On Church Slavonic Accentuation

The Accentuation of a Russian
Church Slavonic Gospel Manuscript
from the Fifteenth Century

by

Per Ambrosiani

Almqvist & Wiksell International
Stockholm/Sweden

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS STOCKHOLMIENSIS

Romanica Stockholmiensia
Stockholm Contributions in Geology
Stockholm Economic Studies. New Series
Stockholm Economic Studies. Pamphlet Series
Stockholm Oriental Studies
Stockholm Slavic Studies
Stockholm Studies in Baltic Languages
Stockholm Studies in Classical Archaeology
Stockholm Studies in Comparative Religion
Stockholm Studies in Economic History
Stockholm Studies in Educational Psychology
Stockholm Studies in English
Stockholm Studies in History
Stockholm Studies in History of Art
Stockholm Studies in History of Literature
Stockholm Studies in Human Geography
Stockholm Studies in Linguistics
Stockholm Studies in Modern Philology. New Series
Stockholm Studies in Philosophy
Stockholm Studies in Psychology
Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature
Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology. New Series
Stockholm Studies in Sociology
Stockholm Studies in Statistics
Stockholm Studies in the History of Ideas
Stockholm Studies in Theatrical History
Stockholmer Germanistische Forschungen
Studia Baltica Stockholmiensia
Studia Fennica Stockholmiensia
Studia Graeca Stockholmiensia
Studia Hungarica Stockholmiensia
Studia Juridica Stockholmiensia
Studia Latina Stockholmiensia
Studies in North-European Archaeology

On Church Slavonic Accentuation

The Accentuation of a Russian Church Slavonic Gospel Manuscript from the Fifteenth Century

AKADEMISK AVHANDLING

som för avläggande av filosofie doktorsexamen
vid Stockholms universitet offentlig försvaras
i hörsal 7, hus D, Frescati
lördagen den 21 september 1991, kl. 10.00

av

Per Ambrosiani
fil. kand.

ABSTRACT

In the present work the accentuation of a fifteenth-century Russian Church Slavonic manuscript ('manuscript F'), comprising fragments located in Swedish libraries and archives, is described and analyzed.

In the second chapter the orthography as well as the relation between the various diacritical marks and phonetic stress in the manuscript is discussed, thus providing a base for the analysis of the accentuation of F in the following chapter. In this analysis, all accentual units comprising accent marks in F are compared both with the reconstructed Common Slavonic accent system and with the accentuation of other East and South Slavic manuscripts written in Church Slavonic.

In the second part of the investigation, the accentuation of a slightly younger Russian Church Slavonic manuscript ('manuscript M') is systematically compared with the accentuation of manuscript F.

The analysis shows that the accentuation of both manuscript F and manuscript M consists of at least two components: a South Slavic—presumably Middle Bulgarian—component, reflecting the accentuation tradition connected with the 'Second South Slavic Influence' in Russia (including, perhaps, the accentuation of the protograph), and an East Slavic—mainly Great Russian—component, probably reflecting the orthoëpic norms familiar to the scribe.

Stockholms universitet
Institutionen för slaviska
och baltiska språk
S-106 91 Stockholm

215 s.
Stockholm 1991
ISSN 0585-3575
ISBN 91-22-01446-2

(Ambrosiani: On Church Slavonic Accentuation)

Errata

- page 3, footnote 7 read: simplified
page 28, line 8 read: realized
page 132, line 29 read: **нѣплѣды** 394r nom sg
page 161, line 17 to be added: **ѣ възѣпиша** 139r, **възѣпиша** же 262r
page 173, line 19 to be deleted: **ѣ възѣпиша** 139r
page 174, line 28 to be deleted: **възѣпиша** же 262r
page 192, line 2 read: practice
page 195 to be added: Hinrichs, J.P. 1989. A rejoinder to David Birnbaum. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, XXXV–XXXVI, pp. 333–334.
page 195 to be added: Horálek, K. 1954. *Evangelidŕe a čtvero-evangelia*. Praha.
page 199 to be added: Синицына, Н.В. (Синицына, Н.В.) 1974. Отождествление почерков русских рукописных книг конца XV – первой половины XVI в. и его трудности. *Проблемы палеографии и кодикологии в СССР*, pp. 89–113. Москва.
page 206, line 4 read: **ѣдѣс(с)а**

On Church Slavonic Accentuation

The Accentuation of a Russian Church Slavonic Gospel Manuscript from the Fifteenth Century

by

Per Ambrosiani

Almqvist & Wiksell International
Stockholm/Sweden

Doctoral dissertation 1991
Stockholm University
Department of Slavic and Baltic Languages
S-106 91 Stockholm

Ambrosiani, P., 1991. *On Church Slavonic Accentuation*. The Accentuation of a Russian Church Slavonic Gospel Manuscript from the Fifteenth Century (= Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Slavic Studies 21). Stockholm 1991. 215 pp. ISSN 0585-3575. ISBN 91-22-01446-2.

ABSTRACT

In the present work the accentuation of a fifteenth-century Russian Church Slavonic manuscript ('manuscript F'), comprising fragments located in Swedish libraries and archives, is described and analyzed.

In the second chapter the orthography as well as the relation between the various diacritical marks and phonetic stress in the manuscript is discussed, thus providing a base for the analysis of the accentuation of F in the following chapter. In this analysis, all accentual units comprising accent marks in F are compared both with the reconstructed Common Slavonic accent system and with the accentuation of other East and South Slavic manuscripts written in Church Slavonic.

In the second part of the investigation, the accentuation of a slightly younger Russian Church Slavonic manuscript ('manuscript M') is systematically compared with the accentuation of manuscript F.

The analysis shows that the accentuation of both manuscript F and manuscript M consists of at least two components: a South Slavic—presumably Middle Bulgarian—component, reflecting the accentuation tradition connected with the 'Second South Slavic Influence' in Russia (including, perhaps, the accentuation of the protograph), and an East Slavic—mainly Great Russian—component, probably reflecting the orthoëpic norms familiar to the scribe.

Key words: Slavic accentology, accentuation, diacritical marks, Church Slavonic

The cover shows a letter from fol. F 7a.

© Per Ambrosiani 1991

ISSN 0585-3575

ISBN 91-22-01446-2

Printed in Sweden by Akademitryck AB, Edsbruk 1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE present dissertation would not have been completed were it not for the support and encouragement of many persons. First of all I want to express my gratitude to my faculty advisor, Dr. Lars Steensland, who proposed the subject and then—untiringly—has encouraged me throughout the work on the dissertation.

The subject of the present dissertation, some aspects of Church Slavonic accentuation, can be seen as a ‘middle way’ between two disciplines constituting important components of the research at the Department of Slavic and Baltic Languages of Stockholm University. There, the inspiring teaching of the late Professor Anders Sjöberg awoke my interest in the study of Church Slavonic and old Slavic manuscripts, and University lecturer Dimitrij Sovrè kindly responded to my first interest in Slavic accentology.

My thanks are also due to all friends and colleagues at the Department of Slavic and Baltic languages and to the staff of Stockholm University Library and the Royal Library, respectively, as well as to Stockholm University for financial assistance making the writing of the dissertation possible.

I would also like to thank David Minugh, who checked the English.

Finally, I feel happy to have been doing this work in the company of my family: Inga, Vidar, Aron, and Agnes.

Stockholm, June 1991

Per Ambrosiani

CONTENTS

1. <i>Introduction</i>	1
2. <i>Manuscript F: orthography and accentography</i>	4
2.1. Introduction	4
2.2. Spelling and punctuation	6
2.2.1. Introduction	6
2.2.2. Vowel letters	7
2.2.3. Consonant letters	10
2.2.4. Letters above the line	11
2.2.5. Punctuation marks	12
2.2.6. Deviations from OChSl orthography	12
2.3. Diacritical marks	15
2.3.1. Introduction	15
2.3.2. Post-consonantal position	18
2.3.3. Post-vocalic position	20
2.3.4. Initial position	22
2.3.5. AU including line-breaks	23
2.3.6. AU with two accent marks	24
2.3.7. Summary	24
2.4. Standard and non-standard accentuation	25
3. <i>The accentuated AU in F</i>	26
3.1. Preliminaries	26
3.1.1. 'Phonetic' and other accentuations	26
3.1.2. Common Slavonic accent paradigms	27
3.1.3. Sources used for comparison	29
3.1.4. Deviations from Common Slavonic accentuation	30
3.1.5. Principles of presentation	36
3.2. Nouns	37
3.2.1. Masculine <i>o</i> - and <i>jo</i> -stems, (including former <i>u</i> -stems)	37
3.2.2. Neuter <i>o</i> - and <i>jo</i> -stems	43
3.2.3. <i>ā</i> - and <i>jā</i> -stems	46
3.2.4. <i>i</i> -, <i>ū</i> -, and <i>n</i> -stems	49
3.3. Adjectives	50
3.3.1. Adjectives ending in -ѣнь	51
3.3.2. Other adjectives	51
3.3.3. The comparative	53

3.4. Indeclinable lexemes	53
3.5. Pronouns	55
3.6. Numerals	58
3.7. Verbs	58
3.7.1. Present tense	59
3.7.2. Imperative	63
3.7.3. Present participle active.....	65
3.7.4. Present participle passive.....	67
3.7.5. Infinitive.....	67
3.7.6. Aorist.....	69
3.7.7. Imperfect.....	71
3.7.8. Past participle active 1.....	73
3.7.9. Past participle active 2.....	74
3.7.10. Past participle passive.....	75
3.8. Accentuated clitics	76
3.8.1. Preliminaries.....	76
3.8.2. AU consisting of main word plus enclitic	77
3.8.3. AU consisting of proclitic(s) plus main word.....	79
3.8.4. AU consisting of proclitics, main word, and enclitics.....	82
3.8.5. AU consisting exclusively of clitics.....	83
3.8.6. Sequences consisting of two enclinenomenon main words.....	83
3.8.7. Conclusions.....	84
3.9. The accentuation of words of Greek origin.....	84
3.9.1. Introduction.....	84
3.9.2. Nouns.....	85
3.9.3. Adjectives.....	87
3.9.4. Indeclinable lexemes	88
3.9.5. Summary	89
3.10. Conclusions.....	89
4. <i>The unaccentuated AU in F</i>	92
4.1. Preliminaries.....	92
4.2. The accentual coefficient.....	93
4.3. Letters possibly indicating ictus.....	95
4.3.1. The letters ϵ and ϵ	95
4.3.2. The letters η and $\tilde{\eta}$	96
4.3.3. The letters $\sigma\gamma$ and γ	96
4.3.4. The letters ω , ϕ , and ϕ	97
5. <i>MS M: text, orthography, and accentography</i>	99
5.1. Introduction.....	99
5.2. The text.....	100

5.3. Spelling and punctuation.....	105
5.3.1. Vowel letters.....	105
5.3.2. Consonant letters	107
5.3.3. Variant letters	108
5.3.4. Letters above the line	108
5.3.5. Punctuation marks	109
5.3.6. The language of M.....	109
5.4. Diacritical marks	109
5.4.1. Introduction.....	109
5.4.2. Post-consonantal position.....	110
5.4.3. Post-vocalic position	114
5.4.4. Initial position.....	115
5.4.5. AU including line-breaks.....	115
5.4.6. AU with two accent marks.....	115
5.4.7. Conclusions.....	116
6. <i>The accentuation of MS M</i>	117
6.1. Introduction.....	117
6.2. Nouns.....	118
6.2.1. Masculine <i>o</i> - and <i>jo</i> -stems (including former <i>u</i> -stems).....	118
6.2.2. Neuter <i>o</i> - and <i>jo</i> -stems	124
6.2.3. <i>ā</i> - and <i>jā</i> -stems.....	128
6.2.4. <i>i</i> -, <i>ū</i> -, <i>n</i> -, and <i>t</i> -stems.....	131
6.3. Adjectives.....	134
6.3.1. Adjectives ending in -ънъ	134
6.3.2. Other adjectives.....	135
6.3.3. The comparative.....	138
6.4. Indeclinable lexemes	139
6.5. Pronouns	141
6.6. Numerals	144
6.7. Verbs	145
6.7.1. Present tense	145
6.7.2. Imperative	150
6.7.3. Present participle active.....	153
6.7.4. Present participle passive.....	155
6.7.5. Infinitive.....	156
6.7.6. Aorist.....	158
6.7.7. Imperfect.....	162
6.7.8. Past participle active 1.....	165
6.7.9. Past participle active 2.....	167
6.7.10. Past participle passive.....	168
6.8. Accentuated clitics	170
6.8.1. AU consisting of main word plus enclitic	170
6.8.2. AU consisting of proclitic(s) plus main word.....	171

6.8.3. AU consisting of proclitics, main word, and enclitics.....	174
6.8.4. AU consisting exclusively of clitics.....	175
6.8.5. Sequences consisting of two enclinenomenon main words.....	176
6.8.6. Conclusions.....	176
6.9. The accentuation of words of Greek origin.....	176
6.9.1. Nouns.....	177
6.9.2. Adjectives.....	179
6.9.3. Indeclinable lexemes.....	180
6.9.4. Summary.....	181
6.10. AU without accent marks.....	181
6.11. Summary.....	183
7. <i>Conclusions</i>	185
<i>Abbreviations</i>	187
<i>Bibliography</i>	192
<i>Glossary</i>	203

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

DURING the last three decades quite a few studies have been published by representatives of the so-called morphological school of accentology, founded on the accentological theory presented by Stang in *Slavonic Accentuation*. Works by among others Dybo, Kolesov, Bulatova, Zaliznjak, Görner, Hinrichs, Schweier, and lately Steensland and Lindgren have been dedicated to the study of accentuation in early written sources. The analysis of the accentuation in medieval Slavonic manuscripts and printed books has also to a not inconsiderable extent contributed to a new reconstruction of the Common Slavonic accentual system.¹ The opportunities for further studies of medieval Slavonic accentuation have also been improved by the publication of editions of important manuscripts and catalogues listing and describing manuscripts and early printed books in various libraries.² Important accentuated material has been collected and published in works like Kolesov 1972a, Bulatova 1975, Ušakov 1982,³ Zaliznjak 1985a, Hinrichs 1985, Schweier 1987, and Dybo 1989. Unfortunately, however, the discipline still lacks an easily accessible full-scale comparative accentological dictionary.

Most published accentological investigations of early literary Slavic monuments treat manuscripts or printed books with a known time and place of origin and with comparatively homogeneous accentuation. Recently, however, in the works by Schweier (1987) and Steensland (1990), on the accentuation of the *Ostrog Bible* (OBa) and a fifteenth century liturgy (Služ. No. 323), respectively, systematic analyses of sources with heterogeneous accentuation, with important methodological contributions, have been published.⁴

In accentological publications the accentuation in Russian ChSl manuscripts from the period of the Second South Slavic Influence has often not been considered worth analyzing, as this type of accentuation is frequent-

¹ For a brief overview of the relevant literature see e.g. Birnbaum 1989:319f, Schweier 1987:13f.

² Worth mentioning are e.g. editions of Mer., Nor. ps., and Čud. Among important catalogues and paleographic albums e.g. Bogdanović 1978, Mošin 1966, Kodov *et al.* 1985, and Vzdornov 1980 are worth noting. See also Pucko 1988.

³ Observe, however, the review by Lehfeldt 1984.

⁴ Cf. Schweier 1987:351. Ohijenko 1925, however, had already discussed the possibilities of localizing early printed books with the help of accentological criteria.

ly described as 'artificial', merely imitating South Slavonic patterns, with little or no relation to the contemporary 'genuine' Russian stress.⁵ As we will try to show in the present study, however, ChSl accentuation, particularly from the period of the Second South Slavic Influence, although in principle distinct from the vernacular stress, is well worth studying, for at least two reasons. Firstly, as stress, or accentuation, constitutes an integral part of the grammatical system of most Slavonic languages, including both Russian and Church Slavonic, the evolution of the stress system constitutes an important part of the history of these languages. Secondly, Church Slavonic being not a vernacular, but a consciously cultivated language, an analysis of its accentuation can help to clarify some of the factors governing the evolution of such languages, as well as, more concretely, some aspects of the cultural situation in Russia during the period in question.

The first part of the present investigation is dedicated to the analysis of the accentuation in a fifteenth century ChSl manuscript of Russian origin, comprising parts of a Gospel Lectionary. The manuscript, consisting of fragments located in various libraries and archives in Sweden and other countries, has been published by Wesslén in her 1985 dissertation *Slavonic Parchment Fragments in Sweden. II. Gospels*, where it is referred to as 'manuscript F'.

In the second part of our investigation the accentuation of manuscript F is systematically compared with the accentuation of another ChSl Gospel Lectionary manuscript, Ev. No. 8619 (M), presently located in the Lenin State Library in Moscow. This manuscript was noticed by Widnäs for its striking similarities with parts of manuscript F (cf. section 5.1, below).

Thus, the objective of the present dissertation is—through a systematic description and comparison of the accentuation of the two manuscripts F and M—to present a contribution to the study of Church Slavonic accentuation both in general, and in particular as it is manifested in ChSl manuscripts from the period of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia.

Examples from F, M, and other ChSl sources which have been excerpted directly from the source (e.g. Ev. 1627) are printed in a Slavonic typeface,⁶ with an orthography as close as possible to the original.

In the excerpts the text has been divided into words according to the same principles as in Wesslén 1985. Ligatures are presented either as they appear in the original with special letters or separated. In the latter case the corresponding letters are underlined. Letters above the lines are placed in their 'etymological' position irrespective of the position in the original. Words written in cinnobar are printed in italics.

⁵ Uspenskij 1987:197, 209, but cf. also Zaliznjak 1985a:195f.

⁶ This typeface has been specially prepared for the Department of Slavic and Baltic Languages, Stockholm University, by the present author and Dr. Lars Steensland.

In metalinguistic usage, as e.g. in the concluding glossary, the spelling of OChSl lexemes follows the normalized orthography of the *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*.

ChSl examples quoted from scientific works or editions of manuscripts or early printed books are normally printed in a typeface similar to that used in the source of quotation. Note, however, that examples from OBa and MB, transliterated in Schweier 1987, are consistently 'retransliterated' in a Slavonic typeface.⁷

⁷ As Schweier uses a simplified transliteration system, with e.g. 'ja' representing both *ja* and *ja*, and the acute ' representing all accent marks, in examples from OBa and MB only the position of the accent mark is significant; cf. Schweier 1987:53.

Chapter 2

MANUSCRIPT F: ORTHOGRAPHY AND ACCENTOGRAPHY

2.1. Introduction

MANUSCRIPT F consists of 18 parchment folios¹ from the same 'long' Gospel lectionary (*polnyj aprakos*).² The folios are located in KB (fols. 2–3 [A 787 a 15:A–B], 6–7 [A 787 a 10:A–B], 8 [A 787 a 6], 9–10 [A 787 a 10:C–D], 16 [A 787 a 23]), RA (fols. 1 [S 51],³ 17–18 [Stafs. 10:A–B]), BL (fol. 12 [Add. MS 34386, f. 29]) and BAN (fols. 4–5 [4.9.7:2–3], 11 [4.9.7:5], 13–15 [4.9.7:6–8]). Prior to the publication of Wesslén's edition parts of the manuscript had been described by Sreznevskij (fols. 4–5, 11, 13–15), Sköld (fols. 6–7, 9–10), Knutsson (fols. 2–3, 8, 16, 17–18), Birnbaum (fols. 2–3, 6–7, 8, 9–10, 16),⁴ and Widnäs (fols. 4–5, 11, 13–15). The use of the different *o*-letters in the manuscript has recently been dealt with by Steensland. Fol. 12 has also been described in Cleminson 1988.⁵

On the basis of her paleographic and linguistic description Wesslén dates the manuscript to the fifteenth century, which agrees with the previous opinions of Sköld, Knutsson, and Birnbaum (1961:204f) on the folios studied by them. Cleminson, however, dates fol. 12 to the fourteenth century.⁶

Sometimes the aforementioned scholars differ in their reproduction of the respective parts of the manuscripts, especially as concerns the presence, relative position, and shape of the different diacritical marks. In the present investigation we will follow Wesslén's edition in this respect. Minor deviations from this edition will, however, be indicated where appropriate; such deviations have appeared as a result of a renewed read-

¹ In addition two more folios, BAN 4.9.7:1 and BAN 4.9.7:4, belong to the same codex. There is, however, only one legible line (the last) on each page. These folios have no special numbers in Wesslén 1985. Originally, they were located between fols. 3 and 4 (BAN 4.9.7:1) and fols. 5 and 6 (BAN 4.9.7:4) (Wesslén 1985:153f).

² Fols. 1–16 belong to the synaxarion part of the lectionary, while fols. 17–18 contain parts of the menologion. For the textual contents of the respective folios see Table 7, section 5.1, below.

³ This call number was added after the publication of Wesslén 1985.

⁴ Including facsimiles of fols. 8a and 16a (Birnbaum 1961:207, 222).

⁵ See Sreznevskij 1874, Sköld 1927, Knutsson 1937/38:61ff, 65ff, Birnbaum 1961, Widnäs 1970, Steensland 1987, Cleminson 1988:114, no. 72.

⁶ Cleminson 1988:114. In this work no reference is made to Wesslén 1985.

ing of the originals—originals, microfilms, and photocopies, respectively—by the present author.

As the reproductions in Wesslén show (Wesslén 1985:XIII, XIV), the folios of manuscript F are written in two different hands. Fols. 1–16, with 18 lines to the page, are written in one hand, while fols. 17–18, with 22–24 lines to the page, are written in a slightly smaller hand. The orthography, however, is mainly the same in both parts of the manuscript.⁷

F is written in the standard language used by the orthodox Slavs during the period in question.⁸ This language, in the present investigation referred to as Middle Church Slavonic (MChSl), is attested in three main varieties or recensions: Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian MChSl.⁹

Note. Mathiesen sees the evolution of ChSl as a succession of prevailing meta-linguistic doctrines, the 'Cyrillo-Methodian', 'Euthymian', and 'Meletian', respectively (Mathiesen 1984:46f). A similar periodization—confined, however, to the language development in (Muscovite) Russia—is proposed by Uspenskij (Uspenskij 1987).

An important point of the terminology here adopted is that the emphasis is put on the supranational character of ChSl throughout its evolution. Thus, the idioms attested in for example the ESl Mst., the Serbian Vukan., and the Bulgarian Ban., are in our opinion best seen as three varieties of the same ChSl standard language, and not as three autonomous standard languages, viz. 'Old Russian', 'Old Serbian', and 'Middle Bulgarian', respectively (cf., e.g., Mathiesen 1984:47, Picchio 1980:21ff, Chaburgaev 1986:5f, Fält 1990:90f).

MChSl was, as a standard language, defined by the existence of certain norms.¹⁰ These norms primarily concerned spelling, which is explained by the fact that the norms were norms 'by example' rather than explicitly formulated grammatical rules.¹¹ In addition to this, we can assume the existence of orthoëpic norms primarily relevant for recitation of written texts.¹² The orthoëpic norms comprised both segmental (e.g. the pronunciation of the *jers*) and suprasegmental features (stress, intonation). It seems probable, however, that the 'permitted' variation was greater on the suprasegmental than on the segmental level: MChSl orthography normally represents segmental features much more accurately and consist-

⁷ For an interesting discussion on variation in the writing of one and the same scribe see Sinicyna 1974. According to O.A. Knjazevskaia (oral communication), the writing in F is typical of Moldavian manuscripts.

⁸ The term 'standard language' is used here, in a wide sense, in preference to 'literary language' (which is also possible). As Brozović (1970:14ff) has shown, the latter term, its long tradition and wide extension notwithstanding, is less suitable in this context. Cf. in this connection also Tolstoj 1988:29, Hill 1988:81f, and Damjanović 1984:178.

⁹ Cf., e.g., Bogdanović 1978:46, Kodov *et al.* 1976:70f, Mošin 1963, 1973, Ščepkin 1967:30ff, Žukovskaja 1973. The split of Russian MChSl into two varieties, Muscovite and Ruthenian (Ukrainian) MChSl, is considered to have taken place during the sixteenth century as a consequence of the reaction against the 'Second South Slavic Influence' in Muscovite Russia; cf. Uspenskij 1987:237ff.

¹⁰ An overview of different types of language norms can be found for example in Rehder 1985:183ff, Uspenskij 1987:178f.

¹¹ See Mathiesen 1984:62.

¹² Cf. Vlasto 1986:345.

ently than it represents stress, not to speak of other suprasegmental phenomena.

It seems probable that the differences between the orthoëpic norms in the different varieties of MChSl, both on the segmental and the suprasegmental levels, depended mainly on the differences between the vernacular languages in use in the respective areas where MChSl functioned as the standard language.¹³ We cannot, however, exclude the presence of certain 'literary' orthoëpic norms, independent from the usage in the vernaculars (cf. section 3.1.1).¹⁴

In the following discussion we will for the sake of clarity distinguish as far as possible between the *phonetic* phenomena of stress, 'ictus', and the (ortho)graphic phenomena accentuation, marking of ictus etc. It is after all well known that the only directly accessible phenomena in a linguistic analysis of written sources are graphic, while phenomena on the phonetic level are—at best—accessible only indirectly.

2.2. Spelling and punctuation

2.2.1. Introduction

The following description of the inventory and distribution of the letters in F is based on the description provided by Wesslén.¹⁵ The purpose of the present account is to supplement and in certain cases state more precisely some of the features described by Wesslén. For example, Wesslén is often silent on the number of instances of a certain feature compared with a parallel feature.¹⁶ Further, Wesslén bases her analysis on the orthography of Early Russian Church Slavonic (prior to the MChSl period).¹⁷ As the purpose of the present investigation differs from that of

¹³ Cf. Mathiesen 1984:62.

¹⁴ Cf. Živov 1984:256, 259ff, 1986:296f. The presence of specifically literary orthoëpic norms in the different varieties of Church Slavonic is discussed in Ohijenko 1928:445, 1952:39, Skljarenko 1969:14ff (Ukrainian Church Slavonic), Bulatova 1977:283, 1979:75, Novaković 1877:151 (Serbian Church Slavonic), and in Hinrichs 1985:23f (Bulgarian Church Slavonic).

¹⁵ Wesslén 1985:158ff.

¹⁶ See e.g. about *з, 3, s*: 'The South Slavonic variant with an extra stroke in the middle of the upper part occurs in the words *сѣзѣжѣоу* (F11b:8) and *сѣѣѣзѣ* (F16a:15)'; further, 's alternates with *з*, e.g. *дрѣусѣмѣ* (F6b:15)' (Wesslén 1985:159f). For criticism of this kind of description see Ščepkin 1967:178f.

¹⁷ See Wesslén 1985:197. This has the consequence that, for example, the spelling *южика* is described as an instance of 'ю instead of *оу*', and the spelling *ѡзѣкъ* an instance of 'ѡ instead of *а, ѡ*' (Wesslén 1985:160).

*jazyka staroslověnského.*¹⁸

2.2.2. Vowel letters

The following vowel letters are attested in the manuscript: а, я, ѡ, о, џ, џ̃, џ̄, џ̅, џ̆, џ̇, џ̈, џ̉, џ̊, џ̋, џ̌, џ̍, џ̎, џ̏, џ̐, џ̑, џ̒, џ̓, џ̔, џ̕, џ̖, џ̗, џ̘, џ̙, џ̚, џ̛, џ̜, џ̝, џ̞, џ̟, џ̠, џ̡, џ̢, џ̣, џ̤, џ̥, џ̦, џ̧, џ̨, џ̩, џ̪, џ̫, џ̬, џ̭, џ̮, џ̯, џ̰, џ̱, џ̲, џ̳, џ̴, џ̵, џ̶, џ̷, џ̸, џ̹, џ̺, џ̻, џ̼, џ̽, џ̾, џ̿, џ̀, џ́, џ͂, џ̓, џ̈́, џͅ, џ͆, џ͇, џ͈, џ͉, џ͊, џ͋, џ͌, џ͍, џ͎, џ͏, џ͐, џ͑, џ͒, џ͓, џ͔, џ͕, џ͖, џ͗, џ͘, џ͙, џ͚, џ͛, џ͜, џ͝, џ͞, џ͟, џ͠, џ͡, џ͢, џͣ, џͤ, џͥ, џͦ, џͧ, џͨ, џͩ, џͪ, џͫ, џͬ, џͭ, џͮ, џͯ, џͰ, џͱ, џͲ, џͳ, џʹ, џ͵, џͶ, џͷ, џ͸, џ͹, џͺ, џͻ, џͼ, џͽ, џͿ, џ̀, џ́, џ͂, џ̓, џ̈́, џͅ, џ͆, џ͇, џ͈, џ͉, џ͊, џ͋, џ͌, џ͍, џ͎, џ͏, џ͐, џ͑, џ͒, џ͓, џ͔, џ͕, џ͖, џ͗, џ͘, џ͙, џ͚, џ͛, џ͜, џ͝, џ͞, џ͟, џ͠, џ͡, џ͢, џͣ, џͤ, џͥ, џͦ, џͧ, џͨ, џͩ, џͪ, џͫ, џͬ, џͭ, џͮ, џͯ, џͰ, џͱ, џͲ, џͳ, џʹ, џ͵, џͶ, џͷ, џ͸, џ͹, џͺ, џͻ, џͼ, џͽ, џͿ.

2.2.2.1. The OChSl nasals and their counterparts in F

F uses the letters **а**, **ѡ**, and **ѧ** for OChSl **а**, **ѧ**, **ѡ**, and **ѧ**. In addition, **ѡ** is written once for **ѧ** in **вѣнѡтрѣ** 12a, once for **ѧ** in the present tense first person singular **глаголю** 9b (Luke 7:8),¹⁹ and 2x for OChSl **ѧ** in **паче** 13b, 15a. OChSl **ѡ** (and **ѧ**, early replaced by **ѡ** in many sources) and **а** are normally written **ѡ** and **а**, respectively, thus retaining their distribution in OChSl.²⁰ OChSl **ѧ** is normally retained in initial position, but written **а** and **ѡ** in post-vocalic and post-consonantal position, respectively, e.g. in **тако** 16a (2x), all attested forms of the lexeme **вѣсѧкъ** (7b, 10b [2x], 17b) as well as in the endings **-ѡ(а)шѣ**, **-ѡ(а)хѡу**, **-ѡетѣ**, **-ѡѡтъ**.

The letter ю is consistently written for both OChSl ю (e.g. in **лю д-стїи** 1b) and ѥ (e.g. in **творю** 1b, **сїѥ** 1b).

The letters ѿѣ, ѧ, and Ѩ are written for both ОChSl ѿѣ and ꙗ. (The letter ꙗ is, however, retained 2x in the lexeme соуѡта [сѡꙗ 5b, 16a].) Of the variant letters, the digraph ѿѣ is written in all positions, including immediately before a line-break. ѧ is written 15x, of which 2x occur on fols. 17 and 18, whereas ѧ is written 9x, of which 7x occurs on page 18b. Of the total of 24 attestations of ѧ or ѧ 12 are written at the end of a line and 4 immediately following the letter ѿѣ. In the following, the variants ѧ and ѧ will not be distinguished; both will be rendered as ѧ.

2.2.2.2. The *jers*

The *jers*, ꞑ and Ꞓ, are normally written for OChSI ꞑ and Ꞓ, although seemingly not according to etymology. In addition, ꞑ is written once for

¹⁸ Cf. Uspenskij 1987:73. In the present investigation the term 'orthography' normally does not refer to the inventory and distribution of diacritical marks. For the latter we will use the term 'accentography'; cf. Steensland 1990:10.

¹⁹ H. Birnbaum (1961:229), seemingly, considers this a scribal error. Cf. also Sköld 1927:31.

²⁰ Exceptions, with **а** for OCHSI **а**, are formed e.g. by **лѣжаща** 11b (Luke 12:19) and **оуча** 4b (Mark 6:6); **сѣбѣраи** and **богатѣа**, both 11b (Luke 12:21).

As for the distribution of **ъ** and **ь**, the letter **ъ** is mainly written in medial position and in the prepositions **въ**, **къ**, and **съ**, in the conjunction **иъ** and in the pronoun **тъ**, whereas **ь** as a rule is written in word-final position. Contrary to this principle, however, **ъ** is written finally almost 80x, in the following categories: 1) 11x in the genitive plural of nouns (vs. 1x with **ь**); 2) 17x in words of Greek origin (vs. 16x with **ь**); 3) 22x in certain abbreviated words: **сѣнь** (**сѣиень**) 16x, **бѣ** (**богъ**) 2x, **гѣль** (**глаголъ**) 2x, **дѣхъ** (**дохъ**) 1x, **блѣ** (**благъ**) 1x (vs. **гб** [**господь**] 10x, **днь** [**день**] 3x). In the lexeme **чловѣкъ** the choice between **ъ** and **ь** is possibly correlated to number, with **члѣ** 3x vs. **члѣ** 1x in the nominative singular, and **члѣ** 2x in the genitive plural, included in the 11x above. The remaining examples with final **ъ** comprise various categories. Worth noting, however, is that the aorist **приѣтъ** 8a (Luke 5:26) is the only verb-form attested with final **ъ**,²¹ this can be compared with 110 attestations—this includes 75 present tense forms, 32 participles, and 3 imperatives—of verb-forms with final **ь**.

The letter **ѣ** is consistently written for OChSl **ѣ**. In addition, **ѣ** is written once for OChSl **ѣ** in the imperative **нѣ|бѣитѣ|сѣ** 18a (Matt. 17:7). The variant **ѣ** is written 2x at the end of a line, in **прѣ|столѣ** 17a and **ѣсѣ|ни** 18a.

²¹ The participle соущимъ 16b, cited by Wesslén, in the original reads соущимъ.

2.2.2.4. The *o*-letters

The letters **о**, **о̇**, **ӧ**, **о̉**, **ѡ**, and **ѣ** are written for OChSl **о**, **ѡ**, and in some instances for OChSl **ѣ** (e.g. in **по плоти** 17b). The distribution of the *o*-letters in F is exhaustively discussed in Steensland 1987, and here only a limited description, based on the latter investigation, will be given.

In word-initial position the letter **ѡ** is written 114x, including 86x in the prefix/preposition **ѡтъ** (normally written **ѡ**). The variant **ѣ** is written 2x, once in the interjection **ѣ** 3a and once in the preposition **ѡтъ** (**ѣ** 5a). The variant **ӧ** is attested once in **ѡчи** 18a. The remaining cases are divided between initial **ӧ** in c. 60x vs. initial **о̇** in c. 10x. As the latter variants are sometimes difficult to separate, the extra-wide **ӧ** will in the following be reproduced identically to the 'normal' wide **о̇**.

In post-vocalic position **ѡ** is written 18x, mainly in words of Greek origin, and **о̇** is written only 3x.

In post-consonantal position **ѡ** is written 65x, **о̇** 273x, and **ӧ** 406x. In the same lexemes both **ѡ** and **о̇** alternate with **ӧ**, but never with each other. An interesting detail in the distribution of **ӧ** and **о̇** is the much higher frequency of **о̇** than of **ӧ**, notwithstanding their general frequency, in the position immediately following the consonant **п**. As for the possible connection between the letter **ѡ** and ictus, see section 4.3.4, below.

2.2.2.5. Other vowel letters

The letters **и** and **ї** (**и** is attested in a few cases) are written for OChSl **и** and once for OChSl **ы** in the infinitive **посылати** 4b. **ї** is written before vowels and sometimes at the end of lines, consistently in **їѣ** (**исоусъ**), and in certain other words of Greek origin, whereas **и** is mainly written before consonants. At boundaries between clitics and main words within accentual units (see below, section 2.3.1) there are no clearcut rules for the distribution of **и** and **ї**; cf., for example, **прї ѡзерѣ** 6a (2x), **при ѡвїѡарѣ** 16b, **нї єдиноѡ** 4a, **ї ѡставї ю** 7b.

The letter **ы** is consistently written for OChSl **ы**, and 7x for OChSl **и** in various forms of the lexeme **изити**; cf. **йзыде** 3a, **йзыдї** 6a, **йзыде** 6a, **йзыдї** 7a, **не йзыдѣте** 12a, **йзыде** 12b, **изыде** 13a. Forms of **вѣнити**, however, are consistently written with **и**; cf. **вѣн-ити** 5a, **вѣнїде** 5b, 7a, **вѣниде** 12b, 16b, **вѣнїде** 16b, **вѣнїд-ошѡ** 18b.

The letter **у** is written 5x for OChSl **ѡу** in ligatures (**ѡ лук** 12a, 12b, 17b [2x in titles], **рѡї сѡ** 17a).

The letter **ѡ** is written 2x for OChSl **ѡу** in ligatures on the same line (**на ѡрї**, **ѡ лук** both 17b:16) and once in the genitive singular **їѡ** 18b of **исоусъ**.

The letter **ѡ** is written 4x for OChSl **и** in words of Greek origin (**и вѣс'сонѣ** 9b, **ѡгвѣпѡныни** 17b, **мѡсїи** 18a, **мѡвѣѡви** 18a).

2.2.3. Consonant letters

The following consonant letters are attested in the manuscript: **б, в, ѿ, г, д, ж, з, ѕ, к, л, м, н, п, р, с, т, т̃, ф, х, ц, ч, ш, щ, ѿ**.

2.2.3.1. The letters **з, ѕ**, and **с**

The letter **з** is written 123x in F. Approximately half of these cases (66x) pertain to the prefixes/prepositions **въз** 23x, **из** 19x, **за** 15x, **раз** 5x, and **бѣз** 4x. In the remaining 57 cases **з** is written for OChSl **з** (reflecting CSI *z) in e.g. **пока́зати** 5b, **призва** 4b (2x), **прї ѿзѣрѣ** 6a (2x), **на| землї** 5a. In addition, **з** is written in words of Greek origin as e.g. **на тра́пезѣ** 14b, **лазарѣ** 9b, **зеведѣова** 7a. The letter **з** is also written 6x for OChSl **с** in the adverb **сѣде** (**здѣ** 4a, 5b, 12a [2x], 18a [2x]). It is worth noting that **з** is never written in positions where reflexes of either the second or third palatalization are reconstructed.

The letter **ѕ** is written twice, in **сѣзидоу** 11b and **сквозѣ** 16a.

The letter **с** is written once as a figure in the title **срѣдѣ. ѿ. нѣ. ѿуѣ**. 10b, and 10x in the words **мнѡси** 4a, **въ дроуѣтъ** 6b, the imperatives **врѣ|си сѣ** 1a and **въврѣсѣте** 6b, the aorist **ѿгѡбси сѣ** 11b, **сѣтѡсаа́хоу сѣ** 6a, **протрѣ|сааше же сѣ** 6b, **въстрѣсающе** 16a, **сѣло** 18a, **сѣло** 5b, respectively. As is clear from these examples, **с** in most cases here reflects the results of the second (in **мнѡси**, **въ дроуѣтъ**, **врѣ|си сѣ**, **въврѣсѣте**, **сѣло/сѣло**) or third palatalization (**сѣтѡсаа́хоу сѣ**, **протрѣ|сааше же сѣ**, **въстрѣсающе**), respectively.

To sum up, the letters **з** and **с** are on the whole written etymologically, **з** reflecting CSI *z, whereas **с** reflects the outcome of the second or third palatalization of CSI *g.

2.2.3.2. Other consonant letters

The letter **ѿ**, which is normally written for OChSl **ѿ**, is also written once for OChSl **з** in **ѿс корабли** 6b.²²

The letter **ѿ** is written once in the name **ѿвїаѿарѣ** 16b and once as a figure in the title **нѣ. ѿ. ѿуѣ. ѿ []** 11b.

The variant **ѿ** of the letter **в** is written 5x, in **ѿзлѣзѣ** 6a, **ѿидѣвѣ-же** 7a, **ѿниде** 7b, **ѿ срѣ** 17b, and **ѿзѣше** 18a.

The variant **с** of the letter **с** is written 21x, in **исоусѣ** (**їс** 14x [vs. **їс** 12x as well as **їс**- in oblique cases 12x]), **христосѣ** (**хс** 7b), **сѣ** 18a,

²² Regressive assimilation of voice, however, is not reflected universally; cf. **ѿзѣ сѣнища** 7b.

сѣи ж[3b, слышав же 9a, 9b (vs. слыш- 2b, 4a, 15b, 18a), слѹжба 18a, and сѣкрѣиваите же 16a.

The variant **Т** of the letter **т** is written 3x near the end of a line, in ѿчѣсѣѡѣ| BAN 4.9.7:1v, сїкѣѡѢа·| 17b, and погѣиѢи| 18b.

2.2.4. Letters above the line

According to Wesslén, 'There is also a tendency to place the letters **д**, **м**, **х**, **т** above the line even when there is no *titlo*. [...] this phenomenon became increasingly common in the fifteenth century.'²³ The total number of letters above the line in the manuscript is 454. Leaving aside the 47 instances at the end of lines, the distribution of the remaining letters above the line, either with or without *titlo* (cf. section 2.3.1), is shown in Table 1.²⁴

Table 1. Letters above the line in F not at the end of a line.

	With <i>titlo</i>	Without <i>titlo</i>	Total
т in ѿ	0	59	59
Remaining т	26	21	47
д	0	77	77
с	63	0	63
м	1	54	55
ч in the aorist рече	49	0	49
Remaining ч	11	2	13
х	0	20	20
Other letters ²⁵	19	5	24
Total	169	238	407

As we can see, the statement by Wesslén describes the distribution fairly well. Note, however, that all instances but one of **д**, **м**, and **х** above the line occur without *titlo*, whereas **т**, not counting the cliché ѿ, occurs approximately as often with as without *titlo*.

According to Ščepkin, in ESl manuscripts from the first half of the fifteenth century, with the exception of **т** in ѿ, only **д** will normally occur above the line without *titlo*. In manuscripts from the second half of this century, however, **ж**, **з**, **м**, and **х** above the line without *titlo* are also attested. Subsequently (in manuscripts from the beginning of the sixteenth century and later) **б**, **г**, **р**, and **и** above the line without *titlo* also occur

²³ Wesslén 1985:158.

²⁴ As Ščepkin (1967:135) states, it is important to distinguish between occurrences of letters above the line in line-medial and line-final position 'ибо в конце строки надстрочные выносы нередко бывают вынужденными и потому более произвольными.'

²⁵ With *titlo*: **к**, **н**, **б**, **в**, **р**, and **о**, altogether 19x. Without *titlo*: **ж** 1x, **о** 2x (in titles). In addition, the enclitic **же** is written once above the line, without *titlo*, on page 9a.

more frequently.²⁶ According to these criteria, manuscript F can be dated more precisely to the second half of the fifteenth century, thus approximately conforming with the view of Bubnov *et al.* 1976, dating the BAN parts of F to the fifteenth century (end)–sixteenth century (beginning).²⁷

2.2.5. Punctuation marks

Among the punctuation marks, in addition to the full stop and the comma only the *stišica* or *statija* (::~),²⁸ indicating the end of the reading for a certain day, is attested in F.

2.2.6. Deviations from OChSl orthography

While classifying and discussing orthographic features in the different varieties of ChSl it is important to distinguish between features *within* the orthographic norms ('intrinsic' features),²⁹ and features which, while characteristic of a certain variety, nevertheless must be considered as falling *outside* the boundaries of the norms for the variety in question ('extrinsic' features).³⁰ The most important deviations from OChSl orthography attested in F are the following (cf. sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3, above):

1) The consistent use of ѿ instead of ꙗ and ѿ instead of ꙗ. This feature is intrinsic both to Russian and Serbian MChSl.

2) The partly non-etymological distribution of the letters ѿ, а, and ꙗ constitutes a feature intrinsic at least to Russian MChSl.³¹ The actual distribution, however, differs between the different sources. Not in accordance with the Russian MChSl orthography, on the other hand, is the consistent spelling with initial ѿ of the lexeme ꙗзыкъ (ἔθνος 'people'), as the two main meanings of this lexeme often are orthographically distinguished, ꙗзыкъ corresponding to ἔθνος, whereas the spelling ꙗзыкъ indicates the meaning γλῶσσα 'tongue'.³² The spelling with initial ѿ (or ꙗ) in both meanings of this lexeme, however, is well attested in MBlg sources.³³

²⁶ Ščepkin 1967:134f.

²⁷ Bubnov *et al.* 1976:178.

²⁸ Cf. Jagić 1896/1968:407, 507f.

²⁹ Note, however, the presence of a certain permitted variability within the norms.

³⁰ Cf., for example, the discussion, with other terms, in Uspenskij 1987:73 and H. Tóth 1988:306f.

³¹ Uspenskij 1987:84, 205f.

³² Cf. Uspenskij 1987:219f.

³³ Cf., for example, Scholvin 1884:46, Talev 1973:337, Hinrichs 1985:38f, Dybo 1973:158f.

3) The spellings with ѡ instead of OChSl ꙗ in ВЪНАТРѢ 12a and the present tense first person singular рѣѡ 9b are both intrinsic to Bulgarian MChSl.³⁴

4) The spelling with **н** instead of OChSl **ѣ** in **патеѣ** 13b, 15a has parallels both in MBlg and some ESl sources, although most ESl sources retain the spelling with **ѣ**.³⁵

5) The spelling with **ѣ** instead of **ж** in **ѣ НЕ ОУСѣМНИТЕ СЯ** 1a (Matt. 21:21) can also be considered a Bulgarism, albeit extrinsic, as the spelling with a *jer* (**ѣ** or **ь**) is attested e.g. in the MBlg sources Ban., Ev. 1355/56, and Kochn., whereas both ESl and Serbian sources here show spellings with **ж** or **оу**.³⁶

6) The largely positionally determined distribution of the *jer*-letters ѣ and ѥ has parallels mainly in Bulgarian and Serbian MChSl, but is also attested in Russian MChSl during the period of the Second South Slavic Influence.³⁷

7) Parallels to the occasionally occurring spellings with **◆** instead of OChSl **◆** are attested as early as in the OChSl manuscripts. During the MChSl period, however, such spellings are more characteristic of ES1 than of SS1 sources.

8) Parallels to the spellings with ѡ instead of OChSl еъ in **мрѡтъѡ-**
цѡ 11a and **сѡѡтит сѡ** 12a are sporadically attested in the MBlg
sources Ban., Ev. 1355/56, Kochn., Zogr. sb., as well as the Bosnian
Čajn.—in all cases, however, probably extrinsic to the respective norm.³⁸

9) The spelling with **и** instead of OChSl **ы** in **посѣлати** 4b:7 (vs. **посѣлати** 4b:11) conforms to the orthographic norms of Bulgarian MChSl and is well attested in many MBlg sources as e.g. Ban. and Ev. 1355/56.³⁹

10) The occurrence of contraction in the imperfect, as in e.g. **ИМАШЕ** 2a, **ХѢТАШЕ** 5a, **МНАХОУ** 5a, **БАХОУ** 6b, **ЙДАШЕ** 9a, is attested in the OChSl manuscripts. The spelling of the contracted forms with **ѡ**, however, is paralleled mainly in ESl sources, whereas MBlg sources normally show spellings with **ѣ**.⁴⁰

³⁴ Note, however, that Birnbaum (1961:229) does not find it necessary to consider $\text{r}\bar{\text{a}}$ in F as reflecting a Middle Bulgarian influence, pointing out the possibility of an error on the part of the scribe.

³⁵ Cf., for example, Talev 1973:329ff, Mirčev 1978:117, Kossek 1986:28f, Koneski 1966:10f, 38, Horálek 1954:79.

³⁶ Cf., for example, Talev 1973:325, 330f, Žukovskaja 1973:35, Hinrichs 1985:119f, Wijk 1931:142, Mirčev 1978:112, Uspenskij 1987:206f.

³⁷ Cf., for example, Mošin 1973:69, Vasilev 1980:411f, Uspenskij 1987:206f, Scholvin 1884:33ff.

³⁸ Cf. Talev 1973:63, Dybo 1987:188, Dogramadžieva, Rajkov 1981:29, Kossek 1986:17, 27, Koneski 1966:48f, Mirčev 1978:147, Jerković 1975:113.

³⁹ Scholvin 1884:40. MBIG sources normally retain the distinction between **и** and **ы** (**у**) with the exception of the lexemes **мынѣ** and **-смыати**, both consistently spelt with **и**. In Serbian sources, on the other hand, the letters **и** and **ы** (**у**) are normally used indiscriminately; cf. e.g. Steensland 1990:17f.

⁴⁰ Cf. Scholvin 1884:211f. Uspenskij 1987:127. Mirčev 1978:215.

11) The spelling with final **-и** in the locative singular instead of OChSl **-ии** as attested in **въ царствѣ бж҃ѣи** 2a (Matt. 21:31), **въ ѿчѣствѣ** 4a (Mark 6:4), and **въ плѣвани** 5a (Mark 6:48) requires a comment of its own. The form **въ царствѣ** is listed by Wesslén as an instance of 'и instead of ѣ', and in the glossary it is cited as the only representative in F of the lexeme **цѣсарьство**, contrasting with nine occurrences of the lexeme **цѣсарьствѣ** (**цр҃ствѣ** 2b, 3b, 11a, 12a [3x], 14b, **и царьствѣю** 17a, **въ цр҃ствѣи** 11a [Luke 9:62]).⁴¹ As even the attested forms in F indicate, this analysis is highly problematic. Further, in the OChSl sources investigated by Talev, no instances of the locative singular ***цр҃ствѣ** are attested, whereas the corresponding form of **цѣсарьствѣ** is well attested.⁴² As for the spelling with a single **-и**, attested also in **въ ѿчѣствѣ** and **въ плѣвани**, corresponding forms of various neuter nouns (not only verbal nouns ending in **-никѣ**) are well attested in MBlg sources, probably conforming with the orthographic norms,⁴³ as well as sporadically in both Ass. (Matt. 13:43) and Sav. (Luke 13:28) (cf. also section 5.3.1.4).

12) The spelling with final **ѣ** instead of OChSl **ѣ** in the imperative plural **нѣ бѡитѣ сѧ** 18a (Matt. 17:7) can be explained as an error on behalf of the scribe. Note, however, that the ending **-итѣ**, indicating the imperative dual feminine (*sic*), is attested both in MBlg sources and in Smotr. 1619.⁴⁴ In addition, final **ѣ** instead of OChSl **ѣ** is also attested 2x in the aorist dual in Ev. 1355/56 as well as in the present tense second person dual in both Ev. 1355/56 and MB.⁴⁵ As suggested by the presence of these examples, the spelling **нѣ бѡитѣ сѧ** might after all not be due to mere chance, but could possibly fit in among the other orthographic 'Bulgarisms'.

13) The spelling with **ѧ** in the imperative **ишѧте** 10b (2x) (Luke 11:9) has parallels early in the OChSl manuscripts as well as in the MBlg Ban. and Ev. 1355/56,⁴⁶ whereas both Mst. and Ostr. normally show the imperative ending **-ѣте** in verbs of this type.⁴⁷

⁴¹ Wesslén 1985:160, 286, here differing from the interpretation in Birnbaum 1961:231.

⁴² Talev 1973:309f. Note, however, that Mst. has **въ ц(с)рствѣ бж҃ѣи** 3x in Matt. 21:31 (49c, 131c, 184a).

⁴³ Cf., for example, Kochn. 77r **въ цр҃ствѣ своем** (Luke 23:42), Scholvin 1884:168ff, as well as the Serbian Ev. No. 3 **царствѣ** (Luke 9:62, Widnäs 1970:217).

⁴⁴ Cf., for example, Ev. 1355/56 85v **нѣ бѡитѣ сѧ** (Matt. 28:5), 85v **рѣитѣ сѧ** (Matt. 28:9), Kochn. 79v **нѣ бѡитѣ сѧ** (Matt. 28:5), Smotr. 1619 p7v **творѣитѣ**, Horbatsch 1964:16, 1974:IV, XVII (note 38).

⁴⁵ Ev. 1355/56 29r **ѿверзѡстѣ сѧ** (Matt. 9:30), 210r **оудръжастѣ сѧ** (Luke 24:16), 190v **бждѣтѣ** (Luke 17:35), MB **боудѣтѣ** (Schweier 1987:115).

⁴⁶ Cf. Leskien 1910:158f, Diels 1932:230f, 268, Wijk 1931:217f, Scholvin 1884:210f.

⁴⁷ Note, however, Ostr. 275c **ишѧте** (Luke 11:9), by Vostokov (1843/1964:138) characterized as 'болгарское'.

14) The nominative plural ending in **-иѣ** of masculine *jo*-stems as in **рыбарѣѣ же ба** (Luke 5:2)⁴⁸ and **моужіѣ** 15a (Luke 22:63) is not uncommon in SS1 sources, thus constituting an additional South Slavonic feature in the orthography of F.⁴⁹

To sum up, the most striking deviation from OChSl orthography in F is the consistent use of the letters **ѡу** and **ѡ** for OChSl **ѡ** and **ѡ**, respectively. This feature is intrinsic in both Russian and Serbian MChSl, but the complete absence of the similarly intrinsic **ѣ** for OChSl **ѣ** and **ѣ** in Serbian MChSl makes it possible to characterize the language of the manuscript as Russian MChSl. Not conforming with the norms of this variety are a not insignificant number of orthographic features with more or less well-attested parallels mainly in MBlg sources, of which at least some can be considered as conforming with the norms of Bulgarian MChSl.⁵⁰ Features of an unambiguously Serbian character—whether intrinsic or extrinsic—are, however, completely absent from the orthography of F.

