than he was with the first. [1924:87] In the discussion of his
findings, he describes the predominant patterns, although he generally does not provide statistics. He also lists exceptions which he recorded.

In most instances, the conclusions which I drew through an analysis of the typeset edition accord with Durnovo's findings. However, there are some discrepancies.

For instance, in the brief treatment of East Slavic features found in Mstislavovo Evangelie, which Durnovo terms "[p]уссизмъ", "чнждемъ" is adduced as an example of the use of "ч" where OCS would have "щ". [1924:84] That item is placed in the right column on the back side of folio 17.18 In the typeset edition the spelling for the form in question is "ччдждежъ/мъ" (17g6-7), i.e., "э" stands after "д", not "е".

In another set of instances the contrast between Durnovo's citations and the orthography in the typeset edition is more subtle. He lists five items which, he claims, contain the sequence "-тнъ-", "гнёва жете са" ("е" - sic!), "гнёва жн са", "гнёздити са", "оугнётаахоуть" and "възгнётилъше" ("е" - sic!). [1926-1927:45] Unfortunately, he fails to provide their location in the manuscript. I could only confirm the first and the third. As for the others, I found examples which are nearly identical. For the second
and fourth the only difference is the presence of "н" instead of "щ". At 28v20-21 there is "гнвамни/са". The form "онгэттакоутъ" occurs twice, at 86v4-5 and 176v11-12. The form most similar to the last of the five, "въргнитивъме/мъ", stands at 120a11-12.

Obviously, depending upon whose version one accepts, this type of discrepancy will affect conclusions about the orthography of ME. Moreover, the only way to resolve such contradictions would be to inspect the manuscript itself, an option which is not available. Therefore, for the purposes of this dissertation, it has been necessary to adopt a principle which will arbitrate such disputes operationally. The principle is that the spelling found in the typeset edition will be accepted unless the typeset edition itself is ambiguous, which could occur, for instance, if the text and the index are not in agreement.

The results which I obtained are also in conflict with several statements by Durnovo that certain symbols or variants are not present in the manuscript. For example, he claims that the symbol "ъ" is not used. [1924:88-89] In fact, although that letter is rare, I did find several instances of it, e.g., "пъръ пъръ" at 154b24 and "плъл пъл" at 211g8 among others.
Similarly, I recorded the word meaning "still" written with initial "мѣ" twice, even though Durnovo asserts that that spelling "мне не разу не встретилось." [1926-1927:31]

In his discussion of the orthography of the root *тѣл-, Durnovo states that, when the marker of the stem extension is present, the spelling is consistently "телес-" ("е" - sic!). [1926-1927:41] In the data which I collected, while that variant does occur, "телес-" is equally frequent.

The opposite applies to words related to the adjective meaning "old". Durnovo's observations do not account for "е" in "древле" at 92а23. [1926-1927:43, 48]

The evidence also does not seem to support his position regarding the dative-locative form of the second person personal pronoun in the singular and of the reflexive pronoun. Durnovo contends that the representations of those forms are "usually" "тѣбе" ("е" - sic!) and "себе" ("е" - sic!), respectively, and that variants with "въ" after "с" are "rare". [1926-1927:41] I encountered the exact opposite situation.

Finally, I will address Durnovo's claim about the letter used to denote the root vowel in the unprefixed verb meaning "throw" and in derivatives of that verb.
He cites one example, "метавьше" ("е" -sic!), from the right column on the front side of folio 161 as the only instance in which "е" (sic!) conveys the vowel in question. [1926-1927:39] Elsewhere "ъ" is used. [1926-1927:39]

Although I did not conduct an exhaustive search for all relevant data items, those which I did examine suggest a different, and far more predictable, pattern. All examples of the unprefixed verb which I found have "е" after "м". Among the prefixed derivatives the choice of "е" or "ъ" correlates with the shape of the non-past stem of the verb. When in non-past forms the thematic vowel would have been immediately preceded by the reflex of *tj, "е" follows "м". When the thematic vowel would have followed the verbal suffix *aj, "ъ" is used.19

In terms of focus, Karskij's article "Особенности письма и языка Мстиславова евангелия" is probably the most similar among the works examined.20 His analysis is divided into five principal parts: paleography and spelling in general; the correlation between sounds and symbols; nominal morphology; verbal morphology; and syntax. However, by design Karskij was selective in
the issues which he addressed and he clearly did not set as his objective a comprehensive treatment of any of the preceding topics.

The article also contains a list of lexical items which Karskij considered "noteworthy", although he did not indicate what specifically is "noteworthy" about them. That list is followed by a typeset, as opposed to photographic, reproduction of a short passage from the manuscript.

In general, Karskij's observations are valid, but there are some inaccuracies. For instance, he indicates that the use of "ъ" and "ї" is connected to the position as the last letter on the line. [1962:14] He then adds that there are examples in which those symbols are found in other positions on the line. Both statements are correct. However, some of the items which he adduces in support of the latter proposition, e.g., "инъ/дз" at 17v20-21 and "стъкланиці/" at 135a21, are not actually evidence of the phenomenon in question.21

In the same section of the article he claims that "написание букв под титлом не в конце строки вообще встречается очень редко." [1962:15] Although "редко" is an imprecise term, by almost any measure it is difficult to agree with that assertion. In fact, based
on the conventions of representation which the editors of the typeset edition adopted, one would have to label the use of supralinear letters a regular phenomenon in headings. In the readings, although it is, in relative terms, less frequent, it is not unusual.\textsuperscript{22}

Another incorrect statement involves the distribution of "ж". Karskij writes that it is found "на месте ж" [1962:16], but, as Toth properly notes [1986:240], he offers no examples to support this claim.\textsuperscript{23} That is because there are none. When "ж" is used, a total of eight times, it always stands where *jо would be reconstructed.

Some inappropriate examples are found in the Karskij's discussion of the use of "ь"/"ъ" vis-a-vis positions for which jers are reconstructed. He adduces "тъсъ", at 30v16 and 172b7, as an instance in which an expected "ь"/"ъ" is omitted. [1962:16] This implies a reconstruction with a jer between *s and *n for the word represented. However, there was no vowel in that position originally. (cf. Vasmer IV:51 and items such as "оу/тъшщахъ" at 86v18-19)

The reverse situation obtains with respect to "съществ" at 108v13 and "съ/мъшахоу" at 97g22-23.
Both denote imperfect forms of "dare". Karskij considers "т" unexpected in these two items. [1962:16] It is not. (cf. Vasmer III:687-688)

Karskij is also incorrect when he asserts that in no instance is "о" or "е" used to denote the reflex of a reconstructed jer. [1962:17] In the portion of the colophon contributed by Naslav "е" occurs four times in slots where *б would be posited, although, as Toth indicates [1986:242], two of the examples could reflect the operation of morphological processes. In addition, I recorded "съве/дпо" at 15923-24.

His generalization regarding the representation of the so-called "tense" jers misses the point that the prevailing orthography when the jer and the jot belong to the same lexical item differs from the predominant spelling when a word boundary would be posited between the two. Furthermore, one of the examples which he cites in this context does not involve a jer in tense position. It is "семь о/ставихь всѣ" at 104б1-2.

In a discussion of the use of "ѣ" and "е", Karskij lists "не имате" at 110v5 as an instance of "ѣ" occurring in place of the expected "е". [1962:17] He believes that the verb form should be a non-past. However, the passage containing this example is Mark 13:21 and an imperative is actually required.
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Two examples adduced as evidence of "ч на месте пт-п" do not, in fact, reflect that phenomenon. They are "чжжалхоуса" at 15g4 and "чжжашеса" (location unspecified).\footnote{1962:19} In both items, "ч" denotes the reflex of *k. (cf. Vasmer IV:377-378)

The use of the term "обыкновенно" to characterize the use of "имь" to denote the instrumental singular desinence of *jo-stem nouns when a vowel letter stood immediately before the marker of the ending [1962:20] is inaccurate. In terms of token frequency, "имь" is the predominant variant in such forms.

As the "soft" variant of the masculine/neuter genitive singular "definite"/"compound" adjective desinence "варо" is quite rare, not the norm, as suggested by Karskij. [1962:22]

Finally, the form "исповедь" at 31a6 which he identifies as a third person aorist [1962:23], is a first singular non-past. The passage containing it is Matthew 7:23.

The preceding is not an exhaustive compilation of the inaccuracies in Karskij's article. In particular, I disregarded instances where he assigned items adduced from the manuscript to the wrong folio and/or side. I also did not address generally discrepancies between Karskij and the typeset edition in the orthography.
which they ascribed to individual forms found in Mstislavovo Evangelie. However, I do want to list two occurrences of the latter phenomenon in order to emphasize a point made in the discussion of Durnovo's article.\textsuperscript{25}

A form of the word for "nest" stands at 92al2. Karskij indicates that the second letter in this example is "H". [1962:13] In the typeset edition one finds "H" in that slot. Similarly, for the instance of the word meaning "week" found at 4v15-16 he gives "J" as the penultimate letter. In the edition which I used it is "J". The problem, as described earlier, is that, lacking access to the manuscript itself, I cannot determine objectively which source is correct. Therefore, applying the principle enunciated in the discussion of Durnovo's article, I accepted the spelling in the typeset edition.

There is one final study which should be mentioned in this overview of the literature. It appeared in two issues of Памятники древней письменности (123 and 129). It is entitled "Мстиславово евангелие начала XII в. в археологическом и палеографическом отношениях" and is by P. K. Simoni. Unfortunately, I could not locate a copy of this work and, therefore, am not able to address its contents, but it is in the bibliography.\textsuperscript{26}
Chapter 2


In Svirin's work one finds a black-and-white picture of the miniature of John [1964:178], while the miniature of Luke is in color [1964:179]. In the text he touches upon the binding, the miniatures, the illumination and the initials. Protas'eva offers black-and-white images of some initials [1974:211] as well as a color picture of the illumination from the front side of folio 2, which is on a separate unnumbered plate. In her brief discussion of the manuscript Il'ina considers the miniatures. Popova's book contains large color photographs of the miniatures of John, Luke and Mark [1984:plates 3, 4 and 5] as well as a smaller black-and-white picture of the miniature of Matthew. Džurova provides large color photographs of the miniatures of Matthew, Luke and John. [1981:plates 45, 46 and 47]

2 Unfortunately, I was unable to inspect the earlier work, but Voskresenskij does briefly characterize it in Характеристические черты. [1896:1-2] It is entitled Евангелие отъ Марка по основнымъ спискамъ четырехъ редакций рукописного славянскаго евангельскаго текста съ разночтениями изъ ста восьми рукописей Евангелия XI-XVI вв. and it is included in the bibliography.

This earlier study is based on an examination of the text of the gospel of Mark in more than 100 Slavic manuscripts. Voskresenskij uses a system of four "redactions" of that gospel and he groups the manuscripts according to the "redaction" which they follow. For each "redaction" one manuscript was selected as a "base copy". Mstislavovo Evangellı performs that function with respect to the second "redaction". In his terminology, "redaction" denotes a
new translation, in the present context from a Greek text, or a systematic substantive revision of an existing translation. [1896:1]

The body of Voskresenskij's discussion consists of a parallel presentation of the text of the gospel of Mark found in the four "base copies" along with indications of differences between each "base copy" and the other manuscripts which follow the same "redaction". He also provides data on lacunae, superfluous words and scribal errors as well as other information.

ХАРАКТЕРИСТИЧЕСКИЯ ЧЕРТЫ is the result of his attempt to systematize the raw material contained in the first work and to identify those elements which characterize each of the four "redactions". [1896:2] With each "redaction" his approach was to locate the features which most or all of the representatives of that "redaction" share with each other, but not with the version of the gospel of Mark in use at the time he conducted his analysis nor with representatives of chronologically antecedent "redactions".

He also juxtaposed the Slavic texts with the Greek versions of the gospel of Mark. His objective was to reach some conclusions about the genesis of the variation encountered. In this regard he posits two situations. First, he states that some passages were not conveyed in a uniform manner in the Greek texts. In such instances, the nature of the Slavic translation would depend on the Greek version which was used as the source. The other situation involves divergences in the Slavic manuscripts attributable to differences in the way in which particular Greek words or phrases were translated.

The body of the monograph begins with some basic information about the individual Slavic manuscripts and some comments about Greek New Testament and gospel texts. Then Voskresenskij proceeds to the presentation of the results of his investigation. In that discussion each "redaction" is treated separately.

Three components are common to each of the four "chapters" containing the descriptions of the findings for the four "redactions". In one component, Voskresenskij lists those characteristic features of a given "redaction" which, in his view, arose because the Greek text(s) on which the representatives of that "redaction" were based differed from the Greek texts on which the representatives of the other "redactions" were based. Another component consists of the unique features which, he believes, reflect differences in
translation. The third contains a discussion of variations among the representatives of the given "redaction".

Some other issues are addressed as well, although usually they are specific to just one "redaction", not all four. For example, in the case of the second "redaction", headed by Mstislavovo Evangelie, Voskresenskij offers some observations regarding the time and place of origination of that "redaction".

3 The context in which Horálek presents his findings is the broader effort to reconstruct the history of the Slavic translation of the gospels. Obviously, that conditioned, to a significant degree, the types of phenomena which he chose to examine.

4 In this article Nevostruev draws several conclusions which have consequences for the dating of the manuscript. They appear in his discussion of the material in the colophon contributed by Naslav". First, Nevostruev claims that, because Naslav" stopped in Kiev on his return from Constantinople, that event must have occurred after Mstislav had already left Novgorod and occupied the throne in Kiev. [1860-1861:78-79] However, if the manuscript was originally copied in Kiev (cf. Zukovskaja 1983:6 and Lunt 1984:35, 47), Naslav" would have taken possession of the manuscript there and, it seems, would naturally return there when his assignment was completed, regardless of the location of Mstislav himself (cf. Lunt 1984:35).

Nevostruev attempts to buttress his conclusion with the observation that "Наславъ далёе выражае благожеланія его (Мстислава) царству, именуя его не княземь, а цесаремь." [1860-1861:79] However, Nevostruev himself acknowledges that that word could be used in two senses, "въ тьсномь дипломатическомь смыслѣ, или въ общемь значеніи властителя." [1860-1861:79] Furthermore, Naslav" uses the other term as well to reference Mstislav, e.g. at 213b10-11.

5 In the list of sources this item is cited under P. S. Biljarskij, who extracted the material for the article from Nevostruev's larger work on Mstislavovo Evangelie.

6 The author, Filimonov, thought that 1125, which was widely quoted in his time as the year in which the document was written [1859:179-180], was too late. He argued for a date of origin of 1103. [1859:185] That
was based upon three propositions: that the lectionary was prepared for the Novgorod Church of the Annunciation, that that church was completed in 1103 and that the manuscript would have been ready approximately when the church itself was finished. [1859:183]

The evidence for the first proposition consists of an indication in Mstislavovo Evangelie itself of the church to which it belonged at the time it was rebound in 1551; the following line from Aleksa's colophon, "иже съверхш си ж еуа(г) ж на бл(с)вн/ ж престъи чътъ вл(д)чи нашетъ бъди" (213a7-8); and the fact that the church in question was built by order of Mstislav. The second proposition reflects the consensus of the chronicles. [1859:183] Filimonov does not explicitly offer a rationale for the last of the three.

Filimonov's position is interesting because Zukovskaja adopts essentially the same line of reasoning in her introduction to the edition of Mstislavovo Evangelie. [1983:5-6] An evaluation of this analysis is included in the general discussion of dating.

There is one other noteworthy element of Filimonov's article. He claims that only two people contributed to the colophon. [1859:182] He seems to treat "Zaden" and Aleksa as the same person. In the examination of the orthography of the manuscript, I did not consider them to be the same individual.

7 The direct reference to the manuscript in "О переводах" occurs when Zukovskaja considers a study by Nevostruev entitled "Исследование о евангелиях, писанных для новгородского князя Мстислава Володимировича в начале XII в., в сличении с Остромировым списком и четырьмя другими, современными или близкими Мстиславову списками". Unfortunately, I was not able to examine this work, but it is listed in the bibliography.

In his study Nevostruev compared several Slavic gospel texts, among them Mstislavovo Evangelie. However, Zukovskaja only quotes some very general statements by Nevostruev. Therefore, her article contains no specific information about the manuscript itself.

Zukovskaja addresses two elements of Mstislavovo Evangelie in "Об объеме". First, she relates it to other gospel manuscripts containing readings for weekdays in the period following Pentecost, in her
terminology "full aprakos" gospels. The point of comparison is the specific gospel passages assigned to particular days.

She also adduces two representations of a particular gospel verse, Mark 5:26, found at different places in Mstislavovo Evangelie. With respect to the two representations she indicates the lexical and phraseological differences between them and compares the two variants with the representations of the same verse in other manuscripts. Incidentally, in several instances the orthography found in the typeset edition of the manuscript disagrees with the orthography given for the corresponding passages in the citation in the article.

In the third article Mstislavovo Evangelie is mentioned in two contexts as well. First, Žukovskaja briefly discusses her typology of "full aprakos" gospels. The parameters which distinguish manuscripts within her system of classification are textological in nature and Mstislavovo Evangelie serves as the representative of one particular type.

In another part of the article, she cites several examples from Mstislavovo Evangelie in which two or more instances of the same gospel verse differ in some respect. In the specific examples which she adduces the differences are primarily lexical.

8 Žukovskaja assigns each of the manuscripts to one of two groups based upon the passages from Matthew and Mark which are allocated to the weekdays in the cycle of readings from Pentecost to the beginning of the new year. The specific arrangements of passages which characterize the respective groups are not important here. What is important is that Mstislavovo Evangelie is chosen as the lead representative of the larger of the two groups thus formed. The smaller group consists of just two manuscripts.

Žukovskaja then subdivides the group headed by Mstislavovo Evangelie. First, she separates the members into those in which the reading for the sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost is immediately followed by the reading for the first Monday in the cycle for the new year and those which contain a reading for the seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost before the beginning of the cycle for the new year.

The latter set of manuscripts is categorized further, according to the manner in which the weekdays falling between the sixteenth and the seventeenth Sundays are handled. In some instances, e.g.,
Mstislavovo Evangelie, no readings are supplied for those days. In others, five extra weekday readings are provided. When those extra five are present, there are differences between manuscripts based upon the content of the five readings and the placement of them within the cycle from Pentecost to the start of the new year.

Zukovskaja also cites another feature, logically independent of those listed above, which distinguishes "full aprakos" gospels from each other. It is the manner in which the weeks in the cycle from Pentecost to the new year are counted. In some of the manuscripts, the Monday following Pentecost is the first day of the first week, so that the weeks are Monday-Sunday. In others, the Saturday following Pentecost is the start of the first week. Thus, under this arrangement a week covers Saturday-Friday, which is the situation in ME. The third variant has the Sunday after Pentecost as the first day of the first week. In addition, according to Zukovskaja, some manuscripts combine more than one of these approaches in the course of the cycle from Pentecost to the new year.

In a separate section the two systems of categorization outlined above, one based on the readings and one based on the method used to count weeks, are combined. Zukovskaja uses a grid to indicate which permutations are represented among the manuscripts which she examined and which are not. She also briefly discusses each of the combinatorial possibilities.

9 There is one misstatement about the composition of ME which I will mention. At one point Zukovskaja states, "Также отсылками помечены чтения на все простые дни 10-й [недели] по [пятидесятнице] в Мстиславовом [евангелии]." [1968:248] In table 1 of appendix 1, which lists the passages assigned in Mstislavovo Evangelie for each day in the cycle from Pentecost to the beginning of the new year, the indication of the readings for Monday through Thursday of that tenth week are followed by "(Дбл.)", which denotes that the information in the table is based on the contents of Dobrilovo Evangelie, a member of the large group headed by Mstislavovo Evangelie. [1968:297] (Actually, that particular designation is only found after the indication of the reading for Monday. In the case of Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, ditto marks replace "(Дбл.)", but that is immaterial.)
The typeset edition contradicts this. In it the readings for the days in question (50g-53b) are written in full at the point when they are to be read. [1983:88-91] Moreover, the passages in the typeset edition match those identified in the table with one exception. In the typeset edition the reading for Wednesday of the week in question is Matthew 23:29-39 (51g-52b). In the table it is given as Matthew 23:29-38. [1968:297]

A cursory search for other similar discrepancies between the table and the typeset edition yielded one more, the reading for the Tuesday immediately following Pentecost. In the table it is Matthew 4:25-5:13. In the typeset edition it is Matthew 4:23-5:13 (28a-v).

10 The monograph is organized in the following manner. In the first chapter Zukovskaja confronts the general issue of variation, primarily lexical, but also syntactic, in the representation of gospel texts. She adduces data from a large number of Slavic short lectionaries, long lectionaries and tetras in order to demonstrate that there are substantial differences across manuscripts in the linguistic means used to convey the content of any particular reading.

The second chapter contains the results of an examination of gospel passages written more than once in Mstislavovo Evangelie. For each such passage Zukovskaja compared the multiple iterations in that manuscript and classified the kinds of variation which she found. Loosely defined, most of them can be characterized as either lexical or syntactic.

The lexical phenomena include variations in the roots on which are based corresponding lexical items in different instances of the same verse and variations in the structure of derivatives formed from the same root which occupy corresponding slots in different iterations of a single verse. In the area of syntax they range from contrasts in the specification for individual grammatical categories, e.g., case, number, etc., assigned to corresponding items in different occurrences of a verse to distinctions in the overall structure of corresponding phrases or clauses. An example of the latter type of syntactic variation would be the use of a participial clause in one instance and a clause containing a finite verb form in another.

In addition, some examples are cited in which the same form, in terms of the specification for the
pertinent grammatical categories, of the same word is
spelled differently in different iterations of the same
verse.

A brief treatment of some categories of
differences which Żukowskaja considers inappropriate
parameters for any large-scale textological
classification of manuscripts constitutes chapter
three. The list includes variations in the artistic
components of the manuscripts, e.g., miniatures,
initials, etc.; differences in the headings; what she
terms "мелкие расхождения" between manuscripts in the
order of readings; variations between manuscripts in
the arrangement of individual passages which combine to
form a single reading; additions to and omissions from
individual readings, whether they be entire verses or
just specific phrases or clauses; and certain types of
lexical substitution.

Then she describes in general terms the structure
of four basic types of Slavic gospel manuscripts:
tetras, short lectionaries, long lectionaries and
Sunday lectionaries ("праздничный апракос" or
"воскресный апракос"). This discussion is found in
chapter four. That chapter also includes some
information on Greek gospel manuscripts and more
detailed comments on short lectionaries and Sunday
lectionaries.

In chapter five the focus is the typological
classification of long lectionaries. A significant
part of this discussion is a recapitulation of the
system presented in Żukowskaja's article from 1968
which is based on the readings in the cycle from
Pentecost to the new year. To this she adds
classifications based on the readings in the cycle of
the new year.

Chapter six is an attempt to demonstrate that some
correlation exists between the degree of "textological"
similarity, as defined by the typological
classification scheme presented earlier in the book,
and the level of linguistic (lexical and syntactic)
similarity.

In examining Żukowskaja's book, I paid particular
attention to her treatment of the gospel passages
appearing more than once in Mstislavovo Evangelie
because that was the only section which potentially
dealt with the sorts of issues considered in this
dissertation. As it happens, her analysis bore only
tangentially upon the topics of interest here.
However, there are some problems in that discussion.
She begins with a comparison of the four instances of Matthew 24:42-43. At the end of verse 43 one finds the following four variants, given below in the orthography of the typeset edition.

"и не б ы  о  став  и т ь подъ  хопа ти хл ъ ти с  в о ж " 53a19-20
"и не б ы  о  став  и т ь подъ  хопа ти хл ъ ти сво  ж " 66v22-24
"и не б ы  о  став  и т ь подъ  хопа ти храма с  в о ж " 136a23-25
"и не б ы д а  л ъ  подъ  хопа ти д о м о у с  в о ж " 170v8-9

The four combinations of "бы" and 1-participle are labeled as perfects [1976:132], even though the context clearly dictates that they should be regarded as conditionals.

In the listing for the manuscript as a whole, one of the topics is the distinction between the dual and the plural. Zukovskaja states that there is evidence in the repeated readings that the loss of that contrast had begun. [1976:148] In support of that conclusion she adduces several instances in which, she claims, corresponding portions of a particular passage found in different parts of the manuscript manifest a contrast in the specification for the category of number. Among the examples are the following passages, which I cite as they are given in the typeset edition.

"с  глаголь и нь хориши" 85a24-25
"с  глаголь и намъ роуга хеши са" 178a18-19
(Luke 11:45)
"оубиоьъ въ" 64a8
"оубиоьъ васъ" 132b14
(Matthew 24:9)

Zukovskaja cites the first member of the first pair with "на", a dual, instead of "нъ", which is at best ambiguous. [1976:149] However, in the typeset edition the text has "нъ" and, due to spelling conventions, the index [1983:300] gives "нъ" for the slot in question and identifies it as a plural. Furthermore, the context clearly requires a plural.

In the second pair of examples the difference is not in the specification for the category of number, a point which the index makes clear [1983:454]. The issue is either vacillation in case government for the syntactic position involved or fluctuation in the shape of the form which represents the second person plural personal pronoun in a particular case.

In the same context, Zukovskaja presents the following putative evidence of the "incorrect" use of the dual. [1976:149]
Neither "имь" nor "имь" is a dual.

Both of the pertinent forms in the other pair, "бав" and "ва", are duals, as the context requires. The issue is the same as in the two representations of the clause from Matthew 24:9 given above. Thus, none of the four pairs bears upon the status of the dual-plural distinction. In fairness, it is necessary to state that Žukovskaja offers the possibility that the last pair reflects a difference in verbal government. [1976:149]

Another error occurs in the treatment of the adjectival declension. Žukovskaja suggests that there is a contrast between "short" and "full" forms of pronouns and she offers the following pair of items as an example.

"имь саге" 154b2
"имь саге" 158b20

(Mark 15:31)

Within the pronominal declension there is no distinction between a "short", which I understand to mean "indefinite"/"simple", and a "full", which I interpret as "definite"/"compound", ending. That applies only to the adjectival declension.

11 Žukovskaja even repeats several errors in the description of the contents of quire 9. In both instances she states that the back of folio 69 contains a miniature of Matthew and that readings from Matthew begin on folio 70. In addition, she claims that on folia 65 and 66 one finds readings from John as part of the cycle from Easter to Pentecost. Finally, she indicates that on folio 68 text occupies column a and the first 20 lines of column b. [1981:31, 1983:8]

In fact, the readings which begin on folio 70 are from Luke. Those on folia 65 and 66 are from Matthew and Mark and they belong to the cycle from Pentecost to the start of the new year. As for folio 68, only the first 20 lines of column a are filled with text. Column b has none.

I must admit that in the errata sheet for the typeset edition most of these mistakes are corrected. However, the emendation does not acknowledge the
presence of readings from Mark on folia 65 and 66 and Zukovskaja does not amend her statement regarding the degree of utilization of folio 68.

12 The issue is whether a singular or a plural of the words for "East" and "West" is used. In the article Pankratova compares the data from Mstislavovo Evangelie with the representation of the corresponding constructions in Greek and in other Slavic manuscripts. With respect to Mstislavovo Evangelie the point to be made is that both variants occur.

13 Most of the items which Vladimirova considers consist of a preposition and a pronominal object and the issue is whether the combinations have attained the status of adverbs and should be treated as a unit for classification purposes.

Some of the decisions which she claims in the article to have made are not actually reflected in the index. For example, Vladimirova states, "Итак, как наречное сочетание отмечаем в нашем словоуказателе предложно-местоименное сочетание въ себѣ (e - sic!)." [1979:199] The pertinent items and the appropriate designation were to appear in the article for the reflexive pronoun. However, the instances of "сеbь" in that "наречное сочетание" which she adduces, e.g., at 77b25, 101b8 and 169a4, are not distinguished from other locative forms of the reflexive pronoun.

[1983:434] A parallel situation obtains for "самъ въ себѣ"/"само въ себѣ" and "самъ са".

14 More specifically, Vrana disputes certain positions which he attributes to Zukovskaja, Olga Nedeljković and Ralja Cječlin. According to Vrana, they claim that Vukanovo Evangelie is of East Slavic origin ("podrijetlo"), which, at least in the context of Vrana's discussion, seems to mean that they regard the "newer redaction" as an East Slavic redaction.

[1985:141-142, 158] In contrast, Vrana is of the view that the "newer redaction" appeared in Bulgaria and spread from there to other parts of the Slavic world.

[1985:142, 158-159]

15 For the comparison, Vrana selected approximately 80 readings ("čitanje") which are written more than once in Mstislavovo Evangelie. [1985:142] The comparison was performed at the level of individual gospel verses. The discussion of the results is a catalog of variations, primarily lexical and
phraseological, within and between the manuscripts examined. Vrana also suggests how his findings bear upon the question of the history of the "newer redaction" in general and Vukanovo Evangelie in particular.

16 The two topics are the history of Boris and Gleb and the history of the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev. Their connection to Mstislavovo Evangelie is that a feast to honor Boris and Gleb and one in memory of the sanctification of the Cathedral of St. Sophia are stipulated in the menologion. The former is assigned to July 24 (202b9-10), while the latter is found under November 4 (174g19-21).

Toth claims that the assignment of the feast for Boris and Gleb to July 24 is evidence that their canonization occurred before 1072, although his justification for that assertion is not entirely convincing. [1988:5]

The information contained in the heading identifying the feast of the sanctification of the Cathedral of St. Sophia, primarily the reference to Metropolitan Efrem, is used in conjunction with the testimony of other sources in an attempt to establish the time of the sanctification and to establish that there was a Metropolitan Efrem and that he was of Greek ancestry. Unfortunately, Toth's argumentation, particularly as it relates to Efrem, is, once again, not completely convincing.

In addition, Toth asserts that the heading for the reading for June 5 (197v6-18) confirms that the compiler of the menologion was Hellenophilic. [1988:7] In that heading there appears to be a reference to an attack by barbarians, but the attackers are not specified nor are the people attacked. Toth interprets this as a reference to a siege of Constantinople by the Avars. The basis for that interpretation is not clear, nor is the basis for the unstated assumption that the wording in that heading is the work of someone directly connected with the creation of Mstislavovo Evangelie and not simply taken from a protograph.

17 Unfortunately, I was not able to locate a copy of issue 5. Therefore, the following comments are limited to the first and third parts of Durnovo's work.

18 In citations of examples, Durnovo provides the folio and usually the column, but not the line. As I understand his system, the columns on a folio are
labeled "a", "b", "c" and "d", starting from the left column on the front side and ending with the right column on the back side.

19 Of course, there are also the normal sorts of mistakes in which the location of items adduced as evidence of various phenomena seems to be given incorrectly. For example, the wrong column appears to be listed for "чегем" (196g25), "земля" (211b22), "своб овьц" (196g19-20), "блюдьница" (171b3) and other examples. [1924:83-84] In the case of the four just cited, they are placed in the left column on one side of a folio, but are actually in the right column. The positions given in parentheses are the true locations. Obviously, such errors are not likely to affect materially any generalizations regarding the use of symbols and/or forms.

20 Citations from the article are based on the reprint in Труды по белорусскому и другим славянским языкам.

21 I have provided the precise location of the pertinent examples. Karskij only lists folio and side (front or back). He does not give the column or the line.

22 Karskij does not distinguish the different components of the manuscript in his presentation. When data are cited, there is no indication whether they have been taken from a reading, a heading or the colophon.

23 Given the context in which Karskij makes this point, "на месте чу" should be understood to mean "in a position for which one would reconstruct "ju"."

24 In contrast to the convention adopted for the typeset edition, Karskij does not separate "ca" from the preceding verb form with a space.

25 Like Durnovo, Karskij examined the manuscript itself.

26 In this review of the literature I did not address information from catalogs of manuscripts which include Mstislavovo Evangelie among their entries. However, I will mention in passing two errors found in one such catalog, the one compiled by Protas'eva.
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In a footnote to her discussion of the colophon Protas'eva makes the following claim, "Наслав отвозил в XVI в. рукопись в Константинополь для обновления переплета." [1970:42] At first glance, one might suspect that there was simply a typographical error and that she meant "XII". However, the use of the word "обновление" implies that Protas'eva truly assigns the efforts of Naslav to the sixteenth century. Among the bibliographical citations, the article by Zukovskaja entitled "Памятники письменности традиционного содержания как лингвистический источник" actually appears in Исследования по лингвистическому источниковедению, a publication from 1963. In the catalog it is assigned to Проблемы лингвистического источниковедения and given a date of 1964. Incidentally, the same error is found in the bibliography for Mstislavovo Evangelie in Се́пкина, et al. [1965:144]
CHAPTER 3

REVIEW OF TYPESET EDITION

Due to a lack of access to the actual manuscript of Mstislavovo Evangelie, the analysis offered in the chapters which follow is based on an edition published in 1983 under the editorship of L. P. Žukovskaja. She was assisted in the preparation of the edition by N. P. Pankratova and L. A. Vladimirova. Their primary responsibility was the compilation of the word indices which accompany the typeset text. [Žukovskaja 1983:3-4]

The edition contains four main parts. First, there is an introductory article in which Žukovskaja describes the history of the manuscript and its physical composition and condition. In addition, she addresses a number of paleographical and orthographical issues and enunciates the principles according to which the text is reproduced. That is followed by the typeset text of Mstislavovo Evangelie. The third section is comprised of three word indices, one for the readings, one for the headings and one for the
colophon. Finally, there are two tables which give the location in the manuscript of individual gospel verses from two different perspectives.

Obviously, when one works with a typeset edition, additional complications are injected into the investigative process, primarily as a result of the fact that the investigator is viewing the object of study only after it has been subjected to the filter of the editorial decisions made by the people who prepared the edition. For that reason, it seems sensible to present an evaluation of the editorial efforts of Žukovskaja, et al., prior to the exposition of the results of the analysis. As a preface to that evaluation, I will briefly discuss the published reviews.

I located four reviews of Žukovskaja's edition of Mstislavovo Evangelie. Two were in Soviet journals and two were in non-Soviet periodicals. The four differ dramatically both in the approach which the authors use and in quality. The most thorough and useful of the four is the assessment offered by Lunt in International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics from 1984. I will discuss his review last because it will serve as the point of departure for the observations which I
will offer. In the examination of the other three, I will provide cross-references to Lunt's treatment of individual topics.

The first of the two reviews in Soviet publications appeared in 1984 in Известия Академии наук СССР. It is extremely short, occupying only two pages. Its author, E. M. Vereščagin, is rather effusive in his praise of the editorial efforts of Zukovskaja, et al. Vereščagin's only criticisms relate to two aspects of the reproduction of the text.

First, he complains that no typographical means are employed to distinguish the material in the headings from the material in the readings, even though, in the manuscript itself, the appearance of the headings differs markedly from the appearance of the readings. [1984:371] (cf. Lunt 1984:45)

Second, he questions some decisions regarding the division of the text into individual words. For instance, he notes that in examples cited in the introduction "ca" is not separated from an immediately preceding verb to which it is subordinated, but in the text a space intervenes between the two.¹ [1984:371] He disagrees with the analysis of the sequence "въблагодать" at 2v14 as a single word. [1984:371] (cf. Lunt 1984:50) He thinks that "ИПРКВЕ" at 5b13
should be divided into "и" and "и[хе]." [1984:371-372] (cf. Lunt 1984:49) Finally, he disapproves of the separation of "же" by a space from preceding material with which it is associated, e.g., in some forms of the relative pronoun. [1984:372] (cf. Lunt 1984:49)

Unfortunately, Vereščagin tries to downplay the importance of even these few objections. He suggests that the problems caused by the uniformity in the representation of the headings and the readings are partially mitigated by the first of the two tables correlating gospel verses with locations in the manuscript, a claim which I dispute. [1984:371] He softens his comments on the parsing of the text into individual lexical items with a statement that the set of rules which one adopts to govern the parsing is not particularly important provided that one applies those rules consistently. [1984:371]

Vereščagin does not offer any substantive observations on the introduction or the indices. In general, his review is superficial and it leaves unmentioned too many deficiencies in the typeset edition and it overstates the quality of the work performed by Жуковская, et al. (see below)

The other review from a Soviet publication is by Е. В. Čežko and is found in Вопросы языкознания from 58
1985. A rather neutral description of the organization and the contents of the edition, including a summary of the introduction, comprises roughly half of the four-page text. As for the actual evaluation, Ceško addresses a broader range of issues that does Veresčagin. Ceško criticizes the lack of Greek glosses in the index [1985:144] (cf. Lunt 1984:50-51) and the decision to separate "že" with a space from some forms of the anaphoric pronoun, when the two together represent the relative pronoun, as well as from certain other items [1985:144] (cf. Veresčagin 1984:372 and Lunt 1984:49).

Like Veresčagin [1984:371], Češko [1985:144-145] disputes the treatment of the sequence "въблагодать" at 2v14 as a single word, arguing instead that "въ" should be separated from "благодать" and regarded as a preposition. (cf. Lunt 1984:50) Češko also rejects the apparent suggestion [Žukovskaja 1983:295] that "намъ" in "и не въ/веди насъ въ искушени" at 177v2-3 should be analyzed as an instance of the genitive form used in a syntactic slot which requires an accusative. [Češko 1985:144] (cf. Lunt 1984:53-54)

On the preceding topics Češko's position coincides with that of Lunt. On other occasions, the two offer different evaluations of the same component. Lunt
[1984:43] disapproves of the structure of the two tables in which gospel verses are correlated with their location in the manuscript, while Češko [1985:144] compliments the editors on them, although this discrepancy might result, at least in part, from the fact that Lunt misunderstood the aim of the two tables (see below). The opposite situation obtains with respect to the absence of information on variant readings in other manuscripts for gospel passages. Lunt [1984:50] agrees with the decision to omit such data, while Češko [1985:144] laments that decision.

Among the other issues which Češko addresses is the treatment of "narrow" versus "wide" variants of "o", "e" and "c". Although it is not stated explicitly, the implication is that Češko has reservations about the decision not to convey those distinctions in the typeset edition and to use "wide" "e" as the cover symbol for both the "wide" and the "narrow" variants of that letter when "narrow" "e" predominates in the manuscript. [1985:145] Češko also complains that the notes which accompany the text lack information about the location of the "wide" and the "narrow" variants. [1985:145]

Another objection is raised in reference to the representation of examples from the text which are
adduced in the introduction to the indices. Češko correctly notes that there is inconsistency in the choice of type. [1985:144] Some items are set using a type which conforms to the modern alphabet in terms of the shapes of letters, some are set with a type more closely resembling the Cyrillic found in the manuscript and some are set with a combination of the two.

In general, Češko is more thorough than Vereščagin and more balanced, but the review still ignores a number of problems. 2

A third review was published in the journal Russian Linguistics in 1986 and was written by I. Toth. Unfortunately, Toth's review offers little assistance to one who seeks an assessment of the quality of the editorial decisions made by Žukovskaja, et al.

The article occupies roughly ten pages. The first two consist of some statements about the manuscript itself, not the edition being reviewed, and brief references to several studies of the manuscript, particularly to the work of Žukovskaja. After a synopsis of the contents of the edition, consuming roughly a quarter of a page, and an indication of the division of labor in the preparation of the various sections of the edition, Toth uses the next three pages to summarize the introductory remarks. That is
followed by approximately three and one half pages on which Toth discusses several orthographical features of the manuscript: the use of "x", "ъ" and "я"; the representations of the reflexes of the reconstructed sequences C jer liquid C, where "C" denotes a consonant; and the representation of jers which stood in other positions. Only at that point does Toth address the sections of the edition which follow the introductory remarks and his primary observation is that the decision to create three separate indices, one for the readings, a second for the headings and other informational material and a third for the colophon, was sound.3

Toth eschews any substantive examination of the editorial decisions made by Žukovskaja, et al., in the preparation of the text, except to lament the fact that certain diacritics were not included in the typeset edition [1986:239]. He makes no statements regarding the quality of the footnotes which accompany the text.

As for Toth's remarks concerning the topics which he does consider, I find some of them unconvincing and others unclear. In one instance, he seems to suggest that the shape of certain letters in Mstislavovo Evangelie argues for a dating at the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century,
rather than 1115-1117. [1986:238] I admit that I am not a specialist in paleography, but such a claim seems questionable given the very short interval between the two dates.

Later in the article he lists several examples in which, according to him, "A" is used "instead of" "\(\text{\~m}\)". [1986:240] The list includes "\(\text{Slakou}\)" at 2g19, "\(\text{Mopa}\)" (genitive singular) at 48v13, "\(\text{\~ai}a\)" at 48g8 and "\(\text{awelma}\)" (genitive singular feminine, denominal possessive adjective) at 52a6, among others. The problem is that his formulation suggests that "\(\text{\~m}\)" would be expected in these items and it is not clear on what that expectation is based. It cannot be the reconstructed segment whose reflex is denoted by "A" because that is not constant in these examples.

Toth ends his discussion of "\(\text{x}\)", "\(\text{\~m}\)" and "A" with the assertion that the distributional interrelationships between those three and other letters, as outlined by him, allow one to conclude that "отсутствие или наличие отдельных букв - в данном случае \(\text{\~m}\) - приводит к выработке определенных графико-орфографических тенденций." [1986:240-241] Depending upon the interpretation which one assigns to this statement, it is either demonstrably false or trivially true.
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The fourth review actually preceded Češko's and Toth's, if one relies on the publication dates. It is by Lunt and his assessment of Żukovskaja's work is part of a larger article which includes evaluations of published editions of two other manuscripts.

Lunt summarizes his approach to the examination of the typeset edition in the following statement, "While I have gone through the notes and indexes with some care in order to assess the editorial principles and aims of the authors, I have read only small portions of the actual text." [1984:56] As evidence of that care, Lunt devotes roughly six pages to a consideration of the layout and the contents of the word indices. He also addresses in some detail Żukovskaja's introduction, the two tables indicating the location of various gospel verses in the manuscript, the footnotes which accompany the text as well as several more general issues.

On the whole, Lunt is rather critical of the editorial efforts of Żukovskaja, et al. His judgements are sound and supported by specific examples. Nonetheless, there are minor errors in his presentation and on some points alternatives to his analyses can be offered.
For example, the rationale for Lunt's objection to Žukovskaja's ordering of letters in "рνα(с)" at 182a18 is flawed. He raises this example in a footnote on the proper interpretation of abbreviations, contending that "а" should be regarded as denoting the inflectional marker, not the stem vowel." [1984:46] Although he does not stipulate it overtly, he operates on the presumption that the representation of the desinence is retained in abbreviations. However, three other occurrences of "рνα(с)", at 203g8 (Luke 9:35), 204a11 (Matthew 17:5) and 204v2 (Mark 9:7), contradict such a view. In all three, a nominative is required. Thus, "а" cannot be regarded as the marker of the desinence.

With respect to the two tables which supply information about the location of gospel verses within the manuscript, I disagree with Lunt's understanding of Žukovskaja's aim in the first of them. Lunt disputes Žukovskaja's listing for June 14, claiming that "there is not a very short lection J[ohn] 4:22-23, as she indicates, rather these verses are merely the incipit." [1984:43] This statement implies that Lunt regards the data in the table as Žukovskaja's assertion about the content of readings assigned to individual dates. However, under that interpretation one would be
compelled to conclude that Žukovskaja believes that no reading is assigned to dates for which only a cross-reference is given in the text because those dates are not even included in the table. Lunt does not adopt this latter position.

The composition of the first table becomes clearer if one views it as an indication of the location of the actual text of individual verses in Mstislavovo Evangelie. That approach would account for the entry under June 14 as well as the absence of any information for dates when only a cross-reference occurs. Furthermore, it would make the two tables complementary. The first lists the verses as a function of position in the manuscript, while the second gives locations as a function of individual verses.¹⁰

Several other minor points of disagreement exist, but they are not of consequence. As for those addressed above, they do not alter the fundamental point which I emphasized at the start of this discussion. Lunt's critique is both thoughtful and thorough and it details a number of deficiencies in the editorial efforts of Žukovskaja, et al.

Nonetheless, I would like to augment his assessment. In some instances, the points considered
below constitute an expansion of topics addressed by Lunt. In others, they cover issues possibly noticed by Lunt, but simply not included in his presentation.

In the introduction, there are certain regrettable inconsistencies in the presentation of data from the manuscript. Zukovskaja suggests that the digraph denoting the reflex of \*ū has "ь" as its first element [1983:15], but both "ь" and "м", primarily the latter, are used when material from the manuscript is adduced. For instance, just two paragraphs after the aforementioned statement, Zukovskaja cites "АДЫМ" in the context of a discussion of a phenomenon not related to the composition of the digraph in question. However, later she lists "ПАЫФ" in the section on diacritical marks. [1983:23] In the text both have "ь".

Where the text contains "і", Zukovskaja's citations contain "и" or "І". Similarly, "и" is substituted for "і".

If Zukovskaja wanted to indicate that a letter or a digraph is formed in particular manner in the text, but that she, for whatever reason, represents it in a slightly different way when material is adduced in the
introduction, she should have stated that decision explicitly and she should have ensured the consistent application of any such approach.

As Lunt correctly observes, there are also problems with the discussion of diacritical marks, which consumes several pages of the introduction. Given the attention devoted to the description of the various shapes of the diacritics, it is simply unacceptable that Zukovskaja does not provide good, clear photographs of the variants with cross-references associating specific examples with the corresponding descriptions. (cf. Lunt 1984:46)

Furthermore, I am not completely convinced that her position, that the scribe intended much of the variation which she outlines [1983:22], is correct. At one point Zukovskaja asserts that the predominant shape for diacritical marks is that of a period. [1983:21] She adds that, due to the nature of the writing instrument, "эти точки имеют не вполне круглую конфигурацию, но скорее угловатую или с небольшим утончающимся сосочком." [1983:21] Shortly thereafter she lists four other shapes for diacritics which she characterizes not as accidental deviations, but as deliberate ones. They are "", "", "" and "". [1983:22] It would seem reasonable to argue that these
four and the deviations from a perfectly round period which \v{z}ukovskaja does not regard as intentional differ only in the degree of carelessness with which the scribe wielded the writing instrument. It is not self-evident that scribal intent was involved. I suspect that this is, in part, the point which Lunt wants to make when he poses the question, "Does she (\v{z}ukovskaja - M.T.) really expect a graphic system to utilize such microscopic distinctions?" [1984:46]

Lunt's criticism that the use of diacritical marks to indicate the omission of "ѣ" or "ѣ" from a sequence of consonant letters or to note the palatal status of "ѣ" and "ѣ" "should have been discussed systematically with exhaustive data" [1984:46], is also appropriate, particularly in light of the decision not to include most diacritics in the typeset edition (see below). (cf. Češko 1985:145)

The last observation relating to the introduction concerns \v{z}ukovskaja's examination of the ligatures. Her formulations suggest that comprehensive data are presented. [1983:16-17, 26] However, Karskij cites examples which are not mentioned in her enumeration, e.g., the ligature combining "ѣ" and the following "ѣ" in "родить" at 104v16. [1962:15]
With respect to the reproduction of the text, Lunt objects to certain conventions which the editors adopted. [1984:35, 49] One which he does not criticize is the deliberate omission of many of the diacritics. [1983:22-23, 26] (cf. Češko 1985:145) The lone attempt to provide a rationale for this decision covers only the diacritics supplied by Žaděn". [1983:22-23] Although Češko apparently thinks otherwise [1985:142] (but cf. 1985:145), it seems unlikely that typographical limitations were the culprit insofar as Žukovskaja illustrates the use of diacritics in the representation of column a of folio 82 [1983:25, 122].

Another issue involves two representations of the preposition "from, by" in headings, "ω(τ)" and "ω". The former is far less frequent and basically it occurs before folio 49. Examples are found at 28v10, 28g23, 33a9, 34v13, 36g1, 38g22, 40a17 and elsewhere. The latter is found after folio 48, e.g., at 49a17, 49g11 and 50v6.

The question is whether the distinction in the typeset edition reflects a real difference in Mstislavovo Evangelie. The evidence suggests not. First, in the index no such contrast exists. Examples of both types are listed under "ω". [1983:482-483]
Then there are the photographs found in the edition. The editors include photographs of a small sample of the folia. Among them there is a picture of the front side of folio 41 [1983:plate 8] and one of the front side of folio 70 [1983:plate 10]. The preposition "from, by" occurs on the last line of column b, folio 41 and, in the typeset reproduction of that item, that particular instance is written "ω(τ)". The same preposition stands on the first line with text in column a, folio 70. The editors recreate this example using "ω". However, when one examines the photographs, the preposition appears to be written in the same manner both times.

The rendering of the preposition at the beginning of 2b17 is also dubious. The editors spell it "茌". However, if one examines the photograph of the front of folio 2 in the edition [1983:plate 1], the second letter appears to be "Ъ". In Ševyrev's citation of this passage, that is what he gives, "茌". [1860:394] Nonetheless, for the analysis presented in subsequent chapters I accepted the orthography which the editors assign.

In another instance the editors stand in opposition to an interpretation which is found rather consistently in other sources. The editors give "ч" as
the second letter on 213a19, the first line of the material which Zaděn added to the colophon. An inspection of the photograph of folio 213 [1983:plate 4], suggests that their view is plausible, although the difficulties caused by the poor quality of the images are exacerbated in this case by the small size of the letter. Elsewhere, this symbol is treated as "r".


Lunt devotes considerable attention to the shortcomings of the concurrent notes supplied by Žukovskaja which accompany the text. [1984:48-50] In that discussion his sole comment on the notes addressing the diacritical marks is that he regards the information on the shapes of diacritics as "useless". [1984:48] While that is a fair point, I think that an explanation is necessary.

In a number of instances one finds the following: "- H. 3. Tax!", which means: "- diacritic(s) sic!" Immediately before "-" there is a lexical item from the text. Examples can be found on pages 193, 202 and elsewhere. Since the editors decided to omit
diacritics such as these in the edition (cf. 1983:22-23, 26), the only information which a note of this sort can provide is that over one or more of the letters which are part of the orthographical representation of the word in question there is a mark which has been interpreted as a diacritic. If Žukovskaja wanted to indicate that fact, she should have used the format found on page 272, where she simply states that over a particular letter in a particular lexical item there is a diacritic of a particular shape.

At least as bad are the notes consisting of a lexical item followed by "- наличие н. з. вызывает сомнение", "- место н. з. вызывает сомнение", "- н. з. вызывает сомнение" or something similar, e.g., on pages 179, 183 and 184. When one cannot view the actual manuscript, such observations provide no information. (cf. Češko 1985:145)

The notes in which Žukovskaja identifies orthographical irregularities are covered rather thoroughly by Lunt. Therefore, the following comments should be understood as a supplement to his.

One can expand Lunt's list of items which Žukovskaja incorrectly considers noteworthy, e.g., " быстро" at 70g3, "на въ/и" at 112a22-23, "посушку жить" at
Likewise, the inventory of items which are unjustifiably ignored can be enlarged. Examples include "глъ" for "гли" at 12v2, "ти" for "тъ" at 25v2 (cf. 149b9), "одържими" for "одържимъ" at 28a16, "десно же десно же" at 29a7, "не" for "нъ" at 29b8, "матерп" for "матеръ" at 30a23, "принесе" for "принеси" at 34a7, "не/виньны" for "невинны" at 36a8-9 (cf. 189b4), "осоудать" for "осоудить" at 37v13, "кънигъчи/я" for "кънигъчии" at 64v15-16, "проса" for "просать" at 87g17 and 87g24, "осмь десать" for "осмь на десать" at 88v2, "и/эгоню бъсы и изгоню бъ/сы" at 88g10-12 (cf. 175v23-24), "объша/ша" for "объша" at 99b4-5 (cf. 140a12-13), "глють" for "глю" at 99v11, "хоть/аше" for "хотлахою" at 101a22-23, "видѣхъ" for "видѣ" at 108b8, "и сидоньскъ и/сидоньскъ" at 126b9-10, "крыше/ниже" for "крышени земь" at 127g9-10, "нъ" for "не" at 131a8 (cf. 49a11), "двою" for "двою"/"двою" at 140g18, "гла" for "глаъ"/"глъ" at 169v21 (cf. 11b19-20, 147a11), "речете" for "речеть" at 177a10 (cf. 105g9, 105g19-20) and "насоудили" for "насоущны"/"насоущны" at 177b23.12,13
Some phenomena are treated inconsistently. For instance, Žukovskaja concluded that "има́ть" at 140b20 (Luke 22:16) and 140v1 (Luke 22:18), where it is used as a first singular non-past, deserves to be noted. However, "има́ть" at 118v15-16 (Luke 22:16) and 118v22 (Luke 22:18) apparently does not. Similarly, "анге́ла" at 210a18 is highlighted and, given the context, it can only be due to the sequence "-нгг-". However, no remark accompanies "анге́ла" at 26g20. The note for "възя" at 67a18 can only be directed at "в", but no attention is drawn to "въ/за" at 137b5-6, which stands in the corresponding slot in another iteration of the same verse.

Another one of Lunt's complaints is the lack of information on "especially peculiar readings" in the manuscript. [1984:50] An example of this which he does not cite is Žukovskaja's treatment of "во́до́уть бо́дьни/ти печа́ль я́ко не́ сбы́сть та/кое от́ начала тва́ри" (Mark 13:19) at 110b20-22. She draws attention to "печа́ль я́ко" and ignores the fact that "во́до́уть бо́дьни/ти" should really be "во́деть бо́ вь́дьни/ть".

Žukovskaja says nothing about the missing "не" after "я́ко" in "и а/же рэкоу я́ко въ́мь я́го" (John 8:55) at 16g17-18. The negative particle "не" in "ничто же́ есть́ ве́же вь́/нъдши́ чл[о]вка въности вь́ нъ/не
можетъ его осквернить" (Mark 7:15) at 65b13-15 is inappropriate, but there is no remark to that effect.\textsuperscript{14} A missing *"одржимъ" before or after "Дхьмы не/чистымъ" in "смртте и аби же о/тъ гробъ чл(о)вкъ. Дхьмы не/чистымъ" (Mark 5:2) at 59g7-9 also passes without comment. At 84g15-17 one finds "фарисей/же видѣвы диви са како не/преже крѣстиша обѣда" (Luke 11:38). It would have been helpful to have a statement that, instead of "крѣстиша", one would expect *"крѣсти са". The fact that "зако не отъ и/збытка комоуждпо жи/вотъ его есть отъ имѣні/и жемоу" at 87a22-25 is a badly disfigured rendition of the second half of Luke 12:15 should have been indicated. Attention should have been drawn as well to the missing *"идоу" in "онъ же о/твѣщавъ рече азь ги и/не идѣ" (Matthew 21:30) at 131b23-25. (cf. 49v5 and 184a1)

Finally, to the kinds of information which Lunt believes should have been in the notes [1984:50], but were not, I would add the location of all ligatures. It would have been better to include those data, not in lieu of the general discussion of ligatures in the introduction, but in conjunction with it. Зуковскайа's defense of this decision is that the ligatures bear no relation to the content or the condition of the manuscript. [1983:27]
I did not examine the indices as systematically as Lunt did. Therefore, his assessment is rather more complete than any which I can provide. Nonetheless, I do want to add several observations to those which he makes. They will be presented after the summary of Lunt's central points.

Lunt addresses a range of issues concerning the structure and composition of the indices. He criticizes the absence of Greek glosses. [1984:50-51] He also raises objections to a number of specific decisions affecting the placement of items within the indices. As Lunt recognizes, many of these specific decisions result from an extreme adherence to an ordering of items based strictly on the orthography of forms which are recorded, which leads, in some instances, to a very non-intuitive arrangement of the data. [1984:51-52] Others reflect the combination of incompatible items in the same article, the assignment of items which belong together to distinct articles or inconsistent application of the organizational principles which the editors themselves adopt. [1984:51, 52, 53] Another area in which deficiencies are found is in the grammatical characterization of individual forms. [1984:53-54] In addition, Lunt correctly complains that the index for the headings
contains only "an alphabetical list of actual spellings," without any supplemental information, e.g., grammatical information, identification of names and terminology. [1984:55] Lunt laments the lack of any systematic treatment of phraseological units as well. [1984:56]

To that extensive catalogue of defects, one can add a rather unfortunate convention which was adopted in the indices. In the text all of the following symbols are used: "\( \mathfrak{m} \), "\( \mathfrak{n} \), "\( \mathfrak{l} \), "\( \mathfrak{r} \), "\( \mathfrak{h} \), "\( i \), "\( \mathfrak{i} \), "\( ! \), "\( \mathfrak{v} \), "\( \mathfrak{v} \), "\( y \), "\( \mathfrak{y} \), "\( H \)" and "\( \mathfrak{M} \). In the index that diversity is simplified according to the following plan.\(^{15}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol in Text</th>
<th>Symbol in Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{m} ), &quot;( \mathfrak{n} )&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{m} )&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{l} ), &quot;( \mathfrak{r} )&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{l} )&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{h} ), &quot;( \mathfrak{i} )&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{h} )&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{i} ), &quot;( \mathfrak{v} ), &quot;!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;( ! )&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{v} ), &quot;( \mathfrak{v} )&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{v} )&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{y} ), &quot;( y )&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{y} )&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{m} ), &quot;( \mathfrak{m} )&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;( \mathfrak{m} )&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, in the introduction to the indices only the elimination of the pairwise distinctions "\( \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m} \), "\( \mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{n} \)" and "\( \mathfrak{h}/\mathfrak{h} \)" is stipulated. [1983:293]

As for the phenomena which Lunt criticizes, one can supplement the data which he cites. The following
examples are all taken from the index to the readings, although that does not mean that the other two indices are free of such errors.

Even though "Слн/годлтм" at 71b15-16, "Слн(о)дтн" at 71b21, "Слн/дтн" at 164a6 and "Слн(д)тн" at 198a12 occupy the same slot in different iterations of Luke 4:22, the first is given its own article near the top of the right column on page 302, while the latter three are included in an article placed at the top of the left column on page 303.

The infinitive written "възвести" at 109g16 is placed by itself, separated from the article containing the data on the remaining forms of the verb in question by the listings for two unrelated words. [1983:320]

The difference in the treatment of the first verb in "оучителю небрежешм/ли како погъба жем" at 59v14-15 (Mark 4:38) as compared to the first verb in "ги. не брежешм/ли како сестра мо жедино/ма остави" at 166v6-8 (Luke 10:40) is also instructive. In the former passage, "небрежешм" is taken as the verb form and it is listed under "н". [1983:391] In the latter, the classification is based on "брежешм". Thus, it is under "с". [1983:305] Based on semantics, it is clear that the same verb is used in both contexts. This illustrates that Zukovskaja's division of the text into
words was not scrutinized with sufficient care during the compilation of the index, as the categorization corresponds to the parsing in the text. (cf. Lunt 1984:50, 52, 53)

Forms of the verb whose infinitive is represented as "имынать" are listed in an article on page 362, while examples of the corresponding verb accompanied by "ca" are cited on page 360. This results from the policy to create distinct articles for verbs with "ca" and the corresponding verbs without "ca" in conjunction with the rather strict adherence to alphabetization based only on forms actually used in the text. (cf. Lunt 1984:51)

As further evidence of the counterintuitive consequences of the refusal to construct normalized headwords for articles one can offer the following. The "indefinite"/"simple" and the "definite"/"compound" forms of the adjective "Judean, Jewish" are not contiguous. The former are at the bottom of the right column on page 370, while the latter stand at the top of that column. The article for "Jesus" begins on page 363 and ends on page 364, but the possessive adjective derived from that name is listed on page 368. These situations reflect chance differences in the orthography of the members of the respective data sets.
The examples of forms of the verb whose reconstructed infinitive is *po(j)güti are split into two articles. The items beginning orthographically with "пом-" are on page 410. Those starting with "пожа-" are on page 414.

The imperfect "пецааме са" and the non-past forms of the same verb are in two different articles. (cf. Lunt 1984:52) Both are found on page 406. The active participle forms of that verb are listed on page 406 as well, but in a third distinct article, while the imperative, under "пьвете са" ("е" - sic!), is found on page 424.

