Old Church Slavonic Grammar

Old Church Slavonic Grammar

SEVENTH REVISED EDITION

by
Horace G. Lunt

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York 2001

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin

♾ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lunt, Horace Gray, 1918–
Old Church Slavonic grammar / by Horace G. Lunt. – 7th rev. ed.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 3110162849 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Church Slavic language–Grammar. I. Title.
PG619.L8 2001
491.8'17015–dc21 2001030588

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Lunt, Horace Gray:
Old church Slavonic grammar / by Horace G. Lunt. – 7., rev. ed. – Berlin ; New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2001
ISBN 3-11-016284-9

Printing: WB-Druck, Rieden/Allgäu.
Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin.
Printed in Germany.

PREFACE

This description of the structure of Old Church Slavonic is intended to present fully the important data about the language, without citing all the minutiae of attested variant spellings. The facts have been treated from the point of view of structural linguistics, but pedagogical clarity has taken precedence over the conciseness required for elegant formal description.

Old Church Slavonic was used over a period of some two hundred years and in various geographical parts of the Slavic world precisely at the time when the Slavic languages were undergoing rapid, fundamental, divergent changes. Some of these changes are doubtless reflected in the variant spellings in the few texts which have survived from this period, so that while most variations in grammar and vocabulary are the sorts of stylistic and idiosyncratic differences that are found in the standard or literary language of any single epoch, some important variant details result from different regional dialectal history. It has thus been necessary to include occasional references to historical and comparative linguistics in the first half of this book, although in principle these problems do not fall within the scope of a strictly descriptive, synchronic grammar.

It is necessary to normalize forms to present the grammatical structure as a consistent whole, and the normalization inevitably obscures the differences in the language of the various manuscripts. A clear picture of the different combinations of linguistic elements making up each of the texts is not to be achieved by lists of spelling variants or tables of percentages, but it is worth while to point out some of the striking variations. First-hand acquaintance with the texts and constant comparison of variant readings is the only way to arrive at an understanding both of the underlying unity of the texts as a whole and of the major and minor differences between them.

Little mention is made here of another type of comparison—the relationship of the OCS translated texts to the Greek originals. And yet it is in the Greek and in the translation technique that the explanations of hundreds of tiny problems (expecially of syntax) are to be found, and certain major structural problems need to be posed in terms of the influence of Greek on OCS. However, so few students have enough Greek to profit by such comparisons that it did not seem worth the considerable space that

would be required. Excellent work in this field is available, though some scholars tend to forget that even a poor translator is governed by the structure of the language into which he is translating. The "Notes on Syntax" in Chapter Six are offered on the premise that something is better than nothing. It is particularly in this area that translation techniques need to be analyzed.

After forty years of teaching OCS and related topics in the history and structure of modern Slavic languages, my views on the nature of language and the models for describing language have evolved away from the Bloomfieldian structuralism of my training. The data of OCS have not changed importantly from the material described by scholars a century ago, although some details from imprecise editions have been discarded and a few new details must be accounted for. I continue to believe that every language is a coherent structure, and that each language can be described in terms of static and dynamic elements and learned by novices who do not have the slightest knowledge of its history.

Departures from tradition in classifying the data in no way change the facts themselves. The OCS verb, for example, is complicated, and classification will not make it less so. *Xvaliti, veléti,* and *želéti* do belong to different paradigms, whether one labels them IV A, IV B, and III 2 with Leskien, or IV, III 1 and III 2 with Diels, or II.8k, II.8e,1k, and I.4a,2b with Koch. I believe that it is most efficient simply to encourage students to learn the form from which the rest of the paradigm can be generated according to rules (*xvali-ti, velě-ti,* but *želěj-ǫtъ*) and leave them to study the tables on pp. 114-117 and 136-137 for similarities and differences between paradigms. The present form of description is based on my belief that it is the morpheme that is the basic unit of communication.

A comparison of Old Church Slavonic—a language I believe to be a partially standardized written form of Late Common Slavic—with either its hypothetical ancestors or the descendants or collateral descendants of other forms of LCoS—is not the task of the synchronic description that takes up the first five chapters of this book. In the 1974 edition, I presented an epilogue ("Toward a generative phonology of OCS") that was based on a generative theory that proved to be too ambitious. Chapter Six in this book is an entirely new and relatively traditional sketch of the genesis of OCS (as a representative of Late Common Slavic).