2.3. Diacritical marks

2.3.1. Introduction

Our present purpose in clarifying the different functions of the diacritical marks is to obtain a basis for the analysis of the accentuation in F. In this perspective what is primarily of interest is the *prosodic* functions of the diacritical marks. To decide which diacritical marks in which positions possess such functions, a possible strategy is to try to eliminate all instances with non-prosodic functions. At best, this will leave a 'kernel' of instances where the diacritical marks exhibit prosodic functions.⁵¹

The most important prosodic function is in the present connection assumed to be that of marking the vowel which bears main stress, the 'ictus',⁵² in an accentual unit (AU).⁵³ This term in the present investiga-

⁴⁸ Indicated with 'sic!' in Wesslén 1985:171. Cf. also Birnbaum 1961:227f.

⁴⁹ Cf., for example, Koch. 40v **рыбаріѣ же** (Luke 5:2), Kossek 1986:37, 80, Mirčev 1978:166, Scholvin 1884:171f, Jerković 1975:143, Koneski 1966:116.

⁵⁰ Thus, in Cleminson 1988:114 the language of BL Add. MS 34386, f. 29 (=F 12) is characterized as 'Bulgaro-Russian Church Slavonic'. Note, however, the complete absence in F of the typically Bulgarian MChSl spelling **нѡ** for the OChSl conjunction **нѡ**; cf., e.g., Žukovskaja 1973:35, Talev 1973:328f.

⁵¹ The kind of analysis which tacitly or overtly assumes that all diacritics in all positions always either *have* or *do not have* prosodic functions must in this connection be rejected (cf., e.g., Lindgren 1990, Ohijenko 1932). See further section 3.1.1, below.

⁵² I.e. the vowel which is dynamically or tonally most emphasized. The exact phonetic realization of this emphasis has at the present no importance for the discussion.

⁵³ Other current terms are the synonymous 'phonetic word' or 'tact group'. The term 'accentual unit' is used in for example Birnbaum 1986:130 and Schweier 1987 ('Akzentinheit').

tion will refer to both a prosodic unit (on the phonetic level) and a sequence of letters (on the graphic level). In the latter case reference is made—analogously with the state on the phonetic level—to *all* such units of a given text, irrespective of the presence or absence of diacritical marks marking ictus.⁵⁴

An AU consists of a main, normally autosemantic, word, optionally preceded by one or more proclitics (monosyllabic prepositions, monosyllabic noun and verbal prefixes, the conjunctions **а**, **и**, **нѣ**, the particles **нѣ**, **ни**, **да**) and/or optionally followed by one or more enclitics (the pronoun forms **мѣ**, **тѣ**, **сѣ**, **ми**, **ти**, **си**, **и** (**нѣ**), **ю**, **ѣ**, **ны**, **бы**, the particles **бо**, **же**, **ли**, and in certain instances the verbal forms **бѣ**, **бы**, **ѣсмь**, **ѣси**, **ѣсть**, **ѣсмѣ**, **ѣсте**, **ѣста**, the particle **сѣ**, and monosyllabic forms of the demonstrative pronouns **сѣ** and **тѣ**).⁵⁵

Note. Some scholars use the notion AU or one of its counterparts to—besides the above mentioned cases—also denote sequences comprising pronouns in the nominative, more than one autosemantic word etc. However, these additional sequences do not seem to appear as prosodic units with the same regularity as the former types. In order to avoid possible problems with the interpretation of certain sequences as one or two AU (the solutions of which largely would be dependent on extra-linguistic criteria), the term in question has been deliberately defined in a narrow manner here (cf., e.g., Zaliznjak 1985a:118, 120f, Dybo 1971c:83, Hinrichs 1985:31ff, 1989:333f).

By definition, every AU is assumed to contain only *one* syllable with ictus. It cannot, however, be excluded that an AU in addition can contain syllables with secondary stress (e.g. in compounds), or other quantitatively or tonally emphasized syllables.

The following diacritical marks are attested in F:⁵⁶

- ˙ (*oksia*, *acute*) is written 477x above post-consonantal, non-final vowels, as well as 17x above the letters **а** and **и** in post-vocalic position.
- ˘ (*varia*, *grave*) is written 60x above final vowels in di- and polysyllabic words as well as 6x above medial vowels.
- ˆ (*kamora*) is written 72x above post-consonantal medial and final vowels in di- and polysyllabic words.
- ˜ (*kendema*) is written 76x above final, mostly post-consonantal vowels in monosyllabic words, as well as 8x in disyllabic and once in a polysyllabic word.
- ˘˘ (*iso*) is written approximately 300x above initial and 11x above post-vocalic medial vowels.
- ˙˙ (*psili*, *spiritus lenis*) is written more than 460x above initial as well as post-vocalic, medial or final, vowels.

⁵⁴ Cf. Schweier 1987:42f.

⁵⁵ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:143, 145.

⁵⁶ For the respective designations cf., e.g., Bulatova 1973:78ff, 1975:54. The terms 'post-consonantal', 'post-vocalic', 'initial', 'final' etc. refer to positions in lexical words.

- “ (*double oksia*) is written once, in the word **мѣшлѣаше** 11b.
- ˘ (*dasia, spiritus asper*) in various shapes is written once above an initial vowel (in **ѡша** 7a) and 5x above vowels in post-vocalic position (in **сѣнѣдаѣте** 3b, **даѣте** 8b, **марїамъ** 17a, **раѣаѣмоѣ** 17a, **мѡѡ-сѣѡви** 18a).
- ˘ (*velikij apostrof*) and ˘ (*apostrof*) are written altogether 6x above words consisting of a single vowel, in the interjection **ѡ** 3a (Matt. 17:17), the conjunction **а** 2b, 11b (2x), 16b, and the pronoun **и** 2b (Matt. 21:44). In the latter five examples the two diacritical marks cannot be distinguished. *Velikij apostrof* above the interjection **ѡ** constitutes a graphic cliché, well attested in sources with various backgrounds.⁵⁷
- ˘ (*titlo*) is written 261x above traditional abbreviations, 186x above certain letters above the line (of which 17x at the end of a line; cf. section 2.2.4), 4x above various forms of the name **иѡанъ**, as well as above letters used as figures (in titles). As for the shape of this diacritical mark, no distinction is made between the use of *titlo* above abbreviations and above letters above the line, respectively. The *titlo* variant ˘ is used 30x, however, of which 25 are attested on fols. 17–18; it is always above traditional abbreviations.⁵⁸
- ˘ (*trema*) is, with some exceptions, consistently written above the letter **і** and in a few cases above **ѡ**, thus forming the complex graphemes **ї** and **ѡ̃**, as indicated by occurrence of *oksia* e.g. in **сїмоѡновъ** 7a and **ївѣсѣсонъ** 9b. In addition, *trema* is written once above **ы** in **мѣта-ре** 2a.
- ˘ (*paerok*) is written 42x between consonants instead of a *jer* letter.

Among the diacritical marks *psili*, *titlo*, *trema*, and *paerok* traditionally have no prosodic functions.⁵⁹ Their attested distribution does not alter the assumption that the same is valid for F. As for *velikij apostrof* and *apostrof*, the limited number of occurrences and the fact that they are only attested in words consisting of a single vowel makes it impossible to draw any well-founded conclusions about their possible prosodic functions in the manuscript. The remaining diacritical marks, tentatively referred to as ‘accent marks’, will be discussed below, distinguishing between occurrences above vowel letters in post-consonantal, post-vocalic, and initial position, respectively.

⁵⁷ Cf., for example, Uspenskij 1987:214, Vasilev 1980:410, Jagić 1896/1968:139, 443, 454. In Smotr. 1619 *velikij apostrof* is used in certain meanings of the interjections **ѡ**, **а**, and **юѡ**, the conjunction **ѡѡѡ**, as well as in certain forms of the pronouns **иже**, whereas *apostrof* is used in certain forms of the pronoun **и** (Smotr. 1619 **и7v ff**, **ѡ6v**, **ѡ7v**, **ѡ7v**).

⁵⁸ On the distinction between *titlo* (above traditional abbreviations) and *pokrytie* (above letters above the line) see e.g. Bulatova 1973:78.

⁵⁹ In some manuscripts, however, *psili* is used exclusively above unstressed vowels; cf. Vasil'ev 1929/1972:153 [617].

2.3.2. *Post-consonantal position*2.3.2.1. *Oksia*

Oksia is written above most vowel letters in post-consonantal, medial position. As *oksia* is in absolute figures the most common accent mark in F, and occurs twice in the same AU only 4x (cf. section 2.3.6), nothing prevents the assumption that post-consonantal *oksia* as a rule indicates ictus in F.

In some sources, however, the presence of *oksia* above ѣ or ѥ does not indicate the position of ictus but rather that the *jer* letter really is pronounced, forming a separate syllable, and not merely an 'orthographic remnant' of an earlier pronunciation.⁶⁰ Except in prefixes and prepositions, the letter ѣ is written in medial position with *oksia* in altogether c. 50% of the attested cases (38x out of 76x), whereas ѥ is written with *oksia* in only c. 17% of the attested cases (4x out of 24x).

Among the AU with accentuated ѣ, probably almost all in syllabic positions, 19x refer to the sequence рѣ and 6x to лѣ.⁶¹ The instances of ѣ without any accent marks, on the other hand, are distributed between mostly syllabic рѣ 11x, mostly syllabic лѣ 4x, other syllabic ѣ 6x, and probably asyllabic ѣ 17x.⁶²

Among the AU with accentuated ѥ (безъ чѣлѣсти 4a, да ничѣсоже 4b, сънѣмъ 13b, чѣли 16b), probably all but чѣли comprise syllabic ѥ, whereas the unaccentuated ѥ, in за невѣрѣствѣе 3a, изъютры-юдоу 10a, члѣбскыи etc. 12x, въ ѿчѣствѣе BAN 4.9.7:1v, въ ѿчѣствѣи 4a, за безъѣчѣство 10a, ѣ царѣствѣю 17a, нѣынымъ 11a, зачѣнешѣи 17a, are probably all asyllabic.

Thus, it is possible to discern in F a certain degree of correlation between the presence of *oksia* above ѣ and (particularly) ѥ and the 'syllabicity' of the *jer* letter. The presence of as many as 22 instances of syllabic, unaccentuated ѣ, comprising c. 60% of the total number of un-

⁶⁰ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:207.

⁶¹ Cf. ѣ повѣрѣга 6a, ѣ вѣрѣстѣе 6b, ѿверѣзетъ сѧ 10b (2x), ѣ ѿверѣзетъ сѧ 10b (2x), ѿверѣже сѧ 13a, ѿверѣжешѣи сѧ 13b, ѡдрѣжаашѣ 7a, зрѣно 3a, мрѣтѣмъ 11a, прѣвыи 2a, къ прѣвомѣу 2a, рѣши 9a, прѣтрѣсаашѣ 6b, вѣстрѣсающе 16a, трѣплю 3a, чрѣвъ 16a, ни чрѣвъ 16a, млѣнѣи 12a, ѣ исплѣниша 6b, тлѣщѣе 10b (2x), ѣ тлѣкоушѣомѣу 10b (2x), тѣкмо 1a, 4a, 4b (2x), 16b, тѣкмо 18a, не тѣкмо 1a, вѣнъ 13a, мѣзда 8b, ѣсѣе 1a (2x), тѣща 7b, тѣщѣно 9a.

⁶² Cf. вѣрѣси сѧ 1a, вѣвѣргоу 6b, ѡдрѣжѣма 7b, дрѣзѣнтѣ 5b, крѣвѣю 14b, прѣрѣцѣи 13a, ѡутѣрѣли 18b, ѡ четѣрѣтѣи 5a, ѣ изѣвлѣше 7a, прѣмѣлѣчѣи 6a, ѣ исплѣниша 8a, тѣкмо 3b, ѡдѣжи 12b, съѣтитъ сѧ 12a, сѣи 3b, сѣтѣникъ 9a, мрѣтѣвѣи 11a, as well as рѣи 15b, ѣ рѣцѣта 14a, ѡставѣлѣше 7a, мѣнѣмъ 8b, вѣспѣтъ 11a, погрѣбѣлѣсти 11a, вѣзрѣвѣли 13a, ѣзѣютрѣюдоу 10a, вѣси 7b, вѣлѣи 1b, вѣси 5b, вѣсѣ 12b, вѣсѣ 11b, вѣсѣ 5b, 12b, ѣ вѣсѣ 1a, 7a, на вѣсѣ 6a, вѣсѣк 10b, вѣсѣк 10b, probably with asyllabic ѣ.

accentuated ѣ, however, indicates that this principle was not consistently followed by the scribe of F. Consequently, the possibility of a connection between the presence of *oksia* above ѣ and ѣ and the position of ictus cannot be excluded.

2.3.2.2. *Varia*

Varia is normally written above most vowel letters in final position, i.e. in complementary distribution with *oksia*. Above vowels in medial position *varia* is attested only in the AU сѣ сѣбѣлюденіѣмъ 12a, тѣтѣ 16a, ѣ дѣашѣ 4b, кѣи 2a, ѡ бѣѡю 2a, and ѣ падѣи 2b. Parallels to this use of medial *varia* can be found in sources with different backgrounds.⁶³ In no case is *varia* written together with another accent mark in the same AU. Consequently, nothing seems to prevent an assumption that *varia* above post-consonantal vowels indicates ictus in F.

2.3.2.3. *Kendema*

Kendema is written mainly above the vowel letters ы, ѣ, а, е, and ѣ (in falling order of frequency) in monosyllabic words such as вѣ, тѣ, нѣ, сѣи, тѣи, дѣа, гдѣ, здѣ, and ѣѣ. Often these words constitute parts of longer AU; cf., e.g., вѣ же 2b, вѣ бо 3b, за вѣ 14b (2x), ѣ мѣ 16b, тѣ же 11a, на тѣ 17a, къ мѣ 10a, ѣ зрѣ 11a, ни тѣ 16a, не сѣи ли 4a. *Kendema* is also written above the di- and polysyllabic words вѣмѣ 1b, ѣдѣ 10b (vs. ѣдѣ 10b), злѣа 8b, the infinitive ѣтѣ 18b, the present participle simple form ѣмѣ 16b (Mark 3:1),⁶⁴ and помѣшлѣахѡу 1b. With the exception of не вѣмѣ *kendema* is never written together with *oksia* or *varia* in the same AU. Consequently, at least in di- and polysyllabic words, *kendema* above post-consonantal vowels can probably be assumed to indicate ictus in F.⁶⁵

2.3.2.4. *Kamora*

Kamora is written mainly above the vowel letters е, и, and оу in medial and final position in both mono- and polysyllabic words. In approximately half of the attestations the vowel with *kamora* is preceded by one of the sonorants м, н, л, or р. In many cases the use of *kamora* seems to be connected with the presence of a certain morphological category or

⁶³ In some sources medial *varia* occur with negatively colored lexemes or with other non-prosodic meanings; cf. Dybo 1981:263, Zaliznjak 1985a:207.

⁶⁴ Note, however, that in this place some sources have the compound form имѣи; cf. Mst. 124b соухѡу рѣкоу имѣи, Ev. 1627 151r ѣхѣ имѣи рѣкѣ vs. Mar. соухѣ рѣкѣ имѣи, M 267v соухѡу ѣмѣ рѣкоу.

⁶⁵ For more data on the use of *kendema* in various sources see Steensland 1990:26, 35ff.

lexeme. Thus, *kamora* is written 14x above the final -и in the imperative second person singular,⁶⁶ 16x in **ѿѿ**, and 4x in **тѿу**. A possibly 'semantic' *kamora* is also attested once in the AU **сѣкрѣваите ѿѿ** 16a (vs. the unaccentuated **нѣ сѣкрѣваите** 16a, **закрѣвше** 15a with the same root).⁶⁷ *Kamora* is never written together with either *oksia*, *varia*, or *kendema* in the same AU. Consequently, nothing seems to prevent an assumption that *kamora* as a rule indicates ictus in F.

Note. According to Wesslén, this diacritical mark 'marks palatalization' in F (Wesslén 1985:158). The same view was previously expressed by Sköld: 'Comme il n'est employé autrement que dans des positions où l'on peut présumer, qu'il a marqué un mouillement, l'on est autorisé à supposer que l'original de KB¹⁰ ou son original primitif a connu l'usage primitif du signe de mouillement. C'est cela un trait extrêmement archaïsant.' (Sköld 1927:11, 17). In quite a few of the attestations in F, however, the use of *kamora* to indicate palatalization seems thoroughly incredible: cf., e.g., the AU **ѿмѿу**, **ѿмѿу**, and **ѿмѿу** altogether 5x, **сѣмѿнѣ** including derivatives 5x, **тѿу** 4x, **мнѿга** 11b, **сѣкрѣваите ѿѿ** 16a, **ѿнѿ ѿѿ** 17a, **сѣлѿ** 18a (cf. also Steensland 1987:48).

2.3.2.5. Double *oksia*

Double oksia is written only once in F, in the AU **и мѣшлѣашѿ** 11b. As both *double oksia* and *kendema* in some other sources seem to occur particularly often with this root, possibly constituting some kind of graphic cliché,⁶⁸ nothing definite can be stated about a possible connection between *double oksia* and the position of ictus in F.

2.3.3. Post-vocalic position

2.3.3.1. *Oksia*

Oksia is written 17x in post-vocalic position, only above the vowel letters **а** and **и**, in **нѣ| боѿ сѣ** 7a, **нѣ бѣиѿ сѣ** 17a, **ѿѿ боѿшѿ** 2b, **прѿ-ѿдоутѿ** 12a, **и прѿѿдѣшѿ** 6b, **ѿѿкѣѿ** 18b, **и ѿѿѿ[]** 18b, **иѿѿѿѿна** 7a, **и лю|бѣѿѿѿѿ** 2a, **моѿми** 14a, **нѣ| достоѿшѿ** 16b, **достоѿнѿ** 9a, **достоѿна** 9a, **скѣѿѿ сѣѿнѿѿ** 16a, **ѿѿ тѿѿнѿ** 16a, **и сѣѿѿѿѿѿѿ сѣ** 6a, **прѿѿметѿ** 3b. At first sight, nothing seems to prevent the assumption that *oksia* in this position, as above vowels in post-consonantal position, also indicates ictus. Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that the position of *oksia*, at least above post-vocalic **и**, is determined by an orthographic rule requiring the accent mark, if any, to be

⁶⁶ Parallels to the use of *kamora* in the imperative are attested e.g. in Ev. 1355/56; cf. Scholvin 1884:56.

⁶⁷ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:207: 'Корень *крь-*, *кров-* 'tego, tectum' часто снабжается каморой (безотносительно к месту ударения) во многих рукописях XV–1 пол. XVI в.; камора своим видом как бы иллюстрирует здесь значение слова'.

⁶⁸ Cf., for example, Služ. No. 323 79v **и мѣсли**, 18v **пѣмѣшлѿнѿѿ**, 74v **пѣмѣшлѿнѿѿѿѿ** etc.

put above the *second* component of a (graphic) ‘diphthong’,⁶⁹ as orthographic systems comprising this kind of rules are attested in other sources, as e.g. in Služ. No. 323.⁷⁰ The only reliable counter-example to this rule is formed by the AU **вѡины** 9b, as the status of *oksia* above the letter **ѣ** immediately preceding **и**, as in the AU **ѣ прѣидѣ** 9b, **прѣити** 9a, **прѣидѣ** 2a, is problematic (cf. section 3.8.3.4). Thus, *oksia* above the letter **и** in post-vocalic position can tentatively be assumed to indicate ictus *either* on this *or* on the immediately preceding vowel.

2.3.3.2. *Iso*

Iso is written 4x above vowels in post-vocalic position in the AU **въ займѣ** 10a, **моѣи** 11b, **стоѡща** 6a, and **ѡйца** 10b as well as 8x in words of Greek origin (**при ѡвѣѡарѣ** 16b, **ѡрхиѣри** 1b, **гѡѡ-ргѣа** 17b, **ѡѡковоу** 4a, **ѡ ѡѡѡдѣ** 4a, **ѡѡѡдѣѡ** 3b, **ѡѡѡдѣискыѡ** 9a, **ѡѡѡдора** 17b). In the former group, nothing except the limited extent of the material seems to contradict the assumption that medial *iso* indicates ictus. Among the words of Greek origin, however, where medial *iso* is written 2x—i.e., in 25% of the attestations—together with *kamora* in the same AU, the presence of *iso* above post-vocalic vowels is probably not systematically related to the position of ictus.

2.3.3.3. *Varia*

Varia is written 6x above post-vocalic vowels, in the disyllabic words **сѣѡ** 4a, **сѣѡ** 1b, 2a, **моѡ** 11b, **моѡ** 14b, **твоѡ** 17a. In many sources *varia* above final, post-vocalic vowels does not indicate ictus, but rather constitutes an allograph or variant of *psili*, one more or less common in the position in question.⁷¹ The small number of attestations in F, however, rather supports the assumption that *varia* above post-vocalic vowels, as with post-consonantal vowels, indicates ictus in F.

2.3.3.4. *Kendema*

Kendema is written 3x above vowels in post-vocalic position, in the AU **сѣѡ** 1b (2x), 5b. The same word is also attested with *varia*, cf. **сѣѡ** 4a, which suggests that *kendema*, as well, indicates ictus in this position. The limited extent of the material as well as the fact that *kendema* is not seldom attested with various forms of this lexeme in many sources, how-

⁶⁹ Note, that in the AU **нѡѡѡѡѡ** 12b, **сѣтрѡѡѡѡѡ** 2b, and **чѡѡѡѡѡ** 8b *oksia* is put above the first vowel.

⁷⁰ Cf. Steensland 1990:25f, 46ff.

⁷¹ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:202, 207, Schweier 1987:45f.

ever, excludes any final statement on the function of post-vocalic *kendema* in F.

2.3.3.5. *Dasia*

Dasia (in slightly different shapes) is written 5x above vowels in post-vocalic position, in the AU **даѣте** 8b, **сънѣдаѣте** 3b, **марїамъ** 17a, **мѡѵсеѡви** 18a, **раѣаѣмоѣ** 17a. It cannot be excluded, however, that some of these AU do not comprise an 'original' *dasia*, but a similarly shaped variant of *iso*, as such variants are attested in other sources.⁷² The limited extent of the material makes the analysis problematic, but the fact that as many as two of the attested AU with *dasia* also contain another accent mark suggests that *dasia* above post-vocalic vowels is not used to indicate ictus in F.

2.3.4. *Initial position*

2.3.4.1. *Iso*

Iso is written approximately 300x above initial vowels. In c. 92% of these cases no other accent mark is attested in the same AU. In the remaining 8%, however—a high number compared with the number of AU with two accent marks, none of which is *iso* (cf. section 2.3.6)—*iso* is written together with *oksia* (**оѵбоаѡшѣ** 2b, **исплѣнишѣ** 6b, **ѡбрѣтаѣтъ** 10b, **ѡтрѡкъ** 3a, **исхѡдѣ** 6a), *varia* (**идѣ** 2a, **ѣдѣ** 10b [2x], **ѣгѡ** 4a, **ѣгѡ** 2b, 3a, **ѡѡѡю** 2a), *kamora* (**ѡрхїѣрѣѣ** 2b, 13b, 16b, **избавѣ** 10a, **идѣ** 8a, **изыдѣ** 6a, **ѡнѣ** 17a, **ѡнѣ** 1b, **ѡнѣ** 9a), and *kendema* (**ѣдѣ** 10b), respectively. In **при ѡвїѡѡартѣ** 16b the second accent mark is another *iso*, and in **ѡѡдѣѡ** two additional accent marks are attested. In addition, initial *iso* is particularly frequently written above the prefixes and/or prepositions **из**, **о**, **ѡв**, and **ѡу**, (for examples, cf. e.g. sections 3.8.3 and 3.8.4). Consequently, it must be assumed that at least in some AU initial *iso* appears as an allograph of *psili*, without indicating ictus. As there is no methodologically sound way at this stage of the analysis to distinguish between AU where initial *iso* does or does not indicate ictus, this excludes all AU accentuated only with initial *iso* from the accentologically relevant material in F.⁷³

Provided that this analysis is correct, we must in F assume the existence of an orthographic system according to which it is structurally impossible to indicate initial ictus in AU beginning in a vowel.⁷⁴ On the other hand,

⁷² Cf. Dybo 1971b:102, Bulatova 1975:65.

⁷³ Cf., for example, Zaliznjak 1985a:202, 204ff, Schweier 1987:45.

⁷⁴ Cf. Bulatova 1972:43.

the graphically natural assumption that *iso* simply combines the functions of its constituents, *oksia* indicating ictus, *psili* initial vowel,⁷⁵ leaves us with some distributional anomalies, e.g. the much higher proportion of accentuation on prepositions and prefixes beginning in a vowel than in a consonant.

Consequently, we must tentatively assume that initial *iso* in F appears both as an allograph of *oksia*, indicating ictus, and as an allograph of *psili*, not indicating ictus. At this stage of the analysis it cannot be determined which of the two types of *iso* appears in a given AU. Therefore, in the analysis in Chapter 3 the AU accentuated only with initial *iso* will be presented separately from the other accentuated AU (cf. section 3.1.5).

Note. It is to be regretted that explicit discussion of the functions of *iso* above initial vowels is often missing in accentological investigations. For example, Hinrichs (1985:19f) states, without motivation, that *iso* above both initial and medial vowels in Ps. No. 3 and Sof. služ. has 'Akzentbedeutung'. Conversely, Schweier (1987:45) assumes that *iso* above initial vowels in OBa primarily *does not* indicate ictus, and so the AU accentuated exclusively with initial *iso* are thereafter excluded from his analysis of the accentuation in OBa.

2.3.4.2. *Dasia*

Dasia is written once above an initial vowel, in ѡшѡ 7a. In the light of the accentuation of the comparable AU ѡхѡ 6b and ѡшѡ 6b, *dasia* may perhaps be seen here as a variant of *iso* (cf. section 2.3.3.5), and thus analyzed together with the latter accent mark.

2.3.5. AU including line-breaks

In some sources accent marks are more common in the vicinity of line-breaks than in other positions, especially when an AU is divided by a line-break.⁷⁶ This perhaps can be explained by a desire to facilitate the reading of the text, indicating the unity of the AU. It cannot be excluded that such a 'unity-indicating' function in some cases could constitute the only motivation for the presence of an accent mark. If this is the case in F, we would expect a higher frequency of anomalous accentuations at line-breaks. The relevant material comprises the following AU:

1) AU with two *oksia*: соў|Ѣўты 16b, нечѣ|стѣими 4b, къ|кѡлѣ-ншма 7a.

2) AU with *oksia* immediately preceding a line-break: грѣ|хы 8a, корá|бли 6b, плó|ды 2b, за неѡѣ|рьствѣе 3a, безъ чѣ|сти 4a, пá|схѡу 14a.

⁷⁵ Cf. Kolesov 1976:72.

⁷⁶ Cf., for example, Steensland 1990:33ff, Schweier 1987:110.

3) AU with *oksia* immediately following a line-break: ни| хлѣба 4b, ѿ| бѣси 7b, ѿ| грѣшници 8b, кни|жнийци 15b, на|стѣвниче 6b, лицѣ|мѣри 3b, по| морю 5a, ѿ| хра́мины 9a, въ сѣю| нѣщѣ 11b, ѿ со|дѣмлянѣ 12b, досто|ѣнь 9a, мѣ|нѣга 8b, на| де́ште 4b, ѿ|брѣтаѣтъ 10b, ѿ|врѣжеши сѧ 13b, ѿ| кра́дѣ 16a, ѿ|врѣзѣт сѧ 10b, прѣ|лѣжити 10a, ѿ|врѣже сѧ 13a, разоу|мѣша 2b, на|чѣша 14b, ѿ на|чѣша 16a, за|прѣти 7b, по|мѧноуша 6b, въ|стѣвь 10a, въ|стѣв же 7b, въ|зѣмь 8a.

4) AU with *varia* immediately following a line-break: съ съ|блѣде-нѣмь 12a, го|рѣ 3a, въ|сѣ бо 1b, ѿ| бѣ 16b.

With the exception of the AU with two *oksia* as well as the AU съ съ|блѣденѣмь, most of the accentuations do not seem to deviate from the normal pattern in F. Tentatively, therefore, the presence of any consistent 'unity-indicating' accentuation in F must be rejected. This does not exclude, however, that in the scribe's choice between accentuating and not accentuating an AU the presence of a 'unity-indicating' function could sporadically be decisive. All such accentuations must, therefore, be considered slightly less reliable from a 'prosodic' point of view.

2.3.6. AU with two accent marks

With the exception of the AU with *iso* and another accent mark (cf. section 2.3.4.1), only a few AU comprise more than one accent mark. In addition to соу|бѣты 16b, нечѣ|стѣми 4b, and къ| кѣлѣшма 7a, divided by line-breaks, only the AU не вѣмѣ 1b are лицевѣри 3b are attested.

As 'double' accentuation in F is clearly anomalous, the possibility of a connection between the presence of a line-break and 'double' accentuation cannot be excluded, particularly in the AU нечѣ|стѣми 4b:8/9, as compared with нечи́стѣми 4b:13 and нечѣстѣимь 6a. As for лицевѣри, 'double' accentuation in compounds is well attested in various sources.⁷⁷ In the AU не вѣмѣ, however, the *kendema* probably has a purely graphic motivation, reflecting the similar accentuation of the pronoun мы, possibly constituting a graphic cliché (cf. section 2.3.2.3).

2.3.7. Summary

To sum up, no facts so far presented prevent the assumption that—at least in polysyllabic AU—both *oksia* (possibly except above post-vocalic и),

⁷⁷ Cf., for example, Bulatova 1975:55.

varia, *kamora*, *kendema*, and *double oksia* normally indicate ictus in F. *Iso* probably can—except in words of Greek origin—be assumed to indicate ictus above medial vowels. Above initial vowels, however, *iso* cannot be considered a reliable indication of the position of ictus. As for *dasia*, neither above initial nor above medial vowels can this accent mark be assumed to indicate ictus.

2.4. Standard and non-standard accentuation

A majority of the accentuated AU in F are accentuated on the root morpheme. When the root is polysyllabic the accent mark is normally placed above the first vowel of the root. Prefixes, prepositions, suffixes, and flexional endings, on the other hand, are more seldom accentuated with accent marks reliably indicating ictus. In the following, therefore, this 'root-initial' accentuation characteristic of F will be referred to as 'standard accentuation'. To this type will also be assigned AU where the etymological root vowel is absent and the accent mark is located over the immediately following vowel, as e.g. in the AU *сѣбрати* and *посла*. Thus defined, the AU with standard accentuation constitute approximately 75% of the total number of accentuated AU, while the remaining c. 25% comprise non-standard accentuated AU.

The division of the accentuated AU between these two categories makes it possible to discern some general features of the accentuation of F that are relevant for our analysis:

1) It would be possible to explain the accentuation of the standard accentuated AU with a simple graphic and/or morphological principle,⁷⁸ which is hardly possible for the non-standard accentuated AU.

2) As quite a few innovations in both stress and accentuation systems are reflected, in sources from different areas, as tendencies towards accentuation of the root (cf. section 3.1.4), the non-standard accentuated AU are in most cases easier to assign to a certain variety of ChSl than are the standard accentuated AU.

Although the AU with standard accentuation constitute the greater part of the material, their relevance for the analysis of the accentuation, at least in a discussion of individual lexemes, is limited. Consequently, in the analysis of the accentuation in F, the greatest emphasis will be put on the *non-standard* accentuated AU.

⁷⁸ For example, such a principle could be formulated as a simple rule of the kind proposed in Steensland 1990:57: 'Первая, стоящая между двумя согласными гласная, не входящая в приставку, снабжается оксией.'

Chapter 3

THE ACCENTUATED AU IN F

3.1. Preliminaries

3.1.1. 'Phonetic' and other accentuations

IN section 2.3.7 we concluded that in principle there are no obstacles to the assumption that at least some diacritical marks in manuscript F indicate ictus. This assumption, however, needs to be specified, because the main body of the accentuations (with the exception of scribal errors) in a source of this kind can be divided into two main categories:¹

A. Accentuations which reflect positions of main stress (ictus) in the system of the scribe. Such accentuations are usually referred to as 'phonetic' accentuations. The 'system of the scribe' refers mainly to the literary orthoëpic norms familiar to the scribe in question. Insofar as there existed a difference between the literary orthoëpic norms and the orthoëpic norms of the scribe's everyday language (i.e. the vernacular), it seems probable that the influence of the latter on the accentuation was of minor importance, at least in sources within the ecclesiastical genre to which manuscript F belongs.

B. Accentuations with other backgrounds. The most important types were 1) accentuations according to (ortho)graphic rules, independent from the literary orthoëpic norms of the scribe; and 2) accentuations copied from the protograph. In principle, though, both types can reflect 'phonetic' accentuations from an earlier period or from a different region. As Dybo puts it, 'Следует обратить внимание на то, что поздние традиционные графические приемы расстановки надстрочных знаков в рукописях часто, по-видимому, имели свои просодические основания в более древних текстах'.²

Note. A direct influence from an accentuated protograph—it can be assumed that the protograph for a manuscript from the period in question was accentuated—can in principle belong to one of two types. On the one hand, a concrete accentuation in a specified place in the protograph can be copied into the corresponding place in the copy (the protograph as *text*; cf. Schweier 1987:165 on 'Divergenzpaare'). On the other hand, the accentuation of a linguistic category in the protograph can influence the accentuation of the corresponding category in the copy (the protograph as *language* or *system*). Besides in-

¹ Cf. Bulatova 1972:38ff, Uspenskij 1987:74ff.

² Dybo 1971b:113.

stances of *direct* influence from the protograph, *indirect* influence is sometimes possible. This is the case when the presence of some type of accentuation in a group of sources—protographs in a wider meaning—influences the orthoëpic norms (cf. the presence of ‘written’ pronunciation in modern languages, e.g. in the adjectival ending -ый in contemporary standard Russian) as well as the orthographic accentuation rules. An indirect influence from a written protograph via the orthoëpic norms of both the reciter and the scribe(s) would also be present during the copying of manuscripts in a scriptorium of the type discussed in Sjöberg 1980 (cf. Sjöberg 1980:42).

The relative importance of the different types has varied between different periods and regions. In the ESl region, the dominating factor at first seems to have been the literary orthoëpic norms. During the period of the Second South Slavic Influence, however, the importance of (ortho)-graphic accentuation rules is assumed to have increased.³

3.1.2. Common Slavonic accent paradigms

All declinable lexemes attested with accentuated AU in manuscript F are classified according to their affiliation to one of the CSI accent paradigms (a.p.) *a*, *b*, or *c*.⁴ This classification is mainly founded on data in the works by Bulatova 1975, Dybo 1981, and Zaliznjak 1985a. Note, however, that the classification in the present investigation, as in the works by Bulatova and Dybo, refers to *Common Slavonic* accent paradigms (пра-славянские акцентные парадигмы), while Zaliznjak as a rule indicates *Common East Slavonic* accent paradigms (раннедревнерусские акцентные парадигмы).⁵ When Bulatova, Dybo, and Zaliznjak agree with respect to which accent paradigm to ascribe to a certain lexeme, normally no reference to the source of the classification is given. In those cases where they disagree—or more often, where a lexeme is not represented in the works in question—references to other relevant sources are given, with major uncertainty on accent paradigm being accompanied by a question mark (?).

The CSI accent paradigms are reconstructed using the following definitions:⁶

In CSI a.p. *a* ictus in all inflected forms fell on the root.

In CSI a.p. *b* ictus in all inflected forms originally fell on the syllable immediately following the root, i.e.—in non-derived formations—on the ending (in the case of polysyllabic endings on the *first* syllable of the end-

³ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:200: ‘В расстановке акцентных знаков, точно так же, как в орфографии, квалифицированные писцы руководствовались прежде всего усвоенными ими нормами, а не оригиналом’, and Uspenskij 1987:77ff, 196f.

⁴ We will here not take into account a proposed fourth a.p., ‘a.p. *d*’ (‘архаизм Илич-Свитыча’), cf. Bulatova *et al.* 1988:49ff, as a thorough discussion of this interesting hypothesis would fall outside the scope of the present investigation.

⁵ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:113, 160ff.

⁶ Cf., for example, Dybo 1981:18f, Zaliznjak 1985a:126f.

ing).⁷ During the late CSI period under certain conditions ictus was in some cases retracted to the preceding syllable, i.e. the last syllable of the root, which created a limited mobility, with different realizations in different morphological categories.

In CSI a.p. *c* some inflected forms originally were phonologically unstressed—the so-called ‘enclinema’⁸—while in other forms ictus fell on the *last* syllable of the ending. An accentual unit consisting exclusively of (one or more) enclinema was originally realised with an ‘automatic’ stress on the first syllable. Originally, this ‘automatic’ stress differed phonetically from the ‘autonomous’ stress occurring in all other positions, including the first syllable of some forms of lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *a* or *b*. Later, however, the phonetic character of the ‘automatic’ stress coincided with that of the ‘autonomous’ stress.⁹ For the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *c* this created a ‘marginal’ mobility between stress on the initial syllable in some forms and stress on the final syllable in other forms. In some polysyllabic endings ictus was under certain conditions retracted to the preceding syllable.¹⁰ As was also the case in a.p. *b*, the mobility in a.p. *c* was differently realized in different morphological categories.

Derived formations are classified principally in the same way as non-derived items: words belonging to CSI a.p. *a* had ictus on one of the syllables of the stem (i.e. both on roots and affixes), words belonging to CSI a.p. *b* originally had constant stress on the ending, and words belonging to CSI a.p. *c* originally showed marginal mobility.¹¹

When referring to suffixed formations, the designations for the ‘general’ CSI accent paradigms *a*, *b*, and *c* usually will be replaced by ‘etymological’ subdivisions of the type a.p. *x^y* (*a^a*, *a^b*, *b^c* etc.), where *x* refers to the a.p. of the derived, and *y* refers to the a.p. of the corresponding non-derived lexeme. Also, prefixed nouns with secondary immobilization of the type **naróds* will be referred to as belonging to CSI a.p. *a*.¹²

Thus, in Common Slavonic all word-forms—both inflected and uninflected—which could serve as the nucleus of an accentual unit belonged to one of two accentual categories. The first category comprised the ‘enclinema’, which were phonologically unstressed but were normally realized with ‘automatic’ stress on the initial syllable. To the second category

⁷ For CSI a.p. *b* Stang uses in the headings the term ‘Stress on the final syllable of the stem’ (e.g. Stang 1957:59, 69, 82, 85). In his analysis, however, the terms ‘constant end-stress’, ‘stress on the ending’ etc. are used (Stang 1957:56, 59).

⁸ Cf., for example, Dybo 1981:52, Zaliznjak 1985a:119, Birnbaum 1986:130f.

⁹ Cf. Zaliznjak 1981:89, 1985a:120.

¹⁰ Cf. Dybo 1981:243ff.

¹¹ This conforms with the definitions given in Zaliznjak 1985a:125f, particularly as concerns a.p. *b*. Consequently, derived formations with constant stress on the suffix are in our analysis considered as belonging to CSI a.p. *a*.

¹² Cf. Dybo 1968a:153ff, 1981:60f.

belonged the 'orthotonic' forms, which had 'autonomous' stress on any syllable, including the first. Inflected lexemes of CSI a.p. *a* and *b* comprised exclusively orthotonic forms, while inflected lexemes of CSI a.p. *c* comprised both enclinomena and orthotonic forms. Indeclinable words were simply either orthotonic or enclinomena.

3.1.3. *Sources used for comparison*

In the discussion in sections 3.2–9 the accentuated AU in F will be compared with material from other accentuated sources from both East and South Slavic—mainly Bulgarian—territory, written in different varieties of Church Slavonic. The comparison material is in most cases quoted from works published by other scholars. Some sources, however, are quoted from excerpts made by the present author.

Note. Each source can be characterized in at least three respects: 1) its historical and geographical background; 2) its language (variety of Church Slavonic); 3) its accentuation. As classifications of language and accentuation normally are based upon analysis of sources with known time and place of origin (cf. Ščepkin 1967:13f), these three components as a rule coincide. In some cases, e.g. when characterizing sources with a background in linguistically and/or culturally heterogeneous environments like Mount Athos or Constantinople, it can be necessary to distinguish between these components.

The comparison material can be divided into two groups:

1) The first group consists of East Slavic sources, most of which are written in Russian Middle Church Slavonic. The ESl sources can be divided into Great Russian and Ukrainian sources,¹³ where the former are divided between West and East Great Russian sources.¹⁴

2) Among the South Slavic sources, comparisons are made primarily with Middle Bulgarian sources, written in Bulgarian Middle Church Slavonic. These sources can be divided into East and West MBlg sources. A separate place among the EBlg sources is occupied by Moldavian sources.

Further, in his classification of the EBlg sources according to accentuation, Dybo distinguishes, for example, between the following local groups: the 'Tărnovo group' (Търновская группа [thirteenth to fourteenth century]), 'the system of Kiprjan' (система киприана [end of the fourteenth–beginning of the fifteenth century]), and 'the system of the scribe Gavriil' (система Гавриила [fifteenth century, written in Moldavia]). In addition, Dybo places the 'presumably Macedonian' manuscript O pism. as in some respects outside the division between East and West MBlg sources.¹⁵

¹³ In the present investigation no distinction is made between Ukrainian and Belorussian sources; cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:166, Ohijenko 1952:46f.

¹⁴ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:113f, 166.

¹⁵ Cf. Hinrichs 1985:21f, Dybo 1971a:64ff, 68 with lists of the sources in the respective group.

Normally, the comparison material does not include Serbian sources written in Serbian Middle Church Slavonic. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, no exclusively Serbian *orthographic* features are attested in F (cf. section 2.2.6), which means that there is no independent reason to assume a Serbian component in the background of the manuscript. In the second place, the accentual variation in Serbian sources from the fifteenth and sixteenth century is quite considerable, partly because of the contemporary progress of the so-called 'Neoštokavian accent retraction' (cf. section 3.1.4.1.4), which makes it possible to attest parallels to almost any accentuation in the Serbian sources taken as a whole. Nevertheless, the presence of an accentuation in Serbian sources will sometimes be indicated, particularly if no parallels have been found in the ESl or MBlg comparison material.

3.1.4. *Deviations from Common Slavonic accentuation*

In the analysis of the accentuation in F it is also necessary to take into account the most important systematic deviations, attested in sources of various origin, from the reconstructed CS1 accentuation. As is the case with the orthographic deviations (cf. section 2.2.6), the accentual deviations can constitute 1) 'intrinsic' deviations, consistently realized in accordance with the literary orthoëpic norms of a certain ChSl variety or variant; 2) 'extrinsic' deviations, falling outside the boundaries of the literary orthoëpic norms but nevertheless often characteristic of a certain ChSl variety or variant.¹⁶

Accentual deviations comprising individual lexemes or limited categories will be discussed in sections 3.2–9 in connection with the presentation of the material. Some deviations of a more general character, however, may conveniently be presented prior to the discussion of the material attested in the manuscript. For the sake of clarity, these deviations are divided into two categories: deviations describable as *regressive* and *progressive* shifts, respectively, compared with the CS1 reconstructed ictus position.¹⁷

Note. In the discussion below and in the following the classification of the (OChSl) verbs with minor adjustments follows the usage in Zaliznjak 1985a (see Zaliznjak 1985a:7). Thus, among the verbs the following classes will be distinguished:

aj-verbs – infinitive in -ати, present tense third person singular in -аетъ.

ěj-verbs – infinitive in -ѣти, present tense third person singular in -ѣетъ.

ova-verbs – infinitive in -овати, present tense third person singular in -оуетъ.

¹⁶ Cf. Uspenskij 1987:73, H. Tóth 1988:306f.

¹⁷ The use of these terms here does not imply any presuppositions about the possible reasons for the shifts in question, but are simply used as formulas convenient for summarizing a series of different evolutions with in some respects common results.

a-verbs – infinitive in **-ати**, present tense third person singular ending in consonant plus **-еть/-ятъ**.

i-verbs – infinitive in **-ити**, present tense third person singular in **-итъ**.

ě-verbs – infinitive in **-ѣти** (**-ати** after **ж, ш, ч**, and vowels), present tense third person singular in **-итъ**.

V-verbs – verbs with the infinitive element **-ти** immediately following a root ending in a vowel.

C-verbs – verbs with the infinitive element **-ти** immediately following a root ending in a consonant.

3.1.4.1. Regressive shifts

3.1.4.1.1. *The West Great Russian definalization*

An important innovation that makes it possible to explain many instances of accent on the syllable preceding the ending (preflexional accent) in word-forms with CS1 end-stress is the so-called definalization, the effects of which according to Zaliznjak are attested mainly in West Great Russian and West Ukrainian sources. The process of definalization originally consisted of a phonetic retraction of ictus from a final open syllable to the preceding syllable. This phonetic process, however, was not consistently carried out, and morphological and lexical factors seem to play a not insignificant role for the spread of the innovation.¹⁸

Important categories affected by the WGrR definalization were nouns belonging to CS1 a.p. *b*,¹⁹ the imperative singular of verbs belonging to CS1 a.p. *b* and *c*,²⁰ and the infinitive of *V*- and *C*-verbs belonging to CS1 a.p. *b* and *c*.²¹ On the other hand, some words with final accent (e.g. the conjunction **или**, the adverb **сѣло**, some adverbs ending in **-ра** and genitives ending in **-го**) were as a rule not affected by the innovation, but are normally attested with final accentuation even in WGrR sources.²²

3.1.4.1.2. *Accentuation on the root in East Bulgarian sources*

An effect similar to that of the WGrR definalization is caused by the so-called East Bulgarian accent retraction, effects of which are attested mainly in EBlg sources. This innovation, however, only affected morphological categories belonging to CS1 a.p. *b* and had the effect that the accentuation of lexemes within these categories completely or partly coincided with the accentuation of lexemes belonging to CS1 a.p. *a*.²³ All

¹⁸ Zaliznjak 1985a:182ff.

¹⁹ See Zaliznjak 1985a:242ff, map no. 3, Schweier 1987:260ff.

²⁰ See Zaliznjak 1985a:355f, Schweier 1987:144ff.

²¹ See Zaliznjak 1985a:351ff, map no. 18, Schweier 1987:129ff.

²² Zaliznjak 1985a:186.

²³ See Dybo 1977:191, 1989:100f. WBlg sources, on the other hand, normally show separate reflexes of CS1 a.p. *b* in all categories; cf. Dybo 1971a:65, 1983:6.

verbal categories except the imperative (cf. section 3.1.4.2.2) were affected by this innovation. Among the nouns it was mainly the *o*- and *jo*-stems that were affected, whereas accentuation on the ending normally was retained among the *ā*- and *jā*-stems.²⁴

Another 'regressive shift', the effects of which are primarily attested in EBlg sources of the 'Tárnovo group', gave rise to the characteristic occurrence of root-accentuation among the secondarily imperfective *aj*-verbs with CSI thematic stress (derived from simple verbs belonging to CSI a.p. *b* and *c*; cf. section 3.1.2).²⁵

3.1.4.1.3. 'Literary' or 'South Slavonic' accentuation in ESl sources

Within Russian Church Slavonic it is theoretically possible to distinguish between three components in the accent system, namely 'specifically literary', 'specifically non-literary', and stylistically neutral stress.²⁶ Both 'specifically literary' and stylistically neutral stress fell within the boundaries of the literary orthoëpic norms, whereas instances of 'specifically non-literary' stress must be seen as deviations from the literary norm.

The concrete lexemes attested with the different types of accentuation as well as the realizations of the stress types varied between different periods and regions within the ESl territory. For example, according to Zaliznjak, the 'literary pronunciation' of Russian Church Slavonic—especially in its Great Russian variant—during the sixteenth and seventeenth century was characterized by the following principle: word-forms existing with the same inventory of phonemes both in RChSl and the vernacular showed the same stress as in the vernacular, whereas word-forms occurring exclusively in the 'literary' language showed a 'specifically literary' stress, which normally was realized as stress on the syllable preceding the ending (preflexional stress) (предфлекссионное ударение).²⁷

3.1.4.1.4. The Neoštokavian accent retraction

In many Serbian sources beginning from the fourteenth century the effects of the so-called Neoštokavian accent retraction can be discerned. This—at least in the vernacular—phonetic innovation, consisting in a

²⁴ Dybo 1973:152f, 1977:191ff, 221, Görner 1974:80. Accentuation on the ending was also retained among derived nouns with a suffix containing a *jer*, e.g. in formations ending in -ѣць.

²⁵ Dybo 1987:200.

²⁶ Cf. the discussion on the language situation among the Croatian 'glagoljaši' in Rehder 1985, where the linguistic material is divided into 'precisely three components: (a) the component of only Čakavic elements, (b) the component of only Church Slavonic elements, (c) the component of those elements which have no specific features, being jointly inherited' (Rehder 1985:186). See also Uspenskij 1987:178f, Živov 1988:49ff.

²⁷ Zaliznjak 1985a:189, 196.

retraction of ictus from any—medial or final—syllable to the preceding syllable affected all morphological categories of the language.²⁸

3.1.4.1.5. *Summary*

As has been shown in the foregoing sections, accentuations interpretable as effects of 'regressive shifts' are widely attested in both ESl and SSl sources from various regions. The only easily discernable exception is constituted by the EGrR sources; this group shows such effects to only a limited extent.

Consequently, the occurrence of preflexional accentuation in a GrR—especially WGrR—source theoretically can be explained in at least three ways: 'specifically literary' accentuation, definalization, and South Slavic (MBlg or Serbian) influence.²⁹

3.1.4.2. Progressive shifts

3.1.4.2.1. *'Thematization'*

A series of innovations mainly affecting verbs belonging to CS1 a.p. *a* can be summarized under the notion 'thematization', signifying a progressive shift of ictus onto the 'thematic element'.³⁰ Word-forms with thematization are attested in both ESl and MBlg sources, for example in the following categories:

- a) All verbal categories of secondarily imperfective *aj*-verbs and denominative *ěj*-verbs in GrR sources from different regions.³¹
- b) Infinitive, aorist, and *l*-participles of *i*-, *ě*-, *a*-, and *ova*-verbs in West and Northeast GrR sources.³²
- c) Present tense and infinitive of *ova*-, *ěj*-, and *aj*-verbs in Ukr sources.³³
- d) Verbal nouns ending in **-ннѣ**, mainly in EBlg and Ukr sources,³⁴ but also sporadically in GrR sources.

²⁸ See Bulatova 1975:223ff, Ivić 1985:144f.

²⁹ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:188ff. On the connection between preflexional and 'South Slavonic' accentuation in ESl sources see Zaliznjak 1985a:195ff; particularly as concerns WGrR sources see also Schweier 1987:366.

³⁰ This term refers to the infinitive stem morphemes *-a-*, *-ě-*, *-ova-*, *-i-*, and *-nφ-*, and the present stem morphemes *-aj-*, *-ěj-*, *-uj-*, and *-n-* (Zaliznjak 1985a:7). Cf. also Zaliznjak 1981:160ff, 165ff, 1985a:182, 356ff, Schweier 1987:106ff.

³¹ See Zaliznjak 1985a:356f, Schweier 1987:106ff.

³² See Zaliznjak 1981:149, 160f, 1985a:356ff, map no. 19.

³³ See Ohijenko 1952:43f.

³⁴ See Dybo 1977:230, Hinrichs 1985:70, Ohijenko 1928:446, 1952:43, Zaliznjak 1985a:357.

3.1.4.2.2. *Accent on the ending in CSI a.p. a*

Instances of accent on the ending among words belonging to CSI a.p. *a* must be distinguished from the types with thematization listed above. Here we may mention the following categories:

a) Imperative of *i*-verbs and thematic verbs in EBlg sources. In these sources accent on the element *-i-* is generalized for the imperative of verbs belonging to all three accent paradigms. Similar accentuation is also attested in the imperative of *i*-verbs in Northwest GrR sources, where it must be interpreted, however, in connection with a strong tendency towards thematization in these sources (cf. section 3.1.4.2.1).³⁵

b) Plural forms of neuter *o*- and *jo*-nouns in EBlg sources.³⁶

c) Plural forms of certain non-derived masculine *o*- and *jo*-nouns in GrR sources.³⁷

3.1.4.2.3. *Accent on present tense endings in CSI a.p. b*

Mainly in ESl sources certain *i*-verbs belonging to CSI a.p. *b* show accentuation on the ending in present tense forms with a reconstructed CSI accent on the syllable preceding the ending (cf. section 3.1.2). This kind of accentuation can be explained either as dialectal variation—perhaps already in the CSI period³⁸—in the realization of CSI a.p. *b* or as a result of transfers from a.p. *b* to a.p. *c*.

Even in the oldest ESl accentuated sources, a limited group of *i*-verbs (mainly denominatives with a short root-vowel) normally show constant accentuation on the ending according to a.p. *c*. To this group belong for example the verbs **-ложити, постити сѧ, разорити, творити**.³⁹

‘Specifically literary’ *i*-verbs with non-pleophonic roots (i.e., of the type **хранити**) also normally show accentuation according to a.p. *c* in sources from the whole GrR area. Other ‘specifically literary’ and denominative *i*-verbs also are sporadically attested with accentuation according to a.p. *c* in sources from the whole GrR area. Normally, however, these types of verbs show accentuation according to a.p. *b*. Non-derived stylistically neutral *i*-verbs (e.g. **любити, молици, просити, служити, ходити**), on the other hand, are only sporadically—mainly in WGrR sources—attested with accentuation on the ending in the present tense, particularly in the second person singular. According to Zaliznjak

³⁵ See Dybo 1989:105ff, Zaliznjak 1981:149.