The verb meaning "look" is partly on page 438 and partly on page 444. Similarly, the abbreviated examples of "save", which begin orthographically with "смс-" are on page 438, while those written in full are cited on page 445.

The examples of the non-past paradigm for the verb whose infinitive is written "изгънати" are listed erroneously in the article for the verb whose infinitive is represented as "изгонити" and vice versa. [1983:362] On the same page, "извожо" is included in the article for the verb whose non-past stem is spelled "извед-". [1983:362]
Incorrectly, "курина" at 180b18-19 and "куриена" at 121v17 are placed in the same article and identified as forms of a geographical name. [1983:376] The first is from Luke 2:2 and denotes the personal name of a governor of Syria. The latter, from Luke 23:26 represents either the genitive of the place name "Cyrene" or the accusative singular of the noun for "Cyrenean".

Of "нападаахоу" at 56v12, "напа/дома" at 33g1-2 and "напа/паде" at 199a18-19 the latter two should be in the same article, while the first of the three should be separate. In index, the first two form an article, while the third stands alone. [1983:387]

Forms of the verb with a reconstructed infinitive *śkryvati are in the same article as those of *śkryti. [1983:444]

The verb form "алчемь" at 31b8 (Matthew 9:14) is labeled as a masculine nominative plural of a present passive participle. [1983:300] In fact, it is a first person plural non-past. The aorist "въровъ" at 210g22 is a second person singular, not a third person singular as it is identified in the index [1983:329]. As the object of "пама", "газофулахин" at 108g18 is in the dative case. The editors label it a genitive. [1983:329, 423] The placement of "жива" at 89v10
suggests that the editors regard it as a masculine genitive singular of the past active participle of the verb "live". [1983:348]. A more likely analysis would classify it as a masculine accusative singular of the adjective "alive", thereby requiring that it be included in a different article altogether. The form of the anaphoric pronoun at 18a4 is written "м" and represents a feminine accusative singular. The index gives it as "м", a neuter accusative singular. [1983:356]

In the handling of "болшша" at 92b15 (Luke 12:18), "болшй/м" at 11l18-19 (Luke 20:47) and "болшшш" at 34b7 (Matthew 6:25) one sees errors in placement which result, in part, from errors in identification. All are comparative adjective forms. The first, a feminine accusative plural, modifies an understood "житъница". The second agrees with the accusative singular "осоужении". The third is subordinated to "ъш", a nominative singular. In the index the first is correctly defined, the second is classified as a comparative adverb, while the third has the identifier "adverb" followed by "?" and after that there is the label "comparative adjective". [1983:304-305]

Furthermore, each of the three constitutes an individual article, i.e., none of them is associated
with any other item from the text. However, a bit earlier in the index, there is a separate article devoted to the comparative adjective which means "greater". [1983:304]

The sequence "\textit{צִּכְתָּרְתָּרְתָּרְתָּר}" at 208v16-17 (Luke 24:21) is treated as a single word, the accusative plural of "Israelite". [1983:362] The corresponding sequence in the other iteration of that verse, "\textit{צִּכְתָּרְתָּרְתָּרְת}" at 3b22-23, is parsed and classified as two separate words, the genitive singular of "Israel" and the conjunction "but". [1983:363, 394]

The two items "\textit{יוֹדְנִי} and "\textit{יוֹדְנִי}" at 15v14 and "\textit{יוֹדְנִי}" at 130v3 are genitive plurals of the noun meaning "Judean, Jew", a person, not genitive singulars of the noun denoting "Judea", a place. The index identifies them in the latter manner. [1983:370] The issue with "\textit{יוֹדְנִי}" at 13v21 is the case. It is correctly located in the article for "Judean, Jew", the person, but it is a nominative plural, not an accusative plural.

The four instances of "\textit{נַוָּלָלָלָלָלָל} all occur in the clause, "\textit{דָּוַיְנָה הַוָּלָלָלָלָלָלָלָלָלָל הַוָּלָלָלָלָלָלָל הָוָּלָלָלָלָלָל הָוָּלָלָלָל הָוָּלָלָל הָוָּלָל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל הָוָּל HoraMa}

The two, at 64b12-13 and 134a21 (both Matthew 22:44), are classified as dative singulars. Two, at 98a5-6 (Luke 20:43) and 108v22-23 (Mark 12:36), are categorized as locative duals. [1983:409-410]
To the items whose absence from the index Lunt noted ("пожи/хь" at 146g10-11 [1984:48] and "оудоре" at 28g2 [1984:52] and "гемона" at 163b22 [1984:52]) one can add "доиде( же)" at 28g14; "звезд" at 73g10; "седмийщ" at 92a1; "ню" at 94g22; "н же" at 94g24; "оу/тря" at 105b15-16; "оум" at 114g7; "въза" at 136a9; "върын/и" at 136b3-4, 137a16 and 137b1; "възаша" at 136v8 and 136v10; "въплъ" at 136v15; "въ/за" at 136g23, 137a9-10 and 137b5-6; "върынъ" at 137b2; "ви/дъхомъ" at 137g11-12 and 137g14-15; "въве/дохомъ" at 137g12-13; "видить" at 139b9; "видят" at 139b9; "вълеби/хь" at 146v9-10; "въ/зенавидъ" at 146g19-20; "видяша" at 147a21; "възненавидъ/ша" at 147a21-22; "вълебисте" at 148b8; "въпроси" at 150b6; "въпраша жни" at 150b15; "въпраша/и" at 150b15-16; "видатъ" at 150b17-18; "ви/дъхъ" at 150v11-12; "въспъ" at 150v14; and others. These data suggest a rather systematic omission of at least some words beginning with "в" located in certain sections of the text, but I did not check the index exhaustively to confirm this.

At 192a3 in the text there is a supine represented as "видеть". In the index this is the sole example under the entry "видеть" ("e" - sic!). [1983:315]

In the right column on page 425 some of the lines are not in the correct order. The articles whose lead
entries are "радошами" ("щ" - sic!) and "радою са" should follow the article headed by "радостъ", not the one headed by "разгонява са". The final line of the article starting with "радою са" is in the correct position. It is the first eleven which are misplaced.

The foregoing enumeration, even when combined with Lunt's, is not comprehensive. Some other errors will be noted in subsequent chapters. However, the examples cited here suffice to confirm Lunt's rather negative assessment of the indices.

Beyond the observations made earlier, I have nothing to add to Lunt's evaluation of the two tables listing the location of individual verses.

Despite the concerns outlined above, I concluded that the typeset edition provides an acceptable basis for an analysis of ME since many of the issues treated here pertain to the supplemental material, i.e., the introduction, the concurrent notes and the indices, rather than to the reproduction of the text itself. As for the comments directed at the text, some merely reflect disagreements over editorial decisions which do not undermine the accuracy of the reproduction. Those which do speak to its accuracy are few compared to the total amount of material in the manuscript.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1 The statement by Щуковская on this topic to which Верещагин refers [1984:371] is in footnote 43 to the introduction, which is on page 28, not on page 27.

2 I noted a misidentification in Češko's review concerning the location of the sixteen plates containing photographs of various folia. They are not between pages 16 and 17, they are between pages 48 and 49, which contain the text of most of, folia 16 and 17. (cf. 1985:142) I also disagree with Češko's characterization of these photographs, that they are "отлично" [1985:142] and "прекрасно" [1985:143] done, although that is clearly a subjective assessment.

3 One of Toth's statements in this context is rather curious. He suggests that the division along the lines described above permits one to distinguish more easily the contributions of the various individuals who participated in the compilation of the manuscript. However, the passages written by the anonymous second scribe are incorporated into the first of the three indices together with the forms from the readings copied by Aleksa, while the index for the colophon combines the data from the entries of Aleksa, Zaděn" and Naslav". Nonetheless, I do agree that the approach adopted is better than a single index containing everything.

4 This contrasts sharply with the other three, who practically ignore the indices.

5 I disregarded instances in which the wrong folio, column and/or line is assigned in Lunt's review to data cited from the manuscript as well as any misspelling of examples, provided an emendation of the spelling does not alter the validity of the conclusion which the items are intended to support.

6 Among the errors is Lunt's description of the sequence of cross-references beginning with the heading for March 26 (194v22-23). The correct series is March 26 to November 8 (175b5-6) to September 6 (166a2-5) to October 18 (172g17), where one finds Luke 10:16-21. Lunt omits the intermediate step of November 8 and he states that there is a reference at October 18 to the third Sunday of Lent. [1984:44] There is such a
reference at September 18 (169a12-14), although Lunt lists the proper folio and column for October 18.

Another occurs in the list of items which, Lunt asserts, are unjustifiably highlighted in the notes to the text as exceptional. One of the forms in his list is "Ойло/те" at 83v14-15. In fact, that particular example is not referenced in the notes.

On several occasions Lunt incorrectly claims that certain items are not recorded in the index. For instance, he indicates that forms of the possessive adjective whose reconstructed masculine nominative singular is *cēsarjē are missing. [1984:52] In fact, they are listed, but under the sequence "цср-", as the example which determines the alphabetization of the article happens to be the abbreviation "ц(ср)" at 9g11. [1983:463] Given the placement of the article, one can easily see why Lunt might have overlooked it.

Similarly, he did not find "благословламе" at 22a18 or "бгр(о)сваме" at 209v18, the second of which he erroneously spells "благословеасе". [1984:57] Both do occur. [1983:303] Once again, Lunt's omission is understandable because the forms of the verb in question are divided between two discontinuous articles in the index. One appears in the right column of page 302. The other is in the left column of page 303.

The situation is slightly different with respect to "оудоре" at 28g2. Lunt is right when he observes that that item was omitted from the index. [1984:52] However, the editors offer an explanation for that absence. In her introduction Žukovskaja writes, "Кроме того, в примечаниях подтверждаются явно ошибочные написания, которые, как правило, не представлены в словоуказателях." [1983:27] In the introduction to the indices one finds the following, "В словоуказателе не приводятся явно ошибочные написания, оговоренные в примечаниях, например: оудоре ("e" - sic!) вместо оуроде ("e" - sic!)." [1983:294] Now, one could still object to the editorial decision to deliberately exclude forms from the indices, whether or not there is a footnote addressing them. Moreover, no objective criteria defining "явно ошибочные" items are presented.

Elsewhere, Lunt expresses dissatisfaction with the fact that hyphens are not used at the end of lines to mark when a word continues at the start of the next line. [1984:35-36] Žukovskaja addresses this situation in the introduction, "Текст воспроизводится буква в букву, строка в строку, с разделением на слова, однако
The symbols "(" and ")" are used by the editors to enclose letters which, in the manuscript itself, are supralinear. With one notable exception, "т" as part of "п", such letters are written on the line in the typeset edition.

The slot in which this item is found requires a genitive.

The actual principle which Lunt enunciates is that, except for the word meaning "Lord", "first and final stem-letters must be present," while "other internal letters may occur." [1984:46]

This analysis does not free the editors from the criticism that they do not supply a comprehensive list of the occasions for which a reading is required in Mstislavovo Evangelie and the passage assigned to each occasion.

As part of his discussion Lunt identifies several misprints which are not corrected in the sheet of errata. [1984:36] To those which he cites one can add "истинь/чк" for "истиньыч" at 2b7-8, "недъла" for "недъла" at 9g8, "велико" for "велико" at 17g15, "самишв" for "самишв" at 23v13, "н" for "н" at 49a14 and 78b10 and 82v2 and 200a22, "има" for "има" at 56g7, "бамъ" for "бамъ" at 93a9, "любодвкцами" for "любодвкцами" at 112v13, "и/ма" for "има" at 118b1-2, "рддрычитм" for "раздрычитм" at 184g21, "врмм" for "врмм" at 198a10 and "дй" for "дй" at 206g1. The form "хомртм", instead of "хомртм", at 103g5 is less clear in this regard. It might be an error in the typesetting or, as Prof. Charles Gribble suggested in a personal communication, it could reflect an error by the scribe. In the index the expected spelling is given for all of the items just listed.

Other apparent misprints go uncorrected in the enumeration of errata as well. In a number of instances the mark of abbreviation, "м", is over a lexical item which clearly is not abbreviated and one cannot associate "м" with an adjacent lexical item which is abbreviated, but lacks "м". Examples of this sort can be found at 3g12-13, 7v20, 12v25, 40g1,
104b22, 117v16-17, 119g9-10 and 190a19-20. For all of these, "n" is not part of the citation in the index. The opposite situation also occurs, where a lexical item is abbreviated, but "n" is not to be found anywhere in the vicinity, e.g., at 75g25 and 104a9. In the index these items are cited with "n".

Another set of obvious mistakes contains errors in the chapter specifications which accompany the text. (cf. Lunt 1984:45) The reading starting on 50v7 is from Matthew 17, not Matthew 18. To the left of 82a9 should be "I. X" since the pericope which begins on that line is from Luke 10, not Luke 16, which the absence of the aforementioned indication implies. At 104v1 the correct marker is "I. XVI", not "I. XV". Similarly, the first 22 lines of 109b are from Mark 13, not Mark 12. The text occupying 158b is part of Mark 15, not Matthew 15. Finally, to the left of 183b15, "M. VI" should appear instead of "Mt. VI". The passages in question are identified correctly in the two indices found at the end of the edition which give the location of verses. The lapses described in this footnote are the kind of errors which are inevitable in any typeset edition of this sort. (cf. Lunt 1984:36)

12 For "и сидонъскъ и сидонъскъ" the index contains an exclamation point immediately after the location of the second of these two instance of "сидонъскъ". [1983:435] Therefore, one might argue that the exceptional nature of this passage is marked, although the marking is enigmatic at best.

13 The identification of these items in the index is not handled in a uniform manner. The first is labeled an accusative plural [1983:334], even though it occupies a syntactic slot in which a nominative plural is required. In contrast, "однажды" is categorized as an accusative plural [1983:397], which accords with the demands of its syntactic position. The form "ты" is classified as a masculine nominative plural of a demonstrative pronoun. [1983:452] For "не", "матеря" and "принце" their orthographical shape determines their placement. [1983:389, 380, 416] The item spelled "не/винны" in the text is under the entry "невинны" [1983:391], which suggests that the orthography of the text might result from an error in the typesetting. Alternatively, the index could be wrong. Genitive plural is the designation attached to "книгны" [1983:373], which reflects what one would expect based
on the context in which it is used. As for the remaining items, their categorization is never at odds with their orthographical shape.

14 Lunt identifies the same problem with the iteration of this verse at the beginning of the immediately subsequent pericope. [1984:50]

15 The presence of both "מ" and "ו" in the manuscript itself is questionable based on Żukovskaja’s formulation on page 15 in the introduction. She only mentions the variant "מ". (cf. Lunt 1984:36)

16 The treatment of the instance at 3b22-23 is much more likely, but even if one were to interpret "יִםָה/יִמ" at 208v16-17 as "Israelites", it could not be an accusative. As Prof. Daniel Collins emphasized in a personal communication, one would need to classify it as a genitive plural.
CHAPTER 4

OVERVIEW OF ORTHOGRAPHY

The description of the orthography of ME will contain three components: an overview of the orthographical system; the relationship between the orthography and reconstructed segments; and the orthographical representation of the morphology. This chapter is devoted to the first component.

However, before proceeding, it is necessary to make several remarks. First, when the term "word" is used in the discussion, it should be understood in the sense of a separate item in a lexicon, not as a synonym for "phonological word".

In addition, three conventions were adopted in the analysis of ME. First, I have divided the set of orthographical symbols into "consonant" letters and "vowel" letters, although I will not define formal criteria for the assignment of individual symbols to one group or the other.
Second, in compiling the lists of letters, I have disregarded a number of "non-letter" symbols. First, there are the symbols "(" , ")", "[" and "]", which the editors of the typeset edition supplied. Then there is a group of symbols which were in the manuscript itself. They include ".", ":", "~", "∆", "∞", "≈", "≠", "ε", "≠", "≈", "∞", "±" and "−". I have adopted this convention even though the editors seem to ascribe letter-like qualities to several of these symbols, e.g., "∞", "ε", "±" and "−". [1983:24, 25]

Finally, in making generalizations I have excluded from consideration the symbols ".", ":", "~", "∆", "≠", "ε", ":", ":", "∞", "/", "]", "(" and ")". The other seven "non-letter" symbols listed in the preceding paragraph play some role in the generalizations. However, only the role of "∞", "−", "(" and ")" requires elaboration.

The symbols "∞" and "−" individually and the symbols "(" and ")" as a pair indicate that at least one letter of a word, as that term was defined above, was not written on the text line. In the case of "∞" and "−", the letter(s) were not written at all. In the case of "(" and ")", the letter standing between them was supralinear, while others might have been omitted entirely. In both instances we are dealing with an abbreviation. This is important because there is no 93
reason to assume that the rules concerning the sequencing of symbols are the same whether the "full" form of a word is written or an abbreviation is used. Therefore, in analyzing the data on the sequencing of letters, when a sequence occurred in an abbreviation, I included the item only if the letters involved would have been consecutive had the word in question been written in full.

Bearing in mind the parameters which have been outlined above, I will proceed with the overview of the orthography of ME. In this and subsequent chapters the discussion will be divided into four sections. The first will address the readings which were copied by the scribe Aleksa. That body of material constitutes the majority of the manuscript. The second section will focus on the headings and other information material contained in the manuscript. In the third section I will treat the portion of the readings copied by the "anonymous" second scribe. In the last section the orthography of the colophon will be described.

4.1. Readings Copied by Aleksa

In Aleksa's portion of the readings the following consonant letters are found:

ВГДЖЗКЛМНПРСТФЭХЦШЩЯ
The symbols "п", "н" and "д" have been classified as individual letters instead of digraphs. I based this decision on a definition of a digraph as a combination of two or more elements, each of which is used independently in a minimally restricted range of orthographical environments. Under that definition the component "п" does not qualify since, in the portion of ME presently under consideration, it only occurs in the immediate proximity of one of three letters. The editors do not treat "п", "н" and "д" as independent letters. Rather, they regard them as variants of "п", "н" and "д", respectively. [1983:15, 21]

The sequence "жд" will not be treated as a digraph because of examples like "дьж*/дить" at 29g3-4. While I do not agree with the editors that non-separation of the components of a digraph is a sufficient criterion for according digraph status [1983:15], I do think that it is a necessary criterion.

The letter "2" is used exclusively to denote the numeral "6", e.g., at 8g16. It is never used in a word. All other consonant letters are used in words.10

The consonant letter "д" occurs in only two examples: "и/женю" at 10v9-10 and "жадеть" at 26b12.11
The letter "ψ" is found five times: "ψιμθε" at 21g22 and 209b23; "ψομμ" at 31v22 and 65g24; and "ψι" at 81v14.

There are only two instances of "ἀ" in its non-numerical use: "ἀλέξανδρο-/βο" at 153g24-25 and 158a18-19.

The letters "ε" and "φ" are used only in the representations of borrowed elements. Furthermore, "ε" and "φ" are not used interchangeably; e.g., if, in one instance, the representation of a word contains "ε" in a particular slot, then there generally will not be other examples of the same word in which "φ" replaces "ε". The one exception to that generalization is the word for "Alpheus". To two examples written "ἀλεσοβ-" (at 32b10-11 and 73v1-2), there are three with "φ" (at 56g14, 125g6 and 200g13).

In the portion of the manuscript under consideration, there are no examples of "πμτ" in place of "ππ".

The vowel letters which are used are listed below:

\[ \text{α ε ι ω ύ υ} \]

Four digraphs consisting of combinations of vowel letters also occur. They are "ογ", "ον", "ελ" and "η".12
With two exceptions, the letters "y" and "ь" only occur in the representations of borrowed elements. The exceptions are "capeфей" at 71v17 and "радовааху" at 199g7. In the first, "y" represents the reflex of a Slavic desinence which has been added to a non-Slavic stem. The latter example might result from an error in the typesetting, as the index lists it under an entry which has final "-oy". [1983:425]

I recorded only seven instances of the letter "i" in the portion of the readings under discussion, "icE" at 3b14, "рвби" at 4v3, "омвани/и" at 65a15-16, "івана" at 72b18, "ві/і" at 120g12-13, "ні/ш" at 164b1-2 and "івна" at 170a11. Moreover, in all except the first, the dot is not directly over the vertical line, but is offset to the left. That could mean that the intended letter for those examples was "и" and the second dot is simply missing for some reason in the typeset edition.

The letter "ж" occurs only eight times: "моож" at 154a15, 158g20 and 161b23; "моож" at 154b24 and 155a12; "твораш" at 164b22; and "лю/сли" at 211g8 and 211gl5-16.

Within the group of vowel letters and digraphs it is possible to delineate sets of symbols whose members manifest some degree of orthographical equivalence.
Here "orthographical equivalence" means that the letters or digraphs in such a set occupy corresponding slots in different instances of the representation of the same form of the same word.

For example, each of "x", "y" and "ov" stands in that type of relationship with the more frequent "oy" and, by extension, with each other. As evidence of that relationship, I list below several pairs and triplets. Within each pair or triplet, all parameters are constant except the choice of "x", "y", "ov" or "oy".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;oy&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;ov&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;x&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;y&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;богоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;богоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;богоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;богоу&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v20</td>
<td>7b17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;и/соусь&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;исоусь&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;исоусь&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;исоусь&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v11-12</td>
<td>13v14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Xов&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Xов&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Xов&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Xов&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a2</td>
<td>3v15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;оск/жденъ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;оск/жденъ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;оск/жденъ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;оск/жденъ&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a19-20</td>
<td>7a18-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;БМоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;БМоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;БМоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;БМоу&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a2</td>
<td>4a20</td>
<td>44b11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Тоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Тоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Тоу&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Тоу&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28g7</td>
<td>5v24</td>
<td>5b5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparative orthographical equivalence of each of "x", "y" and "ov" with "oy" serves as a point of departure for some specific comments about the use of the former three.
The letter "Ѳ" occurs over 500 times. In all but fourteen instances it is clearly the last letter on a line. The exceptions are listed below.

"ръц" 46a22
"оушт" 114g7
"бъ/р" 131a6-7
"мимопутъ/" 133b7
"яс" 154a21, 154v2, 158b14, 161v17
"ъо" 156v9
"спъдьмъ" 176a1
"тчъ/никвой" 196b14-15
"бывшоумъ" 208b9
"субракъ" 209g25
"равнинъ" 210b13

In addition, there is one example in which "Ѳ" is supralinear, although in terms of its appropriate intralinear position relative to the other letters of the word it would still be the last letter on the line. The example is "съвдѣтельствъѲ/емъ" at 5a9-10.

The fact that in line-final position "Ѳ" occupies slots in words which are more often filled by "ой" leads one to suspect that the use of "Ѳ" is designed to avoid separation of the components of "ой" with a line break.

There are over 600 instances of the letter "Ѳ" in the readings copied by Aleksa. Of those 600+, less than 30 (4-5%) are found in the menologion and the small number of readings which follow it, roughly 163g through 212g. As a point of comparison, of the 500+
instances of "у" in the readings copied by Aleksa, approximately 20% of them occur in that same section of the manuscript.

A disproportionately high number of instances of the digraph "ов" occur in various forms of the word for "Jesus" or "Jesus'". Out of approximately 85 instances of "ов", all but nine are in forms of those words. Moreover, four of the nine exceptions are in forms of the words for "Christ" (at 22a2 and 160g17) and "God" (at 7b17 and 210b20). The remaining five examples are "съёкок/плыша" at 3g13-14, "изидовть" at 7g17, "бъ/злежащо" at 38b22-23, "совботъ" at 155g19 and "совботъ" at 209g3. However, as Prof. Charles Gribble observed in a personal communication, three of those five, "съёкок/плыша", "изидовть" and "совботъ", are cited with "оу", not "ов", in the index. (see 1983:362, 440, 442)

Another set of vowel letters which display some degree of orthographical equivalence consists of "и", "и" and "!".13 Evidence for the relationship between the more prevalent "и" and each of the other two is more abundant than for the relationship between "и" and "!". A sampling of the data is presented below.
Bearing in mind this set of relationships, I will make some observations about the use of "î" and "îi".

Most instances of the letter "î" fit into one of three groups. The first group consists of non-Slavic personal names (e.g., "John", "Joseph", "Jeremiah"), non-Slavic geographical names (e.g., "Jerusalem", "Jordan (river)", "Judea") and several other borrowings (e.g., "Judean (person)", "iēpē-"/"iēpē-" ("priest")), as well as possessive adjectives derived from these words and the word denoting "resident of Jerusalem" which is derived from the word for "Jerusalem". A defining feature of the members of this group is that "î", when it occurs in them, is always the first letter of the word.14 Several examples follow.

"iwanoù" 5g5
"iwanova" 8b2
"iērousali/mē" 3b10-11
"iērousali/mēsīť" 22a12-13
"iēpē/salimītēnē" 13v4-5
"iōnē" 37v1
"iōninē" 4a25
"iōsīfē" 41v11
The second group is comparatively small and is not entirely unrelated to the first. It contains the words for "Isaiah" and "Isaiah's". These items are not subsumed in the first group because "i" is not always the first letter in these words, although it does occur exactly once in every instance of them. The letter "i" is either the first or the fourth in the members of this group. Examples include "ісаіх" at 2g18 and 21b7; "ісаіх" at 36b5; "іса/іно" at 39a15-16; and "ісаіӀ" at 21b13, 21b18 and 42b20.

Members in the final group share the feature that "i" is the last letter on the line. The data set numbers in the hundreds. A small sample is given below.

"пв/дє" 2a16-17
"вяни" 4g16
"і" 5v18
"пв/тврь" 11g2-3
"мі/ра" 23v5-6
"ні" 39a13

The most likely explanation for the last usage is an attempt to conserve space in order to fit one additional letter on the line, since "i" generally replaces the more frequent "н" in these items. If that is a valid analysis, then one could argue for inclusion in the third group of another 25-30 instances.
in which "i" is "close" to the end of the line. Here "close" is defined as three or fewer letters following "i" on the same line.\textsuperscript{17}

The three groups described above account for more than 95\% of the instances of "i" in the readings copied by Aleksa. That is based on a total number of occurrences which exceeds 750.

The distribution of "i" is extremely restricted. There are hundreds of examples, but all except 20 are found either in the word for "Jesus" or in the word for "Jesus'". Moreover, it occurs primarily in abbreviations of those two words. A small sample is provided below.

"ГСЪ" 13g12
"ГСЪ" 17a13
"СОВСОВ" 38v16
"ГСВ" 6g1

Among the exceptions, thirteen are in examples of the word for "John". The other seven are "ІЄΡ(Ο)ΣΛΗ" at 11v25, "АСЄ(У)" at 52b7, "Ч/С" at 163g8-9, "ІЄΡ(Ο)ΣΛΗ/НЄ" at 184g9-10, "ІΩАНН" at 202a24, "ІЄΡ/САЛИМ" at 203v16-17 and "ІЄΡΟУ/САЛИМА" at 208b12-13.\textsuperscript{18}

A third instance of the phenomenon under consideration involves the pair "ο" and "ω". The more common of the two, by a wide margin, is "ο", although
the token frequency of "ω" is not insignificant, approximately 400 occurrences. The items which follow offer some evidence in support of the claim of interchangeability between the two.

"ο" (preposition) "ω"
61g15 176v20
"ἱοῦ &/ομ" "ἱοῦω/κ" 74v24-25
"απο/γα" "απογα" 20a20
"Ιωαν" "Ιωαν" 191g24

A careful examination of the examples with "ω" reveals that there are some identifiable patterns in its distribution. In more than three fourths of the items, roughly 325, "ω" is part of the representation of a non-Slavic base, usually a personal name. The pairs "John"/"John's", "Joseph"/"Joseph's" and "Moses"/"Moses'" alone account for nearly 215 occurrences of "ω".

Furthermore, in token frequency, "ω" predominates over "ο" for many of these non-Slavic bases. Thus, the spellings "Ιωαν-"/"Ιωαν-"/"Ιωαν-" in "John" or "John's" are encountered a total of 138 times. In contrast, I recorded only four instances of the correlates which have "ο" in place of "ω". Similarly, "Ιωσιφ-" and "Ιωσιφ-" collectively are used 33 times to
only two for "иосиф-" and "йосиф-", while "Moses" and "Moses'" are never written with initial "мо-", but have initial "мо-" on 43 occasions.

Another subset of occurrences of "ω" consists of prepositional phrases in which the preposition is either "about, concerning" or "по" and the word immediately following the preposition would be reconstructed with initial *о or *у. In this group of examples one finds the sequences "ω о-/"(-)о ω-"/"ω oy-" instead of *

"(-)о о-"/*"(-)о oy-". The first, "ω о-", is the most common, occurring eleven times. In all of them the preposition is "about, concerning". Moreover, I did not locate any instances in which that preposition is spelled "о" and the representation of the word which immediately follows begins with "о" which is not part of the digraph "oy". Sample data are presented below.

"ω одежди" 34b17
"ω обод" 47g3
"ω съёмъ" 96v22
"ω отрочати" 181b13

The second variant, "(-)о ω-", is found on four occasions. Two involve "about, concerning" and in two the preposition is "по". However, unlike "about, concerning", for "по" the variant "по о-" is more common, by a ratio of 10:2. The four instances with
"(-)ο ω-' are "ο ωμή/νία" at 5g4-5, "πο ωσμή" at 6b19, "πο ωμή/νία" at 6g8 and "ο ωμή" at 148b3.

There are seven examples for "ω ου-' and in all of them the preposition is "about, concerning". Opposing these seven are one occurrence of "ο ου-' and two of "πο ου-". The seven containing "ω ου-" are "ω οιάν" at 33g15-16, 50a20-21, 105v24, 133g19 and 150b7-8; "ω οιάν" at 128v3-4; and "ω/οιάνσιάν" at 150b6-7.19

The preposition which means "about, concerning" is the focus of the third subset as well. It is consistently written "ω" when its object is the proper name "John". That prepositional phrase is used seven times.

In six of its seven iterations the interjection which means "Oh!" is written "ω".

On eleven occasions "ω" is the first letter in the representation of a Slavic morpheme suffixed to a non-Slavic base which ends orthographically in "β" or "ε". However, corresponding items with "ο" instead of "ω" are more numerous for the group of non-Slavic bases as a whole and for most of the individual bases as well. Four examples with "ω" are "ανδρψωλά" at 4b8, "φαρί/σεφά" at 85a7-8, "ιερον/βί" at 125a24-25 and "εβεδψωλά" at 211a19. In a personal communication,
Prof. Daniel Collins recommended the removal of the constraint relating to "э"/"е", in which case two more items, "селекаб" at 70b5 and "семаб" at 70v3, could be added to this group.

In the preceding five subsets, if a data item belongs to one of them, then it does not belong to any of the others. That follows from the parameters which define the subsets. The same cannot be said of the last coherent group of examples with "ω". The members of this group share the feature that the "ω" in question is the last character on the line.

Ten items belong only to this subset: "ω/чноу" at 22g8-9; "ω/брать" at 39a25-39b1; "ω/тъ" at 40v15-16; "ω/всъкъ" at 75v24-25; "ω/троковица" at 86g19-20; "ω/выцъ" at 90g23-24; "ω/гнъ" at 92g20-21 and 184v9-10; "ω/сладъ" at 93g19-20; "ω/частъ" at 135g22-23; and "ω/чищатъ" at 191g16-17. As one can see, "ω" is the first letter of a word in all ten instances. In addition, I recorded several other examples of "ω" which meet the criterion for membership in this subset and simultaneously belong in one of the other five groups as well. One such example is "церковь"/"ви", which was cited above. In a personal communication, Prof. Daniel Collins suggested that, since "ω" is wider than "о", "ω" might have been chosen in an attempt to fill
some extra space on the line so that the following
consonant letter would be carried to the start of the
next line.

Finally, there are sixteen occurrences of "ω"
which do not fit into any of the preceding groups. An
exhaustive list follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;ω Н ИЗЪ&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;ОФЪЛИ&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;ОТРОКЪ&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75v22</td>
<td>93a19</td>
<td>182a10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ОПРАВЪДИЩА&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ОЧЕ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ОТИДЕ&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a22</td>
<td>94b25</td>
<td>188a16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;О ИМЕНИ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ОГНЬ/НО&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ОТРОЧА&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80b1</td>
<td>102g4-5</td>
<td>200a20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ОГНЬ/КО&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ОГНЬНААРО&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;О СИХЪ&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85g18</td>
<td>165v24</td>
<td>212a22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ОГНА&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ОЧЕ&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87g25</td>
<td>173a23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ОНИМЕ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ОТРОЧА&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92v20</td>
<td>181g10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear from the list, in all sixteen "ω" is the
first letter of a word.

There are other sets of letters and digraphs whose
members manifest some level of orthographical
equivalence. They include "У"/"У", "У"/"У" and
"Ъ"/"Ъ". The data on the first pair offer nothing of
interest and, in fact, there might not be any such
alternation in the manuscript itself. (cf. Щуковская
1983:15; Lunt 1984:36) As for "У" and "У", one can
state that "Gospel", usually written "еуангеπ-", never
has "У". In contrast, for "Moses"/"Moses'", "МОУС-" is
roughly six times as frequent as "МОУС-" in a data set
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of some 30 items, although there are additional examples written simply "мос-". The instances in which "э" and "е" seem to be interchangeable will be examined in the following two chapters in a different context.

Finally, there are several words which display an isolated type of alternation in their spelling. For example, the use of "й" in "рать/вр" at 18а15-16 is unique in that this word is normally spelled "-вр-", as examples of the form "раввр" at 4а8, 4в23, 5г6 and elsewhere demonstrate. Similarly, the word represented as "теп" at 35б17 is normally spelled with "й" or "у" as the second letter, e.g., "тепт" at 56в4 and "тепт" at 81а3. There are other instances, but these two should suffice to demonstrate the point.

In addition to the statements about the distribution of individual letters and digraphs, there are several more general observations about the orthography which should be made. The first such generalization is that, within a column, vowel letters predominate overwhelmingly as the last letter on the line. (cf. 1983:24)

There are exceptions to this rule and the largest group of them consists of items, approximately 80, which have the sequence vowel letter + "р"/"и" as the last two letters on the line. Furthermore, in all
80, the following line begins with a consonant letter which belongs to the same word as the sequence vowel letter + "р"/"л".22

In all but seven of those examples, "р"/"л" is followed on the same line by "н". The seven which deviate from this pattern are "сър'/вьно" at 31v18-19, "ал'/чопъ" at 55b23-24, "ал/чоть" at 55v10-11, "възал/ка" at 78v9-10, "възал/какъ" at 117b14-15, "отъвър'/жеца" at 145a9-10 and "отъвър'/же" at 150v7-8.

The remaining instances in which a consonant letter is the last letter on the line are listed below. As one can see, in most of the examples the consonant letter in question is followed by a diacritic.23,24

"всёх"/" 3v12    "еуан/гели же" 54v14-15
"ник"/" 18a13 "дон'/дже" 90g16-17
"вам"/" 5a13 "талан"/"тъ" 137a11-12
"худбом"/" 10v21 "ман"/"моу" 212g11-12
"тём"/" 95g24 "оупращ'/наахоу" 62g15-16

"дък'/дить" 29g3-4    "вие'/сагй" 117g17-18
"вък'/дадахъ" 117v18-19    "вие'/сфагй" 129v16-17
"важ'/днаахоу" 171v5-6    "мат'/ватовъ" 179a22-23

"матеос/" 32b9    "неф'/еалимпи" 187a2-3
"вартикос/" 105a12    "неф'/еалима" 187a6-7
"/с/" 184v18

Another group of generalizations involves statements about the use of symbols at the level of the word. I will begin with the question of which letters and digraphs stand adjacent to each other within words.
As a practical matter, these generalizations answer the question, "Within a word (as that term was defined above), for which choices of the variables C and V does one find the sequences VV, CC, CV, VC in ME, where C represents any consonant letter and V represents any vowel letter or digraph?"25

For the sequences CC and VC, I did not find any generalizations which merit attention. That leaves the sequences VV and CV. I will begin with the latter.

In the discussion of the sequence CV I will exclude from consideration the vowel letters "y", "i", "y", "i" and "m" along with the digraph "ov" because those symbols have comparatively low token frequencies and/or lexical frequencies. The vowel letter "o" will be disregarded as well since the only consonant letter with which it forms the sequence CV is "m". The letters "i" and "y" and the digraph "m" will also be set aside as their lexical distribution is paralleled by the lexical distribution of "m", "oy" and "y", respectively. Moreover, the token frequency of each member of the former set is significantly lower than that of its counterpart from the latter.26

Among the consonant letters I will disregard "y", "m" and "y" because of the very small number of
instances in which those letters are used in words. I will also ignore "§" since it only occurs in its numerical use.

The generalizations will be presented from two perspectives. First, I will list the vowel letters and digraphs which are found after particular consonant letters. Then I will present essentially the same information from the perspective of the vowel letters and digraphs. In both discussions, the threshold for inclusion of a particular CV combination is five instances in the portion of the manuscript under consideration.

I will start with the letters "ß" and "е". After "ß" one finds the vowel letters "а", "и", "о", "у", "е" and "ъ". In addition, there are three instances each in which "ß" combines with the digraphs "ю" and "оу".

The list for "е" consists of "а", "е", "о", "ъ", "ъ" and "и" as well as the digraph "ю". It also combines with "ъ" and "оу" three times apiece.

Among the remaining consonant letters, one finds that some can be grouped together based on their combinatorial possibilities.

The first group contains the letters "с", "н", "в", "м" and "т". They are followed by the vowel letters "а", "а", "е", "о", "и", "и", "ъ", "ъ", "ъ" and "ъ".
They are also followed by the digraphs "th" and "oy". From the group of vowel letters and digraphs which are under consideration in this discussion, "w", "w" and "w" are not used after these five consonant letters.

The second group consists of "c" and "p". The vowel letters "a", "a", "e", "o", "i", "x", "h", "t", as well as the digraphs "th" and "oy" follow these consonant letters. Thus, this group differs from the preceding one only in the fact that these consonant letters also form a CV sequence with "w". The set of vowel letters and digraphs which form CV sequences with "s" differs from that for "c" and "p" only in the fact that there are just three instances of the combination "sx". Thus, the threshold has not been met for inclusion of "x" in the list for "s".

Members of the third group of consonant letters display the greatest variety in terms of the quantity of vowel letters and digraphs with which they form CV sequences. The consonant letters "l", "n" and "d" combine with all of the vowel letters and digraphs under consideration except "w". It should be noted that in all examples of the sequences "ld" and "dth" tautolexical "th" immediately precedes "d".27

The number of different vowel letters and digraphs which unite with members of the fourth group, composed
of "k" and "r", is noticeably less than it is for the preceding three groups. These two consonant letters combine with "a", "e", "o", "и", "ь", "х", "у" and "оу". The range of combinations for "x" is the same as for "k" and "r", except that there are only four instances of the sequence "xe". Significantly, in all instances containing "k", "r" or "x" immediately followed by "и" or "е" those sequences are part of the representation of borrowed elements. In native Slavic forms the reflex of reconstructed *u is never written "и" after "k", "r" or "x".

Except for the pair "ж" and "ц", the collection of vowel letters and digraphs differs slightly for each of the remaining seven consonant letters. The pertinent facts are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant Letter</th>
<th>Vowel Letters and Digraphs Which Follow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;п&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;а&quot;, &quot;е&quot;, &quot;и&quot;, &quot;ь&quot;, &quot;у&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;н&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;а&quot;, &quot;е&quot;, &quot;и&quot;, &quot;ь&quot;, &quot;у&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ш&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;а&quot;, &quot;е&quot;, &quot;и&quot;, &quot;ь&quot;, &quot;у&quot;, &quot;х&quot;, &quot;оу&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ч&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;а&quot;, &quot;е&quot;, &quot;и&quot;, &quot;ь&quot;, &quot;у&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ж&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;а&quot;, &quot;е&quot;, &quot;и&quot;, &quot;ь&quot;, &quot;б&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;щ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;а&quot;, &quot;е&quot;, &quot;и&quot;, &quot;ь&quot;, &quot;б&quot;, &quot;оу&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ц&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;а&quot;, &quot;е&quot;, &quot;и&quot;, &quot;ь&quot;, &quot;у&quot;, &quot;б&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the sequences "мешь", "мъ" and "шь" occur four times apiece, while "мешь" and "шь" are encountered twice each. The combination "цъ" is found once.
If one examines CV sequences from the perspective of the vowel letters and digraphs, there is no neat division into groups, which contrasts somewhat with the situation found above. The letter "\( \text{A} \)" stands alone in that, except for one instance (see footnote 27), it does not occur after consonant letters. At the other end of the spectrum, the letter "\( \text{a} \)" occurs after all consonant letters and "\( \text{e} \)" combines with all consonant letters except "\( \text{x} \)".

Of the remaining vowel letters and digraphs, only "\( \text{o} \)" and "\( \text{y} \)" can be grouped together. The data are given below.
Vowel Letter/ Consonant Letters Which Combine Digraph with It to Form CV Sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Letter</th>
<th>Consonant Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;е&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;л&quot;, &quot;н&quot;, &quot;д&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ё&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;д&quot;, &quot;с&quot;, &quot;з&quot;, &quot;р&quot;, &quot;л&quot;, &quot;п&quot;, &quot;ч&quot;, &quot;ш&quot;, &quot;ц&quot;, &quot;т&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;а&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;о&quot;, &quot;п&quot;, &quot;в&quot;, &quot;м&quot;, &quot;д&quot;, &quot;т&quot;, &quot;с&quot;, &quot;з&quot;, &quot;р&quot;, &quot;л&quot;, &quot;н&quot;, &quot;п&quot;, &quot;ч&quot;, &quot;ш&quot;, &quot;ц&quot;, &quot;т&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;б&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;о&quot;, &quot;п&quot;, &quot;в&quot;, &quot;м&quot;, &quot;д&quot;, &quot;т&quot;, &quot;с&quot;, &quot;з&quot;, &quot;р&quot;, &quot;л&quot;, &quot;н&quot;, &quot;п&quot;, &quot;ч&quot;, &quot;ш&quot;, &quot;ц&quot;, &quot;т&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other orthographical sequence which will be discussed is VV. In this sequence the vowel letters and digraphs which replace the second V are the focus. 28

First, the letters "ь", "ь" and "ч" and the digraphs "м", "н" and "оу" do not occupy the second slot in the sequence VV.
The letter "а" occurs only twice as the second component of the sequence ВВ. The examples are "МОЖА" at 8а8 and "СВОЖА" at 178г20.

With the exception of "ВСЕ(1)" at 52б7, the letter "ч" occupies second position in the sequence ВВ only in the words for "Jesus" and "Jesus'". The list of examples includes "ИСОВСО" at 37г10, "ИСОВС" at 38г17 and "ИСОВСОВАМА" at 43а4 and others.

Aside from "РАЙ/БИ" at 18г15-16, "ъ" occupies second position in the sequence ВВ only in the words for "Moses" and "Moses'". Examples are found at 3вл6, 5а17-18, 8в8, 8в10 and 13б18 and elsewhere.

While there are only six instances in which "щ" replaces the second V in ВВ, the fact that "щ" is almost always the last letter on the line (see above) means that, as a practical matter, the set of conditions under which "щ" could be the second in a series of two tautolexical vowel letters or digraphs is highly restrictive. The pertinent examples are at 5а20-21, 94а21-22, 133а20-21, 150вл6-17, 163в25-163вл and 175а9-10.

None of the remaining vowel letters and digraphs, "Я", "Я", "Ю", "С", "А", "И", "И", "У", "Е", "Е",
"ʍ", "ω" and "oy", merit individual treatment. They all do occur as the replacement for the second V in the sequence VV.

The collection of generalizations just presented illustrates one methodological issue in the study of manuscripts. Given any finite body of data, there are always many empirically accurate generalizations which can be formulated. The question is whether all generalizations are equal. If they are not, then how does one rank them?

One way to establish a differential is to demonstrate that one generalization follows as a direct consequence of a second generalization. Thus, for example, if a particular letter or digraph only occurs in one word (even if it occurs in that word every time the word is used in the text) and the position which it occupies in that word is immediately after a consonant letter, then one could formulate at least two generalizations. First, the letter or digraph only occurs in a particular position in a particular word. Second, the letter or digraph is never found after a tautolexical vowel letter. In this instance, the second generalization follows from the first, while the
first in no way follows from the second. Therefore, one could state that the first is the preferred generalization for the given phenomenon.

Unfortunately, the relationship of implicature between two generalizations is usually not as clear as in the example in the preceding paragraph. Therefore, it is necessary to find an additional tool which will help to justify assertions of such a relationship. That tool is the principle which also permits scholars to assert that a scribe was guided by orthographical rules which transcend a mere itemized list of all words and the "acceptable" orthography for each.

The principle is that the orthography of any particular text should be juxtaposed to a theoretical text in which the letters and digraphs are distributed in a "random" manner. Here, by "random" I mean that whenever it is possible to isolate a set of letters whose members are equivalent in the sense that they occupy the same relative positions in the same words, then the comparison should be made with a theoretical text in which each of the members of such a set occurs with roughly the same frequency in each of the words.

The goal in such a comparison is to identify the features in the actual text which deviate from the distribution which would occur in the theoretical text.
Admittedly, there is a need to define what constitutes a deviation which is significant and one could formulate mathematically rigorous criteria, but I have settled for an approach which appeals to a more intuitive sense of "excessive deviation" from a theoretically random distribution. This concession was motivated by considerations of time.

Another generalization involving vowel letters and digraphs addresses their use in word-initial position. In terms of their distribution in this position, the symbols can be divided into three groups. The letters "b", "b", "y", "y" and "x" as well as the digraphs "m", "w" and "ov" never occupy the position of first letter in a word. The letters "x" and "a" occur in word-initial position one time each. The examples are "x" at 18a6 and "x" at 12b3, respectively. The remaining letters, "e", "o", "w", "o", "a", "n", "i", "e", "e", "w", "i", "i", and the digraph "oy" all stand in word-initial position with some degree of frequency.

The last topic to be considered in the discussion of the readings copied by Aleksa is the structure of marked abbreviations. Those abbreviations share the feature that they contain the first letter (or digraph) and the last letter (or digraph) from the full orthographical representation of the word being
abbreviated and both are intralinear. In addition, some of the intervening letters and/or digraphs are often present as well. Among the letters and/or digraphs omitted entirely in the abbreviated representation of a word, at least one is a vowel letter or digraph. Finally, when present, there is generally only one supralinear letter per word. There are exceptions to the pattern described above, but they are comparatively few in number. Below I list a small set of examples which conform to the parameters just described.

"глише" 55a12  
"м(о)лтвоу" 55b19  
"ц(с)рд" 61b10  
"лл" 64a20  
"гн" 66a1  
"чл(о)вьскааро" 73g21

4.2. Headings

The next body of material to be examined is comprised of the headings. The set of consonant letters used in that section of the manuscript includes:

"б в г д ж з к л м н п р с т ф е х щ ч ш ю ѣ "

This list differs from the list for the corresponding readings in that it lacks "ψ", while it contains "]+$.
The letters "2" and "5" are only used in their numerical meaning. In fact, "5" only occurs once, at 194a14.

In three of the ten examples with "2" in its non-numerical use, a portion of "2", "v", is absent. Those instances are at 193g20, 196a12 and 197g5. However, it is as likely as not that these "errors" arose when the typeset edition was printed and do not reflect the actual content of the manuscript.

The letters "e", "о", "å" and "ψ" are only found in the representations of borrowed elements. As for the distribution of "e" and "о", the only exception to their non-interchangeability, as it was in the readings copied by Aleksa, is the word for "Alpheus". There is one example with "е", at 171v11, and one with "о", at 175b10.

The vowels letters and digraphs used in that part of the manuscript are:

а е и ю о у о у о у м н б н а к и й у y v v

As compared to the list for the readings copied by Aleksa, "ж" is absent, while "в" and "з" are present.

With one exception, "у", "ü", "v" and "z" are found exclusively in the representations of elements which were comparatively recent borrowings at the time when Mstislavovo Evangelie was compiled. The lone
exception is "cv(Ơ)" at 22v16, although there is some doubt about this example since it is cited in the index under the entry spelled "coy(Ơ)". [1983:486] The preceding generalization does not apply to instances of "y" and "v" which are part of the digraphs "oy" and "ov", respectively.

There is only one example of "v", in "γύρια" at 175v3. However, I must admit that in the manuscript portion of the typeset edition it seemed that the letter following "r" was "y". Nonetheless, I accepted the "v" given in the index despite the fact that, given the problems with the indices, one cannot dismiss the possibility that this item is listed incorrectly as well.33

The letter "v", outside of the digraph "ov", is found over 250 times in the headings. All but three are in examples of the word for "gospel", either abbreviated or written in full. The three exceptions are "cv(Ơ)" at 22v16, "λι/τύριια" at 130a19-20 and "συμφώνα" at 163v24.34

The letter "i" occurs only twice in the headings, at 141b9 and 175b19-20, and both examples suffer from the problem which cast doubt on the majority of instances of this letter in the readings copied by Aleksa. The dot is offset to the left of the vertical
line. In fact, in the latter of the two there even appears to be a trace of a second dot just to the right of the first.

The use of "ι" parallels its use in the readings copied by Aleksa. The two main groups described earlier, foreign borrowings with initial "ι" and instances in which "ι" is the last letter on the line, account for over 90% of the examples with "ι" in the headings. That is based on a data set containing more than 125 items.

All but two of the instances of "ι" are the first letter in the word for "John" or the word for "Jesus". The exceptions are "στι(χ)" at 185g17 and 205v11. However, that is based on a rather modest number of examples, about thirty.

The headings contain only three examples of the digraph "ις". They are "λούκευ" at 74a1 and 76b23 as well as "ουλιανδι" 192g21.

The distribution of "υ" in the headings contrasts rather sharply with its use in the readings copied by Aleksa. The letter is found approximately 70 times. In only nine examples is it clearly the last letter on the line. In an additional five items it is the last intralinear letter, but in all five there is a supralinear letter which belongs to the same word and
which, if it were intralinear, would have followed "♂". Finally, in 31 examples it is the second to the last letter on the line and the letter which follows is a consonant letter, a situation which, for practical purposes, does not occur in the readings.

A comparable situation obtains with respect to the use of "ov". In the readings copied by Aleksa, the overwhelming majority of examples of that digraph are in forms of the words for "Jesus" and "Jesus'". In the headings, of roughly 115 instances of "ov", only two occur in representations of those words and those two are in incipits. About half of the iterations of "ov" follow initial "c" in the word for "Saturday". Just over 30% follow initial "ji" in the word for "Luke". The remaining items are isolated.

In addition, although the orthographical equivalence of the letters "Χ" and "♂" and the digraphs "ov" and "oy" is maintained in the headings, the relative frequencies of "Χ", "♂" and "ov" differ strikingly from their relative frequencies in the readings. In the readings the most frequent of the three was "Χ" (600+ instances), then "♂" (500+ instances) and finally "ov" (about 85 instances).
the headings "ov" occurs most often (100+ examples), followed by "о" (about 70 examples) with "x" in third place (five examples).

The last letter-specific issues to be addressed in this section concern "о". First, that symbol is actually more frequent in the headings, occurring nearly 550 times, than in the readings which were the subject of the first section. It is also distributed differently. On nearly 375 occasions it is found in the representation of the preposition which means "from, by". In those examples the preposition is written "о". Approximately 170 occurrences are part of the representations of non-Slavic bases, with over 100 of those in iterations of the personal name "John".

The other eight examples of "о" are listed below.

"о саараншни" 14g21   "езедео(в)"  196а5
"о/мтари " 109v24-25   "обрэнени" 197b1
"о/п"  179b23-24   "обража"  204gl1
"(о)но"  190gl1   "сходн(к)"  205v5

In the examination of the readings copied by Aleksa, I discussed the degree to which vowel letters and digraphs predominate as the last letter on the line. In the headings, one finds no such strong tendency. In fact, consonant letters are frequently the last letter on the line in headings.

126
With respect to the other non-letter-specific issues considered in the analysis of the readings copied by Aleksa, I will only treat them to the extent that there is some phenomenon which occurs in the headings, but does not occur in the readings. The reasons for this decision are the lower total amount of data in the headings, as opposed to the readings; the high degree of repetition in the headings; and the formulaic nature of much of the material in the headings.

With that in mind, there is nothing noteworthy in the headings on the topic of CV combinations which one finds. However, in VV sequences the headings deviate from the readings in one respect. In the headings there are four instances in which the digraph "ov" occupies the second position, "sao(T)" at 129v12, 130g15, 133b9 and 139g21. In the readings, "ov" is never found in that position.

The headings also differ from the readings copied by Aleksa in the use of one vowel letter and one digraph in word-initial position. More specifically, "y" occurs once and "ov" occurs three times in word-initial position. The relevant examples are
The structure of abbreviations is rather more complex in the headings than in the readings discussed above. While one does find examples which conform to the pattern elaborated in the preceding section, there seems to be another model which was used alongside the first. According to this model, the final X letters and digraphs are deleted from the full orthographical representation of a word, where X is some integer greater than zero, but less than the total number of letters and digraphs in the representation. Then either the resulting truncated form is used or the final letter of that truncated form is superscripted to produce the abbreviation. This latter approach is used with particular frequency for words denoting the months of the year, the days of the week and the names of the gospel writers as well as with the word for "gospel".

As extreme examples of this pattern one can cite "(в)" 166g11 and "реноуар" 192g16. The first represents the word for "time". All letters except the first have been omitted and the first letter has been superscripted. The other item is the word for
"January". In this instance, the "abbreviation" results from omission of only one letter, the final one.

However, there are also many examples which lie between those two extremes in terms of their structure. Several of them are listed below.38

"ПА(т)" 22b1
"ПО/НЕ(Д)" 58v3-4
"МАТЕ" 63v25
"МАР(К)" 65g7

Finally, there are also abbreviations in which elements of both basic methods seem to be present.

4.3. Readings Copied by Second Scribe

The third section of the manuscript consists of the readings on lines 67b18-67g11, inclusive, and 67g13-68a20, inclusive.39 The set of consonant letters found in those readings is presented below.

О Б Р А Й К СК Ј И П Р С Т Х Ц Ч Ш

A list of the vowel letters and digraphs in those readings follows.

А Е І О Ю ОУОУ Ъ У Ь Ў Ж А Х У

Obviously, these two sets of letters are smaller than the corresponding sets in the readings copied by Aleksa and the headings. However, I hesitate to attach significance to that fact due to the very limited
amount of material involved. For the same reason, it is not possible to assert anything of substance about the use of individual letters or digraphs.

With respect to the other features discussed in the preceding two sections, the predominance of vowel letters and digraphs at the end of lines corresponds to the situation found in the readings copied by Aleksa. In fact, disregarding non-letter symbols, the only deviation from the pattern is "амин/" 67g7.

The only other feature which I will mention concerns the structure of abbreviations in these two readings. They conform to the pattern found in the readings copied by Aleksa.

4.4. Colophon

Based upon its content, it appears that the colophon contains material written by three different individuals. Aleksa seems to be responsible for the text on lines 212g23-213a17, inclusive. An individual named "зади" appears to have written 213a19-213a21, inclusive, while lines 213a22-213b21, inclusive, seem to be the work of someone named "Наслав". I will discuss each of the three separately.
4.4.1. Aleksa

In Aleksa's portion of the colophon the following consonant letters and vowel letters and digraphs are found.

Consonant Letters
спгдзэклмнпрстежцш

Vowel Letters and Digraphs
аеиновиььъявуу

These lists lack a number of the letters/digraphs which were present in one or more of the preceding sections. However, the small amount of material in this section, only 19 lines of text, means that no significant conclusions can be drawn from that fact.

There are only two other observations which I want to make with respect to this passage. First, except for 213a16, which ends in "εya(τ)/ἐ", all lines end in a vowel letter or digraph, if one ignores non-letter symbols. Second, with the exception of "(κ)ε" 213a14, abbreviations fit the basic pattern found in the readings copied by Aleksa.1

4.4.2. Žadën

The entry by Žadën" occupies less than three lines. Therefore, no substantive statements can be
made about the orthographical system which he was using. However, I will list the consonant letters and vowel letters and digraph which occur.  

Consonant Letters

\[ \text{В Г Д Ж З К Л М Н П Р С Т Е Ч Ш} \]

Vowel Letters and Digraph

\[ \text{А Е И О У Ъ Ы Ь Э Я} \]

4.4.3. Naslav"

The material written by Naslav" covers 25 lines, just slightly more than Aleksa's portion. Therefore, as in the other two portions of the colophon, the data set is too small to allow one to draw definitive conclusions about an orthographical system. Nonetheless, the consonant letters and the vowel letters and digraphs which Naslav" uses are listed below.

Consonant Letters

\[ \text{Б В Г Д Ж З К Л М Н П Р С Т Х Ц Ч Ш} \]

Vowel Letters and Digraphs

\[ \text{А Е И О У Ъ Ы Ь Э Я Х У} \]

In general, Naslav" maintains the practice that the last letter symbol on the line is a vowel letter or digraph. The only possible deviation from that pattern is "\(\text{eye(r)}\)" at 213a24.
In addition, with the exception of the example just listed and three instances of "\( ^{\text{\footnote{Note}} \text{\footnote{Note}}} ^{\text{\footnote{Note}}} \)\), at 213b18 (twice) and 213b19 (once), the structure of abbreviations matches that described for abbreviations in the readings copied by Aleksa.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1 Parentheses are used to enclose letters which were supralinear in the original manuscript but which in the typeset edition of ME have been placed on the text line. [1983:26]

I noted two uses for square brackets, "[" and "]". In several instances they enclose material which has been interpolated by the editors, e.g., at 65g18, 65g19, 202g2, 202g4 and elsewhere. They are also used to delimit material which was neither intralinear nor supralinear, e.g., at 161a25.

2 The symbol which the editors represent as "." occurs rather frequently. Although I did not specifically track its distribution, it never seems to stand between two tautolexical letters. In fact, quite often it is found where one would expect a clausal boundary. It is also used immediately before and after letters denoting numerals.

3 The symbols ":" and "~" are usually found together and in the order in which they are listed. They generally mark the end of something, e.g., the end of a heading or a reading. The symbol rendered as "\(\rightarrow\)" is used in a manner similar to "\(~\)" although it occurs with lower frequency. The symbol "\(\ast\)" is found at the end of readings as well.

4 I noted only three instances of the symbol "\(". They are at 161v19, 199g4-5 and 209a15. In the first two, "\(\)" is positioned where an expected letter "\(h\)" or "\(i\)" has been omitted. The motivation for the use of "\(\)" in the third example is unclear.

5 I also disregarded the hyphens at 117g23, 176g20 and 201v17; what seems to be the right half of a titlo at 136b10; as well as the symbol "\(\div\)" at 197b16. These are absent from the list given above because, except for the hyphen at 117g23, I suspect that they represent errors in the typesetting.

I should add that the non-letter symbols discussed in this footnote and those listed above might not constitute a comprehensive list of all non-letter symbols present in this edition of ME. In compiling the list, I attempted to include those symbols which
occur with some degree of frequency as well the isolated symbols which I chanced to notice while analyzing the manuscript.

6 To illustrate this point, there are no instances in the text in which a word written in full contains the sequence "-тн-". However, there are multiple occurrences of that sequence if we include abbreviations. For example, one finds the abbreviation "Фъ" ("Lord") at 14v4, 104a11 and elsewhere.

7 For this dissertation I decided to accept the editors assertion that the portion of the manuscript from 67b18 through 68a20, inclusive, is not the work of Aleksa, but rather of a second "anonymous" scribe. [1983:9] However, I should add that, since one of the primary methods for determining whether two sections of text were copied by the same person is to compare the handwriting in the two sections and since I am working with a typeset edition of ME, I am not in a position to confidently evaluate claims of attribution.