This work was influenced by my teachers of long ago and by the students and colleagues I encountered during my years of teaching. I will not attempt to list them here. I can only express general thanks to the students who asked challenging questions and to their fellow-students and

the colleagues throughout the scholarly world who helped me (in direct or indirect ways) find some of the answers. Special gratitude is due to Thomas J. Butler for his help in reading proof.

This edition too I dedicate to the memory of Professor S. H. Cross of Harvard, who introduced me to the study of Slavic, and to Professor G. R. Noyes of the University of California, who gave me my first lessons in Old Church Slavonic.

Horace G. Lunt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

A = accusative
a., act. = active
AslP = Archiv für slavische Philologie
As = Assemanianus
Bg = Bulgarian
ByzSl = Byzantinoslavica
C = any consonant
Cl, Cloz = Clozianus
Cz = Czech
comp. = comparative
D, dat. = dative
ECoS = Early Common Slavic
Eu, Euch = Euchologium Sinaiticum
Ev. = Gospel(s)
f., fem. = feminine
G, gen. = genitive
Gk = Greek
Gmc = Germanic
Go = Gothic
I, impfv. = imperfective
I, instr. = instrumental
IJSLP = International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics
imv. = imperative
impf. = imperfect
inf. = infinitive
J = St. John
JF = Južnoslovenski Filolog
KF = Kiev Folia
L = St. Luke
L, loc. = locative
LCoS = Late Common Slavic
m, masc. = masculine
Mar = Marianus

MCoS = Middle Common Slavic
Mk = St. Mark
Mt = St. Matthew
ms = manuscript
mss = manuscripts
n = note
n, neut. = neuter
N, nom. = nominative
O = Old
OCS = Old Church Slavonic
P = perfective
P, Pol = Polish
Ps. = Psalterium Sinaiticum
part. = participle
pass. = passive
pl., plur. = plural
RÉSl = Revue des Études slaves
Sa = Sanscrit
Sav = Savvina kniga
SC = Serbo-Croatian
sg., sing. = singular
Slk = Slovak
Sln = Slovene
SPb = Sanktpeterburg
Su, Supr = Suprasliensis
Vat = Vatican Cyrillic Palimpsest
Zo, Zogr = Zographensis
ZoF = Zograph Folia
/ = or
~ = alternates with; is opposed to

Numeration of the paragraphs is decimal; every number to the right of the decimal point is to be read as a separate unit. Thus 15.642 = 15.6.4.2, i.e. the second subdivision of 15.64, which is the fourth subdivision of 15.6. For personal names in references (Diels, Vaillant, etc.) see the bibliography, §0.341 (pp. 12-14). For details about the codices, see §0.321 ff. (pp. 7-10). Citations are made by page and line for Cloz, Euch, Supr, and KF; by chapter and verse for Zo, Mar, As, Sav, and Vat; and by psalm and verse (Eastern numeration, as in the Septuagint) for Ps.

INTRODUCTION

EXTERNAL HISTORY AND SOURCES

0.0 Old Church Slavonic is the name given to the language of the oldest Slavic manuscripts, which date from the tenth or eleventh century. Since it is a literary language, used by the Slavs of many different regions, it represents not one regional dialect, but a generalized form of early Eastern Balkan Slavic (or Bulgaro-Macedonian) which cannot be specifically localized. It is important to cultural historians as the medium of Slavic culture in the Middle Ages and to linguists as the earliest form of Slavic known, a form very close to the language called Proto-Slavic or Common Slavic which was presumably spoken by all Slavs before they became differentiated into separate nations.

0.1 The Slavs are mentioned by historians with increasing frequence from the fifth century CE, but there is no reason to believe that they wrote their language down before the ninth century. In 862, Prince Rastislav, ruler of Morava (located somewhere in the Danube Basin), appealed to the Byzantine Emperor Michael III for a teacher who would give instruction in Christian law "in our own language." Michael appointed a priest, the experienced diplomat and able scholar Constantine, called the Philosopher, to the difficult and important mission. Constantine was a native of Salonika, and the Emperor pointed out that all the people of Salonika spoke Slavic well (Солоунѣне вьси чисто словѣньскы бесѣдоуѭтъ). Constantine went to Morava accompanied by his brother Methodius, a former civil administrator who had become a monk.