³⁶ See Dybo 1977:191, 195, 1989:102, Görner 1974:81.

³⁷ See Zaliznjak 1985a:376.

³⁸ Cf. Dybo 1982b:103, 129ff, 1983:13, Bulatova *et al.* 1988:31ff.

³⁹ See Zaliznjak 1981:161, 1985a:359, Schweier 1987:93, Dybo 1970:54f, 1971b:112.

this reflects dialectal variation within a.p. *b* rather than a transfer to a.p. *c*.⁴⁰

Similar tendencies towards accentuation on the ending in the present tense second person singular—while the third person singular and the plural show accentuation on the root—are attested in some SSl sources, for example in the WBlg Is. Sir. The possibility of a connection with the accentuation of the imperative second person singular, however, cannot be excluded.⁴¹

3.1.4.2.4. *The evolution of the accentuation of CSI enclinema*

As stated in section 3.1.2, the CSI enclinema were originally realized with an 'automatic' stress on the first syllable. When preceded by certain proclitics, however, the accentual unit as a whole functioned as an enclimenon, and the 'automatic' stress, according to the general rule, fell on the first proclitic (for details cf. section 3.8.1). As has been shown by Dybo, reflexes of this kind of stress are attested in the oldest extant ESl and MBlg accentuated sources. In younger sources, however, in most categories this type of accentuation is gradually eliminated in favor of accentuation on the root, the thematic vowel, or the ending, respectively. This evolution is seen for example in the following categories:

a) In ESl sources, noun forms originally preceded by an accentuated preposition in WGrR and Ukr sources are often attested with accentuation on the root of the noun, while EGrR sources normally retain the older type of accentuation.⁴²

b) Prefixed nouns of the type **narodъ* regularly show constant accentuation according to a.p. *a* both in ESl and SSl sources. In EGrR this type is normally realized as accentuation on the root, whereas both WGrR and NEGrR, Ukr, and MBlg sources regularly show accentuation on the prefix.⁴³

c) The present tense first person singular regularly shows accentuation on the ending in sources from the whole GrR area. Remnants of the original accentuation are, however, attested in some sources.⁴⁴

d) In the aorist second and third person singular of prefixed verbs accentuation on the root is regularly attested in EBlg sources, whereas GrR sources normally show final accentuation.⁴⁵

e) In ESl sources, among the *i*-verbs the simple past active participles ending in -ѣтъ (-ѣ) are regularly attested with accentuation on the thematic vowel in sources from the whole GrR area. In corresponding

⁴⁰ See Zaliznjak 1985a:359f, Schweier 1987:94ff.

⁴¹ See Dybo 1969:90, 1982a:258f, 1983:7ff, Bulatova *et al.* 1988:49.

⁴² Zaliznjak 1985a:283ff, 1989:132, Schweier 1987:277ff, Uspenskij 1987:240.

⁴³ Zaliznjak 1985a:153f, Dybo 1977:230, 234.

⁴⁴ See Zaliznjak 1985a:322ff, Schweier 1987:136ff.

⁴⁵ See Dybo 1971b:100f, Zaliznjak 1985a:144.

forms of the *a*- and *V*-verbs, however, this innovation is limited mainly to WGrR sources, whereas EGrR sources normally retain the older, initial accentuation.⁴⁶

3.1.4.2.5. 'Literary' accentuation in ESl sources

As stated in section 3.1.4.1.3, 'specifically literary' accentuation in ESl sources is normally realized as preflexional accentuation. Some word-forms, however, reflecting CSI enclinomena, while initially stressed in the vernacular, are realized in the 'literary' pronunciation with accentuation on the ending. For example, in ESl sources the accusative singular of the lexeme **ГЛАБА** is usually attested with accent on the ending (**ГЛАБѢЮ**), whereas the 'vernacular' lexeme **ГѠЛОБА** retains the reflex of the CSI enclinomenon and usually—when attested in 'literary' sources—occurs with initial accentuation (**ГѠЛОБѢЮ**).⁴⁷

3.1.4.2.6. Summary

As has been demonstrated in sections 3.1.4.2.1–5, innovations possible to interpret as progressive shifts are as a rule more limited in extent than the regressive shifts. Consequently, the occurrence of an AU with accentuation on the thematic vowel or on the ending is as a rule more interesting as a basis for ascribing a source to a specific region or a specific time, and thus constitutes an additional argument for the distinction in the analysis between standard and non-standard accentuation (cf. section 2.4).

3.1.5. Principles of presentation

The accentuated AU in manuscript F are in the following presentation divided according to morphological categories and (in most cases) affiliation to CSI accent paradigms. Within the latter category the attested AU are listed in alphabetical order by headword, which are indicated but inconsistently in the commentaries. All headwords, however, are found in the glossary.⁴⁸ For prefixed verbs their non-prefixed counterparts are considered as headwords, regardless of whether the latter are attested or not.

⁴⁶ See Zaliznjak 1981:142f, 1985a:331ff, map no. 15, Schweier 1987:119ff.

⁴⁷ Cf., for example, Zaliznjak 1985a:192, Skljarenko 1969:14ff, 137, Kolesov 1972a:66.

⁴⁸ As headwords are used the nominative singular (masculine) for nominal categories and the infinitive for verbs. The spelling is according to the normalized orthography of *Slovník* 1966–.

The main bulk of the material is presented in two columns. In the right column are listed the non-standard accentuated AU with an accent mark to the right of the 'standard position', whereas the standard accentuated AU are found in the left column. AU accentuated only with *iso* above an initial vowel are presented separately within the respective category, while non-standard accentuated AU with accentuated pro- and enclitics are treated in section 3.8.

Following the usage in Wesslén 1985, the letters 'a' and 'b' in the references to F indicate the *recto* and *verso* page, respectively. In some instances the attested AU are provided with the asterisk *, signifying that the reading of the accent mark is not to be fully trusted because of the occurrence of stains etc. on the fragments. The symbol + 'plus' indicates accentuations not reproduced in Wesslén's edition. Finally, to facilitate both the grammatical interpretation and the comparison with other sources, some AU have been provided with references to the actual place of occurrence—according to the *Novum Testamentum Graece* 1990—in the text of the Gospels.

3.2. Nouns

Together with the nouns there will normally also be listed adverbs identical with certain nominal case-forms. Nouns derived with unproductive suffixes are found together with the non-derived nouns in the respective morphological category. Proper names etc. of Greek origin are discussed separately in section 3.9.

3.2.1. Masculine o- and jo-stems (including former u-stems)

3.2.1.1. Underived nouns

• CS1 a.p. *a* is reconstructed with root-stress in all forms, whereas CS1 a.p. *b* is reconstructed with stress on the ending in all forms. In late CS1, however, the nominative and accusative singular had stress on the last syllable of the root; cf. section 3.1.2. In CS1 a.p. *c* all cases in the singular as well as the nominative and accusative plural were enclitomena, whereas the remaining cases of the plural are reconstructed with final end-stress.⁴⁹

CS1 a.p. *a*

1. **ѡѣтръ** 5b nom sg.

⁴⁹ Dybo 1981:26f, Garde 1976:27. Some scholars reconstruct end-stress in all cases of the singular except the nominative; see Kolesov 1972a:129. The different reconstructions may possibly reflect an original state with two mobile accent paradigms; cf. Illič-Svityč 1963:119, Kolesov 1972a:141, Bulatova *et al.* 1988:49ff, Bulatova 1989:214f.

2. **ни| хлѣба** 4b, **хлѣб|**] 14b acc
sg, **хлѣбы** 10a acc pl.

3. **ѡ часа** 3a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡзыкь** BAN 4.9.7:4r nom sg, **на ѡзыкь** BAN 4.9.7:4r, **ѡзы|кь** 9a acc sg, **ѡзыкѡу** 2b.

CSl a.p. b

1. **грѣ|хы** 8a acc pl.

2.

корáбль 5a nom sg, **въ ко-
ра́бль** 5a, **въ| корáбль** 5b, **въ
дроусѣмь корáбли** 6b, **ѡ
корáблю** 6a gen du.

3. **три кра́ты** 13b acc pl.

4. **пѣсто́мь** 3b instr sg.

5. **ра́ба** 9b, **и ра́боу** 9b.

6. **тро́уды** 10a acc pl.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡгнь** 18b, **и ѡгнь** 12b, **ѡгню** 7b, **ѡгнемь** 7b; — 2. **ѡдрѣ** 8a acc sg.

CSl a.p. c

1. **еѣсь** 3a, **и| еѣси** 7b.

2. **вра́гы** 8b acc pl.

3. **дѣмоу** 14a dat sg, **въ дѣмь** 7b,
въ дѣмоу 11a, **дѣмы** 3b acc
pl.⁵⁰

4. **дро́угь** 10a, **дроу|гь кь**
дро́угоу 6a.

5.

дѣ́а| 18b gen sg.

6. **класы** 16a acc pl.

7. **плѣда** 1a, **плѣ|ды** 2b acc pl.

8. **на ѡномь пѣлѣ** 5a.

9. **ѡ ро́да** 12b.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *a* the lexeme **часъ** in EGrR sources normally shows accentuation according to a.p. *b*, i.e. accentuation on the ending. Root-accentuation as in F is, however, attested both in WGrR and SSl sources.⁵¹ **ѡзыкь**, on the other hand, in both ESl and MBlg sources normally shows accentuation on the second syllable,⁵² whereas initial accentuation is expected only in Serbian sources (cf. section 3.1.4.1.4).

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *b* parallels to the accentuation of **корáбль**, with accentuation on the second syllable in oblique cases as well, are regularly attested both in WGrR and EBlg sources,⁵³ reflecting definalization and the EBlg accent retraction, respectively (cf. sections 3.1.4.1.1–2).

⁵⁰ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **и еѣ до́моу сво́емь** 4a; cf. section 3.8.3.1.

⁵¹ See Dybo 1975:8, Zaliznjak 1985a:134, Kolesov 1972a:106ff, Bulatova 1989:205.

⁵² Dybo 1977:224, Zaliznjak 1985a:132.

⁵³ Zaliznjak 1985a:243, Dybo 1973:162.

As for the lexemes **грѣхъ**, **кратъ**, **пѣсть**, **рабъ**, and **трудоу**, accentuation on the root is regularly attested in both WGrR, Ukr, and EBlg sources, whereas EGrR sources normally retain accentuation on the ending.

Parallels to the initial accentuation of the polysyllabic AU **ѡгню** and **ѡгнемъ** are mainly attested in EBlg sources.⁵⁴ As has been shown above in sections 3.1.4.1.1–4, however, other sources for this type of accentuation cannot be excluded.

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* parallels to the accentuation of the AU **дѣа** are attested—besides the normal accentuation on the root—in both ESl and SSl sources.⁵⁵ As for **плодъ**, in ESl sources this lexeme is normally accentuated according to a.p. *b*.⁵⁶ Accentuation on the root, however, is attested in both WGrR and SSl sources. Parallels to the root-accentuated locative singulars of **домъ** and **полъ** are attested in EBlg and WGrR sources, whereas EGrR sources normally show accentuation on the ending.⁵⁷

The remaining standard accentuated AU of a.p. *c* all reflect CSI enclitomena, and sources with archaic accentuation normally show accentuation on the proclitic, if any. The absence of this type of accentuation here is paralleled, however, in both WGrR, Ukr, as well as Mold sources.⁵⁸

3.2.1.2. Nouns ending in **-ѣѣ**

• For this category Dybo reconstructs CSI a.p. *a^a*, *a^b*, and *b^c*.⁵⁹

CSI a.p. *a^a* and *a^b*

1. **мрътѣѣѣ** 11a acc pl (Lk. 9:60).
2. **ѣ старѣѣѣ** 1b, **старѣѣѣ** 9a acc pl, **съ старѣѣѣ** 13b.
AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣѣѣ** 10b, 17a, **ѣѣѣ** 11a.

CSI a.p. *b^c*

1. **конѣѣѣ** 17a.

Nouns ending in **-ѣѣѣ** originally belonging to CSI a.p. *a^b* are normally accentuated according to a.p. *b* in both ESl and SSl sources. Not affected by the EBlg accent retraction, they usually show accentuation on the ending in both EBlg and EGrR sources, but accentuation on the preceding

⁵⁴ Cf., for example, Ev. 1355/56 149v **ѣ запрѣѣѣ ѡгню** (Luke 4:39).

⁵⁵ Bulatova 1973:85, Görner 1974:71ff. A different interpretation is discussed in section 3.8.6.

⁵⁶ Dybo 1975:33, Zaliznjak 1985a:137, Bulatova 1975:91f.

⁵⁷ Zaliznjak 1985a:246ff, map no. 4, 369.

⁵⁸ Dybo 1971a:68f, 1977:191ff, 198. Cf. also section 3.1.4.2.4.

⁵⁹ Dybo 1981:146ff.

syllable in WGrR sources (cf. sections 3.1.4.1.1–2). Thus, **мрътъвъць** regularly shows accent on the ending in both EGrR and EBlg sources.⁶⁰ **отъць**, on the other hand, normally shows accentuation on the root in both EBlg and WGrR sources, while the expected accentuation on the ending is mainly restricted to EGrR sources,⁶¹ whereas **старъць** (CSl a.p. *a^a*) is regularly attested with constant accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources.⁶²

As expected, **конъць** is regularly attested with accentuation on the ending in the genitive singular in both ESl—mainly EGrR—and MBlg sources, whereas root accentuation is attested in WGrR and Ukr sources.⁶³

3.2.1.3. Nouns ending in -ъникъ

• For this category Dybo reconstructs CSl a.p. *a^a*, *a^b* (both with constant root-stress in late CSl), and *b^c* (stress on the ending).⁶⁴

CSl a.p. a^a and a^b

1. **й грѣшници** etc. 8b (3x),
грѣшникѹ 8b dat pl.
2. **закѣнникъ** BAN 4.9.7:4v.
3. **книжници** 15b.
4. **настаѣвниче** 6b voc sg.
5. **причаѣстникѹ** 6b dat pl.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡбѣщника** 7a nom du (Lk. 5:10).

CSl a.p. b^c

1. **вѣстники** 18b acc pl.

кънѣжьникъ (CSl a.p. *a^a*) normally shows constant accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources. Parallels with accentuation on the suffix can, however, be found in Serbian sources, with *oksia* possibly indicating length instead of ictus. Note, however, the line-break (cf. section 2.3.5). As for the standard accentuated AU within CSl a.p. *a*, parallels to their accentuation are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

For **ѡбъщъникъ** (CSl a.p. *a^b*),⁶⁵ ESl sources normally show accentuation on the second syllable, and in the SSl sources of the comparison material no parallels to the accentuation in F have been registered.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 278r **сѡѡ мѣртвѣцѡ**, Dybo 1973:163, 190f.

⁶¹ Dybo 1977:217, Zaliznjak 1985a:185. Cf. also Smotr. 1619 є5 **ѡтъцѡ** as well as Smotr. 1648 111r **ѡтъцѡ**.

⁶² Dybo 1977:225, 1981:55, 146.

⁶³ Dybo 1977:227, Zaliznjak 1985a:187, Smotr. 1619 ц3v **доѡбѣнца**.

⁶⁴ Dybo 1981:187.

⁶⁵ Dybo 1975:54, Zaliznjak 1985a:136.

⁶⁶ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 248r **ѡбѣщника**, Ber. 1627:147 **ѡбѣщниѠ**, as well as Ev. 1355/56 150v **ѡбѣщника** (with no accent mark).

For **вѣстѣникъ** as well as for other lexemes belonging to CS1 a.p. *b^c* accentuation is theoretically expected on the ending.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, this lexeme normally shows accentuation on the root in both ESl and SS1 sources.⁶⁸

3.2.1.4. Other suffixed formations

1. **вѣины** 9b acc pl.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **оученици** 1a, 3a, 16a, **оученици** 18a, **оученикъ** 10b, **къ ѣченикъ** 18b, **оученикы** 5a acc pl, **съ оученикы** 14a, **оученика** 18b nom du; — 2. **оучитель** 14a.

The lexeme **воинъ** (CS1 a.p. *a^c?*)⁶⁹ in ESl sources normally shows accentuation on the root, whereas MBlg sources retain the older accentuation on the suffix.⁷⁰

Parallels to the AU of **оученикъ** (CS1 a.p. *b^c*) with initial accentuation are mainly attested in Ukr sources, whereas GrR as well as SS1 sources usually show either accentuation on the ending or constant accentuation on the suffix.⁷¹ As for **оучитель** (originally CS1 a.p. *c^c?*),⁷² accentuation on the second syllable is well attested in both ESl and SS1 sources, so that a 'phonetic' basis for the initial accentuation attested here is rather doubtful.⁷³

3.2.1.5. Prefixed formations (without suffixes)

1. **въ займъ** 10a.
2. **ѣтрѣкъ** 3a.⁷⁴
3. **ни при поасть** 4b*.
4. **сънѣмъ** 13b (Mk. 15:1).

⁶⁷ Cf. Dybo 1981:187f, Kolesov 1972a:75ff.

⁶⁸ Cf., for example, Dybo 1977:230, ОВА **вѣстники** (Schweier 1987:207), Ev. 1627 277r **вѣстники** Apl (*sic*), Ber. 1627:24 **вѣстникъ**, Slavin. 438 **вѣстникъ**, SLS I:260 **вѣстникъ**.

⁶⁹ Dybo 1975:48, 1981:171.

⁷⁰ ESl sources early on show reflexes of a retraction in words of this type, sometimes with reflexes of the phoneme /ð/; see Zaliznjak 1985a:172, 175, Stadnikova 1989:146. For MBlg examples see Dybo 1973:189, Görner 1968:85.

⁷¹ Zaliznjak 1985a:149, Dybo 1973:160ff, 188, 190, but Sb. No. 1735 **оу'ченици** besides **оученици** and **оучени'кы** (2x) (Koneski 1954:83), Berl. 79v **оу'ченици** besides **оученикъмъ** dat pl (6x) (Kul'bakin 1904:37), while a series of Ukr sources with initial accentuation are quoted in Ohijenko 1952:99f. Note, however, Smotr. 1619 **еѣг оу'ченикъ**.

⁷² Dybo 1981:258.

⁷³ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:152, Ohijenko 1952:69f, ОВА **оучитель** etc. (Schweier 1987:218), Sb. No. 1735 **оучи'тель** (Koneski 1954:83), Služ. Sol. ѥ **оу'чителство** (Syrku 1890:78).

⁷⁴ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **ѣтрѣкъ** 9a; cf. section 3.8.3.3.

The CSI stress of this type of formations is often difficult to reconstruct, as later developments often obscure the original state of affairs.⁷⁵ Therefore, most of the statements on CSI a.p. below are tentative.

Parallels to the accentuation of **зѣимъ** (CSI a.p. *a^b?*) are regularly attested in ESl sources, and the same accentuation is to be expected in SSl sources.⁷⁶

отрокъ (CSI a.p. *a^c?*) normally shows accentuation on the root in MBlg sources,⁷⁷ whereas ESl—particularly EGrR, as well as younger WGrR and Ukr—sources show accentuation on the prefix. Older WGrR and Ukr sources, however, usually show accentuation on the ending according to a.p. *b*, which in the nominative singular coincides with the MBlg accentuation.⁷⁸

поѣсъ (CSI a.p. *c^c*) is normally attested with constant accentuation on the prefix in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources often reflect the CSI mobility.⁷⁹ Accentuation on the second syllable is, however, attested in Serbian sources.⁸⁰

Finally, parallels to the accentuation of **сѣньмъ** (CSI a.p. *a^b?*), with accentuation on the root in the nominative singular, are regularly attested in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show constant accentuation on the prefix.⁸¹

3.2.1.6. Compounds

1. **въ вѣногра**[] 2a loc sg.
2. **лицемѣри** 3b, **лицемѣри** 3b.

Compounds were originally stressed in accordance with the same principles as other AU, i.e. the stress depended on the characteristics of the first orthotonic word-form of the compound. If the parts taken separately all were enclinomena, the whole compound constituted a single enclinomenon. According to Zaliznjak, however, in early ESl these types in most cases changed into a single type with constant stress on the last root morpheme.⁸²

⁷⁵ Cf., for example, Zaliznjak 1985a:153 and section 3.1.4.2.4 above.

⁷⁶ Cf., for example, Zaliznjak 1985a:153, **Ова в зѣимъ** (Schweier 1987:209), Bulatova 1982:89.

⁷⁷ Cf., for example, Dybo 1977:220, Hinrichs 1985:46, Görner 1968:98, Ohijenko 1932:397.

⁷⁸ See Zaliznjak 1985a:153, 288f, 1985b:101f, Schweier 1987:213, 236ff.

⁷⁹ Dybo 1977:234, Ps. No. 3 107v **и ѡко побасъ** (Hinrichs 1985:46), Zaliznjak 1985a:137, 154. Čud., on the other hand, can rather be assumed to reflect a.p. *b*; see Dybo 1975:15.

⁸⁰ Cf. Berl. 61v **поѣсъ**, 5r **поѣсъ**, 15r **поѣсъ** (Kul'bakin 1904:37). The function of *oksia* in these examples is, however, not clear.

⁸¹ Cf., for example, Ps. No. 3 58v **сѣньмъ теби** As (Hinrichs 1985:47), Nor. ps. 99v **вѣсь сѣньмъ**, Zaliznjak 1985a:153, Ber. 1627:119 **сѣньмъ**, OBb 25a **ѡ вѣсь сѣньмъ**, Ev. 1627 209v **ѡ вѣсь сѣньмъ**.

⁸² Zaliznjak 1985a:156.

Both **виноградъ** and **лицемѣръ** normally show accentuation on the last root morpheme in ESl sources. In MBlg sources the same accentuation is regularly attested for **лицемѣръ**, whereas **виноградъ** also shows accentuation on the second syllable.⁸³ The occurrence of *oksia* above the *first* vowel in two of the attested AU in this category therefore probably indicates secondary stress, a not unusual phenomenon in words of this type in sources with different backgrounds (cf. section 2.3.6).

3.2.2. Neuter o- and jo-stems

3.2.2.1. Underived nouns

• CSl a.p. *a* is reconstructed with root-stress in all forms, whereas CSl a.p. *b* is reconstructed with stress on the ending in all forms. In CSl a.p. *c* all cases in the singular as well as the nominative and accusative plural were enclitomena, whereas the remaining cases of the plural are reconstructed with final end-stress.

CSl a.p. *a*

1. зръно 3a.
2. кѣ| кѡлѣнѡма 7a dat du.
3. на лѣта 11b.
4. въ вѣско мѣсто 7b.
5. на рало 11a.
6. чад[] 2a nom sg.

CSl a.p. *b*

1. по лицуу 15a, || лице 13a.
2. на лбжи 10a.

CSl a.p. *c*

1. гбре ѿ 3b nom sg (=interj).
 2. мбръ 5a gen sg, по мбрю 5a, по| мбрю 5a, въ мбре 1a.
 3. слово 1b, ѡ словеси 17a.⁸⁴
- AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ѿчи 18a acc du.

The lexeme **колѣно** normally shows constant accentuation on the second syllable in both ESl and MBlg sources.⁸⁵ The occurrence of *oksia* above **ѡ** in the attested AU might be connected with the line-break. Possibly the choice of **ѡ** instead of **ѡ** could also be relevant (cf. sections 2.3.5–6, 4.3.4).

Parallels to the root-accentuated AU of **зръно**, **лѣто**, **мѣсто**, **ра-**
ло, and **чадо** are also regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.

⁸³ Dybo 1977:234, 1981:75, Hinrichs 1985:48.

⁸⁴ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **слово** ѿ 6b; cf. section 3.8.2.1.

⁸⁵ Dybo 1981:149.

Among the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, parallels to the root-accentuated AU of both **лицѣ** and **ложѣ** are regularly attested in MBlg sources. In GrR sources **ложѣ** normally shows accentuation on the root in both EGrR and WGrR sources, whereas **лицѣ** is attested with accentuation on the root mainly in WGrR sources, EGrR sources usually reflecting the original stress on the ending.⁸⁶

Among the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *c* all attested AU reflect CSI enclitomena. As with the masculine *o*- and *jo*-stems, accentuation on the preposition, if any, is best preserved in EGrR and older EBlg sources, whereas WGrR and Mold sources in such sequences usually generalize accentuation on the root (cf. section 3.1.4.2.4).

The *s*-stem locative singular **словеси** is attested with accentuation on the root (besides other types) mainly in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show accentuation on the ending.⁸⁷

As for the dual **ѣчи**, initial accentuation is regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.⁸⁸

3.2.2.2. Verbal nouns ending in -ниѣ

• Dybo reconstructs CSI a.p. *a^a* (root stress), *a^b* (constant stress on the 'thematic' element), and *b^c* (constant stress on the ending). Later developments changed this picture considerably, and both EBlg and Ukr sources normally generalize thematic accentuation in all a.p., whereas in ESl sources a distinction is normally retained between accentuation on the root (<CSI a.p. *a^a*) and thematic accentuation (<CSI a.p. *a^b* and *b^c*).⁸⁹

CSI a.p. a^a

1. **въ плáвани** 5a loc sg.

2.

сквозѣ съáниѣ 16a acc pl (Mk. 2:23).

3. **трѣбованіѣ** 16b acc sg.

CSI a.p. a^b

1. **въспомíнаніѣ** 14b acc sg.

2. **въсхóженіюу** 18b.

3.

желáніємь 14a.

CSI a.p. b^c

1. **съ съблòденіємь** 12a.

⁸⁶ Zaliznjak 1985a:135, 186f, 197.

⁸⁷ Görner 1974:75ff, Dybo 1973:170f, 198f, Kolesov 1972a:201ff, 1973b:125f. According to Stang, accentuation on the ending in ESl sources is 'Church Slavonic', that is, 'specifically literary', in our terminology (Stang 1957:94f). Note the occurrence of root accentuation of *s*-stem forms of this lexeme in ESl sources as well; see Zaliznjak 1985a:283.

⁸⁸ Dybo 1981:37.

⁸⁹ Dybo 1977:230, 1981:186, Hinrichs 1985:70, Ohijenko 1928:446.

Parallels to the thematic accentuation of **сѣѣникъ** are attested in some WGrR, Ukr, and MBlg sources, whereas EGrR sources normally seem to show accentuation on the root.⁹⁰

As for the root-accentuated AU **въ плáвани** and **трѣбованіѣ**, parallels are mainly attested in GrR sources, whereas both Ukr and EBlg sources normally show thematic accentuation.

Among the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *a^b* both ESl and MBlg sources normally show thematic accentuation. Parallels to the root-accentuated AU of **въспоминаниѣ** are, however, attested in both MBlg and Serbian sources, and root-accentuated forms of **въсхожденіѣ** can be found in Serbian sources.⁹¹

The lexeme **сѣблюдениѣ** is normally attested with thematic accentuation in both ESl and MBlg sources, while accentuation on the root can be expected to occur in Serbian sources. Root-accentuation is also not excluded in ESl sources.⁹² Note, however, that in some sources a medial *varia* occurring immediately after a line-break cannot be trusted as an indication of the position of ictus (cf. sections 2.3.2.2, 2.3.5).

3.2.2.3. Other nouns ending in -икъ

• Dybo reconstructs CSI a.p. *a^a*, *a^b* (both with root-stress in late CSI), and *b^c* (constant stress on the ending).⁹³

1. **лѣствѣ** [] 1a acc sg.
2. **за невѣръствѣѣ** 3a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **на оутрѣа** 13b acc pl.

Both **лѣствѣѣ** (CSI a.p. *b^c*) and **невѣръствѣѣ** as well as **оутрѣѣ** (both belonging to CSI a.p. *a^a*) are regularly attested with accentuation on the root in both ESl and MBlg sources.

3.2.2.4. Nouns ending in -ище, -ѣство, and -ѣце

• Nouns ending in -ище are reconstructed with CSI a.p. *a^a* (root stress), *a^b* and *a^c* (stress on the suffix), whereas nouns ending in -ѣство and -ѣце are reconstructed with CSI a.p. *a^a*, *a^b* (both with root-stress in late CSI), and *b^c* (constant stress on the ending).⁹⁴

1. **ѣйца** 10b gen sg (Lk. 11:12).

⁹⁰ Cf., for example, Zaliznjak 1981:167, Slavin. 517 **сѣѣніѣ**, Ev. 1545 146v **сквозѣ сѣѣніѣ** (Luke 6:1), ОВа **сквозѣ сѣѣніѣ** (Schweier 1987:246), Ev. 1627 150v **сквозѣ сѣѣніѣ**. Cf. also the Serbian Dov. 121r **скрѣстѣ сѣѣніѣ**.

⁹¹ Cf., for example, Služ. No. 323 65v **въспомѣнаниѣ**, Lit. 1519 5v **въ въспомѣнаниѣ**, and **въспомѣнаниѣ** in a MBlg fourteenth-century MS (Ivanova 1981:352), Sb. 1536 1r **хѣжденіѣ** (Novaković 1877:58), and Ps. 1495 **въхѣженіѣ** etc. (Novaković 1877:141).

⁹² Cf. section 3.1.4.1.3, Bulatova 1975:244, Steensland 1990:158ff.

⁹³ Dybo 1981:152.

⁹⁴ See Zaliznjak 1985a:146f, Dybo 1981:148ff, 171.

2. **мнѡ|жьство** 6b acc sg.

3. **скрѡвище** 16a nom sg.

скровѣще 16a acc sg, **скровѣщѣ** 16a gen pl.

The lexeme **съкровище** (CSl a.p. *a^b?*) shows accentuation on the suffix mainly in ESl sources, but root-accentuation is regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.⁹⁵

Parallels to the accentuation of **аницѣ** (CSl a.p. *b^c*) with medial *iso* might theoretically be expected in EBlg sources with reflexes of the EBlg accent retraction. This innovation, however, usually did not affect formations with *jer* suffixes (cf. section 3.1.4.1.2). ESl sources, on the other hand, regularly show accentuation on the ending.⁹⁶ Consequently, the probability for *iso* indicating ictus in the AU in question seems rather low.

Parallels to the accentuation of **мъножьство** (CSl a.p. *a^a*) are regularly attested in ESl as well as SSl sources.

3.2.3. *ā-* and *jā-*stems

In this section both feminine and masculine *ā-* and *jā-*stems will be dealt with.

3.2.3.1. Underived nouns

• CSl a.p. *a* is reconstructed with root-stress in all forms, whereas CSl a.p. *b* is reconstructed with stress on the ending in all forms.⁹⁷ In CSl a.p. *c* the dative and accusative singular as well as the nominative and accusative plural were enclitomena, whereas the remaining singular and plural cases are reconstructed with final end-stress.⁹⁸

CSl a.p. *a*

1.

по вѣчѣри 14b loc sg.

2. **вѣры** 9b, **вѣроу** 1a, 3a.

3. **млѣнїи** 12a nom sg.

4. **мрѣжа** 6a acc pl.

5. **нїва** 11b.

6. **ѡ рѣи[ны]** BAN 4.9.7:1r gen sg (Mk. 5:29).

7. **въ рѣбы мѣсто** 10b gen sg, **рѣбѣ** 6b, 7a gen pl.

8. **ѣ сїла** 17a, **сїлы** 4a gen sg, **ѣ сїлою** 6b, **ѣ сїлы** 4a nom pl.

⁹⁵ See Zaliznjak 1985a:134, Gömer 1974:84.

⁹⁶ See Dybo 1981:150, OBb 34c **ѣица**, Ev. 1627 284v **ѣица**. According to Zaliznjak, in ESl sources accentuation on the root must be interpreted as 'non-literary' accentuation; cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:191. See also section 3.1.4.2.5.

⁹⁷ Some scholars, however, reconstruct root-stress in the nominative and accusative plural; cf. Skljarenko 1969:9ff.

⁹⁸ Dybo 1981:27.

9. **ѿ четврѣтѣи стражи** 5a.
10. **тѣща| же** 7b.
11. **ча́ша** 14b, **ча́шоу** 14a, **и ча́шоу** 14b.

CSl a.p. b

1. **во́лю** 2a.
2. **мѣ́зда** 8b.
- 3.
4. **и тлѣ́** 16a, **ни тлѣ́** 16a.

не сестрѣ| ли 4a gen sg.

CSl a.p. c

1. **гла́вы** 11a gen sg.
2. **въ го́роу** 5a.
- 3.
4. **стра́ны** 7b gen sg.

го|рѣ сѣи 3a, **и горѣ́ сѣи** 1a
dat sg.

на| зѣмлѣ 5a, **на зѣмлѣ́** 16a.

Parallels to the accentuation of all AU belonging to CSl a.p. *a*, including the polysyllabic **вечерю́**,⁹⁹ are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *b*, parallels to the accentuation of **сестра́**, **во́лю**, and **тѣлѣ́** are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.¹⁰⁰ As for **мѣ́зда**, most ESl as well as SSl sources show accentuation on the ending. Parallels to the accentuation in the AU **мѣ́зда**, however, are sporadically attested in both MBlg and Serbian sources.¹⁰¹

As for the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *c*, parallels to the accentuation of **горо́** are attested in both ESl and MBlg sources. Note, however, that the accentuation of this lexeme shows a considerable variation between sources from different areas, but also within the respective groups of sources.¹⁰² Accentuation on the ending in the locative singular of **зѣмля́** is regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.¹⁰³

As for the lexemes **глава́** and **страна́**, accentuation on the root in the genitive singular is regularly attested in both WGrR and Ukr sources, as well as in some MBlg sources. EGrR sources, on the other hand, together with other MBlg sources, normally show accentuation on the ending, reflecting the CSl stress pattern.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ Note that MB in contrast to OBa normally shows initial accentuation of this lexeme; cf. Schweier 1987:292.

¹⁰⁰ Note that **во́лю** is reconstructed with a special variant of CSl a.p. *b* with root-stress e.g. in the accusative singular; see Dybo 1981:78, Zaliznjak 1985a:135f, 142. Some scholars, however, reconstruct CSl a.p. *a*; cf. Kolesov 1972a:20, 23, Bulatova 1981:63, 67, Stang 1957:57ff.

¹⁰¹ Dybo 1973:178f, 204, Görner 1968:86. Accentuation on the root, however, is not excluded even in ESl sources; cf., e.g., Nil. T 183b **мѣ́зда** ('непонятное написание', Bogatyrev 1989:184).

¹⁰² See Dybo 1977:210, Zaliznjak 1985a:136.

¹⁰³ Dybo 1973:180, 1977:202, Zaliznjak 1985a:252ff.

¹⁰⁴ See Dybo 1973:179, Görner 1974:78f, Zaliznjak 1985a:135, Hinrichs 1985:51, 53.

3.2.3.2. Nouns ending in **-иѡа**

• Among the nouns ending in **-иѡа** derivatives with two accentologically different suffixes can be discerned:

1) The suffix **-in-a¹** occurs in abstract nouns derived from adjectives. Formations with this suffix are reconstructed with CSI a.p. *a^a* (root-stress), *a^b* (stress on the suffix), and *c^c* (mobile stress). Lexemes belonging to a.p. *c^c* later generalized stress on the ending according to a.p. *b*.

2) The suffix **-in-a²** occurs in other types of formations, accentologically distributed between CSI a.p. *a^a* (root-stress), *a^b*, and *a^c* (the latter two both with constant stress on the suffix).¹⁰⁵

1.

Ѣ ТѢИѢ 16a.

2. **Ѣ хрѡмины 9a.**

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѢСТИИ** [] 13a acc sg (Mk. 14:70); — 2. **ѢЗВИНЫ** 11a acc pl.

Parallels to the accentuation of **тѡиѡа** (CSI a.p. *b^c*) are regularly attested in MBlg sources, whereas early ESl sources usually show accentuation on the ending. On the other hand, younger ESl—both GrR and Ukr—sources normally show accentuation on the root of this lexeme. As for **хрѡмина** (CSI a.p. *a^a* or *a^b?*), accentuation on the root is regularly attested in both MBlg and GrR sources, whereas Ukr sources normally show accentuation on the ending according to a.p. *b*.¹⁰⁶

Parallels to the initial accentuation of **истиѡа** and **ѡзѡина** (both CSI a.p. *a^a*) are also normally attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.

3.2.3.3. Nouns ending in **-иѡа**

• For this category Dybo reconstructs CSI a.p. *a^a* (root-stress), *a^b*, and *a^c* (the latter two both with constant stress on the suffix).¹⁰⁷

1. **ѢДѢИѢЦѢ 3b gen pl.**

2.

Ѣ ЛЮБѢДѢИѢЦѢ 2a, ЛЮБѢДѢИѢЦѢ, 1 2b* nom pl.

The compound **любѡдѡиѡа** in ESl sources is normally attested with accentuation on the second root, conforming to the rule proposed by Zaliznjak (cf. section 3.2.1.6).¹⁰⁸ Accentuation on the suffix, however, could theoretically perhaps be explained as an archaism, reflecting the affiliation of the verb **дѡѡти** to CSI a.p. *c*.¹⁰⁹ The affiliation of the verb

¹⁰⁵ See Dybo 1981:144ff, 173, Zaliznjak 1985a:146f, 149f, Kolesov 1974:83, 85f.

¹⁰⁶ See Dybo 1973:174, Zaliznjak 1985a:225, Kolesov 1969:51.

¹⁰⁷ Dybo 1981:172f.

¹⁰⁸ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 98v **Ѣ ЛЮБѢДѢИѢЦѢ, Ѣ ЛЮБѢДѢИѢЦѢ** (Matt. 21:31, 32).

¹⁰⁹ See Dybo 1982a:207.

ЛЮБИТИ to CSI a.p. *b*, on the other hand, suggests a reconstruction of CSI stress on the second syllable of the compound.

Normally, **ВЪДОВИЦА** (CSI a.p. *a^b*) shows accentuation on the suffix in both ESl and MBlg sources, but nevertheless parallels to the accentuation in F are attested in some EBlg sources.¹¹⁰

3.2.3.4. Other derived nouns

1. **Ѧ ВЛАДЫКОЮ** 9b.
2. **и РАБЫНИ** 13a nom sg.

Both **ВЛАДЫКА** (CSI a.p. *a^c*) and **РАБЫНИ** (CSI a.p. *a^b*) normally show accentuation on the suffix in both ESl and MBlg sources. Accentuation on the root, however, can probably be attested in Serbian sources, possibly also as ‘specifically literary’ accentuations in GrR sources (cf. sections 3.1.4.1.3–4).¹¹¹

3.2.4. *i*-, *ū*-, and *n*-stems

3.2.4.1. Underived nouns

1. **ВЛАСТЬ** 4b acc sg, **ВЛАСТІЮ** 1b, 6a.
2. **КАМЫ** 12b nom sg, **КАМЕНЬ** 5b acc sg. **КАМЕНЬ** 10b acc sg, **НА КАМЕНИ** 2b.
3. **МѢДИ** 4b gen sg.
4. **НОЩЬ** 11b acc sg.
5. **ТАТІЕ** 16a nom pl.
6. **ЧРЪВЬ** 16a, **НИ ЧРЪВЬ** 16a nom sg.
7. **БЕЗ ЧБІСТИ** 4a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ЙМА** 17a acc sg, **ЙМЕНЕМЬ** 9b instr sg.

The lexeme **КАМТЫ** (CSI a.p. *a*) in both ESl and MBlg sources normally shows constant accentuation on the root. Forms accentuated on the second syllable in the oblique cases and forms with two accent marks are, however, sporadically attested mainly in SSl, mostly Serbian sources.¹¹² The phonetic basis for such accentuations in these sources is perhaps doubtful, but their factual occurrence makes it theoretically possible that the ac-

¹¹⁰ See Dybo 1973:176, 202.

¹¹¹ Cf., for example, Smotr. 1619 **дѡв РАБЫНА** /или РАБЫНИ, Smotr. 1648 104г **РАБЫНА**. Some other formations with this suffix, however, in Smotr. 1648 show accentuation on the root; see Horbatsch 1964:39.

¹¹² Cf., for example, Ev. 1548 **НА КАМЕНИ** (Ohijenko 1932:397), Sb. 1536 15v **КАМЕНЬ**, 16r **КАМЕНЕ** (Novaković 1877:33) as well as two possible parallels in the ESl Stich. No. 307; cf. Störmer 1987:31.

centuation of the AU **КАМѢНЬ** and **НА КАМѢНИ** could reflect the accentuation of the protograph.

Parallels to the root-accentuated AU of **мѣдь** (CSl a.p. *a*), **чръвь** (CSl a.p. *b*), and **власть, ношь, тать, and чьсть** (all belonging to CSl a.p. *c*) are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources. As for **имѧ** (CSl a.p. *c*), initial accentuation is regularly attested in both MBlg and GrR sources, whereas Ukr sources normally show accentuation on the second syllable in the nominative, accusative, and vocative singular.¹¹³

3.2.4.2. Derived nouns

1. **неплоды** 17b nom sg.
2. **въ старости** 17b.

Both **неплоды** (CSl a.p. *a^c*) and **старость** (CSl a.p. *a^a*) regularly show accentuation on the root in both ESl and MBlg sources.¹¹⁴

3.3. Adjectives

In the present section on the accentuation of the adjectives—including de-adjectival adverbs, adjectival pronouns, and ordinal numerals—simple and compound forms, as well as the comparative,¹¹⁵ are treated separately. The CSl stress for the simple adjectives is the same as for the nouns, with the masculines and neuters being *o*-stems and the feminines being *ā*-stems.

The compound forms, which according to the definitions in section 3.1.2 all belonged to CSl a.p. *a*, can be divided into three groups according to the CSl a.p. affiliation of the corresponding simple adjectives: Compound adjectives where the corresponding simple adjectives belong to CSl a.p. *a*—in the following abbreviated ‘ $\diamond$ CSl a.p. *a*’, etc.—are reconstructed with constant stress on the root, whereas those with the corresponding simple forms belonging to CSl a.p. *b* normally get constant stress on the syllable immediately preceding the ending (‘preflexional stress’). Compound adjectives with the corresponding simple forms belonging to CSl a.p. *c* are reconstructed with constant stress on the first syllable of the ending (‘flexional stress’).¹¹⁶

¹¹³ See Dybo 1977:219, Nikolaev 1989:69, Smotr. 1619 жлг **имѧ, именемъ**.

¹¹⁴ Note, however, the occurrence of accentuation on the suffix or ending of the lexeme **старость** in some EBlg sources; cf. Dybo 1981:112, 115f.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:126.

¹¹⁶ See Zaliznjak 1985a:142, Dybo 1981:129, Kolesov 1974:77ff.

3.3.1. Adjectives ending in -ЬНЪ

3.3.1.1. Simple forms

• Dybo reconstructs CSI a.p. a^a (constant root-stress), a^b (in all cases except the nominative and accusative singular masculine with stress on the syllable immediately preceding the suffix), and c^c (mobile stress).¹¹⁷

1. **НЕ НЕЪЗМОЖНО** 3a.
2. **НЕВЪРЕИЪ** 3a.
3. **ТЪЦНО** 9a adv.

Parallel to the AU (all belonging to CSI a.p. a^a) accentuated on the root in this category are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.

3.3.1.2. Compound forms

1. **ВЪИУНАГО** 8b.
2. **НОЦНЪИ** 5a loc sg f.

ВЪИШЪИИ (◊ CSI a.p. a) is regularly attested with accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources. The same applies to **НОЦЪИИ** (◊ CSI a.p. c), in MBlg sources, however, besides flexional accentuation.¹¹⁸ In ESl sources accentuation on the root is clearly connected with the 'literary' character of the lexeme, whereas the 'vernacular' variant with **ч** instead of **ѡ** normally shows the 'etymologically' expected flexional accentuation.¹¹⁹

3.3.2. Other adjectives

3.3.2.1. Simple forms

1. 2. 3. И П МАЛЪ 13a loc sg n=adv,
МАЛО 4b, МАЛО 6b adv. 4. МНОГО 6b acc sg n, МНОГЪ
7b, МНОГА 8b nom sg f,
МНОГА 11b, МНОГА 11b,
МНОГА 15a* acc pl n, МНОГО
12b adv. 5. НИИ 18a nom pl m (Mt. 17:6). | БОГАТОУ 11b dat sg m.
ДОСТОИИЪ 9a nom sg m, ДО-
СТОИНА 9a gen sg m. |
|---|---|

¹¹⁷ Dyb 1981:94.

¹¹⁸ Cf., for example, Zogr. sb. **НОВИИ** (Ivanov 1931:377).

¹¹⁹ See aliznjak 1985a:311, Dybo 1981:94, Hinrichs 1985:82.

6. **тѡлики** 9b gen sg f.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡчѣ** 2a acc sg f; — 2. **ѣлицѣ** 7b, **ѣлика** 10a acc pl n.

Among the simple forms in F are only attested adjectives belonging to CSI a.p. *a*, with parallels to the accentuation of most AU, including **богѣтѡу** (CSI a.p. *a*^c), regularly being found in both ESI and SSI sources.¹²⁰

The accentuation of the lexemes **достѡинъ**, **толикъ**, and **ѣликъ**, however, have parallels mainly in MBlg sources, whereas ESI sources normally show accentuation on the root in **достѡинъ** and on the second syllable in **толикъ** and **ѣликъ**.¹²¹

3.3.2.2. Compound forms

CSI root stress (∅ CSI a.p. a)

1. **нечѣстѣми** 4b, **нечѣстѣимъ** 6a dat pl. **нечѣ|стѣми** 4b.
2. **прѣвыи** 2a, **къ прѣвоу** 2a.

CSI prefixional stress (∅ CSI a.p. b)

1. **мрѣтѣи** 11a acc pl.
2. **нѡвыи** 14b.

CSI flexional stress (∅ CSI a.p. c)

1. **дрѡугоу** 2a, **къ дрѡуго-моу** 11a.
2. **и злѣи** 8b acc pl.

The occurrence of a second *oksia* in one of the AU of **нечѣстѣи** can probably be explained graphically as being due to the line-break (cf. section 2.3.6), since accentuation on the root is regularly attested in ESI as well as MBlg sources. The lexeme **прѣвыи**, too, shows root-accentuation in most ESI and MBlg sources.¹²²

Parallels to the accentuation of **мрѣтѣи** are regularly attested in both ESI and MBlg sources.¹²³ Prefixional accentuation of **нѡвыи** is regularly attested mainly in GrR sources, whereas MBlg sources show both prefixional and flexional accentuation.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ See, for example, Hinrichs 1985:64.

¹²¹ Note, however, ОВа **достѡинъ** vs. the more frequent **достѣинъ** (Schweier 1987:345). For SSI examples see e.g. Görner 1968:89. As for **толикъ** and **ѣликъ**; cf., for example, Dybo 1975:49, 1977:229, Zaliznjak 1985a:147.

¹²² See Zaliznjak 1985a:133. Illič-Svityč, on the other hand, reconstructs for this lexeme CSI a.p. *c* (Illič-Svityč 1963:156).

¹²³ Dybo 1981:110, Kolesov 1972a:209.

¹²⁴ This reflects the possible reconstruction of CSI a.p. *c* for the simple adjective **нѡвъ**. Most scholars, however, still reconstruct CSI a.p. *b*; cf. Illič-Svityč 1963:142, Dybo 1981:21, 120, Zaliznjak 1985a:138, 310, Steensland 1990:177f.

The lexeme **дрѹгъи**, notwithstanding the affiliation of its corresponding simple form **дрѹгъ** to CSI a.p. *c*, normally shows accentuation on the root in both MBlg and Ukr sources, whereas GrR sources regularly show flexional accentuation.¹²⁵ As for **зълъи** (◊ CSI a.p. *b*), it seems that all compound adjectives with a *jer* in the root, irrespective of the stress of their simple counterparts, can be reconstructed with flexional stress in late CSI.¹²⁶

3.3.3. The comparative

1. **ѣбѣшю** 11b acc sg f.

For comparatives formed with the suffix **j* Zaliznjak reconstructs a.p. *a* for formations with long and *b* for formations with short root vowels, irrespective of the CSI a.p. affiliation of the corresponding positive adjectives.¹²⁷ As for the AU **ѣбѣшю**, accentuation on the root is regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

3.4. Indeclinable lexemes

In the present section the accentuated AU of the indeclinable lexemes of various categories in F will be discussed.¹²⁸ As these lexemes do not form declensional paradigms, they will be divided according to their reconstructed CSI enclinenomenon or orthotonic status (cf. section 3.1.2). Note, however, that the classification must in some cases be considered tentative, as the accentological literature on this category is comparatively scarce.¹²⁹

CSI orthotonic words

1. ѣѣнѣ 13a adv.	
2. дѣжѣ 13b adv.	
3.	доколѣ 3a adv.
4.	ѣдѣ 10b (2x), ѣдѣ 10b conj.
5.	ѣлѣ 1b, 10b (2x), 12a conj.
6. гдѣ 11b, 14a adv.	
7.	онѣ , 12a adv.
8. ѣсѣдоу 3a adv.	

¹²⁵ See e.g. Dybo 1977:230, Ohijenko 1925:213ff, 1952:178f, Schweier 1987:307.

¹²⁶ Dybo 1981:108.

¹²⁷ For details see Zaliznjak 1985a:148. Note that this reconstruction refers to the CESI system. A slightly different approach to the CSI state of affairs is found in Stang 1957:104f.

¹²⁸ The conjunctions **ѣ**, **и**, and **нѣ**, with clitic character in CSI, are treated in section 3.8.3.2, below.

¹²⁹ Useful information can be found, however, in e.g. Dybo 1975, 1977, 1981, Zaliznjak 1979, and Steensland 1990.

9. **послѣди же** 2a adv.
10. **здѣ** 4a, 5b, 12a (2x), 18a (2x) adv.
11. **сѣмо** 3a adv.
12. **тáкоже** 2a, **тáкоже** 8a, 12b, **тáкоже же** 7a adv.
13. **тáмо** 3a, **тáмо** 16b adv.
14. **тогда** 3a adv.
15. **тѣу** 14a adv.
16. **егда** 16b, 18b conj.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡбѣ** 1a (2x), 5b, 8a, 13b, 15a, **ѡбѣи же** 7b adv; — 2. **йбш** 9a conj; — 3. **й йдеже** 16a, **й йдеже** 16a conj; — 4. **ѡбаче** 14b, **ѡбаче** 8b adv; — 5. **ѡнде** 12a adv; — 6. **ѡубо** 1b, 14b (2x), **ѡубо** 10b adv; — 7. **ѡуже** 10a adv; — 8. **ѡкоже** 6b, **ѡкоже** 14a, **й ѡкоже** 12b adv; — 9. **ѣгда** 12a, 14a conj; — 10. **ѣще же** 9a, 18a adv.

Final accentuation of **ѣда**, **или**, **тогда**, and **егда** is regularly attested in both ESl—including WGrR—and MBlg sources.

The two non-standard accentuated AU **доколѣ** and **ондѣ**, on the other hand, have few or no parallels in the comparison material. Parallels to the final accentuation in **ондѣ** are sporadically attested in some ESl sixteenth-century sources, against a compact background of initial accentuation. In the SSl area, final accentuation has been attested only in some contemporary dialects, whereas here too the medieval written sources regularly show initial accentuation.¹³⁰ As for **доколѣ**, parallels to the accentuation in F have not been found in the comparison material, and both ESl and SSl sources regularly show accentuation on the second syllable.¹³¹

Among the standard accentuated AU most have regularly attested parallels in both ESl and MBlg sources, but e.g. **также** is also attested with non-initial accentuation.¹³²

Among the AU with *iso* accentuation parallels to the accentuation of **абик**, **ондѣ**, and **убо** are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources. For **ѡбаче**, **ѣще**, and **йдеже** parallels are mainly attested in SSl sources, while both **ибо** and, to a lesser extent, **уже** show initial accentuation mainly in ESl sources.¹³³ As for **ѡкоже**, initial accentuation is mainly attested in younger ESl sources, whereas older ESl as well as MBlg sources normally show final accentuation.¹³⁴

¹³⁰ Cf., for example, Peresopn. **ѡнѣдѣ** (Žiteckij 1878:94), Jagić 1896/1968:271, Houtzagers 1985:311, 1988:333, Gustavsson 1969:22, Zaliznjak 1985a:147.

¹³¹ Cf., for example, Ber. 1627:31 **доколѣ**, Mer. 14v **доколѣ** (see the analysis in Zaliznjak 1979:109), Smotr. 1648 274v **доколѣ**, Nor. ps. 99v **доколѣ**.

¹³² Cf., for example, Zogr. sb. **также** (Ivanov 1931:432).

¹³³ Cf. Steensland 1990:105ff, 183f, with examples from various sources.

¹³⁴ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 247r, 257r **ѡкоже**, Dybo 1975:37, 1977:203.

CSl enclinomena

1. **стѣлоу**. 18a adv.
2. **како** 1a adv.
3. **пакы** 16b adv.
4. **ради** 3b, 16b (2x).
5. **тако** 11b, **тако** 12a, 12b adv.
6. **тѣкмо** 1a⁺, 4a, 4b:1⁺, 4b:15, 16b, **тѣкмо** 18a, **не тѣкмо** 1a adv.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣвъ** 16a adv; — 2. **ѣще** 1a, 1b (3x), 3a, 8a, 8b (2x), 9a, 10a, 10b (2x), 15b (2x), 18a conj; — 3. **ѣко** 1b, 3a, 3b, **ѣко** 2a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 6b, 7a, 7b, 8a (2x), 9a, **ѣко** 8a adv.