8 I would like to thank Prof. Charles Gribble for emphasizing the importance of this division on the basis that there is no reason to assume that every scribe who participated in the composition of ME would have been working with the same system of orthographical rules. (cf. Lunt 1988:16)

9 There is one problem with the division as it has been constituted. The initials are not being considered independently. However, it would seem that the principal generalizations which could be made on the basis of a set of data like that would relate to the manner in which the individual letters are formed. Since I am working with a typeset edition, that type of discussion is precluded.

10 The editors state that the letter "ψ" is only used in its numerical meaning. [1983:15] However, only four pages later, while describing the manner in which "ψ" was formed, they refer to several examples in which it is not used to denote a numeral, but rather occurs in a word. [1983:19] (cf. Cesko 1985:145)

11 When they cite these two forms in their introduction, the editors omit the element "ν" from "ψ" in the second one. [1983:18] I would like to thank Professor Charles Gribble who noted this fact.
The rather large number of examples, on the order of 100, of "н" is somewhat surprising considering the editors statement that "[В]уква т в первой части имеет т". [1983:15]

An argument could be made that "и" should be included in this set. However, as the total number of examples of "и" is quite small and most of them are doubtful, I decided to ignore "и" in this discussion.

It should be emphasized that "й" is not found in all instances of the words which belong to this group. When "й" is absent, "н" generally stands in its place.

The plausibility of this hypothesis naturally depends on the relative widths of "й" and "н" and, as Prof. Daniel Collins noted in a personal communication, the degree to which Aleksa maintained a consistent margin.

In this usage the relationship between "й" and "н" would seem to be similar to the relationship between "й" and "ов". (see above)

For one to accept the argument that the examples in which "й" is "close" to the end of the line are motivated by a desire to conserve space, it is necessary to assume a certain degree of advance planning on the part of Aleksa in the process of copying. I admit that even if one accepts that proposition, there could be disagreements over the amount of advance planning and, in that connection, I cannot offer a principle upon which I based the definition of "close" which was adopted for this discussion.

Although it is theoretically possible that the skewed distribution of "й" and "ов" is the result of chance, it is not very likely. Rather, it would seem that one of two situations obtains. Either Aleksa was guided by orthographical conventions which were unique to the words for "Jesus" and "Jesus'" or in these particular examples Aleksa simply retained the orthography of the protograph(s). A third possibility would be that the preceding two factors combined to produce the observed distribution.

While this is speculation, I suspect that, at least to some extent, both factors did influence the observed distribution. However, there probably was not
an explicit orthographical convention which stipulated the particular letters and digraphs which were to be used in the words for "Jesus" and "Jesus'". Rather, it is more likely that the use of "ov" reflects the orthography of the protograph(s) and that Aleksa retained that orthography because the word was a personal name and/or because of the particular person who is the referent. This explanation could also apply to the instances of the words for "Christ" and "God" which contain "ov".

19 There is one other preposition on which data relevant to this discussion are found. For "до", "до о-" and "до оу-" occur one time apiece.

20 The editors place the number of exceptions "около 50". [1983:24] I found almost 120. Furthermore, in their database they seem to have included the readings copied by the second scribe as well as the colophons, although they are rather imprecise in their definition of the domain over which their figure applies. [1983:24] The exceptions which I found were drawn only from the readings copied by Aleksa.

21 There is another well-defined group of exceptions containing about fifteen items. It consists of instances in which the consonant letter at the end of the line denotes a numeral. Examples for this group can be found at 91b25, 137a20 and 203gl.

22 The editors list a number of items which belong to this group. [1983:24] Three times they incorrectly identify the location of the word(s) being cited:

- "дър'/къми" 95v19-20 not 94v19
- "дър'/же" or "дър'/жаше" 120b14-15 not 120b15
- "оутър'/дт" 124b25-124v1 not 121b25

In addition, the word which they claim is at 160g7, in fact, is not there. There is no instance of that word, appropriately positioned with respect to the line boundary, anywhere in the vicinity of folio 160.

Finally, in their citation of the item at 121b19(-20), they omitted the first two letters of the word, "въ-". There are also several problems with their indications of the position of the line boundary.

23 In compiling the list of exceptions I excluded the examples "зачал" 18a19 and "предч" 199v25, because, although they do represent instances in which a consonant letter is the last letter on the line, they
are not truly part of a reading. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the symbol "ː ~" intervenes between these items and the reading itself. (cf. Lunt 1984:43)

I also disregarded instances such as "тся(o)/ъ" 34a16-17 and "въем(o)/ъно" 132q14-15 because, although the last intralinear letters are consonant letters, the supralinear vowel letters would have followed the respective consonant letters, had they been intralinear.

24 The editors indicate that, among the exceptions, there is one instance in which the consonant letter at the end of a line is not accompanied by a diacritic, "неf/элиимихъ" at 187a2-3. [1983:25] Because of the manner in which they arrange the data, that statement is not intended to apply to the items which I included in the main group of exceptions or the consonant letters used as numerals, nor does it extend to "матеос/" at 32b9. (cf. 1983:24-25) However, their discussion does not account for "еван/гелио" at 54v14-15 and "вартимеос/" at 105a12, which lack diacritics in the typeset edition.

For the preceding paragraph, I disregarded " с/" at 184v18 as somewhat problematic. Even though it technically has a diacritic, the symbol marking it as an abbreviation, that diacritic is not one of those under consideration here.

25 For this discussion in particular, it is necessary to emphasize that I am addressing sequences of symbols, not sequences of phonemic or phonetic units.

26 Admittedly, "low" and "high" are subjective terms and do not lend themselves to use in a rigorous methodology. In this instance I am relying on a somewhat intuitive sense that, whatever generalizations could be formulated for orthographical sequences of the form CV which contain one of the vowel symbols that I have decided to exclude from consideration, those generalizations would not be meaningful.

27 There is one instance in which "д" combines with "ва": "смдамые" at 30a19.

It should also be noted that there are exactly five examples with the sequence "д ж". Therefore, the threshold is just met. The examples are "чнжжеж /мъ" at 17g6-7; "внджжежъа" at 39b6; "ижд жнохъ" at 98a15; and "ижд жноуъ" at 126v22 and 147a5.
28  Because of the small number of examples and the dubious nature of most of them (see above), I will disregard "i" in this discussion.

29  For this discussion, I disregarded the item "утрофийчъска" at 65gl8. In a footnote the editors state that the two letters immediately preceding "y" have been scraped off. They interpolated both letters and they regard the second of them, "c", as tautolexical with "y".

30  "Marked" abbreviations are those with a titlo or which have a supralinear letter associated with them.

31  This formula differs from the one described by Lunt. [1984:46] Unfortunately, Lunt's pattern does not account for many abbreviations of the words for "God" and several abbreviations of the word for "Christ", which consist of only two letters (digraphs).

32  The usual abbreviations for the word denoting "Jerusalem" and derivatives of that word have a rather unique feature. Generally, there is a supralinear "o" as part of the abbreviations, but unabbreviated orthographical representations of those words would only contain the symbol "o" as the first element of the digraph "oy". In such instances the second "half" of the digraph is completely absent.

I should note that there are several instances in which the supralinear "o" has been placed after "c", instead of between "p" and "c", in the typeset edition. The examples are at 120g25, 164a15, 188b11, 189g9 and 190b19. In the index "o" stands in its proper place for all five. [1983:360]

33  As I noted in the evaluation of the edition, the indices do not distinguish "v" from "v", nor do they differentiate "y" from "y".

34  The first of the three is surprising since normally, in the slot in question, one finds "x", "ov" or "oy". Furthermore, as I indicated above, the spelling given in the index for this item is "coy(Ơ)". [1983:486] Unfortunately, I cannot determine which of the two is in error.

35  For the purposes of this discussion I treated the representations "ω(τ)" and "ω", both of which are found in the typeset edition, as equivalent.
36 I assume that the instance of the sequence "Ла" at 9g8 ("недъя") represents an error in the typesetting because that particular example is listed under "недъя" in the index [1983:481]. I noted earlier the general absence of the distinctions "л" versus "л" and "н" versus "н" in the indices. Similarly, I treat the example "миъ" 197v9 as an error in the typesetting because in the index it is spelled "миъ" [1983:487].

37 There are two additional instances which were not listed above because they are in the markers which denote the start of readings for individual months within the menologion. As best I can tell from the typeset edition, these markers seem to be two lines in height and I am not certain whether Aleksa wrote them. The items are "нобъ" 197b17-18 and "нобъ" 201a7-8.

38 The abbreviation for the word which means "Tuesday" usually consists of three letters, "в", "т" and "т". The first two are intralinear, while the last is supralinear. In the typeset edition, "т" is generally placed between "в" and "т". However, there are several instances in which it stands after "в". In the index all of the examples are listed under an entry which has "т" after "в". [1983:475] Given the pattern for abbreviations of the words for days of the week in which the relative ordering of the linear and supralinear letters is unambiguous, e.g., "Monday" and "Wednesday", one would expect that the "correct" interpretation would be "вт(т)".

39 It is not entirely clear to whom the editors attribute the headings for these two readings, at 67b17 and 67g12, respectively. [1983:9] However, since there is nothing in either of those headings which distinguishes them from the remaining headings, I decided to disregard them.

40 Between 213a15 and 213a20, according to the editors' numeration, there appear to be only three lines which contain text. Since two belong to the passage written by Aleksa and one belongs to the note by Žadžen, I am treating 213a18 as the blank line. This coincides with the approach used by the editors in the index.

41 There seem to be only three lines of text between 213a10 and 213a15. Since there is a natural
discontinuity in content between the first and second of the three, I am treating 213a12 as the blank line. This matches the approach used by the editors in the index.

42 I want to note one problem with the marking of abbreviations in this portion of the typeset edition. The first three words in the text written by Zaden" are "

The issue is that there are titla over the second and third words, even though the first is clearly an abbreviation. Furthermore, in the index neither the entry for the first word nor the entry for the third word is marked with a titlo, although the entry for the second is. [1983:489] Finally, an examination of the photograph of the front side of folio 213, which is included in the edition [1983:plate 4], leads one to conclude that there probably is a titlo over the second and third letters on the first line of the entry by Zaden". There is also a diacritic over "Khaza", but I cannot determine with certainty whether it is a titlo.
CHAPTER 5

REPRESENTATION OF VOWELS

In the preceding chapter almost no attempt was made to associate the use of orthographical symbols with the distribution of sounds. In this chapter and the next one, I will describe the manner in which the reflexes of reconstructed segments and sequences are represented orthographically in ME. This chapter is devoted to vowel letters and digraphs. Consonant letters will be treated in the next chapter.¹

For this discussion the manuscript will be divided into the same four sections which were used in the preceding chapter: the readings copied by Aleksa, the headings, the readings copied by the anonymous second scribe, and the colophon.

5.1. Readings Copied by Aleksa

The set of vowel letters and digraphs which are found in the portion of the manuscript under consideration is repeated below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a e i o u \overline{e} \overline{o} \overline{u} \overline{y} \overline{w} \overline{h} \overline{y}}
\end{align*}
\]
The same set of vowel letters ("x" and "u") and
digraphs ("ov" and "oy") is used where *u and *q are
reconstructed. An example of each variant is
presented below.

For *q For *u
"ov" "знадовт" 7g17 "съвѣкоков/плѣша" 3g13-14
"ou" "вѣроу" 2a19 "семоу" 32v17
"j" "соха" 9g6 "м" 3v2
"x" "съкв" 41v14 "погѣбитъ" 43a21

Where *ju or *jо are reconstructed, the vowel
letter "w" is the primary marker. Several examples
are listed below.

*ju       *jо
"чю" 3b11     "прить/чю" 131v13-14
"опятать" 79g22 "мыдю" 109v12
"шема" 116g18 "дѣ/шем" 79v21-22
"межо" 135v17 "съкако" 173v24
"п" 79v23

However, there are a number of instances in which
the digraph "oy" or the letters "x" or "i" occupy slots
where *ju or *jо would have been. There is also one
example in which "ov" denotes the reflex of
reconstructed *ju, "вѣ/слежатов" at 38b22-23. In all
of these items, when there is a tautolexical consonant
letter immediately preceding "oy", "ov", "x" or "i", it
is either "m" or "m".

The digraph "oy" is used to represent the reflex
of *ju almost 50 times and in all of them it is the
first, and sometimes only, symbol in the masculine/neuter dative singular desinence. Furthermore, all but one of the examples, "Мъщооа/оо" at 183g24-25, are active participle forms, either present or past.

The reflex of *jé is indicated with "оу" in approximately 15 instances. Unfortunately, the examples do not constitute as uniform a group as the examples of "оу" for *ju. However, most of them fall into one of two categories: the person/number marker in the first person singular non-past form or the first, and sometimes only, symbol in the accusative singular (feminine) desinence.

A sample of the data is presented below.

*ju
"бъшоо/оо" 3а16-17  "хъоо" 25v8
"посълъооооо" 7v24-25  "иоо/оо" 40v8-9
"исъъооооо" 12аb  "къоооо" 47v18-19
"хозоооооо" 29v4  "сооооо" 51а14
"тълоооооо" 31g7  "погъъооо/о" 90g24-25
"имоооо" 46b4
"оооооооо" 49а20

The use of "ъ" or "ъ" in slots for which *ju or *jé would be reconstructed is rarer than the use of "оу". The reflex of *ju is written "ъ" about 15 times and in all but one instance it is the first, and sometimes only, letter in the masculine/neuter dative singular desinence. Moreover, all but two of the
examples are active participle forms. As the reflex of *jq, "x" occurs only four times. Examples are presented in tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*ju</th>
<th>*jo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;имоуф&quot; 54a1</td>
<td>&quot;хоф&quot; 36a12, 70g10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;бимоф/оумф&quot; 74g15-16</td>
<td>&quot;диф&quot; 92b22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;непоуф/о&quot; 77b1-2</td>
<td>&quot;оумф&quot; at 114g7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;собырываф&quot; 170g17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The letter "x" is even less frequent than "ψ" in the use under consideration. There are approximately ten instances of "x" for the reflex of *ju and all are masculine/neuter dative singular forms of active participles in which "x" is the first letter in the desinence. There are only three examples in which "x" represents the reflex of *jq. Examples are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*ju</th>
<th>*jq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;соуф&quot; 6a15</td>
<td>&quot;ф&quot; 18a6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;посоуфумф&quot; 29v12</td>
<td>&quot;соуф&quot; 134g5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;имоуфумфумф&quot; 38b11</td>
<td>&quot;хоф&quot; 193v19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;глгнумфымф&quot; 96g19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, all eight instances of the letter "х" are in slots for which *jq would be reconstructed. The examples were listed in the preceding chapter.

In positions with *e and *a preceded by *j or by the reflex of a sequence consonant + *j, one finds three different letters in the portion of the text under consideration: "a", "м" and "н". The
distribution of these three letters follows a very clear pattern. The letter "a" is used after the consonant letters "m", "n", "n" and "x" and after the sequence "wx". The letter "A" is used after "n", "n", "n", "n" and "p" when those consonants stand where the reflex of a sequence consonant + *j is reconstructed. The letter "a" occurs after vowel letters, i.e., where *j would have preceded *e and *a.10 The same symbol is used for the reflex of initial *je.

For reconstructed *e in the appropriate environment, the number of exceptions to the distribution outlined above is comparatively small. There are two examples in which "A" is used instead of expected "a": "MOEIA" at 8a8 and "COEIA" at 178g20.11

In the remaining exceptions "a" appears for expected "a". I noted 34 such instances. In 31 of them the "a" in question denotes the genitive singular desinence, while in the other three it represents the accusative plural desinence. The examples are in the words for "Galilee", "Judea", "Arimathea", "Isaiah", "Zacharias", "Caesarea", "pharisee" and "sadducee". A sample of the data is presented below.12
Genitive Singular    Accusative Plural
"индъа" 9g14         "салоукеа" 133g21, 184b19
"галилъа" 26v1        "фа/рисеа" 184b18-19
"галилеа" 26g8         "мыулеа" 28a23
"исана" 71a20         "аримаан" 122a15

I recorded less than ten total instances in which these two forms of the listed words are written with final "я".

For reconstructed *a in the appropriate environment, the situation is more complex. Given the generalization presented above, the orthographical sequences which could be regarded as exceptions to it can be divided into three groups:

1) V + "а"/"ах";
2) "п"/"ч"/"п"/"ж"/"жд"/"а"/"я"; or
3) "а" or "я" after "л"/"н"/"л"/"н"/"п"

The third group is restricted to instances in which "л"/"н"/"л"/"н"/"п" occupy positions for which the sequence consonant + *j would be reconstructed. 

As a practical matter, only sequences from the first group are found and all of them are examples of V + "а". The number of such instances is rather large. However, a closer examination leads one to conclude that not all of those examples are relevant to the present discussion.
One set of examples is composed of masculine/neuter "definite"/"compound" adjective forms in the genitive singular, which regularly have V + "aro". In the position represented by "a", the classical reconstruction of this desinence would have *je, whether phonetic or phonemic, not *ja. Moreover, I do not think that there is a way to establish whether there was a stage in which the desinence contained the sequence vowel + *ja. Therefore, the significance of these forms with respect to the phenomenon under discussion is doubtful and they have been excluded from consideration as "exceptions" to the generalization in question. Several examples of these forms are listed below.

"въчнааро" 5a23
"дьвъдааро" 6g17-18
"расна/тааро" 9v21-22
"жива/аро" 12v22-23

Forms of the imperfect comprise a second set, as they consistently have V + "a" before the ending. The difficulty with these examples is that it is not clear whether there was a stage at which the sequence would have been vowel + *ja. Therefore, they too have been omitted as exceptions to the distributional generalization. Three examples of imperfect forms are given below.
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The third set is composed of individual words which contain the sequence V + "a" in the stem and which were comparatively recent (vis-a-vis the time when ME was copied) borrowings into Slavic. I include here derivatives of such borrowed stems, as well. Among the members of this set one finds the words for "John", e.g., at 2a16 and 8a18; "John's", e.g., at 2g1 and 8b2; "Abraham" e.g., at 14g5, 14g12, 16g3-4, 16g9, 16g21, 17a1, 17a4-5 and 36v16; "Abraham's", e.g., at 14v11, 14v23, 14g6-7, 14g8 and 50a16-17; "Siloam's", e.g., at 19a7 and 19a22; "Jacob", e.g., at 31g22, 32b6-7, 32b10, 36v17 and 41v10-11; "Isaac's", e.g., at 50a17; and others. These items are not valid measures of the phenomenon in question because they have not been in the language(s) long enough to permit one to "reconstruct" an earlier form.

Forms of three words which were not recent borrowings at the time when ME would have been copied and which are found with the sequence V + "a" in non-word-final position, should also be considered at this point. The words are "have", "become hungry" and "suddenly". An exhaustive list of the relevant examples is given below.
The reconstructions for the adduced forms of "have" do not contain a sequence of vowel + *ja.\textsuperscript{16} Similarly, there would be no such sequence in reconstructions of the word "become hungry" since the root from which this word was derived had the form *olk- or *alk- (after *ő,*ā > *o and *ő,*ā > *a).\textsuperscript{17} Finally, Vasmer [I:328] derives the word for "suddenly" from the root *ap-, which would suggest that there would not have been a sequence vowel + *ja in that word either. Therefore, the examples listed above must also be excluded from consideration as exceptions to the distributional generalization under discussion.
The next set consists of borrowings which contain the sequence V + "a" at the end of the word.\textsuperscript{18} The members of this set can be subdivided according to the grammatical form which each item represents. Most of the members (35-40) are nominative singular forms. The rest, almost 15, are genitive singulars.\textsuperscript{19} Several examples are presented below.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Nominative & Genitive \\
"свинопития" 12g5 & "моусеа" 3v16 \\
"аполь" 17b1 & "моусеа" 13b19 \\
"исаиа" 21b18 & "севедъа" 54g12 \\
"мариа" 41v10 & "вареоломъа" 56g12 \\
"и/есеа" 179v15-16 & "матееса" 56g13 \\
"авиа" 179v20 & "суангеля" 184v18 \\
"идезия" 179g1 & "тивериа" 185a5 \\
"захария" 200a10 &
\end{tabular}

For these items, since the "a" in the sequence V + "a" represents a desinence, it would be necessary to answer several questions before their status as exceptions to the orthographical generalization could be determined. First, does the "a" reflect the attachment of a Slavic desinence to a non-Slavic stem or was the non-Slavic item borrowed as a whole?\textsuperscript{21} Second, even if the "a" does reflect attachment of a Slavic desinence, what was the actual desinence which was attached? If it was the reflex of *ja, whether, in terms of its phonemic or phonetic content, the earlier *ja consisted of a single segment which differed from
*a or consisted of a sequence of two segments, then it might be possible to argue that these examples are exceptions. However, these questions go beyond the scope of this dissertation and they are probably insoluble based on the information which is presently available to scholars. Therefore, I will label these examples as being of indeterminate value in the present discussion.

That leaves seven items as possible exceptions. They are "покаа/нио" at 22a5-6 and 184b25; "покаание" at 38v13 and 126a2; "пъдаание" at 42b3; "покаание" at 76v18; and "поморийа" 201b10. These seven are exceptions because the reconstructed forms for them would have *ja. As Prof. Daniel Collins indicated in a personal communication, it is pertinent to recall in this context the South Slavic sound change in which intervocalic jot was lost. It is likely that the seven items listed in this paragraph reflect orthographically the results of that process and, therefore, have their origins in a South Slavic protograph.

In positions where *g, not preceded by *j or the reflex of the sequence consonant + *j, is reconstructed, one finds "a" and "a".

The letter "a" occurs after "ч", "ж", "ш", "щ" and "ждж", where one would reconstruct Proto-Slavic *k, *g,
*x, *sk and *zg, respectively. The letter "a" is also used after "ц". After other consonant letters, "а" is used. The one exception to this latter generalization is "съдъв" at 30a19. Examples are given below.

"а"       "А"

"бъща" 2a8       "въръма" 3a12
"лежаща" 3a15 (first)       "разпаша" 3b20
"лежа/ночадни" 2v22-23       "обать" 2a14
"овъца" 5b10       "дива" 3a16
"ицади за" 45b11       "та" 25a20
"въ/жллата" 10v4-5       "цдалъ" 52v13

The example "овъца" cited above is conveying an accusative plural. In adducing this as an instance of the phenomenon in question, I am assuming that the letter "a" which follows "ц" is representing the reflex of the South Slavic variant of the accusative plural desinence (*э), not the East Slavic variant (*э). The inclusion of "обать" assumes that there is a reconstructable stage for the word represented in which *b would have been immediately followed by *э, without an intervening jer.

The next generalization involves the representation of the reflex of jers (*в and *б) when, in the reconstructed form, the jer stood before *j. These are the so-called "tense" jers. When in the
reconstructed form the jer and the *j belonged to the same word, in the sense of an entry in a lexicon, then orthographically one finds "ъ" (or "ъ") where tense *ъ would be reconstructed and "и" (or "и") where tense *ъ would be reconstructed. In contrast, when the reconstructed form had a jer as the last sound in the word, then orthographically one finds "ъ" for reconstructed *ъ and "ъ" for reconstructed *ъ.26

Several examples follow.

Front Jer Back Jer

"оуби жеть" 11v18 "ъди/ноча̀дым" 2v22-23
"знаямення я" 6v9 "глась жего" 17v25
"нолию" 4v22 "съблю/дахь я" 23b23-24
"боли" 15b2 "съхраня/тъ ъ" 20g3-4
"ямь и" 16g17 "обитъ и" 9b21

The number of deviations from this generalization is reasonably large. I noted the following word-internal exceptions.27,28
As one can see, prefixed derivatives of two verbal roots account for 22 of the 49 members of this group. The roots are those which mean "take" and "go". In fifteen of those 22 examples, the prefix is spelled "отъ" and it is the letter "б" in that representation of the prefix which occupies the slot in which the "tense" jër would have been found.
There are non-word-internal exceptions to the generalization regarding the representation of the reflexes of tense jers as well. They are listed below.29,30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Словенська мова</th>
<th>Словенська мова</th>
<th>Словенська мова</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;творити/ жи&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;убить/ми и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;любити и&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a25-29b1</td>
<td>58b11, 96a20,</td>
<td>108v3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106v23-24,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131q11, 203b6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пой/мы и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;видѣ/вы и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;слы/щахомы и&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44b16-17,</td>
<td>60b23-24,</td>
<td>115a3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126b16</td>
<td>89v13, 126g3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;протешети и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;поставити и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;обыкьи и&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53b16, 87g5</td>
<td>87v21</td>
<td>121a16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;имы и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ви/дѣвы и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;показавы и&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54a15, 127a7</td>
<td>89v18-19</td>
<td>121v3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;даты и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;прызвавы и&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;пocht/тёти и&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56g22, 57a5</td>
<td>91b4</td>
<td>138v20-21, 191b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;повъргы и&quot;</td>
<td>71g23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the members of this data set, the obvious common feature is that in all but one the *j following the jer in the reconstructed forms belongs to the masculine accusative singular of the third person personal pronoun. Even in that one instance, the *j following the jer in the reconstruction belongs to a form of the third person personal pronoun, it is simply not the masculine accusative singular. Finally, as Prof. Daniel Collins emphasized in a personal communication, the enclitic nature of the pronoun in question should be mentioned. Thus, linguistically each of the sequences listed above would have constituted a single phonological word.
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Another generalization involving the jers relates to the degree to which the use of "ъ" where a back jer is reconstructed and "ъ" where a front jer is reconstructed is maintained. In the majority of instances, that association between orthography and reconstructed segment is preserved. Several examples are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;ъ&quot; for *ъ</th>
<th>&quot;ъ&quot; for *ъ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;въста&quot; 3g16</td>
<td>&quot;мпунъ&quot; 9g22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;посъланъ&quot; 19a8</td>
<td>&quot;пать&quot; 16g25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;о/дежахъ&quot; 30v22-23</td>
<td>&quot;весь&quot; 25b12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;клъбъ&quot; 44a13</td>
<td>&quot;мълда&quot; 28b25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;рыптаакхот&quot; 107b23</td>
<td>&quot;житъница&quot; 87b9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;бъдите&quot; 111a1</td>
<td>&quot;жърчишка&quot; 114g16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;изънати&quot; 127a12</td>
<td>&quot;избъра&quot; 166v15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;дъскооъ&quot; 167g18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there is a fair number of examples in which that relation between orthography and etymology is not followed. One word which is quite consistent in this regard is written predominantly as "донъджеъ" in the portion of ME under consideration. That spelling occurs 55 times. Examples can be found at 18g23, 19b21-22, 21a14, 21a17, 21a25, 22a13, 26a12-13, 26a19, 44g2, 45g10, 48v8, 52a24, 54b13, 55v4 and elsewhere. I noted no instances spelled with "ъ" in place of "ъ".

Deviations from the generalization also occur in first person singular and plural non-past forms of the
"athematic" verbs "know", "have" and "be". For the last verb, there is one example in the portion of ME under consideration which is written with "b" as the final letter, even though the semantics of the passage require a plural. It is "bəcмб" at 14g15.36,37 I have not noted any examples of the reverse situation, i.e., a form orthographically ending in "b", even though a singular is required by the semantics of the passage.

For the verb "know", examples of the spelling "bəм" when the context requires a plural are found at 13v10 and 25a19.38 Conversely, the spelling "bəм" occurs at 8a14, even though only a singular makes sense in the passage.

For "have", the number of examples of "Имамъ" in contexts where a singular is expected is comparatively large, almost 35. The list includes examples at 8b1, 11G21, 14b10-11, 15b21, 15b23,15g17-18, 16v12, 18a7, 18a8, 24b14 and 47v17, among others. I did not find any examples of the opposite situation, i.e., orthographically final "b" when the context requires a plural. In fact, in the portion of ME under consideration there are no examples at all with the spelling "Имамъ".39,40

Another set of exceptions consists of instances in which the prefix reconstructed as *въз(ъ)- is spelled
"Вьз-". All of them are found in representations of the verb which means "take". There are about 25 examples of this spelling and they occur in various forms of the verb, although, since this word occurs rather frequently, there are far more examples in which the prefix is written "Вьз-". A sample of the pertinent data follows.

"Вьзапа" 45g2
"Вьха" 66v12
"Вьзать" 67b7
"Вьзать" 100b3
"Вьзакте" 100v2
"Вьзать" 110b12

If one accepts Vasmer's reconstruction for Proto-Slavic, *мьнъ [I:632], then the dative/locative singular of the first person personal pronoun must also be included in the list of exceptions. In the majority of instances, the orthographical representation of this form contains neither "з" nor "Ъ" between "М" and "Н".41 (see below) In the remaining examples, 20 in all, "Ъ" is written between "М" and "Н". The latter spelling is found at 6g2-3, 8v11-12, 16v4, 18v1-2, 22v15, 23b20-21, 44v4 and elsewhere.

In the words for "widow" and "widow's", one also finds "Ъ" in a position where, according to Vasmer [I:281-282], *Ъ would be reconstructed. There are about 15 examples of these words and all of them
contain "ъ" after initial "в". However, this set differs from the preceding one because, with respect to the use of "ъ" in "widow", ME agrees with the normalized orthography for OCS given by Lunt [1959:6].42 A sample of the data is given below.

"въдовича" 51a2
"въдо/вица" 71v10-11
"въдовица" 71v18
"въдо/ва" 76g3-4
"въдо/вица" 108g14-15

Derivatives of the root *-зъд- comprise another set of items whose orthographical representations contain "ъ" in a slot for which *ъ would be reconstructed. There are nine such examples. There are also instances in which "ъ" is written between "з" and "д", but they are fewer in number. I found a total of four. The nine examples with "ъ" are listed below.

"съездана" 5v6
"създа" 33g7, 81b2, 131v18, 203a8
"съда/ни та" 63g4, 109a18, 135g12-13
"създа/ъ" 71g3-4

When juxtaposed with the normalized OCS orthography for the verb "satisfy" and the adjective "sufficient", as presented by Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:22] and Lunt [1959:13], the spellings "до/въдять" at 17a22-23; "до/въдеть" at 22v2-3;
"дозвъдеть" at 30b18-19, 33a20 and 145b10-11;
"дозвъльно" at 119b23 and 141b4; and "дозвъльни" at
185v20 would also seem to be exceptions to the generalization regarding the use of "ז" and "ז".\textsuperscript{43}

Unfortunately, Vasmer [I:521] does not provide reconstructed forms for these items. He only relates the root in "satisfy" to the root which gave Russian "велеть" and "воля", stating that they involve different ablaut grades [I:288, 347-348]. That analysis would imply that "satisfy" had the zero grade. If "sufficient" also contained the zero grade of that root, then the only question would be whether one can, with a reasonable degree of certainty, presume that $^1_0 > ^1_1$.

Another instance in which the spelling found in ME deviates from the normalized OCS orthography presented by Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:76] and Lunt [1959:33] is in the adverb/preposition which Lunt glosses as "around, about". In ME, in unabbreviated form, this word is spelled "וקְפָּבּ" , while in OCS it has "ב" as the final letter. There are six examples in ME, at 36b8, 62b18, 88v23-24, 129b22, 199g3-4 and 200a2. Only one of the six is an abbreviation, "וקְפָּבּ" at 62b18. I noted no instances in which this word is spelled with final "ב".\textsuperscript{44}

The six examples of the word for "universe" also belong in this list of exceptions. In all of them the
second letter is "ъ". All six are presented below.
For the portion of ME under consideration, I did not note any instances in which a form of this word is spelled with "ъ" as the second letter.

"ВЪСЕЛ ЖѢЊИ" 52b7
"ВЪСЕЛ ЖѢЊѢ" 70g6
"ВЪСЕЛѢНОУѢ" 116g22
"ВЪСѢЛѢ/ЊѢ" 132v3-4
"ВѢСѢЛѢНОУѢ" 180b16
"ВѢСѢЛѢ/ЊѢѢ" 187g23-24

Treatment of these items as exceptions is predicated upon the fact that for OCS both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:156] and Lunt [1959:8] give a normalized form with "ъ" as the second letter. Furthermore, their orthographical representations suggest that the segment denoted by the fifth letter was equivalent to the reflex of *lj. This fact, in conjunction with the semantics of the item under consideration, would support the conclusion that this word is formally a past passive participle related to the verb whose reconstructed infinitive is *ъселити.

There are four derivatives of the root which means "suck" which have "ъ" between the two "с"'s instead of "ъ". I found no instances with "ъ" in the corresponding slot. The examples are presented below.

"СѢСѢЦѢ" 121g6
"СѢСѢЦѢѢ" 130a14
"СѢСѢЦѢ" 166v21
"СѢСѢЦѢ" 166v22
The word for "reed" occurs three times with final "ъ", e.g., "търсъ" at 158v15, instead of the "ъ" which one would anticipate based on etymology and the general distribution of "ъ" and "ъ". However, there are many more examples in which the expected "ъ" is the final letter. The other two examples ending in "ъ" are found at 154g7 and 157g12.

Based on the normalized OCS orthography of Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:155] and Lunt [1959:8], the orthography in ME of the adverbial/prepositional phrase which means "together" also appears to deviate from the generalization regarding the use of "ъ" and "ъ". The relevant examples are "въкъ/ъ" at 97a21-22 and "въкоуъ" at 209g17 and 211a15. For OCS "ъ" is given as the final letter.45

The two examples spelled "свободъ", at 14v14 and 14v22, belong in this discussion as well. In both instances the context would require that the word in question be analyzed as an adjective. Furthermore, the grammatically correct form would be a masculine nominative plural. The only way to reconcile the linguistic requirements with the orthographical facts is to analyze this form as representing the indeclinable adjective to which both
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Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:134] and Lunt [1959:48] assign a normalized orthography of "свободь".  

Two other exceptions which merit individual treatment are the examples of the preposition whose reconstructed form is *въ*(n). They occur at 64b2 and 134a9. In both instances, the passage is from Matthew 22:40 and the preposition is spelled "въ".  

The remaining exceptions are all isolated. An exhaustive list is given below.  

"вчера" 10a9  
"слишать" (supine) 37v15, 170a18  
"имъ" 46a14 (instrumental singular)  
"десать/ми" 58g21-22  
"взвыну" 65v10  
"маеву/салъ" 70v4-5  
"бздыну" 84a9  
"съемъ" 125g13 (instrumental singular)  
"онъ/си" 141g14-15  
"дымъ" 150g17  
"тъгда" 161b20  
"людьмъ" 185v23 (dative plural)  
"единомъ" 195a4 (locative singular)  

I only noted one sure instance in which a letter other than "ъ" or "ъ" occupied a slot for which a jer would be reconstructed. The example is "жерновь/нми" at 91g16-17. The letter "о" stands for the reflex of *ъ*.  

In the preceding discussion of reconstructed jers, attention was focused exclusively on instances in which there was a letter in the orthographical representation of a word which could be associated with the linguistic  
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reflex of the reconstructed jer and the question was which letter was selected. However, there are many examples in which the orthographical representation contains no letter in the position which the jer would have occupied in the reconstructed linguistic form. These omissions in the orthographical representations are quite systematic and, in fact, most are found in a comparatively small number of lexical items.\footnote{2}

In the group of words consisting of "all", written "в(ь)с-"; "each", written "в(ь)сак-"; "always", written "в(ь)сегда"; and "everywhere", written "в(ь)сюд-"; the absence of a letter to represent the reflex of the reconstructed *b which followed the initial *v is rather common.\footnote{3, 4} The least frequent of the four is the word for "everywhere". I recorded three examples, one spelled "всюдь", at 86b17, and two spelled "всюдоу", at 95b18-19 and 207g5-6. In the first instance of "всюдоу", "ь" is the last letter on the line.

For "always", there are fourteen examples. Five, at 12g18, 14b25, 111b22, 112v16 and 129b19, have "всегда" as their orthographical representation. The other nine have "всегда" and in none of those is "ь" the last letter on the line.
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The word which means "each" occurs much more frequently than either of the previous two and the distribution of the two orthographical representations of the stem, "ВСАК-" and "БСАК-", differs noticeably from that of their counterparts above. To nineteen examples which contain "в" between "в" and "с", there are about 75 without "в" in that position. In percentage terms, that means that approximately 20% of the items contain "в". In roughly one third of those, "в" is the last letter on the line.

For "all", the picture is slightly more complex. There are on the order of 400 instances in which there is no letter between the initial "в" and "с", while there are some 230 instances in which "в" is written between "в" and "с". The only distributional regularity within this body of data is that the masculine nominative/accusative singular is always written " ВСЪ", i.e., with "в" immediately after "в". That one form accounts for approximately 70, around 30%, of the examples with "в". Of the remaining items spelled "ВСС-", less than one fifth are positioned so that the "в" between "в" and "с" is the last letter on the line.

In the orthographical representations for two forms of the first person singular personal pronoun,
there is regular omission of a letter in the position where a jer would be reconstructed. The forms in question are the dative/locative and the instrumental. For the instrumental, to 45 instances of "множ", there are only two examples of "мнь", at 22b22 and 113v12-13. Furthermore, in the second of those, "ъ" is the last letter on the line.

With the dative/locative, the proportion is also strongly in favor of the representation without any letter between "м" and "н". There are close to 220 examples with the spelling "мн" to only 20 with the spelling "мъ". In the latter group of 20, "ъ" stands as the last letter on the line nearly two thirds of the time.

There is another group of items whose orthographical representations consistently lack a letter between "м" and "н", even though in the reconstructed forms a jer stood in the corresponding position. The group is comprised of the word for "much, many" and several derivatives of that word. Several of the derivatives occur only once or twice each. The data on them are presented below.

"ОУМНОЖИ" 92b9
"МНОЖИЦЕЮ" 93v1
"МНО/ГОШЪНН" 111b5-6
"ОУМНОЖЕНИЕ" 132b23
"МНОГО/ЦЪНЬ" 170g11-12
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The word for "multitude" is found twelve times without any letter between "м" and "н" to only one instance with "ъ" between "м" and "н". The one example with "ъ" is "МЪ/НОЖЪСТВО" at 95a19-20, in which "ъ" is the last letter on the line.

All six instances of "многъдь" ("many times") lack "ъ" between "м" and "н". The examples occur at 45a3, 45a4-5, 50v13, 50v15, 126g10-11 and 149v18-19.

I recorded eleven examples of the comparative from "much, many". It is written "множ-" in eight of those and "мънож-" in the other three. The eight are found at 35b7, 35b12-13, 84v10-11, 84v16, 109a4, 170a19, 170a25 and 173v5. The three instances with "ъ" are "Мъ/Ножаша" at 58b3-4, "Мъ/Ножаше" at 129g14-15 and "Мъно/Жаша" at 131g3-4. As one can see, in two of the three with "ъ" between "м" and "н", that "ъ" is the last letter on the line.

For "much, many", there are on the order of 250 examples without any letter between "м" and "н". I noted only 17 instances which contain "ъ" in that position and in 14 of them the "ъ" in question is the last letter on the line. The remaining three items with "ъ" are "мьногъ" at 47g17, "мьногой" at 144v2 and "мьно/го" at 164a13-14.
One can contrast the preceding two groups, in which absence of any letter between "м" and "н" in the orthographical representation is the norm, with derivatives of the verbal root *мън-, in which one usually finds "ъ" written between "м" and "н". In fact, only eight examples do not have "ъ" in that position. That represents just 10-15% of the total number of items denoting derivatives of the root under consideration. The eight exceptions are listed below.

"МЪНША" 63v11
"МЪНТЬ" 66b22
"МЪНИ" 88b21
"ПОМНИТЕ" 147a1, 169v11
"МНИТ" 147b13
"МНААХОУ" 193v2
"МНААХЪ" 209a24

Furthermore, there are several other sets of items whose representations in ME always retain "ъ", denoting the reflex of a reconstructed jer, between "м" and "н". They include various forms of *мънж-, *мънжити, *тъмълъ, *тъмъничъ, *сърълъ and *съръновати.

Given this rather clear distinction in orthographical representations between the dative/locative and the instrumental first person singular personal pronoun and the group of words related to "many", on the one hand, and forms of *(пo)мънъ, *усъмънъ, *мънъ-, *мънжити, *тъмълъ, 169
While acknowledging the dangers of adopting an "argument from silence", I think that the probability that the observed distribution is the result of chance factors is extremely low. It is far more likely that it reflects either the orthography of the protograph(s) or an orthographical principle which was guiding Aleksa. Alternatively, if one imputes phonological significance to this differential in treatment, it would be necessary to propose some phonological motivation.

In any event, these data seem to contradict a conclusion by the editors in their introduction to the edition of ME. It concerns the presence or absence of "ъ"/"ъ" to denote the reflex of jers which would have been in weak position in the sequence sonorant + jer + sonorant. They claim that "в слогах с двумя сонантами и в сохраняются спорадически." [1983:26] To the extent that the word "спорадически" implies a random distribution, the data do not seem to support the assertion.

The next set of data in which the reflex of a reconstructed jer is not marked with a letter consists
of the nominative/accusative of "what" and the nominative(/accusative) of "nothing" are written most frequently with no letter in the position where *ь would be reconstructed. For "nothing", to 31 examples spelled "ничтo" there are only three instances of "ничьтo", at 2а9, 148а20 and 207в23-24.62 Only the last of the three has "ь" as the final letter on the line.

The distribution is similar for the orthographical representation of "what", although the data set is much larger. There are close to 250 instances of the spelling "что" and 25 times the word is written "чтьо". In ten of the 25 with "ь", "ь" is the last letter on the line.

The genitive of "nothing" is spelled "ничесо" in 15 of 50 occurrences. The other 35 examples are split between "ничъесо" and "ничесо". For "what", there are eight instances of "чесо" with 29 others divided between "чьесо" and "чесо".

Another group of items which are written with no letter between "ч" and "т", even though *ь would be reconstructed for that position, consists of non-past forms of the verb "read/count/honor". There are ten examples in all: "чтомьт" at 7в8, 64г16, 65а9 and 65а11; "читать" at 7в9 and 7в10; "почтать" at 20г8;
"чтогд" at 42b25 and 64g18; and "чтешь" at 89b16. However, the spelling "чтй-" is more frequent in the portion of ME under consideration. There are more than fifteen examples with "чтй-" in five of which "Ъ" is the last letter on the line.

Several words which are etymologically related to "what" and "nothing" also lack, for the most part, a letter in their orthographical representations in the position in which a jer would be reconstructed. However, in this instance the jer which is reconstructed is *ъ, not *ѣ. The group consists of the nominative forms of "who", "no one" and "someone".

In the portion of the manuscript under consideration there are 16 instances of the nominative for "someone" and all are written "нѣкто". There are 85 examples of the nominative of "no one" and all but five are spelled "нѣкто", i.e., with no letter between "к" and "т". The five written "нѣктъ" are found at 109b8-9, 145b3-4, 171v7-8, 192a17-18 and 205a14-15 and in all five "Ъ" is the last letter on the line.

For "who" there are almost 150 occurrences of "кто" to only eleven of "къто". Furthermore, in ten of the eleven instances of "къто", "Ъ" is the last letter on the line. The one other example of "къто" is at 93b13.
In the orthographical representation of the word which means "where", frequently there is also no letter standing for the reflex of *ь from the reconstructed form. To fifteen examples of "кде", there are only eleven spelled "къде". In only one of the eleven is "ь" the last letter on the line.

The next group shares with the preceding two the fact that the jer, for which there is no letter in the orthographical representation, followed *к. It is comprised of the words for "prince" and "prince's", as well as three words derived from a base which is reconstructed in Vasmer's dictionary as *къніг- [II:262-263].

Various forms of "prince" occur a total of 28 times, while "prince's" is found once, "князь" at 41a12. In all but one of those 29 examples there is no letter between "к" and "н". The one exception is "къ/назь" at 191б22-23, in which "ь" is the last letter on the line.

The reconstructed forms for the three words derived from the base *къніг- are, in the nominative singular, *къніга, *кънігъникъ and *кънігъя. All told, various forms of these three words occur approximately 135 times and I only noted seven examples in which a letter stands between "к" and "н":
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"къ/нижъникъ" at 33v17-18 and 105v19-20; "къ/нижъникъ" at 41b6-7; "кънитъчи/ма" at 64v15-16; "къ/нижъникъ" at 115g7-8; and "къ/ногъ" at 133g7-8 and 208g12-13. As one can see, in six of the seven the "ъ" between "к" and "н" is the last letter on the line.

While, in general, I have excluded prefixes and prepositions from consideration in this discussion, there is one preposition which merits attention. It is usually written "къ" and it governs the dative. However, there is a reasonable number of examples in which it is written simply "к".

In the portion of the manuscript being examined, the preposition "къ"/"к" is used more than 600 times. In 111 of the 600+ instances the preposition is spelled "к". In the others "къ" is used. The 111 examples of "к" can be classified into three sets based on the object of the preposition in the prepositional phrase.

The first set, and the smallest, contains eleven items. In them the object of the preposition is the second person singular personal pronoun. However, there are also eleven examples of the same prepositional phrase in which the preposition is spelled "къ" and in only two of those is "ъ" in "къ" the last letter on the line."
The members of the second set, 22 in all, have as an object the masculine/neuter dative singular of the demonstrative pronoun whose masculine nominative singular is reconstructed as *tъ, e.g., "к тому" at 12v14. I recorded only three examples of "къ" with that same form as its object. In all three "к" in the representation of the preposition is the last letter on the line.69

In the last set the object is the anaphoric pronoun whose reconstructed masculine nominative singular is *jъ, e.g., "к нему" at 26v25. There are 78 members in this set and among them one finds plurals, duals and masculine/neuter singulars. However, when a form of that pronoun is the object, the orthographical representation "къ" is more frequent, occurring just over 150 times, of which roughly 25 have "ъ" in "къ" as the last letter on the line.

The adverb which is usually spelled "дондже" and which was discussed earlier, is also found written "дондже". There are twenty such examples.70,71,72

The adverb glossed as "only" frequently occurs with the spelling "тъмно", i.e., with no letter between "к" and "м", even though a jer would be reconstructed for that position based upon the normalized OCS orthography in both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:139]
and Lunt [1959:56]. I noted ten instances written "Тыкмо", as compared to 52 spelled "Тыкмо". In only three of the ten is the "ъ" following "к" the last letter on the line.

If one accepts a reconstruction for the numeral "two" which posits *tv- after the initial *d, then the orthographical representation for this item and derivatives of it must be included in the present discussion as well. Against 114 examples spelled "дъв-", there are only 19 written "дъв-". In just under half of those 19, the "ъ" immediately after "д" is the last letter on the line.

Words formed from the root which would be reconstructed as *зъл- also appear without any letter in the position where the jer is reconstructed, but the clear majority of examples contain "ъ" after "з". There are 26 instances in which the letter "ъ" is absent. In contrast, I recorded 60 examples in which "ъ" is written after "з". Vasmer [III:606-607] posits *сьербр- as the reconstructed form of the base which means "silver". However, in the orthographical representations of words formed from this base, the spelling is "срербр-". There
are 40 examples written in that manner. I did not note any instances which contained a letter between "с" and the first "р".7

A similar situation obtains for the root which Vasmer [III:398] reconstructs as *рът- and which is used to form the word meaning "bird". In all but one example, the orthographical representations of words derived from this root contain "рт-". There are 20 such instances. The one exception is "ръ/тицъ" 173g10-11, which has "ъ" as the last letter on the line.

Based on the normalized OCS orthography of Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:46] and Lunt [1959:22], three instances of the word which means "so much" also belong in this discussion. They are "колои" at 82g15 and 87b10 and "колои" at 87b25. However, the spelling "колои" is more frequent for this item.

There are four examples of the word for "faithful" and one of the word for "faithless" which lack a letter to denote the reflex of *ъ, although it is more often that "ъ" stands between "р" and "н". The exceptions are "верни" at 87v12, 136b3-4, 137a16 and 137b1 and "неверными" at 87g6.7

The element which some reconstruct as *ъдо [Vasmer II:158] appears eight times with no letter
standing for the reflex of *β. The examples are in the representations of two different derivatives, each of which occurs approximately twice as often with "β" standing for the reflex of *β. The eight instances without "β" are listed below.\textsuperscript{78}

"къйдо" 25b1
"комуго" 66g10
"кого/кйдо" 72v13-14, 91b18-19
"кот/кйдо" 142v4-5

"къние/кйдо" 80g8, 80g14-15, 92a9

For the element *ṣ̌đy or *ṣ̌đi, which combines with numerals to produce a lexical item which has the meaning "x times", where "x" is the value of the numeral, the representations of such derivatives provide six more examples with no letter denoting the reflex of a reconstructed jer. The six are presented below.

"седмици" 91g25, 92a1, 106g23
"сътици" 104b11
"двацек" 115v18
"трина" 115v19

The root reconstructed as *р̣ь-, which forms the word meaning "dog", consistently lacks a letter representing the reflex of *β, although there are only four examples in the portion of the manuscript under examination. They are "ψомъ" at 31v22 and 65g24, "пси" at 66a1 and "ψи" at 81v14.\textsuperscript{79}
In the final group the reconstructed jer under consideration is part of a desinence. The desinence is in the third person singular and plural of non-past verbal forms. The generalization is that when one of these verbal forms is immediately followed by the reflexive pronoun spelled "ca", there is no letter standing between the "t" in the orthographical representation of the verbal ending and the "c" in the reflexive. This omission occurs in more than 350 instances.

The deviations from this orthographical convention are comparatively few in number. One set consists of the third person singular non-past from *dati, one prefixed derivative of *dati and two prefixed derivatives of *vedeti. There are about 30 examples which belong in this set. They include "дать са" at 38b12, "проповѣсть са" at 85g9 and "преда/сть са" at 141b13-14.

The other deviations do not form a coherent set. There are close to 60 of them and they all involve third person non-past forms of verbs other than those included in the first set of exceptions, e.g., "свѣтить са" at 2a13, "отвѣть/рѣчь са" at 31g7-8 and "оставать са" at 58v18.
Having described in some detail the instances of systematic omission of a letter in a position where a jer would be reconstructed, I consider it necessary to comment on the editors' statements in this regard.

Their cursory discussion is found in the introduction to the edition. [1983:26] They seem to limit themselves to jers which were in the first syllable of the word and which would have been in weak position. With respect to such jers, they offer three generalizations. First, when the consonant which followed the jer had a higher sonority than the consonant which preceded the jer, the letter "z" is normally not used in the orthographical representation. Second, when the consonant which preceded the jer had a higher sonority than the consonant which followed the jer, the weak jers are preserved. Third, when both consonants which surrounded the jer were sonorants, "b" and "d" are preserved "sporadically".

There are many problems with these assertions. First, the editors imply that the first generalization covers items other than words related to "prince" and derivatives of the base *knīg-, although they give no specific examples. In addition, the data on the root *zyl- (see above) would seem to contradict the generalization. Derivatives of *zyl- are written more
frequently with "ъ" between "з" and "л" than without it. Similarly, forms of the verb whose reconstructed infinitive is *sъръстъ are never spelled "ср-" although the generalization would lead one to expect just such a representation.

The formulation of the second generalization is faulty because it is predicated on the assumption that the presence of a letter implies the presence of a sound. On the doubtful validity of the third generalization, see above.

There also seem to be gaps in the generalizations. For example, since the editors limited themselves to reconstructed jers in initial syllables, spellings such as "тъкмо" and "дондаже" are not covered. There is no generalization which would describe the fact that derivatives of, e.g., the reconstructed root *тъм- are consistently spelled with "ъ" between "т" and "м". Finally, the generalizations do not address the situation in which both consonants surrounding the reconstructed jer are obstruents, as occurs in the words for "who" and "what" among others.

The remaining instances in which there is no letter standing in a position where a jer would be reconstructed are all isolated. An exhaustive list follows.63,84,85
I will now examine the orthography of ME as it relates to the word-initial variations *ja/*a, *ju/*u and *je/*e/*o in Slavic. I will start with the alternation *ja/*a. The orthographical representations of forms which participate in this alternation do not permit broad generalizations. Rather, one can only state how individual lexical items are treated.

Forms of the verb for which Vasmer reconstructs an infinitive of *aviti [IV:540-541] as well other words derived from the root found in that verb are always written with "ma" as the first letter. All told, there are about 75 such examples.

In contrast, the nominative case form of the first person singular personal pronoun is almost always "aB'b". That spelling is found several hundred times. There is only one exception, "ma" at 83a20.
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Similarly, the word for "if" is consistently spelled "amē". It never occurs with "ạ" as the first letter. Furthermore, like "aṣẹ", it has a high token frequency. There are literally hundreds of examples.

I recorded five instances of the word for "lamb" and all are written with initial "a". The five examples are "aŋyọ" at 4a2, "a/ŋyọ" at 80v16-17, "aŋyọ" at 165a21 and 211g17, and "aŋyọ/ça" at 186b5-6.

The word which is glossed as "right away" [Lunt 1959:1] is regularly written "aṣi ẹrẹ". The first letter is never "ạ". The total number of examples is on the order of 100.

There are several other words which are relevant to this discussion and, based on general structural and semantic considerations, one might expect that there is some etymological connection between them. One member of this group occurs with very high frequency. It is written "bako" and Lunt [1959:62] gives a gloss of "as, when, in order to, because" for it. There are hundreds of examples of this item. There is also one instance of "ako" at 135b16.

Other members in the group have a much lower token frequency than "bako". First, there is the word for
which Lunt [1959:1] gives a gloss of "like, as". It is consistently spelled "aκи". It is found a total of 22 times.90

The group also contains a pronoun which occurs in only six examples. They are "απάμε" at 11g12, 52a17 and 135v25; "ακα" at 82b12 and 122g7; and "απε/ξε" at 204b13-14.91,92

The remaining items in this group are "αμο" and "αμο". The first is found at 14a21, 14a25, 144g11-12, 144g23-24, 145a22, 165a13, 197g24, 206g11, 211g20 and 211g24. The second is at 22b15, 25g21, 25g25, 64v5 and 92a8-9.93,94

The only other examples pertinent to this discussion of the alternation between word-initial *ja and *a are listed below.

"ανια" 82g11, 177g10

"αγοδιηνα" 107a5
"α/γοδιηνου" 107b12-13

"αφραδιε" 184b11, 184g16

In the case of initial *ju/*u, one finds almost exclusive use of "oy" as the first letter in the orthographical representations. Words derived from the base which means "morning, early" are found only with initial "oy". There is a total of 21 examples. A sample of the data is given below.95
I also noted 13 instances of "ǝǝǝuǝpǝ", e.g., at 9v8, 43g11, 46g10-11, 55b16. However, that represents a derivative in which the "oy" is not word-initial. Furthermore, neither Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955] nor Lunt [1959] lists a spelling for this word with "w" in place of "oy", but Vasmer [II:73], under the entries "ǝǝǝpǝ" and "ǝǝǝpǝx", does cite several forms which might motivate reconstruction of *zajutra, if they do not represent later formations.

In a similar manner, words derived from the root which produced English "young" are always represented orthographically with an initial "oy". There are 14 instances of words with this root, although one is problematical. A subset of the data is listed below.

"уунашп" 9v17
"уунаш" 55g23
"уун" 25g20
"уунюсти" 56a17
"уунъци" 61b18

In the spelling of the word for "already", one also finds only initial "oy", never initial "w". There are over 50 examples of "уюшъе". In addition, there are two certain examples of an expression which would seem to be related to that word. In the manuscript it would
have appeared as "њёу", but Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:141,148] and Lunt [1959:57,61] write a space after "њё" in their normalized orthographies. The editors do the same. The examples are found at 8g12 and 100b15.*7

The sole deviation from the consistent pattern of initial "њё" in the orthographical representations of words which participate in the word-initial alternation *ju/*u, is the form "њё/ња" ("southern") at 37v11-12.** However, in the portion of the manuscript under consideration, this is opposed by four other examples which are listed below.

"њёжска ња" 84v5, 170a14
"њ/њ" 88a20-21
"њёра" 99g11

Several other orthographical representations will be mentioned in this context as well. The reconstructed forms for the words which they denote do not have initial *ju or *u, but rather initial *љо or *љ. Furthermore, in all instances there is some basis for positing an alternation comparable to the *ља/*а and *ju/*u alternations discussed above. The forms are being discussed in the context of the alternation between initial *ju and *u because in East Slavic *љ
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and *jʊ merged into *u and *ju, respectively, prior to the time when the earliest surviving East Slavic manuscripts were written.

The first item is spelled one of three ways in the portion of ME under examination, "оудоу", at 67a21-22, 67b4, 94a7 and 137b9; "оудж", at 94a14; or "оудзв", at 137b16. It means "where". In Lunt's OCS glossary [1959:62] one finds the spellings (using Lunt's set of symbols) "qdu" and "jqdu" with this meaning.

The second item is "оудицу", which is found at 50b13. Sadnik/Aitzetmuller [1955:83] cite the pair (in their system of symbols) "qдica" and "jqдica", which, given semantic considerations and the traditional relationships between sound and symbol which are assumed for OCS and Old East Slavic, would seem to represent OCS words which are etymologically related to the word spelled "оудицу" in ME.

The next set of examples includes "оудоре" at 28g2, "оуроди/воу" at 33g6-7 and "оуродиви" at 51a23 and 51b5. With respect to the first item, the editors of ME imply that the "correct" spelling would have been "оурода", but the scribe wrote what is given above. [1983:61]
The final two forms are "оуэъ" at 84a2 and "оуэа" at 126b24. The gloss for them is "fetter". (cf. Vasmer IV:152, 528)

As a group, the orthographical representations of participants in the third alternation are similar to those of participants in the alternation *ja/*a. There are no global generalizations which apply. Rather, one can only describe what happens with each lexical item.

Forms of the word for "one" and derivatives of the base of that word, e.g., "единочат−" at 2v5 and 7a21, "едина/ч̄е" at 42v24-25, are consistently spelled with initial "э". The total number of examples of such forms, combining derivatives and the word "one", reaches several hundred.

In contrast, the word for "lake" is always written with initial "е". However, the data set is modest in size, consisting of just 13 items. Examples are found at 28g2-3, 29a12-13, 29a19, 33b12-13, 46b5, 72a9, 72a11-12 and elsewhere.

The word to which Lunt [1959:14] assigns the gloss "as much", has as its orthographical representation "ежикъ" in almost all instances, i.e., with initial "э". Out of 62 total examples, there are only two deviations from that spelling: "ежикъ" 17g15 and "еди/ко" 71v1-2. The first deviation still has initial
"ἐ" and it undoubtedly represents an error at some level, either by the scribe, the editors or the typesetter.**

In the representation of the lexical item which means "still", the letter "ἐ" predominates in initial position. In a data set consisting of 44 items, all but two follow that pattern. Examples are found at 15g25, 19g6, 21a12, 21g9, 21g18, 24b13, 44a13-14, 56a17-18, 60v9 and elsewhere. The two exceptions are spelled "ἐψε" and are at 90v12 and 97b17.**

The data adduced in the immediately preceding discussion suggest that the distribution of "ἐ" and "ἐ" in initial position is not random. An examination of the other instances of initial "ἐ" and "ἐ" supports such a conclusion.

The items which are written with "ἐ" as a first letter can be divided into four groups. First, there are non-Slavic personal names and possessive adjectives derived from such names. This group includes, among others, "ελίσει" at 71v20, several instances of the name "ελισαβετ-", as well as a number of derived possessive adjectives which are found in the readings containing Christ's genealogy, which are found at
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70a23-70v11, 179a5-179b20 and 179v1-180a3. The first two passages are Luke 3:23-4:1 and the third is Matthew 1:1-17.

The second group consists of non-Slavic place names. Several examples would be "єма/оусь" at 3a21-22, "єнон" at 5v22, "єфрем" at 20b21, "єрихона" at 55g3 and "єлеонсьсій" at 63g10.101,102

Like the first two groups, the third is composed of borrowings into Slavic and adjectives derived from borrowed words. The difference is that these borrowings do not fit semantically in the other groups. A partial listing of the members of this group follows: "є/вреискъ" at 11g1-2, "єли/ни" at 20v6-7, "єхидньова" at 45b11, "єхидньсци/i" at 51g19-20, "єлинськ-" at 65g18 and the word for "Gospel", e.g., at 28a9-10, 32a6-7, 43v24, 52b6-7, 54v14-15, 54v19 and elsewhere.