The brothers elaborated an alphabet for the Slavic language, translated the most important liturgical books, and started to train Moravans for the clergy. They travelled to Rome to visit the Pope and have some of their pupils ordained into the priesthood. On the way, the "Slavic apostles" stopped at the court of the Slavic prince Kocel (Коцьлъ) of Pannonia (in what is now western Hungary), where they were welcomed enthusiastically and acquired more pupils.

The Pope received them favorably and approved of their work, condemning the "three-tongue" heresy of those who claimed that only Greek, Latin, and Hebrew had the right to serve as written and liturgical languages. Constantine, however, fell sick in Rome, and on his death-bed he took monastic vows and assumed the name of Cyril (869). Later he was sainted.

Methodius was now appointed Archbishop of Pannonia (including Morava), and he set out for Morava with his newly consecrated pupils. Rastislav had been deposed and blinded in 870, and the new ruler Sventopulk (Свѧтопълкъ) was surrounded by Frankish priests who bitterly opposed the Slavic liturgy and the eastern, Greek influences it represented. The Franks had Methodius imprisoned in Bavaria, and only after two years did the Pope come to his aid. The Slavic rite was established in Morava, but on Methodius's death in 885 the Frankish clergy did their best to stamp it out. Driven from Sventopulk's realm, some of the Slavic priests apparently found asylum in Bohemia, and for some time they were able to maintain the Slavic liturgy and the writing that went with it. However, in the eleventh century Slavic culture steadily lost ground in the area and in 1097 the last Slavic monastery was abolished and the Slavic liturgy was formally prohibited.

Meanwhile, the Bulgar ruler Boris had been baptized in 864 and established Christianity as the official religion of his extensive realm. The meager historical sources offer no information about the language used in the new churches, but since Methodius apparently visited Constantinople and left two of his disciples and books in care of the Emperor and Patriarch, it is plausible that some knowledge of OCS existed in the eastern Bulgarian lands. In any case, the main body of Methodius's followers found refuge in Bulgarian territory, and OCS was nourished in two cultural centers, one in the east at the court of the Bulgarian Tsar Simeon (893–927) and one in the west, in Macedonia. Political conditions were favorable, and Slavic culture prospered, but not for long. After the destruction of the Bulgarian state in the east by the Byzantine armies at the beginning of the 970s, a state in Macedonia arose and flourished briefly. The might of Byzantium finally, after a dozen years of warring, crushed the last vestiges of independence by annihilating the armies of King Samuil in 1014. Even after this catastrophe, some degree of learning was maintained in the Bulgarian, Macedonian and Serbian monasteries, and in distant Croatia. When Christianity was accepted by the Rus' prince Volodimer in 988, Slavic books may have found a modest place among East Slavs. In the 1030s Prince Jaroslav "the Wise" apparently adopted

the Slavonic rite, and books and perhaps teachers from the Bulgarian lands made it possible for the East Slavs to adapt Old Church Slavonic for their own use. By the 1050s Kiev and Novgorod were creative cultural centers.

0.2 The few early manuscripts which have come down to us do not go back to the days of Cyril and Methodius, but date at the earliest from the end of the tenth century and more probably from closer to the 1050s. Being thus the products of the period of turmoil attendant upon the destruction of the Macedonian state, they do not represent a thriving, developing culture, but only remnants. The scribes, it seems, were not well trained, and the manuscripts contain blunders which not even the most ingenious theory can bring into accord with a plausible linguistic system.

It is assumed that most of these manuscripts contain translations made by Cyril and Methodius, and the rest are translations made by their disciples, probably during the first decades after the death of the saints. However, since we lack contemporary manuscripts, or even the immediate copies which were doubtless made in the heyday of the states of Simeon and Samuil, we cannot know in precise detail the language actually written by the Slavic Apostles. Their own works, taken to Bohemia, Bulgaria, and Macedonia, were copied and recopied, edited and modified by generations of workers, and we possess only a few random examples of the copies.

The native dialect of Cyril and Methodius, who were born in Salonika, was presumably southeastern Macedonian. Perhaps Methodius adopted some features of the dialect of the Slavic-speaking province (possibly in the mountains northeast of Salonika) where he was an administrator for a time. In Constantinople the brothers may have become acquainted with the speech of Slavs from other areas. It is not impossible that the local dialects of Morava and Pannonia may have influenced the language of the translations. But in any case all evidence indicates that in the ninth century the difference between Slavic dialects from the Baltic to the Adriatic and Aegean Seas, from the Elbe to the steppes of Kievan Rus', were minimal, and it is probable that the dialect of Salonika was readily understandable to the Moravans and Pannonians of the Danube Basin.