Indeclinable lexemes reconstructed as CSl enclinomena are normally expected to appear with initial accentuation in most sources. In contrast to this, however, some lexemes in sources from certain areas regularly show non-initial accentuation.¹³⁵ Both types of accentuation are attested in F.

As typical examples of this phenomenon one may note the lexemes **стѣло** and **ради**, both attested with final accentuation in F. Parallels to the accentuation in the AU **стѣлоу** are mainly attested in GrR sources, whereas both Ukr and MBlg sources normally show the ‘etymologically’ expected initial accentuation.¹³⁶ The postposition **ради**, on the other hand, shows the opposite, with final accentuation attested mainly in SSl sources, ESl sources instead showing initial accentuation.¹³⁷

Among the AU with standard accentuation **пакы**, like **ради**, regularly shows initial accentuation only in ESl and Serbian sources,¹³⁸ whereas parallels to the accentuation of the remaining standard accentuated AU, as well as for the accentuation of the lexemes **ѣще**, **ѣвъ**, and **ѣко**, are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

3.5. Pronouns

In this section the accentuated AU of pronouns, including depronominial particles etc., will be discussed. As in the foregoing section, the accentological classification must in some cases be considered tentative. Note that in the classification of the lexemes **иже** and **ничѣтоже** the uninflected

¹³⁵ Cf. Steensland 1990:186f.

¹³⁶ See, for example, Dybo 1977:210, Zaliznjak 1985a:136, 186, 197, Ohijenko 1928:450, Lehfelddt 1986:137ff, Görner 1968:87.

¹³⁷ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 105v **сѣрѣ ради**, Smotr. 1619 **хѣр ради**, Smotr. 1648 274v **чѣсѣ ради**, Ohijenko 1925:205, Görner 1968:83.

¹³⁸ Dybo 1977:207, Görner 1968:85ff, Bulatova 1975:21, 48.

element **жє** is not taken into consideration, making it possible to refer these lexemes to CSI a.p. c.

CSI a.p. a

1. **в́аша** 8b nom sg f, **в́аше** 3a, 16a, **в́аша** 6b acc pl f.
2. **кѣи** 2a.
3. **н́ашего** 17b, **н́ашеа** 17b nom sg f.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡзъ** 2a, 15b, **ѡзъ** 5b, **и| ѡзъ** 1b, **и ѡзъ** 1b, 9a, **и ѡзъ** 10a; — 2. **въ инъ ѡе** 18b.

CSI a.p. b

1. **вѣ|сѣ бо** 1b, **вѣсѣ** 12b acc pl m.
2. **мои** 9a, 18a nom sg m.
3. **ѡна же** 17a, **ѡни| же** 1b, **ѡни же** 9a.
4. **сѣ** 13a, 18a, **сѣи** 17a, **не сѣи| ли** 4a, **сѣи** 1a, **сѣи** 3a dat s g f, **сѣ** 14b (2x), **сѣ** 11b, 14b nom sg n, **и сѣ** 6b acc sg n, **сѣ** 12a (3x), 17b, 18a, **и сѣ** 18a, **и| сѣ** 17a (2x), **сѣ бо** 12a particle.
5. **твоа** 17a nom sg f.
6. **ѣдино|го** 12a, **ѣдино|го** 18a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡн же** 11a, **ѡнѣ же** 2a, 7b, 13a (2x), 13b, **ѡн| же** 2a, **на ѡномъ пѣлѣ** 5a, **ѡни| же** 5a, **ѡно** 4b, 6a, 7a, 12a, 13b, 16a (in the incipit **въ врѣмѣ оно**); — 2. **ѣдинъ** 5a, **ѣдиномѡу** 3a, **ѣдинъ** 4b acc sg m, **ѣдино** 1a, 1b acc sg n, **ѣдинъ** 18a, **ѣдиномѡу** 18a, **и ѣдиномѡу** 18a acc sg f.

CSI a.p. c

1. **вѣ** 13b, 15b, 18b, **вѣ же** 2b, **вѣ бо** 3b, **и вѣ** 8a, **къ в́ам** 2a, **в́а** 3a, 10b, **в́ам** 3b, **каа в́амъ** 8a, 8b, **в́амъ** 10a, 12a, **съ в́ами** 3a, 14a, **в́ама** 14a dat du.
2. **къ нѣмѡу** 9a, **къ нѣи** 1a.¹³⁹
3. **кто ти** 1b.
4. **ѡ мѣне** 7a, **мнѣ** 1b, **къ мнѣ** 10a, **мнѣ** 17b, **съ мнѡ|ю** 10a, **съ мнѡю** 14b.
5. **мѣ** 1b, 3a, 16b, **н́амъ** 1b, 9a.

ѣгѡ etc. 2b, 7a, 17a (2x), 18b (2x), **ѣгѡ** etc. 5b, 9a, 16a, 17a, **ѣгѡ** 4a gen sg, **ѣмѡу** 1b, **ѣмѡу** 5b, 10a, 10b, **ѣмѡу** 2b, **ѣгѡ** etc. 6a, 16b, 18b, **ѣгѡ** 5a, 15a, **ѣгѡ** 2b, 3a, **ѣгѡ** 5a acc sg.

¹³⁹ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **н́а нѣ** 15a; cf. section 3.8.5.2.

6. НИЧТО́ЖЕ 1a, НИЧТО́ЖЕ 3a.
 7. ТѢ́ 9a, Ѣ́ ТѢ́ 10a, Ѣ́| ТѢ́ 14a, Ѣ́
 ТѢ́,|| 1b, ТѢ́и 8b, Ѣ́ ТѢ́и 18b, Ѣ́
 ТѢ́и| 16b nom sg m, ТО́МОУ 14b,
 Ѣ́ ТѢ́ 14b, Ѣ́ ТѢ́ 17a, ТѢ́м же 9a.
 8. ТѢ́ 7b, 13a, 15b, Ѣ́ ТѢ́ 13a, ТѢ́
 же| 11a, Ѣ́ ТѢ́е 1a, к ТѢ́е 9a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. Ё́МОУ 2a, 2b, 6a, 10a (2x), 18a, Ё́мѸ 18b, Ѣ́хъ 7b, Ѣ́мъ 1a, 1b (2x), 2a, 3b (2x), 4a, 4b (3x), 5a (2x), 5b (2x), 6b, 8a, 12a, 15b, 16b (2x), 18a (3x), Ѣ́мъ 7b, Ѣ́хъ 4b (2x), 5a (2x), 7b (2x), 18b, Ѣ́ма 7a, 14a dat du m, Ё́и 1a, 17a (2x), Ё́и 17b; — 2. Ѣ́же 11a, Ѣ́же 6b, Ѣ́мже 14b instr sg m, Ѣ́ же 16b nom pl m, Ѣ́хже 16b gen pl m, Ѣ́же 7a acc pl f, Ѣ́же 7a acc du m, Ѣ́же 14b nom sg f, Ё́же|| Ѣ́це 9a nom sg n, Ё́же 15a, Ё́же 16b acc sg n, Ѣ́ же 11b nom pl n.

Parallels to the accentuation of most AU belonging to CSI a.p. *a* and *b*—both with standard and non-standard accentuation—are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources. Among the AU with *iso* accentuation, however, **инъ** often occurs with non-initial accentuation in GrR sources, whereas both Ukr and SSl sources regularly show accentuation on the root.¹⁴⁰ As for the demonstrative **онъ**, in the light of the non-standard accentuated AU of the same lexeme the phonetic basis for the initially accentuated AU is doubtful, possibly with the exception of the neuter **оно** in the *incipit* **въ вѣ́мѡ оно**.

Parallels to the standard accentuated AU **къ нѣ́моу**, **ѡ́ мѣ́не**, **то́моу**, **ѡ́ тѣ́е**, and **к тѣ́е** are attested mainly in SSl and Ukr sources, whereas ESl sources in the corresponding forms normally show final accentuation. The opposition **ѣ́мѡу** vs. **къ нѣ́моу** has parallels mainly in SSl and Ukr sources, but similar phenomena are also attested from ESl sources with definalization.¹⁴¹

As for the numeral **ѣ́динъ**, parallels to the accentuation in **ѣ́ди́ного** are regularly attested in both GrR and MBlg sources, whereas Ukr sources normally show accentuation on the ending. Initial accentuation, on the other hand, is normally only attested in Serbian sources.¹⁴²

The accentuation of the remaining AU in this category has well-attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Dybo 1977:215, Zaliznjak 1985a:224, Horbatsch 1964:42. In OBa both initial and non-initial accentuation are attested. In the accusative singular feminine, however, Schweier only lists AU with accentuation on the root; see Schweier 1987:308.

¹⁴¹ See Steensland 1990:180ff.

¹⁴² Cf., for example, Berl. 54r **ѣ́динъ** (Kul'bakin 1904:40), Dybo 1977:231, Hinrichs 1985:141. The preflexional accentuation in GrR sources is according to Zaliznjak motivated by the 'literary' character of this lexeme; see Zaliznjak 1985a:195.

3.6. Numerals

In F accentuated AU of numerals are only attested in a few cases. In the present section most cardinal numerals will be treated, while the pronominal **ѣДИНѢ** as well as the ordinal numerals have been treated above, in sections 3.5 and 3.3, respectively.

1. **дѣѦ** 2a, 4b (4x), 6a, 13b.

2. **ѡѢа на| дѣсѡтѣ** 4b.

3.

ѡ ѡѢѡю 2a gen du.

4. **трѣ** 10a, 18a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡѢа** 6b, **ѡѢа** 7a; — 2. **ѡѢа на дѣсѡтѣ** 4b.

The accentuation of the lexemes **дѣѢа** and **триѢ** (both CSI a.p. *c*) is structurally trivial, with parallels attested in both ESI and SSI sources.¹⁴³

The compound numeral **ѡѢа на дѣсѡтѣ**, where **ѡѢа** and **на дѣсѡтѣ** taken separately both constituted CSI enclimena, is normally in ESI sources attested with an accent mark on **на**.¹⁴⁴ Parallels to the accentuation in F, which probably must be interpreted as pertaining to the first vowel of the locative **дѣсѡтѣ**, can be found in some MBIg sources.¹⁴⁵

As for the simple **ѡѢа**, this lexeme normally shows initial accentuation in the nominative in both ESI and SSI sources, but final accentuation is also attested. Parallels to the AU **ѡ ѡѢѡю**, however, with CSI stress on the ending, are mainly attested in ESI sources.¹⁴⁶

3.7. Verbs

In the present section the accentuated AU will be presented according to verbal categories in the following order: present tense, imperative, active and passive present participles, infinitive, aorist, imperfect, active past participles 1 and 2, and past participle passive. Verbal nouns ending in **-ниѢ** have been discussed above in section 3.2.2.2.

¹⁴³ Dybo 1981:36, Zaliznjak 1985a:139. The use of *kendema* with these lexemes is well attested in many sources and can be seen as a graphic cliché; cf. section 2.3.2.3.

¹⁴⁴ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 163v **ѡѢа на дѣсѡтѣ**, NT 1816 Mark 6:7 **ѡѢа на дѣсѡтѣ**, Dybo 1981:36, Zaliznjak 1985a:142.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Ev. 1355/56 134r **ѣДИНОМУ на дѣсѡтѣ** (Talev 1973:335). On the facsimile in Živkova 1980, however, this accent mark is not discernable.

¹⁴⁶ Cf., for example, Smotr. 1619 κ1r **ѡѢѡю**, Ev. 1627 98v κ1r **ѡ ѡѢѡю**, Dybo 1981:36.

Within each category the AU are divided in two sections, the first comprising the *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs, all belonging to CSI a.p. *a*. Among these verbs, formations derived from lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *a* are reconstructed with constant stress on the root, whereas formations derived from lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *b* and *c* are reconstructed with constant stress on the thematic element.¹⁴⁷ In the second section are treated AU of verbs belonging to the remaining verb-classes, divided between CSI a.p. *a*, *b*, and *c*, respectively.

3.7.1. *Present tense*

3.7.1.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the root

1. **сѣнѣдаѣте** 3b.
2. **ѡбрѣтаѣтъ** 10b.

CSl stress on the thematic element

1. **бывають** 4a.
2. **затвараѣте** 3b.
3. **покопавають** 16a.
4. **проливаѣтъ сѧ** 14b.

Parallels to the root-accentuated AU of **сѣнѣдати** (CSI a.p. *a*)¹⁴⁸ and **ѡбрѣтати** are attested mainly in EBlg sources (cf. section 3.1.4.1.2), whereas ESl sources from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries normally show thematic accentuation in this type of formation.¹⁴⁹

Parallels to the accentuation of **подькопавати** are regularly attested only in Serbian sources, whereas both MBlg and ESl sources usually show accentuation on the root. It is possible, however, that here *oksia* indicates not main, but secondary stress, a phenomenon not unknown within this verb-class.¹⁵⁰

As for the lexemes **бывати**, **-варяти**, and **-ливати**, accentuation on the root is regularly attested in EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show thematic accentuation. Accentuation on the root in secondary imperfectives is, however, attested, providing examples of 'South Slavonic' accentuation in some GrR sources.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷ Cf. section 3.1.2, Zaliznjak 1981:165ff.

¹⁴⁸ Zaliznjak 1985a:147.

¹⁴⁹ Cf., for example, ОВА **ѡбрѣтаю**, **-аѣтъ** etc. (Schweier 1987:68), Zaliznjak 1985a:356.

¹⁵⁰ Cf., e.g., ОВА **подькопавають** (Schweier 1987:69), Dov. 15г **не подькопавають, подькопавають**.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Hinrichs 1985:99, Zaliznjak 1981:165ff, Schweier 1987:66f, as well as sections 3.1.4.1.2–3 above.

3.7.1.2. Other verbs

• CSI a.p. *a* is reconstructed with root-stress in all forms, whereas CSI a.p. *b* is reconstructed with stress on the ending in the first person singular and preflexional stress in the other forms. In CSI a.p. *c* the first person singular originally was an enclitomenon, whereas the other forms are reconstructed with final end-stress.¹⁵²

CSI a.p. a

1. **ѡ|врѣ**жеши сѧ 13b.
2. **ѡ|**к^адѡу 16a, **ни** к^адѡу 16a⁺.
3. **пá**дѣтъ 2b.
4. **вѣ**стáнѣтъ 3b.
5. **сѣ**трѣѣтъ 2b.

CSI a.p. b

1. **вѣ**нїдѣ|ши 9a, **ѡ** прѣ|дѣтъ 3a, прѣ|дѡутъ 12a.¹⁵³
2. **по**кáжѣ 14a.
3. **лю**бѣит бѡ 9a, **лю**бѣѧ 8b.
4. **ѡ** не мѡгѡу 10a, **по**мѡгѡутъ 6b.
5. **раз**бѡрю 11b.
6. **вѣ**прѡшѡу 1b.
7. **твѡ**рю 2a, сѣтвѡрю 11b, сѣтвѡрю 11b, твѡриши 1b, **ѡ** сѣтвѡрѣи 9b, сѣтвѡрѣи 18a, твѡрите 8a, 8b (2x), сѣтвѡрите 1a, твѡрѣѧ 16b, **да** твѡрѣѧ 8a.
8. **вхѡ**дит 14a, **не** вѣхѡди||] 3b **ѡ** исхѡдѣѧ 6a.
2pl.
9. **не** хѡщѡу 2a, хѡщѣши 18a, хѡщѣте 8a.
10. **прѣ**їметѣ 3b, **ѡ**їмет сѧ 2b.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡ**дѡу 2a, **ѡ**дѣтъ 9b, 10a; — 2. **не** ѡмамъ 10a, 11b, 14a, 14b, ѡмаши 11b, **ѡ**мá 3b, 10a, **ѡ**мá 8a, **не** ѡмá 11a, **не** ѡмá 5b, ѡмáте 1a, 3a, ѡмѡутъ 1b.

CSI a.p. c

1. **бѡ**їм сѧ 1b.
2. **нѣ**сѣмъ бѡ 9a, **нѣ**сѣте ли 16b.
3. **ѡ|врѣ**зѣт сѧ 10b, **ѡ|врѣ**зѣт сѧ 10b, **ѡ** **ѡ|врѣ**зѣт сѧ 10b (2x).

¹⁵² Dybo 1971b:95.

¹⁵³ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **ѡ** прѣ|дѣ 9b; cf. section 3.8.3.4.

4. **ВѢМЪ** 13a, **НЕ ВѢМЪ** 13b, **НЕ ВѢМЫ**. 1b⁺ 1pl.¹⁵⁴
ВѢМ ТА 6a 1s.
5. **НЕ ВЪЗГЛАСИТЬ** 13b.
6. **И ДАСТЬ** 17a, **И НЕ ДАСТЬ** 10a,
И ДАСТЬ СЯ 2b, 10b, **ВЪЗ-**
ДАСТЬ 16a.
7. **ЩПОУСТИТЬ** 5a.
8. **РѢКОУ** 1b⁺, **РѢЧЕТЕ** 3a, **И РѢТЬ** 10a⁺.
РѢКОУТЬ 12a.
9. **ТРѢПЮ** 3a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѢСИ** 7b, **ѢСИ** 13b, 15b, **ѢСТА** 18b 2du.

Among the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *a*, parallels to the root-accentuated AU of **ЩВРѢЩИ СЯ**, **КРАСТИ**, and **ВЪСТАТИ** are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources. As for **ПАСТИ**, accentuation on the root is regularly attested in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources reflect the transfer of this lexeme to a.p. *c*, showing accentuation on the ending in the present tense.¹⁵⁵ Note that the a.p. affiliation of **ТРЫТИ** must be considered tentative, as the available comparison material, although mostly showing accentuation on the root, is scarce.¹⁵⁶

As for the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, accentuation on the ending in the third person plural of **ХОДИТИ** is mainly attested in some WGrR sources showing definalization (cf. section 3.1.4.2.3), whereas other ESl as well as MBlg sources normally show accentuation on the root.¹⁵⁷ Note, however, the presence in the root of the letter **ш**, possibly connected with the position of ictus (cf. section 4.2.4). As for the prefixed forms of **-ИТИ**, accentuation on the root is regularly attested in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show accentuation either on the prefix or the ending.¹⁵⁸

Parallels to the root-accentuated first person singulars of **-МОЩИ**, **-ПРОСИТИ**, **-ТВОРИТИ**, and **ХОТѢТИ**, both with and without prefixes, are regularly attested in EBlg sources, to a lesser extent also in WGrR and some Ukr sources, whereas EGrR as well as WBlg sources normally show accentuation on the ending.¹⁵⁹ The lexeme **РАЗОРИТИ**, too, is attested with accentuation on the root in the first person singular in EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources reflect the transfer of this lexeme to a.p. *c*, showing accentuation on the ending (cf. sections 3.1.4.2.3–4).¹⁶⁰ The same applies to **ТВОРИТИ**, regularly showing accentuation according to

¹⁵⁴ The first accent mark in this AU is missing in Wesslén's edition. Nevertheless, on the original a faint *oksa* can be discerned.

¹⁵⁵ See Bulatova 1975:164, Dybo 1983:17, Zaliznjak 1985a:139.

¹⁵⁶ Cf., for example, Sb. 1509 166r **ТРЫТИ**, 7 **СЪТРЫКТЪ** сє (Bulatova 1975:258), Nor ps. 80r **СЪТРЫТИ** (imperative), Deschler 1987:209 **ТРЫТИ**.

¹⁵⁷ Zaliznjak 1985a:358ff, map no. 19, Kolesov 1965:121, Bogatyrev 1989:191.

¹⁵⁸ Zaliznjak 1985a:355.

¹⁵⁹ Zaliznjak 1985a:186.

¹⁶⁰ See Dybo 1983:18, 1987:186, Bulatova 1975:130, Zaliznjak 1981:160, 1985a:140.

a.p. *c* in sources from the whole GrR area. Accentuation on the root is, however, sporadically attested, paralleling the regular accentuation on the root of this lexeme in EBlg sources.¹⁶¹

Parallels to the accentuation of the remaining standard accentuated AU within CSI a.p. *b* are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources. As for the AU with *iso* accentuation, parallels to the accentuation of the non-prefixed AU of both **ити** and **имѣти** are well attested in MBlg sources, whereas GrR sources show accentuation on both root and ending.¹⁶²

As for the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *c*, both EBlg sources and the Čud. regularly show accentuation on the ending in the first person plural of **вѣдѣти**, whereas younger GrR sources normally show accentuation on the root.¹⁶³ The final *kendema* here probably does not indicate ictus, but is rather due to the frequent use of this accent mark in the pronoun **мы** both in F and in other sources.

Parallels to the remaining non-standard accentuated AU **боимъ са** and **ѣрѣтъ** are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources, while root-accentuation in the present tense of **рѣши** is expected in Mold sources.

As for the first person singular root-accentuated AU of **рѣши** and **трѣпѣти**, parallels are attested mainly in MBlg sources,¹⁶⁴ but also—to a lesser extent—in ESl, particularly WGrR, sources.

Accentuation on the root in the third person singular of **-врѣсти са** is regularly attested in ESl sources, whereas MBlg sources normally show accentuation on the ending. Note, however, that the interpretation of *oksia* above the sequence **ръ** is problematic (cf. section 2.3.2, above). The same applies to **-поустити**, normally retaining accentuation on the ending in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources from the beginning of the sixteenth century and later increasingly show accentuation on the root.¹⁶⁵ The verb **-гласити**, on the other hand, normally shows accentuation on the ending in most ESl and EBlg sources. Accentuation on the root is, however, attested in Mold sources.¹⁶⁶

Parallels to the accentuation of the verbs **нѣсмъ** and **-дати** are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the AU accentuated only with initial *iso*, parallels to **ѣси** are mainly attested in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources often show accentuation on the ending. The dual **ѣста**, on the other hand, regularly shows initial accentuation in both ESl and MBlg sources.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶¹ Cf. sections 3.1.4.1.2 and 3.1.4.2.3, as well as Zaliznjak 1985a:140, Bulatova 1975:127.

¹⁶² Zaliznjak 1985a:367f, Schweier 1987:132f, 135f.

¹⁶³ Cf., for example, Sof. služ. 26v **вѣмъ, не вѣмъ**, Zaliznjak 1985a:193.

¹⁶⁴ Cf., for example, Ev. 1545 11r **рѣжѣти** (Mat. 2:13).

¹⁶⁵ Dybo 1969:88, 1987:187, Zaliznjak 1985a:361f, Schweier 1987:98. Note, however, Služ. Sol. **да ѡпоуститѣ ти** (Syrku 1890:74).

¹⁶⁶ Cf., for example, Služ. Sol. 102v **възгласитѣ** (Syrku 1890:119).

¹⁶⁷ Note, however, accentuation on the ending of the dual in Čud.; cf. Ušakov 1982:44.

3.7.2. Imperative

3.7.2.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the root

1. дѣлаи 2a.
2. съкрѣиваите же 16a.
3. рѣй сѧ 17a.
4. послѣушите 18a.
5. почиваи 11b.

CSl stress on the thematic element

1. възвѣщай 11a.

Parallels to the final accentuation in the imperative second person singular of **радовати сѧ** are attested in SSl sources, whereas ESl sources regularly show accentuation on the root.¹⁶⁸

Parallels to the accentuation of **дѣлати** and **-слѹшати** are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources, whereas **-крѣвати** and **-чивати** normally are attested with thematic accentuation in ESl sources and accentuation on the root in MBlg sources.¹⁶⁹

As for the lexeme **-въщати**, both ESl and MBlg sources normally show thematic accentuation in the imperative. Parallels to the AU **възвѣщай**, however, are expected to occur in both EBlg and ESl sources, in the latter case as examples of ‘specifically literary’ accentuation (cf. section 3.1.4.1.3).¹⁷⁰

3.7.2.2. Other verbs

• CSl a.p. *a* is reconstructed with root-stress, whereas both CSl a.p. *b* and *c* are reconstructed with thematic stress.¹⁷¹

CSl a.p. a

1. йзбавей 10a.
2. бѣдй 17b 3sg (Lk. 1:38).
3. вѣжъ 16b.
4. въврѣстѣ 6b.

¹⁶⁸ Cf., for example, Ev. 1355/56 139r рѣй сѧ, 264r рѣй сѧ, Sb. No. 1735 радѣи сѧ (3x) (Koneski 1954:88); cf. also Nor. ps. 107r ѿ радѹйте сѧ, vs. Ev. 1627 228r радѣи сѧ (Luke 1:28), ОВа радѹи сѧ (Schweier 1987:71).

¹⁶⁹ Cf., for example, Nor. ps. 186r ѿ покрѣваи сѧ. The verb **почивати** shows accentuation on the root in the present tense in both Ps. No. 3 and Sof. služ. (Hinrichs 1985:138), indicating similar accentuation in the imperative.

¹⁷⁰ Cf., for example, Ev. No. 34 71r възвѣщай.

¹⁷¹ Lately, however, Dybo has proposed the reconstruction of the imperative second person singular in CSl a.p. *c* as a CSl enclinenomenon, later replaced by final stress in all Slavonic dialects. According to Dybo, this type of stress is reflected in some EBlg sources such as e.g. Nor. ps.; cf. Dybo 1989:106ff.

5.		НЕ ДВИЖИ СѦ 9a.
6.	ДВІГНИ СѦ 1a.	
7.		ОСТАВИ 11a.
8.	ВЪСТА́НѢТЕ 18a.	[ВЪСТА] НИ 8a (Lk. 5:23), ВЪСТАНИ. 8a (Lk. 5:24).

CSl a.p. b

1.		ИДИ 8a, ИДИ 9b, ИЗЫДИ 6a, ИЗЫДИ 7a, ПРѢДИДИ 3a.
2.	ЛЮБИТЕ 8b.	
3.	ПРОСИТЕ 10b.	
4.	НЕ ТВО́РИ МИ 10a, СѢ ТВО́РИТЕ 14b (Lk. 22:19).	
5.		ХОДИ 8a, 11a.
6.	ВЪЗМѢ 8a, ¹⁷² ПРѢИМѢТЕ 14a ⁺⁺ .	

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ИЩАТЕ 10b (2x).

CSl a.p. c

1.		НЕ БО́И СѦ 17a, НЕ БО́И СѦ 7a.
2.		НЕ ВЪВЕДИ 10a.
3.	ДА́ЖЬ МИ 10a.	
4.		ПРѢМЛѢЧИ 6a.
5.	РѢ ЦИ 9a.	ПРОРѢЦИ 13a.
6.	ТЛѢЦѢ ТЕ 10b (2x).	

Among the lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *a*, the finally accentuated AU in the imperative singular of **-БАВИТИ**, **БЫТИ**,¹⁷³ **ДВИСАТИ СѦ**, **-СТАВИТИ**, and **-СТАТИ** have well attested parallels, primarily in EBlg sources, but to some extent also in WGrR sources, while other MBlg and ESl sources regularly show accentuation on the root (cf. section 3.1.4.2.2). Among the AU accentuated on the root (with the exception of the trivial **ВІЙЖЬ**), on the other hand, parallels are attested mainly in ESl sources, contradicting the typical EBlg accentuation.

Apparently, the accentuation of the imperatives belonging to CSl a.p. *a* comprises elements typical of both EBlg and ESl sources. As the non-standard accentuated AU are the most important in the analysis of the accentuation of F (cf. section 2.4), here the 'EBlg' accentuation must be considered the most significant factor. It is interesting to note, however, that out of six finally accentuated AU, five occur with *kamora* instead of *varia*, which is more common in this position. As the other imperatives discussed below conform to this pattern, it cannot be excluded that the

¹⁷² Standard accentuation here equals thematic accentuation.

¹⁷³ Note that formations with **БЖД**- belong to CSl a.p. *a*; see e.g. Stang 1957:113, Dybo 1983:9, Zaliznjak 1985a:133.

final **-и** in this category constitutes a graphic cliché, rather than being connected with the position of ictus.¹⁷⁴

As for the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, normally both ESl and MBlg sources regularly show thematic accentuation, with systematic exceptions attested only in some WGrR sources reflecting definalization. Apparently, however, the accentuation of these imperatives conforms to the pattern established above, with thematic accentuation mainly in the singular, often ending in **-и**. As for **искати**, ESl sources are normally attested with thematic accentuation in the imperative.¹⁷⁵ As similar accentuation is also expected in MBlg sources, the phonetic basis for the accentuation with *iso* here seems rather doubtful.

The AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* also show final accentuation in the singular, mostly with *kamora*.¹⁷⁶ As for the AU with accentuation on the root (leaving aside the trivial **даждь ми**), the AU **ръци** and **тлъцѣтѣ**, comprising *oksia* above the sequences **ръ** and **лъ**, respectively, must be interpreted with great care (cf. section 2.3.2.1).

To summarize, the imperatives in F exhibit a system where differences in accentuation reflecting the etymological affiliation to different CSI a.p. are replaced—at least among the AU originally belonging to CSI a.p. *a* and *b*—by an opposition between the singular and the plural. This lack of ‘etymological differentiation’ is paralleled mainly in EBlg sources, whereas the occurrence of accentuation on the root in the plural of imperatives belonging to CSI a.p. *b* has parallels in some ESl—mostly WGrR—sources.¹⁷⁷

3.7.3. Present participle active

3.7.3.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the root

1. **вѣроующе** 1a.
2. **вѣстрѣсающе** 16a.

CSl stress on the thematic element

1. **сѣѣраѣи** 11b.

Parallels to the accentuation of **-вѣровати** are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources, whereas **-трѣсати** often shows thematic accentuation in the present participle active in ESl sources, normally showing accentuation on the root in MBlg sources. As for **-бирати**, accentuation

¹⁷⁴ The use of *kamora* in this position is attested e.g. in MBlg sources; cf., for example, Ev. 1355/56 **идѣи**, **бѣдѣи** (Scholvin 1884:56).

¹⁷⁵ Cf., for example, ОВа **ицѣтѣ**, **ицѣтѣ** (Schweier 1987:103), Ev. 1627 284v **ицѣтѣ**.

¹⁷⁶ On *oksia* above vowels in post-vocalic position cf. section 2.3.3.1.

¹⁷⁷ See Zaliznjak 1985a:355f.

on the root is regularly attested in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources usually show thematic accentuation.¹⁷⁸

3.7.3.2. Other verbs

• Within CS1 a.p. *a* both the simple and compound participles are reconstructed with root-stress in all forms, whereas CS1 a.p. *b* is reconstructed with constant stress on the syllable immediately following the root. In early ESl ictus was retracted onto an etymologically long root vowel, but in most ESl dialects, irrespective of the etymological quantities, constant stress either on the root or on the suffix was generalized at an early stage. As for CS1 a.p. *c*, the simple masculine and neuter nominative singular forms are reconstructed as enclitomena, the remaining simple forms showing marginal end-stress. The compound forms, like the compound adjectives, are reconstructed with constant stress on the first syllable of the ending ('flexional stress').¹⁷⁹

CS1 a.p. *a*

1. **вѣдѣи** 16a.

2. **славѣа** 8a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **оударѣи** 15a.

CS1 a.p. *b*

1. **любѣща** 8a, 8b acc pl m.

2. **мбѣа** 9a.

3. **прѣсѣи** 10b.

4. **страждоуѣа** 5a Acc pl m.

5. **твѣраще** 3b, **твѣращомоу** 2b, **твѣращѣимъ** 8b dat pl m.

6. **хѣдѣща** 5a acc sg m, **захѣдѣщоу же** 7b dat sg n, **и съхѣдѣщѣи** 18a dat pl m.

7. **хѣтѣи** 14b.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **идѣщомоу** 9b; — 2. **и йѣи** 10b (2x), **и йѣщоуще** 2b.

CS1 a.p. *c*

1. **грѣдыи** 18b.

2. **и зрѣи** 11a.

3. **лѣжаща** 11b acc pl n (Lk. 12:19).

4.

стоѣща 6a acc du m.

5. **тлѣкоущомоу** 10b,

тлѣкоущомоу 10b.

6. **чѣюще** 8b.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **оѣча** 4b, **ѣчащоу** 1b dat sg m.

Parallels to the accentuation of both **видѣти** and **славити** are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

¹⁷⁸ Cf., for example, Ps. No. 3 129v **сѣбѣражи** (Hinrichs 1985:139), Ev. 1627 292r **сѣбирѣи** (Luke 12:21), ОВА **сѣбирѣи** (Schweier 1987:63).

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Dybo 1971b:111ff, 1981:212, 252, 1987:188ff, Zaliznjak 1981:133f, 1985a:145.

Among the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, all the root-accentuated AU in this category have regularly attested parallels in EBlg sources. In ESl sources, on the other hand, the same applies only to **любити**, **страдати**, and **искати**, whereas parallels to the remaining AU normally show thematic accentuation.¹⁸⁰

As for the lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *c*, parallels to the accentuation of the verb **стояти** are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.¹⁸¹ The same applies to the AU **и зрѣ**, originally an enclitomenon. The phonetic basis for the latter accentuation is doubtful, however, as the use of *kendema* with **зърѣти** and its cognates is well attested in sources from different areas, possibly constituting a graphic cliché.¹⁸²

For the verb **чаюти** a transfer to a.p. *a* is assumed in both ESl and SSl dialects. Accordingly, parallels to the accentuation in F are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.¹⁸³

As for the remaining AU, ESl sources regularly show thematic accentuation of **лежати**, **тлѣщи**, and **оучити**, whereas accentuation on the root is attested in MBlg sources.¹⁸⁴

3.7.4. Present participle passive

In F neither standard nor non-standard accentuated AU in this category are attested.¹⁸⁵

3.7.5. Infinitive

3.7.5.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSI stress on the thematic element

1. **ѿвѣщати ми сѧ** 11a*+ (Lk. 9:61).
2. **ѿпбущати** 8a.
3. **посѣлати** 4b, **посѣлаѣти** 4b.

¹⁸⁰ See Stang 1957:141. For examples see e.g. Schweier 1987:83f, 103, 105. Note in this connection that both **творити** and **хотѣти** in ESl sources are regularly accentuated according to a.p. *c*; cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:139f.

¹⁸¹ Note, however, the low frequency of *iso* in this position in F, except in words of Greek origin (cf. section 2.3.3.2).

¹⁸² Cf., for example, Kolesov 1973b:128f, Görner 1968:85.

¹⁸³ Dybo 1983:52f, Zaliznjak 1985a:133. Cf. also ОВа **чающе** (Schweier 1987:105), Služ. Sol. **чаѡщѧ** (Syrku 1890:35, 60).

¹⁸⁴ Cf., for example, ОВа **лежѡща**, **оучѡ**, **оучѡщюу** (Schweier 1987:76, 90), Ев. 1627 284v **и толкѡщемѧ** (Luke 11:10), Ев. No. 34 71v **лѣжщи** (Luke 12:19), Sb. No. 1735 **лѣжща** (Koneski 1954:88), Is. Sir. 32v **ѣчѡтъ**, **ѣчѡтсѧ** (third person plural present tense, Dybo 1983:10), as well as examples quoted in Steensland 1990:144f.

¹⁸⁵ Note, however, the AU **ѡдрѣжма** 7b with initial *iso*; cf. section 3.8.3.4.

Prefixed formations of the verb **-вѣщати** normally show thematic accentuation in ESl sources. In MBlg sources, on the other hand, this type of denominatives¹⁸⁶ are not expected to reflect the accent retraction characteristic of the secondarily imperfective *aj*-verbs (cf. section 3.1.4.1.2). Nevertheless, accentuation on the root is attested in this group of sources.¹⁸⁷ Thus, provided the *oksia* is correctly read, the accentuation in F can be interpreted either as an example of ESl 'specifically literary' or 'South Slavonic' accentuation (cf. section 3.1.4.1.3), or as a genuine MBlg accentuation.

Both **-поущати** and **-сылати**, however, constitute secondary imperfectives with regularly attested accentuation on the root in EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show thematic accentuation.¹⁸⁸

3.7.5.2. Other verbs

• CSL a.p. *a* is reconstructed with constant root-stress, whereas verbs belonging to both CSL a.p. *b* and *c* originally had stress on the syllable immediately following the root.

CSL a.p. a

1. **видѣти**,| 12a.
AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣсти** 14a (2x), 16b.

CSL a.p. b

1. **и варѣти** 5a.
2. **итѣ** 18b.¹⁸⁹
3. **показати** 5b.
4. **прѣлѣжити** 10a.
5. **мѣнути** 5a.
6. **твѣрити** 16a, **сѣтвѣлрити** 4a/b, **сѣтвѣл[рити]** 14b (Lk. 22:23).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣти** 2b.

CSL a.p. c

1. **бѣти** etc. 3b, 5a/b, 12b, 18a.
2. **сѣрати** 11b.
3. **дѣти** 10a.

The verb **видѣти** is normally attested with accentuation on the root in both ESl and MBlg sources, but thematic accentuation is also attested,

¹⁸⁶ See Vasmer 1986–1987 I:305f. Hinrichs, on the other hand, sees **вѣщати** as an iterative to **вѣстити**; cf. Hinrichs 1985:99.

¹⁸⁷ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 278r **ѡвѣщати ми сѧ** (Luke 9:61), Sof. služ. 15v **възвѣщати**, as well as the aorist Ev. 1355/56 263r **ѡвѣща** vs. Ev. No. 34 71r **ѡвѣщати ми сѧ** (Luke 9:61), Služ. No. 323 52r **възвѣщати**.

¹⁸⁸ Cf., for example, ОВа **ѡпоущати**, **посылати** (Schweier 1987:70).

¹⁸⁹ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **прѣити** 9a⁺; cf. section 3.8.3.4.

mainly in WGrR sources.¹⁹⁰ As for **исти**, initial accentuation is well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *b*, the two non-standard accentuated AU **и варѣти** and **итѣ** both have parallels, mainly in ESl sources, whereas EBlg sources usually show accentuation on the root.¹⁹¹ The occurrence of *kendema* in the latter AU, however, is uncommon in most sources (cf. section 2.3.2). As for the AU with standard accentuation, parallels are regularly attested mainly in EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show thematic accentuation, reflecting the original position of ictus. Parallels to the accentuation of **ити** are well attested, however, in both ESl and SSl sources.

As for the three infinitives of verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *c*, all have well attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources.

3.7.6. Aorist

In ESl sources from the period of F the aorist must be considered a ‘specifically literary’ category, and its functions were in the vernacular normally fulfilled by the *l*-participle.

3.7.6.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the thematic element

1.

разѹѡмѣша 2b.

Parallels to the thematic accentuation are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.

3.7.6.2. Other verbs

• CSl a.p. *a* is reconstructed with root-stress in all forms, whereas CSl a.p. *b* is reconstructed with stress on the syllable immediately following the root in all forms. In CSl a.p. *c* the second and third person singular originally were enclitomena, whereas the other forms are reconstructed with thematic stress. The enclitomenon character of the second and third person singular is reflected in both ESl and MBlg sources early on, but later accentuation on the root is generalized mainly in EBlg sources, whereas ESl and some WBlg sources regularly show thematic accentuation.¹⁹²

CSl a.p. a

1. **и видѣ** 5a, **видѣша** 5b.
2. **ѡврѣже** сѧ 13a.
3. **припадѣ** 7a, **падѡша** 18a.

¹⁹⁰ For details see Zaliznjak 1985a:358f, map no. 19, Schweier 1987:112.

¹⁹¹ Cf., e.g., Ev. 1545 146v **ити** (Luke 6:1), Schweier 1987:126, as well as section 3.1.4.1.2.

¹⁹² See Dybo 1971b:98ff as well as section 3.2.4.2.4.

4. **Йсплѣ|ниша** 6b.5. **чѣди сѧ** 9b.*CSl a.p. b*1. **Ѹгѡбеси сѧ** 11b.

2.

3.

4. **послѧ** 9a (2x), **послѧ** 18b.5. **йсѣше** 1a (2x).6. **сѣтворѣ** 9a, **сѣтвори** 16b,**сѣтвориша** 13b (2x).7. **на|чѧша** 14b, **й на|чѧша** 16a.**прѣидѣ** 1a.¹⁹³**пристоупѣша** 1a⁺.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **йде** 5a, **йде** 8a, **йдоша** 7a, 18b; — 2. **ѧхѡ** 6b, **ѧша** 6b.¹⁹⁴

CSl a.p. c

1.

2. **вѣзгласи** 13a, 13b.¹⁹⁵3. **дасть** 1b, **й дасть** 16b.4. **й по|мѧноуша** 6b.5. **за|прѣти** 7b.6. **рѣша** 3a.**оубоѧша** 2b.**й запрѣти** 3a.

For aorists of verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *a* accentuation on the root is regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *b*, final accentuation in the third person singular of prefixed forms of the verb **-ити** is regularly attested in ESl sources, while in MBlg sources both final accentuation and accentuation on the root are attested.¹⁹⁶ Similarly, parallels to the thematic accentuation of **-стѣпѣти** are also mainly attested in ESl sources, but EBlg sources here regularly show accentuation on the root.¹⁹⁷

Except for the lexemes **-сѣлати** and **-чѣти**, the accentuation of which has well attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources, the accentuation of the standard accentuated AU is paralleled mainly in EBlg sources. The AU **Ѹгѡбеси сѧ** and **сѣтвори**, however, also have parallels in WGrR sources showing definalization (cf. section 3.1.4.1.1).

Among the AU accentuated only with initial *iso* initial accentuation of the respective forms is attested in both ESl and SSl sources.¹⁹⁸

Among the lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *c* parallels to the accentuation of the verb **оубоѧти сѧ** are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg

¹⁹³ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **прѣидѣ** 2a; cf. section 3.8.3.4.

¹⁹⁴ Note also the AU **ѧша** 7a with *dasia*; cf. section 2.3.4.2.

¹⁹⁵ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **вѣзгласи** 15a⁺; cf. section 3.8.3.4.

¹⁹⁶ See Dybo 1971b:101, Steensland 1990:134f.

¹⁹⁷ Cf., e.g., ОВа **пристоупѣша** (Schweier 1987:88), the WBlg Is. Sir. 33v **ѡстѣпѣша** (Dybo 1983:8), the EBlg Zogr. sb. 136v **пристѣпиша** (Dybo 1987:194).

¹⁹⁸ On **йдоша** cf. section 4.2.4.2.

sources. As for **-прѣтити**, ESl sources normally show thematic accentuation, whereas MBlg sources usually show either accentuation on the root or on the prefix.¹⁹⁹ Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **възгласи** are attested mainly in EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show thematic accentuation.²⁰⁰

As for **рѣши**, root-accentuation in the aorist third person plural is well attested in both ESl and SSl sources. **-манѣти**, on the other hand, normally appears with thematic accentuation in the same form, but root-accentuation could in an ESl source probably be interpreted as a 'specifically literary' or 'South Slavonic' accentuation (cf. section 3.1.4.1.3).

3.7.7. Imperfect

As was the case with the aorist, in ESl sources the imperfect must also be considered a 'specifically literary' category.

3.7.7.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the root

1. **протрѣсааше же сѧ** 6b.

CSl stress on the thematic element

1. **ѡмѣтаашѣ** 13a*⁺.

2. **ѡмѣтаашѣ** 13a*⁺. **ѡмѣтаашѣ** 13a*⁺.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **оужалсааху сѧ** 5b.

Imperfects in this category normally show accentuation on the thematic element in ESl sources and on the root in MBlg sources (cf. section 3.1.4.1.2).²⁰¹ As for the iterative **оужасати сѧ**, parallels with initial accentuation have not been found in the comparison material.²⁰²

3.7.7.2. Other verbs

• CSl a.p. *a* is reconstructed with constant stress on the root. Verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *b* can be assumed to have had constant stress on the syllable immediately following the root, i.e. normally on the imperfect suffix, and verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *c* are reconstructed with constant stress on the imperfect suffix.²⁰³

¹⁹⁹ See Schweier 1987:86, Hinrichs 1985:117.

²⁰⁰ Cf., for example, Schweier 1987:81.

²⁰¹ Cf., for example, ОВ **протрѣзаше же сѧ**, **ѡмѣташе сѧ**, and **стазѧху сѧ** (Schweier 1987:68, 73). Thematic accentuation is also attested in Ev. 1545 146v **ѡмѣтрѣсѧхѧ** (Luke 6:1).

²⁰² See e.g. Bulatova 1975:210f, Zaliznjak 1985a:140, Schweier 1987:66.

²⁰³ Zaliznjak 1985a:144.

CSl a.p. a

1. мѣшлѣаше 11b,
помѣшлѣаху 1b.
2. плѣкааше сѧ 13b.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ѿдѣху 12b, ѿдѣ|ху 12b.

CSl a.p. b

1. блѣжнѣ|аху сѧ 4a.
2. привѣ|жааху 7b.
3. мѣлѣху 9a.
4. ѿ не мѣжааше 4a.
5. слѣужааше 7b.
6. ѿ хѣтѣаше 5a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ѿдѣаше 9a, ѿдѣаше 16a; — 2. ѿмѣаше 2a, ѿмѣаху 7b.

CSl a.p. c

1. бѣ 5a, 7b, бѣста 7a 3du.
2. ѿ дѣаше 4b⁺.
3. ѿдрѣжааше 7a.
4. лѣжааше 8a.
- 5.

стоѣше ба, не|достоѣше
16b.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. оўчааше 6b.

Parallels to the accentuation of the verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *a* are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *b*,²⁰⁴ the accentuation of all standard accentuated AU has well attested parallels, mainly in EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show accentuation on the suffix.²⁰⁵ As for the non-prefixed forms of *ити* and *имѣти* ESl sources regularly show accentuation on the suffix,²⁰⁶ and the same accentuation can be assumed to constitute the normal accentuation in MBlg sources as well.²⁰⁷

As for the verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *c*, parallels to the accentuation of both *-стоѣти* and *бѣти* are well attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.²⁰⁸ The remaining both standard and *iso* accentuated AU are normally attested with accentuation on the suffix in ESl sources,²⁰⁹ and for the most part also in EBlg sources, where, on the other hand, examples

²⁰⁴ Note that the verb *блѣзнити* is reconstructed by some scholars with CSl a.p. *c*. For details cf. Bulatova 1975:78, Bulatova *et al.* 1988:40, Hinrichs 1985:114, Zaliznjak 1985a:137.

²⁰⁵ Cf., for example, Ps. No. 3 90v слѣжааше (Hinrichs 1985:136); ОВа, МВ слѣужаше (Schweier 1987:88); Ev. 1545 11–12 ѿ не хѣтѣаше (Matt. 2:18); ОВа, МВ хотѣаше (Schweier 1987:78).

²⁰⁶ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 258v ѿдѣаше, ОВа ѿдѣаше, ѿмѣаше, ѿмѣаше (Schweier 1987:66, 116, 126). Note that the two latter forms are referred to different verbs by Schweier.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Steensland 1990:69, where, however, only the aorist is discussed.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:144. For a possible clitic status of *бѣ* see sections 3.8.2.1 and 3.8.5.

²⁰⁹ Cf., for example, ОВа дѣаше, ѿдрѣжаше, лѣжаше, оучаше (Schweier 1987:76, 90, 102), Ev. 1627 163v ѿ дѣаше, 248r ѿдрѣжаше, 250r лѣжаше, 247r оучаше.

with accentuation on the root are also found.²¹⁰ Note, however, the occurrence of *oksia* above **рѣ** in the AU **ѡдрѣжаашѣ**, as well as the exceptional position of *varia* in **ѡ даашѣ**. In the latter case, lack of space above the second **а** might also have influenced the position of the accent mark.

3.7.8. Past participle active 1

3.7.8.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the thematic element

1. **ѡвѣщаѡвъ** 2a, 12a, **ѡвѣщаѡвъ**
жѣ 1a⁺, **ѡвѣщаѡвъ** жѣ 1b, ѡ
ѡвѣщаѡвъшѣ 1b.

Both ESl and MBlg sources normally show thematic accentuation in the *v*-participle of **-ѡвѣщати**,²¹¹ and accentuation on the root here probably must be seen as an example of ‘specifically literary’ or ‘South Slavonic’ accentuation (cf. section 3.1.4.1.3). Note also the occurrence of the same accentuation in the infinitive, see above.

3.7.8.2. Other verbs

• CSl a.p. *a* is reconstructed with constant stress on the root. As for verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *b*, forms ending in **-ѡвъ** are reconstructed with thematic stress, and forms ending in **-ѡ** in Late CSl showed stress on the root. In CSl a.p. *c* the masculine and neuter nominative singular are reconstructed as enclitomena, the remaining forms showing final end-stress.²¹²

CSl a.p. a

1. **ѡвѣдѣѡвъ** 6a, **ѡвѣдѣѡвъ** жѣ 7a, ѡ
ѡвѣдѣѡвъшѣ 1a, **ѡвѣдѣѡвъши** 17a
nom sg f.
2. **ѡ повѣрѣѡвъ** 6a.
- 3.
4. **слѣшавъ** жѣ 9a, **слѣшавъ** жѣ
9b, ѡ **слѣшавъшѣ** 2b, 18a.
5. **ѡ стѣѡвъ** 7b, **ѡвѣстѣѡвъ** 8a, 10a
(2x), **ѡвѣстѣѡвъ** 10a, **ѡвѣстѣѡвъ** жѣ
7b, **ѡвѣстѣѡвъши** 7b nom sg f.

ѡ падѣѡвъ 2b (Mt. 21:44).

CSl a.p. b

1. **ѡ вѣзвѣраѡвъшѣ** сѡ 9b.
2. **сѡвѣзавъшѣ** 13b.

²¹⁰ Cf., for example, Služ. Evf. 148v **сѡлѣжашѣ** (Syrku 1890:99).

²¹¹ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 249v **ѡвѣщаѡвъ**, Ev. 1545 146v ѡ **ѡвѣщаѡвъ** (Luke 6:3), Služ. Sol. **ѡвѣщаѡвъ** (Syrku 1890:134).

²¹² See Dybo 1971b:110f.

3. **вѣзлѡжѣ** 4b, 11a, **вѣзлѡжѣ** 7b.
4. **сѣтворшѣ** 6b.
5. **вѣзѣмѣ** 8a.²¹³

CSl a.p. c

1. **бѣвшѡу** 5a dat sg m.
2. **врѣдивѣ** 6a.
3. **вѣздавѣ** 14b.

The verb **пасти** would normally be expected to have accentuation on the root in the past participle active in both ESl and MBlg sources.²¹⁴ Nevertheless, parallels to the accentuation in F are attested in some ESl sources.²¹⁵ Possibly, this can be ascribed to an influence from the homographic *present* participle, which is expected to show accentuation on the ending in ESl sources (cf. section 3.7.3.2).²¹⁶ The accentuation of the remaining lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *a* shows well attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources for all cases.

As for the lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *b*, parallels to the accentuation of the AU **свѣзавшѣ** are attested mainly in EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show thematic accentuation.²¹⁷ The accentuation of the remaining lexemes has well attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *c* parallels to the accentuation of **врѣдити** are attested mainly in EBlg sources, but similar accentuation is also sporadically attested in ESl sources.²¹⁸ Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **вѣздавѣ** are regularly attested in WGrR sources, whereas both EGrR and EBlg sources normally show accentuation on the prefix in formations of this kind. As for **бѣвшѡу**, accentuation on the root is well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.²¹⁹

3.7.9. Past participle active 2

1. **чѣли** 16b.

²¹³ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **и прѣимѣ** 14a*+; cf. section 3.8.3.4.

²¹⁴ In CESl the present tense-stem system of this lexeme has been transferred to a.p. *c*, whereas the infinitive-stem system retains CSl a.p. *a*; see Zaliznjak 1985a:139.

²¹⁵ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 100г **и падѣи**. A similar accentuation can, according to the edition by Lehfeldt 1989, possibly be found in Čud. 12b.

²¹⁶ A possible interpretation of the *varia* as here being 'semantic' rather than indicating ictus does not seem probable, as *varia* here is not put above the vowel of the *root*. In addition, the shape of the accent mark does not differ from that attested in other AU with *varia* in F; cf. section 2.3.2, and Zaliznjak 1985a:207.

²¹⁷ Steensland 1990:140.

²¹⁸ See Zaliznjak 1985a:333f, Dybo 1987:195f.

²¹⁹ Zaliznjak 1985a:331f, map no. 15, Dybo 1987:197.

Accentuation on the root in the *l*-participle of **чисти** (CSl a.p. *c*) is attested in some MBlg sources, whereas final accentuation is expected in ESl sources.²²⁰

3.7.10. Past participle passive

3.7.10.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the root

1. **ОБРАДОВАН'НАА** 17a.

Accentuation on the root in this category is well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

3.7.10.2. Other verbs

1. **ЗАТВѢРѢНЫ** 10a.
2. **ВЪЗЛЮБЛЕН'НЫИ** 18a.
3. **ВЪПРОШЕНЫ** 12a.
4. **ПОСТЛАНУ** 14a acc sg f.
5. **ПОСЛАН'ИИ** 9b.

All attested AU in this category in F belong to CSl a.p. *b*. The past participle passive of verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *b* was originally distributed between two types. Formations with etymologically long root vowels showed constant stress on the root, whereas formations with etymologically short vowels are reconstructed with constant stress on the ending. The original distribution, however, is normally not reflected in either ESl or MBlg sources.²²¹

Parallels to the accentuation of **-сѣлати** are mainly attested in WGrR and MBlg sources, whereas EGrR sources normally show accentuation on the prefix.²²² As for **-сѣлати**, it seems that the normal accentuation in ESl sources is on the prefix, whereas parallels to the accentuation in F can be expected in MBlg sources. Unfortunately, however, relevant forms are lacking in the comparison material.²²³

Parallels to the accentuation of the *i*-verbs **-ворити**, **-любити**, and **-просити** are regularly attested in EBlg sources.²²⁴ In ESl sources, on the other hand, the picture is more complicated. Parallels to the accentu-

²²⁰ Cf., for example, Ev. 1545 146v **ни сѣго ли чѣли** (Luke 6:3), Ev. 1627 150v **чли**, as well as Schweier 1987:152.