The last group contains five items. None are borrowings. The interjection written "єн", the conjunction spelled "єда" and the base "єтєр-" all occur more than once.103 The other two members of the group are found one time apiece. They are "єльма" at 82v1 and "єдва" at 89a17.104

In contrast, "є" is not found as the first letter in the orthographical representations of forms of the anaphoric (relative) pronoun whose masculine nominative
singular is reconstructed as *jền (*jĕže); of non-past forms of the verb "be"; and of non-past and participial forms of the verb whose reconstructed infinitive is *jĕmati. In addition, the word which Lunt [1959:14] glosses as "when" is always spelled "жеда".

The next phenomenon is the orthographical representation of the prefixed verbs which result from combining the prefix *pri with the base verbs whose reconstructed infinitives are given below.

*jěti/*iti (cf. Vasmer II:117-118)
*(j)ěti (cf. Vasmer II:19)
*jĕmati (reconstruction per Vasmer II:19)

In this discussion only certain forms of the resulting prefixed verbs are relevant because the question is whether or not one finds the spelling "при-".

For the first verb, it is necessary to consider any form which does not involve the suppletive element reconstructed as *-ѣд-. As a practical matter, this means that the non-past, the imperative, the aorist and the infinitive must be examined. With the second verb, the pertinent forms are the non-past, the imperative and the past active participle. Only two relevant examples of the last verb occur, at 5g12 and 26b17-18, and both are infinitives.

In the portion of the manuscript under consideration there are over 400 examples of the first
verb. Only six, at 7v15-16, 32v19, 63g19-20, 81g21, 145b4 and 145g17, were written "праин-". The others had a single "и" after "п".

The examples involving the second and third verbs present a different picture. Combining the latter two gives on the order of 95 data items. Every one of them is written "праин-".

The last topic in the description of the use of the vowel letters will be the relationship between the distribution of the letter "з" in orthographical representations and the positions for which jat' is reconstructed. Normally, the letter "з" marks the reflex of jat'. Furthermore, that letter generally does not occur in positions where a vowel other than jat' would be reconstructed. The exceptions to this distributional pattern can be divided into four groups.

In members of the first group, one finds "е" in positions where jat' is reconstructed and "з" in positions where *е is reconstructed. A large number of these instances involve the dative/locative and the genitive of the second person singular personal pronoun (orthographically "тео" and "тео") and of the reflexive pronoun (orthographically "сео" and "сео"). Evidence of "confusion" in the use of these
four pronominals is adduced below. However, the lists are confined to indisputable examples, i.e., those in which only one case form is acceptable given the context in which the pronominal is found.

The dative/locative "Теbэ" stands for "Те6э" at 30a11, 47v12, 47v13 and 125a4. In the index the authors classify the first three of these as dative forms, which, if true, would mean that they are not pertinent to this discussion. [1983:453] Furthermore, in a personal communication, Prof. Daniel Collins suggested that the first instance might simply be an example of syntactic variation for the slot in which it appears.

That example is found in the phrase "въ слѣдѣ" ТеБэ" 30a11. I examined all instances of "въ слѣдѣ" which the editors list in the index, 40 in all. [1983:437] With the exception of the example under consideration, when an "object" followed "въ слѣдѣ", the orthography would lead one to analyze the "object" as a genitive. In fact, there is even one instance in which the "object" is "Те6э", at 104b2-3, and the editors label this instance of "Те6э" as a dative. [1983:453]

The second and third items occur in the phrases "о десною ТеБэ" (47v12) and "о/лѣвою ТеБэ" (47v12-13),
respectively. Like the first, the editors categorize these as datives. [1983:453] I examined all instances of the phrase "ο δεσούμ" which are cited in the index. [1983:339] There are 27 of them. Ignoring the item at 47v12, when an "object" follows the phrase, it is a genitive in all but one instance.

That one exception is noteworthy because the "object" is "κεφα" (137v18) and the editors label that instance of "κεφα" as a genitive. [1983:433]

Finally, I should mention one more example. It is "ο δεσούμ τεσκ" at 127v24. The editors label this instance of "τεσκ" as a genitive. [1983:453]

The use of "τεσκ" for expected "τεφα" is rather more frequent than the reverse situation discussed above, with examples at 28g19, 48g1-2, 70g8, 71g18, 76g9, 77b23, 88g21-22, 93b19, 123a19-20, 148g18, 157b19, 175g8, 186g9-10, 187g25, 188a5, 190b1 and 198g13. For the reflexive pronoun, one finds "κεφα" in place of "κεφα" at 29a16, 44v2, 134v15 and 137v18. Finally, "κεφα" is used in lieu of "κεφα" at 3a16, 85v22, 91v12, 93v24, 111v9, 151v21, 159v14 and 183g7.

In addition, I recorded a number of other instances of the phenomenon under consideration, although they are not as systematic as those listed above. The first seven all involve the representation
of a single root, *tēl-. In these examples one finds
"тел-", rather than "тъл-". The relevant items are
"телеси" (34b16, 87b13), "телесъняймя" (70a17, 187b12),
"телеса" (155g17, 162a23) and "телесе" (208v22). As
one can see, in all seven the stem extension,
reconstructed as *-es-, is represented. However,
there are examples written "тълес-" and, in general,
this root is written more frequently with "ъ" after
"т", e.g., at 9b14, 34a12, 34a14, 34a16, 34b5-6, 34b8
and elsewhere.

Another set of examples consists of "цесаре" at
118g21, "цеса/вестъ" at 119a12-13 and "це/сара" at
167g7-8. As with the preceding set, spellings with "ъ"
instead of "е" are more frequent for these words.

There are two more instances of the sequence
"-це-" for the reflex of *-се-. The first is found in
"исъстете" at 94b5, an imperative derived from the
reconstructed verbal root *sēk-. The other is
"оце/маете" at 51v7-8. This form is interesting
because at 51v4, just three lines earlier, one finds
"оцѣлаютъ", i.e., what would seem to be a different
form of the same word with "ъ" after "ц".115
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The two instances of "дръвнишъ", at 78a2 and 79v2, belong in this discussion as well. Both examples represent the word which means "old", not a derivative of the word for "tree".

Finally, there are three isolated forms: "обръмъне" at 35g2 (the second "ѣ"); "моръ" at 38g11, accusative singular; and "сѣи" at 50g9, dative singular feminine.\(^{116}\)

Up to this point the examples containing "ѣ" for the reflex of *ē and "ѣ" for the reflex of *e have all been native Slavic words. However, the orthography of several borrowings and derivatives of borrowings suggests that they too deserve mention in this discussion. The list of such items includes the words for "Galilee", "Galilean" (adjective), "Judea", "Matthew", "Zebedee", "high priest", "Pharisee", "Pharisee's" and others. The relevant orthographical feature is presented below in the form of pairs of representations which are found in the manuscript.

"галилеъ-" versus "галиле-"
"матеѣ-" versus "матеѣ-"
"севѣдѣ-" versus "севѣдѣ-"
"архіерѣ-" versus "архіерѣ-"
"фарисѣ-" versus "фарисѣ-"

The quantity of examples varies from word to word over a fairly wide range. However, the relative
frequency of the variants within each pair is less significant than the fact that there is an alternation. 117

One borrowing must be addressed separately. It is the word for "Beelzebub". In their standardized orthographies for OCS, Sadnik/Aitzetmuller [1955:149] and Lunt [1959:5] indicate that the representation(s) for this word contain the sequence "-zë-". However, in the portion of ME under consideration the corresponding item is spelled with "-se-" once, at 33a23-24, and "-so-" five times, at 37a14, 37a25, 57a8-9, 83a1-2 and 83a15-16.

The second group consists primarily of representations of words derived from the root which means "eat" or the root which means "go (using some means of transportation other than walking)". I will begin with the latter root, as forms containing it have a much lower token frequency.

I noted only five forms which represent derivatives of that verbal root. Four are unprefixed derivatives, while one contains a prefix. The unprefixed derivatives include two imperfects, one imperative and one present active participle. The prefixed derivative is an imperative. The examples are
The data on the root which means "eat" have been divided into three sets. The first contains unprefix ed nominals. All five members of this set have "м" as the initial letter in their representations. The data set consists of "мады" at 35b1, 76b18 and 173b24; "мади" at 87b5; and "мадъ" at 184b10.118

The second set contains all prefixed derivatives of the root which are found in the portion of ME under consideration. Among the members of this set four different prefixes are represented. They are spelled "из-", "об-", "по-" and "сън-". In all of the examples with "из-", "об-" and "сън-" the reflex of the root-initial jat' is written "м". That encompasses 23 items.119 There are three examples with "по-". Two have "м" denoting the reflex of the jat' and the other has "м".

Forms of the unprefix ed verb which means "eat" constitute the third set. In these examples, the letters "м", "м" and "м" stand for the reflex of the reconstructed jat'. The last letter occurs only once: "мады" at 12b3. In gross terms, the distribution between "м" and "м" favors "м", although not to an overwhelming degree. There are just over 50 instances.
with initial "א" to almost 80 with initial "מ". However, of the 50+ examples with initial "א", all but three (approximately 6%) are found before folio number 138, even though just under 20% of the total number of examples of this word occur after folio number 137.

In addition, there are several noteworthy distributional facts relating to the use of "א" and "מ" in the representations of particular forms of the verb. For instance, the third person plural aorist form occurs nine times and "א" holds an advantage of 8-1 in those examples. Similarly, in the third person plural non-past form "א" maintains an edge of 7-3. In contrast, totaling the forms of the active participles, past and present, one obtains a ratio of 27:3 in favor of "מ".

The other members of this group are comparative forms of the word "many, much". To four examples spelled "מֹהַרְמ ל", at 84v10-11, 84v16, 170a19 and 170a25, there are seven with "-אה-".

The next group is included because, according to the normalized OCS orthography of Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955] and Lunt [1959], the corresponding words contained the sequence "-א?-" in OCS, instead of "-א?-" which is found in ME. However, Vasmer did not provide etymologies for the specific words represented below.
Therefore, I do not know with what degree of confidence one can reconstruct a jat' in the position in question. A list of the pertinent items, along with the location of the corresponding OCS spelling, is provided below. When an item occurs five or fewer times, I indicate where the examples are found. Otherwise, I only state the total number of instances.

"хаманъ" 6g7 [Sadnik/Aitzetmüller 43; Lunt 21]
"дьянйах/хъ" 17b21-22 [S./A. 27; Lunt 62]
"власа/ница" 35b19-20 [S./A. 152: "vlasenъ"]
"стъкланицъ" (10) [S./A. 124; Lunt 51]
"древъ-" 62g2-3, 89v21 [S./A. 22]
"дѣвъ/нѣкъ" 77b14-15
"багъраницъ" (8) [S./A. 8; Lunt 2]
"багъ/раноу" 152a9, 152a18-19
"оцитано" 154a5, 158a24 [S./A. 74; Lunt 36]

One could add to this list two verbs, consistently written "въспоманъ-" and "поманъ-", respectively. Combined, they account for 17 examples. However, Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:92, 158] and Lunt [1959:9, 39] cite parallel forms in OCS for them. One variant is spelled with "-энъ-" and the other has "-анъ-".

The last word which I want to mention in this group differs slightly from the others in that the sequence in question has "м" as the second letter, not "н". The word is the preposition which means
"opposite". In the portion of ME under consideration all seven instances of this preposition are spelled "пра̀мо". In contrast, for OCS Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:100] and Lunt [1959:44] give the spelling "пра̀мо" for this word.

The last "group" actually contains only one word, although its token frequency is reasonably high. It is the word which means "each, every". In the readings copied by Aleksa it is written "вьсак-" or "вьсак-". For OCS, Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:151, 152] and Lunt [1959:10] give two variants, "вьсакъ" and "вьсъкъ".121

5.2. Headings

For the remaining portions of the manuscript, the discussion will proceed as it did in the preceding chapter. I will focus primarily on orthographical practices which distinguish these other portions from the readings copied by Aleksa.

As a point of departure for the analysis of the headings, I reiterate the set of vowel letters and digraphs used in them.

а е ж и і о оу оу оу а а а к и ъ у у н м "

With respect to the representations of the reflexes of *u, *Ѓ, *ju and *jЃ, there are only two
items which I will address.122 The first is "cv(ẹ)" at 22v16, which represents an abbreviation of the word for "Saturday".

To the extent that it is meaningful to speak of a reconstructed form for this word (cf. Vasmer III:792), the use of "v" to denote the reflex of *q is unique. However, in the index this example is listed under the entry written "coy(ẹ)" [1983:486], which suggests that the orthography of the text in the typeset edition might not match the orthography of the manuscript.

The other item is "coymoy" at 171a24, which denotes the masculine/neuter dative singular of the present active participle from "be". I cite this form because it is the one example in the portion of the manuscript under consideration which has a symbol other than "ọ" standing for the reflex of *ju or *jọ.

The situation is quite different in the data sets for the reflexes of *jɛ, *ja and *q.123 The number of deviations from the pattern found in the readings copied by Aleksa is reasonably large, but almost all of them belong to a rather well-defined class of words.124

The one isolated exception is "недъля" at 9g8. It represents either a nominative singular or a genitive singular of the word for "week", depending upon the syntactic structure. However, there is some reason to
doubt whether the final "a" is actually in the manuscript. In the index this example is listed under the entry spelled "недъла". [1983:481]

In the remaining deviations one finds the letter "a" instead of expected "я". The "a" denotes a Slavic desinence which has been attached to a non-Slavic stem. There are on the order of 150 such items and in most the form being represented is a genitive singular, although in many instances I am not certain which declensional pattern is involved, "*jo-stem" or "*ja-stem". I adduce several examples below.

"матея" 29b4
"григория" 175v9
"еустратия" 177g18
"викентия" 189a3
"терентия" 195a23

The orthography of the so-called "tense" jers follows the pattern which predominates in the readings copied by Aleksa. When the jer and the following jot would have been tautolexical in the reconstructed form, the reflex of "tense" *ъ is written "Ъ", while "и" denotes the reflex of "tense" *ъ. There are no exceptions. Conversely, I found no examples of "Ъ" for the reflex of reconstructed word-final *ъ or "и" for *Ъ# when one would posit initial jot for the word which immediately followed.
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Potential violations of the principle that "ъ" stands for the reflex of *ъ and "ь" represents the reflex of *ь are few in number. Depending upon the reconstruction which one adopts, three instances in which the adverb "yesterday" is written "вчера", at 190v4, 198v20 and 202v20, and three examples of the adjective "yesterday's" with initial "вчр-", at 192g10, 200b6-7 and 205v8, might qualify. There are no examples of either word which contain "ъ" in place of "ь".

Another potential departure from the pattern is "нижъ" at 197v9, although the entry in the index for this form is spelled "нижъ" [1983:487], which raises the possibility that the orthography in the text results from an error in the typesetting.

The compilation of a list of items lacking a letter in a slot for which a jer would be reconstructed is complicated by one of the methods of abbreviation found in the headings. The practice of simple orthographical truncation (see preceding chapter) without the use of an extralinear letter or "ъ", obvious markers of abbreviation, creates the possibility of two analyses of examples such as "правь/дьник" at 124a7-8 and "оудалих" at 205v11.
However, there are examples which do not encounter that problem. I noted 42 such items and none of them represents a departure from the pattern found in the readings copied by Aleksa.\textsuperscript{127}

There is nothing noteworthy in the representations of items which participate in either of the word-initial alternations \(*a/*ja\) or \(*u/*ju\). The number of relevant examples is comparatively small and their orthography is consonant with the patterns found in the readings copied by Aleksa.

In contrast, the data set for participants in the word-initial alternation \(*e/*je/*o\) contains two items which do not conform to the usage found in the readings copied by Aleksa. The two examples are "одиною" at 174a6 and "одина" at 182v18. Both of them are derived from the base meaning "one", which is written more frequently with initial "м" in the headings.\textsuperscript{128}

There is nothing which distinguishes the headings from the readings copied by Aleksa in terms of the orthography of the verb forms containing the prefix reconstructed as \(*pri\). The number of examples is quite small and they all follow the prevailing pattern described in section I.

As for the correlation between the distribution of the letter "м" and the location of slots for which \(e\)
would be reconstructed, I noted only one native Slavic item in which the reflex of *e was denoted with "e", "недела" at 7a7. Furthermore, as this example was listed in the index under an entry spelled "недела", I suspect that the second "е" is in the manuscript.

[1983:481]

5.3. Readings Copied by Second Scribe

The set of vowel letters and digraphs used in the readings attributed to the "anonymous" scribe are listed below.

а е и о у о ё ю ы

Those two readings offer nothing new with respect to the representation of the reflexes of *ř, *u, *jř, *ju, *ę, the "tense" jers, initial *ja/*a, initial *ju/*u, initial *e/*je/*о and the prefixed verbs which contain the reflex of *pri.

The only items worthy of mention in relation to reconstructed *je/*ja are the two examples of "ємьа" at 67v4 and 67v17. Both are genitive singular forms of an obvious borrowing.

Subject to the limitations applied to the corresponding discussion in the preceding two sections, the only deviation from the use of "ъ" to denote the reflex of *ъ and "ъ" to denote the reflex of *ѣ is "въсама" at 67v3.
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There are only two instances in which no letter represents the reflex of a jer, "вса" at 67v9 and 67v13, but this does not mean that the two readings under consideration contrast sharply with the portions of the manuscript examined above. In fact, there is only one word whose orthography in this regard is distinctive.

It is the word which means "dog" and it occurs twice, "пьсомь" at 68a11 and "пьси" at 68a12. In the readings copied by Aleksa "з" never stands between "п" and "с" in examples of this item and most often one finds "ψ" instead of "пс-". However, that statement is based on only four occurrences, so I do not want to attach undue significance to this difference.

At this point I want to address a statement by the editors in their introduction regarding the orthography of the word for "only" in these two readings as opposed to its representation elsewhere in the manuscript. In their brief discussion of the evidence supporting their attribution of these two readings to a scribe other than Aleksa, they assert that the anonymous scribe spells the word "тъкъмо", not "тъкъмо". [1983:9]

The problem is that the example of "тъкъмо" which they cite, at 68a3, is the only instance of that word in the two readings under consideration and one example
hardly establishes a pattern, although that is the implication of their statement. Furthermore, that example is at the end of a line and the word which begins the next line has initial "κ". Therefore, the scribe might have retained "ϣ" between "κ" and "μ" in order to preserve the pattern that the last letter on the line be a vowel letter (or digraph), a pattern for which there is abundant evidence. Finally, the suggestion that "ΤξΚΜ" does not occur elsewhere in the manuscript is simply not correct. It is found in the readings copied by Aleksa, although it is less frequent than the variant without "ϣ" between "κ" and "μ".  

The last issue is the correlation between the use of "ϴ" and the distribution of *ē in reconstructed forms. There is one example of "ćeēe" where, based on the syntax, one would expect "ćeēē", at 67v24.  

5.4. Colophon

As in the preceding chapter, this discussion will consist of three parts, one for each individual who contributed to the colophon.  

5.4.1. Aleksa

With respect to the topics under examination in this chapter, there is nothing in the colophon written
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by Aleksa which merits comment. Representations of the reflexes of reconstructed vowels follow the patterns found in the readings copied by Aleksa.

5.4.2. Žaděn"

The short entry by Žaděn" also conforms to the readings copied by Aleksa in terms of the usage of vowel letters and digraphs to denote the reflexes of various reconstructed segments.

5.4.3. Naslav"

The passage belonging to Naslav" differs from the preceding two in that one finds in it certain phenomena which distinguish it from the remainder of the manuscript. I begin consideration of this material with a recapitulation of the set of vowel letters and digraphs contained therein.

The first two items to be cited relate to the orthography of the reflex of *ju. They are "ъръ" at 213a23 and "ъдъдъ" at 213a24. In both instances, "ъ" stands for the reflex of *ju. While that general phenomenon does occur in the readings copied by Aleksa, the two words represented in the examples just adduced do not belong to the class of forms in which this phenomenon is encountered in those readings.
The representations of the reflexes of "tense" jers generally follows the usage which predominates in the readings copied by Aleksa. However, there are two exceptions, "съконъчаньы" at 213a24 and "подъяхъ" at 213b9.

Probably the most interesting data in this colophon involve the use of letters other than "ѣ" and "ѣ" to denote the reflexes of *ѣ and *ѣ, respectively. More specifically, in four items "ѣ" occupies a slot for which one would reconstruct *ѣ. The examples are "людемѣ" at 213a24, "пришель" at 213b5, "людемѣ" at 213b12 and "честъ" at 213b18. In all four the jer in question would have been in the penultimate syllable and in the so-called "strong" position. Furthermore, these are the only instances in this colophon of words whose reconstructed forms would have contained jers meeting those two criteria. However, one must be careful not to exaggerate the significance of this data set, as it consists of only four examples.

Another unique feature in the text by Naslav" is the treatment of items whose representations in other portions of the manuscript usually lack a letter in a slot where a jer would be posited. The four instances of the word "all" have "ѣ" between "ѣ" and "с". The examples are "вѣсе", at 213b4 and 213b6, and "вѣсѣмѣ", 210
at 213b11 and 213b15. Similarly, the dative/locative form of the first person singular personal pronoun occurs once, at 213b16, and it is written "мынъ". Unfortunately, the number of examples is small. Therefore, the fact that their orthography deviates from patterns found elsewhere might not be meaningful.

Finally, there appears to be an item in which the reflex of *(j)ɛ is written "мɛ". The form is "братьмɛ" at 213b19. It is the genitive of a collective noun which functions as the plural of "brother". That collective noun follows the singular declension of the etymological "ja-stem" nouns.

The colophon by Naslavъ offers nothing noteworthy in the orthographical treatment of the reflexes of *ɛ, *u, *jɛ, *jɛ, *ja, *ɛ, initial *ja/*a, initial *ju/*u, initial *e/*je/*o or prefixed verbs containing the reflex of *pri.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1 In terms of the chapter in which they would be considered, the assignment of reconstructed segments was straightforward. However, for some of the reconstructed sequences there was no obvious principle on which a decision could be made. In those instances, the decision was essentially arbitrary.

2 The example spelled "памовгаху" at 199g7, in which the letter "y" occupies a slot for which *q would be reconstructed, might represent an error in the typesetting because in the index the entry for this item is spelled "-xoy". [1983:425]
   However, the example "cape^ey" at 71v17 appears to be a legitimate exception to the generalization as formulated above since the orthography of the entry for that item in the index matches the orthography in the text portion of the edition. [1983:431] With respect to possible objections that one cannot speak of a reconstructed form for this item, as it is a non-Slavic place name, I think that while the objection is valid for the stem of this word, the desinence is taken from Slavic and, therefore, reconstructable.

3 I did not perform calculations to determine whether the relative frequency of these letters and digraphs in slots for which *u is reconstructed is the same as their relative frequency in slots for which *q is reconstructed. A meaningful comparison between the use of "y" for *q and the use of "u" for *u is hindered by the fact that there appears to be a positional constraint on its use, i.e., it is found in the overwhelming majority of instances as the last letter on a line.

4 I have excluded from this discussion instances in which an alternation between word-initial *u and *ju or between word-initial *q and *jq is observed in Slavic. Those items will be treated separately later.

5 No significance should be attached to the fact that I am transcribing the reconstructed forms with the digraphs "ju" and "jq", respectively. That choice should not be interpreted as a statement about the nature, either phonetic or phonemic, of the sounds.
6 I have excluded from this discussion instances in which an alternation between word-initial *u and *ju or between word-initial *q and *jq is observed in Slavic. Those items will be treated separately later.

7 There might be an objection to adding the "definite"/"compound" forms as examples of "oy" denoting the reflex of reconstructed *ju because, one could argue, the desinence in those items might not have existed in Late Common Slavic. In including those forms, I am assuming that any deviation from the corresponding reconstructed desinence occurred in some sound or sounds other than the sound denoted by "oy".

8 The last item in which "y" stands for the reflex of *jq, "oymū" at 114g7, is somewhat problematical. The difficulty is that two letters have been omitted from this representation, but it is not marked as an abbreviation. Orthographically there should be the sequence "hō" between "y" and "m". The passage is from Mark 14:51 and the form in question is an accusative singular of the word which means "youth". Incidentally, Lunt [1984:49] asserts that a nominative plural is required in this context. That would presumably necessitate an interpretation of the letter "h" which immediately precedes "oymū" as the accusative singular masculine of the anaphoric pronoun and the object of "mama", while "oymū" itself would be the subject of "mama". The problem with that analysis is that the referent for "h" would be the word "oynoma" at 114g5, while "oymū" itself would refer to a group of people to whom such a designation had not been applied, i.e., those who had come to arrest Christ. In contrast, if one accepts the proposition that an accusative singular is appropriate in the slot occupied by "oymū", then the referential problems are eliminated. The form "oymū" refers to the same individual as "oynoma". The letter "h" immediately preceding "oymū" represents the emphatic particle which could be glossed in this instance as "as well". Finally, the subject of "mama" is an unspecified "they" which is understood to be the group which arrested Christ.

9 The representation of the reflex of word-initial *ja is omitted from this discussion. It will be discussed later.
10 This statement should not be interpreted as an assertion about the status of the *j in question in the reconstructed language. I have simply tried to formulate the description of the environment so that it will be clear which positions are involved.

11 There is some doubt about the second example because in the index it is listed under the entry spelled "cоξμα". [1983:432] Unfortunately, I cannot determine where the error is.

12 The treatment of the genitive singulars as exceptions in the present discussion implies that the desinence which the final vowel letter represents is derived from *e (South Slavic), rather than from *ê (East Slavic).

13 In the sequences just characterized, V stands for any vowel letter or digraph and it is assumed that the members of any sequence belong to the same word.

14 The enumeration of examples in parentheses is not intended to be exhaustive.

15 There is one potential member of this third set which is somewhat problematical. It is the word for "Galilean". It occurs a total of five times in the portion of the manuscript under consideration, at 88b21, 88b23, 115v8, 120b3 and 120g19. There are both singular and plural forms among the examples and the element which they all share is "rajrajieaH-".

Based on the orthography, the structure of this word appears to be similar to native Slavic derivatives which generally identify an individual or group by national or geographical affiliation. Furthermore, the singular forms appear to contain the singulative suffix, spelled "-иH-", which is characteristic of these derivatives.

If this word did arise through addition of a Slavic suffix to the base of the non-native place name "Galilee", then these items might not belong to the third set because the "a" in the V + "a" sequence would denote the reflex of an element in a reconstructable morpheme. I will ignore for now the question of the nature of the segment or sequence whose reflex "a" represents.

However, it is also possible that a base which meant "Galilean" was borrowed as a unit and, due to semantic and structural considerations was adapted to
an extant Slavic pattern, which included the attachment of a singulative suffix. In this regard, the segmental composition of the English gloss for this word, "Galilean", is particularly interesting.

16 Karskij regards "-aa-" as the "expected" spelling in these verb forms. [1962:18]

17 Admittedly, there is a problem with each of these reconstructions of the root. In the case of *olk-, how was /alk-/ obtained? If the form was *alk-, why was the vowel in the diphthong in the earlier *ölk- or *ålk- not shortened? However, these questions are not crucial to the present discussion. The important fact is that the root did not begin with *ja.

18 These items are being addressed separately from the foreign borrowings in set three because here the "a" in the sequence V + "a" is the orthographical representation of the desinence and it could be argued that the desinence, at least for forms representing oblique cases, is Slavic and is subject to reconstruction.

19 In a number of instances the genitive singular forms result from the use of the genitive case with nouns denoting male persons in syntactic slots which normally require the accusative case.

20 There are four items which belong either to this set or to the set of items in which the reflex of *je is written "a". (see above) They are "андъя" at 54v23 and 73b23; "хъринеа" at 121v17; and "исеа" at 179v15.

The first two items and the fourth item are personal names and they occupy syntactic slots in which one would expect to find accusative forms. The problem is that the nominative singular of the words represented in these instances is spelled with final "-a" in ME. Therefore, I am not certain from which declensional pattern the "accusative" desinence in these examples was taken.

With respect to the third item, it is not clear what is intended, "Cyrene (place name)", "of Cyrene (adjective)" or "resident of Cyrene". The passage in which it occurs is Luke 23:26.

These four items were excluded from the calculations of total numbers of exceptions to the generalizations on the use of "a", "å" and "æ" for the reflex(es) of *je and *ja.
This question only relates to the words which render nominative case forms.

For the example at 42b3, I am operating on the premise that, at best, forms with the sequence *ava coexisted with ones containing *aja in earlier stages of Slavic. I also must concede that I cannot preclude the possibility that this example reflects a scribal error. It is possible that the form should be *"-дан-".

In this discussion I disregarded the four instances of the interjection spelled "я". They are at 154a21, 154v2, 158b14 and 161v17.

I suspect that the item written "връма" at 198a10 reflects an error in the typesetting. In the index this example is listed under the entry "въ оно връма". [1983:317-318]

One could object to the examples with "ш" and "хд" because the sequences *sk and *zg which I am reconstructing would have had a morpheme boundary between their respective first and second segments. Moreover, the morpheme boundary would have been between the final segment of a prefix and the first segment of a stem/root and there is no way to be certain that the particular prefixed form existed during the time period for which the sequences *sk and *zg would be reconstructed.

On the accuracy of the correlation between etymology and orthography with respect to the distribution of "ъ" and "ъ" see below.

With respect to the time when ME was copied, the word from which "тъмъ въна" was formed was a comparatively recent borrowing into Slavic. Therefore, one might argue that this example is not relevant to the generalization under discussion because there is no earlier form in Slavic to reconstruct. A comparable objection could be raised against "тъмъ въна".

The example "сы" at 5a17 was omitted from the list because I have some doubts about the proper analysis of that sequence of three letters. From reading the passage which contains this item and taking into account the combination of letters which is used, three possibilities exist for completing the linguistic
slot which is represented orthographically by "сыи". They are the masculine nominative singular of the present active participle of "be"; the masculine nominative singular form of the pronoun "this (one)"; and the masculine nominative singular form of the pronoun "this (one)" in combination with the emphatic particle spelled "ъ". In the third possibility there would actually be two words, not one, in the linguistic slot. Moreover, based upon the orthographical norm for the section of the manuscript under consideration, the orthographical representation of that third possibility would be "сыи".

I should note that the editors themselves, via a footnote, indicate that there is something unexpected about this example, although they do not elaborate. [1983:34]

Karskij treats the sequence "ъи" in this example as a unique representation of the reflex of *y, equating it with the more frequent "ъ". [1962:13] That implies that he regards the form in question as the present active participle of "be".

Lunt also addresses this item. Like Karskij, he considers it a form of the present active participle of "be", but he interprets it as the "determined" form, which means that "ъ" stands where one would expect "ъ". [1984:48]

The difference between the analytical approach of Karskij and Lunt and the approach which I adopted here is that they appealed to other sources in order to determine what the "correct" form should be in this instance based on the chapter and verse which is being conveyed (John 3:13). In contrast, I attempted to consider as well how one might make sense of the sequence of symbols which actually occurs given the semantic content of the passage in which they are found.

29 The item "творити/ъи" is problematical. The passage containing it is "ъи оладь поаш /и женоу своя. развь словесе/любодвинааго. творити/ъи любоде вати" at 29а23-29б1 from Matthew 5:32. The form "творити" should represent a third person, non-past, singular form of the verb. If that is the case, then it belongs in the list of exceptions given above. However, the orthographical representation of the word which, in its reconstructed form, contained the *j is not only on a different line, but also in a different
column on the folio. Admittedly, that fact does not have any linguistic significance, but it does seem somewhat odd.

30 The examples "въйну" at 26g21; "въ ину" at 22a24 and 209v24; and "въ ну" at 46b9 are not in either list because I was not certain whether to treat these sequences as combinations of preposition + object or as set forms which already had attained the status of separate lexical items. However, either the first one or the last three should be included, depending upon the analysis which one adopts.

31 In this discussion, I am not considering instances in which there is no orthographical representation in ME where a jer would be reconstructed. That issue is considered later. In addition, the orthography of the so-called "tense" jers is not part of the present discussion. They were treated earlier.

The reconstructed sequences of jer + *r/*l or of *r/*l + jer, when they occurred between consonants, is treated in the discussion of the orthography of consonants.

The representation of the person/number marker in third person singular and plural non-past verbal forms and in certain third person singular aorist forms is discussed in the chapter on morphology.

Finally, I have disregarded borrowed items for which it makes no sense to speak of a reconstructed Common Slavic form.

32 The basis for the conclusion that etymology would lead one to posit *ь and not *ъ in this word is Vasmer's analysis, which derives the word from *do + *ede + *ъ with subsequent analogical reformation leading to the introduction of the nasal. [1:529]

33 Both Lunt [1959:13] and Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:21] give "normalized" spellings for this item which would lead one to believe that the nasal which the word contained was, at least in some areas, phonetically and/or phonemically equivalent to the reflex of Proto-Slavic *nj. If that is correct, then the presence of "ъ" is even more noteworthy.

34 I disregarded the example spelled "допьже" at 63b22 because the scribe clearly erred in this instance.
Incidentally, the editors themselves commit an error in their treatment of this item. On the page where it is found in the text they provide a footnote which indicates that the spelling given above actually occurs in the manuscript. [1983:102] However, in the index they list this example under the entry spelled "дондеоё". [1983:341]

35 In the index, under the entry "дондеоё", the editors list an example at 26a22, but do not list the example at 26a12-13. [1983:341] There is no such example at 26a22.

36 I decided not to distinguish the affirmative and negative forms of "be" for the purposes of this discussion because the difference between them relates to the beginning of the word and the phenomenon under discussion is found at the end of the word.

37 There is an example at 14v11, "жемь", which might also belong in this discussion. The problem is that the context is ambiguous. The reading starts with John 8:31-32 in which Jesus is speaking to a group of people. In that speech second person plural verb forms are consistently used. (Other words in the speech preclude the analysis of the verbs in question as third person dual forms.)

However, in John 8:33, containing direct speech which is not by Jesus, but is in response to what Jesus has just said, the direct speech is introduced by "отъвъща же/жемь" 14v10-11, i.e., the verb of speaking is a singular aorist. To complicate the situation further, immediately after the form "жемь", there is the clause "и никому же не работахо/мь николи же" 14v12-13 with a first person plural aorist.

38 Three other examples of "вамъ" are more problematical. Based on the surrounding text within ME itself, a first person plural or a first person singular would be admissible at 26a23 and 196b20, although the passage, John 21:24 in both instances, normally contains a plural.

At 55a4, "вамъ" is part of a passage which represents direct speech. The verse is Mark 1:24. In the portion of the speech which precedes "вамъ", the forms "на/мь" 55a1-2 and "насть" 55a4 are found. However, Mark 1:25 begins with "и запрасти/жемоу ястъ" 55a5-6, i.e., the speaker from Mark 1:24 is classified
as a singular. Incidentally, the passage in question normally does contain a singular form of the verb "know".

39 For "eat" and "give", the other two verbs which are traditionally classified as "athematic", there are no instances of a violation of the generalization regarding the use of the letters "y" and "b" vis-a-vis the positions in which "y" and "b" are reconstructed. With "give" this holds over a data set totaling approximately 25 items, if one includes the first person singular and plural forms of both the unprefixed verb and derivatives obtained through the addition of a prefix. In the case of "eat", there are roughly ten examples between the unprefixed verb and prefixed derivatives.

40 Examining the data relating to the orthographical representation of the first person singular and plural of the "athematic" verbs, one immediately notices the extent to which instances of the first person singular of the verb "have" dominate the list of exceptions. At that point the obvious question becomes how to explain the observed distribution. Unfortunately, that is a question which I cannot answer because, among other things, I do not know whether for ME it is appropriate to juxtapose the orthographical representations of forms of, for example, "be" with the orthographical representations of the corresponding forms of "have".

41 For this discussion, I am disregarding the dative form of the first person singular personal pronoun which is written "Mh".

42 Lunt does not list the derived possessive adjective.

43 I did not note any instances in which "b" was written between "b" and "r".

44 Obviously, to include this example among the exceptions, one must assume that the final "b" in the normalized OCS orthography can be associated with the vowel *b and that the final vowel in OCS more accurately reflects the earlier state of affairs.

45 For this discussion, it is not crucial whether, at the time ME was compiled, this already represented a single lexical item or was still analyzed as a
prepositional phrase. The editors seem to think that it would have been considered a single lexical item, as there is no space between "TextChanged value" and "TextChanged value" in the text and the expression has its own entry in the index [1983:323].

46 One must also assume that the letter "TextChanged value" used in the OCS orthography can be associated with the vowel *TextChanged value and that the final vowel which is found in the OCS variant of this word more accurately reflects the earlier state of affairs.

47 This word does appear with "TextChanged value" as the final letter, at 50b11, although that seems to be the only such instance.

48 In both passages, when they parsed the text in the manuscript, the editors associated the preposition spelled "TextChanged value" with the sequence "TextChanged value" which followed it. Thus, they treated the sequence "TextChanged value" as a form of the pronoun "all". To the extent that Schmalstieg is correct in his assertion that "all" is not used in the dual, but rather is replaced by forms of the word which means "both" [1983:68], the parsing of the editors is inexplicable because in the two passages "TextChanged value" is immediately followed by "TextChanged value". Furthermore, in the index the editors labeled one instance of "TextChanged value" a genitive dual and the other a (prepositionless) locative dual. [1983:327]

Lunt [1984:50] also mentions these examples, although it is not clear from his statement whether he realizes that the editors analyzed them as instances of "all" and not as preposition + demonstrative pronoun.

49 Several of the examples deserve some additional comment.

For the word spelled "TextChanged value", both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:151] and Lunt [1959:10] give a normalized OCS form with "TextChanged value" as the second letter. Therefore, to classify this example as an exception, one must assume that the "TextChanged value" in the normalized OCS orthography can be associated with the vowel *TextChanged value and that in this instance the vowel found in the OCS variant of this word more accurately reflects the etymology. For ME I did not note any instances in which the orthographical representation of this word had "TextChanged value" instead of "TextChanged value".

With "TextChanged value" at 46a14, the issue might be less one of orthography than of the intended form. The spelling
which is found would be valid for a dative plural of the pronoun. The semantics of the passage (Matthew 18:7) would require an instrumental singular. For the given pronoun, the only difference in the orthographical representation of those two forms is in the final letter.

In addition, while one cannot draw any firm conclusions, it is worth noting the similarity between this example and the group of first person singular and plural non-past verb forms discussed earlier. In all of those instances the "ъ" was the last letter in the word and the letter immediately preceding "ъ" was "м", which I think one could safely regard as the orthographical representation for a bilabial nasal.

The form "десатьми" denotes an instrumental plural. It was included because, at least in OCS, the instrumental plural desinence of the numeral "10" was usually spelled either "-ъ" or "-ым". (cf. Schmalstieg 1983:176) In fact, those other spellings do occur in ME.

The presence of "маеоу/саъ" might seem to be a contradiction of the stated practice of excluding "recent" borrowings from consideration. However, the syntax of the passage in which this example appears, Luke 3:37, which contains part of the genealogy of Christ, requires that this form be analyzed as the masculine nominative singular of a possessive adjective. The only way to reconcile the orthography with the syntactic requirement is to treat this as the representation of a derivable of a personal name obtained through suffixation with the reflex of the formant *-j-. I contend that any material which would have followed that derivational suffix should be regarded as Slavic and, therefore, reconstructable. In this instance, that would apply to the segment denoted by "ъ". Incidentally, the same passage is repeated later in the manuscript and the word under consideration is spelled "маеусъ", at 179bl3, in that second instance.

Obviously, when ME was compiled, the stem represented in "ъ" was a comparatively recent borrowing into Slavic and, therefore, one cannot speak of a reconstructed form for that stem. However, the desinence is a native Slavic element and it is the final "ъ" in the representation of that desinence that is pertinent to the current discussion. Incidentally, in the index this example is listed under the entry
spelled "нибудь". [1983:363-364] Therefore, it is possible that the spelling in the text resulted from an error in the typesetting.

The example "днёми" is an instrumental plural. It was included because, at least in OCS, the desinence in this form of the word meaning "day" was usually spelled either "-ъ" or "-ыми". (cf. Schmalstieg 1983:101) In ME, "-ъ" is not used to denote the desinence in the orthographical representation of instrumental plurals of this word, while "-ыми" is found in numerous examples.

The putative exception "тъгда" is somewhat suspect for two reasons. First, in the index it is listed under the entry spelled "тъгда" [1983:452-453]. Second, at 160v6 in the text the spelling "тъгда" also occurs, but an emendation for that item is provided on the errata sheet at the end of the edition. Therefore, the example at 161b20 might be an error in the typesetting which was simply overlooked during the compilation of the errata sheet.

Finally, in the index the adduced instance of "людьмь" is cited under the entry spelled "людьмь" [1983:379], while the example of "единомь" is found under the entry spelled "единомь" [1983:471].

The example "и/сълить" at 9gl6-17 is interpreted as representing a supine, then it too should be included. However, there is another analysis. The full context in which this example appears is "моляше и. да сънить и/сълить съ него" (John 4:47), which stands at 9gl6-17. It is possible that the scribe omitted a letter, i.e., that he should have written "сънитьисълить". If that is the case, then the form in question represents a third person singular and, consequently, is not germane to the present discussion.

The second item is "бьчень" at 209b16. Its status depends upon the reconstruction which one adopts. Vasmer [III:416] cites etymologies with both *ъ and *ь as the vowel after initial *б, giving preference to one with *ъ in that position. Lunt indicates that in OCS one can find both "ъ" and "ь" as the second letter in the orthographical representation of this word. [1959:4]

For this discussion, I disregarded the sequence "въ сънь/жении" at 108v8-9, even though Lunt
[1984:49-50] indicates that there are not two words, but one, and that the first component of the word should be a form of "all". The problem is that, if Lunt's analysis is correct, then the word should begin with "**всесъ-**" not with "**въсть-**", i.e., the issue ceases to be just the representation of the reflex of a jer.

For this discussion I am disregarding all words which are abbreviations and are marked as such either with the symbol "--" over the word or with an extralinear letter (which the editors indicate by placing the letter on the line in parentheses).

In addition, I am excluding words which are rather obvious borrowings into Slavic. Although I will not define precise criteria for classifying words as borrowings, as a practical matter, the words which fell under this provision can be divided into five categories: personal names, place names, terms for phenomena relating to Christianity, terms for phenomena bound to a non-Slavic culture or words derived from members of the preceding four groups. A partial list of excluded items follows: "Levite", "Andrew", "Andrew's", "Bethsaida", "Bethsaida's", "angel", "Alpheus's", "Matthew", "of the Gergesenes", "Киись (a type of tax)", "blasphemy", "blaspheme", "Ephraim", "Bethlehem's", "Bartholomew" and "Boanerges". I cannot claim that the list is exhaustive because I did not maintain a separate record of the items which I intentionally excluded from consideration.

Finally, I want to emphasize the formulation of the orthographical phenomenon under consideration. The discussion focuses exclusively on the lack of a letter, more specifically "ъ" or "ъ", in a particular position in orthographical representations. That is not the same as claiming that there is no symbol which might be part of the orthographical representation and which might have been intended to stand for the reflex of the reconstructed jer.

Karskij notes a correlation between the presence of diacritical marks and the absence of "ъ" or "ъ" from an orthographical representation in a position in which a jer would be reconstructed. [1962:15] In their introduction, the editors make a similar statement. [1983:22] However, the significant number of other positions in which diacritical marks are found [Karskij 1962:15; Žukovskaja 1983:22] makes it practically impossible to go beyond an empirical statement about the distribution of such symbols, and the intentional
omission of most diacritical marks from the typeset edition [cf., 1983:26] prevents any examination in this dissertation of the use of diacritical marks.

53 These four items are treated together because the latter three are derived from the first. See Vasmer [I:304-305,362-363,364] on the relationship between them and for the reconstructed forms.

54 On the letter which stands after "c" in the word which is glossed as "each", see below.

55 Although it is not possible to draw any firm conclusions, it is interesting that the masculine nominative/accusative singular is the one form of this word in which the reconstructed *b under consideration would have been in "strong" position.

56 These figures do not agree with the index, which lists four instances of "МНОГ". [1983:299] However, three of those, at 140v14, 140g12 and 145b5, are actually spelled "МНОГ" in the text. In addition, the editors list the item at 22b22 under the entry spelled "МНОГ" [1983:299], but in the text it contains "b" between "M" and "H".

57 The item at 22v15, which is listed in the index under the entry "МН" [1983:299] is actually written "МН" in the text.

58 The treatment of these items in the index is inadequate. First, there are three articles on two separate pages [1983:381, 384]. This results, in part, from the classification of some under the initial sequence "МН-" and others under "МК-". Lunt addresses the more general problem with the index which this particular instance exemplifies. [1984:51]

In addition, the example "МНОЖЕБ" at 84v16 is listed twice, once as a comparative adverb [1983:381] and once as a neuter nominative singular of a comparative adjective [1983:384].

59 In tabulating the data on "much, many", I treated adverbial forms and adjectival forms together. For the sake of simplicity, I also did not attempt to distinguish the single lexical item meaning "some" from the combination of the particle of negation and a form of "much, many".
With respect to the latter distinction, the editors seem to have been rather careless. To demonstrate that point one can compare "нажного" at 23v22, written as one word, with "не много" at 146a19, written as two words. Both examples are from John 14:30. Furthermore, the second example is catalogued in the index as two separate words. [1983:383,390] The first is absent from the index.

In the index the examples at 88b21 and 147b13 are listed under entries with "мън-", not "мън-". [1983:384-385]

Lunt offers one possible motivation. In a discussion of the omission of the letters "ь" and "Ъ" in Codex Marianus, he points to the fact that many of the forms lacking those letters "are frequently occurring" and probably would have had "allegro-forms". [1988:18] However, as Gribble [1989:7] correctly argues, that explanation cannot be applied to all of the words lacking "ь" or "Ъ", even in Codex Marianus.

In the index the editors list eight items under "ничъто" which, in the text, lack "ь" between "ч" and "т". [1983:393] The eight are at 16g13, 17b18, 33b2, 50g11, 51b2, 59a3, 65b13 and 65b25.

The item at 132v11 which the editors list in the index [1983:467] under the entry "чтеть" is actually "чтеть" in the text.

The obvious structural similarity between the root *-чън-, on the one hand, and the forms of "what and "nothing" which were discussed earlier, on the other hand, leads one to ask whether the scribe might have "erroneously" used the spelling which was acceptable for "what" and "nothing" (i.e., "чън-") with the verbal forms which were written "чтн-". Since, taken as a group, forms of "what" and "nothing" are far more frequent than forms of the verb in question, it is conceivable that writing "чтн" instead of "чтн" became almost automatic. Unfortunately, there is no way to prove whether this is what happened, and, therefore, this discussion is strictly speculative.

In the index the example at 205a14-15 is listed under the entry "нискто". [1983:393]
66 In the index the example written "κτό" at 12a12 was omitted and the examples which are actually at 12v6 and 12v7 in the text were placed at 12v5 and 12v6. [1983:376]

67 In their dictionaries, both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:49] and Lunt [1959:23] (but cf. Lunt 1959:22) give a normalized OCS orthography for these three words which would lead one to believe that the nasal in the base was qualitatively the same as the reflex of *nj. That would not follow from the reconstruction in Vasmer. Nonetheless, since the quality of the nasal is not crucial to the present discussion, I will accept the reconstruction in Vasmer.

68 In the index one instance of "κ" which belongs to this set is missing. It is found at 23b18.

69 Gribble [1989:10] offers one explanation for this phenomenon. The obvious segmental similarity between the preposition and the first two segments in the pronominal form, on the one hand, and the nominative of "who", on the other hand, could have led to a mechanical transfer of the spelling which predominates in "who" to the sequence "κτο-" in these prepositional phrases. In fact, a similar explanation might also apply to the examples in the preceding set, although the vowel letter following "τ" is not "ο" in those instances.

A different possibility was offered by Prof. Daniel Collins in a personal communication. He suggested that the orthography in this instance might reflect a phonological reality both with respect to "who" and with respect to the prepositional phrases in question. He proposed that, since the prepositional phrases would have constituted a single phonological word, the same processes might have led to the loss of the jer in "who" and in the prepositional phrases.

70 The interpretation of these items is complicated by the fact that a synonymous pronoun *dojëdeže, which would be spelled "дожнє", exists (see Lunt 1959:13) and there are other words in the edition in which the letter "н" appears where "н" is obviously required. Two such examples are "нчннщ/ннъ" at 2b7-8 and "нлнкно" at 17g15. Therefore, it is possible that in one or more of the examples "н" should actually be written instead of "ν". Furthermore, even if such an error had occurred, there is no way for me to determine
whether it was introduced by the scribe, the editors or the typesetter because I do not have access to the manuscript itself.

71 In the tabulation I disregarded the example spelled "доньеже" at 63b22.

72 In the index two of the twenty, at 28g20-21 and 31b11-12, are listed under the entry spelled "доньеже". [1983:341]

73 The treatment of these examples in the index is ill-conceived. First, there are two articles. [1983:453] In one the forms are labeled adverbs. In the other they are listed as conjunctions. However, in a non-exhaustive examination of the items I found five instances in which a gospel passage containing the word under consideration occurs more than once and the multiple examples are not all in the same article in the index.

74 For data which could be interpreted as evidence for a form *du- (= *dw- before a vowel) in Indo-European, see Vasmer I:486.

75 In the index the item at 161b24 is listed under an entry with "ън-", although in the text one finds "ън-". [1983:352] Conversely, the examples at 65a23 and 131g19 are given under the entry "ън", even though the text contains "ън" in both locations. [1983:352] Finally, The index appears to cite an example of "ън" at 45a15. [1983:352] However, no such form is found at that location. I suspect that "15" is simply part of a chapter and verse citation which was not fully deleted. The instance of "ън" at 45a2 is from Matthew 17:15, as is the example at 50v12, which immediately follows in the index.

76 The item placed at 32v7, according to the index, is actually at 32v8 in the text. [1983:439]

77 I could not find the examples at 136b3-4, 137a16 and 137b1 in the index and the example at 87v12 is listed under the entry spelled "ърън-". [1983:329]

78 In the article for the first derivative in the index the examples at 72v13-14 and 91b18-19 are listed under an entry containing "-ъдъо". [1983:376]
79 The first two examples and the fourth one are particularly interesting because a single letter, "ψ", is used to denote the reflexes of two segments which were not adjacent in the reconstructed form.

80 I will not try to resolve the question of which particular jer followed *t in these desinences, as OCS and Old Russian provide conflicting data. It is only important that one accept the proposition that there was a jer after *t.

81 I suspect that the crucial consideration is the fact that in the forms in question "c", and not a vowel letter, precedes the "τ" in the representation of the desinence. If that is the case, then one would expect that the corresponding forms of the verb "eat" and of prefixed derivatives of "eat", as well as the corresponding forms of "be", also should be included in this list. I simply did not record any relevant examples for these latter verbs in the portion of the manuscript under consideration.

82 Both sets of exceptions contain examples in which the "τ" under consideration is the last letter on a line. However, in neither set do they constitute a majority.

83 I omitted "τρεπετ/τ" at 9#4-5 because I decided to accept the editors' assertion that there had been a "b" after the last "τ", but that it had been erased. [1983:40]

84 Several of the enumerated items require some commentary. In "всax" the issue here is the absence of any letter after "x". On the lack of a letter between "в" and "c", see above.

Both "помолит" and "исполнит" occupy syntactic slots in which one would expect to find supine forms. Furthermore, both are immediately followed by "са", which represents the reflexive pronoun. However, in the portion of ME under consideration, it is generally not the case that the supine marker, usually spelled "-τβ", is shortened orthographically to "-τ" when it immediately precedes "са".

Finally, the significance of "в" is in doubt because the editors claim that it was written by a later hand. [1983:283]
85 There are some discrepancies between the index and the text in this regard. For instance, "вам" is listed under the entry spelled "вамъ". [1983:454] Similarly, "надъ" is listed under the entry spelled "надомъ" [1983:370], while "ник" is given under an entry spelled "никъ" [1983:355]. For "send" the editors cite two more examples under the same entry as "посланишо/оумоу", at 24a21 and 147b21. However, in the text both of those are spelled "-съ-". They also list an additional occurrence of "иер(o)съмъ", at 120g25. [1983:360] In the text one finds "иерс(o)лмъ" ("с(o)" - sic!) at that location.

The problem with the treatment of the two examples of "смотреть" is slightly different. They are entered on page 438, while the other examples of that verb are found on page 444.

86 With respect to the last alternation, *e/*je/*o, I am not certain whether convincing evidence can be adduced to justify a distinction, either phonemic or phonetic, between initial *e and initial *je.

87 In the index the instance of "мало" at 23a1 is missing. [1983:468] In addition, the example of "выйти" placed at 145g11 is actually at 145g12 in the text and the example of "завит" assigned to 182b12 is at 186b12. [1983:468]

88 The spelling "абъ" occurs once, at 60g7.

89 In the index the one exception is actually listed under the entry "бако". [1983:469]

90 In the index the editors list the example at 120a24 twice, classifying it once as a conjunction and once as an adverbial. [1983:300]

91 These forms are catalogued under the initial sequence "акъ" in the index. [1983:301]

92 Although it does not occur, one would expect that the masculine nominative singular form of this pronoun would be written *"акъ".

93 In the index the article containing the examples spelled "амо" is on page 300, while the article citing the instances written "амо" is on page 470. Moreover, there is no cross reference.
94 I refrain from any categorical assertion of etymological relationship between the members of this group, even between the words with the orthographical representations of "амо" and "амо", because of a claim by Vasmer [IV:552-553] in the discussion under the entry "яко". In that discussion, a suggestion is made that the forms *ako and *jako might derive from different Indo-European pronouns. If that is true, then that analysis could also apply to other doublets.

95 In the index the editors omitted the example of "оу/трима" from 105б15-16. [1983:459]

96 The problematical example is "оумъ" at 114г7 and it is missing from the index [1983:458], although that is not entirely surprising based on the assertion by the editors in the introduction to the edition that forms in the text which represent obvious scribal errors are generally omitted from the indices [1983:27].

97 There are several other potential examples of this latter item. The problem is that the sequence of symbols found in the text admits more than one parsing. Thus, at both 5г1 and 6г3 the manuscript would have had the sequence "негоубо". That could be parsed as "негоубо" or as "негоубо".

98 Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:148] and Lunt [1959:62] only cite the derived adjective from the root in question which was formed with the suffix *-уск-. They do not list "укънъ".

99 In the index both of the exceptions are listed under an entry which is spelled "хелико". [1983:472]

100 The representations for the words which mean "still" and "as much" were included in this discussion on the basis of forms cited by Vasmer [II:30-31 and II:15-16, respectively].

101 I do not know the base from which the last example is derived. However, in the reading it represents the name of a mountain. Therefore, I included it in the list of place names.

102 At least one member of this group does not seem to be included in the index. It is "елг/омъ" at 99а9-10.
103 In the index the example of the first item at 192a9 is listed under the entry "эй". [1983:345] In the text it is spelled "эй".

104 For none of the words in any of the preceding four groups did I note an example with initial "е".

105 In the index the example at 81g21 is listed under an entry spelled "прицать" [1983:418], although in the text it is written "прицать".

106 The example at 32v23, which is listed in the index under the entry "приять" [1983:419], is actually spelled "приять" in the text.

107 In this discussion I am excluding from consideration the orthographical representations of sequences which are reconstructed as *КерC and *СелC, where C stands for a consonant. Those sequences will be addressed later.

In addition, the question of the so-called "third" jat' will not be treated in this discussion. It will be handled in the chapter on nominal morphology.

Finally, an examination of the contrast, expressed in terms of orthography, between South Slavic "F" and East Slavic "A" in forms of the imperfect will also be omitted. That examination will be undertaken in the chapter on verbal morphology.

108 The issue of the vowel letter which stands before the person/number marker in imperative forms of verbs will be addressed in the chapter on verbal morphology.

109 On the presence of "е" after initial "т" and "с" in these forms, see the chapter on nominal morphology.

110 The example at 28g19 is listed under an entry spelled "тее" in the index [1983:453], although in the text it is written "тее".

The instance of "тее" at 104b3, which is labeled as a dative [1983:453], was addressed above.

111 The instance at 44v2 is labeled as an accusative in the index. [1983:433] However, the form "це" at 44v9, which occupies the same syntactic slot, is classified as a genitive. [1983:433]

112 I could not find the example at 183g7 in the index. The instances of "ceе" at 85v22 and 111v9 are
categorized as accusative forms. [1983:433] However, the expression in which both are found is "внимайте себе", which means "take care". In that construction a dative form would be expected.

113 There are several other times when the context would appear to require an imperative, but the letter before the person/number marker "-те" is "е", not "ъ". The problem is that in those examples the consonant letter which precedes "-ете" does not disambiguate, as it does in the deviation listed above. Below I list five such instances with an indication of their location in the manuscript and the gospel verse in which they occur. The editors classify four of the five as non-past forms, not as imperatives. [1983:310, 442, 470] Only the third example is listed as an imperative in the index. [1983:323]

"жмете" 18g3 (John 10:37)
"жмете" 18g6 (John 10:38)
"жметете" 72a21 (Luke 5:4)
"съблизете" 145v10 (John 14:15) (cf. 22g12)
"съдете" 185v20 (Luke 3:14)

114 In the index this example is cited under an entry containing the sequence "-мъ-". [1983:405] Lunt's statement regarding this example implies that he considers the spelling in the index to be the correct reflection of the orthography of the manuscript. [1984:36]

115 The semantics of the two clauses cast some doubt on the proposition that the same verb would be suitable in both instances. The reading is from Matthew 23. The earlier example is in Matthew 23:24. I checked two versions of the Gospel (one English and one Russian) and they gave "strain" [1976:35] and "оцеживающие" [1944:83], respectively. For the later example, from Matthew 23:25, the same two sources had "clean" [1976:35] and "оцемают" [1944:83]. Furthermore, Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:74] give, in their orthography, both "оцестати" and "оцездати". Similarly, Lunt [1959:36] lists, in his orthography, "оцездайте" and "оцестити".

116 The second item, "море" is actually listed under the entry spelled "море" in the index. [1983:382]

117 I realize that one cannot speak of reconstructed forms for these words and, therefore, one might object
to inclusion of them in the current discussion. Furthermore, both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955] and Lunt [1959] suggest a similar alternation in the corresponding OCS forms. However, these examples do reflect the same orthographical vacillation between "e" and "æ", as was found in the words listed earlier. For that reason, I decided to include them.

118 In the index the example which is actually at 35bl is placed at 35al. [1983:469]

119 One member of this set, "ΩΕΛΘΤΕ" at 84g14, was omitted from the index. [1983:396]

120 Moreover, in the one instance with "α", "βαμα" at 48b19, the context would actually admit the appropriate form of either "take" or "eat". If for some reason the scribe initially interpreted the form in the protograph as denoting an aorist of "take", then this example would not be relevant to the discussion of the orthography of "eat" and the distribution would be 8-0 in favor of "e".

121 I excluded from this discussion any consideration of the alternation between final "a" and final "α" in the representation of the lexical item(s) meaning "now" because Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:71] and Lunt [1959:31] list two variants for OCS. In Sadnik/Aitzetmüller the two are given as "nyña" and "nynē", while in Lunt's orthography the contrast is between "nyňja" and "nyne".

122 As in the examination of the readings copied by Aleksa, I omit from this discussion items for which the Slavic data reveal a word-initial alternation between *u and *ju or between *q and *q. They will be addressed separately.

123 The orthography of words which participate in the word-initial alternation between *a and *ja are not included in this discussion. They will be treated later.

124 For this discussion I am ignoring representations which contain "a" immediately preceded by a tautolexical vowel letter or digraph when both the "a" and the vowel letter or digraph preceding it belong to
a borrowed element. This convention affects items such as "релоуар" at 201a23, "дика/на" at 204v22-23 and "анфорана" at 205v1, among others.