0.21 Whatever the spoken dialects were, the *church language* appears to have been essentially the same in different areas. Because this language was used in the west and south and then served for centuries in Rus', in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and in Muscovy as a literary language (which naturally became modified progressively with the course of time), it is

known as **Church Slavonic**. Since the majority of the early manuscripts which have survived were copied in the Bulgaro-Macedonian area and since there are certain specifically eastern Balkan Slavic features, many scholars have preferred to call the language **Old Bulgarian**, although **Old Macedonian** could also be justified. Early nineteenth-century scholars conjectured that this language was based on the dialect of Pannonia, and accordingly called it **Old Slovenian**. In the earliest sources, the language and letters are referred to by the adjectives **словѣньскъ**, Greek σκλαβικός, σθλοβενικός, or σκλαβινικός, Latin *sclavinica, sclavinisca* or *sclavina,* all of which mean simply *Slavic* (or *Slavonic*).

0.3 The tenth and eleventh centuries witnessed far-reaching changes in the several Slavic macrodialects. Reflections of the changes in the spoken languages appear in the spelling and the grammatical forms in the manuscripts and enable us to identify them as Serbian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, or Rusian (early East Slavic). As a convenient (but arbitrary) date, it is generally reckoned that non-East Slavic manuscripts written (or believed to have been written) before 1100 are Old Church Slavonic, as opposed to the Macedonian-Church Slavonic,[1] Bulgarian-Church Slavonic, or Serbian-Church Slavonic written after that time.[2] Most grammars of Old Church Slavonic exclude the considerable body of manuscripts produced in Rus' before 1100, because they have unmistakeably East Slavic traits. In fact, some Rus' manuscripts come about as close to the theoretical ideal described in grammars as the "classical" manuscripts do.

None of the OCS manuscripts is dated. None can be much older than the year 1000, and some may be considerably younger. It is not easy to establish even the relative age of the manuscript, since a text with archaic phonetic features may present younger morphological forms and vice versa, and the chronologies established on grounds of paleography are not reliable for this earliest period.

---

[1] The line between OCS and post-OCS manuscripts is arbitrary and terminology is varied. The common term "Middle Bulgarian" is usually contrasted to "Old Bulgarian" (= OCS), and loosely used for manuscripts whose language demonstrates a broad spectrum of regional and temporal dialect features, often clearly the result of generations of copying by scribes with different habits.

[2] These later forms of Church Slavonic are also known as the Serbian, Russian, etc. *recensions* of Church Slavonic. There is also a Croatian recension, attested in glagolitic mss throughout the Middle Ages and still used in some Croatian parishes. There is evidence (beside KF, cf. §0.311) for a Bohemian or "Moravian" recension, although only isolated fragments from this area have survived.

It must therefore be emphasized that Old Church Slavonic, as we deal with it in describing the grammatical patterns, is a theoretical, reconstructed language. The manuscripts written over a period of many decades, in different parts of the Balkan peninsula, present numerous variations in spelling, grammar, and vocabulary. It is assumed that the variations are later modifications affecting the originally unified type of language used by Cyril and Methodius and their immediate associates. On this assumption, all grammars of OCS have dealt with the "original" language, with some concessions to the usage of the several manuscripts. Indeed, the myriad attested variants constitute long and essentially uninformative lists. Therefore this grammar too describes a norm, a generalized type of dialect which does not correspond exactly to the facts of any one manuscript. Definable classes of variants are mentioned, and important individual deviations in detail are noted.

0.301 For the purposes of a grammatical description of the oldest attainable stage of OCS, it is imperative to restrict the data to the oldest manuscripts. I prefer a narrower "canon" than many linguists have defined in recent years (see below). The study of broader cultural problems is quite a different matter. There is no doubt that the scribes who produced the surviving OCS manuscripts were familiar with many texts that are available to us only in copies that were written down decades or centuries later. The language of some of these copies no doubt reflects OCS in many details—but precisely what is old and what is new constitutes a long series of controversial questions. In particular, just what words can be called *Old* Church Slavonic? Lexicographers have admitted a series of texts into the domain of OCS; many more could be justified. But for historical study of the language and related dialects, investigators should be alert to the antiquity of the manuscripts from which each item is cited as evidence.