²²¹ Zaliznjak 1985a:145, 340f, 349.

²²² Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:344, map no. 17, 350, Schweier 1987:159f, Služ. Sol. **посланныа** (Syku 1890:101), Dybo 1981:225f, 1982b:104, 106.

²²³ Zaliznjak 1985a:351, Schweier 1987:105. Note, however, Čud. 112a **пѣстлани** (Dybo 1981:224) with two accent marks.

²²⁴ See e.g. Dybo 1987:198.

ation of both **-любѣти** and **-просѣти** are attested mainly in EGrR sources, whereas WGrR sources normally show accentuation on the suffix.²²⁵ As for **-ворѣти**, this lexeme in GrR sources is normally accentuated either on the suffix or on the ending, whereas Ukr sources also show accentuation on the root.²²⁶

3.8. Accentuated clitics

3.8.1. Preliminaries

In the present section the AU with accentuated clitics will be discussed. In this connection proclitics will be defined as monosyllabic prepositions, monosyllabic noun and verbal prefixes, the conjunctions **а**, **и**, **нѣ**, and the particles **нѣ**, **ни**, **да**. The enclitics comprise the pronoun forms **мѣ**, **тѣ**, **сѣ**, **ми**, **ти**, **си**, **и** (**нѣ**), **ю**, **ѣ**, **ны**, **бы** (acc pl) as well as the particles **бо**, **же**, and **ли** (cf. section 2.3.1).

In addition some other words which, 'etymologically' speaking, are not considered clitics, but which nevertheless sometimes do not form AU on their own, are discussed. To this category belong in particular some word-forms of **быти** (**бѣ**, **бы**, the present tense forms **ѣсмь**, **ѣси** etc.), the particle **сѣ**, and monosyllabic forms of the demonstrative pronouns **сѣ** and **тѣ**.²²⁷

The overall picture of the accentuated AU in sections 3.1–7 shows that, generally speaking, accentuation of clitics must be considered exceptional in F. Accordingly, AU comprising accentuated clitics are seen as *non-standard* accentuated (cf. section 2.4).²²⁸

In CSI, according to the standard theory, stressed clitics occurred mainly in connection with enclitomena. The most important types of AU are the following:²²⁹

²²⁵ Schweier 1987:153.

²²⁶ According to Zaliznjak 'Каких-либо акцентных различий между первоначальными **tvoriti* и **voriti* (последнее в *отворити*) на восточнославянской почве не усматривается.' (Zaliznjak 1981:158). Cf. also Zaliznjak 1985a:335, 342, Schweier 1987:151f, Bulatova *et al.* 1988:36.

²²⁷ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:125, 145.

²²⁸ The relation between rule and exception in this connection is discussed in Zaliznjak 1985a:283f.

²²⁹ Important data on the accentuation of clitics in different positions can be found not only in Zaliznjak 1985a, but also in Zaliznjak 1989 as well as Dybo 1968b, 1971b, 1971c, 1975, 1977.

1) AU consisting of an enclinenomenon main word plus an enclitic normally had 'autonomous' stress on the enclitic, alternatively on the last syllable of the main word. AU consisting of monosyllabic main words plus 'minus' enclitics, however, are reconstructed with initial 'automatic' stress.²³⁰

2) AU consisting of one or more proclitics plus an enclinenomenon main word normally had the same prosodic characteristics as enclinenomena proper, thus taking initial 'automatic' stress on the first proclitic. In the presence of 'plus' proclitics, however, the AU had 'autonomous' stress on the proclitic, irrespective of the prosodic characteristics of the main word.²³¹

3) AU comprising both proclitic(s), main word, and enclitic normally had 'autonomous' stress on the enclitic as in the first type described above. In the presence of 'plus' proclitics, however, initial 'autonomous' stress is reconstructed.

Some additional types of AU need a special comment:

4) AU consisting exclusively of proclitics and enclitics, without a main word, are reconstructed with either initial 'automatic' or final 'autonomous' stress, depending on the prosodic characteristics of the respective components.²³²

5) An exceptional type is sometimes constituted by a sequence consisting of two enclinenomenon main words with no intermediary clitic (e.g. **oba dъva*). Under certain conditions this kind of sequence could be treated as *one* AU, getting initial 'automatic' stress according to the normal rules. Sometimes, however, such sequences exhibit 'autonomous' stress on the last syllable of the first main word (**ob'a dъva*).²³³

In the following sections the AU comprising accentuated clitics are presented separately for each of the above described types of AU.

3.8.2. AU consisting of main word plus enclitic

3.8.2.1. AU with 'plus' enclitics

AU accentuated with kendema or kamora: — 1. *съ назарѣ|ниномъ їѣомъ ѣѣ* 13a* (Mk. 14:67); — 2. [*съ нимъ*]|| *ѣѣ* 15a* (Lk. 22:59); — 3. *лицѣ ѣго ѣѣ гра-дыи* 18b (Lk. 9:53); — 4. *бѣудѣ| ѣѣ* 17a nom sg n (Lk. 1:34); — 5. *сло|во ѣѣ* 6a nom sg n (Lk. 4:36).

²³⁰ 'Minus' enclitics ('минусовые энклитики') were mainly accusatives of some personal pronouns: *и (нѣ)*, *ю, ѣ, нѣ, ѣѣ*. Following polysyllabic enclinenomena 'minus' enclitics, at least in CESI, exhibit the same properties as the normal, 'plus' enclitics; cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:125, 143, 145, Dybo 1981:35f.

²³¹ To this category belong mainly the prefixes *нѣ-*, *па-*, *пра-*, and *сѣ-*; see Zaliznjak 1985a:146.

²³² Cf. Dybo 1981:51ff.

²³³ Cf. Dybo 1981:52f, Zaliznjak 1985a:125, Görner 1968:89.

The verb-form **ѣѣ** could in CSI appear either as an orthotonic main word or as a 'plus' enclitic.²³⁴ In all the attested cases above (possibly with the exception of [сѣ нимь]|| ѣѣ), however, **ѣѣ** immediately follows orthotonic main words, excluding the reconstruction of CSI stress on an *enclitic* **ѣѣ**. Consequently, **ѣѣ** in these cases can be assumed to be orthotonic, with its own stress. Alternatively, the presence of *kendema* here has nothing to do with ictus, as *kendema* above **ѣѣ** in many sources from different areas apparently can be considered a graphic cliché (cf. section 2.3.2.3).

As for the pronoun form **се**, this word could in CSI appear as a 'plus' enclitic, positioned after an enclinomenon main word receiving ictus.²³⁵ In the two attested cases above **сеу дѣ** reflects an orthotonic form, excluding CSI stress on an enclitic **се**.²³⁶ In the AU **слово се**, on the other hand, with an enclinomenon main word, the accentuation conforms with the reconstructed CSI position of stress,²³⁷ but as *kamora* probably can be seen as a graphic cliché for this word, and as the absence of accent marks above main words generally is not significant (cf. section 4.2), the phonetic basis in F for this accentuation is doubtful.

3.8.2.2. AU with 'minus' enclitics

AU accentuated with kendema: — 1. **любаща ѣѣ** 8a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **тѣ ѣси хѣ** 7b, **тѣ ѣси хѣ** 15b; — 2. **коѣго дѣѣ ѣста ѣѣ** 18b.

As is clear from the preliminaries above, the 'minus' enclitic **ѣѣ** cannot be reconstructed with CSI stress in the position after the orthotonic **любаща**, and *kendema* must in this case probably be interpreted as a graphic cliché, parallels to which are well attested in many sources from different areas.

As for the present tense forms of **ѣѣти**, according to Zaliznjak such forms appear as unstressed enclitics under certain conditions.²³⁸ Unfortunately, however, the scarcity of material, as well as the problematic status of *iso* above initial vowels, does not permit any clear interpretation of the accentuation of the AU in question (see also section 3.8.6, below).

²³⁴ See Zaliznjak 1985a:145, Dybo 1975:61ff, 67f, 70f. In section 3.7.7.2, above, those instances of **ѣѣ** were treated where enclitic status is excluded. Cf. also sections 3.8.4 and 3.8.5, below.

²³⁵ Zaliznjak 1985a:125, 145, Dybo 1975:27f.

²³⁶ Parallels to the use of *kendema* above **се** are attested in some MBlg sources; cf. Gömer 1968:85.

²³⁷ Cf. Dybo 1975:27.

²³⁸ Zaliznjak 1985a:145.

3.8.3. AU consisting of proclitic(s) plus main word

3.8.3.1. AU with accentuated prepositions

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **ѿ вѣ до|моу** 4a.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѿ ловитеѣ** 7a; — 2. **ѿ хлѣбѣх** 5b; — 3. **ѿ четверѣ|тѣи** 5a loc sg f; — 4. **ѿб ноцѣ** 6b acc sg.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **ѿ вѣ до|моу** are mainly attested in MBlg and WGrR sources, whereas EGrR sources normally reflect CSI stress on the ending.²³⁹ The original position of ictus, however, is in cases of this type expected to have been on the *first* proclitic, but at least GrR sources only sporadically show accentuation on conjunctions in this type of AU.²⁴⁰

In the AU **ѿб ноцѣ** the main word is reconstructed as a CSI enclinenomenon, and *iso* in this case possibly reflects stress on the proclitic. As for the AU with the preposition **ѿ**, they all comprise main words belonging to CSI a.p. *a*, and accentuation on the proclitic can in these cases not be assumed to have any phonetic basis, the absence of accent marks above the main words notwithstanding.

3.8.3.2. AU with accentuated conjunctions

AU accentuated with kendema: — 1. **нѣ аще** 1a; — 2. **нѣ ѿб|оу|вєни** 4b; — 3. **нѣ да оу|вє|сте** 8a; — 4. **нѣ рѣ|ци** 9a; — 5. **нѣ ѿ|збавѣи** 10a; — 6. **нѣ за бє|зъ|бч-|ство** 10a; — 7. **нѣ спастѣи** 18b.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѿ на ѿрѣ** 17b; — 2. **ѿ| за|повѣ|да** 4b; — 3. **ѿ ры|бы** 10b acc pl; — 4. **ѿ по|вѣ|до|но|сца** 17b; — 5. **ѿ рѣ** 18b.

Among the AU with the conjunction **нѣ** originally only **нѣ аще** comprises an enclinenomenon main word, fulfilling the conditions for a phonetic basis for accentuation of the proclitic. As the remaining AU with **нѣ**, possibly with the exception of the imperative second person singular in **нѣ рѣ|ци** (cf. section 3.7.2.2), comprise orthotonic main words, it seems probable that *kendema* above this lexeme constitutes a graphic cliché with no reference to the presence or absence of ictus.²⁴¹

The single occurrence of the conjunction **а** with *iso* does not permit any conclusion on the relation between *iso* and ictus.²⁴² As for the AU with the conjunction **и** only **ѿ рѣ** comprises an enclinenomenon main word, whereas the remaining AU all comprise main words belonging to CSI a.p.

²³⁹ See Dybo 1973:156, 165, 1981:30, Zaliznjak 1985a:245ff, map no. 4, 250ff.

²⁴⁰ Zaliznjak 1989:117.

²⁴¹ Cf. section 2.3.2.3 as well as Görner 1968:84f.

²⁴² Note also the instances of this conjunction accentuated with *velikij apostrof* and *apostrof* listed in section 2.3.1.

a. The possible phonetic basis of the accentuation of **й рѣ** is, however, mainly restricted to MBlg sources, as ESl sources normally show final accentuation in the corresponding aorists of verbs belonging to CSl a.p. c (cf. section 3.1.4.2.4).

3.8.3.3. AU with accentuated noun prefixes

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **на́роды** 5a, | **на́ршды** 5a acc pl; — 2. **нѣкыи** 9b; — 3. **прѣтчю** 2b, 11b; — 4. **й сѣнмище** 9a; — 5. **й въ сѣрѣствѣ** 4a*.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **йзлѣха** 5b adv; — 2. **въ йскоушеніе** 10a; — 3. **ѡблакъ** 18a, **йзъ ѡблака** 18a; — 4. **ѡбласть** 1b; — 5. **ѡбразъ** 18b; — 6. **ѡкрѣтъ** 4b adv; — 7. **ѡсужденіе** 3b; — 8. **ѡтрокъ** 9a; — 9. **ѡужасъ** 6a, **й! ѡужасъ** 8a, **ѡужасъ** 6b 7a; — 10. **ѡуспеніе** 18a.

Among the AU accentuated with *oksia*, parallels to the accentuation in **нѣкыи**, **прѣтчю**, and **й сѣнмище** are well attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.²⁴³ **на́родъ** (CSl a.p. a"), on the other hand, normally shows accentuation on the prefix mainly in MBlg and Ukr sources, whereas in GrR—particularly EGrR—sources this lexeme is usually attested with accentuation on the root.²⁴⁴ As for **сѣродѣство**, parallels with accentuation on the prefix have not been found in the comparison material, which corroborates the uncertainty of the reading of the accent mark.

Parallels to the accentuation of the lexemes **ѡблакъ**, **ѡбразъ**, **ѡужасъ**, **ѡбласть**, and **йзлѣха** are attested in both ESl and MBlg sources,²⁴⁵ whereas the adverb **ѡкрѣстъ** is attested with initial accentuation at least in ESl sources.²⁴⁶ As for **ѡтрокъ**, accentuation on the prefix is paralleled mainly in ESl sources, whereas MBlg sources normally show accentuation on the root (cf. section 3.2.1.5). Parallels to the accentuation of the lexemes **ѡуспеніе**, **ѡсужденіе**, and **йскоушеніе**, however, have not been found in the comparison material, and these lexemes are normally attested with thematic accentuation in both ESl and MBlg sources.²⁴⁷

To summarize, notwithstanding the occurrence in some AU of *iso* above initial vowels with ictus, the general impression of the accentuation in this category does not support an assumption of *iso* independently indicating ictus. On the other hand, *oksia* probably indicates ictus above prefixes, as well.

²⁴³ See e.g. Dybo 1973:177, 204, Bulatova 1977:274f, Schweier 1987:346.

²⁴⁴ See e.g. Dybo 1975:26, 37, 1981:76, Zaliznjak 1985a:153, 225, Schweier 1987:212, Ohijenko 1925:210ff, 221, 1928:446, 1952:110ff, 131.

²⁴⁵ Cf., for example, Smotr. 1648 37r **йзлѣха** as well as Zaliznjak 1985a:153ff, Hinrichs 1985:45f, Dybo 1977:197, Ivanov 1931:376.

²⁴⁶ Zaliznjak 1989:128.

²⁴⁷ Cf. section 3.2.2.2 as well as Hinrichs 1985:70, Bulatova 1975:31, Ohijenko 1925:205, 1928:446.

3.8.3.4. AU with accentuated verbal prefixes

Verbs belonging to CSI a.p. a

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и оубѣють** 3b; — 2. **и оуготоваста** 14a 3du; — 3. **ѡкамено** 5b; — 4. **оуправлень** 11a; — 5. **ѡбрацете** etc. 10b (2x), **ѡбрѣте** 1a, **ѡбрѣтоша** 9b; — 6. **ѡбрѣтаеть** 10b; — 7. **ѡставльше** 7a; — 8. **ѡстати** 5b; — 9. **ѡсѣли** 18a aor 3sg; — 10. **ѡбоувени** 4b; — 11. **ицѣлѣеть** 9a, **ицѣлѣ** 3a, BAN 4.9.7:1r, **ицѣлѣвша** 9b.

Verbs belonging to CSI a.p. b

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **и прѣидѣ** 9b, **прѣити** 9a, **прѣиде** 2a; — 2. **и прѣимь** 14a:17*+.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡдѣжи** 12b aor 3sg; — 2. **не изыдѣте** 12a, **иzydе** 3a, **иzydе** 13a, **и ижѣше** 18b; — 3. **и искоушеи** 12b;²⁴⁸ — 4. **иcхѡждаше** 7a, **иcхѡждаху** 7b, **ѡхѡждаше** 4b.

Verbs belonging to CSI a.p. c

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **вѣзгласи** 15a*; — 2. **и прѣдаша** 13b; — 3. **прѣзва** 4b.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и ижвѣкше** 7a; — 2. **ѡдрѣжима** 7b; — 3. **и не оўзрите** 12a 2nd pl. pres. (Lk. 17:22); — 4. **и оўлеже** 5b; — 5. **ицѣли** 4b aor 3sg, **ицѣлаше** 7b; — 6. **оўчинень** 9b.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **и прѣидѣ** are attested mainly in WGrR and Ukr sources, whereas MBlg sources normally show accentuation on the root in the present tense of prefixed forms of **ити**.²⁴⁹ The presence of *oksia* above *trema* in the AU **прѣити**, **прѣиде**, and **и прѣимь**, however, where accentuation on the prefix is not expected, makes it possible to assume that the complex diacritical mark ‘**ѣ**’ must be interpreted as an allograph of the simple *trema* rather than of the simple *oksia*, and thus has nothing to do with the presence or absence of ictus (cf. section 2.3.1).

Note. In addition to the AU above the complex diacritical mark ‘**ѣ**’ is attested only in the AU **сѣмѡиновѣ** 7a, **сѣмѡнова** 7b, and **и вѣсѣсонѣ** 9b (cf. sections 3.9.2.1, 3.9.3). Against the hypothesis that *oksia* in ‘**ѣ**’ does not indicate ictus speaks the complex character of the diacritical mark, contradicting the psychologically ‘natural’ relation unstressed vowel – simple diacritical mark vs. stressed vowel – complex diacritical mark. An analogous situation is, however, clearly attested in the relation between *oksia* and *iso*, where the latter diacritical mark, graphically consisting of *oksia* together with *psili*, cannot be taken as a certain indication of ictus (cf. section 2.3.4), whereas nothing contradicts the assumption that the simple *oksia* normally indicates ictus. As for the graphic origin of ‘**ѣ**’, it is interesting to note that most examples comprise the prefix **при-** followed

²⁴⁸ The reconstruction of the CSI a.p. affiliation of the verb **-коусити** is complicated by the fact that the reflexes of this verb, at least in ESl, cannot be distinguished from the reflexes of the verb **-кжсити**; cf. Bulatova *et al.* 1988:42.

²⁴⁹ Cf., for example, Zaliznjak 1985a:362ff, map no. 20, Schweier 1987:132ff, Ohijenko 1928:450, Dybo 1983:4.

by the letter **и**, suggesting perhaps a 'graphic evolution' from **ѣи** or **ѣи** towards **ѣи** in the semiuncial writing of the period in question.

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* both **вѣлѣзѣгласи** and **прѣзва** reflect CSI enclitomena. Parallels with accentuation on the prefix are attested mainly in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show final accentuation.²⁵⁰ As for the AU **и прѣдаша**, however, both ESl and MBlg sources normally show accentuation on the root. Nevertheless, there exists a possible phonetic explanation of this accentuation. As was briefly mentioned in section 3.7.6 above, in the ESl area the aorist was mainly a 'literary' category, substituting for the functions of the vernacular *l*-participle. This had in some cases the consequence that aorist forms were accentuated similarly to the corresponding *l*-participle, thus constituting a possible phonetic basis for the initial accentuation of the aorist third person plural of the verb **прѣдати**.²⁵¹

As for the AU accentuated with initial *iso*, it is interesting to note that this type of accentuation in absolute numbers is more common among the verbs belonging to both CSI a.p. *a* and a.p. *b* than among the verbs belonging to CSI a.p. *c*, which clearly contradicts what is reconstructed for CSI. Among the AU with verbs belonging to CSI a.p. *c* parallels to the accentuation of **оузьрѣти** are attested in both ESl and MBlg sources,²⁵² and parallels to the AU **и оўлежѣ**, **ицѣли**, and **оўчинѣнѣ**, reflecting CSI enclitomena, are expected in MBlg sources (cf. section 3.7.6.2), whereas the remaining AU in this category are reconstructed with CSI thematic stress. To summarize, most facts speak against an assumption of *iso* indicating ictus in this category.

3.8.4. AU consisting of proclitics, main word, and enclitics

AU accentuated with kendema or kamora: — 1. **ѡкоудѡу ѣѣ** 1b (Mt. 21:25); — 2. **нѣкыи ѣѣ** 9b (Lk. 16:19); — 3. **сѣтвори сѣ** 9b (Lk. 7:8).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и оўбоашѣ** 18a; — 2. **ѡблачаашѣ сѣ** 9b; — 3. **и ѡбращѣ** сѣ 9b, 18b; — 4. **и нѣ оўсѣлмните сѣ** 1a pres 2pl (Mt. 21:21); — 5. **исплѣнишѣ** 8a; — 6. **и ѡстави ю** 7b aor 3sg.

Among these AU all main words reflect CSI orthotonic word-forms. Consequently, in none of these cases is stress to be expected either on proclitics or enclitics. Note also the possibility of interpreting both **ѣѣ** and **сѣ** as graphic clichés (cf. section 3.8.2.1).

²⁵⁰ See e.g. Dybo 1987:192, 195, Schweier 1987:81, 102.

²⁵¹ Zaliznjak 1985a:329.

²⁵² Cf., for example, **ОБѣ оўзритѣ** (Schweier 1987:76), Nor. ps. 84г **нѣ оўзритѣ** (?).

3.8.5. AU consisting exclusively of clitics²⁵³

AU accentuated with oksia, varia, or kendema: — 1. **н|ѣѣ** 16b (Mk. 3:1); — 2. **з а вѣи** 14b (2x); — 3. **н а н ъ** 15a; — 4. **н а т ѣ** 17a.

In the AU **н|ѣѣ** *varia* is found above the vowel on which ictus is expected, irrespective of the status of **ѣѣ** as either a ‘plus’ enclitic or an orthotonic main word. The use of *varia* instead of the usual *kendema* here suggests that this really is an indication of ictus, contrasting with the graphic cliché **ѣѣ**, which often has no phonetic basis (cf. sections 3.7.7.2, 3.8.2.1, 3.8.4).

Similarly, the accentuation of **н а т ѣ** also reflects the CSI position of ictus, and has parallels in both ESI and MBIg sources. Note, however, that in sources from both these areas initial accentuation is also attested.²⁵⁴

On the other hand, the accentuation of **з а вѣи** does not reflect the reconstructed CSI position of ictus, as **в ѣ** belongs to the category of ‘minus’ enclitics (cf. above), but parallels to the accentuation in F are regularly attested in both MBIg and ESI sources.²⁵⁵ Note, however, that a phonetic interpretation is rather doubtful, as *kendema* with this word-form often has no reference to the position of ictus (cf. section 3.8.2.2).

As for **н а н ъ**, parallels to this trivial accentuation are attested in both ESI and SSI sources.

3.8.6. Sequences consisting of two enclinomenon main words

AU accentuated with varia: — 1. **коѣго дѣѣ ѣста вѣи** 18b.

In section 3.8.2.2 the verb-form **ѣста** in this sequence was tentatively interpreted as an enclitic. Alternatively, this word could possibly be interpreted as the second enclinomenon in a sequence of two, and *varia* in the AU **дѣѣ** would then reflect stress on the ending of the first enclinomenon of the sequence in accordance with the principle briefly described in section 3.8.1 above. This hypothesis is, however, difficult to corroborate, as no parallel cases are attested in F.

²⁵³ The lexeme **или**, originally comprising the enclitic **ли**, is discussed in section 3.4, above.

²⁵⁴ Cf., for example, Dybo 1975:18f, Hinrichs 1985:116, Steensland 1990:110f. Among ESI sources accentuation on the preposition is regularly attested in e.g. OBa, Ev. 1627, and Smotr. 1619, whereas both Smotr. 1648 and MB regularly show accentuation on the pronoun. This distribution seems to corroborate the hypothesis proposed by Schweier that this opposition within the ESI area is rather chronological than ‘geographical’; cf. Schweier 1987:341ff, 349, Horbatsch 1964:40.

²⁵⁵ Cf., for example, Dybo 1975:16, 1977:267, 1981:35, 50, Görner 1968:87, Schweier 1987:341, 343, 349, whereas Ev. 1627 335v **з а в ѣ** reflects the CSI position of ictus.

3.8.7. *Conclusions*

To sum up, the following conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the AU comprising accentuated clitics in F.

The occurrence of *iso* in initial position above prepositions, conjunctions as well as different prefixes cannot be seen as reliable indications of ictus, notwithstanding the fact that at least in some cases—particularly among the prefixed nouns—*iso* has with great probability been placed above stressed vowels. In addition, *kendema* with the words **ѣѣ**, **ѣѣ**, and **ѣѣ**, as well as *kamora* above **ѣѣ**, probably constitute graphic clichés, where the presence of the accent mark has no reference to the position of ictus (cf. sections 2.3.2.3–4). The same possibly applies also to the occurrence of the complex diacritical mark ‘, particularly with the prefix **при**.

The AU comprising clitics accentuated with *oksia*, on the other hand, can be—not unexpectedly—assumed to indicate ictus to the same extent as among the AU discussed in sections 3.2–7 above. Parallels to the accentuation in F are in this connection attested mainly in MBlg sources, but also commonly in ESl sources.

3.9. The accentuation of words of Greek origin

3.9.1. *Introduction*

The accentuation of words of Greek origin belonging to the realm of Christian terminology, i.e. personal names, terms denoting nationality, ethnic origin etc., in Slavic manuscripts and early printed books has, it would seem, hitherto not been the subject of any comprehensive investigation. Interesting material and discussion can, however, be found e.g. in Bulatova 1981:72f, Dybo 1975:65, Kolesov 1972b, Steensland 1990:124ff, and Uspenskij 1969.

Generally speaking, one finds that in ChSl sources from different areas this kind of word with few exceptions shows constant accentuation on one of the syllables of the stem, conforming with a.p. *a*. As they frequently contain polysyllabic stems,²⁵⁶ however, accentuation on the stem is often tantamount to *non-standard* accentuation (cf. section 2.4), which would make a division between standard and non-standard accentuated AU less relevant in this category. Instead, the material will be divided according

²⁵⁶ Whether the Greek counterparts of these polysyllabic stems consisted of one or more root morphemes is in this connection without importance.

to whether the accentuation of the ChSl AU is similar or not to the accentuation of its Greek counterpart.²⁵⁷

Kolesov 1972b contains some general observations on the accentuation of words of Greek origin in ChSl texts. According to Kolesov, these words in both SSl and Ukr sources are normally accentuated on the same syllable as their Greek counterparts. On the other hand, in GrR sources Greek accentuation on the root is retained only in those instances where the accented vowel in the original Greek word is long, whereas if the Greek accented vowel is short, in the ChSl counterpart the following vowel is accentuated.²⁵⁸

The majority of the words of Greek origin attested in the manuscript consist of nouns and adjectives. The Greek counterparts to the attested lexemes are—if not explicitly otherwise stated—reproduced according to the orthography used in Bauer 1957.

3.9.2. Nouns

3.9.2.1. *o-* and *jo-*stems

Accentuation similar to Gk

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. при [...] ἀρχιῆρεν 16b loc sg, ἀρχιῆρεε 2b, 13b (ἀρχιερεύς); — 2. ѿ βύσσου 9b (βύσσον, βύσσοσ); — 3. ѿ ἰωάννου 2a, ѿ ἰωάν[] 18b, ѿ ἰωάνна 1b, ѿ ἰωάνна 7a (Ἰωάννης); — 4. ἰάκωβъ 18b, ἰάкову 4a, ἰάкови 7a (Ἰάκωβος); — 5. ἱερεѿ 16b (ιερεύς); — 6. ѿ μωϋсеѿ 18a (Μωϋσῆς); — 7. πέτρъ 7a, 13b, 15a, 18a, πέтрови 13a (Πέτρος); — 8. къ пѣтяѿ:~ 15b (Πιλάτος); — 9. сѣмѣнъ 6b, 7a, ѿ сѣмѣну 4a, къ сѣмѣну 6b, 7a (Συμεών); — 10. τέκτονъ 4a (τέκτων); — 11. τήρων 16a (τήρων);²⁵⁹ — 12. ѿ φари́сеѿ 2b, ѿ φари́сеѿ 16a, φари́сеѿ 3b (2x), ѿ φари́сеи 12a (φариσαῖος).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ἄγγελъ 17a (3x), 17b, къ ἄγγелу 17a (ἄγγελος).

Accentuation different from Gk

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. при ἀβι̑θάρѣ 16b (Ἀβιαθάρ); — 2. ἀρχι̑ѣрен 1b (ἀρχιερεύς); — 3. галила̑нинъ 15a*⁺ (referring to Γαλιλαία); — 4. ἰсѡвѣи̑ 1b, ἰѣ̑хъ · 18b (Ἰησοῦς); — 5. ἰѣ̑дѣѡ 3b, ἰѡ̑ѣи̑ 2b (λουδαῖος); — 6. ѿ сѡдѡмля̑нъ 12b (Lk. 17:29, referring to Σόδομα).²⁶⁰

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ἀπ̑ла 14a acc du (ἀπόστολος); — 2. ἀρ̑хι̑ереѿ 15b; — 3. ἡ̑л̑а 18a (Ἠλίας).

²⁵⁷ Note that the comparison is normally made with the nominative singular (or corresponding form) of the Greek lexeme, irrespective of the actual case-form of the ChSl AU.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Kolesov 1972b:39, Lehfeldt, Berger 1984:149.

²⁵⁹ Referring to Theodore Tyro; cf. *The book of saints* 1989:535. The initial syllable of τήρων is also written τε̑-, τ̑у, or τ̑ή-; cf. Lampe 1961–68 V:1394, Sophocles 1957 II:1083, Liddell, Scott 1925–1940 II:1766, 1796, *Thesaurus* 1831–1865 VII:1929, D'jačenko 1899:719.

²⁶⁰ Cf., however, *Novum Testamentum Graece* 1990 Luke 17:29 ἀπὸ Σοδόμων.

Among the AU with accentuation similar to Greek almost all have well-attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. The AU **ѿѿ'сонѣ, пѣтровои, тѣктонѣ**, as well as the accentuated AUs of the lexeme **симонѣ**, however, deserve special comment.

In agreement with the general quantity-based rule quoted above, the lexeme **ѿѿ(с)онѣ** is normally attested with initial accentuation in SSl and Ukr sources, while GrR sources usually show accentuation on the second syllable.²⁶¹

The occurrence of accentuation on the root in oblique cases of the proper name **пѣтрѣ** is a typical trait in both SSl and Ukr sources, as well as in GrR ecclesiastical sources from the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century.²⁶²

The proper name **симонѣ** is in ESl and MBlg sources usually attested with accentuation on the first syllable. Parallels to the accentuation on the second syllable can, however, be found in Serbian sources.²⁶³

As for **тѣктонѣ**, the available comparison material is scarce; possibly accentuation on the second syllable can be considered the normal accentuation in GrR sources.²⁶⁴

The AU with accentuation different from Greek can be divided into AU with 1) *oksia*, 2) *varia*, 3) non-initial *iso*, and 4) initial *iso*.

To the first group belong the AU **ѿ соудѣмѣнѣ** and **галилеѣнинѣ**. Parallels to the accentuation of **ѿ соудѣмѣнѣ** are attested in both ESl and SSl sources.²⁶⁵ As for **галилеѣнинѣ**, the ESl sources in the comparison material consistently show accentuation on the third syllable as in the Greek Γαλιλαία. The same accentuation is according to the general rule above also expected in SSl sources.²⁶⁶

исѿѿсѣ is attested twice with a final *varia*. Final accentuation in oblique cases is attested in both ESl and SSl sources. As Steensland points out, however, accentuated forms of this lexeme in many sources consti-

²⁶¹ Cf., for example, Ber. 1627:196 **ѿѿссонѣ**, Lex. 1722:262 **ѿѿссонѣ** vs. Čud. **ѿѿссѣнѣ** etc. (Ušakov 1982:64), *Slovar'* 1847 I:232 **ѿѿссѣнѣ**. Note, however, the accentuation **ѿѿссонѣ** in Deschler 1987:49.

²⁶² This lexeme usually is considered belonging to a.p. *b*; cf. Dybo 1975:65, Zaliznjak 1985a:134, Uspenskij 1969:99ff.

²⁶³ Cf. Ev. 1627 247r **к' сѣмонѣ**, Ber. 1627:232 **сѣмѣнѣ**, Čud (Ušakov 1982:323f), Ev. 1355/56 271v **сѣмѣноу пѣтроу**. For Serbian examples cf., for example, Dov. 118v **сѣмѣнѣ**, **сѣмѣнѣ пѣтрѣ**, **кѣ сѣмѣноу** as well as Bulatova 1973:99.

²⁶⁴ Cf. Ev. 1627 163r **тѣктѣнѣ**, D'jačenko 1899:613, OBa **тѣктѣнѣ** (Schweier 1987:314). In Čud., on the other hand, the adjective **тѣктѣнѣ** is attested with accentuation on the first syllable; cf. Ušakov 1982:356.

²⁶⁵ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 315r **ѿ соудѣмѣнѣ**, Nor. ps. 252r **сѿѿѿмѣскѣ**, Čud. (Ušakov 1982:336).

²⁶⁶ Cf., e.g., Ev. 1627 290v **галилеѣнинѣ**, Smotr. 1619 **ѿг галилеѣнинѣ**, Smotr. 1648 289v **галилеѣнинѣ**. The same accentuation as in F is, however, attested in M; see section 6.9.1.1, below.

tute orthographic stereotypes, and thus have limited relevance for an accentological analysis.²⁶⁷

Among the AU with *iso* above vowels in initial and non-initial position only parallels to **при ѣвѣѡарѣ** have been found.²⁶⁸ The remaining AU in this category are normally not—whether in ESl or MBlg sources—attested with accentuation parallel to that in F.²⁶⁹

3.9.2.2. $\bar{a}$ - and $j\bar{a}$ -stems

Accentuation similar to Gk

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣ** **галиї**лѣи 3b loc sg (Γαλιλαία); — 2. **ѣ** **ѳѳѣ**дѣ 4a dat sg (Ἰούδας); — 3. **пѣ**лѣхѣу 14a (2x) (πάσχα); — 4. **ни** **пѣ**ры 4b gen sg (πήρα); — 5. **сѳѳѣ**ты **радѣ**и 16b (σάμβατον); — 6. **на** **тѣ**рѣпѣзѣ 14b (τράπεζα).

The AU **сѡѣбѣтъ** belongs to the small group of AU with two *oksa*. Presumably, one of the accent marks indicates ictus, while the other may possibly have something to do with the presence of a line-break (cf. sections 2.3.5–6). In SSl sources **сѡѣбѣтъ** usually is accentuated on the first syllable, and in ESl on the second.

The lexeme **τραπεζα** is usually attested with accentuation on the first syllable in SS1 and Ukr sources, while GrR sources often show accentuation on the second syllable. According to Kolesov, both types of accentuation are attested in Greek.²⁷⁰

The accentuation of the lexemes **галилея**, **иуда**, **пасха**, and **пира** has well-attested parallels in both ESI and SSI sources.

3.9.3. *Adjectives*

Accentuation similar to Gk

Standard and non-standard accented AU: — 1. **ЗЕΒΕΔΑΪΟΥ** 7a acc du m (pertaining to Ζεβεδαῖος); — 2. **ἸΟΥΔΑΪΚΩΝ** 9a (referring to Ἰουδαία, Ἰουδαῖος); — 3. **ΛΩΤ-**
ΟΥ 12b (pertaining to Λώτ); — 4. **ΝΩΕΩΝ** 12b (pertaining to Νῶε); — 5. **ΣΥΜΕΩΝ-**
ΟΥ 7b (Lk. 4:38) (pertaining to Συμεών).

Accentuation different from Gk

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. ма́рїи̑нь 4a (pertaining to Ма́рїа); — 2. сѣ́мо-
но́вь 7a* (Lk. 4:38), сѣ́монова 7b (Lk. 4:38).

²⁶⁷ Steensland 1990:88.

²⁶⁸ Cf. Ev. 1627 150v при авіаѣартъ, Ev. 1355/56 93v при авиаѣартъ (Talev 1973:250. On the facsimile in Živkova 1980, however, I have not been able to distinguish any accent mark in this word).

²⁶⁹ According to Uspenskij, the prevailing accentuation of the proper name **илин** in Russian sources from the period of the Second South Slavic Influence is on the second syllable (Uspenskij 1969:61). The same accentuation is found in MBIG sources; cf., for example, Sb. 1348 150v **илиа** (Kuev 1981:283).

²⁷⁰ Zaliznjak 1985a:225, Kolesov 1972b:32.

Adjectives formed on the basis of words of Greek origin normally show constant accentuation on one of the syllables of the stem, i.e. simple forms conform with a.p. *a*, and compound forms with the types with either root- or prefixional stress (cf. section 3.3).

The vacillation in the accentuation of the adjective **СИМОНОВЪ** can be explained as reflecting different accentuation of the noun **СИМОНЪ** (cf. above), but in light of the discussion in section 3.8.3.4 on the complex grapheme **ѣ**, a 'graphic' explanation of this accentuation is perhaps to be preferred.²⁷¹

ИЮДѢСКЫИ is usually attested with accentuation parallel to F in both ESl and SSl sources.²⁷² For the occurrence of non-initial *iso* in this AU cf. section 3.9.2.1 above. As for **МАРІИНЪ**, the proper name **МАРИЯ** shows vacillation between accentuation on the first and second syllable in both ESl and SSl sources.²⁷³

3.9.4. *Indeclinable lexemes*

Accentuation similar to Gk

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **НѠЄ** 12b (NŰЄ).

Accentuation different from Gk

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ЃМИНЬ** 1a, 5b, **ЃМИ|НЬ** 2a, **ЃМИН БѠ** 3a (ἀμήν); — 2. **ЃЛ|САВѢ** 17a (Ἑλισάβετ).

Parallels to the accentuation of **НѠЄ** are attested in both ESl and SSl sources. On the other hand, the proper name **ЕЛ|САВЕТЬ** is normally attested with accentuation either on the third or fourth syllable.²⁷⁴ Finally, the word **ЃМИНЬ** in both MBlg and GrR sources usually shows accentuation on the second syllable, similar to Greek. Initial accentuation is, however, attested in Ukr sources.²⁷⁵

²⁷¹ Note, however, the corresponding text in *Novum Testamentum Graece* 1990 Luke 4:38: '[...] εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος. πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος [...]']'.

²⁷² Cf., for example, Hinrichs 1985:85, Görner 1968:88, Talev 1973:286.

²⁷³ Cf. Uspenskij 1969:46.

²⁷⁴ Uspenskij 1969:229f.

²⁷⁵ See Ohijenko 1952:39. Cf. also Služ. No. 323 13v **ЃМИНЬ**.

3.9.5. Summary

The accentuation of the words of Greek origin in the manuscript as a rule has parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. In some instances, however, the accentuation does not conform to what is characteristic of ESl—particularly GrR—sources. In some instances *iso* occur in positions—both initially and non-initially—without parallels in either ESl or SSl sources, which considerably diminishes the probability of *iso* being a reliable indication of ictus in this category.

3.10. Conclusions

As noted in section 2.4, the AU with non-standard accentuation are assumed to be the most significant when characterizing the accentuation of F. As the analysis in sections 3.2–9 has shown, the accentuation of most non-standard accented AU has well-attested parallels in both ESl and MBlg sources. Some AU, however, having parallels in one group of sources, can at the same time be characterized as ‘untypical’ or ‘uncharacteristic’ of another group.²⁷⁶ These ‘negatively’ characterized AU can be divided into two main categories, with accentuation untypical of ESl (particularly EGr) and MBlg (particularly EBlg) sources, respectively.

To the AU with accentuation untypical of ESl sources belong mainly the finally accented imperatives belonging to CSl a.p. *a* (cf. sections 3.7.2.1–2). The remaining AU untypical of ESl sources are distributed between various categories, comprising the nouns **ѡѡца** (?) (cf. section 3.2.2.4), **въ тайнѣ** (cf. section 3.2.3.2), **камень, на каменѣ** (cf. section 3.2.4.1), **на́роды, на́рѡды** (cf. section 3.8.3.3), the adjectives **достѡинь, достѡйна** (cf. section 3.3.2.1), the postposition **радѣ** (3x) (cf. section 3.4), as well as the aorists **възгласи** and **прѣзва** (cf. section 3.8.3.4).

The non-standard accented AU untypical of MBlg sources, on the other hand, comprise the nouns **скровѣще, скровѣщъ** (cf. section 3.2.2.4), the adverb **сѣлѡ** (cf. section 3.4), the numeral **ѡ ѡбѡю** (cf. section 3.6), the present **ѡ ѡсхѡдѡ** (cf. section 3.7.1.2), the infinitives **ѡ варѣти, видѣти, ѡтѣи** (cf. section 3.7.5.2), the aorists **прѣстоупѣша, ѡ запрѣтѣи** (cf. section 3.7.6.2), as well as the participle **ѡ падѣи** (cf. section 3.7.8.2).

²⁷⁶ Using the terms which were adopted in section 2.2.6, these accentuations are *not* intrinsic to a certain source or group of sources.

Notwithstanding the limited extent of these two categories, this clearly indicates the presence of at least two components—a non-ESI and a non-MBlg—in the accentuation of F. Thus, in ‘positive’ terms, the accentuation of the non-standard accentuated AU falls within one of the following three categories: 1) accentuation characteristic of both ESI and MBlg sources; 2) accentuation characteristic of ESI but not of MBlg sources; and 3) accentuation characteristic of MBlg but not of ESI sources.

Among the standard accentuated AU almost all fall within the first of these categories, as parallels to the accentuation of these AU are well attested in both ESI—particularly WGrR—and SSl sources. In the former group of sources standard accentuation can in many cases be considered as either ‘specifically literary’ or ‘South Slavonic’ accentuation, or else ascribed to the WGrR definalization. To distinguish between these types of accentuation is often problematic, as ‘die westgroßrussische Definalisation des Akzents einerseits oder ein südslavischer Einfluß andererseits auf der Oberfläche vielfach zu einer und derselben Akzentuierung von Wortformen führen konnten’.²⁷⁷

For the accentuated AU of words of Greek origin the mechanical relation between standard and non-standard accentuation is reversed, a majority of the accentuated AU in this category showing ‘non-standard’ accentuation (cf. section 3.9.1). This phenomenon constitutes an additional argument in favor of the interpretation of the accentuation in F as basically ‘phonetic’, as words within this category are in fact attested with ‘non-standard’ accentuation in sources from various areas more frequently than ‘normal’ ChSl words. Among these AU, only **Ѣ ВѢСЬСОНЪ**, **ТЕКТОНЪ** (cf. section 3.9.2.1), and **НА ТРАПЕЗѢ** (cf. section 3.9.2.2), can be considered ‘untypical’ of ESI sources, whereas the accentuation of the remaining both standard and non-standard accentuated AU has well attested parallels in both ESI and SSl sources.

The AU accentuated only with initial *iso* present a special problem. As was stated in section 2.3.4, *iso* in the present manuscript can be assumed to have two functions: either indicating ictus, as an allograph of *oksia*, or else, as an allograph of *psili*, just indicating a word-initial vowel, irrespective of the position of ictus. On the basis of internal, distributional criteria a distinction between these two functions is not possible. Summarizing the commentaries in sections 3.2–9, however, some points can be clarified. As has been shown, excluding words of Greek origin, initial *iso* above vowels in root-morphemes in many cases has parallels in either ESI or MBlg sources, or in both.

Note. This applies to most AU attested for the nouns **ИМА**, **ИСТИНА**, **ОГНЬ**, **ОКО**, **ОТЬЦЬ**, **ОУТРИКЪ**, **ОУЧЕНИКЪ**, **ЮЗВИНА**, **ЮЗЫКЪ**, the adjective **ОТЬЦЬ**, the indeclinables **АБИКЪ**, **АВѢ**, **АЩЕ**, **ИБО**, **ИДЕЖЕ**, **ОБАЧЕ**, **ОНЪДЕ**, **ОУБО**, **ОУЖЕ**, **ЮКО**, **ЮКО-**

²⁷⁷ Schweier 1987:370.

ЖЕ, ЮГДА, ЮЩЕ, the pronouns И, ИЖЕ, ОНЪ, КЛИКЪ, the numerals ОБА, ЮДИНЪ, as well as unprefixed forms of the verbs БЫТИ, ИМѢТИ, ИСКАТИ, ИТИ, ОУЖАСАТИ СЯ, ОУЧИТИ, ЫСТИ, and ЯТИ in various categories.

On the other hand, *iso* above initial vowels in proclitics, as well as generally in words of Greek origin, is seldom paralleled in sources with 'phonetic' accentuation. Tentatively, therefore, *iso* above initial root-vowels can normally be assumed to indicate ictus, except in words of Greek origin, whereas *iso* above prefixes cannot be considered a reliable indication of ictus. The accentuation of the AU in question, however, cannot be said to adhere strictly to this principle, and in a careful accentological analysis these AU are probably best ignored.

Finally, the relation between the 'specifically ESl' and 'specifically MBlg' component of the accentuation of F deserves a commentary. According to Zaliznjak, at least some accentuations in ESl manuscripts copied from SSl originals can be assumed to have been 'phonetically real'.²⁷⁸ As we have seen, this assumption is amply illustrated in the accentuation of manuscript F. The accentuation is in most cases linguistically motivated, with mostly well attested parallels. Further, the two 'geographically specific' components of the accentuation, seen against the background of the 'non-accentual' orthography of F as well as of the general cultural situation during the period of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia, probably can be ascribed to different phases in the transmission of the language of the text from Bulgarian to Russian Middle Church Slavonic. This change of language variety can be assumed to be a consequence of the subsequent copying of the original protograph, adapting the text to an ESl environment. Thus, in F, the 'specifically MBlg' component of the accentuation can be seen as reflecting orthoëpic norms ultimately originating in a MBlg protograph, whereas the remaining accentuations, comprising components with backgrounds in different traditions of pronunciation, can be assumed to reflect the orthoëpic norms relevant, or at least acceptable, to the scribe. In the 'non-accentual orthography', on the other hand, where the same components can be distinguished, the 'specifically MBlg' component is relatively less important, comprising only sporadic 'Bulgarisms' contrasting with the general ESl character of the orthography (cf. section 2.2.6).

²⁷⁸ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:195f.

Chapter 4

THE UNACCENTUATED AU IN F

4.1. Preliminaries

A COMPREHENSIVE analysis of the accentuation of a source like manuscript F is not possible without at least a brief discussion of the AU *not* supplied with accent marks, i.e. the unaccentuated AU. As was stated in section 2.3.1, the departing point for the analysis is the assumption that every AU comprises not more than one syllable with ictus. In addition it is assumed, at least for CSI, that some AU constitute enclinomena, lacking syllables with 'autonomous' stress (cf. section 3.1.2).

On the graphic level—i.e. in the accentuation—every accentuated vowel letter ideally corresponds to a phonetically stressed vowel, and every unaccentuated vowel letter to an unstressed vowel. As is well known, however, in many manuscripts, including F, the relation between accentuated and unaccentuated vowel letters does not conform to the CSI reconstructed relation between stressed and unstressed vowels, the number of unaccentuated vowel letters being relatively much too high. This absence of agreement can be explained in at least two basically different ways:

1) According to one line of reasoning, all graphically unaccentuated vowel letters can be assumed to reflect phonetically unstressed vowels. Consequently, quite a few CSI orthotonic words must be assumed to have become enclinomena, or at least in many cases to appear in phonetically unstressed variants.¹

2) Alternatively, only some of the graphically unaccentuated vowel letters can be assumed to reflect phonetically unstressed vowels, whereas other unaccentuated letters correspond to phonetically stressed vowels. Consequently, we must assume that, according to the scribal norms, the writing of accent marks above 'stressed vowels' was not compulsory. This principle is termed by Birnbaum, quoting Zaliznjak, as 'the "principle of optional expression" (принцип факультативности выражения)'.²

¹ This kind of explanation is elaborated in e.g. Hinrichs 1985:31ff.

² See Birnbaum 1986:128ff.

In the analysis of sources like F, with a considerable number of unaccentuated AU, the latter line of reasoning, according to the principle of optional expression, seems the most fruitful. To proceed according to the former model would require assuming a whole series of seemingly unrelated innovations.

4.2. The accentual coefficient

The degree of optionality in the graphic expression of the opposition between stressed and unstressed vowels is reflected in the so-called 'accentual coefficient'. In F, the over-all accentual coefficient, i.e. the number of accentuated AU divided by the total number of AU,³ constitutes on the average almost 40%. The range of variation, however, is considerable: fols. 1–3 show *c.* 50%, fols. 4–11, 14, and 16 between 45 and 35%, while fols. 12–13, 15, and 17–18 show an accentual coefficient of only *c.* 30%.

In addition, there also exists a difference in the accentual coefficient between different morphological categories, certain lexemes etc. To illustrate this we will briefly take a look at the accentual 'inclination' of the masculine and neuter *o-* and *jo-*stem underived nouns and the feminine *ā-* and *jā-*stem underived nouns, in all 145 AU of 70 lexemes.⁴ Among these 145 AU 71 show accentuation on the root and 6 on the ending, whereas 68 AU, almost half of the total number, are unaccentuated (cf. Table 2).

Table 2: The accentual inclination of primary *o-*, *jo-*, *ā-*, and *jā-*stem nouns in F

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSl a.p. <i>a</i>	31 (72%)	0 (0%)	12 (28%)	43 (100%)
CSl a.p. <i>b</i>	17 (47%)	1 (3%)	18 (50%)	36 (100%)
CSl a.p. <i>c</i>	23 (35%)	5 (8%)	38 (56%)	66 (100%)
Total	71 (49%)	6 (4%)	68 (47%)	145 (100%)

The figures show that the AU of lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *a* show the greatest accentual inclination, with only 28% unaccentuated AU, whereas the lexemes belonging to CSl a.p. *b* and *c* show considerably less accentual inclination, with 50 and 56% unaccentuated AU, respectively. As

³ Cf. Zalaznjak 1985a:202f, Schweier 1987:41. In the calculation both illegible AU and AU in which the original presence or absence of accent marks is impossible to determine (e.g. on cut folios) are not counted. AU comprising abbreviations and/or letters above the line are, however, counted, as some such AU are accentuated.

⁴ This material comprises the standard and non-standard accentuated AU of the lexemes treated in sections 3.2.1.1, 3.2.2.1, and 3.2.3.1, as well as lexemes with unaccentuated AU which, provided they had exhibited accentuated AU, would have been treated in these sections. Note, however, that AU without root vowel or with a letter above the root vowel are excepted (cf. section 2.3.4).

shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5, this pattern is repeated within each morphological category, most clearly, however, among the *ā*- and *jā*-stem nouns.

Note. Among the AU of lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *c* we do not here distinguish between original enclitomena and orthotonic word-forms (cf. the discussion in Birnbaum 1986:131f), as the important component in this a.p. in fifteenth-century manuscripts is the presence of paradigmatic stress mobility rather than the status of the word-forms with initial stress as 'etymological' enclitomena.

Table 3: The accentual inclination of fem. *ā*- and *jā*-stem nouns (28 lexemes,⁵ 53 AU)

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSI a.p. <i>a</i>	20 (77%)	0 (0%)	6 (23%)	26 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>b</i>	2 (25%)	1 (12%)	5 (62%)	8 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>c</i>	3 (16%)	4 (21%)	12 (63%)	19 (100%)
Total	25 (47%)	5 (9%)	23 (43%)	53 (100%)

Table 4: The accentual inclination of masc. *o*- and *jo*-stem nouns (26 lexemes,⁶ 62 AU)

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSI a.p. <i>a</i>	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	9 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>b</i>	12 (57%)	0 (0%)	9 (43%)	21 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>c</i>	13 (41%)	1 (3%)	18 (56%)	32 (100%)
Total	30 (48%)	1 (2%)	31 (50%)	62 (100%)

Table 5: The accentual inclination of neut. *o*- and *jo*-stem nouns (16 lexemes,⁷ 30 AU)

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSI a.p. <i>a</i>	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	8 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>b</i>	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	4 (57%)	7 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>c</i>	7 (47%)	0 (0%)	8 (53%)	15 (100%)
Total	16 (53%)	0 (0%)	14 (47%)	30 (100%)

⁵ CSI a.p. *a*: *бесѣда, вечерю, вѣра, млѣнии, мрѣжа, мѣка, нѣва, пѣтица, рана, рыба, сила, стража, тѣща, чаша*; CSI a.p. *b*: *волю, жена, змию, мѣзда, раба, сестра, слоуга, хвала*; CSI a.p. *c*: *вина, глава, гора, землю, рѣка, страна*.

⁶ CSI a.p. *a*: *вѣтрѣ, хлѣбѣ, часѣ*; CSI a.p. *b*: *грѣхѣ, дворѣ, жѣзлѣ, кораблѣ, кратѣ, кровѣ, полѣ, постѣ, рабѣ, трѣудѣ*; CSI a.p. *c*: *вѣсѣ, вѣчерѣ, врагѣ, вѣкѣ, домѣ, дреугѣ, доухѣ, класѣ, лисѣ, мѣжѣ, плодѣ, родѣ, страхѣ*.