125 The parameters established in the corresponding discussion of the readings copied by Aleksa remain valid. Instances in which no letter stands where one would posit a jer are excluded, as are the representations of the reflexes of "tense" jers and jer + liquid or liquid + jer combinations between tautolexical consonants; the person/number marker for third person non-past verb forms and certain third person singular aorist forms; and borrowings.

126 I am not certain which form the first example represents because the syntax is unclear. Therefore, it is possible that this item is irrelevant to the present discussion.

127 I omitted from the list "рьбда" at 202b10, even though Vasmer [I:411] cites the spelling "рьбда" for Old Russian. I also disregarded the two instances of "мрика", at 197b13 and 212b16, although Vasmer [II:633] gives "мрикь" for Old Russian and OCS and Lunt [1959:27] also indicates that the letter "ъ" stood before "н" in OCS. I mention this, despite the fact that Vasmer labels both items as borrowings.

128 Karskij does not cite the first of the two examples. Furthermore, he states that the form at 182v18 is the only instance of initial "о = ь". [1962:18]

The editors list "одинов" separately as an adverb, spelling it "одинов". [1983:482] They include "одина" with the other examples of the base which means "one". [1983:487]

129 In this discussion I am excluding from consideration the orthographical representations of sequences which are reconstructed as *CerC and *CelC, where C stands for a consonant. Likewise, the so-called "third" jat' will not be treated here. Finally, the contrast, expressed orthographically, between South Slavic "а" and East Slavic "ъ" in forms of the imperfect will also be omitted.

130 The erroneous claim that the spelling of the word for "only" constitutes evidence of the participation of
a second scribe is particularly striking given the complete absence of any mention of the orthography of the word for "dog".

131 This analysis assumes that the letter "р" should be associated with the East Slavic variant of the genitive singular desinence (*ē), not with the South Slavic variant (*q). Under that scenario, this would represent evidence of the loss of the contrast between *e and *ē after *j which occurred in East Slavic.

There is a second possible instance of this same phenomenon, "въроумие" at 213bl9. It immediately follows "братьм" and might modify it. However, the editors label "въроумие" as a nominative plural. [1983:488] The problem with that analysis is that it becomes unclear how "въроумие" fits syntactically if it is a nominative plural.
CHAPTER 6

REPRESENTATION OF CONSONANTS

The last chapter was devoted to an examination of the representations of reflexes of reconstructed vowels. In this chapter the focus shifts to the orthography as it conveys the reflexes of reconstructed consonants and certain sequences containing consonants and vowels. The analysis will be organized in the same manner as it was in the preceding two chapters.

6.1. Readings Copied by Aleksa

The set of consonant letters used in the readings which Aleksa copied are reiterated below.

\[b r a f f x \]

I will begin the discussion of the use of these letters with a consideration of the orthographical representation of the results of various palatalizations, particularly those involving the sequence \(*C + *j\), where \(*C\) is a consonant.¹
The orthographical means used to convey the reflex of the sequence *tj is almost uniformly "ф".\(^2\)\(^3\) The number of exceptions to that generalization is small. Those which I noted are listed below.

"ЧЖДНЕ/МЕ" 17g6-7
"ЧЖДЕМЬ" 104v8
"ОЧУТИША" 136a8
"МЕЧУПЕ" 154a7, 154b17
"МЕЧЪМЪ" (first person plural imperative) 159v11
"ЧЖЖЕМЪ" 196g25
"ЧЖЖИ/ИХЪ" 197a2-3

As one can see, the deviations are confined to three lexical items. Furthermore, there are other examples of these words elsewhere in the readings copied by Aleksa, although not necessarily representing the same grammatical forms, which contain "ф" in place of "ч", e.g., "ЧЖДНИХЪ" at 17g9, "ОЧУТАТЬ" at 79g22 and "МЕ/МЕТЪ" at 108g19-20.

In addition, there are three instances of the imperfect "ПРЪТАМЕ", in which the letter "т" occupies a slot where one would expect the reflex of the cluster *tj. The three are found at 155b11, 159a18-19 and 161v2-3.

Finally, there is "ВЪЗДРУЦУЮЩАЯ" at 28a18.\(^4\) In purely formal terms, operating with the traditional relationship between sound and symbol, if one can
relate "въздохнатьъ" to the verb listed by Vasmer [III:533] as "дышать", then this item should be included among the exceptions as well. 5

The distribution of the variants which represent the reflex of *dj is less one-sided. Two spellings predominate, "ж" and "жд", with the former holding a quantitative advantage in a ratio of approximately 11:4. That is based on a data set containing close to 400 examples. In terms of their position within the manuscript, almost half of the examples with "жд" occur in the first 50 folia and over 90% are in the set of readings assigned to dates within the church calendar, i.e., the readings which precede the menologion (through 163v).

There are also two other representations, each occurring once. One is "жд" and is found in the example "жаждеть" at 26b12. The other is in the imperfect form "вьхо/дышать" at 64v5-6.

It is necessary to add several qualifications regarding the domain over which the preceding quantitative statements apply. The first concerns the pair "тако же" and "такожде". 6 For OCS both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:135] and Lunt [1959:54] cite essentially synonymous parallel forms, in their orthographies, "тако же" and "такожде". Given that fact
and the use in ME of both "<&gt;" and "&gt;" to denote the reflex of *dj, one could analyze the final "&gt;" in the first member of the pair in two ways. It might denote the emphatic particle whose reconstructed form would not contain the sequence *dj (cf. Vasmer II:39), but the "<&gt;" in that sequence could also represent the reflex of the cluster *dj, i.e., the pair might be alternative spellings for the same word.7,8

In the quantitative statements presented above I included examples of the second item, but excluded examples of the first. I recorded approximately 40 instances of that first item. Thus, if they had been incorporated into the data set, the ratio in favor of "<&gt;" would have exceeded 3:1.

The second qualification involves the pair "послъ же" and "послъжде".9 The editors once again associate the sequence "&gt;" in the first member with the emphatic particle. Unfortunately, that treatment ignores the fact that one of the two instances of "послъ же" occurs in a verse which elsewhere contains "послъжде". The verse is Mark 12:6, and the two examples are at 203a25-203b1 ("-&gt;") and 106v18 ("&gt;"). In the tabulations I included the two instances of "послъ же".10
In addition, I should mention two isolated items which were included in the data set. They are "нікомоужде" at 13g20 and "тожде" at 161g6. I did not count corresponding forms with "же" instead of "жде", e.g., "нікомоу же" at 9g5.

There are some statements which can be made about the use of "ж" and "жд" in particular words or forms, but each one covers so few examples that it is not possible to be confident that the generalizations are significant. For instance, the word which means "leader" and the word which means "back" always contain "жд", "вожд-" and "завдж-", respectively. However, that is based on data sets of only six and four examples, respectively.

In contrast, past active participles of verbs in Leskien's fourth class whose reconstructed infinitives end in *-diti and which are formed with a jot palatalization of the *d have "ж", e.g., "троужь са" at 15a4 and "заблоужьма/ма" at 27a7-8. The same is true for representations of present active participles from verbs in Leskien's third class for which, in all non-past forms, one would reconstruct *dj immediately before the thematic vowel, e.g., "жажди/ы" at 28b10-11 and "эджради" at 58b25. All examples of the verb *stradati which involve a jot palatalization are
written with "ъ" as well, but over half of them denote present active participle forms and, therefore, are subsumed under the second generalization. These patterns rest on seven, eighteen and eleven examples, respectively.\textsuperscript{11,12}

The consonant letter which stands where *rj would be reconstructed is indistinguishable from the consonant letter which denotes the reflex of *r (i.e., *r not followed by jot). In both instances "п" is used. Furthermore, almost all of the vowel letters which follow "п" when it represents the reflex of *rj are also found after "п" representing the reflex of *r.

The only vowel letters which follow "п" standing where *rj would be reconstructed are "и", "в", "э", "а" and "о".\textsuperscript{13,14} For the first four, there are instances when the same vowel letter follows an "п" which represents the reflex of *r. A pair of examples for each of the four vowel letters is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*rj</th>
<th>*r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;вечери&quot; 26a7</td>
<td>&quot;низъ/тентъ&quot; 71g4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;сътворъ&quot; 21b5</td>
<td>&quot;рыцать&quot; 61b16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;горе&quot; 12a20</td>
<td>&quot;матеръ&quot; 30a23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;распьо&quot; 26v6</td>
<td>&quot;приобрашъ&quot; 27a21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only in the case of "о" is there an unambiguous orthographical indication that the reflex of *рj is being represented. Two examples of that sequence are "твопи" at 10v11 and "мопи" at 59v17.

In positions where one would posit the reflex of *пj, two different letters are found, "н" (which also denotes the reflex of *п not followed by *j) and "р". The latter spelling occurs in approximately 20% of the examples in the data set. The data set contains over 1400 items. However, those gross numerical statements mask some significant correlations between the choice of "н" or "р" and the vowel letter which follows them.

After "н" or "р", representing the reflex of *пj, the vowel letters "а", "е", "е", "и", "ы", "о" and "ъ" are used. The last vowel letter is found in only one word, "донъцес", which occurs 55 times. The letter "н" precedes "ъ" in all of them.

Before "е" and "о", "н" is written consistently. That is based on more than five hundred examples with "е" and approximately 65 examples with "о". The only exceptions are "оуме" at 150a11, "неному" at 153a24, "посте" at 70v11, "по/клон" at 181b15-16 and "меж" at 196b25 and 212b3.
Conversely, before "ε" the letter "η" is written in all but one instance. The exception is "Héó" at 71g24. This generalization is based on a modest number of examples, on the order of 50.

Before the remaining three vowel letters ("α", "ι" and "υ"), "η" occurs with varying degrees of frequency: before "α", in approximately 45% of the examples; before "ι", in 20%-25% of the instances; and before "υ", about 50% of the time. The percentages are based on roughly 165, 420 and 150 data items, respectively.

As with *ŋj, two different symbols are used in the representations of the reflex of *lj.19 They are "ι" and "ι". The first predominates by a ratio of approximately 4:1. That is in a data set containing more than 1700 items. Collectively, "ι" and "ι", occupying a position for which one would reconstruct *lj, can be followed by one of seven vowel letters: "α", "ι", "ε", "ι", "υ", "ο" or "ε". The combinatorial possibilities and their relative frequencies parallel quite closely the data for the reflex of *ŋj. However, before I address the individual pairs, it is necessary to state several decisions regarding the selection of data for this analysis.
First, I omitted from consideration the proper name "Nathaniel". I realize that this item represents a borrowing and, therefore, might not be relevant to the discussion of *lj because within Slavic one cannot reconstruct an earlier form of the word with *lj. However, both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:62] and Lunt [1959:29] give a normalized OCS orthography for this word which would lead one to believe that the consonant which precedes the desinence was phonetically, if not phonemically, equivalent to the reflex of *lj.

However, the examples of this word which are found in the portion of ME under consideration are spelled in a way which creates just the opposite impression, assuming the traditional correlation between sound and symbol. Several examples follow.

"наеанайл" 4b9, 4b18
"наеанайль" 4b14, 4v2-3

Another item which I disregarded is the form "маеоу/саль" at 70v4-5. It is found in the reading from Luke 3 which contains the genealogy of Christ. The passage consists of a series of possessive adjectives and given the means available in Slavic to derive possessive adjectives from personal names, one
would expect that the lateral in the word represented above would be phonetically equivalent to the reflex of *lj.

I also excluded several other isolated examples. They are listed below.

"зоровавелевъ" 70b9
"салаеиминъевъ" 70b10
"малеиленъ" 70v6
"съгляда" 105b12
"лана" 154v24
"зорова/велиевъ" 179a17-18
"салаеиленъ" 179a18
"мале/илевъ" 179b14-15
"сала/емилъ" 179g8-9
"салаеилъ" 179g9
"зоровавель" 179g10
"зоровавелъ" 179g10-11
"енманоуилъ" 180b3
"фа/нуилева" 190b5-6

All except "съгляда" are borrowings or derivatives of borrowings and there is no internal Slavic basis on which to posit the reflex of *lj in any of them. As for "съгляда", the reconstructed form of the word which it represents does not contain *lj.

Among the items which I included in the data set are the words for "Israel" and "Israel's" as well as the example of "Israelite" at 208v16-17 written "иизла/нъ". The word "Israel" occurs 13 times, while "Israel's" is found 24 times. Based on the orthography, one would conclude that the latter was derived from the former through the addition of the
suffix whose reconstructed form is *-ov-. I concede that it is methodologically inconsistent to admit "Israel" and "Israel's" when I excluded the borrowings listed above.

Plural forms of agentive nouns derived with the suffix reconstructed as *-tel- are also in the data set even though traditionally the sequence *lj is not posited in the plural stem of these nouns. This decision was based on the actual orthography of the forms in question, which led me to conclude that the singular/dual stem had been extended to the plural as well.

Two other members of the data set which deserve mention are the derived possessive adjective "Abel's", which occurs five times, and "маэусаль" at 179b13. The latter example represents the same word as "маэоусаль" which was listed among the omitted items above.

Finally, I adopted Lunt's position regarding the interpretation of abbreviations of the verb whose reconstructed infinitive is *golgolati. [1984:46] More specifically, I treated the "ר"/"יו" which followed "ר" in those abbreviations as an overt marker for the second lateral, not the first. Consequently, abbreviations of non-past, imperative, present active participial and present passive participial forms of
that verb, as well as of derivatives formed through the addition of a prefix, are part of the data set. Furthermore, they constitute a significant portion of the total number of data items considered in this discussion, just under 45%.

Before "в" and "д" one finds almost exclusive use of "л". I recorded only three instances in which "в" followed "л" to more than 200 examples with "л в". Similarly, "л" preceded "д" only 18 times in the data set for "д", which has over 850 items. The three instances with "л д" and several of the examples containing "л д" are presented below.

"ПОМИЩЕНИЕ " 41b9
"ВРЕТЕ " 76b17
"ВРЕЩ" 152b12

"ГЛЮ/ЦА " 3v22-23
"ОУЧИТЕЛЮ " 4a9, 59v14
"ГЛЮ " 4v10, 5a7
"ПОСИЩ " 25g13
"СТРОИТЕЛЮ " 47a10

In contrast, "л" predominates before "е". There are only six instances in which "л" is used, although I only recorded about 40 examples with "е". The six items containing "л е" are "исколено" at 61b19, "оклевета/нъ" at 91bl-2, "ГЛЮ/ТЕ" at 116a21-22, "выселеною" at 180b16, "оклеветайте" at 185v19 and "възглете" at 202g15.20
I only recorded nine examples in which the vowel letter was "ъ" and in all of them "ъ" denotes the reflex of *lj.

The other three vowel letters combine with both "ъ" and "я". The percentages with "ъ" are roughly 40% for "ъ", 35%-40% for "ъ" and about 50% for "а". The total number of examples for each of the three vowel letters is approximately 70, 130 and 385, respectively.

The letters used for "epenthetic-1" are the same as those which represent the reflex of *lj. Furthermore, in this usage the two letters combine with the same set of vowel letters as they do when they denote the reflex of *lj. Finally, the distribution of "ъ" and "я" as a function of the vowel letter which follows is, for the most part, close to the distribution which one finds when *lj is being represented.

Before "ъ" and "я", only "ъ" is used to indicate "epenthetic-1", with three exceptions, "ъъъъ" at 25g10, "ъъъъ" at 211v6 and "ъъъъ" at 36b19-20. That is based on almost 170 examples with "ъ" and approximately 110 with "ъ".

Conversely, there is just one instance in which "ъ" represents "epenthetic-1" and combines with "е",
although I only noted a total of eleven examples with "п". The lone exception is "приемлет" at 178 gl.

In combination with "а", "epenthetic-1" is always represented by "п", but that generalization covers a mere nine items, e.g., "въяс/мять" at 86b4-5 and "землъ" at 211b22.

With "а", "и" and "ь" the letter "п" is more frequent as the representative of "epenthetic-1", but "п" occurs in 10%-15% of the examples with "и", in 25%-30% of the instances with "ь" and in slightly less than 50% of the examples with "а". These percentages are based on data sets containing on the order of 90, 115 and 165 examples, respectively.

In addition to the Common Slavic consonant clusters ending in jot which were considered above, there were sequences in which more than a single consonant preceded the jot. Forms which contain the reflexes of some of the three-segment jot clusters are found in ME and it is the representation of those reflexes which will be examined next.

For this discussion the clusters were divided into three groups according to the morphemic and lexical affiliation of the two segments which preceded jot in the reconstructed sequence. The first group contains those instances in which the two consonants would
probably have been regarded as members of a single morpheme. In the second group the two segments belong to the same lexical item, but to different morphemes. The last group consists of instances in which the two segments belong to different lexical items which combine to form a single phonological word.

In ME, there are examples of the reflexes of six clusters which qualify for the first group. The corresponding reconstructed sequences are *skj, *stj, *snj, *znj, *slj and *klj. The reflexes of *skj and *stj are consistently spelled "ш". An example for the former cluster would be "шп" at 16v14. For the latter, "пръвъщени" at 26v19 can be adduced.

I noted only one instance in which the reflex of *snj is represented. The example is "оу/тъшнауке" and it is found at 86v18-19.

In the portion of ME under consideration there are 16 items whose reconstructions would contain the sequence *znj. The primary exponents are certain forms and derivatives of the verb whose infinitive in OCS was spelled "слазити". (cf. Sadnik/Aitzetmüller 1955:12, Lunt 1959:3) In all of the instances, either "жн" or
"жн" is found in the position where *znj would be posited. Two examples are "Слажнаахоу" at 62b7 and "оупраж/њахоу" at 62g15-16.

All of the instances in which *slj would be reconstructed are derivatives of the base *mysl-. The reflex of *slj in these items is spelled "шп" or "шп", as in "помъплєнниа" at 21g1-2 and "помищлаахоу" at 49b8.

I recorded less than ten examples representing words in which *klj would be reconstructed. In all of them, the reflex of *klj is written "кљ". One such item is "приключъшші/къ" at 3a23-24.

In the second group, two clusters are represented, *zlj and *zrj. The first would be posited for forms of the verb "love" to which the prefix *въз- has been added and its reflex is written "ал" or "ел". Examples can be found at 7a10, 21b24, 34a24 and elsewhere.

The reflex of *zrj occurs just once, in "въздружната" 28a18.28

The last group contains only one cluster, *znj. It would have arisen in prepositional phrases consisting of *bez or *jъz and, as their object, a form of the anaphoric pronoun whose reconstructed masculine nominative singular is *jъ. In approximately 15 instances, the reflex of *znj with the word boundary
between *z and *n is spelled "шн". It is written "шн" twice, in "нз неро" at 71g23 and "нз неро/з" at 77v13-14. It is also spelled "жн" four times, in "жн неро/ро" at 37v22-23 and in "жн неро" at 179g21, 202a22 and 207b15. Finally, the variant "жн" occurs once, in "жн неро" at 164a23.

Among the non-jot palatalizations, the orthography regularly reflects the results of the second regressive palatalization of the velars. For reconstructed *k, *g and *x, the reflexes are spelled "ц", "з" and "с", respectively. Several examples are given below.

"апьь" 11g12 (masculine instrumental singular pronoun)
"пицьте" 32g21 (second person plural imperative)

"слпou/зъ" 28g17-18 (dative singular)
"мпоси" 30b3 (masculine nominative plural)

"грьськъ" 14b7 (locative plural)
"весьзь" 31b19 (feminine dative singular)

The effects of the first regressive palatalization of the velars are also manifested through the orthography. In positions where that sound change would have operated, "ч", "ж" and "ш" occur for reconstructed *k, *g and *x, respectively.²⁹

In formulating the preceding generalizations, I excluded from consideration instances in which the reconstructed velar immediately followed, in morphophonemic terms, either *s or *z. The
representations of the reflexes of those obstruent clusters in the appropriate environments will be described as a function of the morphemic and lexical affiliation of the segments which constitute the clusters. (cf. the discussion of *CCj.)

In the first group, where the continuant and the velar were members of a single morpheme, the clusters *zg and *sk are represented. The former would be reconstructed for only three examples, "ро/ждях" at 23q18, 146b16-17 and 172a3, and the vowel which followed *zg was one which conditioned the first regressive palatalization.

Similarly, the reflex of the sequence *sk preceding an original front vowel is represented just twice. The items are "слпша" at 204b12 and "слыша" at 207g22-23.

In contrast, there are almost 55 instances of the reflex of the cluster *sk in an environment which conditioned the second regressive palatalization. All of them are in adjectives derived with the suffix which is reconstructed as *-бск-. In these items the reflex of *sk is spelled in one of two ways, "сц" or "ст". The latter is more frequent, by a ratio of nearly 4:1. Furthermore, all but one of the examples containing "сц" are found prior to folio number 74.32,33
The second group, in which the continuant and velar belonged to the same lexical item, but to different morphemes, contains words in which, morphophonemically, *z + *g, *z + *x or *z + *k would be reconstructed. For all three sequences there are examples in which the vowel following the cluster conditioned the first regressive palatalization, while only the last cluster is represented in a position before a vowel which conditioned the second regressive palatalization.

The reflex of *z + *g occurs on the order of 35 times and it is spelled "жл" in all but two instances. The two exceptions are "и/жленоу" at 10v9-10 and "ъжазд/т" at 15b7-8.34

In the latter exception I am assuming that the intended prefix is *ъъz- and not *ъъ(w)-. If that assumption is wrong, then the data item is irrelevant to the current discussion. However, if it is correct, then that exception is the only member of the data set in which the sequence "жл" would have occurred twice in the same word had the reflex of *z + *g been written "жл". Obviously there is no way to know whether that consideration influenced the scribe.

The instances in which *z + *x would be reconstructed are almost exclusively forms of the verb
"go" in which the stem *ząd- is used and to which the prefix *jż- has been added. In these forms the reflex of *z + *x is consistently spelled "m". Examples can be found at 25a22, 38a2, 61g24 and elsewhere.35

There are 16 instances in which *z + *k would be reconstructed before a vowel which conditioned the first regressive palatalization. The reflex of that sequence is represented "m" in 14 examples and "u" twice. A sample of the data is adduced below.36

"ише" 3g6
"ицътени" 33b18
"бечъстънъ" 41v17
"ирадиъ" 45b11

The reflex of *z + *k before a vowel which conditioned the second regressive palatalization has a higher token frequency, but extremely limited lexical frequency. In fact, all of the instances are derivatives of the root which means "whole" combined with the prefix *jż-. From a data set consisting of roughly 80 examples, in nearly 60 the reflex of *z + *k is spelled "сц". In the others only "ц" is found.37

I recorded a total of ten instances in which the continuant and velar belonged to different lexical items, but would have been part of a single
phonological word. In all of them *z was the first segment and *k was the second. The examples are listed below.

"и/чрева" 53g9-10, 121g5  
"вечєсти" 62b9, 183v6  
"беддада" 97v12  
"ишрєва" 199b7  
"ічєркє" 5b13  
"у/с цєркє" 17a7-8  
"ис цєркє" 109a14  
"ис цєркє/є" 135g9-10

The last orthographical issue relating to the result of a palatalization is the representation of the nasal consonant which derives from *n in the reconstructed sequence *C[+high,+back] n V[-back]. In ME, "н" and "щ" are used to denote the segment in question. Those, of course, are the same two letters which represent the reflex of *nj.

The items in ME whose reconstructed form would contain the sequence velar + n + front vowel include "огн-", "fire", and an adjective derived from it;  "агньц-", "lamb"; derivatives of the verbal root *gнет-, "гнет-"; "гнєв-", "anger", and derivatives of it; "гнєзд-", "nest", and derivatives of it; as well as "гнил-", "rotten". In addition, there are examples of non-past and imperative forms of verbs whose reconstructed infinitive contained the sequence *-нєт preceded by a velar.30
The last group, consisting of non-past and imperative forms of the verbs in *-nɔti, contains close to 30 members and involves several different verbs. Furthermore, it is the only group in which "h" does not occur. Two examples of such forms are "въздвижнеш" 5v8 and "пръъкнеш" 71al.

Combined there are 46 instances of the word for "fire" and the adjective derived from it. Seventeen of them are written with "h". A sample of those seventeen is given below.

"огнь" 24a1
"огньих" 28g3
"огньем" 40b10
"огньню" 40b17
"огньну" 40g1 (Titlo - sic!)
"о/гньна" 51a16-17

Each of the remaining groups is comparatively small, ranging from four to twelve members in size. The word for "lamb" occurs five times. Two contain "н", while three are written with "н". For the derivatives of *gnet-, three of seven are written with "н". Furthermore, the three with "н" have "е" immediately after "н" and the four with "н" have "е" in the corresponding position.

In the group consisting of the word for "anger" and its derivatives, "н" is found in only one of the twelve members. I recorded four instances of "nest"
and its derivatives. Two are spelled with "н".

Finally, in one of four examples the word for "rotten" is spelled with "н". A sample of the data follows.

"агнъцъ" 4a2
"гнетьахоуть" 61g7
"гнетоуп" 62a4
"гнъва же" 13b25
"гнѣва жи" 28v20
"прогнѣва" 54b11
"разгнѣва" 61v1
"вѣгѣзді/тъ" 39g25-40a1
"гнѣ/здить" 59b18-19
"гнѣль/зъ" 40v20-21
"гнѣль" 45b8, 45b9

Alongside the orthography of the products of the various palatalizations, the other major issue concerning the consonant letters is the representation of the reflexes of the reconstructed sequences which consist of two consonants with one of the following between them: *el, *ol, *er, *or, *ъѣ, *ъѣ, *гѣ, *ѣ, *ѣi, *ѣl, *ѣl, *ѣl, *ѣl. However, before beginning that discussion, there are three other phenomena which I want to describe briefly.

Although it does not involve a palatalization, the first of the three does seem to bear some relationship to the orthography of the reflexes of *CCj and the continuant + velar clusters. The items in question are prefixed forms in which the prefix, morphophonemically,
ended in *z and the base to which it was attached began with *s or *z.¹⁰ In all such forms, the representation contains only a single "c" or "s", depending upon the first segment of the base. Examples include "безаконние" at 3la9, "исчезъ" at 9b23 and "рассужати" at 43g14.¹¹

I also noted two instances of a preposition + object combination in which the same type of sequence would have arisen, "исьборища" at 21b23 and "безъ съкро/вища" at 119b7-8.¹²

The second phenomenon concerns the use of "тй"("т") and "и" after the consonant letters "к", "г" and "х". In the portion of ME under consideration, in non-abbreviated words which can be classified as Slavic, "и" is never written after the consonant letters just listed. However, the sequences "ки", "ги" and "хи" do occur in the representations of some words which, when ME was copied, would have been comparatively recent borrowings into Slavic. Examples with "и" are "кифа" at 4bl, "книсъ" at 50b7, "левгитъ" at 2g3, "архй/ерей" at 3b18-19 and "экиднова" at 45b11.¹³

Finally, there is the representation of the reflex of *zr which arose when two morphemes combined in the derivation of a word or when two words combined to create a single phonological word. In all such
instances, one finds "здр" in the portion of ME under consideration. In only one of the examples which I recorded would *z and *r have belonged to different words. In the remainder, *zr would have resulted from the combination of two morphemes in the process of word formation. A non-exhaustive list of such forms is given below.

"бездравоум" 42v25 (preposition + object)
"издрече" 41g17
"въздравоваша" 6a24
"въздрыда нете" 74g5
"раздрь/шите" 27b9-10

When one examines the representation of the reflexes of reconstructed clusters containing a vowel and a liquid between two consonants, two questions must be answered. First, what vowel letters are used in combination with "р"/"л"? Second, what is the relative ordering between those vowel letters, on the one hand, and "р"/"л", on the other?

For sequences consisting of a jer and *r, there is a one-to-one relationship between reconstruction and spelling. The reflexes of *ъr, *ъr, *ъ and *ъ are written "ьр", "ър", "ръ" and "ръ", respectively, e.g., "тържникомъ" at 5b14, "ърха" at 6g13, "кръвъ" at 12b4 and "кръста" at 5v22.
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There are only two exceptions to that pattern. In "съве/ρδιο" at 15g23-24 "ε" stands for reconstructed *β, while in "τρυστ" at 154g7 one finds "β" denoting the reflex of *β.44,45,46

There are three other sets of data which should be mentioned in this context. One consists of the forms "грънъ" at 30g2 and 172bl6 and "гръзни" at 75b10. For the corresponding items in OCS, both Sadnik/Aitzetmuller [1955:31] and Lunt [1959:11] list, in their orthographies, "grozn-". Neither lists a comparable form with "τ" or "β" in place of "ο". Furthermore, the comparative Slavic data in Vasmer's entry [I:460] would make reconstruction of a jer for the position after *r extremely unlikely.

In the second set are forms of the name for the city "Capernaum". I noted a total of seventeen examples of that word. Fourteen of them are spelled with "-περν-", but in three of them the same portion of the word is written "-πγν-", at 54g14-15, 71v3 and 75v18.

Finally, there is the word for "scorpion", which occurs four times. In three of the four representations one finds "сκχρν-", at 82g12, 94b12 and 173a10. In the other the corresponding part of the word is spelled "сκόρν-", at 177g11.47
For the forms in which *1 combined with the jer, the relationship between the reconstructed sequence and the orthographical representations follows a different pattern than with *r. When the jer preceded *1, the spelling is always "Ъл", regardless of the kind of jer in the reconstructed form. In contrast, when the jer followed *1, orthographically one finds "ЪЬ" for *ЪЪ and "ЪЪ" for *ЪЬ. As examples one can adduce "ЪЪ/ЪЪЪЪ" at 57v21-22 (*Ъ1, Vasmer III:710-711), "ЪЪЪЪ" at 32g11 (*Ъ1, Vasmer I:338), "ЪЪЪ" at 4g18 and "ЪЪЪ" at 29b17.48,49,50

The reflexes of *ColC and *CorC are spelled with "Ъла" and "Ъра", respectively. Examples include "Ъла" at 17v25, "ЪлаЪла" at 31b18, "ЪЪЪЪЪ" at 11g11 and "ЪЪЪЪЪ" at 29b15. When *ол and *ор were in initial position and followed by a consonant, one finds "Ъла" and "Ъра", as well, e.g., "Ъла/ЪбъъъЪ" at 29v2-3, "ЪЪЪЪЪ" at 7b17 and "ЪЪЪЪЪ" at 33a19.51

The total number of examples for which *CelC would be reconstructed is comparatively modest. Therefore, it is difficult to offer any meaningful generalizations. Forms containing the root *-pel-, meaning "weed", occur eleven times. In all but one instance, the reflex is written "Ъла-". The exception is "ЪЪЪЪЪ" at 185g11.
I noted 36 examples for which the verbal root *-velk- could be reconstructed. (but cf. footnote 49) By a ratio of 25:11 the spelling "-лє-" is favored over "-лъ-" in these items. However, all eleven instances with "-лъ-" are found in representations of forms of the verb in which the prefix *об immediately preceded the root. Moreover, forms of that verb are written with "-лє-" only six times. The other nineteen members of this set denote derivatives which contained some other prefix or no prefix at all and in them the reflex of the root is uniformly spelled with "-лє-".

Examples with "-лъ-" are at 22а13-14, 34b6, 34b23, 34g13-14 and elsewhere. The spelling "-лє-" is found at 10g17, 21а1, 61v16-17, 72b22-23 and elsewhere.

I only recorded five other forms whose reconstruction contains *CelC. They are "плѣньник/мѣ" at 71b2-3, "плѣнь" at 83b4, "плѣни" at 98g3, "плѣши" at 99v17 and "плѣнь/никомѣ" at 163g17-18.

In contrast to *CelC, the number of instances in which *CerC would be reconstructed is quite large, over 1200. In approximately 57% of those examples the reflex of *er is spelled "рѣ". In the others it is spelled "рѣ". However, as with the figures for "н" and "ъ" given earlier, that statement of gross distribution is somewhat misleading.
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If one examines the distribution of "-пE-" and "-pe-" at the level of individual words/morphemes/bases, one finds that the spelling "-pe-" often predominates in orthographical representations. For the words/morphemes/bases which occur more than once, the variants and their token frequencies are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;пE&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;pe&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пEдъ&quot; 66</td>
<td>&quot;пEдъ&quot; 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пEдъ-&quot; 9</td>
<td>&quot;пEдъ-&quot; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пEд-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;пEд-&quot; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пEж(д)е&quot; 38</td>
<td>&quot;пEж(д)е&quot; 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пE&quot; 175</td>
<td>&quot;пE-&quot; 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;сEд-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;сEд-&quot; 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;вEм-&quot; 283</td>
<td>&quot;вEм-&quot; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;мEж-&quot; 12</td>
<td>&quot;мEж-&quot; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;тEб-&quot; 21</td>
<td>&quot;тEб-&quot; 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;дEв-&quot; 13</td>
<td>&quot;дEв-&quot; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пEт-&quot; /</td>
<td>&quot;пEт-&quot; /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пEф-&quot; 46</td>
<td>&quot;пEф-&quot; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;мE-&quot; 6</td>
<td>&quot;мE-&quot; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;чEв-&quot; 2</td>
<td>&quot;чEв-&quot; 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;брEг-&quot; 3</td>
<td>&quot;брEг-&quot; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;нEбрEг-&quot; 3</td>
<td>&quot;нEбрEг-&quot; /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;бEм-&quot; 2</td>
<td>&quot;бEм-&quot; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;кEврEт-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;кEврEт-&quot; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;стEт-&quot; /</td>
<td>&quot;стEт-&quot; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;стEр-&quot; 6</td>
<td>&quot;стEр-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;жEб-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;жEб-&quot; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;жEб-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;жEб-&quot; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;чEсл-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;чEсл-&quot; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;вEд-&quot; 3</td>
<td>&quot;вEд-&quot; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;-вEфи&quot; 2</td>
<td>&quot;-вEфи&quot; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;чEд-&quot; /</td>
<td>&quot;чEд-&quot; /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;чEж(д)-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;чEж(д)-&quot; 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In addition, there are three isolated forms which are also pertinent to this discussion. They are "почать" at 15a8, "отверсти" at 18a19 and "чрез" at 85a10.53

Several observations need to be made about the data set for "врем-"/"врем-". First, of the 308 members in this set, fully 260 syntactically are components of prepositional phrases which stand at the very beginning of readings and which rarely, if ever, are part of the first gospel verse found in those readings.

Linguistically two different phrases are found. They both mean "at that time" and both consist of the same three lexical items. They only differ in the relative ordering of those items. In addition, one of the two has three orthographical variants in the portion of ME under consideration. In descending order of frequency the four are "въ оно время", "въ время оно", "въ оно время" and "въ оно время".54

The first occurs 245 times. The second is found in twelve instances, at 9b8, 9g10, 12v25, 17a12, 18g11, 20a18, 20v1, 21v18, 23a5, 25b8, 25v24 and 28a6. The third stands at 167b25 and 171b4, while the lone occurrence of the fourth variant, at 198a10, might
represent an error in the typesetting, as it is listed in the index under the entry "въ оно врeмe".55
[1983:317-318]

The remaining 48 items in this data set can be divided into two subsets based on the presence or absence of the stem extension, written "-мен-". There are thirty examples of forms which lack the stem extension. All represent nominative/accusative singulars of the word for "time". In this subset the reflex of *CerC is spelled with "-пe-" 22 times to only eight instances with "-pe-". Conversely, in 15 of 18 examples of forms which contain the stem extension, the reflex of *CerC is spelled with "-pe-". This subset includes plurals and oblique case singulars of "time" as well as derivatives of that word.56

A similar situation exists in the data set for "брeм-"/"бreme-". In seven of the eight members representing forms which contain the stem extension, the reflex of *CerC is written with "-pe-". Furthermore, the one exception, "обрeмeнe" at 35g2, is aberrant in two other respects. In place of the second "б" one would expect "e". In addition, there should be an additional "-н(и)" at the end, as this is a masculine vocative plural of a past active participle.
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Another parameter along which data on the orthography of the reflex of *CerC can be examined is the relative frequency of the two representations, 
"-pft-" and "-pe-", in various parts of the manuscript. In the following discussion the statistics are given for individual pairs listed in the table above and not on a gross basis. This approach was adopted to control for pairs in which only one member is actually represented in the readings copied by Aleksa, e.g., "сръд-"/"сред-", "прът-"/"прет-", etc.

The pattern which prevails across the data sets can be seen quite clearly in the distribution of the pair "сръм-"/"сред-". With respect to the subset containing 30 nominative/accusative singular forms, the first instance of "-pe-" is found on folio 117. Prior to that there are 20 examples with "-pft-". Furthermore, in the menologion and the small number of readings which follow it the spelling "-pe-" is preferred 6-0.

Of the 18 items denoting forms in which the stem extension is present, the first one with "-pe-" occurs on folio 66 and all three examples with "-pft-" precede that one in the manuscript.

Similarly, the spelling "пръдъ" for the preposition first occurs at 80b12. In the readings
copied by Aleksa which precede that example one finds the same preposition written "передъ" 32 times, which constitutes roughly half of the data set for "передъ". (cf. Lunt 1984:56-57) The first time the corresponding prefix is written "передъ" is at 66b10, although only three items with "передъ" precede that example.

Among the members of the pair "перед(д)е"/"преж(д)е", 22, over half, with "-ръ-" occur before folio 61, while only three with "-ръ-" are in that same section of the text. In contrast, in the readings which comprise the menologion and those which follow it "преже" holds a 9-1 advantage over "переде".

For the prefix reconstructed as *per-, the spelling "пр(д)е" predominates, occurring in approximately 56% of the nearly 400 examples which constitute the data set. However, in folia 1-46 "пръ-" accounts for only 14% of the instances, while in the menologion and the small number of readings which follow it the reflex of *per- is written "пръ-" 81% of the time. In the former section the prefix is represented just over 70 times, while in the latter it occurs almost 85 times. In the remaining readings copied by Aleksa "пръ-" maintains an edge in a ratio approaching 3:2.
All three examples of the word for "net" with "-pe-" are in the menologion and the small number of readings which follow it, while only one instance with "-pB-" is found in that same portion of the manuscript.

Eleven of the thirteen instances of the reflex of *derv- spelled "πρεβ-" occur before folio 78. Only two spelled "πρεβ-" are in that section of the manuscript.

The two examples of the reflex of *cerv- written with "-pB-" are found before folio 43, while 13 of 14 items spelled with "πρεβ-" are after folio 42.

I could adduce similar figures for several other data sets, but the preceding should suffice to demonstrate the point that, in general, when both variants are represented in a data set, the examples with "-pB-" denoting the reflex of *er in *CerC tend to be disproportionately located towards the beginning of the manuscript, while those with "-pe-" are found to a greater degree in the later parts of the manuscript. (cf. Lunt 1984:56-57)

6.2. Headings

In the discussion of the remaining parts of the manuscript I will address the same topics which were considered above. As was the practice in earlier
chapters, particular attention will be paid to orthographical phenomena not found in the readings copied by Aleksa.

Before beginning the examination of the headings, I will list once again the set of consonant letters found in them.

The representations used in the headings for the results of various jot palatalizations do not deviate dramatically from those found in the readings copied by Aleksa. The reflex of *tj is consistently written "м". The reflex of *dj is always spelled "ж". For slots where *rj would be reconstructed the result is represented with "п". The segment which developed from *nj is denoted in two different ways, with "н" and with "н". Similarly, the symbols "й" and "м" stand for the reflex of *lj.

However, with respect to the last two reconstructed sequences there is some deviation from the orthographical pattern found in the readings copied by Aleksa in terms of the variant encountered when the vowel letter which immediately follows is "а". As the reflex of *nj, "н" maintains an edge of 7-2 in the position in question. As the reflex of *lj, "м" predominates in the corresponding position by a margin
of 37-2. It should be noted that the size of the data sets, particularly the first, vitiates somewhat the significance of these observations.

"Epenthetic-l" is denoted with the same two letters which stand for the segment which developed from *lj, i.e., "\( \text{ːl} \)" and "\( \text{ːr} \)". Furthermore, for all forms in which one would expect to find an "epenthetic-l" based on etymology, the orthographical representation contains one or the other of those two in the expected position.

There is nothing noteworthy to state with respect to the orthography of the reflexes of reconstructed sequences of the form *CCj or of the form *C[+high,+back] n V[-back]. The same is true for the representations found in positions where one would expect the results of the first regressive palatalization of the velars, if one adopts traditional assumptions about the correlation between sound and symbol.

With respect to the reflexes of the second regressive palatalization of the velars four data items need to be addressed. The first two denote locative singular forms of the word for "Easter". Both are written "\( \text{nacm} \)" and they occur at 6all-12 and 166g10."
The other two examples are "си/наистъи" at 188b5-6 and "панильстъи" at 195b24. They are the only two instances in the headings of the reflex of *sk in an environment which conditioned the second regressive palatalization.4

The headings contain no examples of forms in which one can indisputably reconstruct, from a morphophonemic perspective, *zs or *zz, either at the boundary between a prefix and the base to which it was attached or at the boundary between a preposition and its object, which combined to form a single phonological word. The generalization regarding the distribution of "ъ" and "и" after "к", "р" and "ч", as enunciated in the discussion of the readings copied by Aleksa, is valid for the headings as well. The same holds for the spelling which one finds for positions where the cluster *zr would have arisen as a result of the attachment of a prefix to a base. I noted no instances of a preposition ending in *z having as its object a word beginning with *r.

For the most part the orthography of forms in which one would reconstruct a vowel and a liquid between two consonants offers nothing that is new. For *ъг and *ъб in the appropriate environment, one finds
" rubbing" and " rubbing", respectively. I recorded no examples of words whose reconstructed form would contain either *гг or *гг between two consonants.

Among the data three of the corresponding sequences involving *гг are represented. The reflex of *гг and the reflex of *гг are both written " rubbing", while " rubbing" stands where *гг would be posited.

In positions where *ор and *ол would be reconstructed between two consonants, the headings contain "ор" and "ол", respectively. No examples for *ел were found, while the data for *ег are presented in tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;ор&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;ол&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;сржн-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;средн-&quot; 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;пр-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;пр-&quot; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;држ-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;држ-&quot; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;прдъ&quot; 2</td>
<td>&quot;прдъ&quot; 6  preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;прдъ-&quot; 0</td>
<td>&quot;прдъ-&quot; 4  prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;преже&quot; 2</td>
<td>&quot;преже&quot; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;врем-&quot; 1</td>
<td>&quot;врем-&quot; 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. Readings Copied by Second Scribe

The consonant letters used in the two readings which constitute this portion of the manuscript are repeated below.

В Г Д Ж З К Л М Н Р С Т Х Ф Ц Ч Ш

In terms of the reflexes under consideration in this chapter the orthography of these two readings offers little that is new. The reflex of *тг, and *кт
followed by a front vowel, is written "\(\text{\textpi}\)" exclusively. The letter "\(\text{\textp}\)" stands where *\(\text{\textrj}\) would be posited. For the reflex of *\(\text{\textnj}\) one finds either "\(\text{\textn}\)" or "\(\text{\textn}^\text{\textf}\)". While "epenthetic-\(\text{l}\)" is denoted with "\(\text{\textj}\)" or "\(\text{\textj}^\text{\textf}\)". For none of the three, *\(\text{\textrj}\), *\(\text{\textnj}\) or "epenthetic-\(\text{l}\)" is the data set of any meaningful size. Finally, there are no examples of words in which one would reconstruct *\(\text{\textdj}\) or *\(\text{\textCCj}\).

In the orthography of the results of jot palatalizations only the reflex of *\(\text{\textlj}\) merits comment.\(^{65}\) The actual letters used are the same as those found in the parts of the manuscript discussed in the preceding sections, "\(\text{\textn}\)" and "\(\text{\textn}^\text{\textf}\)". However, there is a unique feature in the distribution of "\(\text{\textn}\)". The three examples with that letter are abbreviations of present active participle forms for the verb which means "speak" and all are spelled "\(\text{\textrj}\text{\textrape}\)". They are at 67v20, 67g5 and 67g24.\(^{66}\) In the readings copied by Aleksa, similar abbreviations of that word consistently have the letter "\(\text{\textn}\)", not "\(\text{\textn}^\text{\textf}\)", when "\(\text{\textm}\)" immediately follows, although admittedly the number of such items is not large.\(^{67,68}\)

The orthography of the results of the two regressive palatalizations conforms to the predominant pattern in the portions of the manuscript examined earlier. For a number of the other phenomena there are
no pertinent examples in these two readings. They include the reflex of *n which followed a velar and preceded a front vowel; the reflex of morphophonemic *z + *s and *z + *z; and the sequences "ки", "ги" and "хи". There is only one data item which might offer evidence on the orthography of the reflex of *zr, "издрава/лежва" at 68a5-6.

As for the combinations of a liquid and a vowel between two consonants, the number of relevant examples is small and in none of them are the reflexes in question represented in a manner which is unknown in the parts of the manuscript described earlier.69

6.4. Colophon

In the discussion of the colophon I will continue the practice adopted in the preceding chapters and analyze the contributions of Aleksa, Жаден" and Naslav" separately.

6.4.1. Aleksa

A list of the consonant letters used in Aleksa's colophon follows.

А В Г Д Ж З К Л М Н П Р С Т Э Х Ц Ч Ш

For many of the phenomena under consideration in the present chapter no pertinent examples exist in Aleksa's colophon. For those which are represented,
the orthography does not disagree with the orthography found in the readings copied by Aleksa for the same phenomena.

The one exception to those statements is the representation of the reflexes of *or and *ol, when those sequences stood between two consonants. The former is found once, while the latter occurs twice. The examples are "новгородьскому" at 213a6-7, "вьесволож" at 213a5 and "володимирю" at 213a6.

However, the nature of the words being denoted might have influenced decisions about their orthography. All three items are denominal possessive adjectives. Moreover, none of them are derived from common nouns. Rather, the first is derived from a geographical name which denotes a specific city, while the other two are based on personal names which refer to specific individuals.

6.4.2. ژادَنَ"

With respect to the topics addressed in this chapter, the part of the colophon written by ژادَن" contains nothing which requires commentary. In fact, for most of them there are no data at all in this short passage.
6.4.3. Naslav

As I indicated earlier, Naslav uses the following consonant letters.

ОВГДЖЗКЛМНПРСТХЦЧШ

In the data set composed of the items in this last part of the colophon, many of the phenomena of interest in this discussion are not represented and for a number of those that are the orthography conforms to the prevailing patterns found elsewhere in the manuscript.

One of the examples which is worthy of note concerns the reflex of *rj. However, the issue is not the letter which stands where *rj would be reconstructed, but rather the vowel letter which follows it. The item is "пнп" at 213a23. There is a parallel instance involving the reflex of *lj. It is "лдем" at 213a24.

Another example with the reflex of *lj which deserves mention is "вомеш" at 213b3. The issue once again is the choice of vowel letter to follow the symbol denoting the segment which developed from *lj. However, unlike "х", "е" does occur elsewhere in the manuscript immediately after the representation of the reflex of *lj, but that vowel letter is quite rare when the reflex of *lj is indicated with "и".

278
One also finds a unique representation of a sequence which one would reconstruct morphophonemically as *zk before a vowel which conditioned the second regressive palatalization of the velars, where *z is the final segment of a preposition and *k is the initial segment of an adjective which is a component of the object of that preposition. The example is "ись пра" at 213b3. Assuming the traditional relationship between sound and symbol, the representation seems to reflect the expected regressive voicing assimilation of the final consonant in the preposition to the initial voiceless segment of the adjective, even though orthographically "з" intervenes between the symbols which denote the consonant segments participating in the assimilation process.

Finally, the spelling "-opo-" for the reflex of *or between two consonants is encountered twice, in "городоу" at 213b2 and "города" at 213b4. Both instances of "город-" are part of the name for a particular city, Constantinople. The other two examples of the reflex of *or between two consonants, both in representations of words etymologically unrelated to *gord-, have "-pa-".
NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1. For the following discussion I made no distinction between the reflex of the cluster *Cj and the reflex of *C which, in the reconstructed form, was followed by *eu.

2. This statement also applies to the representation of the reflex of the cluster *kt in the reconstructed sequence *ktV[-back].

3. The representations of the reflex of *sk in the reconstructed sequence *skV[-back] as well as the reflexes of *skj and *stj will be considered below.

4. This is probably the form which Karskij [1962:19] cites as "въдрачанна васа" and which he credits to Sreznevsikij. Karskij indicates that the example in question is on the front side of folio 28. In general, when he places items, Karskij does not indicate the column or the line, he only gives the folio number and the side.

5. The other two putative exceptions which Karskij [1962:19] lists are, in fact, not relevant to the present discussion. They are "чужаохоса" and "чужаамеаса". He indicates that the first is on the back side of folio 15 and he does not indicate where the second is to be found.

These two represent imperfect forms of a verb derived from *чудо for which initial *k is reconstructed. (cf. Vasmer IV:377-378) Thus, there was no *tj in these words. As a point of comparison, for OCS, Sadnik/Aitzemuller [1955:17, 135] and Lunt [1959:60, 61] cite such a verb with initial "ч", but none with initial "щ"/"щи".

6. The space between "о" and "ж" in the former of the two obviously was interpolated by the editors. It was not in the manuscript.

7. The treatment of "тако же" in the index is consistent with an adoption of the first approach, but it is possible that the editors did not acknowledge the existence of the second option. I compared non-exhaustively the examples of "тако же" with those of "такожде". I found three different gospel verses which contained "тако же" in one instance and "такожде".
in another. The three are Matthew 22:26, at 133v25 and 50a1; Matthew 25:17, at 136g25-137a1 and 66g15; and Matthew 21:30, at 183g25 and 49v4.

8 As evidence that "жду" in the second member of this pair stands for the reflex of *dj one can cite the form which Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:135] and Lunt [1959:54] ascribe to the Kiev Fragments and which they spell, in their orthographies, "takoze".

9 As with the first member of the preceding pair, the space before "жев" was supplied by the editors. However, in the text it is only present in one of the two examples of "по/см жев", at 203a25-203b1. In the index both examples are listed under an entry containing the space. [1983:412]

10 The argument that the sequence "жду" in the second member of this pair stands in a slot for which one would reconstruct *dj is based on the probable etymology for the word. The most likely etymology, both formally and semantically, would derive the word in question from the prefix *по and the base *sled.

11 The eighteen examples of present active participles are equally divided between three verbs, "suffer", "build" and "thirst". It is noteworthy that for "build" and "thirst" the representations of other forms in which one would expect to find the reflex of *dj consistently contain "жду" (for "thirst", "жду" in one instance).

12 There are additional generalizations, but they suffer from the same dearth of examples. Therefore, I decided to omit them.

13 I disregarded the example "Мори" at 38g11 in the text because it is isolated and because in the index it is listed under an entry spelled "Мори" [1983:382].

14 For the readings copied by Aleksa, I excluded from consideration the vowel letters "y", "y", "i", "i" and "x" due to their comparatively low lexical and/or token frequencies. In addition, except in citations of specific examples from the text, the letter "u" is used as a cover symbol for both "y" and "x". Similarly, "oy" means any member of the set containing "oy", "ov", "a" and "x"; "u" stands for "u" or "i"; and "o" denotes the pair "o" and "ω".
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15 At this time I am not addressing the representation of the reflex of *n which, either in Common Slavic or later, stood after a velar consonant and before a front vowel. That question will be considered later.

16 For the analysis, it was, of course, necessary to define which data "count" and which do not. I think that several of the decisions in that regard should be made explicit.

First, I admitted into the data set just over 30 items which were derivatives of borrowed bases or were borrowed stems adapted to a Slavic derivational pattern, even though those items probably were not present in the Common Slavic period and, therefore, it is doubtful whether one could posit a stage when they actually contained the sequence *nj. The basis for inclusion was the derivational pattern, i.e., whether one would expect the reflex of *Cj in the corresponding position of a native Slavic word constructed according to the same pattern. Examples of words included on this basis are "СОЛО/МОЙ" at 18a23-24, which is the derived possessive adjective from the proper name "Solomon", and "МАГДАЛЫНИ" at 77v13.

In contrast, I excluded the variant of the word meaning "now" which is spelled with final "A", even though in two instances "Н" immediately precedes "A", at 147a20 and 211v4. However, I did include the variant of that word which has final "A". This decision was based on the representations of the corresponding items which Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:71] and Lunt [1959:31] give for OCS. The spellings "-НИЯ/-НИЯ" occur 51 times, while "НИЯ", "НИЯ" and "НИЯ" together account for 36 examples.

A few individual examples were omitted from the data set as well. Two of them denote native Slavic words. The first is "НЕН" at 122b25. It represents the particle of negation, which is written "Н" in the overwhelming majority of instances. The second such item is "НЕН" at 136a7. It stands for the genitive singular of the word "day".

These two are noteworthy because the letter "Н" does not occupy a slot in which one would expect to find the reflex of *nj. Furthermore, if one ignores the representation of the reflex of the reconstructed sequence velar + *n + V{-back}, in other items containing the sequence "НЕН" the "Н" does stand for the reflex of *nj.
The remaining isolated examples denote non-Slavic items. They all contain the letter "H" in positions where, from a Slavic perspective, one would not expect the reflex of *nj. The pertinent items are "СУанте/Лис" at 132v2-3; "анге" at 194v8 and 199a20; and "анге" at 194v21. For both words there are far more examples with "н" instead of "H".

17 There is one instance in which the vowel letter is "н". It is "вон" at 130b11.

18 Although this is conjecture, I suspect that the consonant denoted by "н" in this word was not treated as equivalent to the reflex of *nj. Etymological considerations dictated the inclusion of these examples.

19 The representation of the so-called "epenthetic-l" is not part of this discussion, even though I suspect that, phonetically, there was no difference between "epenthetic-l" and the reflex of *lj. "Epenthetic-l" will be treated later.

20 The examples at 91b and 185v were included based on the normalized orthography for the corresponding items in OCS, as cited by Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:76] and Lunt [1959:22, 33]. In the portion of ME under consideration I recorded no instances in which this word or an etymologically related word is spelled with "н" instead of "н".

21 I noted only one instance in which one can conclude with a reasonable degree of certainty that there is no "epenthetic-l" in a position where the sequence labial + *j would be reconstructed. It is "СИг(o)сваам" at 209v18.

Incidentally, the placement by the editors of the letter "о", which was supralinear in the manuscript itself as indicated by the presence of parentheses, before "с" must be considered arbitrary. In the full representation of this word, "о" would appear twice, once immediately before "с" and once two letters after "с".

22 I included in the data set denominal possessive adjectives derived from non-Slavic bases whose structure is parallel to the structure of native Slavic derivatives formed through the addition of the suffix reconstructed as *-j-.
I concede that the condition for assignment to the first group is formulated rather tentatively. Operationally, I compared the items in question with etymologically related words in an attempt to draw some conclusions about the parsing which speakers might have assigned.

As a practical matter, the relevant morpheme boundary in the members of this group occurs between a prefix and a base.

This group involves combinations of preposition + object.

The formulation of the statements regarding these clusters implies that for all members of all three groups there was a stage at which the sequence *CCj existed. I realize that, at least for the members of groups two and three, that might not be true.

The cover symbol *CCj should be understood to mean both the three-consonant sequence ending in jot as well as *CC when, in the reconstructed form, that cluster was followed by *eu. (cf. footnote 1)

On the presence of the letter "z" between "e" and "p" in this word, see below.

The only possible exception to the generalizations regarding the representations of the reflexes of the two regressive palatalizations of the velars is "мъдете" at 94b5. However, since the context (Luke 19:27) requires an imperative, the incongruous component seems to be "е", not "ье". Therefore, the status of this example as an exception is doubtful.

I concede that in some of the instances which will be discussed below there might not have been a stage at which the cluster continuant + velar actually existed. (cf. footnote 26)

Most of the derived adjectives in the data set were formed from bases which, at the time when ME was compiled, were comparatively recent borrowings into Slavic. Therefore, those particular adjectives probably did not exist in Common Slavic. Nonetheless, I think that it is legitimate to include them because the suffix and desinences are Slavic and the only logical source for the orthography of the suffix +
desinence in these adjectives would have been Slavic adjectives derived according to the same pattern.

32 There are three additional examples whose membership in this group is somewhat problematical. They are "Слистанием" at 84g11, "Слистации" at 92v22 and "Слистам" at 203v11. According to entries in the glossaries of Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:12] and Lunt [1959:3], OCS contained several items which would seem to be etymologically related to the three just listed and which orthographically contained "сц", "ст" or "ск" in the slot occupied by "ст" in the examples from ME. However, based on the morphological structure of the words in question, if they all derive from forms with *sk, it is not clear how the sequences *sc and *st would have arisen.

33 Items such as "нпет" at 31g3 (second person plural imperative) were classified as examples with the reflex of the cluster *skj because of the presence of forms like "ниж" at 16v14 and "ниш" at 9a16 and the complete absence of forms like *"иско" and *"искому". The imperative cited above is discussed further in the chapter on morphology.

34 There are five other examples which were not included in the data set, but which might be pertinent to the phenomenon in question. They are listed below.

"Въж/гъ" 83v5-6, 84v18, 170b2
"Въжа/жъ" 91a9-10
"Въжага/жъ" 175g24-25

All of them involve the root which means "burn" and they were omitted because it is not clear whether the intended prefix is *vъз- or *vъ(n)-.

35 The examples at the three locations cited above were chosen because they do not admit a different parsing of the text, i.e., "и пъд-", in which "и" is analyzed as a conjunction or an emphatic particle.

36 Three of the items in the data set require additional comment. In "ичистиша" at 99g24 it is possible that the initial "и" represents a scribal error instead of the sole overt indicator of the reflex of the prefix *ъбъ. The next vowel letter after that initial "и" is also "и". Furthermore, the example is at the start of the line and the first letter of the preceding line is "и".
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The other two members which merit individual treatment are the instances of "без вел" at 97v17-18 and 97v19. While both could be forms of the adjective which means "childless", theoretically they could also be prepositional phrases consisting of the reflex of *bez and the genitive plural of the word for "child", literally "without children".

37 A careful examination of the contexts in which the forms with only "ущ" appear leads to the conclusion that an alternative parsing of the text, in which "ущ" is not treated as part of the representation of the verb, is not justified.

38 Another group of words which is adduced in discussions of this phenomenon consists of derivatives of the reconstructed base *кънис-, despite the presence of *ъ between the velar and the nasal. If segmental adjacency of those two was crucial to the operation of the process in question, then inclusion of the derivatives of *кънис- would create some problems for the chronology of the change. In any event, in ME such derivatives are always spelled with "ущ", never with "ущ".

For the sake of completeness, I will add that, with one exception, the same generalization holds for examples of the word which means "prince". Only "ущ" is used in the orthographical representations. The one exception is "кънис/ущ" at 159a1-2.

39 Six items were not included in the figures just cited. They are "огнис", at 51g21 and 114g18; "огнис", at 87g25; "огнис", at 72v7 and 205a2; and "огнисев", at 134g8. The first three represent genitive singular forms, while the last three are dative singulars. These six were omitted because it is unlikely that they denote the reflex of forms which contained the sequence velar + *ь + front vowel.

40 No claim is made that all of the prefixed forms in question actually existed in Common Slavic. Some might have been constituted later. (cf. footnotes 26 and 30) The reconstruction notation applies to the components, which, it is presumed, did exist in Common Slavic.

41 The context in which the second example is found makes a parsing which separates "ущ" from "съчень" extremely unlikely.
42 The reconstructed form of the prefix found in the
second prepositional phrase is *bez. Thus, the
presence of "n" in the representation of that prefix
does not render this example irrelevant to the present
discussion.

43 I want to emphasize that in abbreviations the only
sequences which were considered were those consisting
of letters which would still have been adjacent had the
word been written in full. Therefore, examples such as
"ni" at 26a8 did not count in this analysis.

44 The first of these two items is missing from the
index.

45 The final "n" in the second example was addressed
above.

46 In several instances I was not able to
satisfactorily establish a reconstructed form which
means that it is not possible to state whether the
representation in ME for those particular items
conforms to the stated generalization.