0.31 There is no clear-cut set of features which differentiate the language of the manuscripts called Old Church Slavonic from the oldest of the texts termed simply Church Slavonic, but the relatively "correct" usage of certain letters and the relatively high occurrence of certain morphological forms which comparative evidence shows to be old give us some criteria. In the spelling, the use of the letters for the nasal vowels (*ǫ, ę* and perhaps *ję*) are of great importance. It is the "misuse" of these letters which is the clearest sign of an East Slavic scribe and the reason why such manuscripts as the *Ostromirovo Evangelie* (dated 1056-57, the oldest *dated* Slavic ms) are excluded from a description of OCS. Further, the writing of the symbols ъ and ь more or less where we expect them, and the

consistent usage of the letter *ě* (ѣ) help to identify the language. Chief among the morphological characteristics are the use of the root-aorists (an archaism which was irregular from the point of view of the over-all system of OCS) and the uncontracted forms of the long adjectives. All of these features together, in conjunction with paleographical evidence (the details of the shape of the letters and the style of writing them), and the *absence* of specifically dialect features, serve to mark a manuscript as OCS.[3]

0.311 Three groups of manuscripts can be distinguished on the grounds of variant phonetic and morphological features. The Kiev Folia, with at least one pervasive Czech trait (see below §0.326), are the only representative of a variant of OCS which was presumably used in Bohemia or perhaps Moravia. (The location of the "Morava" where Constantine and Methodius worked in the 860s is unknown.) It is to be regarded as a "literary dialect", following local norms worked out in a specific area and opposed to the other OCS texts. Two of the cyrillic texts (Sav and Supr, see below) show in general some fairly specific eastern Bulgarian features, but the differences are neither great enough nor consistent enough to make it necessary to oppose a Macedonian "dialect" to a "Bulgarian" dialect of OCS.[4]

0.32 The "classical" or "canonical" texts of OCS include eight fairly extensive manuscripts (one a palimpsest), two sizeable fragments, and a number of single folia and parts of pages. Best represented is the *Gospel* text, with five manuscripts. The *psalms* are nearly complete, and there is

---

[3] Citations from post-OCS mss that are believed to be reasonably faithful copies of originally OCS texts will be marked **OCS* in this book (e.g. *OCS *snъxa* 'daughter-in-law'): the label is marked, not the word.

[4] Elaborate schemes of "OCS dialects" have been set up by some scholars on the basis of minute orthographic and morphological details, cf., e.g., Kul'bakin, Vieux Slave 354ff., Marguliés, Codex Supr., 227ff. The chief objection to this method is that it regards each scribe as a careful, trained phonetician who was trying to reproduce his own pronunciation. In reality the scribes were chiefly concerned with writing "correctly"—which sometimes meant copying exactly, and sometimes meant applying slightly different orthographical rules to the text being copied. We can determine literary norms (i.e. the spellings and grammatical forms given scribes or groups of scribes thought were proper), but to determine the phonetic details of pronunciation and from them the local origin of a scribe is impossible from the type of manuscript which we have in OCS. Cf. N. Durnovo, 'Slavjanskoe pravopisanie X-XII vv.', *Slavia* 12.45-84.

a *prayer-book,* a fragment of a *missal,* parts of a few *hymns,* and some *sermons* and *saints' lives*. To these manuscripts must be added the oldest dated Slavic text, a short gravestone inscription set up by the Macedonian king Samuil in 993.

The amount is actually quite modest: if the entire body of material were set up in the type and format of this book, it would make a volume well under a thousand pages, including perhaps 350 which represent variants and not separate texts. The individual mss would occupy roughly the following number of pages (for abbreviations see below): Supr 300, Mar 175, Zo 150, Sav, Ps and Euch each 75, Vat 60, Cloz 20, and the fragments another 20.

0.321 Perhaps the oldest manuscripts are the two full versions of the Gospels, the so-called *tetraevangelia,* both written in glagolitic (see the next chapter, particularly §1.01). The **Codex Zographensis** (Zo) has 271 folia in OCS, plus 17 in an old Macedonian ChSl glagolitic version (Zo^2), and some later addenda in cyrillic. The OCS text contains Matthew 3:11 through the end of John (but Mt 16:20-24:20 is later, Zo^2). Phonetically it is nearest to the theoretical norms posited for the language of Cyril and Methodius, but certain morphological forms (especially aorists) and some textual readings seem to be rather younger. The **Codex Marianus** (Mar) has 174 folia, containing the Gospel text from Mt 5:23 to John 21:7. Certain deviations from the theoretical norms indicate Macedonian influences, others possibly Serbian (if not northern Macedonian). In the nineteenth century both were still on Mt. Athos, Zo in the Zograph Monastery, and Mar in the *skete* of the Virgin Mary. Zo is now in the Russian State Library in St. Petersburg, Mar in the Russian National Library in Moscow. Zo may be presumed to have been written in the 1020s, Mar in the 1030s; any dating is guesswork.