⁷ CSI a.p. *a*: *житѣ, зрънѣ, колѣнѣ, лѣтѣ, мѣстѣ, ралѣ, чадѣ*; CSI a.p. *b*: *гнѣздо, лице, ложе*; CSI a.p. *c*: *горѣ, морѣ, словѣ, тѣлѣ, чрѣво, кѣзѣ*.

In our opinion, the attested distribution of the unaccentuated AU with great probability disproves any assumption of chance distribution. On the contrary, the data suggest a correlation between the CSI a.p. affiliation and the accentual coefficient, which constitutes a clear indication of the mainly phonetic character of the accentuation in F.⁸

4.3. Letters possibly indicating ictus

So far only the possible relations of different diacritical marks to ictus have been discussed. In some sources, however, a connection has been demonstrated between the distribution of certain vowel letters and the position of ictus.⁹ As is the case with the accent marks, normally the opposition between phonetically stressed and unstressed vowels is only optionally expressed in this way, with e.g. one letter occurring exclusively in stressed position, whereas the corresponding letter occurs both in stressed and unstressed position.¹⁰

The possibility of correlations between the distribution of certain letter-variants and the presence or absence of ictus cannot be *a priori* excluded from F. We will therefore briefly discuss the most important distributional constraints for the *e*-, *i*-, *u*-, and *o*-letters to see if these constraints can be assumed to have any prosodic basis.¹¹

4.3.1. The letters *ε* and *е*

The letters *ε* and *е* alternate both in initial and post-vocalic position (cf. section 2.2.2). Not counting the word-form *ѣ*, attested 19x, in initial position *ε* is written 82x and *е* 44x. In 57% of the *ε*-cases the letter is written with *iso*, whereas among the AU with initial *ε* only 5% (=2x) are written with *iso*. As initial *iso* in F is not an unequivocal indication of the position of ictus, the connection between *ε* and *iso* can be assumed to have a purely orthographic character. In addition, in 22% of the cases (=18x) initial *ε* is written in AU with an accent mark above another vowel. The corresponding figure for initial *е* is 30%. For both vowel letters this must

⁸ Such a correlation can also be found in other sources; cf., for example, Dybo 1971a:70, Zaliznjak 1981:117f, 1989:118. To note but one lexeme: *рѣка* (CSI a.p. c) is attested 7x in F, always unaccentuated. In *Služ*. No. 323, with 43 attestations of *рѣка*, accentuation on the root is attested only 3x, whereas the remaining AU are unaccentuated (Steenland 1990:200).

⁹ This type of connection is attested in sources both with and without accent marks indicating ictus; cf. Zaliznjak 1981:99, 111, 1985a:207f.

¹⁰ The converse relation is at least theoretically possible, with one letter occurring exclusively in unstressed position, the other in both stressed and unstressed position.

¹¹ The distribution of the *a*-letters *а*, *ѣ*, and *ѧ* can apparently be described without reference to prosodic factors; see section 2.2.2.

be considered a very high proportion of potentially 'double accented' AU, should either *ε* or *ε* indicate ictus in F, particularly compared with the corresponding figures for the accent marks (cf. section 2.3.6). Consequently, an assumption of either *ε* or *ε* indicating ictus in F must be considered as highly improbable.

In post-vocalic position *ε* is written only 6x (ἀρχιῆρεи 1b, ἀρχιῆρε-овѣ 13a [Mark 14:66], μοιῆи 10b, нѣкоѣмоу 11b, сътрѣѣтъ 2b, трѣбуѣтъ 10a), apparently without reference to the position of ictus.

4.3.2. *The letters и and ї*

The distribution of the letters и and ї (except at the end of a line) can be described as follows: ї is written before vowels, и in all other positions (cf. section 2.2.2). Consequently, either pre-consonantal ї or pre-vocalic и, or both, theoretically can be assumed to indicate ictus in F.

Pre-consonantal ї, however, is attested only in words of Greek origin and their derivatives (cf. section 3.9), often with accent marks above other letters. As for pre-vocalic и, only two examples are attested, namely ἰωάν'на 7a (vs. ἰωάν'на 1b, ἰωάν'нъ 2a, and ἰ ἰωάν[] 18b) and приѣтъ 8a (vs. e.g. въспрїѣти 8b). Consequently, neither pre-consonantal ї nor pre-vocalic и can be assumed to indicate ictus in F.

4.3.3. *The letters оу and ѣ*

The *u*-letters are distributed according to the following principle: оу is written in all positions, whereas ѣ (and ѣ) is written mainly either immediately following оу or at the end of a line (cf. section 2.2.2). In addition, ѣ is written 8x—of which seven occur on fols. 17–18—in the AU вѣдѣи 17b (imperative third person singular), ѣ другомоу 9b, погѣбити,| 18b, | ѣмѣ 18b, въ ѣнѣ вѣ·| 18b, скончаваахѣ сѣ 18b, да ѣготовѣѣ| 18b, къ ѣченикѣ 18b. Theoretically, ѣ here could be assumed to indicate ictus. Such an assumption, however, is contradicted either by the presence of accent marks above other vowels (in вѣдѣи, | ѣмѣ, въ ѣнѣ вѣ·|) or by the proximity to the end of a line (погѣбити,|, въ ѣнѣ вѣ·|, да ѣготовѣѣ|), the remaining AU with ѣ being too few to support any assumption of an ictus-indicating function. In addition, supposing that ѣ in these eight AU really were to indicate ictus, four out of eight AU (|ѣмѣ, въ ѣнѣ, скончаваахѣ сѣ, да ѣготовѣѣ) would then be non-standard accented, which is a notably higher relative number than the average for the AU accented with accent marks. Thus, the available material does not support an assumption of a connection between the presence of ѣ and the position of ictus in F.

4.3.4. The letters **ѡ**, **Ѣ**, and **ѣ**

The distribution of the *o*-letters in F has exhaustively been treated in Steensland 1987 (cf. section 2.2.2). Briefly summarized, there exists according to Steensland a connection between the presence of the letter **ѡ** in post-consonantal position—except in the endings **-ѡ** and **-ѡмѣ**—in ‘Slavonic words’ (‘в славянских словах’) and the position of ictus.¹²

4.3.4.1. AU with the particle **Ѣѣ**

The particle **Ѣѣ** is in F written either as **Ѣѡ**, **ѢѢ**, or **Ѣѣ**, always unaccentuated. The alternation of the vowels in this lexeme is connected with the stress by Steensland, who, however, does not go into details.¹³ We will therefore take a closer look at the distribution of the *o*-letters in this lexeme.

The particle **Ѣѣ** is in all attested 28x in F, including in the conjunctions **ѢѢѣ** and **ѣѢѣ**. According to the theory, **Ѣѣ** is expected to carry ictus only when following a CSI enclinenomenon or a ‘minus’ proclitic (cf. section 3.8.1). The distribution of the respective variants of **Ѣѣ** in F is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: The distribution of the letters **ѡ**, **Ѣ**, and **ѣ** in the particle **Ѣѣ** and its derivatives

	Ѣѡ	ѢѢ	Ѣѣ	Total
in ѢѢѣ ¹⁴	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)
in ѣѢѣ ¹⁵	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
following CSI enclinom. ¹⁶	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)
following CSI orthot. ¹⁷	4 (31%)	7 (54%)	2 (15%)	13 (100%)
Total	13 (46%)	12 (43%)	3 (11%)	28 (100%)

The lexemes **Ѣ** and **ѣѢ** are reconstructed as a CSI ‘minus’ proclitic and an orthotonic word, respectively. Consequently, in the conjunctions **ѢѢѣ** and **ѣѢѣ** CSI final and initial ‘autonomous’ stress, respectively, are expected. As shown in Table 6, the presence of **ѡ** here fully corresponds with the CSI reconstructed position of ictus.¹⁸

¹² See Steensland 1987:49, 1990:39.

¹³ Steensland 1987:49.

¹⁴ **Ѣѡѡ** 8b (3x), 13b, **Ѣѡѡ** 15a, **Ѣѡѡ** 9a.

¹⁵ **ѣѢѢ** 1b, 14b (2x), **ѣѢѢ** 10b.

¹⁶ **ѢѢѢ** 12a, **ѢѢѢ** 14a, 14b; **ѢѢѢ** 3b, **ѢѢѢ** 18b.

¹⁷ **ѢѢѢ** 3a, **ѢѢѢ** 9a, **ѢѢѢ** 10b, **ѢѢѢ** 16a; **ѢѢѢ** 1b, **ѢѢѢ** 5b, **ѢѢѢ** 5b, **ѢѢѢ** 9a, **ѢѢѢ** 10b, **ѢѢѢ** 12a, **ѢѢѢ** 17a; **ѢѢѢ** 5a, **ѢѢѢ** 7a.

¹⁸ Cf. Dybo 1981:53.

The remaining AU with the particle **ео** do not give such a clear picture. Worth noting, however, is the fact that following CSI orthotonic words the variants **ео** and **ео** taken together occur approximately twice as often as the variant **еу**, whereas they are equally common when following CSI enclimena. This, in our opinion, indicates at least some connection between the choice of **еу**, **ео**, or **ео** and the position of ictus. To decide which element of the opposition is marked—that is, whether **у** indicates a stressed vowel or **о** and **е** an unstressed vowel—a more extensive material would be needed.¹⁹

4.3.4.2. Other AU with **у**

As Steensland shows, almost all the remaining AU with **у**, both accented and unaccented, in some way or another have a meaning of 'plurality' ('значение множественности'),²⁰ and in the accented AU the position of **у** coincides with the position of the accent mark. Exceptions are formed only by the AU **нарѡды** 5a, **ѣ ѣсѡдѣ** 6a, **ѣдѡшѣ** 7a, 18b, and **ѣ прѣѣдѡшѣ** 6b. In both **нарѡды**, **ѣ прѣѣдѡшѣ**, and **ѣдѡшѣ** the position of the accent mark has parallels mainly in MBlg sources, whereas **у** occupies the position which normally is accented in parallel AU in GrR sources. In **ѣ ѣсѡдѣ**, on the other hand, parallels with accentuation on the ending are attested mainly in WGrR sources, whereas accentuation on the root is well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

4.3.4.3. Summary

To sum up, the results of the analysis in Steensland 1987 may be considered as confirmed, showing that the presence of the letter **у** is at least in some categories connected with the CSI stress and/or with the accentuation in F or other sources. In the few instances where the 'accentuation' with **у** does not conform to the accentuation with the accent marks *oksia* and *iso*, the former seems to belong to the ESl component of the accentuation, whereas the latter fits best into the MBlg or SSl component of the accentuation. Indirectly, this division is supported by the fact that the use of various *o*-letters to indicate both prosodic and phonematic oppositions is well attested in a number of ESl sources.²¹

¹⁹ For data on the occurrence of various variants of **ео** in ESl sources see e.g. Stadnikova 1989:144.

²⁰ Steensland 1987:47.

²¹ Cf. e.g. Zaliznjak 1985a:173ff, Stadnikova 1989:135ff.

Chapter 5

MS M: TEXT, ORTHOGRAPHY, AND ACCENTOGRAPHY

5.1. Introduction

IN the present and following chapter manuscript F is compared with parts of the codex Ev. No. 8619, presently kept in the manuscript department of the Lenin State Library in Moscow (GBL, Fond 178 [*Muzejnoe sobranie*], No. 8619). The brief description given below is based on the information in the typewritten description of the *Muzejnoe sobranie* available at the manuscript department of the GBL as well as on the article by Widnäs 1970.¹ At certain points these data are complemented with the results of my own observations when working directly with the manuscript; for various reasons it has not been possible to work with microfilms or photocopies.

Ev. No. 8619 is a 'long' Gospel lectionary (*polnyj aprakos*), containing 414 paper folios, of which fols. 2, 266v, 408, 413, and 414 are blank. According to the scribal note on fol. 407v, the codex was written in the year 7015 (=1506/07) in the monastery of Chutyn' in Novgorod.

Note. A thorough investigation of the watermarks in the codex has not been carried out. On fol. 408, however, is attested a watermark of the type 'Couronne à diadème' (the Russian term is *korona* or *tiara*; cf. Zagrebin, Švarc 1990:8), similar to Briquet Nos. 4896 and 4899. According to Ščepkin, among Russian manuscripts this type is characteristic of sixteenth-century manuscripts, thus not contradicting the date of origin as given in the scribal note. Similar watermarks are also attested in SS1 sources (cf. Briquet 1923/1977:295, Ščepkin 1967:104, Bulatova 1975:27). Watermarks similar to this are also found in Lichačev 1899 (No. 1382, 1383).

The text of Ev. No. 8619 is written in a semiuncial hand (*poluustav*), in one column, with normally 18 lines to a page (written area c. 22 x 12 cm). The initials are thin, sometimes with details in ink.² The hand is similar to the hand of F. As Widnäs states, the two manuscripts are 'semblable par l'écriture (ouks, červ's et E širokoe) ainsi que par le nombre des lignes (18), l'espace recouvert par l'écriture (20 x 11 cm) et par l'ornementation des initiales'.³

¹ To my knowledge there are no other published investigations of this manuscript.

² Cf. Nevolin 1973:176, tab. XI.

³ Widnäs 1970:210.

As the main objective of the present investigation is the description of the accentuation of F, only certain parts of Ev. No. 8619 have been investigated. These parts comprise 75–80 fols., constituting about 20% of the whole text. In the following, these parts will be referred to as (manuscript) 'M'. Thus, all statements on orthography, accentuation etc. below refer only to M, but as no systematic differences have been discerned between the different parts of M, the results can in most cases probably be applied to the text of Ev. No. 8619 as a whole.

For the present investigation the most important parts of M are the sections textually corresponding to F, i.e. the same readings for the same days according to the *aparakos* scheme. These parts will be referred to as 'corpus A'. The remaining parts of M, often adjoining to corpus A, will be referred to as 'corpus B' (see Table 7; folios where not all AU have been excerpted are enclosed within brackets). The boundaries between corpus A and B are in most cases dependent on the line and page divisions of F. Thus, in M these boundaries often occur in the middle of a page. When giving addresses to the text of M those pertaining to corpus A will be put in italics, while addresses pertaining to corpus B are set in roman.⁴

5.2. The text

The differences between the texts of F and M, respectively, are rather small. The relation between the parallel texts in F 3a:1–3b:18 and M 110r:13–111r:10 (cf. Fig. 1) can be considered representative.⁵ The text, Matt. 17:16–23 and Matt. 23:13–14, belongs in both manuscripts to the readings for Sunday of the tenth and Monday of the eleventh week after Pentecost, respectively. Differences between the manuscripts are indicated by double underlining.⁶ Note that most of the text reproduced from M belongs to corpus A; parts belonging to corpus B are indicated by scrolled brackets { }.

⁴ Note that AU with only partial counterparts in F will be considered as pertaining to corpus A only under the following conditions: a) both AU are accentuated; b) the occurrence of an accent mark in the part of the AU missing in F would not change the interpretation of the accentuation. This has the consequence that in some cases non-accentual differences between AU belonging to corpus B and manuscript F are attested; cf., for example, Fig. 1 below, line 19.

⁵ The text from F can also be found in Wesslén 1985:165f and Birnbaum 1961:219f. In order to facilitate the reading of F the parallel extract from M is slightly longer.

⁶ Both texts have been divided into words. The line division follows F, while indicated with the symbol | in the M extract. Page breaks are in both extracts indicated with the symbol ||. As for the rendering of the *o*-letters in M see section 5.3.1.3.

Table 7. The contents of corpus A and B.

<i>F</i>	<i>M: corpus A</i>	<i>M: corpus B</i>	<i>Gospel texts</i>
		3r:9–18	John 1:1–7
		14v:6–15r:2 (20r–54v)	John 5:17–19 Various readings from Mark 16, Luke 24, John 4–12, 14–17
		106v:10–13	Matt. 21:18–19
1	106v:13–107v:10		Matt. 21:19–27
2	107v:10–108v:5		Matt. 21:27–32, 43–46
		108v:5–110r:13	Matt. 22:23–33, 17:24–27, Matt. 18:1–4, 17:14–16
3	110r:13–111r:8		Matt. 17:16–23, 23:14, 23:13
		111r:8–9	Matt. 23:13
BAN 4.9.7:1r			Mark 5:29 ⁷
		135v:18–136r:2	Mark 5:34
BAN 4.9.7:1v	136r:3–4		Mark 6:1
		136r:4–6	Mark 6:1–2
4	136r:7–136v:17		Mark 6:2–9
		136v:17–138v:8	Mark 6:9–13, 6:30–45
5	138v:8–139v:5		Mark 6:45–53, Matt. 24:1–2
BAN 4.9.7:4r			Matt. 24:7
BAN 4.9.7:4v			Matt. 22:35
6	158r:14–159r:11		Luke 4:34–36, 5:1–7
7	159r:11–160r:5		Luke 5:7–11, 4:38, 37–41
		160r:5–163v:11	Luke 4:41–44, 5:12–16, 33–39, 6:12–19, 17–23, 5:17–23
8	163v:11–164v:6		Luke 5:23–26, 6:31–36
		164v:6–8	Luke 6:36
		178v:1–9	Luke 10:14–15, 7:1–2
9	178v:9–179v:5		Luke 7:2–10, 16:19–20
		179v:5–181r:18	Luke 16:20–31, 10:22–24, Luke 11:1–4
10	181r:18–182r:15		Luke 11:4–10, 9–13
		182r:17–182v:1	Luke 11:13
11	201r:15–202r:11		Luke 9:57
12	202r:12–203r:8		Luke 9:57–62, 12:16–21
		203r:8–10	Luke 17:20–25, 26–30
		249v:9–16	Luke 17:30–31
13	249v:16–250v:13		Mark 14:63–65
14	256r:11–257r:8		Mark 14:65–72, 15:1
		257r:8–11	Luke 22:10–23
		259v:15–17	Luke 22:23–25
15	259v:17–260v:11		Luke 22:59
		260v:11–265v:18	Luke 22:59–67, 70–71, 23:1
16	265v:18–267v:7		Luke 23:1–56, Matt. 6:1–18
		267v:7–268r:1 (326v–327v)	Matt. 6:18–21, Mark 2:23–28, Mark 3:1–2
		393r:13–393v:5	Mark 3:2–5
17	393v:5–394v:10		Matt. 27:25–29, 37–38, 45–46
		394v:11	Luke 1:24–27
		403r:11–18	Luke 1:27–38
18	403v:1–404v:11		[title]
		404v:11–405r:5	Matt. 17:1–3
			Matt. 17:3–9, Luke 9:51–56
			Luke 10:22–24

⁷ In Wesslén's edition by mistake printed as Matt. 5:29 (Wesslén 1985:153).

Figure 1. Examples of the text in F and M

F 3a:1–3b:18

- 1 гошѧ ѿго исцѣ[]ѧ. ѿвѣ
щав же ѿ рѣ, ѿ роде невѣре
нь и развращень. доколѣ бѣ
доу съ вами, доколѣ трѣплю
5 ѡ, приведеѣте ми ѿго сѣмо.
и запрѣти ѿмоу ѿ, и ѿзыде
ѿз него бѣсѣ. и ѿцѣлѣ ѿ
трѣкъ ѿ часа того. тогда
пристоуплѣше ѡченици ѿсѣ
10 ви единому рѣшѧ. почто
мы не възмогѡхѡмъ ѿзгна
ти ѿго. ѿ же рѣ ѿмъ, за невѣ
рствѣе ваше. ѡминъ бѣ гла
ѡ, ѡще ѿмате вѣроу ѿко
15 зрѣно горѡушно, речете го
рѣ сѣи, прѣиди ѿсюдоу та
мо, и прѣидеѣ. и ничѣ
же не невѣзмѡжно боудѣ ѡ.

- сѣи ж[]е исходитъ, тѣ
20 кмо млитвою и постомъ.
живоущемъ же ѿмъ въ галі
леи, рѣ ѿмъ ѿ. прѣданъ ѿ
ма бѣти сѣ члѣьскыи въ
роуцѣ члѣь, и ѡубѣють ѿго.
25 и третѣи възстанѣтъ:~
пѣ. а. пѣ. ѿ. ѿ. ѿ. ѿ. ѿ.
рѣ гѣ къ пришеши к нему ѿ
дѣѡ, горе вамъ фарїсеѣ лицѣ
мѣри. ѿко сънѣдаѣте дѡмы
30 вдѡвицъ, и виноу далече
мѣтвы творѣще. сего радѣ
лишѣше прѣимѣте ѡсоужѣ
нїе. горе ѡ книжници
и фарїсеѣ лицѣмѣри, ѿко
35 затварѣете цѣтвѣе нѣное
прѣ члѣь. ѡ бѣ не възхѡди

M 110r:13–111r:10

(и не възмо
гѡшѧ) ѿго (и|сцѣлѣти). ѿвѣ
щав же ѿ речѣ. ѿ роде невѣре
нь и развращень. доколѣ боу
дѣ с вами. доколѣ трѣплю
ѡ. приведеѣте ми ѿго сѣмо. и
и запрѣти ѿмоу ѿ, и ѿзыде
ѿз не|го бѣсѣ. и ѿцѣлѣ ѿ
трѣкъ ѿ часа тогѣ. тогда
пристоуплѣше ѡченици ѿсѣ
ви единому рѣшѧ. побѣто
мы не възмогѡхѡмъ ѿзгнѣ
ти ѿго. ѿ же рѣ ѿмъ, за невѣ
рствѣе ваше. ѡминъ бѣ гла
вамъ. ѡще ѿмате вѣроу ѿко
зрѣно горѡушнѣ, речѣте го
рѣ сѣи, прѣиди ѿсюдоу та
мо, и прѣидѣ. и ничѣ
же| не невѣзмѡжно боудѣтъ вамъ.

(сѣ же рѣ) не ѿсхѡдѣ, тѣ
кмо м|литвою и постомъ.
живоущемъ жѣ| ѿмъ въ галі
леи, рѣ ѿмъ ѿ. прѣданъ ѿ
ма бѣти сѣ члѣьскыи вѣ
роуцѣ члѣь. и ѡубѣють ѿго,
и третѣи дѣ възстанѣтъ:~::~~|
ѿ пѣ. а, пѣ. ѿ. ѿ. ѿ. ѿ. ѿ.
речѣ гѣ къ пришешимъ кѣ нему|| ѿу
дѣѡ. горе вамъ книжници и фарїсеѣ лицѣ
мѣри. ѿко сънѣдаѣте дѡ|мы
вдѡвицъ. и винѡю, далече|
мѣтвы творѣще. сего радѣ
лишѣше прѣимѡу ѡсоужѣ
нїе. горе ѡ книжници
и фарїсеѣ лицѣмѣри. ѿко
затварѣете цѣтвѣе нѣное|
прѣ члѣь. ѡ бѣ не възхѡди
те, {м| възхѡдѣшихъ ѡстаѣлаѣте вънѣ|ти.}

On lines 25, 26, and 28, respectively, M includes words lacking in F. On line 25 and 28 M reflects the 'normal' Slavonic Gospel text,⁸ whereas the occurrence of the preposition **ѣ** in M on line 26 reflects a systematic difference between F and M in the formulation of the titles.

Note. Among other examples of this type of differences between F and M can be mentioned the absence of the words **къ вѣсаниѣ** in F 5a:5 (Mark 6:45, the beginning of the reading for Friday of the fifteenth week after Pentecost), contrasting with their presence in the corresponding text in M 138v:12/13. An example of the converse situation, with words present in F but not in M, is attested in F 7a:17/18 (Luke 4:37–38, the beginning of the reading for Monday of the second week of the New Year; cf. Birnbaum 1961:228), contrasting with M 159v:8/9.

On line 19 and 32 the differences are of another character, pertaining to morphology and/or syntax. Note, however, that on line 32 it is M—in contrast with the instances discussed above—that deviates from the usual Slavonic Gospel text.

Note. Among other examples of this type of difference can be mentioned F 6b:10/11 **мрѣжѣ** accusative plural vs. M 159r:4 **мрѣжѣ** accusative singular (Luke 5:5, the reading for Sunday of the first week of the New Year), and F 14a:9/10 **сѣ ѡбѣма на десѣте** vs. M 256v:1/2 **ѣ ѡбѣ на десѣте** (Luke 22:14, the reading for Monday of Tyrophagia⁹ [*syropustnaja nedelja*]).

Among interesting *similarities* between the texts of the two manuscripts the extracts on ll. 28–36 are worth mentioning. As indicated in the title on line 26, the extracts following the *incipit* contain the beginning of the reading for Monday of the eleventh week after Pentecost. In *Novum Testamentum Graece* 1990, the Greek counterparts of these texts are indicated as Matt. 23:13 (ll. 33–36) and Matt. 23:14 (ll. 28–33), the latter verse not being considered as belonging to the original text of the Gospels.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it forms an integral part of the Slavonic Gospel text. The order between Matt. 23:13 and 14 is, however, of some significance. Parallels to the order attested in both F and M, with verse 14 *preceding* verse 13, are firmly established in the older ChSl Gospel manuscripts, comprising Mar., Zogr., Ban., Ev. 1355/56, Ljub., Mst., B, Čud., Muz. as well as the younger Ev. 1627,¹¹ following the majority of the Greek manuscripts, whereas the earliest example of the 'modern' order in the ChSl manuscripts presently investigated is found in OBb.

Among interesting syntactical similarities between F and M can be mentioned the presence of a triple negation on lines 17–18 (Matt. 17:20).

⁸ Cf., for example, Birnbaum 1961:231.

⁹ For this term cf. Talley 1986:219.

¹⁰ Cf. Aland, Aland 1989:298, 301f.

¹¹ The same order is found in the reconstructed text in Vajs 1935:87.

In the corresponding text the OChSl manuscripts show only a double negation.¹²

Note. Among other interesting similarities between F and M can be mentioned the presence of a single negation in both M 159r:3 **НИЧЕСОЖЕ** ѿхѡ and F 6b:9 **НИЧЕСОЖЕ** ѿхѡ (Luke 5:5, the reading for Sunday of the first week of the New Year) as well as M 164v:2/3 **НИЧЕСОЖЕ** чѡюще and F 8b:14 **НИЧЕСОЖЕ** чѡюще (Luke 6:35, the reading for Sunday of the second week of the New Year). This syntactical construction is characteristic of ESl sources from the period of the Second South Slavic Influence, whereas older ESl as well as the OChSl sources are characterized by constructions using double negation (cf. Uspenskij 1987:212f).

Among further examples of the same type can be mentioned the presence of the lexeme **владыка** as well as the word order in M 256r:11/12 **и рѣцѣта домоу владыцѣ** and F 14a:1/2 **и рѣцѣта домоу влцѣ** (Luke 22:11, the reading for Monday of *Tyrophagia*), the presence of the lexeme **плаванник** in M 138v:18/139r:1 **въ плѣванні** and F 5a:12 **въ плѣвани** (Mark 6:48, the reading for Friday of the fifteenth week after Pentecost), and the presence of the infinitive variant **погрѣести** of the lexeme **погрѣти** in M 201v:3/4 **погрѣѣсти**, 5 **погрѣѣсти** and F 11a:7/8 **погрѣѣсти**, 9/10 **погрѣѣсти** (Luke 9:59, 60, the reading for Saturday of the ninth week of the New Year) (cf. Widnäs 1970:219f, 222f).

As for the text pertaining to corpus B, where a direct comparison with F is excluded, worth mentioning is e.g. the choice of words in M 26v **ПОТЧѢНІЕ| СѢНИ** (John 7:2) and in M 23v, 53v **оутѣшитель** (John 15:26, 16:7) as well as M 50r **оутѣшителя** (John 14:16), corresponding to Gk σκηνοπηγία and παράκλητος, respectively.

In the text of John 7:2 the Greek lexeme σκηνοπηγία in both Mar., Zogr., Ass., Ostr., Mst., Vukan., Ban., Dobr., Om., and Čud. is rendered with ChSl **скѣнопиγѣя**, whereas the younger ESl sources OBb, Ev. 1627, and NT 1816, as well as the MBlg Ev. 1355/56 agree with the formulation in M.¹³ According to Talev, Ev. 1355/56 is characterized by the fact that 'Greek and Hebrew lexical borrowings in OCS have been systematically purged from the language'.¹⁴ Consequently, it seems reasonable to connect the presence of the lexeme **потъченикѣ сѣни** in the ESl sources listed above to a MBlg component within the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia.

The ChSl counterparts to Gk παράκλητος are similarly distributed. While the OChSl sources show either **параклитѣ** or **оувѣтъникѣ**,¹⁵ the lexeme **оутѣшитель** is attested in both OBb, Ev. 1627, NT 1816, as well as the SSl Ev. 1355/56 (fol. 256v), Vukan., Kochn., and Ban.¹⁶

¹² Cf., for example, Mar. **и ничтоже не възможно еждетъ вамъ** (Birnbäum 1961:231). Double negation is also attested in e.g. Mst., Kochn., as well as the younger NT 1816. Note, however, the parallel to F and M in Ev. 1627 82r **и ничтоже не возможно еждетъ вамъ**.

¹³ Cf. OBb 47v **потъчѣнїе сѣни**, Ev. 1627 35v **потъчѣнїе сѣни**, Ev. 1355/56 231v **пѣтъчѣнїе кѣщѣ**.

¹⁴ Talev 1973:355.

¹⁵ Cf., for example, Cejtin 1977:88, Žukovskaja 1976:125.

¹⁶ Both Ostr., Mst., Čud. (49b, 49d), Dobr., and Om., however, have the lexeme **параклитѣ** in the corresponding texts.

5.3. Spelling and punctuation

The description of the orthography of M will in principle be done in the same way as for F (cf. section 2.2). In the following presentation, however, only a brief overview will be given, with the emphasis put on the relation to F.

5.3.1. Vowel letters

The inventory of vowel letters in M is on the whole identical with that in F (cf. section 2.2.2). As for their distribution, the most notable features will briefly be discussed below.

5.3.1.1. The OChSl nasals and their counterparts

Normally M agrees with F in the distribution of the nasal vowels, regularly showing **оу** and **ю** for OChSl **ѡ** and **ѣ**, respectively, whereas **ѣ** is in most cases written for both OChSl **ѡ** and **ѣ**. The letter **ѡ** is attested, however, by way of exception, in e.g. **мѡкъ** 256v and **гѡлѡкъ** 201r/v.

The letter **ѡ** is also attested in the titles **прѣбываѡ мѣре нашеѡ марѣ ѡвѣтъныѡ** 394r/v and **оуспѣніе прѣтъѡ ѡлѣцѡ нашоѡ** 404r. The occurrence of **ѡ** instead of the genitive ending **ѡ** or **ѣ** in these cases is most easily explained as reflecting the MBlg alternation between the nasal vowel letters. For the form **нашоѡ**, however, we must assume a transitory **нашоѡ** from **нашеѡ**. The shorter ending **-ѡ** instead of **-ѣѡ** in the genitive singular feminine of the pronominal declension is attested as early as in the OChSl manuscripts.¹⁷

Worth noting is also the spelling with **ю** in the participle **горющѡ** 203r (Luke 17:29, the reading for Tuesday of the tenth week of the New Year). In the corresponding text F, as well as a series of other sources, has the letter **ѡ**.¹⁸ Not excluding the possibility of this spelling reflecting the MBlg nasal alternation, it must be noted that even in the OChSl sources the verb **горѣти** shows alternation between **ѡ** and **ѡ** in the present participle active. This would explain a spelling with the letter **оу** in an ESl source. As for **ю**, possibly the use of this letter can be assumed to indicate a palatalized pronunciation of the preceding consonant, due to the influence of the pronunciation of the more common form **горащѡ**.¹⁹

¹⁷ Cf. Diels 1932:208 **моѡ, твоѡ, сеѡ** etc.

¹⁸ Cf., for example, Mst. 92d **горащѡ**, B 17c **горащѡ**, Ev. 1627 315v **горащѡ**, OBb 38c **горѡ**, NT 1816 **горащѡ**. Note, however, Peresopn. **горѡчеѡ** (Žiteckij 1878:95).

¹⁹ Cf. Vasmer 1986–1987 I:441, Diels 1932:262, Wijk 1931:191f, Ščepkin 1967:34.

As for the letter **ѡ**, in contrast to the orthography of F, this letter is written instead of OChSl **ѡ** in the position mainly after the letter **ч**, cf., for example, **чѡсоу** 137v, **начѡтолкъ** 30r, **въ начѡлѣ** 3r, **сѣѡ чѡша** 256v, **чѡшоу** 256v, **ѡ чѡшоу** 256v, **печѡль** 54v (cf. the corresponding nouns in F: **ѡ чѡса** 3a, **чѡ** 14a, **чѡшоу** 14a, **ѡ чѡшоу** 14b, **сѣѡ чѡша** 14b etc.).

In a few word-forms **ѡ** is written instead of the expected **ѣ**. In addition to **пѡтелъ** 250v, 260r, with parallels in F (cf. section 2.2.6), this alternation is also found in the present tense first person singular **не вѣдѡ** 42r (John 9:25). A well motivated choice between phonetic and morphological explanations for these spellings can unfortunately not be made, as the material is too small. Note, however, that the alternation as such is attested in some MBlg—including Moldavian—sources.²⁰

5.3.1.2. The letters **ѣ** and **ѥ**

In quite a few instances OChSl **ѣ** is replaced by the letter **ѥ**. This occurs mainly in locative endings, cf., e.g., **въ закѡнѥ** 48r, **въ ѡкрѣстнѣ** сѣлѣхъ 138r, **въ нѡродѣ** 27r, but also in the spelling of the preposition **прѣдъ** as well as the prefixes **прѣ-** and **прѣд-**, besides spellings with **ѣ**. Examples: **прѣ** 163v, 261v, 264v vs. **прѣ** 138r, 163r, **прѣд** 326v; **прѣидѣ** 110v, **прѣдѣ** 110v, **прѣдѣвъ** 262v, **прѣдѣсты** сѡ 257r, **прѣдѣтель** 162r, **прѣстѣ** 181r, **прѣбываѣ** ѡ 49v, **прѣсѣлѣвнаѣ** 164r, **прѣмоудрѣсть** 136r vs. **прѣдѣна** 404v, **прѣбываѣте** 137r, **прѣхѣдѣ** 180r, **прѣмѣчи** 158r, **прѣсѣтол** 393v; **прѣвари** 109v, **прѣложѣ** ѡ 181v, **на прѣдворѣѣ** 250r vs. **прѣварѣшѡ** 137v, **прѣлагаѣ** ѡ 138r, **прѣсѣстоѣ** щимъ 250r. Note also the phrase **ѡ прѣбѣрази сѡ прѣд ними** 403r.

5.3.1.3. The *o*-letters

As in F, the *o*-letters in M, usually reflecting OChSl **ѡ**,²¹ are divided between two main types, **ѡ** and **ѡ**. The letter **ѡ** is attested in a series of variants with different widths. It is not clear, however, whether these different variants are best seen as belonging to two, three, or perhaps four main types, and as a thorough investigation of this phenomenon falls outside the scope of the present work, in quotations from M the different variants of the letter **ѡ** will not be distinguished. Note that this constitutes an important difference from the principles of quotation from F, where **ѡ** exclusively indicates 'narrow' **ѡ** and **ѡ** 'wide' **ѡ**.

²⁰ For example, the present tense first person singular **вѣдѡ** is well attested in Ev. 1355/56; see Talev 1973:312f. Cf. also Syрку 1890:LIV.

²¹ Exceptions with **ѡ** for OChSl **ѡ**: **нѡ** (regularly; cf. section 6.8.2.2), **ѡспѣлнишѡ** 159r, **крѣѣѡ** 256v.

Among the *o*-letters **ѡ** has the most limited distribution, mainly occurring in words of Greek origin and in word-forms with a 'plural' sense (cf. section 4.3.4.2). In the latter category **ѡ** is attested both in roots and dual and plural endings. In some cases the presence of an opposition between the singular and plural can be suspected; cf., e.g., **нѣпѡды** 394r nominative singular (Luke 1:36) vs. **нѣпѡды** 263r nominative plural (Luke 23:29). In addition to these categories, **ѡ** also occurs in some individual lexemes, as e.g. in the enclitic particle **ѡ** (cf. section 6.8.1.1). In a few cases—e.g. in forms of the lexemes **народъ** and **воинъ**—a spelling with **ѡ** can possibly be connected with the presence of the phoneme /ô/ in ESl (cf. section 5.4.2).

5.3.1.4. Other vowel letters

The letter **ѣ** is written for OChSl **ѣ** in the suffix **-ѣц-** in some cases; cf., e.g., **вѣнѣцъ** 326v, **конѣцъ** 179v.

The spelling with **ѣ** instead of OChSl **и** in the imperative **ѣ видѣте** 138r probably has a morphological explanation, bearing no reference to the pronunciation of either **ѣ** or **и**.

An interesting feature, attested only twice in M, is the spelling with double vowels in the AU **знаѡли** 49r (John 14:7) and the accusative dual **злѡѡдѣѡ** 263r, possibly having parallels in Serbian sources.²² Alternatively, the spelling in the former AU could perhaps be explained as being formed on the spelling of the imperfect.

As in F, the locative singular of the lexeme **цѣсарьствѣ** and some verbal nouns in **-нѣ** are sometimes written with only one **и**; cf., e.g., **въ цѣр'ствѣ бѣи** 108r, **ѡ ѡчищени| своѣмъ** 160v, **въ плѡвѣни** 138v/139r (cf. section 2.2.6).

5.3.2. Consonant letters

For the consonant letters, it is worth mentioning that, in addition to the frequently occurring **з**, both **с** and **з** are attested, e.g. in **сѣло** etc. 139r, 261r, 403v; **въврѣсѣте** 158v, **сѣсѣѣ** 202r; **пѣнѣсѣ** 36v, **зилѡта** 161v, and **ѣгобѣи** сѣ 201v. One should also note the occurrence of **ж** instead of OChSl **жд**, attested in e.g. **стражѣ** 110r, **стражѣшѣ** 180r, **прихожѡу** 24v, **нѣ хѡжаахѣ** 26r, **ѡбѣхожаашѣ** 136v.

²² Cf. Bulatova 1975:40.

5.3.3. Variant letters

As in F, in position near the end of a line particular variant letters are often attested. Notable are e.g. the 'high' variants of the letters **ъ**, **ѣ**, and **т**, occurring, for example, in **вѣ|нъ** 43r, **сѣ|крѣ сѧ** 45v, **вѣ||здасть** 265v/266r, **посрѣдѣ|** 138v, **сѣ|ло** 139r, **врѣ||днѣвъ** 158r/v, **ничѣ|**же 3r, **тѣ|** 31v, **не бѣсѣ|** 37v, **власѣ|ю** 158v, **слѣшасѣ|** 249v, **пѣТра|** 403r. Not attested in F, however, is the variant of **з** occurring, e.g., in **ѣз'|** 107r, **зѣм'стїи** 109v, **вѣзмѣ|** 136v, **вѣзѣ|пиша** 139r, **и|зѣ|де** 250r, **ѣзѣ|къ** 260v, **и|зѣ|ви** 265r, **ѣбра|за** 404r.²³

In contrast to F, in positions near the end of a line various ligatures are also attested, the most frequently occurring ones formed by the letters **ни** (**ни**), **пр** (**пр**), **тв** (**ѣ**), and **ти** (**ѣ**), respectively. Examples: **сѣмѣ|дѣ** 22r, **нѣ|вы** 34r, **и|скомѣ|** 35r, **нѣ|жѣнат сѧ** 109r, **свѣбоднѣ|** 109v, **нѣ|в'хѣдѣщїихъ** 111r, **празнѣ|къ** 262r, **вѣ прѣ|тѣбрѣ** 38v, **прѣ|не-сѣнїе** 404r; **ѣо|ѧ** 264v, **ѣоѣ|** 265r, **ѣбѣ|рїте** 31r, **за неѣ|рѣсѣ|е** 110v, **и вѣ сѣ|рѣсѣ|ѣ|** 136r, **сѣ|ѣбѣ|р'ше** 159r; **тѣбѣ|рїтѣ** 14v, **исѣ|н'но** 29r, **ѣуѣ|тѣ|** 31r, **и|сѣ|тною** 33r, **посѣ|тїи сѧ** 161r, **ѣпоу-щѣтѣ|** 163v, **прѣ|ложїтѣ|** 181v. Other ligatures are attested, for example, in **сѣ|рѣжѣшї|** 180r, **и|ѣ|** 267v, **насѣ|ѣвнїче** 159r, **ѣзѣ|шѣ же** 36r, **ѣзѣ|гласїшѣ же** 42r, **трѣ|ѣѣѣте** 265r, and **заѣ|тра** 46v.

5.3.4. Letters above the line

In M the letters commonly occurring above the line are the same as in F (cf. section 2.2.4), i.e. **д**, **х**, **т**, **м** without *titlo*, and **с**, **ч** etc. with *titlo*. Note, however, that the letter **т** with *titlo* is not attested in M. In addition, tentatively attested in M is the occurrence above the line of an **и**, shaped as *kendema*, e.g. in the adjective **дрѣугѣ** 201v (Luke 9:61).²⁴

²³ A similar variant of **з** is reproduced in Ščepkin 1967:126 as an example of a South Slavic semi-uncial from the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries (line 2, the twelfth letter). The occurrence of this and similar variants of **з** is according to Ščepkin characteristic of the period of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia (Ščepkin 1967:130).

²⁴ Cf. the corresponding text in F 11a: **и дрѣуги**. See also below, section 5.4.2.

5.3.5. Punctuation marks

In contrast to F, where this punctuation mark is not attested, the semicolon is sometimes used, in accordance with Greek orthography, to indicate a question. Cf., e.g., M 136r **НЕ СЪ ЛИ ѿ ТЕКТО́НЪ · СНЪ МАРІ́І-ІНЪ · БРА́ЖЕ ІА́КШВОУ · ѿ ІУ́СИ ѿ ІЮ́ДЪ · ѿ СІ́МШНОУ ; ѿ НЕ СЕСТ-РЫ І ѿ Е́ГО ЗДѢ́СОУ ВЪ НА́ ;** (Mark 6:3).

5.3.6. The language of M

The language of M can undisputedly be characterized as Russian MChSl. A typical feature of this ChSl variety is e.g. the regularly attested **оу** and **ю** for OChSl **ѡ** and **ѣ**, respectively, as well as the spelling **но** of the conjunction **нѣ**. Among more sporadically attested features indicating the same ChSl variety can be mentioned the spelling **ча** for OChSl **ча**, the occurrence of **ѣ** for OChSl **ѣ** in the locative endings **-ѣ** and **-ѣхъ** as well as in **прѣ-** and **прѣд-**, and the spelling **ж** for OChSl **жд**. On the other hand, the spelling of the words **не вѣда**, **горющъ**, **нашъ**, **бѣжъ**, and **марїѣ** can possibly be seen as reflecting a Bulgarian MChSl orthography, while distinctly Serbian MChSl features are not attested.

5.4. Diacritical marks

5.4.1. Introduction

In M, as in F, a whole series of different diacritical marks are attested. In addition to *psili*, *titlo*, *trema*, *paerok*, *apostrof*, and *velikij apostrof*, which traditionally have no prosodic functions (cf. section 2.3.1), we will also consider *oksia*, *varia* (possibly also *longa*, see below), *kamora*, *kendema*, *dasia*, and *iso*. In contrast to F, however, *double oksia* is not attested in either corpus A or corpus B. As in section 2.3, in the following the distribution of these diacritical marks above vowels in post-consonantal, post-vocalic, and initial position will be treated separately.

Note. The distribution of *psili* does not fully agree with what is attested in F; cf., for example, its occurrence above **ѡ** in **ѡвѣръзѣтъ сѧ** 181v, as well as above the sequence **нн** in **рождѣн'н'оу** 42v etc. As for *apostrof*, this diacritical mark is attested in the conjunction **а** 27v, 32r, 50v, 161r, 202r (2x), 263r, 267v, the adverb **не оу** 26v, 27r, 28v, and the pronouns **и** and **ю** in the AU **сѣтрыѣтъ ѿ** 108r/v, **полагаю ѿ** 38v, **прі-моу ѿ** 38v, **вѣзмѣ ѿ** 38v, whereas *velikij apostrof* is attested above the interjection **ѡ** 110r. In **а** 37v and **не оу** 36r, however, it has not been possible to decide which of these two diacritical marks is attested.

5.4.2. Post-consonantal position

5.4.2.1. *Oksia*, *varia*, *kendema*, and *iso*

Oksia is written above most vowel letters, with sporadic exceptions (cf., for example **прихожоу ѣзъ** 24v) only in non-final position.

Above the letter **ї** *oksia* is attested 6x in corpus A and 4x in corpus B: **ѡмї|нѣ** 139v, 265v, **сїмѡ|нѣ** 159r, **къ сїмѡнѡу** 159v, **ѣ сїмѡнѡу** 136r, **ѣ сїмѡнѣ** 161v, **сїмѡнѡвъ** 158v, **да вї|дими** 264r, **ѣлї, ѣлї. лїма саваѡѡни** 327v. On the basis of these examples it cannot be excluded that *oksia* in this position, as well, indicates ictus in M (cf. section 3.8.7).

It was mentioned in section 2.3.2.1 above, that in some sources the presence of *oksia* above the letters **ъ** or **ь**, particularly in a position immediately following **р** or **л**, is not correlated to the presence or absence of ictus, but rather indicates that the *jer* forms the nucleus of a syllable. In M, no clear decision can be made: the presence of the AU **ни почръ-пала** 32r and **дръзайте** 139r, however, demonstrates the possibility of leaving seemingly unstressed syllabic **ръ** without an accent mark.

Varia is written above most vowels, with sporadic exceptions (cf., e.g., **падѡшѡ** 403v) only in final position. In comparison with F, the shape of *varia* shows greater variation. In addition to the 'normal' *varia*, in some cases, as for example in **ѡвцѡ** 38r, **ѡце лѣ** 44v, **в'зати** 203r, **припадѣ** 159r, **ѣмѣ** 267r*, **моли** 158v (aorist), **глаголю вѡ вѡмѣ** 256v, **не хоташе вѡ** 26v, **кто** 108v, there are attested variants with a longer, almost horizontal line. Such variants are sometimes referred to as *longa* or *dolgaja*. Because of the difficulties in distinguishing between *longa* and the 'normal' *varia*, whether in M or in other sources, all variants will be reproduced with the diacritical mark `.²⁵

Sometimes 'longa variants' are written above vowels at the end of a line in AU also accentuated with *oksia*; cf., e.g., **дрѡуѣ| дрѡугѡ** 23r, **знѡменїѡ|** 45v, **ѡггѣл|** 393v, **чїм`|** 36v, **вѡм`,|** 109v, **нѣсїм|** 29r, **ѣ въпрѣсїшѡ** 108v, **ѣ възѣм`|** 24v. As is clear from these examples, *varia* here does not indicate ictus. Consequently, line-final *varia* in AU with no other diacritical marks, as for example in **ѣсїѡ|** 106v, **кораблем`|** 137v, **живѡта** 22v, **народа радї.`|** 45r, hardly can be seen as a reliable indication of ictus, either.

Kendema, as in F, is mainly written above monosyllabic word-forms, including the clitics **ѡ** 44v, **ѣ** 264r, and **ѡ** 41v. In addition to the categories attested in F *kendema* is also written in the AU **ѣ прѡ** 257r and **нѡ ѣ ѡ** 179v. Above adjectival endings it is in some cases difficult to

²⁵ Cf. Bulatova 1973b:80f, Zaliznjak 1981:112.

decide whether it is *kendema* or an *и* that is written above the line; cf., for example, **Ѣ ДРОУГѢ** 201v (Luke 9:61), **ЖИВОТНѢ** 22v (John 6:48), 28v (John 8:12) (cf. section 5.3.4).

As for *iso*, this diacritical mark is attested only once above a post-consonantal vowel, in the aorist **ВЪЗЪЛ'КА** 106v.

5.4.2.2. *Kamora*

Kamora is written mainly above the letters **о**, **ш**, **оу**, **е**, and **и** in medial and final position in both mono- and polysyllabic word-forms. In addition to the lexemes attested in F *kamora* is also written with some *ā*-stem nouns, such as e.g. **ЖЕНА**, **ВИНА**, and **РЖКА**, as well as in the word-forms **ѠКРѢ** 45v and **СѠКРѢ** 45v (cf. section 2.3.2.4).

Note. *Kamora* is also regularly written above abbreviated forms of **ИСОУСЪ** (Ἰησοῦς), cf. **Ѣ** etc. 14v, 20r, 20v (2x), 21r etc. (in all 44x), **Ѣ ЖЕ** 139v, 178v, **ѢОВИ** 201r, **КЪ** **ѢОВИ** 403v, **КЪ** **ѢОУ** 161r, **ѢА** 160v, 163r, 250v, 260v, 261r, 262r, 403v, **Ѣ** **ѢѢ** 178v, **ПО** **ѢѢ** 262v as well as above abbreviated forms of the possessive adjective **ИСОУСОВЪ**; cf. **ѢОВИ** 110v (Matt. 17:19), **ѢО** 264r, **ѢОМА** 159r.

The occurrence of *kamora* above the letters **о** and **ш** requires special comment, as these combinations in certain ESl manuscripts are assumed to indicate the presence of the phoneme /ô/, mainly in stressed position alternating with the phoneme /ɔ/. According to Zaliznjak, an opposition between these two phonemes was to be found early on in all or almost all ESl dialects.²⁶ We will therefore take a closer look at the relevant AU to see if a similar relation can be attested in M. Let us first examine the cases with *kamora* above the letter **ш**.

In 'normal' Slavonic words, *kamora* is regularly written above **ш** in the root **МЪНОГ-**, cf., e.g., **МНѠГЪ** 36v etc. (see section 6.3.2.1);²⁷ **МНѠЖЕСТВО** 24r etc. (see section 6.2.2.4); **МНѠЖИЦЮ** **Ѣ** 110r, **МНѠЖИЦЮ** 110r; **ВЪ** **МНѠГОГЛАН'И** 265r. Examples with other roots include the AU **ГѠРАМЪ** 263r;²⁸ **ЧЕ|ѠВѢСКИ** 404r; **РАЗѢШНИКА** 327r*;²⁹ **ВЪ** **ЖИѢТѢ** 180r;³⁰ **ПРЕМОУДРѠСТЬ** 136r.³¹ *Kamora* is also written above **ш** in some words of Greek origin, cf., e.g., **С'МѠНЪ** 159r, **КЪ** **С'МѠНОУ** 159v;³² **С'МѠНОВЪ** 159v, **С'МѠНО|ВА** 159v, **СѠДѠМѠ** 137r, **ВЪ** **СОУѢШТЫ** etc. 267r, 267v (2x), **И** **С'ДѠН'СКА** etc. 162r, 162v, **СОЛОМѠНИ** 38v.

²⁶ Zaliznjak 1985a:173, 1988:169.

²⁷ Note, however, the AU **Ѡ** **МНѠГЪ** 160r with *oksia*.

²⁸ Note, however, the AU **СЪ** **ГѠРЫ** 403v etc. with *oksia* (cf. section 6.2.3.1).

²⁹ Note, however, the AU **И** **РАЗѢШНИКЪ** 37v, **РАЗѢШНИЦИ** 38r with only *oksia*.

³⁰ Note, however, the AU **И** **ЖИѢТ'** 3r, **ЖИѢТА** 22v with *oksia* or *varia*, respectively (the latter probably not indicating ictus).

³¹ In the AU **Ѡ** **СНѠВЪ** 109v *kamora* probably constitutes a variant of *titlo*; cf. **ДА** **СНѠВѢ** 45v, **СНѠВѢ** 109v.

³² Note, however, the AU **СѠМЕѠНА** 394v with *varia*.

A comparison with the material in Stadnikova 1989 shows that in sources distinguishing between /ô/ and /ɔ/ both **мъног-** and **сѣбота** are often attested with reflexes of /ô/.³³ Parallels to the spellings with *kamora* in the AU **разѣѡинника**, **въ живѣѡтъ**, and **премоудрѣѡсть** are also attested in various sources.³⁴ In **гѡ|рамь** and **челѡвѣскыи** (both including line-breaks), however, no connection with /ô/ has been attested. As for the remaining words of Greek origin, *kamora* seems to be particularly frequent in this category.

The examples with the letter **о** are more numerous. *Kamora* above **о** in root morphemes are attested in the following AU: **не бѡи сѡ** etc. 159v, 393v, **не бѡите сѡ** 403v; **бѡла** 181r, **бѡлю** 27v; **готѡво** 26v, **да оѹ-готѡвѡ** 404r, **ѹготѡванита** 256r, **оѹ|готѡвашѡ** 264r; **подѡбѣи** 36r, **подѡбит сѡ** 250r; **сѣлѡ** 261r, 403v; **закѡнъ** 28r, **закѡна** 27v, **ѡ закѡна** 45r, **закѡнъ** 27v, **въ закѡнѣ** 23v, 29r, **в закѡне** 48r, **и закѡнооѹ|чителїе** 163r; **и поклѡнѣше сѡ** 326v; **докѡлѣ** 110r (2x); **пѡ крѡвъ** 179r As; **и не мѡ|гоу** 181v, **мѡжетъ** 40v, **не мѡжѣ** 14v, 26v, **и не мѡ|жѣ** 39v, **не и|знемѡжетъ** 394r, **не мѡжете** 34v, **по|мѡгоу** 159r, **не възмѡгоу** 180r, **и не мѡжашѣ** 136r, **не невѡзмѡжно** 110v; **мѡлю тѡ** 180r, **мѡ|лиши сѡ** 264v, **мѡлїши сѡ** 264v, **мѡ|лащоу сѡ** 181r, **мѡлаще же сѡ** 265r; **и понѡсѡ** 162v; **нѡ** 14v etc. (see section 6.8.2.2), **и испѡ|лнишѡ** 159r; **прѡ|рѡкъ** 37r Ns, **и||пррѡкы** 180r/v, **и пррѡкы** 180v; **прѣ|стѡль** 393v; **сѡи** 33v; **достѡитъ** 33r, **не достѡитъ тѡ** 25r, **достѡит ли** 267v, **не достѡитъ** 267r, **достѡинъ** 179r, **достѡинъ** 178v, **достѡина** 179r, **достѡина** 262r, **достѡино** 262r; **сѡборъ** 394r.