The word for "beam" is consistently written
"бърв-", at 31v12, 31v16-17, 31v18-19, 75a18, 75a23-24
and 75b1. According to Vasmer [I:209-210], there is
disagreement over the proper reconstruction for this
item. However, he does conclude that it must be either
*брьв- or *бърв-.

Similarly, the spelling for "mud" is regularly
"бърн-", at 19a3, 19a5, 19a19-20, 19b3-4 and 19b7.
Vasmer [I:212] states that there are two proposed
reconstructions for this item: the more traditional
*брн- and *бърн-.

The last set of problematical forms differs from
the earlier ones in that the issue is the particular
vowel which should be reconstructed. The relevant
items all contain a root for which Vasmer posits the
parallel forms *търг- and *търг-. [IV:48, 83] Of the
seventeen members in this set the reflex of the root in
question is written "-търл-" eight times, "-търл-" six
times, "-търл-" two times and "-търл-" once. One
example of each spelling is given below.

"растъркъ/ть" 31g1-2
"въстъркани" 35g16
"претъ/реаах" 59g14-15
"протърк" 211v9
47 Since the members of these last two sets were borrowings into Slavic, one cannot speak of reconstructed forms for them. Therefore, these data are outside the scope of the generalization presented above.

48 There is one possible deviation from the generalization just presented, "гълкъръ" at 65a16 from Mark 7:8 (cf. "гълкъръ" at 64g4 from Mark 7:4). However, neither Sadnik/Aitzetmüller nor Lunt list any items which might be related to the word denoted in these examples and the only entry in Vasmer's dictionary [I:428-429] which might correspond formally, has problems semantically.

49 There are several other data items which merit consideration in this context. All denote participial forms of prefixed verbs derived from the root *-vlk-/*-velk-. I cite them because, depending upon the interpretation which one adopts, some of the forms might not conform to the generalization articulated above.

"обълкъ" 121a16
"обълье/на" 34g13-14
"объ/лечена" 60b1, 84a25, 192b23-24
"о/облечена" 61v16-17
"облечена" 184g13
"изълкъ" 40v18
"изъле/къле" 72b22-23
"изълкъ" 114v18
"и/зълкъ" 170g18-19
"сълкъ" 89v8
"сълкъ" 153v9, 157g3

50 The editors assert that diacritic marks in ME are used to denote the presence of secondary jers which arose during the process labeled "the second pleophony". [1983:24-25] Unfortunately, since diacritic marks, in general, have been omitted from the typset edition, I am unable to assess that claim.

51 The root which means "hunger" is regularly spelled "алк-"/"алч-", e.g., "алчъ" at 31b9 and "а/лкать" at 73a16-17.

52 Two of the examples which contain "-ле-" in the text, at 158a13 and 161b2, are classified in the index under an entry written with "-лъ-". [1983:395] For the analysis I accepted the spelling found in the text.
53 I must concede that for one pair in the preceding list, "тпрел"/"тпрел", the data set includes representations of several words which might not all be etymologically related. (cf. Vasmer IV:45-46, 95, 96)

54 For the example at 12v25 I disregarded the symbol "м" over "оне" because there is no abbreviation and, therefore, no reason to have "м".

55 In gross terms, without these 260 items "-прел" would be more frequent than "-прел".

56 The article in the index for the noun which means "time" is deficient in several respects. [1983:317-318] First, nine items which should be listed are not. That includes five examples of "время", at 138b7, 139v9, 139g22, 149v11 and 150v21; two instances of "время", at 139g18-19 and 140a14; and one each of "время", at 138g23, and "время", at 137a6. In addition, the example of "время" at 167b15 is listed under "время". Finally, although the editors try to list separately those occurrences of the prepositional phrase(s) discussed above which they consider to be not a part of the gospel verses at the beginning of the readings with which they are associated, there are not separate entries, e.g., for "въ оно время" and "въ время оно". (cf. Lunt 1984:56)

57 The information in the index on this preposition contains a number of errors. [1983:415] First, the example of "прел" at 115b25 is listed twice, once governing the accusative and once governing the instrumental. The example of "прел" at 117a17 is listed under "прел" and is placed at 117v17. Several other instances of "прел" are listed under "прел" as well. They include the items at 86a5, 86a7, 137v12 and 186b10. Finally, in the text one finds "прел" at 82v3, although that example is listed under "прел" in the index.

58 The citations in the index for this pair suffer from the same deficiencies which plague the citations for the preposition "прел"/"прел". [1983:422] The examples at 140b17-18, 144v11-12, 146a17 and 148v23 are all listed twice, once under "преже" and once under "преже даже". The instances of "преже" found at 11b4 and 81a5 in the text are given under "преже" in the index. Conversely, at 92a17 the text contains "преже", but this item is cited under "преже". The example of
"нр/же" at 11g9-10 is absent from the index. Finally, the instance of "нр/же" placed at 4b25 is actually at 4b24 and, based on the editors' classification scheme, it should be listed under "нр/же даже". There are other problems as well, but I do not want to belabor the point.

59 For any particular consonant the statements in this discussion apply equally to the reflex of the sequence *Cj and to the reflex of *C when it was immediately followed in the reconstructed form by the diphthong *eu.

60 The same is true for the reflex of *kt in the reconstructed sequence *ktV[-back]. In the formulation of this generalization I disregarded two data items, "галактона" at 174g22 and "єє/ктіста" at 184a15-16. Both denote non-Slavic personal names.

61 Two data items which contain the sequence "на" were not included in the figures just cited. Both denote genitive singular forms of the name for the month "June" and both are written "науна". The examples are found at 170b8 and 205b22. These two were omitted because the word is an obvious borrowing into Slavic and the letter "н" is not part of the representation of a native Slavic morpheme which was affixed to the borrowed element nor can one assert with certainty that the quality of the segment denoted by "н" results from the application of some Slavic derivational process to the borrowed element. There are no examples of this word with the sequence "на" in the representation.

62 In tabulating the preceding figures the following five data items were not counted, even though they contain the sequence "ла": "априв" at 196v6 and 212b25, "са/велэ" at 198a25-198b1, "измайла" at 198b1, "ноула" at 212b10. This decision was motivated by the considerations enumerated in the preceding footnote. None of these words occur elsewhere with the spelling "ла".

63 I realize that this spelling is not unusual in manuscripts for the given form of this word. I draw attention to these examples only because of the phonological alternation which they imply, based on the traditional association of sound and symbol. Of course, the fact that the given word was a
comparatively recent borrowing into Slavic when ME was compiled casts some doubt on its relevance in a discussion of the representation of results of internal Slavic phonological processes.

The dative singular and the locative singular of this word do not happen to occur in the readings copied by Aleksa. Therefore, the orthographical practice of the two parts of the manuscript in this respect cannot be compared directly.

64 Although the two words are not Slavic because the bases from which they are derived are borrowed, the suffix which contains the pertinent reflex is a Slavic morpheme.

65 As in the preceding sections of this chapter, *Cj and *CCj should be understood as cover symbols which refer both to the reflex of the sequences *Cj/*CCj proper and to the reflexes of *C/*CC when they stood before the diphthong *eu.

66 The two instances with "ш" in the first reading signify nominative plural feminine forms, so the final "е", which denotes the desinence, is surprising. Under the prevailing orthographical pattern for these readings, one would expect "-а". In fact, that is the spelling which one finds in the small number of past active participle forms from the same reading which also represent nominative plural feminine forms.

67 As I indicated earlier, I adopted Lunt's [1984:46] position with respect to the particular lateral which is being represented, not that of the editors [1983:9].

68 More generally, I noted only one instance in which the letter after "ш" was not a vowel letter, "изв" at 186b13.

69 The data set includes three examples of words whose reconstructed form contains *er between two consonants. The three denote etymologically unrelated items. In two of the three one finds "-pe-", while the other has "-pэ-". The one instance of "-пэ-" is in the word for "time" which is part of the reading-initial phrase "въ врема оно" at 67g13.
CHAPTER 7

NOMINAL MORPHOLOGY

In the preceding three chapters, the use of letters and digraphs was described as a function of parameters such as the physical position of the symbols on the folia and the reconstructed segment(s) whose reflex was being represented. Only minimal reference was made to grammatical categories. In this chapter and the next I will examine how various grammatical categories are conveyed in ME.

However, I will not address all categorial distinctions which are found in ME. Rather, I have limited the scope of this examination to a subset of the morphology. In general, I attempted to focus on the categories which traditionally receive attention in such investigations, e.g., the dual, the consonant-stem and the *u-stem declensional patterns, the genitive singular and the nominative accusative plural of the *ja-stem declensional pattern, etc.
For the discussion the manuscript was divided into the same four sections which were used in the previous chapters. The individual topics were separated into two categories, nominal morphology, in the broad sense, and verbal morphology. This chapter will address nominal morphology. Verbal morphology will be considered in the next chapter.

7.1. Readings Copied by Aleksa

The examination of nominal morphology will begin with a consideration of pronominal declension.

The orthography of the various forms of the reflexive pronoun is presented below.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>сеbе</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>сеbе (&quot;бебе&quot; once, at 59a25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>сеbе/си</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>собою</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form written "си" occurs less than ten times and most of the examples are part of the expression, "въ своем си".² I classified the instances of "си" in that phrase as datives based on the treatment of them in the index [1983:433] because I was not certain of the syntactic structure of the expression.

The following two sets of forms constitute the paradigms for the first- and second-person personal pronouns.
I noted only three instances of the nominative dual "\( \text{въ} \)" at 19b25, 80b25 and 163a13. All of them are listed as nominative plurals in the index [1983:454]. Similarly, the example of "\( \text{въ} \)" at 95a2, which should be interpreted as a dual based on the sense of the passage containing it (Luke 19:31), is classified as a plural in the index [1983:454]. Finally, despite indications to the contrary in the index, the instrumental dual of the second person personal pronoun does not occur in the portion of the manuscript under consideration. The
two forms labeled as such, at 112g6-7 and 129v21, denote objects of the preposition written "прамо", which governs the dative.³

The preceding three sets of paradigms were designed to reflect the predominant usage which is found in the portion of the manuscript under consideration. Not surprisingly, there are departures from the distribution of forms implicit in the paradigms, but they are not all alike in kind.

One type was discussed in the chapter on the orthography of vowels. (see above) It involves the presence of "ceCfe" or "TeC*" in contexts where a genitive would be expected and the use of "ceGe" or "TeCe" when a dative or a locative would be needed. I suspect that these examples reveal more about the merger of *e and *e in certain South Slavic areas, reflected orthographically in protographs used by East Slavic scribes, than they do about any morphological or syntactic phenomena, although in one context, after "въ сладъ", it was suggested that the issue might be variation in the government of the object of "въ сладъ".⁴

A different explanation is needed in those instances where the forms labeled as "accusative" and "genitive" in the tables occur in comparable syntactic...
slots. For each of the pairs "са"/"себе", "ма"/"мене", "та"/"тебе", "ы"/"вась" and "ва"/"вад" examples are presented below. The list is non-exhaustive.
Unfortunately, I was not always able to locate pairs of examples in which the two members convey the same chapter and verse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;са&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;себе&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;вълюбши ближь/ нааго своего како и са&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;и же люби/тьближнааго акъ себе&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108b21-22 Mark 12:31</td>
<td>108v6-7 Mark 12:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;жако/сня жики творит са&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;и же самы ц(с)ра себе творить&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152b4-5 John 19:7</td>
<td>152b24-25 John 19:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;спси са са/мь&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;спси себе&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ма&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;мене&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;жако же ты/ма ды же послыла въ мн/рь&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;жако же мене посль/ла въ мирь&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25b10-12 John 17:18</td>
<td>149a18-19 John 17:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;жако же и/ма вълюбить деси&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;жако въ мене вълюбисте&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v6-7 John 17:23</td>
<td>25a10 John 16:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;и видахи ма&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;и видахи мене&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v4 John 12:45</td>
<td>139b9 John 12:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a personal communication, Prof. Daniel Collins indicated that this type of phenomenon is not unusual in early manuscripts and that it simply reflects variation in the formal marker of the accusative case.

The pairs "ть"/"бъ" and "въ"/"вамъ" present a third situation. Two sets of examples are adduced below. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;ть&quot;/&quot;бъ&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;въ&quot;/&quot;вамъ&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;дай съ/твои прославить та&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;дай съ/твои прославить тебе&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23а8-9</td>
<td>148в9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 17:1</td>
<td>John 17:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;и и/женоуть въ&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;и ва/съ иженуть&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28в21-22</td>
<td>11в13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 5:11</td>
<td>John 15:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;съращеть въ&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;съращеть/вамъ&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>чл(о)въ&quot;</td>
<td>чл(о)въ&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11вb20</td>
<td>140в24-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was proposed to me that these items could reflect the opposition between clitic and non-clitic forms of the personal pronouns, in which event "нъ" and "въ" in these passages should be added as datives to the paradigms listed above.

There might be additional kinds of variation in the usage of the pronominals found in the paradigms listed earlier, but it is not the goal of this discussion to provide a comprehensive list.

Before proceeding to the examination of the morphology of other nominals, I will address several additional issues relating to the use of certain items contained in the tables.

The dative singular forms "мнъ", "ты" and "сн" never occur as the object of a preposition. In addition, based on traditional notions as to which words are independently accented and which are not, at least one accented word belonging to the same clause always precedes "мнъ", "ты" or "сн". In contrast, the
dative singular forms "м(ъ)нъ", "тебь" and "сеебъ" do appear as the object of prepositions and "м(ъ)нъ" and "тебь" are, at times, not preceded by any accented words which are part of the same clause. I did not record any instances in which "сеебъ" denoted the first accented word in a clause.

In contrast to "мъ", "тъ" and "съ", the forms "мъ", "тъ" and "съ" are all used as the objects of prepositions.

If the instances in which "съ" is the object of a preposition are set aside, "съ" most frequently stands immediately after the verb with which it is associated. There are literally hundreds of examples with that ordering. The exceptions to this generalization fall into four categories.

In five instances, "съ" occurs in a clause which contains no overt verb word. The clauses are elliptical and the implied verb word can be deduced from the broader context. One such example is in the passage "и въдь/быши ближнаго своему/акы самъ съ" at 56a13-15. The other four are found at 64b2, 89b23, 108b22 and 134a9.

On six occasions when "съ" does immediately follow a verb word, it is not the verb word to which it is most directly subordinated. In one of the examples, at
"ca" immediately follows the modal "be able" and is itself followed immediately by the infinitive "разорити". In three others, at 19v13-14, 52v5-6 and 123a9-10, a form of "be" immediately precedes "ca", which itself immediately precedes an l-participle. The final two are like the preceding three except that a word intervenes between "ca" and the l-participle. At 93b1-2 the word is "ихъ". At 142v13-14 it is "не".

The third category of exceptions is the largest, containing 86 examples. In these items "ca" follows the verb, but a word stands between the two of them. In 49 instances that word is "же". In 24 it is "бо". In ten it is "ти". The form "ми" occurs twice, at 92a24 and 186g10-11, while "самъ" intervenes in one example, at 61b5-6. Furthermore, in almost all of the 86, the verb word is the first word after the clause break which one would expect to bear an independent accent.

Two other examples properly belong in the the third category as well, although they have two words between "ca" and its verb. At 90b3-4 one finds "бо ти", while at 120g4-5 the intervening material is "съ самъ". In both of these instances the verb word is the first word in its clause.
The last category consists of 44 examples. In 32 of the 44, "съ" immediately precedes the verb word with which it is associated. In the others, "съ" also precedes the verb, but one or more words stand between them. In two instances, at 14a23-24 and 16g11, the intervening word is "самъ". The word "не" also occurs twice, at 52b19-21 and 132v17-19, while "вамь" separates "съ" and its verb six times. At 100v10-11 "жемь" occupies the slot in question. In the last example, at 37a22-23, the sequence is "съ" "жесть" 1-participle.

Another set of pronouns consists of the words which mean "what", "nothing" and "something". However, it is not the entire paradigm which is of interest, only the genitive and the dative forms.

For "what", there are three variants: "чесо", "чесо" and "чесо". They are found in twelve, seventeen and eight instances, respectively. Similarly, the genitive of "nothing" is spelled "ничесо", "ничесо" and "ничесо", with the variants occurring in seventeen, eighteen and fifteen examples, respectively. The genitive of "something" occurs only once and is written "нчесо" at 47v8.

In terms of the distribution within the manuscript, the first example spelled with the sequence
"(-)чесо" is found on folio 62. All but one of items spelled with "(-)чесо" occur before folio 128. Finally, in the menologion and the small number of readings which follow it "(-)чесо" is used fifteen times to one example each of "ничесо" and "ничесо".

Datives of these pronouns are far less frequent than genitives. In fact, there are only two instances, "чесомо" at 59b7 and "чесомо" at 199b18.

The last pronominal which I will consider is the demonstrative meaning "this". Its singular and plural paradigms are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>сь</td>
<td>си/сига</td>
<td>се</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>сь/сего</td>
<td>сио/си</td>
<td>се</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>сего</td>
<td>се/са</td>
<td>сего</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>сего/сы</td>
<td>се/са</td>
<td>сего</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>сегоу/сы</td>
<td>се/са</td>
<td>сегоу/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>сегоу/сы</td>
<td>се/са</td>
<td>сегоу/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>симь</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>симь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>си/сиий</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>си</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>си/сиий</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>си</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>сихь</td>
<td>сихь</td>
<td>сихь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>сихь</td>
<td>сихь</td>
<td>сихь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>симь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>сими</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variant "си" is used only once as the feminine nominative singular, at 57b17. The same is true for the feminine dative singular "съ", which stands at 50g9.

One instance of "се", at 180g2, is described as a masculine nominative singular in the index. It is found in the clause "и вънезапно състь се ангълъ множество во/н босынихъ", from Luke 2:13. Given the expected semantics of this passage, *"съ ангълъ" should stand where "се ангълъ" is. The editors themselves recognize that the use of "се ангълъ" is inappropriate, although in their footnote [1983:242] the only comment is "sic!". This item was disregarded when I compiled the preceding tables.

The dual paradigm of this word is quite poorly represented. I recorded a total of five examples, denoting four different forms. The data set includes the masculine nominative "сие" at 47v11, the masculine dative "сие" at 34g6, the feminine locative "сео" at 64b2 and 134a9, as well as the neuter genitive "сео" at 29b21. In addition, "сие" at 121a18 stands where one would anticipate a masculine nominative dual.
Among the adjectives, there is a comparatively small number of desinences which will be discussed. The first three are the genitive, locative and dative singular forms for masculine and neuter.

The masculine/neuter genitive singular "definite"/"compound" adjectival desinence is spelled "-aaro" or "-Aaro". The "hard" ending is always "-aaro". In adjectives which follow the "soft" declension, the choice between initial "a" and "A" conforms to the generalizations regarding the distribution of "a" and "A" which were discussed earlier.

In the masculine/neuter locative singular, the "hard" "definite"/"compound" desinence is most frequently written "-бъмъ". There are only two exceptions: "въчньбъмъ" at 10a25 and "въчнбъмъ" at 20g3.

For adjectives of the "soft" declension, the marker for the masculine/neuter locative singular "definite"/"compound" form is usually "-нимъ". Just three items deviate from that pattern. They are "чуждъмъ" at 17g6-7, "чуждемъ" at 104v8 and "чуждемъ" at 196g25. Furthermore, those three are the only instances of the pertinent form of the adjective which means "strange, foreign".
The masculine/neuter dative singular forms present a slightly more complex picture. In the "hard" declension, the template for the "definite"/"compound" desinence is "-VVmV", where V stands for a vowel letter or digraph. The replacement for the first V is "oy", "x" or "γ". The second V is replaced by "oy", except for one instance which has "γ". In place of the last V, "oy", "x" or "γ" is used, with "oy" predominating. The only items which do not conform to the generalizations just presented are "κρού/γροώμ" at 36v5-6, "πέρυμμα" at 49b23, "σπλέγματος" at 129b2, "ραπατοόμα" at 155g24 and "ρα/σατοόμο" at 162b5-6.

For the "soft" declension, the template "-VVmV" is still valid. Furthermore, the replacements for the second and third V are the same as those found in the "hard" declension. Only "oy" stands for the second V with one exception, which has "γ". In place of the third V one finds "oy", "x" or "γ". However, the set of symbols which replace the first V includes not only "oy", "x" and "γ", but also "μ".

The next group of adjectival desinences which will be considered are the masculine/neuter instrumental in the singular and the genitive, the locative, the dative and the instrumental in the plural. In the "hard" "definite"/"compound" declension, these endings are
consistently written with the sequence "-и-" or "-и-". In the "soft" declension, the sequence "-и-" is always present with two exceptions. In both instances one finds "мышными". The two examples are at 77b21-22 and 168g25.

The remaining desinences which I will address are found in nominative case forms of certain words which, in general, follow the "soft" declension. The first such desinence marks the "indefinite"/"simple" feminine nominative singular of comparative adjectives, present active participles and past active participles. In a data set containing more than 100 examples, that desinence is regularly spelled "-и". I recorded less than ten examples of the corresponding "definite"/"compound" desinence. In all of them the ending is written "-иза".

The "indefinite"/"simple" masculine nominative plural of comparative adjectives, present active participles and past active participles is written "-е". This holds in a data set which exceeds 650 items. I recorded only one exception to that pattern, the comparative adjective "оу/мыши" at 34b13-14.

The corresponding "definite"/"compound" desinence has two variants, "-еи" and "-ии". The two are close
to equal in frequency, with "-en" holding an advantage. The data set for the "definite"/"compound" form has over 100 examples.¹⁹

The analysis of the inflection of nouns will begin with a consideration of the evidence in ME of the etymological *u~stem declensional pattern. The discussion will consist of two parts. First, I will describe the orthographical representation of the declensional pattern for several nouns which are often classified as etymological *u-stem nouns. Then I will examine forms of words not normally labeled as etymological *u-stems in which the inflectional marker would seem to derive from the *u-stem declensional pattern.²⁰

There are five nouns normally categorized as etymological *u-stems whose declension in ME I will describe. They are the words which mean "son", "house", "top", "half, side" and "ox".

The word which means "son" occurs more frequently than any of the others. In the majority of examples the first two letters are "ch-", i.e., "h" (or "w"), which one would expect immediately after the initial "c", is absent. With rare exceptions, such instances are marked as abbreviations with the symbol "~". In fact, I noted only one deviation from that pattern. At
one finds "онъ", without "о", which represents a nominative singular. However, the following word, "и(о)въ", does have "о" over it, which is unexpected given the presence of the supralinear "о". Therefore, the putative exception might actually reflect an error in the typesetting.

The orthographical variants of the case-number markers used with "сон" are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-ъ</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-ъ/-а</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-а</td>
<td>-оу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-оу/-ъ</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-оу/-ъ/-ъ</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-ьмъ</td>
<td>-ьма</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>-оу/-е</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The size of the data sets for individual case-number combinations varies over a rather wide range. Combining the genitive singular with those instances of the accusative singular in which the desinence is spelled "-а", one obtains over 80 examples. Similarly, there are roughly 25 examples of the nominative plural. At the other extreme, there is only one instance each of the instrumental singular, the instrumental dual, the accusative plural and the dative plural.
In the dative singular, there were twelve instances of "-oy", two examples with "-ови" and one each for "-x" and "-y". The examples of the vocative singular form were split 8-5 in favor of "-е". The letter "-т" denotes the case-number marker in three of the four items which represent locative singulars. Finally, for the nominative plural the variant "-ве", i.e., without "о" immediately before "в", occurs only once.

The second most common word from among the five listed above is the one which means "house". For that item, I found no examples of any of the dual forms and in the data set for the plural only two cases are represented. The paradigm is presented in tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-т</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-т</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-оий/-х/-ят'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-оий/-х/-ят'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-оий/-х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-ъят'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three variants of the genitive singular, "-оий", "-х" and "-ят" occur eleven, three and two times, respectively. In the dative singular, "-оий" and "-х" are each found in three items. In addition, there are eight instances with "-оий" and three with "-х"
which, based on the syntax of the passages where they occur, could represent either genitive singular or dative singular forms. The digraph "-oy" predominates in the data set for the locative singular. It is used 22 times to three examples with "-x" and two with "-y".

The data set for the word which means "top", "верх-", contains fourteen items, although only two case-number combinations are represented, the genitive singular and the locative singular. The three genitive singulars all have "-a" as the orthographical representation of the desinence. In the eleven locative singulars the marker is consistently written "-oy".

Three forms of the word which means "half, side", "половину", are present. For the genitive singular the desinence is written "-oy" twice and "-x" once. The accusative singular has "-y". In the accusative plural "-y" denotes the ending.

The word for "ox", "воло", has the lowest token frequency of the five items traditionally classified as *u*-stem nouns under consideration here. However, in the five examples one finds four different forms, the
nominative singular ("-ъ"), the genitive singular ("-оу"), the genitive plural ("-овь") and the accusative plural ("-ьм").

The second component of the data on the *ǔ-stem declensional pattern involves words not traditionally reconstructed as etymological *ǔ-stem nouns, but which are found in ME with inflectional markers normally associated with the *ǔ-stem declension. Most of the items fit into one of two coherent groups.

The largest group consists of dative singular forms of masculine nouns in which the desinence is spelled "-вi" (confined to abbreviations), "-ови", "-ови", or "-ежи". There are over 85 such examples, and for twelve of the twenty words represented in the set, the token frequency of dative singular forms in which the ending is denoted by one of "-оу"/"-ов"/"-ъ"/"-ъ" is equal to or exceeds the frequency of forms with "*ǔ-stem" desinences. The data set includes the words for "Simon" (3), "Jesus" (30), "Peter" (11), "Joseph" (3), "Andrew" (2), "Israel" (1), "John" (3), "Moses" (3), "Herod" (1), "man, husband" (2), "spirit" (2), "caesar, Roman emperor" ("кесар-", 6), "king, ruler" (*cesar(j)-, 1), "Lord" (8), "God" (2), "priest" ("иепсъ", 1), "fox" (1), "fire" (1),
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"high priest, bishop" (6) and "ruler of the feast" (1). The numbers in parentheses indicate the quantity of examples which I noted.

The second group is considerably smaller and contains genitive plurals in which the ending is written "-євъ" or "-объ". Only two words are represented, "doctor" and "sin". For the first, "врачаєвъ" is found at 61g11 and 176v16. In both instances the context virtually precludes an analysis which would treat this form as a denominal possessive adjective, i.e., in which "-євъ" would be regarded as the representation of a derivational suffix.

The genitive plural of "sin" is spelled "грахобъ" on three occasions, at 142g4, 185a23 and 209v7. As with the two examples for "doctor" listed above, the context admits only one analysis. It is not possible to treat any of the three as denominal possessive adjectives.

In addition to those two groups there is one isolated form which should be mentioned. It is "чинау" at 199a7. It is a locative singular and the only instance of that word in the portion of the manuscript under consideration.

The remaining items are rather more problematical. They are nominative and genitive plurals of the word 312
which means "Jew". All nine nominative plural forms have as their orthographical representation "жидове", while both genitive plural forms have "жидовъ". Juxtaposing those examples with the three dative plurals spelled "жидомъ", one would posit that the orthographical representation for the nominative singular form would be *"жидъ", a form which is cited for OCS by Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:169]. Under that scenario the eleven nominative and genitive plurals would be germane to this discussion.

However, both Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:169] and Lunt [1959:15] list a nominative singular of "жидовинъ" for OCS. That would be compatible with a nominative plural spelled "жидове" and a genitive plural written "жидовъ", but in such a paradigm "-ов-" would be part of the stem, not part of the desinence. Moreover, in the portion of ME under consideration, a nominative singular "жидовинъ" does occur once.

The other set of paradigms which will be discussed in this investigation is that of the etymological consonant-stem nouns. For purposes of analysis, the consonant-stem nouns are frequently divided into subgroups according to the sound or sequence which is
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reconstructed in stem-final position. The subgroups thus obtained include *s-stems, *r-stems, *ū-stems, *men-stems, *ent-stems, etc.

In addition, there are three other sets of derivatives which are normally discussed in the context of consonant-stem nouns. They are *ar-stems, *tel-stems and a set of nouns having a stem-final suffix *-in- in the singular and the dual, but lacking that suffix in the plural and denoting the inhabitants of a geographical region. These three sets differ from the other subgroups in that, usually, only their plural paradigm is regarded as belonging to the consonant-stem declension.

In the portion of ME under consideration there is sufficient data to permit an examination of the five specific subgroups listed in the preceding paragraph as well as the plural paradigm of the other three sets of derivatives. I will also discuss the declension of several isolated nouns which are normally classified as consonant stems, but which do not belong to one of the aforementioned subgroups.

A proper examination of the inflection of these nouns, as it is orthographically conveyed in ME, requires that one address two issues, whether the stem alternations characteristic of consonant-stem nouns are
reflected in the orthography and whether, in the
case-number combinations for which the consonant-stem
nouns had a distinctive desinence, that distinctive
desinence is maintained.  

Orthographically, one would expect the stem
alternation characteristic of the *s-stem nouns to
manifest itself as a stem-final sequence "-ec-" in all
forms except the nominative/accusative/vocative
singular. In ME, one finds data on six words often
labeled as etymological *s-stem nouns. They are
"miracle", "ear", "eye", "body", "sky" and "word". I
recorded only five examples of the word for "miracle",
a genitive plural, at 9g19-20, and four accusative
plurals, at 52v14-15, 110v8-9, 130a7 and 132g13. All
contain the sequence "-ec-".

The words for "ear" and "eye" are somewhat unusual
in that the label "consonant-stem" is generally not
applied to their dual paradigm and, for obvious
reasons, they occur most frequently in the dual. In
fact, ignoring the instances of the accusative
singular, where the stem extension is not expected, all
but two of the examples of "ear" are dual forms and
"-ec-" does not occur in any of them. The two
"non-dual" items are both dative singulars which also
lack "-ec-".
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A clear majority of the instances of "eye" are dual forms and "-ec-" was consistently absent from them as well. However, I also recorded fourteen examples of oblique case singular forms of "eye". Two of them are instrumentals. Eight are locatives and four are genitives. All four genitive forms contain "-ec-", while none of the others do.

I noted a total of 21 instances of "body" in which one would expect "-ec-". All of the plurals in the data set contain the orthographical marker of the stem extension. Among the oblique case singular forms, there are six genitives, two datives, two locatives and five instrumentals. The sequence "-ec-" occurs in the locative examples and in four of the six genitives.

The word for "sky" has the highest token frequency of any of the six, roughly 125 occurrences in which one would expect "-ec-" to be written. From that group there are only five instances lacking "-(e)c-". Four are dative singulars, at 35v11, 43g10, 88a23 and 91g4. The other is an instrumental singular, at 29b11. As a point of comparison there is one instrumental singular with "-(e)c-", at 51b14, and at least two examples of a dative singular with "-(e)c-", at 94b21 and 173a19.

For the last member of this subgroup, "word", I recorded almost 70 instances in which "-ec-" should be
present based on etymology. In all but seven of them, 
"-еc-" does occur. The exceptions are six instrumental 
singular forms, at 3b16, 25b17, 36b2, 81b11-12, 133b13 
and 208v10, and one genitive singular, at 58g10. This 
contrasts with more than fifteen genitive singulars 
which contain "-еc-" and one instrumental singular with 
"-еc-", at 57g13.

Beyond the paradigms of the six lexical items 
discussed above the stem extension "-еc-" is quite 
rare. It is found once in a form of the word for 
"tree", "древеса" at 98g17. The example represents an 
accusative plural and it is the only plural of that 
word in the portion of the manuscript under 
consideration. The small number of oblique case 
singualrs for "tree" all lack "-еc-".

Finally, "-еc-" also occurs in the genitive plural 
"чадесь" at 35b5. However, there are many more 
instances of this word which lack "-еc-". For example, 
there is another genitive plural at 76b21-22 and it is 
spelled "ча/дъ". In fact, the verse containing 
"чадесь", Matthew 11:19, is repeated at 173b-v and the 
corresponding slot contains "чадъ" in that second 
iteration.

The second subgroup, *r-stems, is quite small, 
consisting of the words for "mother" and "daughter".
The orthographical manifestation of the stem alternation of these two items would be the presence of the sequence "-ep-" in all forms except the nominative/vocative singular. In the data set that pattern is regularly maintained, although it is necessary to add that in some instances the word for "mother" is abbreviated. In the abbreviated forms in which "-ep-" would be expected, the only overt marker of that sequence is "p", the "e" is not written.

The nouns frequently classified as *u*-stems for which data were found in ME are "mother-in-law", "love", "adultery", "fig", "church", "blood", "barren woman" and "millstone". In these words the stem alternation would be reflected orthographically as "-b-" which, ignoring the vocative, would be found in all forms except the nominative singular. For all of the words listed above except "adultery" and "blood", the use of "-b-" is as expected, although it should be noted that most of the examples for "church" are abbreviations and in place of "-b-" one finds only "-v-".

The word meaning "adultery" occurs only once, "неплоч" at 56a10. The syntactic context would lead
one to expect a genitive singular, but the form which actually occurs matches the expected orthography for a nominative singular.

The word "blood" deviates from the generalization in that "-ьб-" is also found in the nominative singular, which occurs sixteen times, e.g., at 52a4. The spelling "*КРЬ" is not found for this word.

The stem alternation in the fourth subgroup opposes the nominative/accusative/vocative singular to all other forms. The differentiating sequence, spelled "-еH-", would be absent in the three singular forms listed above and present in all other forms. In the portion of ME under consideration there are data on five nouns traditionally labeled *men-stems: "time", "seed", "burden", "tribe" and "name". In the examples, the distribution of "-еH-" matches the stated expectations.35

Among members of the fifth subgroup, *ent-stems, one would expect the same division of forms as in the fourth subgroup, i.e., the nominative/accusative/vocative singular contrasting with all others. Orthographically, the contrast would manifest itself in the following manner. The stem of the latter forms would be equivalent to the nominative/accusative/vocative singular with "-T-"
added at the end. In the readings copied by Aleksa that is precisely what one finds in the data set for this subgroup.

As I indicated earlier, interest in the three sets of derivatives is limited to their plural paradigms. Within those plural paradigms there is no expected stem alternation.

The other component of the consonant-stem declensional pattern is the inflectional markers themselves, particularly the desinences which are found in the consonant-stem declension and not in the declensional patterns of the other stem classes. There are three such desinences, the genitive singular and the locative singular of all consonant stems and the nominative plural of masculine consonant stems. In all three instances the consonant-stem desinence had the form *-e, which would be written "-e".36

Although the three desinences listed above are the only ones unique to the consonant-stem declensional pattern, in the following discussion I will also describe the representation of endings for other case-number combinations. In addition, when there are multiple examples for a particular case-number
combination and the stem is not the same in all of the examples, I will indicate how the choice of desinence correlates with the choice of stem.

Among the six members of the *s*-stem subgroup the number of examples and the range of case-number combinations varies significantly from word to word. For "miracle", I recorded a total of five examples. One is a genitive plural in which the desinence is spelled "-зв". The other four are accusative plurals in which "-а" represents the desinence.

As I stated earlier, most of the examples for "ear" are dual forms and none have the sequence "-éc-". The orthographical representations of the desinences are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-оу</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples of "eye" include both dual and singular forms. The declensional markers are presented in the table which follows. It is noteworthy that all of the genitive singular forms contain "-éc-" while none of the others in the singular or dual do.
The data set for "body" contains primarily singular forms. The orthography of the desinences is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. -о</td>
<td>-и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. -о</td>
<td>-и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. -е/-а</td>
<td>-и/-ио</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. -ъ</td>
<td>-ио</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. ---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr. -ъмь</td>
<td>-ъма</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stem containing "-еc-" was used with both locative singulars, the four examples of the genitive singular in which the desinence was written "-е" and the six nominative plurals.38

Among the forms represented one finds singulars and plurals, but no duals. The following table contains the case-number markers which are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. -о</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. -о</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. -е/-а</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. -ъ</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. -оу</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr. -ъмь</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The token frequency of "sky" is significantly greater than that of the *s-stems discussed above.
Singular  |  Plural
---|---
nom.  | -ο  | -α
acc.  | -ο  | -α
gen.  | -ε  | -τ
loc.  | -ε/-ι  | -θη/-θλ
dat.  | -ου/-ι  | ---
instr.  | -γμ/-γμμ  | ---

The locative singular "-ε" is in just one example, at 5a17. The locative plural "-θλ" also occurs only once, at 200v17, and it is in an abbreviation which is marked as such.

There are two problematical examples, "κε/κες" at 43g13-14 and "νοςε" at 110g4. They could be either dative singulars or genitive singulars. In the index both are classified as dative singulars, although the latter is followed by a question mark. [1983:391]

The stem extension is present orthographically, either as "-ες-" or as "-ς-" in all plural forms, all genitive singulars and all locative singulars. In addition, it is present in the dative singular when the desinence is written "-ι" and in the instrumental singular when the ending is spelled "-θμμ".

The last member of this subgroup, "word", has a token frequency comparable to "sky" and its plural paradigm is somewhat more complete than that for "sky".
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Once again, the data set contains singulars and plurals, but no duals. The pertinent information is presented in tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-о</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-о</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-е/-и/-а</td>
<td>-ъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>-ъмь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>-ъмь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-ъмь/-ъмь</td>
<td>-ъь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The genitive singular desinences "-и" and "-а" occur once each. The first is at 39b22, while the second stands at 58g10. Similarly, the instrumental singular "-ъмь" is used just once, at 57g13.

In addition, there is one item which I could not satisfactorily categorize, "слю/веси" at 198g9-10. It could be either a genitive singular or a dative singular. In the index it is listed as a dative singular. [1983:436]

The sequence "-ес-" occurs in all plural forms and in all oblique case singulars except the one example of the genitive singular ending in "-а" and the six examples of the instrumental singular with "-ъмь".

With two exceptions, the data for *r-stems consists of only singulars. The exceptions are the vocative (or nominative) plural "дщери" at 121v25 and the genitive plural "дщеръ" at 198g21.39

324
For "mother", all singular forms, except for the vocative and the locative, are represented. The data set for "daughter" lacks the locative and the instrumental. The paradigms are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Mother&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Daughter&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>мати/мти</td>
<td>дыши</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>дыши</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-ь</td>
<td>-ь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-е</td>
<td>-е</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>-и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-ию</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ignoring the nominative and the vocative, the case-number markers listed in the preceding table follow "матер-" or "мтер-" in the paradigm for "mother" and "дьшер-" in the paradigm for "daughter".

Three of the examples of *r-stem forms require additional comment. The item "дьшеръ" at 33v9 is syntactically the object of a supine. Thus, one would expect a genitive, not an accusative. The reverse is true at 30a23, where "матеръ" stands as the object of "оставить". The third example is like the first in that the context would lead one to anticipate a genitive. The form is "мтръ" at 104b14 and it is the object of "не имать прияти".
Based on the data for "mother-in-law", "love", "fig", "church" and "barren woman", the following singular paradigm emerges for the etymological *u*-stems.

acc.  -ъ
gen.  -е
loc.  -и
dat.  -и
instr.  -ио

The nominative singulars for those five nouns are, respectively, "свекры", "любь", "смокъ", "церкъ"/"цркъ" and "неплодъ".\(^4\)

Two of the examples considered in the compilation of the declensional pattern just outlined need to be mentioned individually. Both are instances of "любъе". One is at 85а11 and the other is at 144с20. The first occurs in Luke 11:42 and the difficulty is that the syntax of the passage is unclear, particularly in light of the anticipated semantics. The problem with the second is that "любъе" represents the object of "имать", i.e., it stands where one would expect an accusative form.

The data regarding "blood" deviate from the paradigm presented above. The nominative singular is spelled "кровь" and in the genitive singular two variants are used, "кровь" and "крови". Incidentally, many instances of both "кровь" and "крови" occupy
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syntactic slots in which either a genitive singular or a dative singular would be possible. However, there are no examples which are indisputably datives, but there are items which, given syntactic considerations, can only be categorized as genitives. For this discussion, I adopted the position of the editors, as reflected in the index [1983:374], and treated the ambiguous forms as genitives.

The lone example for "adultery" is "премю" at 56a10. It stands where one would anticipate a genitive form. The editors label this item as an accusative singular, but place a question mark after "accusative". [1983:415]

The dual is not represented at all in the data set for *ʔ-stems and the number of plurals is comparatively small. There is one nominative plural, "неплюдъви" at 121g5, one dative plural, "смокъ/вамъ" at 105b24-25, and two certain accusative plurals, "смокъви" at 30g3 and 172b17. In addition, there is one other possible accusative plural, "смокъви" at 75b9. That item is from Luke 6:44 where, based on semantics, a plural should be used. However, it denotes the object of a negated verb which would lead one to expect a genitive. In the index the editors classify it as an accusative plural. [1983:438]
I will conclude the examination of the *ū*-stems with a discussion of the data on "millstone". The word occurs only twice, "мёртвъ" at 46a8 and "мёртвъахъ" at 136a15. The former example is an accusative singular and it presents two problems. First, the accusative singular desinence of the other *ū*-stems in this subgroup is spelled "-ъ". Second, the *ū*-stem "millstone" was a feminine noun [Sadnik/Aitzetmüller 1955:169, Lunt 1959:15], but the form "мёртвъ" is modified by a denominal possessive adjective, "осьлож" at 46a9, which has a masculine ending.

The latter of the two examples denotes a locative plural and, given the context in which it is found (Matthew 24:41), it should be understood to mean "mill". The orthography of its desinence conforms to expectations regarding *ū*-stems, which were feminine. Nonetheless, the editors place it in the index together with "мёртвъ" in a single article thereby implying that "мёртвъахъ" is also a form of a masculine noun. [1983:349] Unfortunately, there is no modifier agreeing with "мёртвъахъ" in case and number which would allow one to determine the gender.

In the fourth subgroup, the range of case-number combinations represented for any individual word is rather small. However, taken together, the data for
the members provide information on almost all singular and plural forms. A composite paradigm follows.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>(see below)</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>(see below)</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-е</td>
<td>-ъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>-ънъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>-ъмъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-ъмь</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nominative and accusative singulars which occur are listed by individual member within the subgroup.42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;time&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ВРЕМА&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ВРЕМА&quot;/&quot;ВРЕМА&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;seed&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;СЕМА&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;СЕМА&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;burden&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;БРАМА&quot;/ &quot;БРАМА&quot;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;tribe&quot;</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>&quot;ПЛЕМА&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;name&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ИМА&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ИМА&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only possible instance of a dual is "и/мени" at 56g9-10. It occupies a slot in which an accusative is required.

One other example of "name" should also be mentioned, "имена" at 200g6. It is the subject of "съят", which implies that it should be regarded as a nominative plural. However, it refers to the names of the twelve apostles, which would lead one to anticipate a dual form.

The *ent-stem paradigm is rather poorly represented in the readings copied by Aleksa. Setting
aside the nominative singular and the accusative singular, one finds examples of only three case-number combinations, the genitive singular, the locative singular and the genitive plural. The markers for those three are "-е", "-и" and "-ъ", respectively.

I indicated earlier that, in addition to the five subgroups listed above, there were three sets of derivatives whose affiliation with the consonant stem declension was limited to their plural paradigms. The orthographical shape of the plural desinences for those derivatives is given below in tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*AR-stems</th>
<th>*TEL-stems</th>
<th>*EN-/*JAN-stems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-и/-е</td>
<td>-е/-е</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-а</td>
<td>-а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-ъ</td>
<td>-ъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-емъ</td>
<td>-емъ/-емъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-и/ъмъ</td>
<td>-и</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the nominative plural of the *ar-stems, "-е" occurs roughly twenty times, while "-и" is used once, in "рыбари" at 72a12. Furthermore, that lone instance with "-и" is the only example of the nominative plural of "fisherman".

The instrumental plural "-ымъ" also appears but once, in "ц(с)ры/мы" at 175a4-5. In contrast, "-и" is found five times.
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In the nominative and the dative plural of the *tel-stem nouns, the choice between initial "-ε" and initial "-e" correlates with the preceding consonant letter, "-ε" follows "η", while "-e" follows "ί".

I should add that there are several items in the data set for the *tel-stems whose categorization was problematical. At 99g2-3, "μα/ματελεθ" represents either a nominative plural or a vocative plural. In the index it is listed as a nominative plural. [1983:344]

The proper interpretation of the four examples of the word for "teacher" at 61a18, 61a19-20, 134v1-2 and 134v3 is unclear as well. In all of them the ending is written "-ιά". The first and third are from Matthew 23:7, while the second and fourth are from Matthew 23:8. Depending upon the analysis, the pair in Matthew 23:7 might be nominative, instrumental or vocative plurals, while the two in Matthew 23:8 could be either nominative or instrumental plurals.4

To conclude this examination of consonant-stem nouns, I will describe the paradigms of six other words which are often categorized as etymological consonant stems. They are the numeral "10" and the words for "root", "stone", "day", "flame" and "cubit".
The range of case-number combinations in which "10" is used is rather limited. In the singular, only nominatives, locatives and instrumentals are found.\textsuperscript{4, 5} The desinences for those forms are written "-ь", "-е" and "-и"/"-ы", respectively.\textsuperscript{4, 6} In the plural, one finds accusatives, genitives and instrumentals. The accusative ending is spelled "-и", while the genitive is spelled "-ъ". Three variants are used for the instrumental plural: "-ь" and "-еми" and "-ємі". Each occurs once, at 5v5, 57g5 and 58g21-22, respectively. Finally, there is one instrumental dual, "десать/ма" at 90v10-11.

I should add that many of the examples of "10" are in compound numerals and one might argue whether they represent valid evidence of the declensional pattern or simply set forms which synchronically were not the result of the inflection of "10". For example, all of the locative singular forms are found in the representations of cardinal and ordinal numerals from "11" through "19". It is an open question whether, at the time when ME was copied, the component "надесать" was still analyzed as a prepositional phrase with the numeral "10" as the object of the preposition.

Several examples were excluded from the data set which served as the basis for the preceding
generalizations. In all of them the word for "10" is part of a compound numeral, either "30" or "40". The case-number marker is "-e", at 11g14, 152g15-16 and 187g8, or "-ъ", at 70a24 and 179a6.

The problem at 11g14 is that I am not certain which case form was intended. The noun "десате" combines with "три", which, if "10" is treated as feminine, could be a nominative, an accusative or a genitive plural. The desinence "-e" of the word for "10" suggests a nominative. Unfortunately, the syntax of the passage would lead one to expect an accusative.

At 152g15-16 one finds a similar situation. The relevant ending is again "-e" and "10" is part of the numeral "30". Furthermore, the compound numeral occupies a slot in which one would anticipate an accusative.

The third instance with "-e" as the case-number marker for "10" differs from the other two. The compound numeral represented is "40" and the form of "4" which "десате" follows is "четири". This suggests that "10" be analyzed as a masculine noun and that the compound numeral is in the nominative. However, as with the two examples discussed above, the context seems to require an accusative.
The problem with the last two items is the syntax. The desinence "-ь" would seem to indicate a genitive plural. Unfortunately, since the structure of the clause containing the numeral, which is the same for both examples, is not entirely clear, I do not know why a genitive would be required.

I only recorded six instances of the word for "root". Four are genitive singular forms and are written "короёе". The other two are locative singulars with the representation "короёи".

Most of the singular forms for "stone" are found in ME. The following table presents the orthography of the desinences. The stem which combines with these endings is spelled "камён-".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>acc.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>loc.</th>
<th>dat.</th>
<th>instr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ь</td>
<td>-ь</td>
<td>-е/-и</td>
<td>-е/-и</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, "камь" occurs once, at 92g20. That is the representation which one would expect for the reflex of the reconstructed nominative singular of "stone". There is a problem with that example, though. In the index it is identified as a nominative singular [1983:372], but the modifier which agrees with it is "гораць". That spelling is appropriate for the
masculine accusative singular indefinite/simple form of the present active participle. It is not the representation which one normally finds for a nominative singular.47

In the locative singular "-е" is the case-number marker only twice, as compared to thirteen instances with "-и".

Examples of the fourth word, "day", are most frequently abbreviations in which the stem is spelled "ДН-". The orthographical representations of the singular and the plural desinences are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-Ъ</td>
<td>-И/-ИЯ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>-Ъ</td>
<td>-И</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>-е/-И/-Я</td>
<td>-ъ/-ИИ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>-И/-е</td>
<td>-ЪЪЪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>-И</td>
<td>-ЪЪЪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>-ЪМЪ/-ИЮ</td>
<td>-ЪМИ/-ЪМИ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the genitive singular, the variant "-Я" occurs just once, at 136а7, while "-е" exceeds "-И" in token frequency by approximately 4:1.48 The situation is reversed in the locative singular, with "-И" as the predominant marker, although the data set is much smaller. The instrumental singular "-ИЮ" is found only once, at 99а6-7.49

The more common nominative plural ending, by a ratio of roughly 3:1, is "-ИЯ". In the genitive
plural, "-и" maintains a slight advantage. Finally, the use of the instrumental plural "-ъни" is limited to one example, at 150g17.

There are very few dual forms of "day". In fact, I recorded a total of two accusatives and three locatives.50 The accusative desinence is spelled "-и". In the locative forms "-ънд" is used once and "-ю" twice.

Two members of the data set for "day" were problematical. The first is "днев" at 54v9. It is in Mark 1:13 and, based on the semantics of the passage, is subordinated to the numeral "40". That would lead one to expect a genitive plural. In the index this item is categorized as an accusative plural. [1983:344]

The second example is "днев" at 110b25. The passage is Mark 13:20 and "днев" is the object of a negated verb, which means that a genitive is needed. However, the semantics of the verse demand a plural. In the index this is classified as an accusative plural. [1983:344]

I noted only one instance of the fifth noun, "flame". It is the locative singular "пламени" at 81g4.

The last of the six, "cubit", is also quite rare in the portion of the manuscript under consideration.
The accusative singular, spelled "лакъть", occurs twice, at 34b16 and 87b14. The genitive plural, written "лакъть", is found once, at 211b23.

Among the other declensional patterns, the orthography of the nominative singular form in certain *ja-stem nouns merits attention. The nouns in question are those derivationally related to the words for "desert" and "judge". I recorded instances of nominative singular forms for three different nouns which belong to the first group, "Magdalene", "female slave" and "Samaritan woman". For all three the ending in question is consistently spelled "-и". Some examples are "магдалъ/ни" at 9b25-9v1, "магдалыч" at 9v4 and "самаранъ/ни" at 15a12-13.

The data for the second group is less uniform than that for the first. Two different words are represented, "lightning" and "judge". Among the five instances of "lightning", two have "-и" as the last letter, while three have "-я". In contrast, all four nominative singulars of "judge" end in "-и". Examples include "соудий" at 28g17, "мышни" at 52v21 and "мыш/я" at 52g5-6.51

I would also like to describe one orthographical feature in the declensional pattern for a particular set of non-Slavic nouns found in the portion of ME 337
under consideration. The nouns are masculine and in all of them the last letter before the representation of the desinence is either "f" or "e". The members of this set include the words for "Pharisee", "Jew", "high priest" and "priest", as well as the personal names "Moses", "Andrew" and "Zebedee".

The feature is that in the instrumental singular, the dative plural and, when the desinence associated with etymological *u-stems is used, the dative singular, the first letter of the desinence is "o" or "m", not "se" or "е". This is even more noteworthy in the face of examples such as the genitive plural "фарисьи", at 2g19, 4v19 and elsewhere, and the locative plural "иоудьихъ"/"иоудьихъ", at 18а12 and 20b18-19. Several examples of forms with "o" are listed below.

"Мосеомъ" 2v15
"Зеведеомъ" 31g24
"Фарисьомъ" 19b1
"И/Оудьомъ" 14a18-19
"Ар/Хиеромъ" 26v11-12
"Моусови" 8v10
"Андръ/ови" 20v14-15

For each of the topics discussed above the data were taken from only one class of nominals, either pronouns, adjectives or nouns. The topics which I will
consider next all involve data from two, and sometimes all three, of the classes. The first such topic is the vocative form.

In the examination of the vocative the issue is whether an orthographical distinction exists in ME between the representations of vocative forms and the representations of the nominative forms of the same words. I will begin the discussion with a consideration of nouns. In the selection of data, association with a particular declensional pattern was not a criterion.

There are several groups of forms which can be treated in a summary manner. In the dual and the plural of all nouns, there is no evidence of a distinction between the vocative and the nominative. The same is true for neuter nouns and etymological *r-stem nouns in the singular.

Finally, there is a small number of data items which I excluded from consideration. All but two are instances of a word meaning "rabbi" which occur in contexts where one would expect a vocative singular. In the examples, the word is spelled in one of three ways: "רָבָבִי", "רָבָבי" or "רַעְבֵי". Those items were excluded because the word was clearly borrowed into Slavic and I could not determine how thoroughly it had
been integrated into the Slavic inflectional system. For the same reason I disregarded "павоум" at 105b5 and "павни" at 210b13.

In the forms which remain, essentially the singular of masculine and feminine nouns, there is a rather consistent orthographical distinction between the vocative and the nominative. Within the collection of distinct vocative singulars, the word with the highest token frequency is "Lord". Its vocative is found in nearly 125 instances. In the vast majority of them the form is abbreviated as "ГМ", although the unabbreviated version, written "господи", is also present.

The closest in size to "Lord", the data sets for "father" and "teacher" contain over forty members apiece. Within each data set one finds two orthographical variants. The vocative singular of "father" is rendered "Оче" and "Оче", while "учителю" and "учителю" are used for "teacher".

There are only four other nouns whose vocative singular appears more than ten times each. They are "woman" ("жено"), "God" ("йс"), "son" ("сыно"/"сноу"/"сне") and "Simon" ("симвен"/"симоне").

The list of nouns whose data sets have 2-10 members is rather large. Furthermore, it is usually
true that within individual data sets the orthography is consistent across the members. That situation obtains for the following items: "рабе", "назариние", "сотоно", "лицемьер", "роде", "друже", "наставьниче", "аврааме", "отроковище", "петре", "дме" (from masculine *dux-), "филипе" and "мариже".54

The other six words whose vocative occurs more than once are "Jesus", "person", "Jerusalem", "Christ", "Pharisee" and "king, ruler". For each of them the form in question is represented in more than one way. The information on the orthographical variants is given in tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Vocative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jesus&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ге&quot;, &quot;и&quot;ге&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;person&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;чловъче&quot;, &quot;ч(о)вче&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jerusalem&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;иер(о)смие&quot;, &quot;иерусалиме&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Christ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;хсе&quot;, &quot;Хе&quot;, &quot;христе&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pharisee&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;фарисъе&quot;, &quot;фарисе&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;king, ruler&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ц(с)ръ&quot;, &quot;царъ&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the vocative singular of some nouns occurs only once. An exhaustive list is presented below.
Despite the rather pronounced tendency to maintain an orthographical distinction between the vocative singular and the nominative singular of most masculine and feminine nouns, there is a small number of instances in which the context would lead one to expect a vocative, but the form in the text matches the nominative. Three certain examples of this phenomenon are "ιερ(ο)σαλμων" at 52a12, "ιερου/σαλμων" at 52a12-13 and "врачъ" at 71v1. The first two are from Matthew 23:37 and the last is from Luke 4:23.

There are several others which might belong in this list of exceptions. I am presenting them separately because, in the readings copied by Aleksa, there are no instances of the verses containing these
items in which a distinctive vocative is used. The relevant examples are listed below along with their location in ME and the Gospels.

"Господи" 6v5, 210g20  John 20:28
"отц" 6v6, 210g20  John 20:28
"паха" 28v24  Matthew 5:22 (cf. 28g2)
"хоразинъ" 35b15  Matthew 11:21
"виясайда" 35b16  Matthew 11:21
"хоразинъ" 81a1  Luke 10:13
"виясайда" 81a2  Luke 10:13
"капернаоумъ" 81a10  Luke 10:15
"ксъ" 154b3, 158b22  Mark 15:32
"ц(с)рь" 154b3, 158b22  Mark 15:32
"мара" 166v11  Luke 10:41
"мап/еа" 166v11-12  Luke 10:41

In contrast to the comparative abundance of distinct vocative singulars found among the nouns, there are almost none among the adjectives. In fact, I recorded only three instances in which a vocative form was distinct from the corresponding nominative. They are "се/эоумъне" at 92b21-22, "въръне" at 93g18 and "слъне" at 135a24.

The second topic encompassing more than one class of nominals is the dual. In ME, when the semantics of a passage would require a dual, a dual generally is used. Conversely, dual forms essentially do not occur where they would be semantically inappropriate.

One important exception to this pattern involves agreement with the numeral "12". One would expect, when the context implies that a group of twelve is
meant, that a dual would be used. However, in such instances one often finds a plural form, particularly when the numeral "12" is not present in the clause. In fact, even nouns subordinated to "12" (the cardinal, not the ordinal) have plural desinences at times.

Several examples are presented below.

"и призъвавъ и/съ оба на десате ученика/свои. дасть имъ власть на/дкъ нечисть" 32a22-25 ("имъ" instead of "има")

"и възда вукру/хъ .би. те копьници испъ/лнъ" 63b7-9 ("копьници" instead of "копьници")

"изборавъ отъ ни/хъ .еи. те. заже и аплъ на/рече" 73b20-22 ("аплъ" instead of "апла" or "аплова", "заже" could represent either an accusative dual or an accusative plural)

There are several other irregularities in the distribution of dual forms which I would like to describe as well. In some examples of the words for "hand" and "foot", the specification for the category of number seems, at best, suspect.

At 210a17-21 one finds the following portion of John 20:12.

"и ви/дъ два ангела въ сбахъ/ризахъ садаща. ждино/го оу главъ а дрогоаго но/гахъ"

The "feet" referenced at the end would seem to be those of Christ whose body had been interred where these events occurred. If that is correct, then a dual is required, not a plural.
A similar example exists for "hand". The passage, at 42g14-15, is cited below. It is from Matthew 15:20. "а не оумятами рука/ми часть"

Although the statement does not refer to a specific individual, the verb is a singular. Therefore, one would expect "hands" to be a dual.

A slightly different problem becomes apparent if one juxtaposes, e.g., the passages containing "hand" at 98a14 and 114v16. The first is in Luke 21:12, while the second is from Mark 14:46. The relevant clauses are adduced below.

"воздлож/ъ бо на въ руку своя" (Luke 21:12)
"они же воздложи/ша руцъ на их" (Mark 14:46)

The forms of "hand" in those two examples occupy the same syntactic slot. Therefore, it is not clear why one has a dual, while in the other there is a plural.

Another inter-class topic is the orthography of the masculine/feminine accusative plural and the feminine genitive singular and nominative plural desinences in the "soft" pronoun and adjective declensions and what are traditionally labeled the *jo-stem and *ja-stem paradigms. The relevant positions are those in which one would reconstruct the contrast between "North" Slavic */-ь* and South Slavic */-ь*. In ME, in the positions under consideration one
finds almost universally "-a"/"-a"/"-a", which, given the relationship between orthography and reconstructed segments described earlier, would lead one to conclude that the South Slavic variant of the desinences was being used.

I recorded only sixteen exceptions to this generalization. They are listed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;многий&quot;</td>
<td>34b9</td>
<td>acc. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;многий&quot;</td>
<td>38a14, 57v17, 78г22</td>
<td>nom. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;многий/мног&quot;</td>
<td>38b18-19</td>
<td>gen. sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;чонь&quot;</td>
<td>130b11</td>
<td>gen. sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;м(с)цин&quot;</td>
<td>166b18</td>
<td>acc. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;все&quot;</td>
<td>182v2</td>
<td>nom. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;о́выц&quot;</td>
<td>189b24</td>
<td>gen. sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;о́выц&quot;</td>
<td>196g18, 196g23</td>
<td>nom. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;своё&quot;</td>
<td>196g19</td>
<td>acc. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;о́выц&quot;</td>
<td>196g20, 196g22</td>
<td>acc. pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;захарий&quot;</td>
<td>199v8</td>
<td>gen. sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;земля&quot;</td>
<td>211b22</td>
<td>gen. sing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see, five of the sixteen, almost one third of the items, are concentrated in the six lines beginning on 196g18 and ten of the examples are in the menologion and the small number of readings which follow it.55

The last topic involving nominal inflectional morphology is the orthography of the instrumental singular desinence of masculine and neuter nouns and "indefinite"/"simple" adjectives. In the portion of ME
under consideration, five markers are used to denote this form, ""ёмь", "ъемь", "ёемь", "семь" and "имь".\textsuperscript{56,57}

The final two are comparatively rare and an exhaustive list of the items which contain them is presented below.