0.322 Quite different arrangements of gospel materials are found in the three *gospel lectionaries,* where the excerpts from the four gospels are presented as lessons to be read on specific days of the year.[5] The Greek term for such a book is εὐαγγέλιον, borrowed into OCS as **евангелие**. In the Greek Orthodox tradition the lectionary, as the primary source for the Word of God, is itself a sacred object that requires special care; it is for this reason that some 25% of all surviving Slavic medieval manuscripts are gospel lectionaries. Yet the individual manuscripts ordinarily vary in content, because—unlike the *tetraevangelion,* which contains the full gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John—the lectionary is a general plan

---

[5] In Rus' a lectionary could be called **апракосъ**—apparently an adaptation of a Greek designation.

that provides well over 350 slots that designate a particular gospel pericope (reading, lection) that may or should be read. The usual selection provides lections (1) for all Saturdays and Sundays, the weekdays for the six weeks of the Great Fast (Lent) and the seven weeks from Easter to Ascension, and (2) selected Feast Days defined by day of the month. The first part is relatively standard, while the second part varies considerably because each manuscript was written with the needs of a particular region or individual church in mind. The glagolitic **Codex Assemanianus** (As), with 158 folia, has a chaotic innovating orthography, but retains numerous archaisms; it was written after 1038, and perhaps well after 1050, almost certainly in Macedonia. The newly discovered **Vatican palimpsest cyrillic lectionary** (Vat) is only partially legible, for the OCS text was washed off sometime near 1200 and a Greek lectionary text was written over the cyrillic lines. Although 96 folia had cyrillic writing, only about half of them contain reasonably legible connected text. Vat seems to be generally conservative, but with enough innovations to place it perhaps in the 1040s, possibly in Macedonia. **Sava's Book**, or **Savvina Kniga** (Sav) retains only 129 out of the original 200 or so folia. It is written in cyrillic, and while it retains some old textual readings, the language is definitely innovative, and seems to reflect central or eastern Bulgarian dialects. It probably was written in the 1030s. The Assemanianus was found in Jerusalem in the eighteenth century and taken to Rome, where it is kept in the Vatican Library. Vat is housed in the same library. Sav was in Rus' by the fourteenth century, to judge from the fact that lost folia were replaced by pages written in an East Slavic hand of that time. It was found in a Pskov monastery in the nineteenth century and is now in the Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Arxiv Drevnix Aktov in Moscow.

0.323 The Psalter and Prayer-Book are both still in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, and are named accordingly. The glagolitic **Psalterium Sinaiticum** contains the 151 psalms plus ten canticles and some common prayers. The text is riddled with faults, but preserves archaisms along with innovating spelling reflecting Macedonian phonetics; it was produced by several scribes who worked together, very likely in the 1040s.[6] From the glagolitic **Euchologium Sinaiticum** (Euch), 137 folia have survived of what must have been a much larger book. Euch

---

[6] A second glagolitic psalter, apparently from the same workshop, was found at St. Catherine's in 1975, but it has not yet been adequately described and is known to the scholarly world from a single photograph.

contains also three damaged folia from an eastern missal (or liturgiarium). The language of the two manuscripts is in many respect similar, and both appear to be from Macedonia.

0.324 The largest Old Church Slavonic manuscript is the **Codex Suprasliensis** (Supr), with 285 folia. It is a menaeum (четья минея in Russian terminology) for the month of March, that is, a collection of saints' lives for daily reading, and contains also a series of sermons for Holy Week and Easter. The writing is cyrillic, and the language is in every particular younger than that of the other texts, excepting Sav. It seems to have been written in central or eastern Bulgaria. Found in 1823 in a monastery in what is now Poland, it was later broken up: part (1-236, numbering each side) is now in the National Library in Ljubljana (Slovenia), while a second part (237-268) somehow (stolen?) found its way to Russia, where it is now in the Russian State Library in St. Petersburg. The largest section (269-570) remained in Warsaw. Removed from the Zamojski Library during World War II, it reappeared in the US in 1968, was acquired by an American and returned to Poland.