"мисеомь" 2v15
"зведеомь" 31g24
"лефнтиомь" 142a9-10
"гноимь" 88v24
"елемь" 123a14
"оукроимь" 129v3
"жада/ниимь" 140b15-16
"мисъеимь" 204b17

The distribution of the remaining three correlates with the letter immediately preceding the desinence in the word. When a consonant letter precedes, either "ъемь" or "имь" is used. When the letter before the ending is "н", "имь" is used.

The choice between "ёмь" and "ъемь" correlates with the overall declensional pattern which the noun follows, stated in terms of the traditional stem classes. The former combines with so-called *o-stem and *u-stem nouns. The latter is used with *jo-stem and *i-stem nouns. Among consonant-stem nouns, "ъемь" is used, except with etymological *s-stems lacking the "stem extension".\textsuperscript{58} A sample of the data follows.
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Before turning to the other sections of the manuscript, I will describe briefly several syntactic phenomena in the readings copied by Aleksa. The first is the prepositionless locative.

The objects of the verbs whose reconstructed infinitives are \(^{*}\text{kosnqti} \text{ s}q\), \(^{*}\text{prikosnqti} \text{ s}q\), \(^{*}\text{prikasati} \text{ s}q\), \(^{*}\text{prile}z\text{ati} \text{ s}q\) and \(^{*}\text{pril}ep\text{iti} \text{ s}q\) are prepositionless locatives.\(^{59}\) On two occasions, at 34b15-17 and 87b12-14, a noun phrase directly subordinated to "приложит" is in the locative. The two examples of "прильжтый", at 80g18 and 165b23, have as their object "насъ", which could be either a locative plural or a genitive plural. Finally, "земь" serves as the object of "нападаахоу" at 56v12-13.

Prepositionless locatives are also used for some time expressions. The phrase "томь часъ", without any preposition, occurs twice, at 45a15 and 50v25-50g1. The form "зимь", which I regard as a locative singular even though the orthographical representation for the
dative singular would be the same, stands at 52b25, 110b19 and 132v22. There are four instances of "толова", which means "at midnight". As with "сих", the orthography of "толова" admits more than one interpretation, although in the index the editors identify all four examples as locative singulars.

[1983:411] To complete the list of time expressions employing prepositionless locatives I will also cite the three instances of "отръ", at 34b25, 88g13 and 88g15, despite the fact that they are categorized as adverbials in the index [1983:459], not as locative singulars of "morning".

The remaining examples which I recorded are all isolated. The clauses containing them are listed below.

"и не/могоше зазърти глъ не/го предъ людьми" 96v19-21 (Luke 20:26)
"съ не съ присталь/съвът и дължани ихъ" 122a13-14 (Luke 23:51)
"не бъхомъ оу/бо обвалице имъ были/кръви пр(o)ршцъ" 135b20-22 (Matthew 23:30)
"и въ всей странъ предъ/лъ иоудьстъмъ повъд/а/ въ към болху въси кули си" 200a3-5 (Luke 1:65)

Of course, for any of the putative prepositionless locatives cited above, the absence of an orthographical
indication of the presence of a preposition governing the locative could reflect an error on the part of the scribe.62

The second syntactic construction which I want to mention is the dative absolute. The only observation to be made is that it is well-represented in the readings copied by Aleksa. In fact, the construction is used on the order of 200 times.

The focus of the third phenomenon is not a construction, but the agreement between certain *a-stem nouns and their modifiers. In the plural, the modifiers of masculine *a-stems decline as if the crucial parameter were stem class, not gender. Thus, the desinence of the modifier corresponds to the feminine form, not the masculine.63 However, this type of agreement is limited to pronominals and "true" adjectives which belong to the same noun phrase as the *a-stem with which they agree. Participials do not conform to this pattern. Several examples follow.64,65

"a/слюкъ вёдаахоу почърпъ/шеи водоу" 6g19-21 (John 2:9)
"слю/гъмоа подвизали са бъ/ша" 151g5-7 (John 18:36)
"о/тъдшаша старьшинъ/жърчъскъ" 167g5-7 (John 19:15)
"в/гда иродъ р(о)жству своимъ/вечерю обѣдь твораше./вельможамъ и тысяечь/никомъ и старьшинамъ/галилеискамъ" 206b9-14 (Mark 6:21)
7.2. Headings

The orthographical representation of the nominal morphology in the headings, for the most part, does not depart from the patterns which prevail in the readings. One example which does is "すこと" at 197v15, which denotes the feminine accusative singular of the demonstrative pronoun meaning "this". In the readings the corresponding form is consistently written "ことお". The latter variant is found on several occasions in the headings as well. (cf. Lunt 1984:57)

There are three instances in which the masculine/neuter genitive singular "definite"/"compound" adjective desinence is written with only one "a". However, all three of those are in marked abbreviations. Therefore, the significance of them is questionable.

I should also mention "ことへリ" at 197g4, which would seem to be a genitive plural form of a noun. If it is, then the inflectional marker would appear to be an adaptation of the *u-stem genitive plural desinence.

With respect to the consonant stem nouns the headings contain an example of a case-number combination for a particular word which simply was not present in the data set for that word in the readings. It is the genitive singular "ことへリ" at 166a2.
However, that representation is not surprising given the spelling of genitive singular forms of other *s-stems which do occur in the readings.

One topic which merits particular consideration is the representation of the endings for the case-number combinations of certain declensional patterns where there was a contrast between South Slavic *q and "North" Slavic *ě. The use of the marker "-ъ" in such forms is far more prevalent in the headings than in the readings, despite the fact that the total amount of material in the headings is substantially less than in the readings. An exhaustive list of the items with "-ъ" is presented below. All of them occur in headings found in the menologion and all are genitive singulars. The examples have been divided into two groups with the second group consisting of non-Slavic personal names.
The items "оси"", "захири" and "или" refer to men, while "зинови" and "епистими" might also be men. I mention this because, given the structure of these names, any which denote a male might follow the *jo-stem declensional pattern instead of the *ja-stem pattern, in which case they would not be pertinent to the current discussion and another explanation for the use of "-ь" would be required, such as an appeal to the absence in Glagolitic of an orthographical contrast corresponding to Cyrillic "ь" versus "$\mathfrak{m}$".
The only other observation is that for most of the words which are not personal names there are other examples in the headings of the genitive singular of those words with the ending spelled "-a", which would be the expected orthography for the South Slavic variant of the genitive singular desinence under consideration. As for the personal names, there are instances of the genitive singular of other non-Slavic personal names which are similar in structure to those listed above and in which the ending is written "-a" or "-ъ".

Turning to the syntactical issues, one example of "са" deserves comment. It stands at 182v18 in preposition to the verb with which it is associated and some material intervenes between them. It is the nature of that material, "одина. не(д).", which should be noted. In comparable examples from the readings one finds either a pronoun, the negative particle, written "не", or, in one instance, an auxiliary verb occupying the slot between "са" and its verb, i.e., the material always consists of exactly one word. The pertinent passage is presented below.

"Аще ли са одна. не(д)./сплоучить" 182v18-19
7.3. Readings Copied by Second Scribe

In the two lections copied by the anonymous second scribe there is nothing noteworthy in the representation of the nominal morphology. The same observation is valid with respect to the syntactic phenomena considered in the analysis of the readings copied by Aleksa.

7.4. Colophon

The discussion of the material in the colophon will be organized in accordance with the practice adopted in previous chapters. The contributions of Aleksa, Žadēn" and Naslav" will be examined separately.

7.4.1. Aleksa

The portion of the colophon written by Aleksa contains two features relating to nominal morphology which distinguish it from other parts of the manuscript.

The first is in the declension of the demonstrative pronoun with a reconstructed masculine nominative singular of *sē. The pronoun occurs four times, at 213a1, 213a7, 213a13 and 213a16, and all four examples are neuter accusative singulars spelled "сие". Elsewhere the corresponding form is written "сє".
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The representation of the masculine/neuter dative singular "definite"/"compound" adjective ending is far less consistent. I found four instances of it as well, but each one is unique as far as the orthography of the desinence. Furthermore, only one of the variants conforms to the templates which predominate in the readings copied by Aleksa. The four spellings are "-oyoyMoy" at 213a2, "-oMoy" at 213a2-3, "-oMoy" at 213a3 and "-oyomoy" at 213a6-7.

The only other observation concerns the vocative. At 213al3 one finds "öpa(T) e", which denotes the vocative singular of a collective noun derived from the word meaning "brother". That collective noun follows the *ja-stem declensional pattern. I cite this example because the vocative of this word does not occur elsewhere in the manuscript.

7.4.2. ḫadēn"

In the three lines of text supplied by ḫadēn" only one item needs to be mentioned, "owwi" at 213a19. It denotes the vocative singular of the word for "father". Based on etymology and the traditional relationships between sound and symbol, one would expect the last letter to be "-e", not "-i".⁶⁷⁶⁸
7.4.3. Naslav"

The unique features of the nominal morphology in the part of the colophon for which Naslav" was responsible relate to the masculine/neuter dative singular of "definite"/"compound" adjectives and the case-number marker for the genitive singular in the *ja-stem declensional pattern.

The first form occurs twice, at 213b1 and 213b16. In both instances one finds "хуoдoмoу". Elsewhere in the manuscript, the use of "-oMoy" as the dative singular ending is normally confined to certain pronominals.

For the genitive singular of words following the *ja-stem paradigm there is one example which I want to adduce. It is "брaтиве" at 213b19. The orthography of the desinence in this item probably reflects the loss of contrast between *e and *e after jot. Of course, that implies that the "North" Slavic variant of the case-number marker, reconstructed as *e, was intended."
1 In this chapter, the letter "ъ" is used as a cover symbol for both "ъ" and "ѣ". Similarly, "ѣ" means either member of the pair "ѣ"/"и". However, these two conventions do not apply to citations of specific examples from the text.

In the tables of forms, the symbol "---" occupies slots in a paradigm for which no examples were found in the portion of ME under consideration.

2 Excluding the ones in "ъ съ въ си",

there are at most three occurrences of "си" as the dative of the reflexive pronoun. They are at 54b1, 103b9 and 103b18. The editors categorize the latter two as masculine accusative singular forms of the demonstrative pronoun which means "this (one)". [1983:447] The problem with that analysis is that it necessitates agreement with "моужъ" and "мъ/мъ", respectively. In both instances the verse is Mark 10:12.

3 There are other problems with the article in the index for the second person personal pronoun. [1983:453-455] The examples of "вась" at 90g11 and 169b15 are not registered. No form "въ"/"въ" is found at 23g3. The item spelled "ти" at 90a21 is not the dative singular of the second person personal pronoun, but rather the masculine nominative plural of the demonstrative pronoun. Similarly, "въ" at 174a2 is an accusative plural, not a nominative plural. The instance of "тебе" at 28g16 is listed twice, once under "genitive" and once under "genitive-accusative". The placement of several examples, in terms of folio, column and/or line, is incorrect. Finally, the introduction of a separate category "genitive-accusative" for "тебе" and "вась", as distinct from the "genitive" and the "accusative" entries for the same two items, as well as some of the assignments of individual examples within that ternary framework are, at best, questionable. (cf. Lunt 1984:53-54)

Many of the same errors are found in the article for the first person personal pronoun. The list of omissions includes "мнъ" at 104b9 and 139g2, "ма" at 37b13, "въ" at 155b14 and "нан" at 155b15. At 67a22, "ми" does not occur, contrary to the citation in the index. The same is true for "нъ"/"нн" at 73b8. In addition, there is the usual assortment of duplicate
citations, incorrect placements (in terms of folio, column and/or line), as well as misassignments (in terms of case). Finally, one finds an entry "genitive=accusative" for "меня" and "нась" alongside the entries labeled "genitive" and "accusative".

4 Inattentiveness or misunderstanding of the passages in which the deviations occur could explain Aleksa's failure to correct some or all of these "errors".

5 A similar situation would seem to exist between the members of the pair "сА"/"сева" based on the instance of "сев" found in the clause "а иже съярри/ть сев" at 134v14-15 (Matthew 23:12), which can be juxtaposed with examples such as "съярри сА" at 134v14 (Matthew 23:12). However, I did not treat the two pairs together because I suspect that for "сА"/"сева" the putative alternation which these two examples suggest actually arose from a confluence of the first two types of deviations described above. Such an analysis cannot apply to "ны"/"нами" or "вы"/"вами".

6 For "ти" there is one possible exception to the claim that it always follows at least one accented word in its clause. The pertinent passage is "вко сестра мо ве ждиноу/ма остави ти служити/ти" at 166v7-9. If the portion which means "to serve you" is treated as a separate clause, albeit subordinated to the material immediately preceding it, then "ти" would be clause-initial. However, the presence of a second "ти" after "служити" at least admits the possibility that the first was written in error, which vitiates somewhat the significance of this example.

7 In the index the editors attempt to provide essentially the same information, although they organize it in a slightly different manner. They divide the examples of "сА" into those which they regard as accusative case forms and those which are part of reflexive verbs. Within the latter category they further separate the items according to the relative position of "сА" and the verb with which it is most directly associated. The four classifications are "postposition", "distant postposition", "preposition" and "distant preposition". The qualifier "distant" indicates that at least one word intervenes between "сА" and its verb.
Unfortunately, even though their system seems reasonably well-conceived, there are a number of problems in the assignment of individual items. The most serious involves the use of the "accusative" label. As one would expect, that category includes all examples in which "ca" is the object of a preposition. However, one also finds the five instances in which there is no overt verb word in the clause containing "ca" as well as 20 other examples in which "ca" is not the object of a preposition and where "ca" and its verb both occur in the same clause.

An examination of the last 20 items in particular raises questions about the care with which the data were assigned. Fifteen of them are cited a second time in the article for the reflexive pronoun under the appropriate entry for "ca" used as part of a reflexive verb. In addition, for some of the 20 the same chapter and verse in which they occur is found elsewhere in the manuscript, also with "ca", but that second instance of "ca" is not listed under "accusative". As examples of the latter phenomenon one can adduce Matthew 18:4, at 45g23 and 50v3, and Luke 4:23, at 198a18 and 71v1. Only the reflexive pronoun in the occurrence listed first for each pair is classified under "accusative".

Another problem consists of classification errors. For instance, "ca" at 159a6 is listed under "postposition". It should be under "distant postposition". Conversely, the example at 23v16 belongs under "postposition", but it is found under "distant postposition". The entry for "preposition" includes data items at 90b3 and 93b1. The first should be under "distant postposition", while the latter should be assigned to "distant preposition".

Finally, the examples at 11a11, 123a9, 155a23 and 180a19 are absent from this article in the index.

8 In the index [1983:393] the entries for these forms all include the "жс" which immediately follows "ничесо"/"ничъсо"/"ничо".

9 In at least one instance one of these three seems to stand in a position in which a genitive would not be expected. The relevant example is "и ничъ/-so жс вась не вредить" 94b13-14 which is from Luke 10:19. In this clause the form in question occupies the position of the subject and "ничъ(о)то( жс)" is generally used in that capacity elsewhere in the readings copied by Aleksa. In fact, the same chapter and verse stands at 173a and instead of "ничъсо" one finds "ничто".
At 207v23-24 the same basic construction occurs, with "ничего" as the subject, although that example is from Mark 16:18.

10  Lunt [1984:55] discounts the significance of this one instance based on a second iteration in ME of the same verse, Mark 3:32, in which "мати твоя" is found instead of "сына". That second iteration is at 202b.

11  In a personal communication, Prof. Charles Gribble suggested that "се" might be modifying "множество" and that "англъ" could be taken as a genitive plural subordinated to "множество". There are two problems with that interpretation. First, from a semantic perspective, the presence of "се" would lead one to expect that the "multitude" in question had been mentioned already in the preceding context. That is not the case. In addition, such an analysis renders "вон ионних" superfluous, unless one regards it as being in apposition to "англъ".

12  The two items which I categorize as feminine locative duals are treated differently by the editors. They combine the three letters in "сеи" with the two immediately preceding letters, "ъъ" both times, analyzing the resulting sequences as forms of "all". [1983:103, 183, 327] I regard "ъъ" as a representation of the preposition which means "in" with "ъ" instead of the expected "ъ" after "ъ".

I should add that, even though the verse containing "ъсеи" is Matthew 22:40 in both instances, one example is labeled a locative dual in the index, while the other is classified as a genitive dual. [1983:327]

13  Several observations need to be made about the article for this word in the index. [1983:447-448] I think that the three examples of "се" at 34gl4, 121g3 and 192b24, identified as masculine nominative plurals, should all be regarded as instances of the interjection meaning "lo".

The two instances of "сы" at 103b9 and 103b18 are not masculine accusative singulars of the demonstrative pronoun. They are dative forms of the reflexive pronoun.

The examples of "сєро" labeled as "genitive-accusative", both masculine and neuter, are all genitives. The same is true for "сєро" at 34v9, which is listed as a neuter accusative singular. The former
are all objects of negated verbs (cf. Lunt 1984:53-54), while the latter is the object of "need", which regularly governs the genitive in the portion of ME under consideration.

Many other members of the data set are incorrectly categorized as well. In addition, I recorded one item which does not seem to be cited at all. It is "сихъ" at 208b15.

14 Both "indefinite"/"simple" and "definite"/"compound" adjectival desinences are encountered in ME. However, I will not address the distribution of the two types, only the orthographical shape of individual case/number markers.

15 In the examination of adjectival declension I included participles because in the particular categories which I will consider participles inflect like "true" adjectives.

16 There are adjectives for which one might expect the spelling "-мако", based on the orthographical generalizations outlined in the preceding chapter and the probable reconstructed base for those adjectives. However, in the portion of ME under consideration, only for the adjective meaning "third" does the relevant form occur. There are two examples, "третимако" at 156v22 and "третимако" at 162g8.

17 Given the apparent orthographical equivalence between "оу", "х" and "ъ" (see above), I think that the variants just described should not be regarded as different desinences, but rather as different representations of a single desinence.

18 An examination of the "hard" and the "soft" declensions, disregarding the five examples with "о" in place of one or both of the first two instances of "ъ" in the template, reveals a contrast between the distribution of "оу" and "ъ", on the one hand, and "х", on the other. Both "оу" and "ъ" are found in each of the three positions occupied by "ъ" in the template. However, "х" only occurs in place of the first and the third "ъ".

19 There is one important issue which is not treated in this paragraph, the parsing of the text. More specifically, in the original manuscript there were no spaces between words. Therefore, it would be left to
the investigator to determine where word boundaries should be placed, i.e., before or after the "n" which would mark the form as "definite"/"compound".

In compiling the data sets for the generalizations presented above, I attached no particular significance to the parsing performed by the editors and I classified all examples either as "indefinite"/"simple" or as "definite"/"compound". With respect to possible ambiguous data items, only those which I categorized as "definite"/"compound" and in which the desinence is spelled "-n" need to be addressed.

I noted less than ten examples which meet the criteria just described. Even if one assumes that all of them should be labeled as "indefinite"/"simple" forms and that the second "n" should not be regarded as part of the representation of the ending, that would only increase somewhat the comparative predominance of "-n" as the "definite"/"compound" marker and would force one to modify the categorical nature of the generalization regarding the orthography of the "indefinite"/"simple" desinence, but the preponderence of "-e" as the inflectional marker for the latter form would remain overwhelming.

20 For the second part of the discussion it was necessary to make some assumptions about the phonological value of forms found in ME. In making those assumptions, I proceeded on the basis of traditional notions about the relationship between sound and symbol.

21 I did not tabulate the number of examples of the accusative singular in which the desinence is spelled "-n" or the number of instances of the nominative singular.

22 The representation of the vocative singular form for nouns in general will be discussed separately below.

23 I disagree with the editors' classification of several items in the data set for "son", as manifested in the index. [1983:446-447] The form "Choy" at 47v6 should be labeled a genitive dual, not a dative singular. Similarly, the instance of "Cha" found at 72bl8 should be under accusative dual, not accusative singular. Finally, the form "Chomt" at 199b8 should be analyzed as a genitive plural, not an accusative plural.
24 In the index all eleven are categorized under dative singular. [1983:340-341]

25 The synchronic (at the time when ME was compiled) status of the eleven examples of the locative singular might be questioned based on the fact that none are the objects of a preposition. Furthermore, both Sadnik/Aitzetmuller [1955:154] and Lunt [1959:6] list for OCS a preposition "βρῆχος" which governs the genitive and in seven of the eleven "βρῆχος" is followed immediately by a pronoun or noun in the genitive which is syntactically subordinated to it. In fact, the editors classify some of the examples as adverbials and the others as prepositions governing the genitive. [1983:326]

26 It is possible that the item classified as a genitive plural of the noun is actually the genitive plural of the denominal possessive adjective derived from "οξα". The example is at 97b2-3 and it is part of Luke 14:19.

27 In the lexicon of Sadnik/Aitzetmüller, that is alongside "χιλβα".

28 For ease of exposition, I will label the third set "*en-/*jan-stems".

29 For the second issue, it was necessary to make assumptions about the phonological value of the inflectional markers which the data contained. All such assumptions were based on traditional notions about the relationship between sound and symbol.

30 I do not intend to address the question of the etymologically "correct" composition of any of the subgroups under consideration. That is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

31 The data set does not contain any nominative or vocative singulars for this word.

32 In the index the editors classify two examples of "οξα" as accusative plurals. [1983:397] Both do occupy slots where one would expect an accusative. However, the first, at 16a2, is modified by "βαμμα", which cannot be an accusative plural, but it could be an accusative dual. In the second instance, at 18a19, there is no
comparable modifier which refutes the analysis of the editors. Nonetheless, I treated both of these items as accusative duals. (cf. Lunt 1984:53)

33 Actually, the vast majority of examples are abbreviations in which the stem is written "нс-". Therefore, the entire sequence "-ек-" is not usually present, only the last letter of it.

34 For this subgroup the vocative has been excluded from consideration because I do not know what form is reconstructed for the vocative singular of these nouns.

35 There is one possible exception, "и/меня" at 56g9-10. The problem is that I am not certain how the clause containing this form should be analyzed. The context would seem to require an accusative singular, although a dual might also fit.

36 I realize that historically the nominative plural desinence in both the *l-stem (masculine) and the *u-stem declensions was also *e, preceded by full grade forms of the stem marker. However, I think that one can make the case that, by the time that ME was copied, the synchronic analysis of those forms would treat the reflex of the stem marker as part of the desinence. In contrast, there would be no such generic reanalysis which the consonant stems could have undergone.

37 In the index several examples of this word are incorrectly classified. [1983:397-398] The item at 19a17, "очи", is labeled an accusative dual. It should be categorized as a nominative dual since it is the subject of the verb in its clause.

At 55g19 one finds "чию", which the editors include under the entry for genitive duals. However, that word represents the object of the verb form "прикосново са", which regularly governs a prepositionless locative in the portion of the manuscript under consideration.

The citation for "очи" at 75b3 is positioned so as to create the impression that the editors regard it as an accusative singular. It is, in fact, a locative singular.

Finally, the editors identify two instances of "очи" as accusative plurals. They are at 16a2 and 18a19. The former is modified by "ваш", which cannot denote an accusative plural form. However, it could
represent an accusative dual and the context does require an accusative. In fact, in the index "вами" at 16a3 is entered as a neuter accusative dual. [1983:314] The editors probably classified this example of "очи" as a plural because its modifier is a form of *вас- and because it is the object of a non-singular imperative.

I suspect that the editors based their treatment of the second item on the dative "слъпомъ", a plural, which denotes the individuals to whose eyes the clause refers. Unfortunately, in this instance there is no modifier agreeing with "очи" in case and number. Nonetheless, the example at 16a2 demonstrates that one cannot automatically conclude that a plural form is being used just because the referent is the eyes of more than one individual. The editors themselves tacitly acknowledge this in their treatment of "очи" at 21b13. It stands in the clause "ослъпи очи имъ" from John 12:40. The modifier "имъ", subordinated to "очи", indicates that the eyes of several people are involved, but in the index this occurrence of "очи" is labeled as an accusative dual. [1983:397-398] Therefore, I decided to regard "очи" at 18a19 as an accusative dual as well. (cf. Lunt 1984:53)

38 In the index four of the six nominative plurals are identified as accusative plurals. [1983:455] They are at 155g17, 159g15, 162a23 and 168a17-18. All four are from John 19:31 and the verb in the clause with "бodies" is rendered as "останутъ".

The problem with the analysis found in the index is that it requires one to treat the verb in question as transitive. However, examples of clauses with the form "оста", representing a third singular aorist of the same verb, at 13a2 (John 7:9), 17v2 (John 8:9) and 182g24 (Luke 2:43) demonstrate that the assumption of transitivity is not valid. The "bodies" are the subject, not the object, of the verse in question.

The analysis by the editors encounters an additional problem. Even if the verb were transitive, one would expect the object to be in the genitive, not in the accusative, because the pertinent clause is negated.

39 The editors identify the first of the two as a nominative plural. [1983:343] I think that it should be considered a vocative plural. The example is from Luke 23:28.
40 The editors identify "цркви" at 13v14 as a dative singular. [1983:463] In fact, it is a locative singular.

41 In the index the editors incorrectly label "бреме/нъхъ" at 85b6-7 as a genitive plural. [1983:305] It is a locative plural.

42 I disregarded the accusative singulars "и/ма" at 118b1-2 and "вреъма" at 198a10, assuming that they reflect errors in the typesetting.

43 The article in the index for one of the *ent-stems contains an error. The genitive plurals of the noun whose reconstructed nominative singular is *otrodo are listed under "отрочать", with final "ъ" instead of "ь". [1983:400]

44 The editors are inconsistent in their classification of these four items. In the index those at 61a are labeled as instrumental plurals, while the pair at 134v are found under the entry for nominative plurals, albeit followed by question marks. [1983:461]

There are a number of other problems with the treatment of *tel-stems in the index as well. In the article for "witness", "съе/детея" at 150g7-8 is listed as an accusative dual. [1983:443] However, it is the object of the verb "seek", which generally governs the genitive in the manuscript, and there is no reason to assume a dual form based on the passage, Matthew 26:59.

A similar situation exists with "съе/детея" at 151a9-10. It is identified as an accusative plural [1983:443], but it is the object of "need", which, like "seek", governs the genitive.

In addition, some orthographical differences which exist in the text are unexpectedly ignored in the index. In particular, within individual articles, examples of nominative and dative plurals in which the desinence begins with "-е" are not distinguished from instances with "-е" as the first letter of the ending.

Finally, I could not find an article for the word meaning "benefactor", although the nominative plural of it occurs twice, at 118g23 and 140g2-3.

The preceding inventory is not exhaustive, but it does highlight the more salient deficiencies.

45 The example at 54v9, which is labeled in the index as a genitive singular [1983:339], is actually an
accusative plural. The item at 27a5 is not spelled "десать" as the index indicates [1984:339], nor is it an accusative singular. It is a genitive plural and is written "десать".

46. The instrumental singular "-м" is only used in " autre " at 93g20, which diminishes its significance somewhat.

47. Three items are incorrectly categorized in the index. They are the examples of "камень" at 98b21, 109a22 and 131g25. All three are listed as accusative singulars [1983:372], but, in fact, they represent nominative singulars. The first two apparently result from the erroneous conclusion that the verb whose reconstructed infinitive is *ostati is transitive. As for the third item, the same verse, Matthew 21:42, is found at 58b-58v and that instance of "камень" is labeled a nominative singular. [1983:372]

48. Two items which I consider to be genitive singulars are identified as genitive plurals in the index. [1983:344] They are "дь/ни" at 192v13-14 and "дь" at 35a3. Both are from Matthew 11:12.

49. In the index this example is identified as a locative dual. [1983:344] For OCS, Sadnik/Aitzetmüller [1955:20] and Lunt [1959:14] treat the corresponding form as an adverbial, although they list it under the entry for the noun.

50. In the index the accusative dual at 16a24 is included with the accusative plurals. [1983:344]

51. As one can see from the discussion, in the first group I admitted derivatives which were not purely Slavic in terms of their morphemic composition. When compiling the second group, I did not consider obvious borrowings.

52. There are two deviations from this pattern, but even they do not have "е" or "е" in the position in question. Rather, they have "и". The pertinent items are "какник" at 123a14 and "моусим" at 204b17. Both are instrumental singular forms. For a more detailed discussion of the instrumental singular of masculine and neuter nouns, see below.
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53 One can contrast the representations of items which meet the criteria outlined above with instances in which just one of the parameters is not met. Four such examples are "ίσαιρ/ίβ" at 184b2-3 and 187a4, "ταλλείρακα" at 185a9 and "κοο/κάκα" at 185a7-8. In the first two, the letter immediately preceding the representation of the desinence is "ι", not "η" or "ε". The latter two are feminine, not masculine, nouns. All four are instrumental singular forms.

54 In the index the editors incorrectly classify the two instances of "δμε" as vocative singulars for the feminine noun with the reconstructed nominative singular *δυσα. [1983:343]

55 In the index the editors inexplicably identify "μ(ς)ύβ" at 166b18 as a genitive plural [1983:385] and "ομυβη" at 189b24 as a dative singular [1983:397]. (cf. Lunt 1984:53)

56 This discussion does not apply to masculine *a-stem and *ja-stem nouns. In addition, I excluded from consideration the instrumental "θυθ/υ", which stands at 99a6-7. I also disregarded marked abbreviations in which final "-μβ" is preceded by a consonant letter, e.g., "θυμβ" at 3b17.

57 There is the possibility of a sixth variant. If it exists, it only occurs once, in "δόρβ/ιβ" at 98b17-18. However, the editors indicate in a footnote [1983:142] that the letter which they render as "η" might actually be "ζ".

58 The statements about the distribution of "λμβ" and "υμβ" should be regarded as no more than empirically accurate generalizations. In particular, I make no claim that the presence or absence of the "stem extension" was the determining factor for the scribe with respect to etymological *s-stems.

59 There are two exceptions, at 64v10-11 (Mark 6:56), where "πρικοσνουτ κα" governs the dative, and at 64v11-13 (Mark 6:56), where "πρικασαμε κα" combines with the preposition "κ" whose object is in the dative. In addition, there are instances in which the object is not unambiguously a locative. For example, at 210b15 the object is "κμβ", which conceivably could be either a locative or a dative. At 103b21-22 one finds "κ/κβ", which, from a purely orthographical
perspective, could be either a locative or a genitive. I treated such ambiguous forms as locatives based on the government which predominates in the instances where only one analysis is possible.

60 Semantic considerations offer some justification for the position which the editors adopt, as "утрe" is used in the meaning of "tomorrow", rather than "in the morning".

61 I must emphasize that no claim is made regarding the comprehensiveness of the catalog of prepositionless locatives presented. This applies especially to the list of isolated items.

62 In that connection, I note that Matthew 23:30 occurs a second time at 165v14-17 and in that second instance the preposition spelled "в", absent at 135b, immediately precedes "кръвь".

63 Of course, this distinction is only relevant when the masculine and the feminine adjectival markers for a particular case-number combination differ. Since there is no orthographical contrast between the masculine and the feminine desinences in the accusative plural of the "indefinite"/"simple" and the "definite"/"compound" adjective declensions and there is no gender distinction at all in the "definite"/"compound" adjective declension for the oblique cases of the plural, I disregarded those forms in this discussion.

64 I address only *a-stems in this analysis because I did not record any pertinent examples for masculine *ja-stems.

65 In the singular the masculine(/neuter) endings are used for modifiers of these nouns with four exceptions. In three instances one finds the genitive singular noun phrase "старыхъ нынѣйскѣ", at 115b17-18, 119g16 and 120a8-9. The fourth is the phrase "сюгра/мoя" at 138v18-19.

In the index the editors classify "сюгра" at 138v as a feminine noun. [1983:436] Given its semantics and the existence of a structurally similar noun, spelled "оужка" in ME [1983:457] and meaning "relative", which was used as both a masculine and a feminine (cf. Sadnik/Aitzetmuller 1955:83 and Lunt 1959:62), their analysis would seem plausible. However, this particular example is from John 12:26 and denotes
generically anyone who serves Christ. That type of use would require a masculine and, in fact, in the other occurrence of that verse, at 20g4-8, the modifier is spelled "κων".

66 Lunt incorrectly states that there are only three instances of "σήμερον". [1984:57]

67 The absence of a titlo in the citation, the usual symbol for an abbreviation lacking supralinear letters, accurately reflects the situation in the typeset edition. However, the two words which immediately follow "ούκ" each have a titlo over them and the second of the two is "κγασανα". Based on the use of "ού" in the remainder of ME one would not expect "κγασανα" to be marked in that manner. Therefore, it is possible that the two instances of "ού" were inadvertently displaced one lexical item to the right in the process of typesetting and that the manuscript itself has "σύνα". The photograph of the front side of folio 213 which is included in the typeset edition [1983:plate 4] seems to support this conclusion.

68 There is some question about the proper interpretation of the second letter in the text by Zaděn". Other scholars, e.g., Filimonov [1859:181], have taken it to be "r", which led them to parse the first three letters as "ωρα", meaning "Oh, Lord". Under that analysis, there is nothing irregular in the representation of the vocative marker. However, if one examines the photograph of the front side of folio 213 found in the edition of ME [1983:plate 4], it becomes clear why the editors might have concluded that the letter in question is "ο".

69 There is another form which might be pertinent to this discussion, "βαπούνα", which is also at 213b19 and appears to modify "στραταίαξενα". However, there is a second possible explanation for the presence of "-ε" in this item.

Karskij claims that in some instances certain "indefinite"/"simple" forms of participles, particularly the one with the nominative plural desinence spelled "-ε", are used as indeclinable "gerunds". [1962:24] To the extent that his assertion is valid, one cannot preclude the possibility that the same principle led to "βαπούνα", even thought none of Karskij's putative examples of this phenomenon are taken from the material contributed by Naslav".
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CHAPTER 8

VERBAL MORPHOLOGY

As in the preceding chapter, the subject of the analysis which follows is the representation of the morphology in ME. The difference is that in this chapter the focus shifts to verb forms. Organizationally, I continue the approach adopted in the previous chapters, examining the material in each of the four sections of the manuscript individually.

8.1. Readings Copied by Aleksa

The discussion of verbal morphology in this portion of the manuscript will consist of three parts. First, I will describe the orthographical representations of the desinences in six verbal forms, the non-past (present), the aorist, the imperfect, the imperative, the supine and the infinitive, for all verbs except the five unprefixed which are traditionally labeled as "athematic" and derivatives formed by adding prefixes to those five. The second part will be devoted to the athematic verbs, "be",
"have", "eat", "know" and "give" and their derivatives. The last topic, which will comprise the third part, will be the shape of the second and third person dual desinences for all verbs.

In the first part, I limited the scope of the analysis. More specifically, for any particular form, I address in detail only a proper subset of the range of person-number combinations which are found in ME. However, for each form I provide a brief description of the orthography of those desinences which are not discussed individually. Finally, the term "class", as it is used below, should be understood to mean one of the first four groups in Leskien's system.

Decisions about individual person-number combinations were made on the basis of two considerations. First, I included those items which are usually considered in examinations of Old Russian manuscripts. For the person-number combinations which did not meet the first criterion, the presence of an alternation in ME itself was a sufficient condition for inclusion.

The only desinences in the non-past conjugation of thematic verbs which merit particular attention are the third person singular and plural. For the remaining
forms, the following table lists the orthographical representation(s) for the various person-number combinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>-oy/-x/-y/-m</td>
<td>-ελ</td>
<td>-μλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>ει</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>-τε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>see below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In broad terms, the choice of variant in the first person singular correlates with the structure of the reconstructed non-past stem for the verb. More specifically, "-ον" is used only when *j or the reflex of *Cj immediately preceded the desinence in this form. Otherwise, "-oy", "-x" or "-y" is the marker.

There are deviations from this pattern. All of them involve the use of "-oy", "-x" or "-y" after "μν". Examples include "χομνύ" at 36a12, "κρε/πνου" at 47v18-19, "οτύπουτου" at 121b10 and "χομψ" at 193v19.

In ME the marker of person-number which overwhelmingly predominates in third person singular and plural forms is "-τebile. The vast majority of the deviations from this pattern belong to a single well-defined group. When the verb forms under consideration are followed immediately on the same line by "ςα", the marker is spelled simply "-τ". The exceptions to the latter generalization have "-τebile" instead of "-τ".
There is also a small group of examples in which one finds "-тн" in place of "-тн". I recorded six such items. They are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>творитн</td>
<td>29a25</td>
<td>Matthew 5:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>претепитн</td>
<td>53b16</td>
<td>Matthew 24:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поставитн</td>
<td>87v21</td>
<td>Luke 12:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>претепитн</td>
<td>87g5</td>
<td>Luke 12:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>поцъ/тетн</td>
<td>138v20-21, 191b7</td>
<td>John 12:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the manuscript, all but the first of these are immediately followed by the letter "и", which represents the masculine accusative singular form of the anaphoric pronoun. Therefore, to the extent that the letter "и" in the desinence "-тн" can be regarded as denoting a front jer, the "и" at the end of these examples could be considered to represent a so-called "tense" jer.4 5

The first of the six differs in that the word immediately after it is "ёи" and that word is on the next line, which, in this instance, is in a different column on the folio. Nonetheless, it is still a form of the anaphoric pronoun which follows the verb.6

In the conjugation of the aorist there are three elements which I will examine. The first is the kind of aorist formation which is represented, root aorist, "old" sigmatic aorist or "new" sigmatic aorist. In ME,
there is almost exclusive use of the "new" sigmatic aorist. The orthography of the basic endings is presented in tabular form below. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>-(o)xβ</td>
<td>-xobβ</td>
<td>-(o)xomβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>-(e)</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>-(o)stε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>-(e)</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>-(o)ма</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vowel letters in parentheses are present for two groups of verbs. The first consists of members of the first class in which the non-past stem is used in the formation of the aorist. The second is comprised of members of the second class in which the reflex of *-nq- is lost.

The marker of the first person dual, as it is presented in the preceding table, lacks such a vowel because the readings copied by Aleksa contain no examples of that form for verbs belonging to either of the two groups just described. In fact, I recorded only one instance of a first person dual aorist, "искачовъ" at 183a20.

The one exception to the general use of the "new" sigmatic aorist is the unprefixed verb derived from the root meaning "say" (*rek-), for which one finds both "old" and "new" sigmatic aorist forms.

In the aorist conjugation of this verb, three case-number combinations in which there is a contrast
between the "old" and "new" sigmatic aorist forms are represented. They are the first singular, the third dual and the third plural. The representations of the "old" sigmatic variants of those forms are "рехъ", "рєста" and "рєма", respectively. The "new" sigmatic variants are spelled "рекохъ", "рекоста" and "рекома", respectively.

In quantitative terms, for each of the three pairs, the "new" sigmatic variant is more frequent. The ratio in the data set for the first person singular, which contains roughly 45 items, is almost 3:2. In the third person dual there are twenty instances of "рєкоста" to three of "рєста". Finally, the third plural "рекома" occurs nearly 100 times, as compared to twenty examples of "рєма".

In addition, for each form the two variants are distributed "unevenly" within the manuscript. Through folio 12 there are eight instances of "рехъ" and none of "рекохъ". All three examples of "рєста" are found before folio 5, while "рєкоста" is used for the first time on folio 19. In the third person plural, "рєма" is used only three times after folio 58, while more than two thirds of the instances of "рекома" are in that same portion of the manuscript.
I recorded only four relevant examples of prefixed verbs derived from the same root. Three involve the prefix *pro-. The other has *na-. All are "new" sigmatic aorist forms. The examples are "прорекохъ" at 35a8-9 and 192v18, "прорекохъ" at 52v17 and "нарекохъ" at 146g6.

The second topic in the examination of the aorist is the orthography of the second and third person singular forms. The issue is the use of final "-тъ" in representations of those forms. In the portion of ME under consideration, the sequence "-тъ" is found in the aorist of only a small number of verbs. The list includes the words for "die" and "swear"; an unprefixed verb based on *-(j)eιm-; as well as certain prefixed derivatives formed from *-(j)eιm- and the root found in the unprefixed verb meaning "wind, wrap" (*viti).

There are four examples of "die" with final "-тъ", "оумретъ" at 9b15-16, 9b17-18 and 16g9-10 and "оумретъ" at 16g4, to seventeen without "-тъ". All 21 items are third person singular forms.

In contrast, I recorded only one instance of "swear" which is pertinent to this discussion, "хла/тъ са" at 206b20-21. It is a third person singular.
The data set for *-Xtn- is comparatively large. All of the members are third person forms and all are prefixed. However, only two prefixes are represented, "Ha" and "Sa" orthographically. Of the 47 with "Ha", only three have "тъ". They are at 35b10, 111g24 and 195v12-13. The four examples with "sa" are split. Two have "тъ", while two lack it.

I recorded instances of two different prefixed derivatives of "wind, wrap". The lone item containing the prefix written "пo", "пови" at 180v8, is a third person singular and lacks "тъ". The four with the prefix spelled "об" are also third person forms, but two of them have "тъ". Those two stand at 9b21 and 162v13.

Verbs belonging to the first class derived from the reconstructed root *-(j)им- offer the greatest range of data. Relevant forms of derivatives containing the prefixes *vъз(ъ)- and *pod(ъ)- consistently lack "тъ". The one pertinent example of the derivative formed with the prefix *ob(ъ)-, "обать" at 2a14, does have "тъ". That leaves the unprefixed verb and prefixed derivatives which contain the reflex of one of the following: *pri-, *po- or *na-.

For each of those four verbs there are examples with "тъ" and examples without it. The two variants
occur in a ratio of 3:1 for the unprefixed verb, 6:7 for the derivative with *pri-*, 11:9 when the prefix is *po-* and 1:1 in the case of *na-*. The first figure in each ratio denotes the number of items with "тъ". All of the relevant data for these verbs are third person singulars.

In this context, I also want to mention an item standing where a third person singular aorist would be expected which has an additional final "-тъ". The example is "посудить" at 116b4 (Mark 15:15).

The last element of the aorist conjugation which I want to consider involves the stem from which the aorist is constructed. Most of the verbs which are of interest in this discussion share a common derivational structure. They are verbs whose reconstructed infinitive ended in the sequence *-nɔtɨ*. The point of interest is whether the reflex of the reconstructed suffix *-nɔ-* is present in the aorist forms.

The data slightly favor instances in which the reflex of *-nɔ-* is absent over those in which it is present. More significantly, with one exception, for each individual verb the aorist forms either consistently lack or always retain the marker of the
reflex of *-n⁴-. Unfortunately, the omission or the retention of that marker does not seem to correlate with any obvious structural parameter.

A sample of aorist forms in which the reflex of *-n⁴- is lost follows.

"погиб" 23v1-2
"помазу" 38a18
"усто/пома" 38g11-12
"въскръсе" 41g2
"ожасова" 55a10
"въздвиже" 55b2

Among aorists which do not manifest a loss of the reflex of *-n⁴-, five verbs, *kosnɔti, *prikosnɔti, *pomɛnɔti (*-mɛn-), *vɔspomɛnɔti (*-mɛn-) and *usɛknɔti, account for more than 80% of the examples. The remaining instances of retention include "доуноу" at 6b4, "плинъ" at 19a2, "отъбъгноува" at 38g13 and several others.

The one verb represented in both groups is derived from the root *-sъх-. The pertinent examples are "исъше" at 38a22 versus "исъхнх" at 61g20.¹⁶ I should add that in the aorists of verbs based on *-sъх- + *-n⁴- which have a different prefix the reflex of *-n⁴- is regularly absent.
One finds a different type of contrast in the pair "въскъ/се" at 40a6-7 and "въскъме" at 99v2. Both represent third singular aorists of a verb constructed from *vъz- + *-kys- + *-np-.

Finally, there is one verb, not derivationally related to those discussed above, whose aorist forms seem to exhibit some vacillation in the stem. It is the verb which means "die". In the overwhelming majority of instances, the non-past stem appears to be used to form the aorist for this verb. However, there is one example which seems to be based on the infinitive stem. It is "оумрать" at 16g4.

The data set for the other "simple" past tense form, the imperfect, raises a number of issues which should be addressed. Several of them are minor and involve a comparatively small number of items.

In the imperfect of verbs in Leskien's fourth class whose reconstructed infinitive ends in *-iti, there was a jot palatalization of the consonant preceding *-iti, unless that consonant was already a palatal. In the section of ME copied by Aleksa, there are six instances in which the orthography does not reflect the results of such a palatalization. They are
Almost a mirror image of the preceding situation exists among the verbs whose reconstructed infinitive ended in *-ati and in which the consonant immediately preceding *-ati underwent a jot palatalization in all forms of the non-past, e.g., "глаголати" - "глаголате", In these verbs there was no jot palatalization of the consonant in the imperfect. However, in ME there is one example in which the orthography reflects the results of such a palatalization. It is "плачаахоу" at 72a13. The verb means "wash". (cf. Lunt 1984:54)

The data on the word for "dare" are not consistent in terms of the representation of the material which precedes the person-number marker. The three imperfect forms of this verb which I recorded are "съ/мънахоу" at 97g22-23, "съ/нахоу" at 108v13 and "съ/маане" at 211v11-12.

The scope of the next issue is not limited to one verb or a particular class of verbs. It involves the symbols preceding the representation of the person-number marker. Normally, one of the following
sequences stands immediately before that inflectional material, "-aa-", "-ma-" or "-aa-". The deviations from that pattern are listed below.18,19

"МОЛАХОУ" 20v12  
"Вьпи/захоу" 56v17-18  
"одържаше" 72b15  
"пи/мак" 92g15-16  
"ра/зоумбахоу" 93v16-17, 93v18-19  
"искаше" 99b5  
"въпра/макоу" 101a10-11  
"бо макоу" 104b23  
"сълхъ" 143g12  
"бълъхъ" 148g23  
"полоша/ста" 154v17-18, 158b25-158v1, 161g7-8  
"зрваста" 156b13  
"би макоу" 161a24  
"идаста" 163b1, 208g15, 209g15  
"кожаста" 182g16  
"нарицаху" 199g10  
"хра/наше" 206b5-6  
"течаста" 209g16

With respect to the distribution of "-aa-", "-ma-" and "-aa-" there are two classes of verbs and one other isolated verb which are of interest. They are Leskien's first class, those members of the fourth class which have a reconstructed infinitive ending in *-ети and the verb which means "want".20

The verbs in Leskien's first class share the property that no suffix is reconstructed between the final consonant of the verbal root and the thematic vowel (*e/*o) in non-past forms. In the representations of imperfect forms for these verbs the following generalizations hold. When the root-final
consonant was neither a velar nor a palatal and the non-past stem is used in the formation of the imperfect, the first vowel letter in the two-letter sequence is "a". When the root-final consonant was a velar, the first vowel letter in the sequence is "a" and the consonant letter immediately preceding it is the same letter which stands in positions where the reflex of the first palatalization of the corresponding velar occurs. This is what one would expect in an East Slavic manuscript produced in the period to which ME is assigned. Several examples for verbs in this class are listed below.

"ицлаше" 3b2
"флакоу" 8g10
"живлаше" 20b22
"гметлахоутъ" 61g7
"греблахоу" 63v4
"ведлаше" 70v10
"можлаше" 64b16

I will treat the specified subset of the fourth class and the verb for "want" simultaneously because they pattern the same in terms of their imperfect forms. All of these verbs share the feature that their reconstructed infinitive ends in *-ěti. Furthermore, in OCS all of them have "a" as the first vowel letter in the two-letter sequence immediately preceding the person-number marker in the imperfect. However, in ME
these verbs consistently have "a" as the first vowel letter in that sequence. Several examples follow.

"зыра/аста" 9v1-2
"болааше" 9g12
"хотаахх" 24v13
"съдааше" 38a3
"мьнаа/хоу" 47a17-18
"вя/даахоу" 72v19-20

The last issue relating to the imperfect involves the orthography of the person-number marker in third person plural forms. However, before proceeding to the discussion of that form, I will indicate the orthographical shape of the desinences which will not be examined in detail.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>-хь</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>-ме</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>-ме</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>see below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there is one instance of a third person singular ending in "-шеть", "напа шашеть" at 116v5.23

In the majority of instances, the third person plural marker is written "-хоу"/"-хх"/"-хш". However, there is a set of examples in which it is spelled "-хоуть"/"-ххть".24 The feature which is common to all but one member of that set is that the word immediately following the imperfect is the masculine accusative singular of the anaphoric pronoun, written "и"/"и". In
the only certain deviation from that pattern, at 199g10, the verb form in question precedes "и", denoting the neuter accusative singular of the anaphoric pronoun. I should add that "-хоут" is found in roughly two thirds of the instances in which a third person plural imperfect is immediately followed by the masculine accusative singular of the anaphoric pronoun.

In the discussion of the imperative it is possible to disregard the category of person and state the generalizations solely with respect to number because the most important element is the vowel letter which marks the form as an imperative. The person-number markers themselves are not of particular interest.

In the singular the final letter is consistently "-и"/"-й", with one exception. The singular imperative from "see" is "видь"/"видеть". The two variants are used in a ratio of 10:4. Furthermore, all examples of "видеть" occur before folio 73, while nine of the ten instances of "видеть" are after folio 108.

In the dual and the plural, one finds "-и"/"-и" and "-ъ" as the vowel letters marking the forms as imperatives. The former, "-и"/"-и", are used with verbs of the fourth class. In contrast, "-ъ" is regular in verbs which had the thematic vowel *e/*o in 387
the non-past and in which neither jot nor the sequence *Cj would be reconstructed immediately before that thematic vowel in the non-past forms.27

However, in verbs which had either jot or *Cj right before the thematic vowel throughout the non-past, the situation is more complex. For items in which the sequence *Cj preceded the thematic vowel in all forms of the non-past, the marker in the non-singular imperative forms is regularly written "-э-". Several examples follow.

"рыши те" 10g14
"оси жые" 21g5
"по/меши те" 31v22-23
"иши те" 31g3
"пришите" 32v7
"по/кажите" 58a1-2

When the reconstructed sequence before the thematic vowel was *Vj, the marker which one finds in ME is "-и-/"-и-".28 The only deviation from that pattern is "убий", a first person plural imperative which occurs five times.29 Moreover, those five are the only examples which I recorded of non-singular imperatives from verbs derived from the root which means "beat". However, I noted one non-singular imperative for a verb derived from a different root with a similar structure, "пьйте" at 142v25.
Finally, I want to note an alternation in the orthography of two roots which distinguishes imperatives of verbs containing those roots from other forms of those same verbs. The pertinent alternation concerns the vowel letter used in the representations. For the unprefixed verb meaning "say" and the derivative of that verb created by the addition of the prefix reconstructed as *pro-, one finds "(-)pьц-" in imperatives, while "е" follows "р" in the other forms. A similar situation exists for the root which means "worry, care". The variant in imperatives is "пьц-" and elsewhere it is "пек-"/"печ-".

The supine and the infinitive will be discussed simultaneously because traditionally they are regarded as somewhat complementary in terms of their use. First, I will indicate the orthographical marker in ME for each form. Then I will describe the contexts in which each is found.

The marker of the supine is, not surprisingly, "-ть". I noted eight certain exceptions to that spelling. First, there are the two examples of "обьчь", at 3gl and 208g21. They represent the supine from a verb in the first class for which one would reconstruct a velar consonant immediately before the thematic vowel in non-past forms.
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Two more exceptions are found at 56g22 and 57a5. In both instances the form is "жатъ". However, both times the verb is immediately followed by the accusative singular of the anaphoric pronoun, written "и". Therefore, assuming that one can equate "ъ" in the marker "-тъ" with a back jer, the use of "ъ" is probably related to fact that the jer in these examples would have been a so-called "tense" jer.

In the third pair of exceptions the verb form ends in "-т", not in "-тъ". The relevant items are "Помолит" at 73bl6 and "Исцелит" at 73v12. There are several possible explanations for these examples. First, in both instances, the verb is immediately followed by the reflexive pronoun spelled "са". Therefore, one possibility is that the orthographical rule which apparently applied to the third person singular and plural non-past forms (see above) also applied to the supine. However, that explanation is weakened by the fact that there are more instances of supine forms followed by "са" in which the letter "ъ" is preserved in the marker.

A second possible explanation also relies on the fact that the reflexive "са" immediately followed these verb forms. Although the contents of the protograph cannot be known, in OCS the third person singular
non-past and the supine for these verbs would be orthographically identical, both ending in "-тъ". Since third person non-past forms followed by "съ" are far more frequent than supine forms followed by "съ", it is possible that the omission of the vowel letter after "т" in the supine marker reflects automatic application of a rule in an inappropriate context based on the presence of the orthographical sequence which conditions the rule.31

The last two certain exceptions are "слипать" at 37v15 (Matthew 12:42) and 170a18 (Luke 11:31).

In terms of its orthography, there is nothing noteworthy about the infinitive. The marker ends in "-и", or, in a small number of instances, "-и".

The syntactic distribution of the two forms is, for the most part, as one would expect.32 The readings copied by Aleksa contain just over 100 examples of supines and in all but fourteen of them the supine is subordinated to a derivative of the reconstructed verbal root *(j)ьд-, a derivative of the reconstructed verbal root *-ход- or a form of the verb whose reconstructed infinitive is *посълата. For nine of the remaining fourteen, I will simply indicate the verbal forms to which the supines are subordinated: "въста", at 71a19 and 163g8-9; "приближание [съ]", at 90g1-5;
The other five require closer scrutiny.

Two of the five are the examples of "блъговъсти́ть" at 71a24 and 163g14. In both instances the passage containing the supine is Luke 4:18. Based upon the expected semantics of that verse, one would subordinate "блъговъсти́ть" to the verbal form "помаза" which precedes it. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that the choice of a supine was predicated on subordination to the verbal form "посъла" which follows.

The last three involve supines subordinated to derivatives of the root *-ved-. The point of interest in the three is the nature of the construction in which the supine appears. The pertinent passages are cited below.

"введе́нъ бы́сть съ гъмъ ина/два злодъ жа оубить" 155a5-7 and 158g13-15 (Luke 23:32)

"вьзведе/нь бы́сть съ дэмь/въ поустиню искоуси/ть са отъ диавола" 186v3-6 (Matthew 4:1)

Infinitive forms occur predominantly in slots where supines would not be appropriate, e.g., in predicates in which they are subordinated to verbs such
as "be able", "want", "begin", "order", "be fitting", "be proper", "seek", etc. However, in approximately forty instances they are used in the same kinds of environments as supines. For example, they are subordinated to derivatives of *-(j)bd- on roughly fifteen occasions and are in predicates with forms of *posłati almost an equal number of times. One can even find multiple occurrences of individual verses which differ from each other in the choice of verb form to fill such a slot, although that phenomenon is rare. Two examples are adduced below.

"и посылал за проповедать ц(с)рства джин" 86b1-2
"и посылал за проповедать/ц(с)рства бжин" 201b24-25
(Luke 9:2)

"посыла ма. исцелити спрушенные сердца" 163g15-17
"посыла ма. исце/лить съкрышенныя срцья" 71a25-71b1
(Luke 4:18)

Finally, I want to address the question of the case form for objects of supines. The expectation is that for verbs which normally take an accusative direct object, that object, when the supine is used, will be in the genitive. For the most part that principle is followed. However, in five instances the objects are in the accusative case. They are at 33v7-10, 56g22, 57a4-5, 71a25-71b1 and 110b11-13. These five do not form any sort of coherent group in terms of the verb whose supine is used, the verb to which that supine is
subordinated, the word(s) serving as the object of the supine, the relative ordering of those three or even the gospel verses in which the examples are found.

I will now turn to the set of verbs which were not considered in the formulation of the generalizations outlined above, the so-called athematic verbs. For the analysis I grouped each unprefixed verb with the derivatives of it which were formed solely by the addition of prefixes. That means that there are five data sets, which I will label according to the gloss for the unprefixed member.

The forms which will be discussed are the same ones considered above, the non-past (present), the aorist, the imperfect, the imperative, the supine and the infinitive. The presentation will consist of a list of the variants found within each data set. I will begin with the set containing the verb which means "know".

The data set for the verb "know" and its relevant derivatives contains examples which provide almost a complete paradigm for the non-past (present). The paradigm is presented in tabular form below.34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>-бъм/-бъдъ</td>
<td>бълъ</td>
<td>бъмъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>бъси</td>
<td>бъста</td>
<td>-бъстъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>-бъсть</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-бъдать</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

394
In constructing the table, I disregarded the instances of "βεμβ" at 13v10 and 25a19 as well as the instance of "βεμβ" at 8a14. The orthography of those three examples was addressed in the examination of the representation of reconstructed jers.

In addition, I treated "βμ/μβ" at 145a24-25 and "βεμβ" at 19g18, 209g13 and 212a23 differently than the editors did in the index. [1983:328]

The first of the four is used in John 14:5. The same verse occurs at 22b with "βεμβ" in place of "βεμβ". In the index, both forms are labeled as singulars. [1983:328] Based upon the verse involved, a plural would be expected. However, for the purposes of the preceding table, I classified "βεμβ" as a plural and "βεμβ" as a singular. The justification for the latter decision is the clause at the beginning of the verse, "ηλα ενυμον ηο/μα", at 22b16-17. Since it is made explicit that only one individual is speaking, it is possible that a singular was deliberately chosen, despite the requirements of the particular verse.

The item at 19g18 is found in John 9:31, a verse which, as it happens, occurs only once in the readings copied by Aleksa. In the index the editors identify this verb form as a plural. [1983:328] That treatment agrees with the specification for the category of
number used in the corresponding clause in both a Russian [1944:307] and an English [1976:138] edition of the gospel which I consulted. However, the clause in question represents the direct speech of a single individual, which means that a singular form could have been intentionally, even if erroneously, selected.

The same situation applies to "Вер" at 209g13. It is used in a verse found only once in the part of the manuscript under consideration, John 20:2, and it is labeled as a plural in the index [1983:328]. Furthermore, the Russian [1944:339] and the English [1976:154] editions of the gospel which I checked also have plural subjects in the pertinent clauses. Nonetheless, I treated the item as a singular based on the orthography and the fact that the clause conveys the direct speech of one individual.

The last of the three instances of "Вер", at 212a23, is in the representation of John 21:24, a verse copied by Aleksa three times. The other two occurrences of that verse, at 26a20-24 and 196b17-21, also have "Вер". However, in the index the editors categorize "Вер" at 26a23 and 196b20 as singulars, but label "Вер" at 212a23 as a plural. [1983:328] I regarded all three as singulars.
For the aorist, only one of the person-number combinations is represented, the third person plural. Ignoring prefixes, it is written "-вёдёша".

The data on the imperfect displays more diversity than the aorist data. I recorded all forms of the singular as well as the third person plural. The latter is written three different ways, "вёдаахоу", "вёдаахр" and "вёдаахх". The variants in the singular are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>вёдаах/вёдах</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>вёдааше</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>вёдааше/вёдаше</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the imperative, only second person forms were noted, but all three numbers are represented. The orthography for singular, dual and plural is "-вёжъ", "-вёдита" and "-вёдите", respectively. No examples of the supine were found. The infinitive is written "вёдяти"/"вёдяті".35

The data set for verbs related to "give" contains no dual forms. The non-past and aorist paradigms in the singular and plural are given below.
There is one imperfect form for "give" in the data set, "дадаchuе". It is a third person singular and it occurs three times. In the imperative there are only second person forms. The singular is spelled "-дайп" or "дайхь". The plural is "-дадите". There are no examples of the supine. The infinitive is written "-дати"/"датi".\(^3\)

As with "give", there are no dual forms for "eat" or any of the pertinent derivatives of "eat". In the non-past the entire singular and plural paradigms are represented. The variants for each person-number combination are listed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Past</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>-дамь</td>
<td>дамь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>-даси</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>-дасть</td>
<td>-дадать</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aorist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>дахь</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>-дась/-да</td>
<td>-дасте</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>-дась/-да</td>
<td>-даша</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on the aorist conjugation are less diverse. Only the three plural forms and the third person singular are found. For the latter, three
variants are used, "местъ", "местъ" and "-и". The plural paradigm consists of "домъ" (first person), "местъ" (second person) and "маша"/"маша" (third person).  