0.325 Another book which must have contained a large number of homilies (some of which are also in Supr) has survived only in fragments, fourteen folia in glagolitic called the **Glagolita Clozianus** (Cloz). One part of this ms has been demonstrated to be a sermon composed by Methodius. Like Mar, the language of Cloz shows both Macedonian and Serbian influences. Formerly the property of Count Cloz, two of the folia are now in the Ferdinandeum in Innsbruck (Austria), the other twelve in the Museo Civico in Trento, Italy.

0.326 The remnants of a missal (more precisely, sacramentary) of the western rite is possibly the oldest of our texts. The seven glagolitic folia known as the **Kiev Folia** (KF) are generally considered as most archaic from both the paleographic and the linguistic points of view, but at the same time this text replaces the most characteristically Bulgarian phonetic traits of the other mss with unmistakably Czech features.[7] By this simple modification of the most striking foreign features, the literary language was adapted for local use. Unfortunately the small amount of text of the

---

[7] The Bg *št* and *žd* which stem historically from **tj* (and **kt*), **dj* are kept, as a rule, in Rusian and Serbian ChSl, although they stand out as specifically foreign elements. But in KF they are regularly replaced by the Czech *c/z*, e.g. *prosęce* VIb6 'begging,' *pomocь* 'help,' *podazъ* 'give' for Bg *prosęšte, pomoštь, podaždь*.

KF does not permit far-reading conclusions as to the place of the Czech type of language in the development of the early Slavic literary languages. The ms was taken from Jerusalem (perhaps originally from Sinai) to Kiev in 1870, and is now in the Vernadskyi Central Library.

0.327 A few isolated pages or fragments which are generally considered OCS are of importance chiefly to confirm the linguistic evidence offered by the larger texts and to demonstrate the early date of some of the literature. The **Słuck Psalter** (Sl), now lost, was five leaves of a cyrillic ms, containing part of the 118th psalm. Two leaves from a glagolitic gospel lectionary are known as the **Ochrid Folia** (Ochr).[8] The Church Fathers are represented by the two cyrillic **Hilandar Folia** (Hil) containing a text of Cyril of Jerusalem and the glagolitic **Rila Folia** (Ril, formerly called *Macedonian Frag.*), with parts of sermons by Ephraim the Syrian. The two cyrillic **Zograph Folia** (ZogrF) are from a monastic code of St. Basil.[9] Eight partially legible pages of liturgical hymns survive in the glagolitic **St. Petersburg Octoich**.

0.33 The mass of later manuscripts that have survived, mostly now in libraries, offer irrefutable evidence that the literature of the Slavs before 1100 must have been far more extensive than this small list. Doubtless Cyril and Methodius themselves translated the Acts and Epistles (*Apostolъ*, in Slavic terminology), and Methodius may well have finished translating the Old Testament. A code of church law (*nomokanon*) and a *patericon* (didactic tales about famous monks and hermits) are also attributed to the Slavic Apostles. It is probable that a number of liturgical works were translated from Latin as well as from Greek in the earliest period: the Kiev Folia are an example. Some of the prayers in Euch reflect Old High German versions. The hagiographic *Lives* (Žitija) of Ss. Cyril and Methodius are early; Methodius may well have written about his brother. At least two poems (*Proglasъ* and the *Alphabet Acrostic*) must be attributed to the immediate pupils of the Slavic Apostles if not to Cyril himself, and another poem (*Poxvala Simeonu*) is from the early tenth century. Some original hymns surely go back to tenth-century Bulgaria. However, all

---

[8] *Undol'skij's Fragments*, two folia of a cyrillic gospel lectionary usually called OCS, are rather to be classed with the *Enina Apostol* (discovered in 1960) as representing a slightly more recent kind of language.

[9] The badly damaged *Cyrillic Macedonian Folium* is usually called OCS, but it has some later features and in any case supplies no crucial data for grammar. The text appears to be from St. Cyril's preface to his translation of the Gospel.

these works have come down to us in a language which has been modified to suit the tastes of later scribes and which we therefore do not consider in the linguistic study of Old Church Slavonic.