For the imperfect only third person plurals are found, of which there are two variants, "адаахаоу" and "адаахоу". The data on the imperative is confined to second person forms. The singular is written "адад" and "адад", while the plural is spelled "адайте". The supine is "местъ" and the representations of the infinitive are "местъ" and "-местъ".

The data set for the verb "have" differs from those for the three preceding athematic verbs in the degree of variation for individual case-number combinations. However, it shares with "give" and "eat" an absence of dual forms. The singular and plural paradigms for the non-past conjugation are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>иметь</td>
<td>имаи/имаи, имеате/има (те)/имате</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>иметь</td>
<td>иметь, имеуте/имуть/имыть/имыют</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>иметь</td>
<td>иметь, иметь, иметь, иметь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three variants for the third person plural form coincide with the expected orthographical representations for the third person plural non-past of the unprefixed verb which means "take" (reconstructed infinitive *(j)̣eti). Therefore, it was necessary to
examine the context in which each data item occurred and to try to determine which of the two verbs would fit best semantically. Not surprisingly, in some instances it was not possible to resolve the question conclusively.

I raise this issue because it appears that the editors did not make the connection. Evidence for that assertion is found in the classification in the index of two examples spelled "ἵμούτη", one at 49b14, the other at 183g11-12. The two items represent the same word from the same verse, Matthew 21:26. However, the first instance is listed under "take" [1983:470], while the second is listed under "have" [1983:365]. Incidentally, I consider both to be examples of "have".

One could cite other items whose misidentification results from this homography. Two are "ἵμνυ/τη" at 2a19-2b5 (John 1:7) and "ἵμοντε" at 20a24 (John 11:48). The editors list both under "have" [1983:365], but I think that they belong under "take". The error in these two examples I ascribe to a failure to clearly distinguish semantically the phrases, written in terms of the reconstructed form of their components, *(j)ετι νερο ("to come to believe") and *(j)ιμετι νερο ("to be in the state of believing").
In the index the editors also incorrectly classify three instances of "имамъ". They are the examples at 8bl, 152b13 and 152b14. All are singulairs, but are labeled as first person plurals. [1983:365] The first of the three is particularly noteworthy since the clause in the text to which "имамъ" belongs has an overt subject. It is the personal pronoun spelled "ауъ".

Only three person-number combinations are represented in the examples of aorist forms, the first person singular, spelled "имъхъ", the third person singular, written "имъ", and the third person plural, rendered as "имъна".

In the imperfect, the data set includes only third person forms, both singular and plural. For the third person singular, there are four orthographical variants, "имънаше", "имъаше", "имъаше" and "имъ наме". A similar situation obtains in the third person plural. The form is spelled in one of five ways, "имъахоу", "имъахоу", "имъахоу", "имъахоу" and "имъахоутъ".39

The third plural variants with final "-тъ" occur a total of three times. The lone instance of "имъахоутъ", at 49g10, is followed by "и", representing the masculine accusative singular of the
anaphoric pronoun. The same is true of "имахоуть" at 205g3. The other example is "и не имахоуть/имь върь" at 208a22-23.40

The imperatives are all second person forms. For the singular one finds "имьи" and "имьи". The plural is represented as "имьите".

There are no examples of the supine. The infinitive is written "имьити"/"имьтй".

Before beginning to list the forms for verbs related to "be", I must note one additional convention which was adopted in the interests of simplicity. In the listings, "oy" is used as a cover symbol for "oy", "x" and "v", except in citations of specific data items from the manuscript. Such citations will always be accompanied by an indication of the folio, the column and the line on which the items occur and in them I will preserve the orthography of the typeset edition.

In the non-past, the manuscript presents a full paradigm for "be", i.e., all nine person-number combinations are represented. The data are given in tabular form below.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>жесть</td>
<td>жесть</td>
<td>жесть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>жесть</td>
<td>жесть</td>
<td>жесть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>жесть/же</td>
<td>жесть</td>
<td>жесть</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There are only three instances of the spelling "ἐσ" for the third person singular form. They are at 26a13, 58a8 and 84g24.42

The aorist paradigm is far less complete than the non-past paradigm in terms of the variety of person-number combinations found in the data set. There are no first person forms. In the second person, only the plural is represented. It is written "οὐκατε". The third person offers the most diversity. Examples of all three numbers are found. The variants are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>ὁντε/-ον</td>
<td>ὁντα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of items are incorrectly categorized as aorists in the index. Those errors will be addressed below in the discussion of the conditional.

With respect to the range of person-number combinations represented, the imperfect is even more limited than the aorist, as only third person forms were recorded. However, there are several different variants for each of the person-number combinations which do occur.
Singular | Dual | Plural
---|---|---
Third | \(\text{съаме}/\) | \(\text{съаста}/\) | \(\text{саахоу}/\)
        | \(\text{сааме}/\) | \(\text{съаста}/\) | \(\text{саахоу}/\)
        | \(\text{съаме}/\) | \(\text{съасте}\) | \(\text{саахоу}/\)
        | \(\text{съаме}\) | \(\text{съахоу}\)

There was only one example of "съасте", at 114b13. In the index the editors incorrectly label it as a second plural. [1983:310]

The data set for the imperative contains second person singulars, "боуди", third person singulars, "боуди", and second person plurals, "-боудъте". In the index the editors erroneously classify the third person singulars, e.g., at 29b19, 36v24, 43v6 and elsewhere, as second person imperatives. [1983:310]

There are no examples of supines. The infinitive is written "-оути". In the data set for "be" there are several other paradigms which do not exist for verbs outside of this set. They include the negated non-past, the so-called "imperfective" aorist, the conditional and the future. The first three apply only to the verb "be" itself. The fourth includes non-past forms of derivatives created through the addition of a prefix to the verb which means "be".

For the negated non-past there are data on all three singular forms, the third dual and the second
plural. In the singular one finds "нъсъм" (first person), "нъси" (second person) and "нъстъ" (third person). The third dual is "нъстъ", while the second plural is "нъстъ".

There are also two examples which are somewhat problematical. The first, "нъсъм" at 14g15, is in a context (John 8:41) which clearly requires a first person plural. The clause contains the overt subject "мъ". Nonetheless, the editors classify this example as a first person singular. [1983:306]

The other problematical example is "нъстъ" at 53v11. The context (Matthew 19:6) leads one to expect a third person dual. However, the editors classify this item as a second person plural. [1983:309]

The so-called "imperfective" aorist is well-represented in the readings copied by Aleksa. I recorded all three forms in the singular and the plural, but only third person forms in the dual. The latter is generally written "състъ", but in one instance it is spelled "състъ", at 143b19. That example is labeled as a second person plural by the editors. [1983:312] The singular and the plural paradigms are given in the following table.
In the index all second person singulars, e.g., at 25g20, 67a5, 67a14 and elsewhere, are identified as third person forms. [1983:311-312]

As with the "imperfective" aorist, one finds a full complement of singular and plural forms of the conditional. However, the dual is not represented at all. The data are summarized below.45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Выхь</td>
<td>Выхомь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>быть</td>
<td>бысте</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>быть</td>
<td>бяна</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The editors do not have the label "conditional" in their classification scheme. Instead, under the broader category "aorist", they isolate a group of items which are used in a "compound subjunctive mood". [1983:310-312] However, there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the members of that group and the set of examples which I identify as conditionals.

In general, the differences involve instances in which the editors treat an item as a "regular" aorist, i.e., one which is not part of a construction conveying the "subjunctive mood", while I consider it to be a conditional. The example of "Выхь" at 151g7 (John 406
18:36) is just such an item, as are the instances of "спеш" at 52v16 (Matthew 24:24), 91g16 (Luke 17:2), 132g14 (Matthew 24:24), 152b17 (John 19:11) and 169v7 (John 15:19). As an illustration, I cite below the full context in which "спеш" at 151g7 is found.

"аще отъ сего мира/спеш въ царство моє слонъ/спеш подвигали са въ/ша. да не прѣданъ вѣкъ и/вѣчомь" 151g4-8

In addition, even though I do not know the specific criteria which guided the decisions of the editors regarding the categorization of individual examples, I can state that, whatever the criteria were, they were not followed consistently. The verse John 15:19 occurs three times in the portion of the manuscript under consideration, at 11b, 146g-147a and 169v. In all three the form "спеш" is found. However, twice the "спеш" in question is listed as an aorist used in the "compound subjunctive mood" [1983:312], while the instance at 169v7 is identified as a "regular" aorist [1983:311].

The last topic in the discussion of "be" is the future, which also includes the non-past forms of derivatives of "be" created through the addition of a prefix. The data provide a paradigm which is almost complete. Only the first person dual and plural are missing.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>боудоу</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>боудеши</td>
<td>боудета</td>
<td>боудете</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>-бутель/</td>
<td>боудета/</td>
<td>боудуть/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-боудет</td>
<td>боудете</td>
<td>-боудут</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the index the second person dual at 54g3 (Mark 1:17) is incorrectly classified as a third person dual, while the third dual "боудете" at 93a12-13 (Luke 17:35) is erroneously cited with the second plurals. [1983:310]

The third person singulars and plurals which lack the final "ъ" are immediately followed by "са". The more general nature of this phenomenon was discussed earlier. In addition, the spelling "боудоут" for the third person plural occurred once, at 188v2. However, it is possible that the final "ъ" results from an error in the typesetting as this particular item is found under "боудоут" in the index. [1983:310]

I will conclude this discussion of the verbal inflectional morphology in the readings copied by Aleksa with a consideration of the orthography of the second and third person dual desinences in the non-past, the aorist, the imperfect and the imperative. In the portion of ME under examination, the last letter in these desinences is almost always "-а". The number of exceptions to that pattern is small, roughly a
dozen. All of them have "-e" in place of "-a", e.g., "държате" at 3b3, "събираете" at 27b13, "късте" at 53v11 and "о/тъбръстете" at 55g16-17."

Before proceeding to the other portions of the manuscript, I want to address several additional topics which involve verbs, but which do not fall under the heading of inflectional morphology. Three of them are morphological in nature, but they relate to derivational morphology, and more specifically, to the formation of active participles.

For verbs in Leskien's fourth class whose infinitives ended in *-iti, the orthography suggests that two different approaches were used to produce the stem of the past active participle. One method, which is historically prior, starts with a base which coincides segmentally with the infinitive less *-iti. The final consonant cluster, or individual consonant if that base ends in -VC, undergoes, when possible, a jot palatalization. A suffix which would be reconstructed as *-ъ(ъ)- is then attached. The other approach matches the pattern used with verbs in the fourth class whose infinitives ended in *-ъti and with verbs in other classes, i.e., addition of a suffix which would be reconstructed as *-ъ(ъ)- to a base which is segmentally equivalent to the infinitive without *-ti.
The first type of stem predominates in a ratio which slightly exceeds 3:2 in a data set containing more than 220 items. However, there do not seem to be any significant generalizations which one can offer regarding the distribution of the two types, either in terms of their position in the manuscript or in terms of the individual verbs which follow one pattern or the other.

The members of the other group of past active participles to be discussed are derived from verbs in Leskien's first class which contain the root reconstructed as \*(-(j)ьм-*. Normally, the base for these past active participles is segmentally identical to the non-past stem of the verb, which orthographically ends in "-им" or, in certain prefixed verbs, "-ьм". However, on one occasion the past active participle of the unprefixed verb "take" is written "мьвь". The example is at 60g3 and it is in Mark 5:41, a verse which, as it happens, does not recur.

Among the present active participles, I recorded one instance in which, based upon the orthography, it appears that the East Slavic formant was used with the unprefixed verb meaning "go". The item is "ида" at 204g24. It is found in Luke 9:53. In the other occurrence of that verse, at 80b, the corresponding
slot is occupied by "грипич." In the index the two are not classified in the same manner. Judging by its position in the article, the editors appear to regard the former as a neuter nominative singular of a past active participle. [1983:370] The latter is identified as a masculine nominative singular of a present active participle. [1983:337] I consider both to be neuter nominative singulars of present active participles.

The last topic to be considered is the compound future construction, which consists of an auxiliary in combination with the infinitive. There are three different variants to this construction, depending upon the form of the auxiliary which is used, and I will examine each one separately.

In the first, the infinitive is subordinated to a non-past of the auxiliary. The examples of this variant tend to be in direct speech, as opposed to narration, although I did not verify that that assertion holds in every instance. The semantics are as one would expect. This construction is used to denote a future event.

As for the lexical composition of the individual examples, three different auxiliary verbs are found in the data set for this variant, non-past forms of "have" and "want" as well as the future of "be." However,
the three are not equal in their token frequency. The preferred choice is clearly "have", occurring literally dozens of times. I noted only three data items for "want", at 139g14-15 (Matthew 26:15), 141g3 (Matthew 26:15) and 174g7-10 (Matthew 16:27). The future of "be" is even rarer in this capacity. I found it used just one time, at 27a8-9 (Matthew 18:13).50,51

The second variant has the infinitive subordinated to an imperfect. It is encountered exclusively in narration and its data set contains less than fifteen items. In terms of its semantics this construction denotes a future with respect to a past event or a point in time in the past. It corresponds roughly to English "was (about-going) to X", "were (about-going) to X", "would X", where "X" is the non-auxiliary. All of the members of the data set for this variant have the same auxiliary, "want". Several examples are cited below.

"ХОТАЕШЕ/БО СУМРЯТИ" 9g17-18
(John 4:47)

"НЕЖЕ ХОТАЯ/ШЕ РИТИ ЖЕМОУ" 127v4-5
(Mark 10:32)

"ИЖЕ ХОТАХОУ ПРИ/ИМАТИ ВЪРОУЩИИ ВЪ НЪ ЕGO" 26b17-19
(John 7:39)

The last and least frequent compound future consists of a present active participle of the
auxiliary in combination with an infinitive. It is used in both direct speech and narration. The auxiliary in all of the instances is "want". A sample of the data follows.

"Я/КО СЪ ЖЕСТЬ ХОТА ИЗБАВИТІ И/ЗДА" 3b21-23 (Luke 24:21)

"КЪИ СОБО БЙДЕТЬ ОТЪ/НИХЪ ХОТАИ СЪТВОРИТИ/СЕ" 118g16-18 (Luke 22:23)

8.2. Headings

Not surprisingly, the range of verbal forms represented in the headings is far more limited than in the section of the manuscript discussed above. For those which do occur, there is nothing noteworthy in the orthography of the inflectional markers.52

8.3. Readings Copied by Second Scribe

Like the headings, the passages copied by the anonymous second scribe do not offer anything unique in terms of the representation of verbal paradigms.

8.4. Colophon

In the examination of the colophon, I will continue the practice of the preceding chapters and address the comments of each contributor separately.

8.4.1. Aleksa

There is nothing distinctive in the orthographical representation of the verbal morphology in Aleksa's
colophon. The spelling of the few pertinent data items which do occur is consistent with patterns found in the readings which he copied.

8.4.2. Ζαδέν

The statement by Ζαδέν contains only two verbs and the orthography of the inflectional markers in them does not merit particular attention. However, I do want to note one unique element of the form "πφσαλβ" at 213a21. It is the use of "β" to denote the vowel letter in the verbal root. In representations of that verb Aleksa always has "и" in the corresponding position.35

8.4.3. Naslav

In the statements by Naslav there is a unique representation of the third person singular of "be", "σασεθ" at 213a25. In addition, he employs the same convention as Ζαδέν in the representation of the root meaning "write". In this instance the form is an aorist of a prefixed derivative, "σφσασθ" at 213a23.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 8

1 As in chapter 7, except for citations of specific examples from the manuscript, "ъ" should be regarded as a cover symbol for "ъ" and "ъ". Similarly, the letter "ъ" stands for both "ъ" and "ъ".

2 The letter C denotes any consonant.

3 The use of "-ъ" correlates most closely with a physical position on the line. (see above)

4 The missing component of this analysis is the orthography of the protograph. If the protograph was South Slavic in origin, then the predominant orthography of the verbal desinence in question would have been "-ъ" and, assuming that the letter "ъ" stands for a back jer, the so-called tense jer in this example would have been spelled "ъ" or "ъ". If such a situation existed, then one would have to admit the possibility that the scribe converted the representation for one type of tense jer into the representation for the other.

5 In the index the editors label the instances of "творить" and "поставить" cited above as infinitives. [1983:412, 450]

6 There are some isolated examples which do not conform to the non-past conjugation pattern outlined above.

   One is a second person singular in which the marker is spelled "-мъ". The item is "хохмать" at 103g5. However, there is no note regarding this example on the page in the text where it occurs and in the index it is listed under an entry with final "-мъ" [1983:462]. Therefore, the second "мъ" could result from an error in the typesetting or, as Prof. Charles Gribble proposed in a personal communication, the scribe might have repeated the letter "мъ" under the influence of the first occurrence of that letter.

   In the first person plural, there is one instance, "алчать" at 31b8, in which the marker is not spelled "-мъ". Furthermore, the word which immediately follows does not begin with a jot, so there is no possibility to analyze "-мъ" as the representation of a so-called "tense" jer.
Similarly, I noted one exception to the regular use of "-те" in the second person plural, "мо/жет" at 14a25-14b1. This form might represent an anticipatory error, as the word which immediately follows is "прийти".

The third person singular "умретъ" at 26a16 also belongs in this discussion. Although it is orthographically identical to one variant of the corresponding aorist form of the verb "die" (see below), the semantics of the passage, John 21:23, only admit a non-past interpretation. In addition, one could adduce a number of items which, in one sense, deviate more dramatically from the basic pattern, e.g., "яво/на" at 37b1-2 and "плютъ" at 99v11. The first stands where one would anticipate a third person plural non-past form, while, in place of the second, "плото" would be more appropriate.

I recorded two first person plurals which had final "-ъ" instead of "-тъ". They are "о/стамобъ" at 104b1-2 and "слу/шахомъ" at 115a3-4. Only the second stands in a position which would permit one to interpret the final "-ъ" as the marker of a "tense".

The second and third person singular aorist forms of this verb are not relevant to this discussion because one would expect them to be represented as "рече" in either the "old" or the "new" sigmatic paradigm.

In the four instances listed above the syntax of the passages containing them would admit an alternative analysis in which the sequence "тъ" is treated as the masculine nominative singular of a demonstrative pronoun. In the index the editors note this possibility with respect to three of the examples.

Their article also lists a fifth example of a third singular aorist for "die" with "-тъ", "умретъ" at 26a16. However, as I indicated in an earlier footnote, the sense of the passage in which this item is used requires that it be interpreted as a non-past form.

The sequence "тъ" in this example, as in the four instances involving "die", could be treated as a masculine nominative singular of a demonstrative pronoun. Under that approach this would represent
another deviation from the prevailing pattern that "са" immediately follows the verb with which it is most directly associated.

11 Of the three with "тъ" only the last could conceivably be segmented into "нача" and "тъ", with the latter sequence being classified as the masculine nominative singular of a demonstrative pronoun.

12 The first of the two examples with "тъ", at 182g11, could be split into "зача" and "тъ", with "тъ" denoting the subject of the clause. Under that approach there would be one more exception to the principle that "са" usually stands immediately after the verb to which it is subordinated since "са" follows "зачать" in this instance.

13 For the first of the two it would be possible to treat the sequence "тъ" as the masculine nominative singular of a demonstrative pronoun and, consequently, as the subject of the clause.

14 One instance of "приъять" which I regard as an aorist, but which the editors label as a supine [1983:419], is not included in the preceding figures. It stands at 107b21 and the context in which it appears is "Сълъг и приъять и", from Luke 19:6.

15 In several instances one might be able to argue for a reclassification of "приъять" into "приз" and "тъ", with "тъ" representing a pronominal form. The same is true for the lone example of "назать", at 193b13.

16 In the index the first of these is incorrectly identified as an aorist of the verb whose reconstructed infinitive would end in *-ъхати. [1983:369]

17 Since the last of the six is clearly an abbreviation, one must acknowledge the possibility that the absence of "л" or "л" after "в", which would be the expected orthographical indicator of the reflex of a jot palatalization, might result from the abbreviation process.

18 One group of items was deliberately excluded from consideration during the compilation of the list of exceptions. It consists of abbreviations, such as "гдъсъ" at 7b16.
In addition, I omitted one other potential deviation, "свирахо/мыш" at 76b10-11, which means "play, pipe". If the reconstructed infinitive for the verb in question ended in \*-\-\-ti, then this form should be included in the list. However, the only potentially related item cited by Sadnik/Aitzetmüller or Lunt is spelled, in their systems of transcription, "svirati" [Sadnik/Aitzetmüller 1955:134; Lunt 1959:48]. Furthermore, the other verb forms in the clauses contextually connected with this example appear to be aorists. In the index "свирахомъ" is labeled an aorist. [1983:431]

With those stipulations, the list is intended to be exhaustive, although I must add the caveat that in certain person-number combinations (e.g., the first person singular) for certain verbs the only contrast between the imperfect and the aorist would be that in the imperfect one would expect an "extra" "a" immediately before the person-number marker.

19 In the index the three instances of "помощаета" as well as "хозаста" and "течаства" are identified as aorists. [1983:411, 462, 451]

20 I recorded no examples of imperfect forms for verbs whose reconstructed infinitive ends in \*-\-nqti.

21 The second condition was included to account for verbs of this class whose reconstructed infinitive ended in \*-ati, such as the verb represented at 8g10. That example can be contrasted with the form "элб/вааме" at 26b10-11.

22 As in chapter 7, the symbol "---" is used in tables to indicate that no relevant examples were recorded.

23 I disregarded "мола/аме" at 54a18-19, assuming that it represents an error in the typesetting, insofar as this example is listed under "молнаме" in the index. [1983:382]

24 For this discussion I disregarded "родоваяху" at 199g7.

25 Another possible exception to the generalization regarding the distribution of "-хоутъ" is "слы/маахоутъ" at 64v3-4. Although I am reasonably certain that the letter "н" immediately following that
imperfect form should be analyzed as the masculine accusative singular of the anaphoric pronoun, I can conceive of an analysis under which that letter is treated as denoting a conjunction.

26 On several occasions a verb form occupying a slot in which one could reasonably expect to find an imperative has "-e-" instead of "-a-". In most of these the result is orthographically identical to the corresponding non-past form. The one instance in which the last statement does not hold is "исьте" at 94b5.

27 In this sentence and the following paragraph, C denotes any consonant other than jot.

28 For this discussion I ignored "разумете" at 65b24.

29 In all five the word which immediately follows the imperative is the accusative singular masculine of the anaphoric pronoun, spelled "и". Therefore, the final "ь" after "и" could be regarded as the marker of a so-called "tense" jerk.

30 In the old sigmatic aorists of "say", "и", not "а", occupies the position in question.

31 There is other evidence which might support this latter explanation. It is "и/сълить" at 9gl6-17. The entire clause in which it appears is "да сънидеть и/сълить съ него". Unless the scribe inadvertently omitted the conjunction spelled "и" between the two verb forms, one would expect the second verb form to be a supine. Given the fact that in OCS the third person singular non-past and the supine for the verb in question would be identical and the fact that in ME the usual person-number marker for the third person singular is "-е", a comparable misapplication of a spelling rule could have occurred. However, since I cannot know whether the protograph followed OCS orthographical norms with respect to the third person non-past verb forms, this discussion remains speculative.

32 For the discussion of syntactic distribution, I included the data on the supine and the infinitive of the five athematic verbs.
33 I disregarded instances in which the object was a noun or adjective denoting a masculine animate in the singular and the orthography would lead one to interpret the form as a genitive. I did this because the issue of the animate accusative vitiates somewhat the value of such examples.

I also excluded the item at 9g16-17 discussed in footnote 31 due to the uncertainty regarding the parsing of the text.

34 In the discussion of the athematic verbs, the symbol "-" preceding an orthographical representation should be understood to indicate that one or more examples on which the entry is based has a prefix.

35 The index contains a number of errors and omissions in the articles for the verbs considered in this paragraph. I could not find citations for the examples of "вьем" at 147g16 and 148b16, "въдаапсе" at 137b15 and "въдапсе" at 149v17. [1983:328] The occurrences of "въдаапсе" at 67b2 and 94a10 are listed as third person imperfects. [1983:328] In fact, they are second person forms.

Among the prefixed derivatives, "исповадь" at 31a6 is classified as a third singular aorist. [1983:367] Actually, it is a first singular non-past.

Three examples of forms of the derivative produced through the addition of *pro- + *po- are cited in the article headed by the infinitive written "проповадати". [1983:420] One of those three, "проповамь" at 125a7, is identified as a first person plural imperative. [1983:420] In reality, it denotes a first singular non-past.

It is necessary to add that no attempt was made at an exhaustive examination of the pertinent articles in the index. The preceding list contains only those items which I happened to notice during the analysis of the data on "know" and its derivatives. Therefore, there might be additional inaccuracies.

36 As with "know" and its derivatives, there are some problems with the treatment in the index of some members of this data set.

All second person singular aorist forms are categorized as third singulars, e.g., "прадать" at 67a10 [1983:422], "да" at 77b8 [1983:338], "въяда" at 94a15 [1983:321] and others.

The examples of "падите" at 32v3-4 and 85a1 are labeled as non-past forms, when, in fact, they are
imperatives. [1983:338] The first of the two is particularly noteworthy because the verse containing it, Matthew 10:8, is found in two other locations, at 174v and 201a, and the instances of "дайте" in those iterations are identified as imperatives. [1983:338]

The three first person plural non-past forms which I recorded are not classified as such by the editors. The two at 2gl2 and 107g2 are labeled singulars, while the other, at 63al6, is treated as an imperative. [1983:338]

The list could be extended, but I think that these examples suffice to demonstrate the point.

37 I recorded only one instance of the third plural spelled "μαμα", at 48b19. Moreover, that example might not be an aorist of "eat", but rather the corresponding form of the verb meaning "take". Semantically, either of those two would fit in the passage. However, based on the particular verse involved, Matthew 15:37, one would expect "eat" to occupy the slot in question. In the index this item is listed under the article for "eat". [1983:468]

38 I want to mention two classification errors involving forms of "eat" in the index. The editors label "δέτα" at 11a16 as a second plural aorist [1983:458], when, in fact, it is a non-past. Conversely, they identify "δέτα" at 21g16 as a third singular non-past. [1983:458] It is actually an aorist. Moreover, the verse containing the second item, Luke 24:43, occurs again at 209b and the corresponding lexeme, written "δέτα", is correctly categorized as an aorist in the index. [1983:468]

39 In the imperfect the problem of orthographical ambiguity due to homography arose again, i.e., for certain variants the context in which each example occurred had to be examined in order to determine which verb was actually being represented, "have" or "take". The difference is that in this instance the issue affected both the singular and the plural.

40 The last of the three is in Luke 24:11, whose semantics would lead one to interpret "имахоутъ" as an imperfect from "take" rather than from "have". Nonetheless, I accepted the interpretation of the editors as reflected in the index. [1983:365]
41 In constructing the table I ignored the example of "мест" at 14v11. It stands in a context which would seem to require a first person plural.

42 In the index there are two errors in the treatment of non-past forms of "be". First, the item at 60a7 is classified as a first singular with the spelling "мест". [1983:306] However, in the text one finds "мест" and the context (Mark 5:9) does require a first person plural form.

In addition, all instances of "мест" are identified as third duals. [1983:309] However, some of those cited are actually second person forms, e.g., at 3b6-7 (Luke 24:17) and at 80b24 (Luke 9:55).

43 I disregarded "обудете" at 185v20 even though, based on the verse involved, Luke 3:14, one would expect an imperative in the slot in question.

44 There is one instance, at 121v9, in which one finds "бити" where an infinitive of "be" is required.

45 Once again, the second person singulars, e.g., at 15a18 and 15a20 (John 4:10), are incorrectly labeled as third person singulars in the index. [1983:312]

46 In fact, on only two occasions, at 120b21 and 121a2, did I conclude that unprefixed "обы" should be regarded as an aorist. In the index both are listed as "regular" aorists. [1983:311]

There are two more examples of "обы" which the editors define as "regular" aorists. The analysis of them is rather more problematical. The first, at 28v9, is found in Matthew 5:13. Unfortunately, I could not locate another instance of the same verse. However, given the context in which this item occurs, it cannot be a "regular" aorist.

The other is at 101b12. The verse involved is Mark 9:33 and it does occur a second time, at 178v. In the latter iteration, one finds "обы" instead of "обы".

Incidentally, one can juxtapose the extremely limited use of "обы" as a "regular" aorist to the exclusive use of "обы" in that capacity. The form "обы" never denotes a conditional in the readings copied by Aleksa.

47 In classifying the examples with final "-е" as duals, I relied upon the requirements of the contexts in which the forms occurred. In all of the instances
which I noted, third person forms are needed, which would preclude the possibility that they could be analyzed as plurals.

I distinguish this construction from the future perfect, which consists of a future from "be" together with an 1-participle.

In collocations incorporating "auxiliaries" other than "be", e.g., "want", it was necessary to determine in each individual instance whether the clause should be interpreted as "want to X" or "will X", where "X" represents the non-auxiliary in the construction. To assist in such determinations, I consulted a Russian edition of the gospels. However, operationally, the guiding principle was to include in the data set only those examples for which, e.g., the semantics "want to X" simply would not make sense given the linguistic context in which the construction occurs, irregardless of the specific verse being represented.

One consequence of this approach is that I did not include "begin" (*naceti) in the list of auxiliaries, even though in the index the editors claim that essentially all instances of the non-past of that verb are used in the construction under consideration. A detailed explanation of the rationale for this decision is offered below.

When ME was compiled, there were verbs, e.g., the verb with a reconstructed infinitive of *dati, whose non-past forms conveyed a future meaning, i.e., their future form did not involve an auxiliary. I contend that "begin", reconstructed infinitive *naceti, was such a verb. That proposition is based on the existence of another verb, *nacinati, which is related etymologically to and would have been roughly synonymous with *naceti.

In the absence of a well-developed category of aspect, the only difference which one could posit between, e.g., the reflex of *nacinati and the reflex of *naceti would be one of tense. If futurity was an intrinsic component of the non-past forms of *naceti, then one cannot automatically treat as an auxiliary the verb "begin" in a predicate which has an infinitive subordinated to a non-past of *naceti. One must first demonstrate that, for the predicate in question, "will X" is an acceptable interpretation and that "will begin to X" is not, where "X" denotes the verb whose infinitive is subordinated to "begin". A careful
examination of the pertinent non-past examples of "begin" in ME reveals that that criterion is not met. There is one possible exception to the last statement. At 98a25-98b1 the form "начьноутъ" combines with an infinitive, but the context makes the interpretation "will begin to X" extremely unlikely. The verse containing the relevant predicate, Luke 21:15, is given below. "азь бо дамь/вамь оуста и прьмоудро/стъ. цен же не моць начь/ноутъ противити са и оть/вздати вси противлаку/дии са вамь" 98a23-98b3

50 In the index none of the four is categorized as part of the compound future. [1983:309, 462] I should add that the editors incorrectly identify a number of instances of the non-past of "have" in this regard as well. [1983:365] The errors are numerous and cannot be attributed to a difference between their criteria and the criteria which I used to identify individual forms. One example will suffice to demonstrate this latter claim.

The representation of John 16:12 occurs twice. Each iteration contain "имамъ", denoting the first person singular non-past. One of those instances of "имамъ", at 24b14, is classified as part of the compound future, while the other, at 147v15, is not. [1983:365] The semantics of the pertinent clause are "have much to say to you". Therefore, neither of the two should be treated as part of compound future formations.

51 The presence of three distinct auxiliaries naturally leads one to ask whether, for some verse in which a compound future construction is used, there are multiple iterations of that verse which disagree in the choice of auxiliary. The answer to that question is that the phenomenon just described does occur on at least one occasion. The verse is Matthew 16:27 and the relevant clauses are cited below.

"пригъ бо/имать съ чл(о)въ въ славъ/ оца своего съ англы своими" 44v19-21
"какъ бо оны чл(о)въсками пригъ/въ славъ/ оца его съ англы/стыми" 174g7-10
As one can see, there are additional differences between the two iterations as well. Incidentally, in the index neither of these two predicates is treated as a compound future. [1983:365, 462]
52 In the analysis of the data contained in the headings, I disregarded deviations from the patterns found in readings copied by Aleksa if one could argue that those deviations arose as a result of the abbreviation process.

53 Although Aleksa does not happen to use any 1-participle forms of the verb in question he does use other forms which would have had the same base/stem, e.g., the infinitive and the aorist.
CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

As I indicated in the introductory chapter, texts such as ME are an important source of information for Slavists who seek to determine how the various Slavic languages have changed over time. However, as Lunt [1988:16] notes, no meaningful interpretation of the data in any particular manuscript can be offered unless one first defines the system(s) of orthographical rules which the scribe(s) followed while compiling the text. It has been the primary purpose of this dissertation to provide just such a description for one specific manuscript, ME.

In this concluding chapter I will consider the degree to which the orthography of ME adheres to principles generally considered to be typical for early East Slavic manuscripts. I will also address some issues concerning the linguistic interpretation of the data from ME. The discussion will be divided into two parts. The first will concentrate on the orthography
as it conveys the reflexes of reconstructed segments. In the second I will consider the shape of morphological markers as well as the kinds of morphological distinctions which appear. In both parts primary attention will be paid to the readings copied by Aleksa and the headings since quantitatively they contain the overwhelming majority of the data.

9.1. Orthography of Segments

In the choice of symbols to represent the reflexes of specific reconstructed segments, ME fits quite clearly in the general pattern for early East Slavic manuscripts, although there are some differences between ME and other texts in the frequency and/or distribution of individual letters and digraphs. (cf. Lunt 1984:56-57)

For example, the reflexes of *η not preceded by jot, *jê and *ja are not distinguished orthographically. The are represented by "а", "а" or "а", with the choice of letter being determined by the position within the word. The first variant is found word-internally when another vowel letter or digraph immediately precedes in the representation as well as word-initially. The second variant occurs word-internally after the letters "ь", "ъ", "ъ", "ъ" and "ъ" as well as after the sequence "ьн". The letter
"Ἀ" is used word-internally after consonant letters other than the five just listed, with the exception that after "Ἁ" it is limited to instances in which there is no tautolexical "Ἁ" immediately before "Ἁ".

From the methodology adopted for this study it follows that the pattern just described reflects the intent of the scribe, although that does not mean that, e.g., Aleksa formulated spelling rules in terms of reconstructed segments. Rather, within the domain of slots which the preceding description covers, the orthographical outcome of that description and Aleksa's rules, however they were formulated, would be the same.

Naturally there are deviations from this distribution, but they are not systematic and, in particular, the number of instances in which "Ἁ" and "Ἀ" stand in environments other than those specified above is very small. In fact, I recorded only five, "ΜΟἩΑ" at 8α8 (feminine genitive singular), "ἌΔΝΗ" at 12β3, "ΣΧΔΙΑΜΕ" at 30α19, "Ϲ(Ϲ)ΡϹΑ" at 84ν5 (nominative singular) and "ϹΒΩΗΑ" at 178γ20 (feminine genitive singular). As it happens, all five are in readings copied by Aleksa.

An examination of these items illustrates the variety of interpretations which investigators must consider when they attempt to identify the source of 428
exceptional, from the perspective of a specific scribe
or manuscript, spellings. They could be completely
unmotivated, i.e., equivalent to writing "прадь"
instead of the expected *"при" at 133b2. (cf. Lunt
1984:54)

They could be unintentional, but motivated by the
distributional relationship between "ма", "а" and "А"
outlined earlier. In this analysis one would claim
that the scribe chose the incorrect variant.
Furthermore, it would provide evidence that the scribe
himself regarded these symbols as orthographically
equivalent.

A third option is only available for "можа",
"сво жа" and "съдяме". In the first two, "а" is the
last letter on the line, while in "съдяме" the final
"е" ends the line. If, as one might expect, there is a
consistent difference in width between "ма" and "А", it
is conceivable that Aleksa deliberately violated the
normal pattern of distribution to adjust to space
constraints on the line. As with the preceding
scenario, this would be evidence that Aleksa considered
"ма" and "А" as equivalent markers.

The last possibility is that these spellings
reflect what Aleksa found in the protograph(s) and,
either intentionally or unintentionally, he did not
alter that orthography to suit his norms. This particular influence could have operated in conjunction with either the second or the third to produce the observed data. Furthermore, with respect to "АДЫИ", "СХДИА" and "Ц(С)ПЦА", attribution of their spelling to the orthography of the protograph(s) would imply that the protograph(s), at least in these particular items, followed East Slavic orthographical practices since "А" and "Я" were not generally equivalent in South Slavic manuscripts.

As one can see, the range of possible analyses for even this small number of examples is rather wide. Moreover, there is no reason to assume that all five result from the same factor or set of factors.

The treatment of the sounds which developed from *u, *q, *ju and *jq also matches, in general terms, what one would expect from an East Slavic manuscript. More specifically, the reflexes of *u and *q are not distinguished orthographically, nor are the reflexes of *ju and *jq. For the former pair, "oy" is the preferred representation, with "ы", "х" and "ов" being used to varying degrees as well. For the latter, "о" predominates by a wide margin, although "ой", "ы", "х", "ов" and "ъ" are also found, but in comparatively small numbers. For neither pair of reconstructed
forms are the variant spellings distributed as neatly as they are for the reflexes of *(j)ē and *ja.

With respect to the distribution of the "second-tier" representatives, the only symbols which merit individual attention are "ь" and "x". The disproportionately high degree to which the examples of "ь" stand at the end of lines in slots where one would expect to find "oy" suggests that, as in other manuscripts (cf. Lunt 1988:85), it functions in its usual role as a space-saving replacement for "oy".

As for "x", there are several points to be made about its use. First, there is no particular correlation between the placement of "x" and the location of slots for which *q or *jq would be reconstructed. Second, except for one instance, "x" does not occur word-initially, nor is it found word-internally after another vowel letter or digraph. Finally, the comparative dearth of examples of "x" in the menologion and the small number of readings which follow it as well as in the headings and its complete absence in Aleksa's colophon contrast sharply with its rather frequent appearance in the readings of the synaxarion.4

This complex of distributional facts naturally leads one to ask what the source of the occurrences of
"x" in ME is. It is possible that in the compilation of the manuscript the letter was intentionally introduced into the readings of the synaxarion and was rather fastidiously avoided in the other sections of the manuscript, possibly as a means to distinguish the readings in the synaxarion. However, it seems more likely that the presence of "x" in the readings of the synaxarion reflects the orthography of the protograph(s). (cf. Lunt 1988:81) If that is correct, then the distribution of "x" would imply that a single or a set of East Slavic protographs was used. Incidentally, under the latter scenario, the exclusion of "x" from positions at the beginning of words and internally after vowel letters and digraphs could reflect the distribution of that letter in the protograph(s) or the result of a spelling rule applied in the production of ME.

Another characteristic feature of East Slavic manuscripts from this era is the absence of the replacement in native Slavic words of "кь", "гь" and "хь" with "кИ", "гИ" and "хИ", respectively.5 ME adheres to this principle and, more generally, preserves the opposition between "ь" and "и", although
this latter feature is not unique to early East Slavic documents. For example, later Russian manuscripts maintain the same distinction.

The distribution of initial "зе" and "е" in the readings copied by Aleksa is quite similar to the usage in the part of Ostromirovo Evangelie compiled by the principal scribe, the portion of Arxangel'skoe Evangelie (AE) copied by the second scribe and the section of Minei 1097 starting on page 38. In all four, "е" in initial position is the rule in Greek, or more generally non-Slavic, items. (see Lunt 1988:76-77, 86, 130) In addition, each has a small number of Slavic lexemes which are written with initial "е". Moreover, the composition of those four groups of Slavic items is quite similar. For instance, "еда", "э" and "эзэр" are in three of them, while "эме" and "этер" also occur in more than one list. (see Lunt 1988:77, 86, 130) In contrast, Lunt [1988:61, 112, 117, 122-123, 130] suggests that that pattern does not hold in the first part of AE, in Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073, in Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1076, in Minei 1095 and Minei 1096, as well as in the first 37 pages of Minei 1097.

In its use of "ах"/"ам" to stand for sequences which in South Slavic was written "зн"/"зн", ME follows
a well-established pattern. Lunt notes the same phenomenon in his descriptions of several dated eleventh century East Slavic manuscripts. [1988:104, 115, 123]

In the treatment of the successors to the reconstructed jers the theoretical norm is to have "τ" for the reflex of *τ and to have "β" marking the segment which developed from *β. To a significant degree that is what one finds in early East Slavic documents and ME is no exception in this respect. The deviations from that theoretical norm are of three basic types. In some instances letters other than "τ" and "β" are used to denote the segments under consideration. In others, "τ" stands where one would reconstruct *τ and/or "β" occupies a slot where one would posit *τ. Finally, there are examples in which the successor to *τ or *β is simply not indicated with a letter.

In ME deviations of the first type are almost non-existent, with one significant exception. In the colophon by Naslav there are four examples in which "e" stands for the reflex of *τ. In all four the jer was in the penultimate syllable and the final syllable also contained a jer. Furthermore, the four examples in question are the only four in that colophon which
contained a jer meeting the two conditions just listed. However, two of the four, "*Л"DEMь" at 213a24 and "Л"DEMь" at 213b12, both dative plural forms, are only pertinent to this discussion if one can preclude the possibility that the "e" results from the influence of the *jo-stem declensional pattern. As for the other two, "пришелъ" at 213b5 and "честъ" at 213b18, using Modern Russian as a guide, one might expect that the penultimate syllable was the prosodic center for both of them.

These data are potentially significant because of their possible implications for the chronology of the loss of the jers in East Slavic. First, since the forms are in the colophon of a person who apparently did not participate in the compilation of the manuscript, one could hardly argue that these spellings derive from any source other than the author of that colophon. Furthermore, given examples such as the preposition "дЕЛА" at 213a23, the genitive singular "кЪ/НАЗА" at 213b10-11, the dative singular "ЦУХ" at 213a23 and others, one must conclude that Naslav followed East Slavic, rather than South Slavic, orthographical norms, which at least suggests that his
native speech patterns were more likely to be East Slavic, although admittedly that implicature is not particularly strong.

Unfortunately, any determination of the information which these data provide about the loss of the jers is complicated by two considerations. First, there is no indisputable dating for the colophon of Naslav'. All that one can state with certainty is that it was written after the manuscript was completed. Second, the data in this colophon really only speak to the vocalization of "strong" jers, not to the complete elimination of "weak" jers. Therefore, I am not able to offer any concrete conclusions about the importance of this material.

The second type of deviation, in which "b" is used for the successor of *þ or "t" stands where one would posit *þ, is far more frequent than the first with the vast majority of examples found in the readings copied by Aleksa. However, the number of different lexical items which display this feature is rather small and the items do not seem to form a coherent group. Thus, there might not be a single factor or a uniform set of factors which can explain all of the items.

In this discussion I will consider only a subset of the data, the instances of the first person singular
non-past form of the verb "have", which are written uniformly "имамъ". All of the pertinent data are in the readings copied by Aleksa and the position advocated below, at least in terms of it ultimate conclusion, essentially corresponds to the one which Lunt adopts in his discussion of the portion of Arxangel'skoe Evangelie written by the first scribe. [1988:69]

The fact that Aleksa consistently made no orthographical distinction between the first person, singular and the first person plural non-past forms of "have", but, with only four exceptions, maintained the orthographical distinction between the corresponding forms of the other "athematic" verbs, "be", "give", "eat" and "know", suggests that the use of final "z" in "have" was not a feature introduced by Aleksa, but rather was one which he found in his protograph(s). Furthermore, I submit that he would be likely to retain the orthography of the protograph in these instances only in the event that no countervailing principle directed him to proceed otherwise. Thus, at a minimum, his orthographical rules gave him no guidance and, to the extent that he would consider it appropriate to appeal to it, his native speech pattern offered no direction as well. Following this line of reasoning,
one could conclude that the non-past paradigm of this verb was no longer productive in at least some East Slavic areas and had become a purely literary form by the time ME was compiled.

The third type of deviation is the most represented in quantitative terms and, like the first, it also has possible implications for the chronology of the loss of the jers.

In ME the omission of expected "ъ" or "ь" is actually not uncommon. In the readings copied by Aleksa there are well over 1000 total examples. However, the data are spread over a rather small base of lexical items. The significant point is that ME seems to be rather typical of early East Slavic manuscripts in this respect.

This latter conclusion was drawn after a comparison of the material found in ME with an article from Russian Linguistics by C. Gribble. For the article Gribble examined data on the phenomenon in question from a number of early East Slavic manuscripts. As a result of his investigation, he offered an interpretation of the observed facts, based in part on statements by Lunt and Markov, which differed from the more prevalent views found in the literature to that time.
Gribble's proposal [1989:9] is that one need not ascribe any linguistic significance to the majority of examples from early East Slavic documents which lack "ъ" or "Ъ". Rather, they might simply reflect spelling conventions, possibly abbreviations in which the titlo or the superscript letter often used as a marker of abbreviation was absent. Gribble proceeds to posit a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the omission of "ъ" or "Ъ" in such instances. It is that "the resulting consonant cluster was one that otherwise could not occur in early East Slavic." [1989:9] For Gribble, the importance of this requirement is that it would allow the scribe to exclude "ъ" or "Ъ" in the representation without impeding comprehension. [1989:9]

I think that the data from ME are consistent with Gribble's analysis and might even suggest some directions for further inquiry which could lead to a slight refinement of his proposal. However, before embarking upon that discussion there are several elements of the hypothesis which should be addressed.

First, insofar as the phenomenon under consideration relates to orthography, it might have been better to formulate the necessary condition in orthographical terms instead of linguistic terms, i.e., to state that it is the sequence of letters which is
not found elsewhere. Naturally, one would need to exclude from the domain of such a condition obviously non-Slavic items, e.g., "галактиона" at 174g22 in ME. However, to the extent that such words would be pronounced as they are spelled, Gribble's formulation would need a corresponding stipulation. The adoption of an orthographically oriented condition would remove the necessity to provide a separate explanation for the spelling "сде" or "сде", which explanation is offered in the article [1989:7].

The second issue concerns the claim about possible confusion when "ь" or "ъ" was not part of a representation. Gribble's position in this respect must refer to the ability to decode a sequence of letters when an expected "ь" or "ъ" is absent and for some of the pertinent items his statement is manifestly true. For instance, since, at the time in question, East Slavic had no contrast which opposed velar + back jer to velar + front jer and since the consonant cluster implied by the sequence "кс" was not found in Slavic words, "кс" would have only one interpretation, provided that the only vowel letters omitted without using a titlo or a superscript letter were "ь" and "ъ". Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for, e.g., labial + jer sequences. Thus, "бс" could, in
principle, be shorthand for either "віс" or "ввс", unless one knew that only certain words could be abbreviated in that manner.

Finally, Gribble's analysis is predicated upon a proposition which is often, if not usually, accepted by linguists when they attempt to explain historical phenomena. It is that one should try to handle the largest number of examples possible with a single explanation. (cf. Gribble 1989:9) That proposition has a non-trivial drawback. It presupposes that relationships which investigators might perceive after the fact must have been relevant in the genesis of a particular phenomenon. In the present instance, the relationship is that each of the items enumerated by Gribble [1989:8] lacks an expected "в" or "в" in its orthographical representation.10

The specific material in ME does not bear upon the preceding three points. However, a juxtaposition of the data from ME with Gribble's discussion does suggest a line of inquiry which deserves consideration and further study.

Gribble states that examples of the preposition meaning "towards" written "к", when it is followed by the masculine/neuter dative singular of the demonstrative pronoun whose reconstructed masculine
nominative singular is *t̂b, reflect, in essence, the application of a spelling rule designed for the nominative singular of "who" to an orthographically equivalent context. [1989:10] Given the token frequencies found in ME one might ask whether a corresponding explanation could be offered, e.g., for items involving the verbal roots *čět- and *měn- as well as the preposition "k" when followed by the second person singular personal pronoun. The models would be, respectively, "what"; the first person singular personal pronoun and "much, many"; and "who".

Another question is motivated by three considerations: Lunt's conclusion [1984:56] that ME might exhibit rather less variation in certain features than at least some of the manuscripts which he examined for his dissertation; Lunt's statements [Lunt 1988:18; Gribble 1989:6] about "regular" absence of expected "t̂" and "Ě" in Codex Marianus; and Gribble's suggestion [1989:9] about the influence of the orthography of South Slavic protographs on the use of "t̂" and "Ě" in East Slavic manuscripts. One wonders whether it would be possible to trace an evolution in East Slavic orthographical norms relating to the omission of "t̂" and "Ě" prior to the time when any such developmental
process would have been disrupted by the effects of the linguistic process known as the loss of the jers.

The orthography of word-internal tense jers does not, in general, reflect the fate of those segments in the East Slavic linguistic area, although there are a reasonable number of exceptions to that generalization. The predominant pattern is "ь" for the successor to tense *ь and "н" for the reflex of tense *ъ.

The opposite situation obtains for combinations of a jer and a liquid between two consonants. The relative ordering of the letter denoting the jer and the letter denoting the liquid matches the expectations which one would have for an early East Slavic manuscript, as does the choice of letter to represent the jer. For the reconstructed sequences *ър and *ър in the appropriate environment one finds "ър" and "ър", respectively, while for both *ъл and *ъл standing between two consonants "ъл" is used. The exceptions are few and isolated.

The treatment of the successors of *ор and *ол between two consonants is as consistent, but reflects the South Slavic state of affairs, with the pertinent sequences being regularly written "ра" and "ла", respectively. The only exceptions are found in the
colophons of Aleksa and Naslav" where several examples of spellings suited to the results of East Slavic linguistic changes occur.

The representations of the reflexes of *er and *el present quite a different picture. The true East Slavic variants, which would be written "епе" and "ого", respectively, are never used. For *er there is a preference for "пс" as opposed to "пе", which Lunt labels "the normal Russian compromise form" [1988:118], in the readings copied by Aleksa, but that advantage is due strictly to the degree to which "времен" predominates as the representation of the base which means "time". At the level of individual bases, there are more for which "пе" holds an edge in frequency.

Several bases deserve particular mention because they exhibit no vacillation in their representation in this regard. On one side there is the exclusive use of "прептр"/"препт" in roughly 45 examples. On the other there is the consistent use of "сред" in approximately forty instances and of "пред" in 25. For the latter I combined the bases which mean "foal" and "lot".

In gross terms, the data of ME place Aleksa between the two principal scribes of Arxangel'skoe Evangelie. According to Lunt the first chose "пс" close to 80% of the time, while the second selected
"pe" for more than 90% of the pertinent items. [1988:94-95] The primary scribe of Ostomirovo Evangelie (OE) used "pE" in all but one example. [Lunt 1988:94] The two scribes who compiled Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073 prefer "pE" to almost the same degree as the primary scribe of OE. [Lunt 1988:114] In Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1076, "pE" is used 80% of the time. [Lunt 1988:118] Aleksa's practice is actually most similar to that found in Minei 1095, Minei 1096 and Minei 1097 in the sense that none of them display any clear orthographical norm in this regard either. [Lunt 1988:124, 132]

In the case of *el, Aleksa prefers "je" over "jë". Any comparison of Aleksa's practice in this regard with that found in the other East Slavic manuscripts listed in the preceding paragraph is complicated by the fact that Lunt's discussion of this feature often does not include numbers of examples or percentages and when it does, the total number of examples is so small that no meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

The consistent use by Aleksa of "m" to mark the reflex of *tj seems to be the norm for early East Slavic manuscripts.11 With respect to the small number of exceptions to that practice, the fact that four of
them are in examples of the word for "foreign, strange" makes a point of contact with Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073. (see Lunt 1988:115)

The degree to which "w" predominates over "wx" as the marker of the successor to *dj does not distinguish ME in any particular way. That general phenomenon is common for early East Slavic manuscripts.

Aleksa distinguishes the reflex of *l followed by jot from the reflex of *l not followed by jot with a high degree of accuracy only for the successors to the pairs *le/*lje, *lu/*lju and *lj/*ljg. The effects of the jot in the first of those are conveyed through the use of the vowel letter "w", the consonant letter "w" or a combination of the two. For *lju and *ljg the principal indicator is the vowel letter "w", but "w" and "w" are also found in a small number of examples, with "w" and "w" always accompanying "w". In those instances in which the following vowel was *e, *i, *e or *a, the effects the jot are marked, at most, half of the time, basically through the use of "w". However, "w" is not generally found in the representations for the reflexes of *1e, *1i, *1e and *1a, i.e., when there never was a jot. Thus, Aleksa does not seem to use "w" indiscriminately.
Although the specific percentages differ slightly the same situation obtains for *n, while for *r only the successors to *rju and *rjo contain any evidence of the effects of the reconstructed jot.\textsuperscript{12} That evidence is in the choice of vowel letter, "и".

Lunt's discussion of several dated East Slavic manuscripts from the eleventh century indicates that, in Aleksa's treatment of the lateral arising from *lj and the nasal evolving from *nj, ME follows a pattern which, in a general sense, had been used before. Ostromirovo Evangelie \textsuperscript{[1988:77-78]}, Arxangel'skoe Evangelie \textsuperscript{[1988:86-87]}, Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073 \textsuperscript{[1988:112]} and Minei 1097 \textsuperscript{[1988:130-131]} are particularly pertinent in this respect.

9.2. Morphology

In the representation of the morphology in ME one finds a number of characteristically East Slavic features. First there is the use of "-ьмь" and "-ьмь" as markers of the instrumental singular for the etymological *о- and *jo-stem paradigms, respectively.

The explanations for two of the three types of deviations from this pattern in the readings copied by Aleksa seem rather straightforward. For those with "-иймь", insofar as a vowel letter always precedes the "и" in the representation of the desinence, the linguistic
reality is probably that "и" denotes the combination of a jot, whether phonetic or phonemic, with the reflex of *
й. Thus, these items would not be exceptions in a linguistic sense, only in a strict orthographical sense.

The rare spelling "-омь", being found only in non-Slavic words, probably reflects the orthography of the protograph(s) used by Aleksa.

The last group, those with "-емь", is both more numerous and more problematical than either of the other two. The size of the data set, nearly fifty items, and the consistent presence of "и" before "ем" suggest that these spellings result from the operation of a rule. The orthographical shape of the ending indicates a South Slavic influence, but almost all of the words involved are Slavic.

The marker of the genitive singular, the nominative plural and the accusative plural for the etymological *ja-stem paradigm as well as the representative of the accusative plural for the etymological *jo-stem paradigm reflect the South Slavic pattern in most examples. However, the number of instances of "ем", conveying the native East Slavic variant of these desinences, is rather high, particularly in the headings of the menologion, which,
incidentally, is not necessarily surprising, insofar as that component of the manuscript, after the colophons, is the one which is most likely to have been created at the time when ME was compiled, rather than simply being copied from a protograph.

In the readings copied by Aleksa, the concentration of roughly one third of the instances of this phenomenon in a passage which occupies only six lines suggests that Aleksa might not have had a Slavic translation of the appropriate verses available to him and had to appeal to a Greek version or to supply them from memory. (but cf. Lunt 1984:41)

The conclusions drawn in the preceding two paragraphs rely on a proposition which I will formulate as follows: the more a scribe needs to attend to content, the less he is able to attend to form. Naturally, this does not imply that all deviations from orthographical norms result from a need on the part of the scribe to focus particular attention on content.

Among pronominal forms, with only one exception, the South Slavic "ceG*" and "Ted*" are used exclusively in place of the East Slavic "coCfe" and "ToCfe".

In the verbal morphology several features align ME with other early East Slavic manuscripts. First, there
is the use of "-тъ" as the person-number marker in the third person singular and plural non-past forms of verbs in place of South Slavic "-тъ".

Two more are found in imperfect forms. Where South Slavic has "ха" immediately preceding the person-number marker, ME has "ъа", with some exceptions in imperfects for "have" and "be". In terms of the general principle underlying this substitution, ME agrees with the part of Ostromirovo Evangelie written by the first scribe [1988:103], Arxangel'skoe Evangelie [1988:103], Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073 [1988:115], Minei 1095 and Minei 1096 [1988:123]. The verbs for which some exceptions are found make a point of contact between ME and Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073. (cf. Lunt 1988:115)

The other set of imperfect forms which are germane to this discussion consists of a small number of examples in which an expected jot palatalization is not reflected orthographically. I treat them as distinctively East Slavic because of the appellation which Lunt assigns to them, "Rusian". [1984:56-57]

The spelling of the conditional form of "be" follows the East Slavic pattern as well. It consistently has "и" as the vowel letter after "в", whereas in OCS one finds "и". Obviously, this feature
cannot be used to compare ME to South Slavic manuscripts which reflect the merger of the successors to *i and *y.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 9

1. Under *ja I include the reflex of *碇 which was originally preceded by a velar consonant or by *j, whether *j was phonemic or not.

2. The use of the symbol "j" in the reconstructed forms should not be interpreted as a claim about the phonemic status of jot.

3. After " Empresa", "x" is used. The same is true after "c" in the word for "all" and "s" in the lexeme for "sickness, disease", e.g., "מש" at 28all, and the lexeme for "prince".

4. In the note by "יידן", there are simply no slots in which "x" could even potentially be used. Since Naslav" did not participate in the compilation of the manuscript, his colophon was ignored for this discussion.

5. As in earlier chapters, "י" should be treated as a cover symbol representing both "י" and "י".

6. I used the orthography of ME in the citations.

7. To the discussion of the jers, I must add a significant caveat. Karskij [1962:15] as well as Zukovskaja, et al., [1983:24] seem to propose a rough symbolic equivalence between "י" and "י" on the one hand and certain diacritical marks on the other. (cf. Lunt 1984:46) Since the diacritical marks in question were generally omitted from the typeset edition I cannot respond to the linguistic implications of their claims. However, I can address the correlation between the placement of the letters "י"/"י" and the locations of slots in which specific segments would be posited.

8. The so-called "tense" jers as well as jers which stood in the sequence consonant + jer + liquid + consonant or the sequence consonant + liquid + jer + consonant will be considered below and are not part of the current discussion.

9. In order to reject this conclusion, one would need to accept the proposition that there might have been a gratuitous decision to eliminate the orthographical distinction between two forms of one verb, but to
retain that distinction in the corresponding forms of other verbs which pattern in exactly the same manner.

10 In addition, Gribble's approach does not account for the rather frequent omission of "e" in the representation of the verbal root *s3l- in the part of Arxangel'skoe Evangelie written by the second scribe. (cf. Lunt 1988:87) However, to the extent that this feature is unique to this particular section of text, it does not fall within the purview of Gribble's explanation as it is intended for phenomena which occur across manuscripts.

11 In this and the following discussions of the representations of the successors to reconstructed sequences of the form *Cj, where "C" denotes a consonant, I include the reflexes of consonants in the sequence *Ceu. For *tj, I include as well the reflex of *kt when it was followed by a front vowel.

12 I include here the reflex of *n in the sequence velar + *n + front vowel.

13 As elsewhere, "n" stands for both "m" and "l".
NOTE: Items preceded by an asterisk ("*") were not examined due to accessibility problems.
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*Симони, П. К. 1904-1910. "Мстиславово Евангелие Начала XII в. в Археографическом и Палеографическом Отношениях." Pamjatniki Drevnej Pis'mennosti: Izdanie Obshchestva Ljubitelej Drevnej Pis'mennosti 123 and 129.
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