0.34 The study of Church Slavonic, the literary language of all the Orthodox East and South Slavs (and some Catholic Croats), was begun early by native writers, but their grammars were unoriginal adaptations of Greek and Latin works, wholly inadequate to describe a Slavic language. The best and most famous grammar was published by the Rutherian Meletij Smotryc'kyj in 1619. Modern study of ChSl begins with the great Czech scholar Josef Dobrovský's *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris,* 1822. The exploration and description of old manuscripts was continued by the Slovenes Jernej Kopitar and Franjo Miklošič (Miklosich) and the Russian Aleksandr Vostokov (among others), but it was the exemplary editions of the codices Zographensis (1879) and Marianus (1883) by the Croat Vatroslav Jagić that finally made it possible to separate Old Slavonic from later accretions.

The classical description was made by the great leader of the "Young Grammarians", August Leskien, in his *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*. This manual appeared first in 1871, was revised four times, translated into Russian (1890), and has never gone out of use as a textbook. Moreover, its principle of including historical and comparative data beside the synchronic description set the style for nearly all later grammars and textbooks. The reference grammar by Václav Vondrák (1912) is an example. Unquestionably the most important book of this type is the encyclopedic *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik* by Paul Diels (1932), still an indispensable tool for anyone doing detailed work with OCS, although newer editions of some of the manuscripts show that some of his evidence needs to be modified. The Dutch scholar Nikolaas van Wijk lays an even greater emphasis on the historical factors in his *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache* (1931).

The fundamental discussion of Common Slavic (or Proto-Slavic), with reference to its relations with other Indo-European languages and to the modern Slavic languages, is Antoine Meillet's *Le Slave Commun* (2nd ed., with A. Vaillant, 1934), which is of course based largely on the material of OCS.

An excellent non-historical description of OCS is André Vaillant's *Manuel du Vieux Slave*[2] (1964). It is rich in detail and frequently cites data from later texts to clarify some of the obscure points in OCS, but the treatment of sounds is somewhat old-fashioned for the time. Nikolaj

Trubetzkoy's uneven *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik* (written before 1938, published 1954) offered stimulating new views on the writing system and the organization of morphological description.

Syntax is given some attention by Vondrák and Vaillant, and more problems are discussed in the 1963 volume edited by Kurz. More comprehensive treatment of many questions is available in Večerka.

The lexicon of the short list of canonical texts, along with a broad selection of words from post-OCS manuscripts whose text is believed to go back to the OCS period, is treated in the *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, published by the Czech Academy, 1958–97. A single-volume distillation of SJS is *Словарь старославянского языка*, 1994, edited by Raisa Cejtlin and others [reprinted in 1999].

0.341 Bibliography. The number of books and articles that deal wholly or in part with OCS is enormous. Here I list only the editions of the OCS texts, some analyses, and some of my own works that provide the background for my decisions. Further titles will appear in footnotes.

A. TEXTS. [The editions are listed first (a) and then studies (b).]

1. Glagolitic

KF: (a) Jos **Schaeken**, *Die Kiever Blätter*. (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 9) Amsterdam. (b) H. G. **Lunt**, 'Once Again the Kiev Folia,' *SEEJ* 32 (1988): 341-83.
Zo: (a) V. Jagić (ed.), *Quattuor evangeliorum Codex Glagoliticus olim zographensis*. Berlin, 1879. (b) L. **Moszyński**, 'Ze studiów nad rękopisem kodeksu zografskiego,' Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków; idem, *Język Kodeksu Zografskiego, I* (1975), *II* (1990).
Mar: (a) V. **Jagić** (ed.), *Quattuor evangeliorum ... Codex Marianus glagoliticus*. St. Petersburg, 1883 [contains study and lexicon].
As: (a) Josef **Kurz**, *Evangeliarium Assemani II* Prague, 1955 [Cyrillic transcription]; I. **Dujčev** (ed.), *Асеманиево евангелце*. Sofia, 1981 [photo-reproduction of ms, in color]. (b) H. G. **Lunt**, 'On the Old Church Slavonic codex Assemanianus,' *Makedonski jazik* 31-32 (1981-82): 405-16. Christoph **Koch**, *Kommentiertes Wort- und Formenverzeichnis des altkirchenslavischen Codex Assemanianus* (= Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialekti Veteris, XLIII), Freiburg i. Br., 2000.[10]

---

[10] The extensive comments provide meticulous data that elucidate scores of major and minor details (of spelling, morphology, syntax, meaning, translation technique).