Other examples include the adjective endings **-аго** and **-ѡго**: **вѣш-наго** 393v, **вѣш'|ннаго** 164v, **вышнаго** 394r; **дѣвѡтааго** 327v; **живаго** 26r; **їскари|ѡт'скаго** 162r; **лознааго** 256v; **ѡ лоукава-аго** 181v, **ѡ лоукавааго** 265r; **ѡ|новааго** 161r; **реченааго** 109r; **нарицаемаго** 161v; **нероукотворенаго** 404r; **въсажен'наго** 262v; **до седмаго** 108v; **члѣскааго** 30r, **члѣскаго** 202v; the pronoun endings **-ого** and **-его**: **ѣго** etc. (see section 6.5); **сего ради** 38r, **сего ради** 14v, **сего ради** 35r, 111r, **сего ради** 42r; **никогдаже** 403v; **коѣго** 404v; **самого** 41v; the neuter ending **-о**: **добрѡ** etc. 267v, 403v; **ѡнѡ** 36v etc., **ѡнѡ** 20r etc. (see section 6.5); the instrumental feminine ending **-ѡмъ**: **сѣ же|нѡю** 33v, **и винѡю** 111r, **мнѡю** 49r as well as the aorist elements **-оу-** and **-ош-**: **не възмѡгѡшѡ** 110r; **и погрѣбѡшѡ** 179v. In addition, the word **сѣбота**, even when spelt with **о**, often has *kamora*; cf. **соубѡта**

³³ Stadnikova 1989:155, 170.

³⁴ Cf., for example, Vas. sb. 106 **разѣѡинникъ**, 259 **живѡтъ** (Vasil'ev 1929/1972:99 [563], 115 [579]) with a possibility of analogous /ô/ in the oblique cases, as well. As for nouns ending in **-ѡсть**, reflexes of /ô/ are attested e.g. in Kz. (cf. Kolesov 1962a:153).

24v, 41r, 267v, **ѿ соуѣѡта** 264r, **соуѣѡ|та** 25r,³⁵ **соуѣѡтѣ** 267v, **соуѣѡтоу** 14v, 46v, **въ соуѣѡтоу** 28r (2x).

The comparison with the material in Stadnikova 1989 shows that almost all the AU attested with *kamora* above **ѡ** have counterparts with reflexes of the phoneme /**ô**/. Exceptions are formed only by the AU **пѡ крѡвь**, **ѿ не мѡ|гоу**, **мѡлю тѡ**, and **ѿ испѡ|лниша**. As for **нѡ**, notwithstanding the fact that **ѡ** here reflects a back *jer*, this lexeme is often written with *kamora* in many ESl sources, including those where **ѡ** normally indicates the presence of /**ô**/. The lexeme **пророкѣ**, not treated in Stadnikova 1989, is attested with *kamora* above the root **ѡ** in at least one manuscript from the Novgorod area.³⁶

To sum up, it seems that *kamora* above **ѡ** and **ѡ** in M normally indicates the presence of the phoneme /**ô**/. This orthographic principle—the ‘*kamora* system’—has parallels in a considerable number of ESl sources.³⁷

Note. The presence or absence of graphic reflexes of the phoneme /**ô**/ in various categories differs in sources from different parts of the ESl area. The following categories are discussed by Zaliznjak and Stadnikova (Zaliznjak 1985a:175, Stadnikova 1989:138): 1) the final genitive **-го** in stressed position; 2) the final genitive **-го** in unstressed position; 3) other instances of stressed final **-о**; 4) the stressed dative plural ending **-омѣ**; 5) the stressed instrumental singular ending **-оу**; 6) the word-form **тоѣ**; 7) the word-forms **плотѣ**, **плотью**; 8) various forms of the lexeme **воинѣ**. In M *kamora* above **ѡ** is attested in categories 1, 2, 3, 5, and possibly 7 (**плѣѣ** 23r, 25r with *kamora* above **ѣ**!), whereas examples belonging to categories 4, 6, and 8 are absent. The attested distribution has its closest counterparts in Northwest GrR sources, which supports the Novgorod origin of M. Apparently, these facts must be considered an additional argument in favor of the proposed linguistic interpretation of *kamora* above **ѡ** and **ѡ**.

As was stated above, the phoneme /**ô**/ normally occurs only in stressed position. In M, however, some AU with **ѡ** or **ѡ** also comprise an *oksia*, either above the same vowel, as in **ѡѡла** 181r, **ѡѡлю** 27v; **не невѣз-мѡжно** 110v; **разѡѡинника** 327r,³⁸ or above another vowel, as in **вѡшнѡгѡ** 393v, **вѡш|нѡгѡ** 164v; **дѡѡтаѡгѡ** 327v; **ѿ закѡно-ѡу|чїтѡїѡ** 163r; **ѡ лоукѡѡѡгѡ** 181v; **не вѣзмѡгѡхѡмѣ** 110v; **мѡлїши сѡ** 264v; **дѡстѡїно** 262r, **не дѡстѡїтѣ** 267v; **соуѣѡ|та** 25r.³⁹ In both groups of examples it seems probable that *kamora* indicates the particular quality of the vowel /**ô**/, irrespective of its stressed or unstressed position, whereas *oksia* indicates ictus, irrespective of the quality

³⁵ Note, however, the AU **соуѡѡтѣ** 136r with *oksia* but without *kamora*.

³⁶ Cf. Stadnikova 1989:157, Vas. ps. **прѡрѡка** 99v, **-иѡ** 219v, **ѡ прѡрѡцѡхѣ** 144v (Vasil'ev 1929/1972:59 [523]).

³⁷ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:209, Stadnikova 1989:135.

³⁸ Parallels to this use are attested in various sources from the Novgorod area; cf., e.g., Eg. 53 **нѡи**, 57b **плѡды**, 76 **покрѡвѡно**, 142b **тѡкѡ**, 148b **истѡргѡїѡ** (Stadnikova 1989:147, 162, 154, 170, 171) as well as Vas. ps. and Vas. sb.

³⁹ In the AU **пѡ|слоушѡти** 25v the first diacritical mark can be interpreted either as *kamora* or *titlo*.

of the vowel.⁴⁰ Thus, *kamora* above **о** and **ω** normally can be assumed to only indirectly indicate ictus. Consequently, in AU with *oksia* and *kamora* above the same vowel the diacritical marks have complementary functions, indicating stress and vowel quality, respectively. In AU with *oksia* and *kamora* above *different* vowels, on the other hand, *oksia* normally indicates main stress, whereas *kamora* in some cases (e.g. the adjective endings -аго) can be assumed to indicate the presence of the phoneme /ô/, possibly linked with secondary stress. In AU of the type **мѡлѣши сѡ**, however, *kamora* is most likely to indicate an alternative position of ictus.

5.4.3. Post-vocalic position

Oksia is in post-vocalic position, except in the AU **вѣтхое** 161v (Luke 5:39, in the context **гѣт бѡ. вѣтхое лѡучше ѣ :~:~**), written medially, mainly above the letters **а** and **и**.

Above the imperfect endings -аше and -аху *oksia* is written in a considerable number of AU together with another *oksia* above the root, which permits the assumption that post-vocalic *oksia* here does not indicate ictus, but rather constitutes a graphic cliché, possibly of SSI origin.⁴¹ Consequently, in AU exclusively accentuated in this way *oksia* cannot be considered a reliable indication of ictus. The same applies to the second *oksia* in the AU **посла́вшаа́го** 27v, **посла́вшаа́го** 46r, forcing a careful interpretation of the accentuation of the AU **дрѡгаа́го** 263r, **члѣскаа́го** 162v, and possibly also **богатаа́го** 179v. As for the function of *oksia* above post-vocalic **и**, nothing seems to indicate the presence of a particular 'diphthong accentuation' in M (cf. section 2.3.3.1).

Varia is, in addition to in e.g. AU of the lexeme **авраамъ** (cf. section 6.9.1.1) mainly written above the letters **а**, **е**, and **и** in final position. In many AU, however, *oksia* is written above a preceding vowel, cf., e.g., **лѣш'шеѣ** 111r, **лѣбноѣ** 263r, **гѣблющеѣ** 20v, **расточѣнаа** 43v, **вѣрѡи** 46r, **вѣдаи** 264v, and **каменѣи** 39v, which makes *varia* in this position an unreliable indication of ictus. The assumption of a purely graphic function of *varia* in this position is supported by the presence of the AU **галілеискыѡ** 163r, **ѡѡренѣѣ** 31v, **саадоукѣѣ** 108v, **и за-прѣцаа** 160r (with 'longa') etc., in which *varia* probably does not indicate the position of ictus.

Dasia is written in the AU **прѣмѣ** 182r, **ноѣвы** 202v, **моѣи** 202r, **моѣю** 256v, **моѣа** 34v, **своѣи** 394r, and **твоѣи** 136r. Nothing seems to contradict the assumption that *dasia* here appears as an allograph of *psili*, without any reference to the position of ictus.

⁴⁰ Cf. Kolesov 1973a:247.

⁴¹ Cf. Schweier 1987:183.

In the AU **ѠЙМЕТ СѦ** 108r and the participle **ѠЙТЬ** 161r *iso* can be considered as appearing above vowels in post-vocalic position, presumably above vowels with ictus. The limited extent of the material, however, does not permit any definite conclusions on whether *iso* here indicates ictus or not.

5.4.4. Initial position

Except for *psili*, the main diacritical mark written above initial vowels in M is *iso*, with sporadic exceptions—e.g. among the verbs only in **Й ЙЗГѠНИТЬ** 37v, **ѢСТА** 404v, and **ѢДРѢЖИМЬ** 24v—constituting the only accent mark in the respective AU. Thus, the difference from the distribution in F is considerable: among the verbs in corpus A only one AU with *iso* and some other accent mark is attested, whereas in F eight comparable examples are attested (cf. section 2.3.4). Consequently, *iso*, constituting a positional allograph of *oksia* above vowels in initial position, unlike the situation in F can be assumed as normally indicating ictus above both prefixes and roots to the same extent as *oksia*.

Occasionally *oksia* and *dasia* are also attested in initial position; cf., e.g., **ІАКО** 111r and **ІЗЫКЪ** 257r. The presence of *oksia* in the latter example, however, indicates that *dasia* here appears as an allograph of *psili* in this position, as well.

5.4.5. AU including line-breaks

Except in AU with line-final *varia* (cf. section 5.4.2.1, above), the presence or absence of line-breaks in an AU does not seem to be related to the accentuation in M; cf., e.g., **МАРІІНЬ** 136r vs. **ЗАХАРІЙНА** 393r, **ПОСЛАВШААГО** 27v vs. **ПОСЛАВШААГО** 46r. In some cases, however, the presence of a line-break might explain an anomalous accentuation; cf., e.g., the AU **Й ОУВѢДѢШЕ** 138r (cf. section 6.7.8.2).

5.4.6. AU with two accent marks

In addition to the AU with *oksia* or *varia* probably not indicating ictus discussed above in section 5.4.2–3, two accent marks in the same AU are attested only in the following AU (excepting AU with accentuated clitics): **ЛИЦЕМЪРИ** 111r (2x), **ПРОСѦЩІИМЬ** 182v, **Й НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЕ** 39r, and **СПОСЛѢДСТВОВАВШАА** 263v, in one way or another all belonging to categories not infrequently showing ‘double’ accentuation in sources from many areas.

5.4.7. Conclusions

To sum up, in principle the same diacritical marks indicate ictus in M as in F. Certain differences, however, have been discerned, the most important of which are the following:

1) *Iso* above vowels in initial position can be assumed to indicate ictus both above prefixes and roots.

2) *Varia* above word-final, post-vocalic vowels, as well as in line-final position, probably does not indicate ictus.

3) *Oksia* above post-vocalic **а** in the imperfect elements **-аѡ-** and **-аѡ-** probably does not indicate ictus.

4) *Kamora* above the letters **ѡ** and **ѡ**, in most cases indicating the presence of the phoneme /ô/, only *indirectly* indicates ictus. In some cases, however, such as e.g. in the adjective ending **-аѡѡ**, *kamora* can be assumed to indicate some particular quality of the final vowel or secondary stress.

As we can see, as compared to F, M is characterized by a greater number of cases with accent marks *not* indicating ictus. Therefore, in Chapter 6 AU accentuated exclusively with accent marks in these positions ('non-ictus accent marks') will be treated separately. To facilitate the comparison with the accentuation in F, the same applies to the AU accentuated only with *iso* above initial vowels.

Compared with F, the relative number of non-standard accentuated AU is considerably higher in M, which in a separate analysis of M would make the distinction between standard and non-standard accentuation less relevant. As the accentuation of M, however, plays a 'passive role' in relation to the accentuation of F, this distinction will be retained in the presentation of the accentuated AU in M, as well.

Chapter 6

THE ACCENTUATION OF MS M

6.1. Introduction

A COMPARISON of the accentuation of texts from two different sources can in principle be done in two ways. One method is to compare the accentuation in each concrete 'textual instance', which presupposes that both sources contain the same text. As the number of accentual units in both texts normally can be assumed to be identical, this kind of comparison, via a 'textual' method, can create opportunities for applying statistical methods as an additional tool in the analysis.

The other method is to compare the accentuation of the two texts category to category, lexeme to lexeme, irrespective of the actual 'places of occurrence' of the respective accentual units. Given a sufficient size of the texts, this kind of proceeding, a 'categorical' method, makes it possible to compare a much wider choice of sources with each other. On the other hand, the relevance of statistical methods is diminished.

In a comparison according to the 'textual' method, the most interesting results can be obtained when both sources are consistently accentuated, i.e. have a high accentual coefficient. As this is not the case in either F or M, sections 6.2–9 (treating the accentuated AU in M) will use the 'categorical' method, thus expanding the material relevant for comparison. In the discussion of the unaccentuated AU in section 6.10, however, the 'textual' method will be used, restricting the analysis to corpus A, thus making possible a statistical comparison between F and M. In this way, the two methods of comparison complement each other, each adding something of its own to the general characteristics of the accentuation of F and M.

In the subsections comprising AU from the respective CSI accent paradigms the accentuated AU are divided into three categories according to the relation between comparable AU in M and F (*nota bene*, on the lexematic level): 'Accentuation similar to F', 'Accentuation different from F', and 'Accentuation without equivalents in F'. Within each of these categories standard and non-standard accentuated AU as well as AU accentuated only with *iso* above initial vowels or with non-ictus accent marks as a rule are treated separately. Note, however, that in the classi-

fication the presence or absence of non-ictus accent marks in AU with both ictus and non-ictus accent marks is neglected.

Normally, graphic variants which are considered irrelevant for the accentuation are not separated, but one of the variants is reproduced followed by the abbreviation 'etc.'¹ As mentioned in section 5.1, italic and roman figures refer to corpora A and B, respectively.

6.2. Nouns

6.2.1. Masculine o- and jo-stems (including former u-stems)

6.2.1.1. Underived nouns

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣтръ** 139r (2x); — 2. **хлѣбъ** 21v, 22r, 22v (2x), 25v, **и хлѣбъ** 22v, **хлѣбъ ешъ** 21r, **хлѣба** 21r, **ѿ хлѣба** 22v, **ни хлѣба** 136v, **хлѣбъ** 21r (2x), 181r, 265r, **хлѣбъ сѣ** 25v As, **хлѣби** 36v nom pl, **хлѣбъ** 138r gen pl, **хлѣбы** etc. 36v (2x), 37r, 138r (4x), 138v, 181v, **и хлѣбы** 267r acc pl; — 3. **ѿ часа** 45r, 110v, **до часа** 327v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **часа** 327v; — 2. **ѿзѣкъ** 43v, **ѿзѣкоу** 108r, **ѿзѣкъ** etc. 178v, 180r, 260v, **и ѿзѣкъ** 43r acc sg, **ѿзѣкъ** 257r gen pl, **въ вѣѣ ѿзѣкъ** 48v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **брѣ** 36v, **брѣ же** 136r nom sg, **брѣта** 108v, 394v gen sg, **брѣтъ** 108v, **брѣта ѣгѣ** 161v, 403r acc sg; — 2. **жидѡѡе** 42r, **жидѡѡе же** 27r; — 3. **въ коупѣ** 34r; — 4. **мѣсѡци** 34r; — 5. **пѣнѡсъ** 36v gen pl; — 6. **на хрѣмъ** 163r; — 7. **чѣсоу** 137v, **на чѣсъ сѣи** 45r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **жидѡѡе** 32r; — 2. **сквозѣ скоудѣлы** 163r acc pl (Lk. 5:19).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **до ѡда** 178v, **и въ ѡдѣ** 179v.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **крѣты** 250v (2x), 260r acc pl; — 2. **на ѡномъ пѡлѣ** etc. 138v, 138v; — 3. **трѡѡды** 181v acc pl.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **корѣбѣ** 138v, **въ корѣбѣ** etc. 138v, 138v, 139r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡгнь** 20v, **и ѡгнѣ** 203r, **да ѡгнь** 404v, **въ ѡгнь** 110r, **ѡгнемъ** 159v instr sg; — 2. **ѡдръ** 24v (2x), 25r (2x), 163v.

¹ To this category belong line-breaks, alternations between *paerok* and *jers*, occurrences of ligatures and letters above the line etc.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **постà** 267r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accented AU: — 1. *ѿ грѣѡа* 20r, *грѣѡъ* 264r, *ѡ грѣѡѣ* 264r; — 2. *ѡ грѣѡѣ* 23v, 35r; — 3. *ѡ двѡръ* 37v; — 4. *жѣзль* 136v; — 5. *кѡшѡ* 37r acc du; — 6. *пѡ крѡвь* 179r, *на крѡѡѣ* 203r; — 7. *прѣѡѣ* 180r; — 8. *нѡ ѡ ѡѡ* 179v; — 9. *рѡѡѣ* etc. 23r, 30v, 178v, *рѡѡ же* 30v, *рѡѡѡ* 20v; — 10. *ѡ скѡѡѡ* 32r; — 11. *ѡѡѡѡ* 109v acc du; — 12. *ѡ хлѡѡѡѡ* 263r dat pl; — 13. *ѡѡѡѡѡ* 109v nom pl.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. грѣхѧ 23v; — 2. кораблѧ 159v acc du.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ѿдра 25r; — 2. ѿ оусть 260v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **КОРАБЛЕМ** | 137v instr sg.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. бѣсь 38v, 110v, 158r, ѿ бѣси 160r; — 2. вѣ дѣмь 163v, в дѣмоу etc. 30v, 49r, 201v, ѿ в дѣмоу 136r, дѣ|мы 111r acc pl; — 3. дреуѣгъ etc. 181v (2x), дреуѣ| дреуѣга 23r;² — 4. клáсы 267r acc pl; — 4. плѣ|да 106v. ѿ плѣ|да 256v, плѣ|ды 108r acc pl.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accented AU: — 1. **ѡси** 39v, **ѡгы** 39v acc pl; — 2. **ѣ|сѣ** 35r, **ѣ|сѡ|вѣ** 46v gen pl; — 3. **и вѣ|е|роу** 138v; — 4. **ѡ вѣ|ка** 42v;³ — 5. **г|л|а|с|а** 38r, 39r (2x), **г|л|а|д** 37v, **г|л|а|с|омь** 263v instr sg, **г|л|а|си** 262v, **г|л|а|сы** 262v instr pl; — 6. **сѣ гнѣ|вомь** 267v; — 7. **г|р|а|да** 263v, **и|з г|р|а|да** 33v, **ѡ г|р|а|да же** 34r, **г|р|а|доу** 137r, **вѣ г|р|а|дѣ** etc. 48v, 262r, **ѡ г|р|а|д|шѣ** 160r, **г|р|а|д|ш|омь** 160r dat pl (Lk. 4:43); — 8. **г|р|омь** 45r; — 9. **д|а|рѣ** 32r; — 10. **д|лѣ|гы** 265r acc pl; — 11. **д|омь** 20v; — 12. **д|р|оу|же** 181v voc sg, **д|р|ѡ|га** 261v nom du; — 13. **ѡ д|оу|хъ**¹ 162v, **и|а д|оу|хы** etc. 136v (2x) instr pl; — 14. **кнѣ|сь** 45r, **и кнѣ|сѣ** 261v acc pl; — 15. **л|и|си** 201r; — 16. **л|ю|ди** 261r, 261v, **з|а л|ю|ди** 43v; — 17. **м|и|рѣ** 23r (2x), 26v, 44r, **м|и|ра** 22v, 45r, **ѡ м|и|ра** 23r, 29v, 51r, **м|и|роу** 21v, 28v, 34v, 40v, 45r, **м|и|ро|ви** 26v, 46v dat sg, **м|и|рѣ** 23r, 46v, **вѣ м|и|рѣ** 37r, 39v, **вѣ м|и|рѣ сѣ** 37r, **вѣ м|и|рѣ** 40v, 44v, 51v, **не ѡ все|мь м|и|рѣ** 51v;⁴ — 18. **мѣ|хы** 161v, **вѣ мѣ|хы** 161v; — 19. **моу|жъ** 32v, 159r, 160r, **моу|жъ** etc. 20r, 263v (2x), **моу|жа** 32v (2x), 394r, **моу|жѣ** 163r nom pl, **моу|жѣи** 37r gen pl; — 20. **п|р|а|хѣ** 137r; — 21. **свѣ|тъ** etc. 3r, 28v, 40v, **и свѣ|тъ** 3r, **свѣ|та** 45v (2x), **сѣ|тъ** 28v, 45v (2x);⁵ — 22. **сл|оу|хоу** 45v; — 23. **на спѡ|ды на спѡ|ды** 138r (Mk. 6:39); — 24. **ст|р|а|ха** 27r, 164r.

For most AU belonging to CSI a.p. *a* the accentuation on the root has well attested parallels in both ESI and SSI sources. The accentuation of some of the attested AU, however, needs special comment.

Among the AU with accentuation different from F, parallels to the accentuation of **чacъ** are found above all in EGrR sources, while both

² This lexeme is also attested in the AU κῆ δροῦροϋ 158v; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

³ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **ѣѣ** etc. 39r, 393v, **ѣѣ** etc. 22v, 106v; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

⁴ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **ѡ** **мнрѡ** 46r, 47r, **ѡ** **мнрѡ** 51v; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

⁵ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎠** 45v; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

WGR and SSI sources, in conformity with F, normally show accentuation on the root (cf. section 3.2.1.1). The accentuation of the lexeme **h3ykyk**, which in F is accentuated with initial *iso*, is well attested in both ESI and MBIg sources.

As for the AU without equivalents in F, the lexeme **жидѣ** in younger ESl sources is attested with accentuation according to a.p. c,⁶ which provides the AU **жидѣ|вѣ**, contrasting with the root accented AU of the same lexeme, with a possible phonetic basis, at least in the ESl area. Parallels to the accentuation of the lexeme **скждѣлѣ** are also attested in ESl sources.⁷

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, contrasting with F, some cases of accentuation on the ending are attested in M, with parallels mainly in EGrR sources (cf. section 3.2.1.1). Quantitatively, however, the root accentuated AU dominate within this category in M, as well. Whether root accentuation here is best explained as reflecting SSI accentuation, ‘specifically literary’ accentuation, or the WGrR definalization cannot be decided with any certainty (cf. section 3.1.4.1.4).⁸

As in F, the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* regularly show standard accentuation in M, in most cases with parallels in both ESI and SSI sources.⁹

6.2.1.2. Nouns ending in -ЬЦЬ

CSl a.p. a^a and a^b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. ѣ стáрци etc. 107r, 260v, стáрцѣ 178v acc pl, съ стáрцы etc. 250v, 250v (2x).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣа** 21v (2x), 180r, 393v, 394v, **ѡ** **ѣа** 180v, 264r, 404v, **ѣоу** 264v, **но ѡоу** 265v, **ѣа** 14v, 31r, 182r, 201v, **и** **ѣа** 14v acc sg, **ѣѣ** etc. 44v, 45r, 179v, 180r, 180v, 181r, 263r, 265r voc sg,¹⁰ **ѡѡ** 21r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **мрѣтѣца** 20lv acc pl.

⁶ Zaliznjak 1985a:131, 376f.

⁷ Cf., for example, OBA **скѹдѣлы** (Schweier 1987:216), Ber. 1627:115, Dybo 1981:75. Note that this lexeme, in OChSl is attested in different variants: **скѹдѣльъ**, **скѹдѣльь**, **скѹдѣльъ** as well as the feminine *i*-stems **скѹдѣльь**, **скѹдѣльь**, and **скѹдѣльь** (cf. *Slovník* 1966–).

⁸ Cf., for example, the discussion on the accentuation of **скотъ** in Zaliznjak 1985a:177. Note, however, OBA **скотѣ** (Schweier 1987:215).

⁹ Assigning **сподъ** to CSI a.p. *c* must be considered tentative, as, to my knowledge, this lexeme is not discussed in modern accentological works. The presence of accentuation on the (etymologically short) root, e.g. in **Оба на споды** (Schweier 1987:216), supports this reconstruction.

¹⁰ In 265г ѿче наішь ѿже єси на нбєсѣхъ [...] (Matt. 6:9) the initial ѿ in ѿче is written in cinnabar.

CSl a.p. b^c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **конца** 394r, **конѣць** 179v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣнѣць** 326v.

The accentuation of the AU **мрѣт'вца**, conforming with the reconstructed CSl accentuation, is nevertheless not typical of either ESl or MBlg sources (cf. section 3.2.1.2). Possibly, however, *oksia* above sequences of **р** or **л** and a *jer* constitutes a weaker indication of ictus than *oksia* in other positions (cf. section 5.4.2.1). As for the lexeme **вѣнѣць**, parallels to the accentuation on the suffix are attested in ESl sources.¹¹

6.2.1.3. Nouns ending in -ѣникъ

CSl a.p. a^a and a^b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **грѣшникъ** 42r, **и грѣшници** 164r (3x), **грѣшникѡ** 164r dat pl, **грѣшники** 42v acc pl; — 2. **настѣвниче** 159r voc sg.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **кнѣжници** 111r (2x), 163v, **и кнѣжници** 260r, 260v, 261v, **и кнѣжники** 250v, **и кнѣжѣники** 250v instr pl.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **двѣрникъ** 37v; — 2. **иѣстѣчникъ** etc. 31v, 32v, **на иѣстѣницѣ** 31v; — 3. **прѣзѣникъ** 26v, **прѣзѣника** 27v, **въ прѣзѣникъ** 27r (4x), 44r (2x), **на всѣ прѣзѣникъ** 262r (Lk. 23:17);¹² — 4. **сѣвѣтникъ** 263v; — 5. **сѣтникъ** 263v, **сѣтѣникоу же** 178v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣзѣчници** 265r.

CSl a.p. b^c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣстники** 404r acc pl.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **длѣжѣникоу** 181r **длѣжѣникѡ** 265r dat pl; — 2. **и разѣѣвѣникъ** 37v, **разѣѣвѣници** 38r, **разѣѣвѣника** 327r* acc du.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. a^a and a^b parallels to the accentuation on the root are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources. This also applies to the lexeme **кѣнѣжѣникъ**, attested with accentuation on the suffix in F. As for the AU belonging to CSl a.p. b^c, notwithstanding

¹¹ Cf., for example, ОВа **вѣнѣць** (Schweier 1987:207).

¹² Obviously erroneously for **на всѣхъ праздѣники** (Mar.) etc.

the reconstruction of CSI suffix stress, only accentuation on the root is attested, as in F. Note, however, that *oksia* above *лъ* in the AU *длѣж-никоу* and *длѣжникѹ* possibly does not indicate ictus (cf. section 5.4.2.1).

6.2.1.4. Other suffixed formations

The remaining suffixed formations originally had constant stress either on the root (CSI a.p. *a*) or on the ending (CSI a.p. *b*).

CSI a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *вѣинъ* 326v gen pl, *съ вѣи* 261v instr pl.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *вѣины* 179r acc pl; — 2. *оучитель* 109r, 256r, *оучителю* 108v voc sg.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *начѣтокъ* 30r; — 2. *ѡтрѡчишь* 36v; — 3. *рыбарѣ же* 158v nom pl; — 4. *оутѣшитель* 23v, 53v, *оутѣшителя* 50r acc sg.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *родителя* etc. 40r, 41v/42r, *ни родителя* 40r nom du, *родителя* 41v:6/7 acc du.

CSI a.p. b

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *оученикъ* 42v, *оученици* etc. 25v, 26v, 30v, 33r/v, 33v (2x), 40r, 42r, 42v, 137v, 267r, 403v, *ѡченици же* 37r, *оученици вѣ* 31v, *оученикъ* 162r, *ѡ оученикъ* etc. 25v, 26r, 36v, 181r gen pl, *оученикъѹ* 23r, 37r (2x), 110r, 138r, 180v, 182r, *къ оученикъѹ* 180v dat pl, *оученикъы* 138v, 181r acc pl, *съ оученикъы* 43v, 256r instr pl, *оученика* 404v nom du.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *мѣтарѣ* 108r nom pl; — 2. *ѣ сѣсци* 263r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ѣ живѣтѣ* 3r, *въ живѣтѣ* 180; — 2. *пас-тѣрь* 37v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. *живѣ|та* 22v.

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *a*, parallels to the accentuation in *вѣины* are primarily attested in MBlg sources, whereas both *вѣинъ* and *съ вѣи*, like F *вѣины*, instead have parallels in ESl sources (cf. section 3.2.1.4). Parallels to the accentuation on the root of the lexeme *оутѣшитель* are also attested in some ESl sources.¹³

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, parallels to the accentuation in *мѣтарѣ* are attested in some MBlg and younger ESl sources, whereas

¹³ Cf., for example, Smotr. 1648 285r *оутѣшитель*, Kiparsky 1962:131.

both ESl and SSl sources usually show accentuation either on the suffix or on the ending.¹⁴ As for the lexeme **пастырѣ**, parallels to the accentuation on the suffix are attested mainly in SSl and older ESl sources, whereas younger ESl sources normally show accentuation on the root.¹⁵

6.2.1.5. Prefixed formations (without suffixes)

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ займѣ** 164r, 164v, 181v; — 2. **ни при поѡстѣ** 136v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣ нарѡдоу** 261r.¹⁶

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **закѣѣ** 256v; — 2. **закѡнѣ** 28r, **закѡна** 27v, **ѡ закѡна** 45r, **закѡнѣ** 27v, **въ закѡнѣ** 23v, 29r, **в закѡнѣ** 48r;¹⁷ — 3. **ѡ не-доуѣ** 160v, **ѣ2r**, 162v gen pl, **недоуѣ** 159v instr pl; — 4. **въ прѣтѣборѣ** 38v, **прѣтѣворѣ** 2r gen pl; — 5. **прѡрѡкъ** 37r, **ѣ пррѡкы** 180r/v, **ѣ пррѡкы** 180v acc pl; — 6. **прѣстѡлъ** 393v; — 7. **сѣборѣ** 394r (title); — 8. **сѣвѣтоу** 263v, **сѣвѣѣ** 44r, 250v — 9. **сѣсѣди же** 40v.

Among the prefixed nouns in this category, as in F all AU show accentuation either on the root or on the prefix (cf. section 6.8.2.3). In some cases, such as e.g. in **ѣ нарѡдоу**, parallels to the AU with root accentuation are mainly attested in EGrR sources, whereas other AU have parallels in both ESl and SSl sources.

6.2.1.6. Compounds

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **лицемѣри** 264v, **лицемѣри** etc. 111r (2x).

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ виноградеѣ** 107v; — 2. **лицемѣри** 264v.

¹⁴ Cf., for example, Ev. 1355/56 92v **мытарѣ**, Služ. Sol. **мытарѣ** (Syrku 1890:79), Lex. 1722 **мытарѣ** (Nimčuk 1961:267), D'jačenko 1899:322 **мытарѣ**, whereas accentuation on the suffix or ending, respectively, is attested in e.g. Deschler 1987:108 **мытарѣ**, OBa **мытарѣ** etc. (Schweier 1987:212), Ev. 1627 98 **мытарѣ**, Ber. 1627:67 **мытарѣ**, Ev. 1545 **не ѣ мытарѣ ли** (2x). See also Zaliznjak 1985a:149 Kiparsky 1962:115, and Gömer 1968:97.

¹⁵ Cf. Gömer 1968:87, Schweier 1987:297 (on the Serbian Ev. 1548), Služ. Sol. **пастырю** (Syrku 1890:75). Accentuation on the suffix is also attested in OBa, contrasting with the regularly attested accentuation on the root in both OBa and MB (Schweier 1987:213), Ber. 1627:81 **пастырь**, Smotr. 1619 **ѣ4r пастыря**, Smotr. 1648 123r **пастырь**, **пастыря**. Note, however, Lex. 1722 **пастырь** (Nimčuk 1961:269). See also Kiparsky 1962:183.

¹⁶ This lexeme is regularly attested with accentuation on the prefix; cf. section 6.8.2.3.

¹⁷ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **въ закѡнѣ** 39v; cf. section 6.8.2.3.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. БҢОЧТҢЦЬ 42v; — 2. ВЕЛҢКОМНИКА 394r; — 3. ВОДОНБСЬ 33v; — 4. И ЗАКОННОУЧҢТЕЛҢЕ 163r non pl; — 5. ЗЛОБЛДѢ 263r acc du.

The accentuation of most AU within this category has parallel: in both ESI and SSI sources. It is also worth noting the relatively high proportion, compared to other categories, of AU with two accent marks, a well-known feature of the accentuation of compounds (cf. section 3.2.1.6). Thus, in both ЛҢЦЕМҢРИ and И ЗАКОННОУЧҢТЕЛҢЕ, the first accent mark is probably best interpreted as indicating secondary stress. A similar interpretation could also be made of the position of the single *oksia* in both ВЕЛҢКОМНИКА and ЗЛОБЛДѢ. Note, however, the presence of line-breaks in both these AU, as well as the exceptional vowel geniation in ЗЛОБЛДѢ (cf. section 5.3.1.4).

6.2.2. *Neuter o- and jo-stems*

6.2.2.1. Underived nouns

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. ЗРҢНО 44v, 110v; — 2. ЛҢТОУ etc. 43r, 43v, ЛҢТО 24r, ЛҢ 36r gen pl, ЛҢТА 24v, НА ЛҢТА 202r acc pl; — 3. МҢСТО 12v, 137v, МҢСТО· 160r, И МҢСТО 43r, НА МҢСТО 180r, 263r, ВҢ [...] МҢСТО etc. 137v (2x), ВҢ [...] МҢСТО 182r, НА МҢСТѢ 25r, 36v, 162r (2x), 181r; — 4. ЧҢДО 107v, 180r voc sg, ЧҢДА 31r, И ЧҢДА 43v nom pl, ЧҢДШМЬ 182r dat pl.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. НА КОЛҢНОУ 326v acc du, КҢ КОЛҢШМА 159r dat du.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. ДҢЛО 21r, И ДҢЛОУ 263v, ДҢЛО 28r, 35v, 39v, ДОБРѢ ДҢЛѢ 39v, ДҢЛА 27r, 40r nom pl, ДҢЛѢ 23v gen pl, ДҢЛѢ 40r dat pl, ДҢЛА 21r, 26v, 31r (2x), 39r, 40r acc pl; — 2. ЖҢТА 202r acc pl; — 3. МА:ЛѢ 137r instr sg.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. ЛИЦѢ 404r (2x), И ЛИЦѢ 265v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. ВҢНО 161v (2x), ВҢНА 161r acc pl; — 2. ГНҢЗДА 201r acc pl; — 3. СҢЛЕХҢ 138r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. СҢ СҢЛА 262v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. ЛИЦА 265v nom pl.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **гѡре вѡмь** etc. 111r (2x), **гѡре члѡу** 257r nom sg (=interj); — 2. **пѡсрѣдѣ мѡрѡ** 138v gen sg, **пѡ мѡрю** 139r (2x), **въ мѡре** etc. 107r, 109v; — 3. **слѡво** 3r (2x), 23v, 31r, 34r, 39v, 45v, 160v, **и слѡво** 3r, **слѡво сѣ** 25v, **слѡво сѣ** 158v nom sg, **слѡво** etc. 23r (2x), 35v (3x), 107r, 179r, 260r, **и слѡво** 36r acc sg.¹⁸

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡчи** 41r, 180v, 404v nom du, **ѡчи** 34r, 36v, 41r, 41v (2x), 42r, 42v (2x), 162v, 179v, 403v, **ѡчи** 38v, 40v, 41r, **на ѡчи** 41r acc du.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **слѡвесѡ** 48r nom pl.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **блѡга** 182r gen sg; — 2. **брѡшно** 20v (2x), 33v (2x), **да брѡшна** 31v acc pl; — 3. **тѣло** 256v, 264r (2x).

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡчѣма** 46r instr du.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. a, parallels with accentuation on the root—for **колѣно** on the second syllable of the root—are regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. b the lexeme **лицѣ**, contrasting with F, regularly shows accentuation on the ending, mainly paralleled in EGrR sources (cf. section 3.2.2.1). The alternation between accentuation on the root and on the ending of **цѣло** suggests a possible opposition between the singular and the plural, contradicted, however, by the occurrence of the AU **вѣно**, with well attested accentuation on the ending in the singular in ESl sources.¹⁹

The AU belonging to CSl a.p. c in F regularly show accentuation on the root. With a few exceptions, the same applies to M. Parallels to both **ѡчѣма** (with *oksia* indicating the reconstructed CSl position of ictus) and **слѡвесѡ** are, however, attested in both ESl and SSl sources.²⁰

6.2.2.2. Verbal nouns ending in -нїѣ

CSl a.p. e^a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ плѡвѣни** 138v/139r loc sg.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сквозѣ сѣѣнїѣ** 267r acc pl.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **трѣбѡвѣнїѣ** 267r.

¹⁸ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **зѡ слово** 34r, 34v; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

¹⁹ Cf., for example, ОВа **винѡ**, **винѡ**, **винѡмъ** (Schweier 1987:240), Zaliznjak 1985a:373.

²⁰ See, e.g., Dybo 1981:37.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡ ѡчищени| своѣмь** 160v; — 2. **приста́вленїа** 161r gen sg.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **видѣ́нїа** 404r gen sg; — 2. **ѡбѣ́тованїе** 48v; — 3. **ѡ плюно́венїа** 40v.

CSl a.p. a^b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въсх́бжденїю** 404r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **желáнїемь** 256v instr sg.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **въ йскоу́шенїе** 181r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡсоу́женїе** 111r; — 2. **оу́спенїе** 404r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡ́знїа** 139v acc pl; — 2. **въ мнѡ́гоглáнїи** 265r; — 3. **ѡ́бновленїа** 38v nom pl.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **прош́енїа** 265r gen sg, **прош́енїю** 262v; — 2. **писа́нїа** 48r acc pl; — 3. **сѣгрѣ́шенїи** 265v gen pl; — 4. **сказа́нїе** 267r.

CSl a.p. b^c

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **съ съблю́днїемь** 202r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **потч́енїе** 26v (Jn. 7:2).

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въскр́сенїю** 108v; — 2. **да́нїа** 182r acc pl; — 3. **ѡ лю́бодѣ́анїа** 31r; — 4. **пре́несенїе** 404r; — 5. **сп́сенїе** 33r; — 6. **оу́ченїе** 27v, **ѡ оу́ченїи** 27v, 109r.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *a^a* thematic accentuation is relatively more prominent in M than in F. As stated in section 3.2.2.2, this type of accentuation is mainly attested in EBlg and Ukr sources, whereas GrR sources normally show accentuation on the root.²¹

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *a^b*, particularly worth noting are the AU **въсх́бжденїю**, **ѡсоу́женїе**, and **ѡ́бновленїа** with accentuation on the root, with parallels mainly in Serbian sources (cf. section 3.2.2.2). The occurrence of *iso* above the initial vowel in **въ йскоу́шенїе** in both F and M, notwithstanding the different interpretations of *iso* in this position, is also interesting.²²

²¹ Note, however, thematic accentuation in Ev. 1627 47r **ѡ плюно́венїа**, notwithstanding the fact that the verb **плюнѣти** seems to retain its affiliation to CSl a.p. *a*; cf. the aorist **плюнѣ** on fol. 47r, as well. As for **ѡбѣ́тованиѣ**, thematic accentuation is attested even in GrR sources; cf., for example, Ev. 1627 351r **ѡбѣ́тованїе**.

²² Cf. the similar accentuation in Služ. No. 323 58v/59r **въ йскоу́шенїе**.

The regularly attested thematic accentuation among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b^c* is normally paralleled in both ESl and MBlg sources,²³ thus forming a contrast with F, where the only AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b^c* is the root accentuated **съ съ|блѹденїемь** 12a (cf. section 3.2.2.2).

6.2.2.3. Other nouns ending in -икъ

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **лїствїє** 106v; — 2. **за невѣрствїє** etc. 110v, 136v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **бєзѹмїє** 202r; — 2. **брѣнїє** 40v, 41r (2x); — 3. **знáменїє** 20v, 21r, 37r, 261v, **знáменїи** 20r gen pl, **знáменїа** 41r, 43r, **знáменїа** 45v acc pl; — 4. **кáменїє** 36r, 39v (2x), **кáменїє** 39v; — 5. **и помѣрїа** etc. 162r, 162v gen sg; — 6. **на| распáтїє** 262v; — 7. **рѣждїє** 52v; — 8. **ѡ трѣнїа**, 326v; — 9. **цáр'ствїє** 256v, **и цáр'ствїю** 393v/394r, **въ цáр'ствї** 108r loc sg.

Both **лїствики** and **невѣрствики** show accentuation on the root in both F and M. Parallels to the accentuation of the remaining AU are attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

6.2.2.4. Nouns ending in -ище, -ство, -ъце, and -ло

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **мнѡжество** 24r, 260v, **мнѡжьство** etc. 159r, 326v, **и| мнѡжьство** 162r (2x).

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **скрѡвище** 266r, **скрѡвищъ** 266r (2x) gen pl.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡица** 182r gen sg.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **зачáло** 20r (in the margin); — 2. **въ начáлѣ** 3r; — 3. **ѡ рѣжьства** 40r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и оубѣи|ство** 262r, 262v.

Parallels to the accentuation of **мѡножьство** are attested in both ESl and SSl sources. As for **рождѣство**, this lexeme is reconstructed with CSI a.p. *b^c*, normally reflected as accentuation on the ending, at least in ESl sources. Parallels to the accentuation of **зачáло** and **начáло**, on the other hand, as well as the remaining both standard and non-standard accentuated AU, are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources (cf. section 3.2.2.4).

²³ Cf., for example, ОВа **възда́ниє** (Schweier 1987:240).

6.2.3. *ā-* and *jā-*stems

In this section both feminine and masculine *ā-* and *jā-*stems will be treated.

6.2.3.1. Underived nouns

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣры** 30r, 41v, 46v, 47r (2x), 179r, 180v, 260v gen sg, **вѣроу** etc. 47r, 107r, 110v, 163r, **и вѣроу** 21r, **вѣроу ми** 33r (Jn. 4:21);²⁴ — 2. **млѣніи** 202v nom sg; — 3. **мрѣжѣ** 159r, **мрѣжа** 158v acc pl; — 4. **нйва** 201v, **нйвы** 34r acc pl; — 5. **ѡ раны** 136r; — 6. **и рѣбы** 182r, **въ рѣбы** **мѣсто** 182r gen sg, **рѣбоу** 109v, **рѣбѣ** 159r gen pl, **рѣбѣ** 138r (3x) acc du, **ѡ рѣбоу** 37r, **и ѡ рѣбоу** 138v gen du; — 7. **сйла** etc. 162r, 162v, 163r, **и сйла** 265v, 394r, **сйлы** 136v, 260v, **ни сйлы** 109r gen sg, **и сйлоу** 158v, **и| сйлы** 136r nom pl; — 8. **тѣща же** 159v; — 9. **сйа чѣша** 256v, **чѣшоу** 256v, **и| чѣшоу** 256v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **кнйгы** 27v acc pl; — 2. **по ланитама** 249v dat du; — 3. **мѣжѣ** 256v gen pl; — 4. **ноуждоу же** 262r; — 5. **пѣлза** 44r; — 6. **и птйца** 201r nom pl; — 7. **рйзы** 161r gen sg, **въ рйзоу** 261v, **на рйзоу** 161r, **рйзы же** 403r nom pl, **въ дѣѣ рйзѣ** 136v acc du; — 8. **слаѣва** 35v/36r, **и слаѣва** 265v, **слаѣвы** 27v (2x), 35r gen sg, **слаѣвоу** 42r, 46r (3x); — 9. **слоужбоу** etc. 24r, 53r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **бесѣдоу** 34v, **бесѣды** 34v acc pl.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣла** 21v, 22r, 265r, **вѣла** 181r, **вѣли** 262v dat sg, **вѣлю** 21v (2x), 33v, 108r, **вѣлю** 27v, **и вѣлю** 42v; — 2. **мѣзда** 163r, **мѣзѣоу** 265v; — 3. **и тлѣ** 266r, **ни тлѣ** 266r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **мѣзды** 264r gen sg.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **врѣжѣоу** 261v; — 2. **женѣ** 33r voc sg; — 3. **крд⁴** **молоу** 262r; — 4. **лѣжоу** 35r (Jn. 8:44); — 5. **на лѣхы на лѣхы** 138r acc pl; — 6. **и прѣ** 257r; — 7. **рѣзга** 52v, **рѣзгоу** 52v; — 8. **и въ стѣгнѣ** 264v; — 9. **траѣва** 36v; — 10. **хѣалоу** 256v, **и хѣалѣ** 37r; — 11. **хоулы** 163v acc pl.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **женѣ** 31v (2x), 32r, 32v (2x), 33r, 33v, 54v, 109r, 393r, **женѣ** 32v, **и женѣ** 109r, **женѣ** 34r, **женоу** 108v (2x), **съ же|нѣю** 33v, **женѣ** 32r, 264r, **и женѣ** 262v, 263v nom pl; — 2. **и зима** 38v; — 3. **ѡвца** 37v,

²⁴ This lexeme is attested also in the erroneous example **не ймате вѣро ти** 20r (John 4:48); cf., for example, Mar. **не ймате вѣры ѡ ти**.

38r acc pl; — 4. **розга** 52v; — 5. **й слоуга** 44v; — 6. **хвалоу** 256v; — 7. **хоулоу** 40r, 249v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡвца** etc. 39r (2x), **й ѡвца** 38r, **ѡко ѡвца** 137v nom pl.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ гóроу** 138v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **на зéмль** 44v, 181r, **й на зéмль** 265r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **главы** 327r gen sg; — 2. **на горóу** 403r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вóды** 32v gen sg, **вóдѣ** 24r, 24v, **вóдоу** 24r, 31v, 32r (2x), 32v, **въ вóдѣ** 180r; — 2. **главóу** 265v, **главѣ** 201r/v; — 3. **съ гóры** 403v, **ни в гóрѣ сѣи** 33r, **гѡрѣ** 263r; — 4. **доушь** 404v gen pl; — 5. **на лóзѣ** 52v; — 6. **й нóсѣ** 47v, 48r acc du; — 7. **ѡ роўкы** 39v, **роўкоу** 160v, 267v (2x), **роўцѣ** 48r, 160r, **ѣ роўцѣ** 110v acc du; — 8. **ѡ стрáнѣ** 43v; — 9. **тма** 327v, **й тма** 3r, 263r, **да тма** 45v, **въ тмѣ** 28v, **въ тмѣ** etc. 3r, 45v, 46r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вины** 261v, **вины** 261r gen sg, **винóу** 327r, **й винóу** 111r; — 2. **водá** 32r, **ѡ воды** 32r;²⁵ — 3. **на главоу** 326v; — 4. **зём-ль** 263r, 327v dat sg;²⁶ — 5. **лóзѣ** 52v (2x); — 6. **ѡ нѡгáми** 137r; — 7. **роукá** etc. 257r, 267v.

As in F, all AU belonging to CSl a.p. *a* show the expected accentuation on the root.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *b* it is interesting to note the two occurrences of root accentuation of **мьзда**, conforming with F, against the background of the accentuation on the ending that is normally more frequently attested in both ESl and SSl sources (cf. section 3.2.3.1). The remaining AU in this category with root accentuation also have parallels in F. Note, however, the vacillation in the accentuation of the lexemes **овьца**, **розга**, **хвала**, and **хоула**.²⁷ Whether this vacillation should be explained as reflecting different realizations of CSl a.p. *b* or transfers to a.p. *a* or *c* can, however, not be objectively determined on the basis of the limited material attested.

Note. The CSl a.p. affiliation for the lexemes here referred to CSl a.p. *b* is in some cases uncertain, which further complicates the analysis. This applies to **овьца** (CSl a.p. *b* [Dybo 1981:166], or *c* [Illič-Svityč 1963:99]), **розга** (CSl a.p. *a* [Dybo 1973:172], or *b* or *c* [Zaliznjak 1985a:135, 177]), **хоула** (CSl a.p. *a* [Kolesov 1972a:12, 19], or *b* [Dybo 1981:78, 187, Bulatova *et al.* 1988:40]), **стыгна** (CSl a.p. *a* [Dybo 1973:204]), but the presence of a short root suggests either a.p. *b* or *c*). As for **крамoла**, accentuation on the root in the accusative singular is attested in Serbian sources (a.p. *a*; cf.

²⁵ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **ѣвóу** 110r; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

²⁶ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **на зéмлю** 159v; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

²⁷ Note that the accentuation of the vocative **жéно** is linguistically motivated, notwithstanding the affiliation of **жена** to CSl a.p. *b*.

Bulatova 1981:67), whereas ESl sources normally show accentuation on the ending according to CSl a.p. *b* or *c* (Zaliznjak 1985a:135).

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *c* some deviations from what is expected are also attested. Possibly this can be related to the uncertainty in the reconstruction of the CSl a.p. affiliation, with both **вина** and **лоза** alternatively referred to CSl a.p. *b*.²⁸

6.2.3.2. Nouns ending in -ина

CSl a.p. a^a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѿ хрѣмины** 178v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѿ истина** 30v, **ѿ истины** 35r gen sg, **ѿ истинѡу** etc. 30v, 31r, 35r (2x), **въ истинѡу** 30v (2x), 32v, 34v, 37r, 250r, 259v, 263v, **ѿ истинѡю** etc. 33r (2x), **ѿ въ истинѣ** 35r; — 2. **ѿзвинѣ** 201r acc pl.

CSl a.p. b^c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ таинѣ** etc. 265r, 265v, 265r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ таинѣ** etc. 26v, 264v (2x), 265r.

Worth noting in this category is mainly the vacillation in the accentuation of the lexeme **таина**. Parallels to the accentuation on the root are regularly attested in younger ESl sources, normally showing a.p. *a* for this lexeme, whereas accentuation on the suffix is primarily paralleled in MBlg sources (cf. section 3.2.3.2).²⁹

6.2.3.3. Nouns ending in -ица (including -ъница)

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣдѣицѣ** 111r gen pl.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѿ любадѣицѣ** 108r nom pl.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **гѣрницѣ** 256r; — 2. **житницѡу** 202r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **дѣсницѣ** 264v, **въ дѣсницѡу** 326v; — 2. **плащанѣицѣю** 264r; — 3. **въ темнѣицѣ** 262r.

The accentuation of both **вѣдовица** and **любадѣица**, uncharacteristic of most ESl and MBlg sources, nevertheless conforms with F, thus indicating a common factor in the accentuation of the two manuscripts. Both **житѣница**, **дѣсница**, and **тѣмѣница**, on the other hand, show the

²⁸ Cf. Dybo 1977:234f, Zaliznjak 1985a:135, and Dybo 1968a:187, Zaliznjak 1985a:138, respectively.

²⁹ Cf. section 3.2.3.2 as well as **ОБѣ таинѣ** (Schweier 1987:195).

expected accentuation, whereas the accentuation of **горница** and **плащаница** has parallels at least in ESl sources.³⁰

6.2.3.4. Other derived nouns

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡ владыкою** 179r; — 2. **ѡ рабынь** 250r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **братиѧ** 26v, 27r, **ни братиѧ** **ѡ** 26v, **братиѧ** 108v (Mt. 22:25), 180r (Lk. 16:28) gen sg; — 2. **ѡ жатва** 34r, **къ жатвѣ** 34r; — 3. **ѡ мышца** 45v; — 4. **не правды** 27v gen sg, **ѡ правдѣ** 53v, **ѡ правдѣ же** 53v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ ловитвоу** 158v, **ѡ ловитвѣ** 159r; — 2. **близъ поустыниѧ** 43v gen sg, **въ поустыню** 160v, **въ поустыни** 21r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡ жика** 394r.

The accentuation of most AU in this category—with the exception of **владыка** and **рабыни**—has parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. Interestingly, however, the accentuation of both **владыка** and **рабыни** is paralleled in F (cf. section 3.2.3.4), constituting one additional agreement in the accentuation of the two manuscripts.

6.2.4. i-, ū-, n-, and t-stems

6.2.4.1. Underived nouns

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **камы** 203r; — 2. **мѣди** 136v gen sg.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **камень** 139v, 182r acc sg, **на камени** 108r, 139v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **печаль** 54v.

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **прѣси** 263v acc pl; — 2. **сѣма** 30v, 31r, 108v, **сѣмене** 108v gen sg; — 3. **сѣни** 403v acc pl.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **чрѣвь** 266r, **ни чрѣвь** 266r.

³⁰ Cf., for example, ОВа **гѡрницоу** (Schweier 1987:189), Ber. 1627:27 **гѡрниѧ. плащаница** often shows accentuation on the suffix in ESl sources; cf. ОВа, МВ **плащаниѧѡ** (Schweier 1987: 193, 295), Ev. 1627 346r **плащаниѧѡ**, notwithstanding the reconstruction of CESl stress on the preceding syllable (Zaliznjak 1985a:147).

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **двѣрь** 38r, **двѣри** 181v nom pl, **двѣри** 264v acc pl, **двѣрми** 37v (2x); — 2. **ѡ поўти** 31v, **поўть** etc. 49r, 267r, **на поў'** 136v, **поўтемь** 108r instr sg.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **влáсть** etc. 136v, 163v, **влáстїю** 158v, **влáстїю** etc. 107r (2x), 107v; — 2. **нóщъ** 40v, 202r, **ѡб нóщъ** 159r acc sg; — 3. **тáтъ** 37v, **тáтїе** 266r (2x) nom pl.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡмá** 3r, 181r, 265r, 393v (2x), **ѡ ѡмá** 393v, **по ѡмени** 37v dat sg, **ѡмá** 45r, 162v, 393v, **за ѡмá** 23v, **ѡменемь** 179v, 263v, **ѡ ѡмени** 39r loc sg.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **врѣмá** 26v, 27r, 45v, **врѣмá же** 26v, **врѣмене** 261r gen sg;³¹ — 2. **блѣзъ вѣси** 31v, **ѡ [...]** **вѣси** 163r, **вѣсь** 404v, **въ вѣсь** 404r, **вѣси** 136v acc pl, **ѡ вѣсѣ** 138r; — 3. **дáнь** 261r, **дáни** 109v acc pl; — 4. **дѣти** 109v/110r, **ѡ дѣти** 181v; — 5. **днй** 34v acc du; — 6. **ѡ кóсти** 47v gen sg; — 7. **крѣвь** 22v, 23r, 25v, 326v, **крѣвїю** 256v; — 8. **полоу нóщи** 181v loc sg (=adv); — 9. **въ плá'мени** 180r; — 10. **плѣ'22v**, **плѣти** 22v, 47v gen sg, **по плѣти** 29r dat sg, **плѣть** 23r, 25r acc sg; — 11. **ѡ трѣ'истъ** 326v.

The accentuation of the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *a*, including **камъ**, as well as CSl a.p. *c* has well attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources.³²

As for the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *b*, parallels to the accentuation of the lexeme **двѣрь** are regularly attested in both ESl and MBlg sources.³³ The lexeme **пáть**, on the other hand, shows accentuation on the root mainly in MBlg sources and WGrR sources with definalization.³⁴

6.2.4.2. Derived nouns

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **неплóды** 394r Ns, **неплóды** 263r nom pl; — 2. **въ старóсти** 394r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **коўпѣли** 24r loc sg (Jn. 5:2); — 2. **въ напáсть** 265r; — 3. **ѡбїтель** 256r; — 4. **ѡтрóча** 20r, 109v, **ѡтрó'ча сѣ** 110r; — 5. **про-**

³¹ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **вѣ врѣмá ѡнѡ** 36v, 44r, 260v, 404r, **вѣ врѣмá ѡнѡ** 26v, **вѣ врѣмá** 163r, 250v, 267r, 403r; cf. section 6.8.2.1.

³² Note, however, that the noun **вѣсь** can also be reconstructed, at least in CESl, as belonging to a.p. *b*; cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:136, 138, 284, Dybo 1973:184f.

³³ Cf. Dybo 1977:215, Schweier 1987:197.

³⁴ Cf., for example, Ps. No. 3 **ѡ пáти** 103v (2x), **пáтемь** 70v (2x) (Hinrichs 1985:63), Nor. ps. 199r **пáти** vs. **Овa поутї, поутѣмъ** (Schweier 1987:220), Smotr. 1619 **з6r пáти**, Zaliznjak 1985a:186.

пáсть 180r; — 6. **ѿ рáдости** 48r, **съ рáдостію** 48v; — 7. **съмрѣти** 249v gen sg (Mk. 14:64).

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въ коупѣль** 24v; — 2. **ѡбитѣли** 49r nom pl (Jn. 14:2); — 3. **премоудрѣсть** 136r.

Among the derived nouns, almost all belonging to CSI a.p. *a*, parallels to the accentuation of both **старость** and **радость** are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources. The accentuation of the AU **премоудрѣсть** (CSI a.p. *a^b*), on the other hand, reflecting the CSI position of ictus, has parallels in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show accentuation on the root.³⁵

Worth noting is also the vacillation in the accentuation of both **кжпѣль** and **ѡбитѣль**. The lexeme **кжпѣль** (CSI a.p. *a^b*) shows accentuation on the suffix mainly in GrR sources, whereas accentuation on the root is attested in both MBlg and Ukr sources.³⁶ **ѡбитѣль**, on the other hand, regularly shows accentuation on the root in ESl sources. The same applies to EBlg sources, where accentuation on the prefix is also attested. Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **ѡбитѣли**, however, have not been found in the comparison material.³⁷

The accentuation of the prefixed formations **напáсть** and **пропáсть** conforms with the reconstructed CESl position of stress, but both lexemes—**пропáсть** often, **напáсть** more seldom—in ESl sources are also attested with accentuation on the prefix.³⁸

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **ѡтрѣча** are mainly attested in SSl sources, whereas ESl sources regularly show constant accentuation on the element following the root.³⁹

As for the lexeme **съмрѣть**, possibly originally belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, accentuation on the root is regularly attested in both ESl and SSl sources.⁴⁰

³⁵ Cf., for example, ОВа **премоудрѣсть** (Schweier 1987:198), Smotr. 1619 **ѡбѣ премоудрѣсть** as well as Dybo 1981:110, 113, 117f, Zaliznjak 1985a:150f.

³⁶ Cf., for example, ОВа **въ коупѣль**, **въ коупѣли** (Schweier 1987:198), Ev. 1627 22v **на ѡвчѣи кѡпѣли**, 23r **ѡ кѡпѣль**, 23v **ѡ кѡпѣль** vs. Služ. Evf. 148r/v **на ѡвчѣи кѡпѣли**, 148v **въ кѡпѣль** (Syrku 1890:99), Služ. Sol. **ѡ кѡпѣль** (Syrku 1890:67) as well as Zaliznjak 1985a:147. Note also the difference between Smotr. 1619 **слг кѡпѣль** and Smotr. 1648 121r **кѡпѣль**.

³⁷ Cf., for example, ОВа **ѡбитѣль**, **въ ѡбитѣли** (Schweier 1987:198), Ev. 1627 335r **ѡбитѣль**, 69v **ѡбитѣли многи** as well as Steensland 1990:168.

³⁸ Cf., for example, ОВа **прѡпáсть** (Schweier 1987:199), Ev. 1627 311v **прѡпáсть**, Ber. 1627:101 **прѡпáсть**, Slav. 497 **прѡпáсть** as well as Zaliznjak 1985a:155, ОВа **напáсть** (Schweier 1987:198), Ber. 1627:69 **напáсть**.

³⁹ Cf., for example Služ. Sol. **ѡтрѣча** (Syrku 1890:76) as well as Dybo 1973:167, ОВа, МВ **ѡтрѣча** (Schweier 1987:249), Smotr. 1619 **ѡтрѣча** etc., Ber. 1627:154 **ѡтрѣча** as well as Zaliznjak 1985a:147.

⁴⁰ Cf. Dybo 1981:87, Zaliznjak 1985a:136, 155, Kolesov 1972a:73ff, ОВа **смѣрти** (Schweier 1987:199), Ev. 1627 208v **повѣнна смѣрти** (Mark 14:64), Dybo 1977:231, Ps. No. 3 57 **въ смѣрѣти** (Hinrichs 1985:100).

6.3. Adjectives

In this section is treated the accentuation of the adjectives—including de-adjectival adverbs, adjectival pronouns, and ordinal numerals—in M. The material is arranged as in section 3.3, where information on the CSI stress for the respective categories is also given.

6.3.1. Adjectives ending in -ЬНЪ

6.3.1.1. Simple forms

CSI a.p. a^a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **НЕВѢРЕНЬ** 110r; — 2. **НЕВЪЗМОЖНО** 110v adv; — 3. **ПОДБЕЖИ** 36r (Jn. 8:55); — 4. **ТЪЩНО** 178v adv.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **НЕДЪЖНЫ** 137r; — 2. **И ПРÁВЕДЕНЬ** 263v; — 3. **ПРИЛѢЖНО** 261v adv.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ПРОТІВЕНЬ** 139r; — 2. **ПШЕНИЧНО** 44v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ИСТИНЕНЬ** etc. 27v, 28v, 29r, 30r, **ИСТИН'НО** etc. 29r (3x).

CSI a.p. a^b

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ГРѢШЕНЬ** 41r, 159r; — 2. **ПОВІ|Н'Н'А** 249v (Mk. 14:64); — 3. **РАВЕЕН** 14v, **РАВЕНЬ** 162r (2x) loc sg n.

CSI a.p. c^c

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ДІВНО** 42v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ГОРОУШЬ|НО** 110v; — 2. **СВОБОДНИ** 30v.

Parallels to the accentuation of most of the adjectives belonging to CSI a.p. *a^a* and *c^c* are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources. As for the AU of lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *a^b*, although older ESl, WBlg, and Serbian sources show constant accentuation on the ending (a.p. *b^b*), accentuation on the syllable preceding the suffix is attested in EBlg sources as well as in many ESl sources from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁴¹

⁴¹ Dybo 1981:72, 88, Schweier 1987:313, 327, Zalaznjak 1985a:307f. Note also the literary character of the lexeme **РАВЕНЬ** in ESl sources.

6.3.1.2. Compound forms

CSl root or preflexional stress (∅ CSl a.p. a^a or a^b)

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣшнѧго** 393v, **вѣш'нѧго** 164v, **ѡ вѣшнѣ** 29v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **вышнѧго** 394r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **лѣбноѥ** 263r; — 2. **насоушныи** 181r, 265r; — 3. **недоужныи** 24v; — 4. **ѡ нѣжнихъ** 29v; — 5. **въ послѣднѣи** 21v, 22r, 23r; — 6. **прѣвѣдныи** 28r, **прѣвѣднѣи** 108r instr sg; — 7. **прѣславнаа** 164r acc pl n; — 8. **равнаа** 164r (Lk. 6:34); — 9. **различныи** 159v; — 10. **сѣдныи** 137r; — 11. **оубѣднаа** 30r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сыропоустнѣю** 264r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣстинѣи** 23v, **ѣстин'н'аго** 21r, **ѣстин'нѣи** 33r, **ѣст'н'ное** 34r.

CSl flexional stress (∅ CSl a.p. c^c)

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **нощнѣи** 139r loc sg f.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **брачныѧ** 161r; — 2. **вѣчныи** 34r, **вѣчныи** 22r, 23r, 32v, 39r (2x), **вѣчнаго** 26r, **вѣчнѣмъ** 21r, 44v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **лознааго** 256v.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU with CSl root and preflexional stress, respectively, are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources. Among the compound forms with CSl flexional stress the same applies to the AU **брачныѧ**, whereas accentuation on the root of both **вѣчнѣи** and **нощнѣи** is mainly attested in ESl sources, while MBlg sources show either root or flexional accentuation (cf. section 3.3.1.2).⁴²

6.3.2. Other adjectives

6.3.2.1. Simple forms

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **мало** 45v, 136v, 137v, 158v adv, **и по малѣ** 250r; — 2. **мнѡгъ** 36v, 137v:18, 262v, **мнѡгъ** 137v, **мнѡгъ** 137v:12, **мнѡси** 25v, 26r, 34r, 38v, 137v (2x), 160v, 180v, 405r, **и мнѡси** 136r, **мнѡгы** 49r, 137r (2x), **ѡ мнѡга** 261r, **мнѡга** 24v, 43r, 202r (2x), 261r, **мнѡгы** 261v instr pl n,

⁴² Cf. Dybo 1981:87, 93, Schweier 1987:304, 333.

мнѡга 36v, 163r, 164v nom sg f, **ѡ мнѡгъ** 160r, **мнѡго** 137v, 159r, 162r (2x), 202v adv; — 3. **нѣцъ** 160v nom sg m (Lk. 5:12), **нѣци** 403v nom pl m (Mt. 17:6).

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **богáтоу** 201v dat sg m.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡцю** 108r acc sg f; — 2. **ѣлика** 107r, **ѣлика** 181v, **ѣлика** 137r, **ѣлицы** 159v, **ѣлицы** 137r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **досѣоинъ** 179r, **досѣоинъ** 178r, **досѣоина** 179r, **досѣоина** 262r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **досѣоино** 262r; — 2. **тѡлика** 45v acc pl n, **толѣикы** 179r gen sg f.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣспѣнь** 138v, 160r/v; — 2. **нѣшь же** 179v; — 3. **ѣ пѣши** 137v; — 4. **радъ** 36r, 261r; — 5. **сѣцева** 41r acc pl n; — 6. **здравъ** etc. 24v (2x), 25r, **здравъ** 28r acc sg m.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **велика** 180r nom sg f; — 2. **готѡво** 26v; — 3. **коликъ** 138r; — 4. **мѣлосрдъ** 164v.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **бѣлы** 403r nom pl f; — 2. **глоубокъ** 32r; — 3. **дѡбрѣ** 32v adv; — 4. **злѡ** 262r, **злѡ** 162v, **злѡ** 27r, **злѣ** 182r, **злѣ** 178v, **ѣ злѣ** 110r adv; — 5. **лѣжь** 35r (Jn. 8:44), 36r (Jn. 8:55); — 6. **нѡвы** 161v acc pl m, **нѡва** 161r acc pl n, **на нѡвы** 110r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **дѡбрѡ** 267v, 403v, **ѡ дѡбрѣ** **дѣлѣ** 39v; — 2. **злѡдъ** 180r (Lk. 16:25).

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣтхы** 161r acc pl m, **вѣтхъ** 161r acc sg f; — 2. **дроугы** 179r acc pl m; — 3. **жѣвъ** 20v (2x), 25v, **жѣвъ** 46v; — 4. **зѣленѣ** 138r; — 5. **каково** 393v; — 6. **пѣавы** 34r; — 7. **поуѣсто** 137v:17/18, **въ поуѣсто** etc. 137v (2x), 160r; — 8. **свѣтелъ** 403v, **свѣтлоу** 261v acc sg f, **свѣтло** 179v adv; — 9. **сѣры** 50v acc pl m; — 10. **слѣпъ** 40r, 41r, 41v (3x), 42r (2x), **слѣпа** 40r acc sg m, **слѣпи** 37v (2x); — 11. **въ соурѡвѣ** 263r; — 12. **въ соусѣ** 263r; — 13. **цѣлъ** 24v, **цѣла** 25r, 136r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **блѣжѣни** 162v (3x), **блѣжѣнѣ** 180v nom du.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **бжѣа** 263v gen sg n.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. a the accentuation of both **толѣикъ** and **коликъ**, contrasting with F, are worth noting. The initial accentuation in the AU **ѣлика** etc., conforming with F, must against this background probably be considered as not indicating ictus. As for **досѣоинъ**, this lexeme normally shows accentuation on the root in ESl and on the suffix in MBlg sources (cf. section 3.3.2.1), with M clearly conforming to the ESl pattern. In the AU **досѣоино**, however, *oksia* seems to indicate the traditional SSl position of ictus, whereas *kamora* can be as-

sumed to indicate the phoneme /ô/ in stressed position (cf. section 5.4.2). The lexeme **сицевъ**, finally, probably also originally belonging to CSI a.p. *a*, is attested with accentuation on the root in some ESI sources, but particularly GrR sources also show accentuation on the ending.⁴³

Within CSI a.p. *b* some AU not unexpectedly show accentuation on the ending. As for **добръ**, parallels with accentuation on the root in the adverb **добрѣ**, coexisting with accentuation on the ending in other forms, are regularly attested in ESI sources.⁴⁴ The lexeme **глагокъ**, on the other hand, is normally attested with accentuation either on the ending or on the suffix in both ESI and SSI sources.⁴⁵

Parallels to the accentuation of most AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* are attested in both ESI and SSI sources.⁴⁶ The lexeme **какъвъ**, however, normally shows constant accentuation on the ending in both ESI and SSI sources, but parallels with accentuation on the root are attested in some ESI sources.⁴⁷

6.3.2.2. Compound forms

CSI root stress (∅ CSI a.p. *a*)

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **нечѣстымъ** 158v dat pl m, **нечѣстый** 162r, 162v, **нечѣстыми** 136v (2x); — 2. **прѣвыи** 108r, **и прѣвыи** 108v, **къ прѣвому** 107v, **въ прѣвою**.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и вѣбрыи** 108v, **вѣброе** 20v; — 2. **нищо|мому** 179v, **ни|щии** 162v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и бо|гатыи** 179v; — 2. **че|ловѣцкыи** 404r.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **члѣ|скааго** 162v, **члѣ|скааго** 30r, **члѣ|скааго** 202v.

CSI preflexional stress (∅ CSI a.p. *b*)

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **мрѣтвѣи** 109r, **и мрѣтвѣи** 180v, **мрѣтвѣа** 201v acc pl m; — 2. **нѣвыи** 256v, **нѣвое** 161v, **нѣвому** 161v, **и нѣвою** 161r, **нѣвыи** 161r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **хрѣмѣи** 24r.

⁴³ Dybo 1981:36. Cf., for example, ОБа **сицевѣа** accusative plural, МВ **сицевѣа** (Schweier 1987:313), Smotr. 1619 **в2v сицевѣъ**, **в2г ѿ сицевѣи**, Smotr. 1648 181r **сицевѣъ**, **сицевѣи**. Cf. also Slovar' 1847 IV:127 **сицевый**, **ая**, **ое** vs. D'jačenko 1899:602 **сицевый**.

⁴⁴ Zaliznjak 1985a:301ff, Schweier 1987:325f.

⁴⁵ Zaliznjak 1985a:151f, 303ff.

⁴⁶ Cf., for example, ОБа **благѣнъ**, **благѣно** etc. (Schweier 1987:304), Nor. ps. 13r **благѣнъ**.

⁴⁷ Zaliznjak 1985a:297f.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ВЕЛІКЫМИ** 262v, **ВЕЛІКОЮ** 48v; — 2. **ДЕВАТААГѢ** 327v; — 3. **КОТѢРЫИ** 257r, **КОТѢРААГО** 109r, **ВЪ КОТѢРЫИ** 20v; — 4. **Ѡ ЛОУКАВААГѢ** 181v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **НА ѢВѢИ** 24r loc sg f (Jn. 5:2).

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **БОГАТААГО** 179v; — 2. **ДЕВАТААГѢ** 263r; — 3. **Ѡ ЛОУКАВААГѢ** 265r; — 4. **НЕРОУКОТВОРЕНАГѢ** 404r; — 5. **Ѡ| НОВААГѢ** 161r; — 6. **ѢУРЕНЕѢ** 31v (title).

CSl flexional stress (∅ CSl a.p. c)

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ВЕЛІИ** 393v, **ВЕЛІЕМЬ** 159v, 263v, **ВЕЛІЮ** 256r; — 2. **ВѢТХОѢ** 161v, **И ВѢТСИ** 161r (Lk. 5:36); — 3. **Ѡ СЕДЫМИХЪ** 109r; — 4. **СЛѢПЫ** 24r; — 5. **И ТРЕТИИ** 108v; — 6. **ПО ЧЮЖЕМЪ ЖЕ** 38r, **Ѡ ТѢЖДИ** 109v, **ѢЖДИ** 109v; — 7. **ШЕСТЫИ** 31v, 263r, 393v, 394r, **Ѡ ШЕСТАГО ЖЕ** 327v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ВѢТХОѢ** 161v (Lk. 5:39); — 2. **Ѡ ДЕСНОЮ** 327r acc sg f (=adv); — 3. **Ѡ ШОУЮ** 327r acc sg f (=adv).

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **ДРЪ|ГААГО** 263r; — 2. **ЖИВАГѢ** 26r; — 3. **ДО СЕДМАГѢ** 108v.

Among the compound adjectives the accentuation of most AU with CSl root or prefixional stress has well attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. The lexeme **ВѢТОРЫИ**, however, often shows flexional accentuation in GrR sources, but accentuation on the root is regularly attested in both Ukr and SSl sources.⁴⁸

Among the AU with CSl flexional stress accentuation on the root is well attested in ESl sources, particularly for 'specifically literary' forms or lexemes, whereas MBlg sources at least partially show flexional accentuation.⁴⁹ Parallels to the accentuation of **ТРЕТИИ**, however, are attested in both ESl and SSl sources.⁵⁰ As for the adverbial **Ѡ ДЕСНЖЪ**, parallels with flexional accentuation are attested in both MBlg and ESl—particularly GrR—sources, whereas accentuation on the root is attested in both Mold and Ukr sources.⁵¹

6.3.3. *The comparative*

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **И БѢЛШЪ** 202r acc sg f.

⁴⁸ Schweier 1987:343f.

⁴⁹ Cf., for example, Zaliznjak 1985a:310ff, Ps. No. 3 62v **ВЕЛІИ** etc. (Hinrichs 1985:86).

⁵⁰ Cf., for example, ОВа **ТРЕТИИ** (Schweier 1987:315), Sof. služ. 46v **ВЪ ТРЕТИИ**. Note, however, that flexional accentuation is not uncommon in ESl sources; cf. Kiparsky 1962:281, Zaliznjak 1985a:150, 186.

⁵¹ Cf., for example, Sof. služ. 46v **Ѡ ДЕСНЖЪ**, ОВа **Ѡ ДЕСНЖЮ**, Smotr. 1648 295r **Ѡ ДЕСНОЮ** vs. Služ. Sol. **Ѡ ДЕСНЖЪ** (Syрку 1890:40), Smotr. 1619 14r **Ѡ ДЕСНЖЮ** as well as Služ. No. 323 2v **Ѡ ДЕСНОЮ**. Note, however, also МВ **Ѡ ДЕСНЖЮ** (Schweier 1987:335ff).

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **бѣлѣи** 23v, 39v, 109v, 110r, 257r, **бѣлѣ** 20v adv; — 2. **нѣ горѣ ти** 25r nom sg n (Jn. 5:14);⁵² — 3. **лѣшѣ|шѣѣ** 111r acc sg n (Mt. 23:14), **нѣ лѣшѣ** 265r adv (Mt. 6:7); — 4. **лѣучѣшѣ** 161v nom sg n (Lk. 5:39); — 5. **ѡрадѣнѣѣ** 137r, 178v; — 6. **прѣвѣѣ** 24r; — 7. **ѡудѣбѣѣ** 163v adv (Lk. 5:23).

Parallels to the accentuation on the root of the comparatives—formed from adjectives as well as adverbs—in M are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.⁵³

6.4. Indeclinable lexemes

In the present section the accentuation of the indeclinable lexemes of various categories will be treated. As in section 3.4, the material is divided between CSl orthotonic words and enclinae.

CSl orthotonic words

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣнѣ** etc. 21v, 43r, 45r, 52v, 250r, 260r adv; — 2. **дѣжѣ** 20r, 250v, 256v, 260r adv; — 3. **гдѣ** 44r, 201r, 201v, 256r adv; — 4. **ѡсѣ|доу** etc. 26v, 110v adv; — 5. **послѣди** 108r, **послѣди же** etc. 107v, 108v/109r adv; — 6. **здѣ** etc. 36v, 136r, 139v, 180r, 202v, 261r, 403v (2x) adv; — 7. **сѣмо** 32v, 110r adv; — 8. **тѣкоже** 15r, 107v, 161r, 164r, 203r, **тѣкоже** 180r, **тѣкоже же** 108v, 159r, 256v adv; — 9. **тѣмо** 20r, 110v, 137v, 267v adv; — 10. **тѣу** etc. 136r, 137r, 202r, 256r, 263r, 266r, **и тѣу** 43v adv.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣдѣ** 161r, 182r (3x) conj; — 2. **и|и** etc. 107v, 109v (2x), 163v, 182r (2x), 267v conj; — 3. **тогда** etc. 110v, 263r, 327r, **тогда| бѣ** 326v adv; — 4. **ѣдѣ** 161r, 162v (2x), 181r, 202v, 264r, 264v, 404r, **и ѣдѣ** 109v, 161v, 256v, 263r, 264v conj.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣбѣѣ** 107r, **и ѣбѣѣ** 106v, 138v, 139r, 160v, 163v, 250v, 260r, **ѣбѣѣ же** 20v, 159v conj; — 2. **и|бѣ** 181r conj; — 3. **ѣбачѣ** etc. 164r/v, 257r (2x) adv; — 4. **ѣндѣ** 202r, 202v adv; — 5. **ѣбѣѣ** etc. 20r, 20v, 21r (2x), 23r, 28v, 41v, 107v, 109r, 109v, 164v, 180r, 182r, 257r (2x), 262r (2x), 263r, 264r (2x), 265r (2x) conj; — 6. **ѣѣже** 181v, **и ѣѣже** 137v (2x), **ѣѣже бѣ** 42r adv; — 7. **ѣкоже** 21r conj; — 8. **ѣѣѣ** 249v, 260r adv.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **доко|лѣ** 110r (2x) conj.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и|и|дѣже** 266r adv.

⁵² See *Slovník* 1966—**горѣи**. The corresponding form in Mst. 12a is interpreted as the nominative singular of the noun **горѣ** (Žukovskaja 1983:334), in Mar. 141v as the interjection **горѣ** (Jagić 1883/1960:499).

⁵³ Note, however, that older ESl sources such as Čud. and Mer. show final accentuation of both **бѣлѣ** and **горѣ**; see Zaliznjak 1979:94.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **блѣзъ вѣси** 31v, **блѣзъ поустына** 43v adv;⁵⁴ — 2. **дѣндеже** 138v, 138v conj; — 3. **завѣтра** 46v adv; — 4. **камо** 45v, **и кімо** 29r adv; — 5. **и мѣмо** 36r adv; — 6. **и мнѣужицею** 110r, **мнѣужицею бѣ** 110r adv; — 7. **да нѣ** 21v, 24r, 160r, 180r, 203r, 264v, 265v particle; — 8. **нѣ** 180v, **ѣще ли же** | **нѣ** 264r, **же нѣ** 49r, 161r (2x) particle; — 9. **нѣзѣу** 250r adv; — 10. **никакоже** 158r adv; — 11. **ѡкоудѣу** etc. 107v, 136r adv; — 12. **ѡсѣлѣ** 159v, 260v adv; — 13. **ѡтоудѣу** etc. 137r (2x), 180r adv; — 14. **пачѣ** 14v, 160v, 182r adv; — 15. **прѣже** 109v adv, **прѣже** 43v prep; — 16. **сѣце** 265r adv.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вънегда** 181r adv; — 2. **всѣгда** 26v adv; — 3. **далѣче** 111r adv; — 4. **занѣ** 137v, 261r, 263r conj; — 5. **ижедалѣче** 263v adv; — 6. **искомѣ** 35r adv; — 7. **когда** 202r adv; — 8. **ни ѣсти ѣмѣ бѣ колѣ** 137r adv; — 9. **когда** 182r adv; — 10. **никогдаже** 264r adv; — 11. **да николѣже** 106r adv; — 12. **третѣцею** 262r adv.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣи** 109v (Mt. 17:25) interj; — 2. **ѣнегда** 41r adv; — 3. **ѣможе** 201r adv.

CSI enclitomena

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **како** 31v, 41r, 107r, 267r, 394r adv; — 2. **гакы** 20v, 32r, 42r, 250r (2x), **да пакы** 38v, **пакы же** 262r adv; — 3. **радѣ** 35r 42r, 111r, 267v postp; — 4. **такѣ** 36r, 48r, 202r, 202v (2x), 393r adv; — 5. **тѣкмѣ** etc. 106v, 110v, 136r, 136v (2x), 163v, 180v (2x), 267r/v, 403v, 404v, **не тѣкмѣ** 14v, 107r adv; — 6. **ѣко** 107v, 111r, 404r conj.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сѣлѣ** 261r, 403v adv.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣвѣ** 264v, 265r, 266r adv; — 2. **ѣще** 14v, 20r, 32r, 42r, 107r (4x), 107v, 108v, 109v, 110v, 137r (2x), 160v, 180v (4x), 181v, 182r (2x), 201r, 260r, 261r 263r, 267v, 403v, 404v, **да ѣще** 44r, **ѣще ли** 40r, 49r, 107v, 161r, 264r, **ѣще ли** 44v, 265v, **ѣще же** 260v, **ѣже ѣще** 178v conj; — 3. **ѣкрѣтъ** 136v adv.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **радѣ** · 45r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **радѣ** etc. 14v, 27r, 38r, 163r, 162v/163r, 267v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **нѣнѣ** 41v, 162v (2x) adv; — 2. **чѣсто** 161r adv.

Among the orthotonic words with accentuation comparable to F mos: AU show similar accentuation in both manuscripts. Exceptions are formed only by the AU **докѣлѣ** and **и ѣдѣже**, parallels to which are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources (cf. section 3.4). Parallels to the accentuation of the originally orthotonic AU with no equivalents in F can

⁵⁴ Here used as a preposition; cf. Leskien 1910:110, 117.

also mostly be attested in various sources. Note, however, that the accentuation of the lexeme **донѣдеже** is mainly paralleled in ESl sources, whereas MBlg sources often show prefinal accentuation.⁵⁵

Also among the AU originally constituting CSl enclimena the accentuation in most cases conforms to F. Here, the accentuation of the postposition **ради** is notable, with alternating initial and final accentuation in both corpus A and B, whereas only final accentuation is attested in F (cf. section 3.4).

6.5. Pronouns

The various pronouns are referred to CSl a.p. according to the same principles as in section 3.5.

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **в́ашь** 109r, 164v, 265r, 265v (2x), **в́ашемь** 29r, 39v loc sg, **в́аши** 34r, **в́аша** 164v acc pl, **в́аше** 162v, 266r, **в́ашегѡ** 265r, **в́аше** 23r, 110v, 162v, **в́ашихъ** 262v, **в́ашй** 265v, **в́ашиимь** 182r, **в́аши** 163v loc pl, **в́аша** 163r, 164v nom sg f, **в́аша** 158v, 264r acc pl f, **в́ашиими** 137r; — 2. **н́ашегѡ** 394v, 404r, **н́ашемоу** 45v, 181r, **н́ашь** 43r, 178v, 181r (2x), 260v, 265r (2x), **н́аши** 21r, **н́аша** 181r, 265r acc pl m, **н́ашеа** 394r, **н́ашиимъ** 265r, **н́ашж** 404r gen sg (*sic*, title).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣзъ** 21v, 24v, 28v, 34r, 35v, 39r, 39v, 46r, 108r, 109r, 139r, 261v, **ѣзь** 32r, 32v, 38r, 260v, **и ѣзь** 14v, 39r, 50v, 107r, **и ѣзь** 39r, 179r, 181v, **и ѣзъ** 107r, **ни ѣзь** 107v, **ѣзъ же** 36r; — 2. **и́нь** 259v, **въ и́ноу** 404v, **и́на** 263r acc du m.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вс́акъ бо** 181v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **ва|шегѡ** 264r; — 2. **коѣгѡ** 404v; — 3. **никаѡже** 44r.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣсь** 42v, 43v, 47r, **и вѣсь** 20v, 162r, 162v, 250v, **всѣ** 21v (2x), 260v, 326v, **всѧ** 180v, **всѧ** 3r, **всѣю** 159r, **всѧ** 138v, 159v, 249v, 260v, 262r, 262v, 263v, **всѧ** 107v, 109r, **всѧ** etc. 107r, 138r, 159v, 162r, 162v, 202r, 202v, 203r, **и всѧ** 159r; — 2. **мѡи** 14v, 21r, 36r, 41r, 44v, 179r (2x), 180r, 263v, 403v; — 3. **сѣ** 3r, 20r, 163v, 250r, 262r, 263v (2x), 327r, 393v, **сѣ же** 110v, **и сѣ** 259v, **не сѣ ли** 136r, **сѣи** 403v, **сѣ** 27r (2x), 37r, 263v, **сѣи** 45r, **сѣмь** 44v, 108r, 180r, **ѡ сѣмъ бо** 42v, **ѡ сѣмъ бо** 34r, **сѣи** 107r dat sg f, **сѣи** 48r, 261v, **сѣ** 21r,

⁵⁵ Cf., e.g., Smotr. 1619 х4r **дѡндеже**, Ber. 1627:31 **дѡндеже**, Slovar' 1847 I:351 **дондеже**, but Ev. 1545 **дондеже**, Služ. Sol. **и дѡндеже** (Syrku 1890:56) as well as Dybo 1977:251.

110r, 158v, 202r, 202v (2x), 256v, 263r, 393v, 394r nom sg n, сѣ 179r, 180r, 202r, 256v (2x), 257r, на сѣ 160r, ѿ сѣ 159r acc sg n, ѿ сѣ 160r, 163r, 261v, 2Qr, 263v, 393v, 394r, 403r, сѣ 20v (2x), 25r, 34r, 44r, 394r, 403v, ѿ сѣ 403v particle.⁵⁵

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. вѣсѣ 43r, по всеѣ 261r, 263r, 37v; — 2. моймь 40r dat pl, мойхъ 39r, 202r, мойми 256r; — 3. ѡнѣ 36v, 44r, 16v, 136r, 137r, 138v, 139r, 158v, 159v, 160v, 161v, 162r, 163r, 178v, 181r, 201r, 202r, 250v, 260v, 267r, 404r, ѡнѣ 20r, 26v, 107r, 108v, 109r, 110r, 136v, 160r, ѿ ѡнѣ 46v, ѡнѣ же 107v, ѡнѣ же 139r, 178v; — 4. твоимь 110r dat pl; — 5. еди́н-го 202v, еди́н-го 327r, еди́н-го 31r, еди́н-го 30r, 262r, 403v, ѿ еди́н-го 32r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. ѡнѣ 15r, 21r, ѡн же etc. 107v (2x), 138r (2x), 159v, 160r, 161r, 180v, 201v, 250r (3x), 257r, 260v, 261r, 261v, 282r, ѡнѣ 403r.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. моѣ 20r, 23v, 26v, 31r, 256v (2x), моѣ 22v, 36r; — 2. сѣѣ 15r, 107v, 136r, 139v, 256v, 263r, сѣѣ 107v; — 3. твоѣ 45r, 181r, 265r (2x), 265v, твоѣ 26v, 180r, 264v (3x), 265r, 394r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. еди́нь 180v, 404v, еди́нь 163v, еди́нь 36v, 138v, еди́н же 43r, да еди́нь 43v, еди́н-ому etc. 110v, 259v, еди́нь 136v, вѣ еди́нь 158v, вѣ еди́нь 160r, на еди́н-омъ 159v, еди́ни 137v (2x), еди́ны 403r, еди́но 39v, 42r, 106v, 107r, вѣ еди́но 43v, еди́на 250r, ни еди́н-омъ 136v, 261v, еди́ноу 106v, 403v (2x), ѿ еди́ноу 403v; — 2. сѣѣ 32v, 13r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. сѣѣ 33v, 202v; — 2. сѣѣ 180r; — 3. твоѣ 20v, твоѣ 24v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. ѡнѣ 393r; — 2. своимь 404r instr sg, ѡ своимъ ли 109v, своимь 37r, 138r, 180v, 182r, своѣ 202v dat pl, своимъ 43v, 261v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. моѣго 39r (2x), 11r, 180r, 180v, 201v, 404v; — 2. своѣ 136r, 404r, своѣго 108v, 180r, своѣ, 263v acc pl; — 3. сѣго etc. 14v, 35r, 38r, 42r, 45r (2x), 111r, 202v, 250r, 261v, 262r.

CSl *a.p.* c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. вѣ 25v, 28v, 29v, 30v, 31r, 33r, 33v, 39r, 42v, 43r, 137v, 138r, 164r, 180v, 182r, 250r, 260v, 265r, 404v, 405r, вѣ бѣ 111r, вѣ же 108r, вѣ же 50r, вѣмъ 14v, 20r, 21r (3x), 21v, 23v, 26r, 27v, 30r, 30v, 3r, 35v, 36r (2x), 38r, 39r, 44r, 107r (2x), 107v, 108r (2x), 109r, 110v (2x), 111r, 13v, 164r (4x), 179r, 180v, 181v (3x), 182r (2x), 202v, 256v (2x), 260r, 264v (2x), 26v (2x), 405r, вѣмъ 31r, вѣмъ сѣ 249v, вѣмъ, 109v, вѣ 111r, к вѣмъ 108r, 180r, ѿ вѣми 180r, съ вѣми 256v, с вѣми 110r, прѣ вѣми 261v, вѣма etc. 178v, 256; — 2. съ нѣмъ etc. 159r, 161r, 256v, 259v, 263r, 264r, 267r, 403v, прѣд нѣмъ 26v, ѡ нѣхъ etc. 20v, 51v, 250r, къ нѣмъ etc. 139r (2x), 161r (2x), 163v, 180v, 256v, 260v, 261v, 262r, 262v, прѣ нѣми 138r, прѣ нѣми 163v, съ нѣми 139, 162r, 178v; — 3. вѣ нѣмъ же 264r, ѿ на нѣмъ же 108r, ѡ нѣхъ же 164r; — 4. кѣ 45v, 108v, 158r, 163v (2x), 180v (3x), 181v, 404v, ѿ кѣ 107r, ѿ кѣ 404v; — 5. мѣ 21v, 39v, 107r, 393r, 404v, мѣ / 180v, мѣ 394r, къ мѣ 21v, 181v, къ мѣ 178r.

⁵⁶ This lexeme is also attested in the AU сѣ бѣ 163r, 202r, сѣго бѣ 21r; cf. section 6.8.1.

21v (2x), **мнѣю** 49r, **съ мнѣю** 257r, **ѡ мнѣ** 262v, **и по мнѣ** 39r; — 6. **мѣ** 22r, 31r, 33r, 41v, 42r, 42v, 45r, 110v, 265r, **и мѣ** 26r, 37v, **намѣ** 32r, 33r, 39r, 49v, 107v, 178v, 181r (2x), 260r, 262r, 265r (2x), 403v, **к намѣ** 180r, **нами** 180r; — 7. **ничѣже** etc. 3r, 262r, **и ничѣже** 110v, **и ничѣже** 106v; — 8. **тѣ** 20v, 21r, 37v, 109v, 110r, 163r, 164v, 178v, 261v, 264v, **тѣ же** 160v, **и тѣ** 32r, 107v, 160v, 162v, 179v, 181v, 256r, 263v, 267r, 404r, **въ тѣ** 109v, 203r, **и тѣ** 180r, 257r, **въ тѣ** 161r, 261r, **и тѣ** 46v nom du m, **ни тѣма** 47r dat du m, **тѣм** 3r, **и тѣ** 394r nom sg f, **тѣм же** 179r, 267v, 394r conj; — 9. **тѣ** 21r, 42v (2x), 43r, 160r, 250r, 260r, 261r, 393v, **тѣ** 31v, **и тѣ** 178v, 250r, **тѣ же** 180r, 264v, 265v, **тѣ ли** 260v, 261r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣгѡ** 108v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣи** 31v, 32r (2x), 106v, 109v, 393v, **ѣи** 394r dat sg f, **ѣхъ** etc. 31x (20r, 37v, 39r [3x], 39v, 109v, 136v [3x], 137v [2x], 138r, 138v, 139r, 159r, 159v [2x], 160r, 163r [2x], 163v, 203r, 260v, 262v [3x], 265v, 267v, 403r, 404v), **ѣмъ** etc. 53x Dpl (14v, 21r [3x], 30v, 31r [2x], 33v [2x], 38r, 39r [2x], 107r [2x], 107v, 108r, 109r, 109v, 110v [3x], 136r, 136v [3x], 137r, 137v [2x], 138r [5x], 138v, 139r, 139v, 159v, 160r, 160v, 164r, 180r, 181r, 202r, 256v, 260r, 262r, 263r, 265r, 267r, 267v, 267v, 403v, 404r), **ѣми** 264r, **ѣма** 159r, 256r, 404v Ddu; — 2. **ѣже** 29x (32r [2x], 39v, 137r, 158v, 159r, 162r, 162v, 163r [2x], 163v, 178v [2x], 179v, 180r, 181r, 182r, 201v, 203r, 250v, 262r, 262v, 263r, 263v, 264r, 264v, 265r, 265v, 267r), **ѣже бѣ** 110r, **ѣже** etc. 3r, 20v, 21r, 21v (2x), 31r, 40v, 139v, 161r, 256v, 259v, 267r, **не ѣже** 14v, **ѣже** 31v, **и ѣже** 109v, **ѣже** etc. 48r, 159v, 180v, 202r, 256v, 262r, 262v, 404v, 405r (2x), **ѣже** 159r, 264r, **ѣже** etc. 161v, 265r, 267r, **ѣмже** 257r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **ѣгѡ** etc. 91x (14v, 20r [3x], 20v [3x], 31v, 32r, 36r, 37v, 40r [2x], 41r [2x], 42v [2x], 43r [4x], 44r [2x], 108r, 108v, 108v [2x], 109r, 109v, 110r, 110r [2x], 110v [2x], 136r, 136r, 137v, 138v, 158r, 159v, 160r [2x], 160v, 161v, 162r [2x], 162v, 163r [3x], 178v [2x], 179v [4x], 180r, 181r, 203r, 260r, 260v, 260v, 261r [3x], 261v [4x], 262r [4x], 262v [4x], 263r, 263v, 264r, 267r, 267v, 267v [2x], 393v [2x], 394r, 404r [3x], 404v), **до негѡ** 160r, **ѡ негѡ** 21v, 160v (2x), 162r, 256v, 261v, **иъ негѡ** etc. 158r (2x), **и бѣъ негѡ** 3r, **кѣ негѡ** 106v, **на негѡ** 106v, **ѡ негѡ** 159v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **на ѣдѣномъ кѡмѣже** 159v (Lk. 4:40); — 2. **никѣже** etc. 38v, 161r, 264r, **и никѣже** 29v, 39v, 51v, 161v; — 3. **самѣ** 20v, 35v, 41v, 138v, 138v, **и самѣ** 138v, **и самѡ** 161v, **самѣ** 137v, **и самѣ** 181r, **самѣ бѣ** 34v, 260v; — 4. **чѣдѡ** 158v, 163v (2x), 264v, 267r, **чѣмѣ** 36v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ничѣсѡже** 14v, 159r, **ничѣсѡже** 261v, **ничѣсѡже** 20r, 262r, **да ничѣсѡже** 136v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡви** 40v, 41r.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **ѣгѡже** 250r; — 2. **никѡгѡже** 403v; — 3. **самѡгѡ** 41v; — 4. **тогѡ** 110v, 403v.

The accentuation of most pronouns conforms to the accentuation in F. An important difference, however, is the presence of AU accentuated exclusively with non-ictus *kamora* and *varia*, respectively, which has the consequence that the superficially similar AU **сѣю** F 2a and **сѣю** M107v are

accentographically not identical. Nevertheless, in quite a few cases in M these accent marks are probably written in the position of ictus. As for **ѣдинѣ**, in contrast to F, this lexeme shows constant accentuation on the second vowel in M. Parallels to this accentuation are well attested in both SSl and, because of the literary character of the lexeme, also in ESl sources (cf. section 3.5).

6.6. Numerals

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **тысѣцѣ** 37r, **тысѣцѣ** 138v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **четѣри** 34r.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сѣдмѣ** 108v, **сѣдмѣ** 46v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и ѣсмѣ** 24v.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **двѣ** 34v, 107v, 158v, 250v, 263r, 327r, **двѣ двѣ** 136v (2x), **и двѣ** 36v, 138r (2x), **въ двѣ** 136v; — 2. **двѣ на десѣте** 138v, 161v, **двѣ на десѣте** 37r; — 3. **трѣ** 181v, 260r, 403v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡба** 159r, **ѡба** 159v, **и ѡбѣ** 138r; — 2. **ѡба на десѣте** 36v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡ ѣбою** 108r gen du.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **двѣма стѡма** 138r, **двѣма стѡма** 36v; — 2. **пѣ** 138r, 138v, **пѣтѣ** 24r; — 3. **по стѡ** 138r; — 4. **трѣ десѣте** 24v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и ѡбоѣ** 161v.

The accentuation of all AU within this category has well attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. Note that this also includes the initial accentuation of the AU **ѡ ѣбою**, with parallels perhaps particularly frequently in MBlg sources, constituting the only difference to the accentuation of the numerals in F (cf. section 3.6).

6.7. Verbs

6.7.1. Present tense

6.7.1.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSl stress on the root

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡБРѢТАЮ** 261r, 261v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ВѢРОУЮ** 43r, **ДА ВѢРОУЮ** 43r, **ВѢ|РОУѢШИ** **ЛИ** 43r, **НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЬ** 46r, **И НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЬ** 46v, **ВѢРОУЕМЪ** 34v, **ДА ВѢРОУЕТЕ** 21r, **И ВѢРОУЕТЕ** 40r, **НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЕ** etc. 35r, 39r, 40r, **И НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЕ** 21v, **ВѢРОУЮТЪ** 43r, **НЕ ВѢРОУЮТЪ** 26r; — 2. **ДѢЛАЮ** 14v, **ДѢЛАЕШИ** 21r, **ДѢ|ЛАЕТЬ** 14v, **ДА ДѢЛАЕМЪ** 21r; — 3. **КЛАНИЕМЪ СѦ** 33r, **КЛАНАЕТЕ СѦ** 33r; — 4. **ПОСЛОУШАЕТЬ** 35r, 42v, **НЕ ПОСЛОУШАЕ** 42v, **СЛОУШАЮТЪ** etc. 39r (2x), **НЕ ПОСЛОУШАЮ** 180v; — 5. **ДА ПОСЛѢДСТВУЕТЕ** 44v; — 6. **ПРИСТАВЛАЕТЬ** 161r, **ѠСТАВЛАЕМЪ** 181r, 265r, **ѠСТАВЛАЕТЕ** 111r, **ѠСТАВЛАЮТ ТИ СѦ** etc. 163r/v, 163v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **И НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЕ** 39r.

CSl stress on the thematic element

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ЗАТВАРАЕТЕ** 111r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **И СЪВѢРАЕТЬ** 34r; — 2. **ВАРАЮТ** 108r; — 3. **ѠВРѢЗАЕТЪ** 37v; — 4. **НЕ СЪГЛАСУЕТЪ** 161r; — 5. **ГНЕВАЕТЕ СѦ** 28r; — 6. **СКАЗАЕТЪ| СѦ** 40v; — 7. **ѠБЛИЧАЕТ МА** 35r; — 8. **СТАСАЕТЕ СѦ** 54r.

The consistent accentuation on the root among the AU with CSl stress both on the root and on the thematic element conforms well to F (cf. section 3.7.1.1). In the AU **И НЕ ВѢРОУЕТЕ** the second *oksia* might by mistake have been written instead of the *psili* occurring in other AU of this lexeme, thus not indicating ictus (cf. section 5.4.6). On the other hand, as indications of secondary stress in this type of verbs are not uncommon in some manuscripts, a phonetic motivation cannot be excluded.

6.7.1.2. Other verbs

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въврѣгоу** 159r, **ѡврѣжеши** сѧ 250v, 260r, **въврѣжет** мѧ 24v, **ѡзврѣжет** сѧ 52v, **да вѣргѡу** 36r; — 2. **ѡ крадоуѣ**·| 266r, **ни крадоуѣ** 266r; — 3. **въстанеть** 110v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡбръѣѣ** 38r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡубѣѣтъ** 29v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **боудѡу** 36r, 45r, **боудѣши** 159v, **боудѣтъ** etc. 29x (22v, 25r, 25v [2x], 28v, 32v, 44r, 44v, 45r [2x], 106v, 107r, 109r, 110v, 137r, 161r, 178v, 181r, 202v [2x], 203r, 203r, 260v, 263r, 264v, 265r, 393v [2x], 394r), **ѡ боудѣ** 164v, **не боудѣтъ** о. dyl. 26r, 394r, **да боудѣтъ** 42r, **да събоудѣтъ** сѧ 45v, **да събоудѣтъ**·| сѧ 23v, **не ꙗко пребоудѣ** 46r/v, **боудѣте** etc. 30v (2x), 30v/31r, 45v (2x), 162v, 264r, **ѡ боудѣте** 109v, 164v, **пребоудѣте** 30v, **боудѡу** 37v, 46r, 202r, 265r; — 2. **вѣдите** 262r; — 3. **вѣжѡу** 32v, 42r, **ѡ вѣжѡу** 41r, **вѣдитъ** etc. 14v, 41v (2x), 46r, **вѣдимъ** 37v, **да вѣдимъ** 21r, **вѣдите** 20r, 44r, 180v (2x), 404v, 405r, **не вѣдите** 20r, **не вѣдите ли** 139v, **вѣдѡ** etc. 26v, 37v, **да не вѣдѡ** 46r; — 4. **ненавѣдитъ** etc. 23r (2x), 23v, 26v/27r, **възненавѣдѡ** 162v; — 5. **не ѡбръѣте** сѧ 109v; — 6. **погѣбнѣтъ** 43v, **да не погѣбнѣ** 37r, **погѣбнѡу** 161v, **ѡ не погѣбнѡу** 39r; — 7. **знѡу** 39r, **не знѡу** 394r, **знѡемъ** 22r, **знѡете** 50r, **не знѡютъ** 38r; — 8. **слѡзѡу** 24v, **слѡзитъ** 203r; — 9. **вѣсплѡчете** сѧ 54r; — 10. **слѡвлю** сѧ 35v, **прослѡвлю** 45r, **да прослѡвит** сѧ 44v, **да прослѡвѡтъ** сѧ 264v; — 11. **ѡслѡшѡу** 46v, **слѡшите** 181r, 405r, **слѡшѡ** 37v; — 12. **не ѡстѡвлю** 50r, **настѡвитъ** вы 53v, **ѡстѡвимъ** 43r; — 13. **набѣтѡте** сѧ 162v; — 14. **растрѣгнѣтъ** 161r; — 15. **ѡ не въсхѣтитъ**·| 39r; — 16. **да ѡчѣстѡтъ** сѧ 43v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **видѣте** 34r, **не видѣте** 54r, **ѡ не видѣте** 54r; — 2. **да ѡгѡтѡвѡ** 404r.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вънѣдѣши** 179r, **да сънѣдѣ** 20r, **ѡ ѡзбѣдѣ** 38r, **прѣидѣтъ** etc. 23v, 24r, 28v, 33r, 34r, 40v, 202r, 256v, **не прѣидѣтъ** 202r, 265r, **ѡ прѣидѣ** 179r, **да прѣидѣтъ**·| 181r, **вънѣдете** 137r, **ѡзбѣдете** 137r, **възбѣдете** 27r, **прѣидѡу** etc. 180r, 202v, **ѡ прѣидѡу** 43r, **прѣидѡутъ** же 161r; — 2. **покажѣтъ** 256r; — 3. **лѡвѣтъ** 38r, **лѡвитъ** бо 178v, **лѡвите** 164r, **лѡвите** мѧ 50r, **лѡвѡ**·| 164r, 264v; — 4. **ѡ не мѡгоу** 181v, **мѡжеши** 160v, **мѡжѣтъ** etc. 22r, 22v, 25v, 26r, 39v, 41r, 163v, **мѡжѣтъ** 40v, **не мѡжѣ** 14v, 26v, **ѡ не мѡжѣ** 39v, **не ѡзнемѡжѣтъ** 394r, **мѡжемъ** 49r, **мѡжете** 161r, **не мѡжете** 29v, **не мѡжете** 34v, **поимѡгоу** 159r, **не възмѡгоу** 180r; — 5. **разбѡру** 202r, **не разбѡритъ** сѧ 139v; — 6. **тѡвѡру** 21v, 39r, 40r, 107r/v, 107v, **не тѡвѡру** 30r, 40r, **сътѡвѡру** 201v, 202r, **да сътѡвѡру** 33v, **тѡвориши** 21r, 26v (2x), 35v, 39v, 107r,

264r, твѣрѣть 15r, 26v, 27v, 42v, 43r, 264v, твѣрѣи 15r, 44v, ѿ сътворѣи 179r, сътворѣимъ 21r, 43r, твѣрѣте etc. 31r (2x), 164r, сътворѣте 107r, твѣрѣ etc. 23r, 161r, 164r (2x), 263r, 264v, 267r; — 7. хѣдитъ 37v, въхѣдѣи 256r, ѿсхѣдитъ 23v, не ѿсхѣдѣи 110v, не въхѣдите 111r; — 8. хѣщоу 160v, не хѣщоу 107v, хѣщеши 160v, 403v, хѣщеши ли 24v, хѣщеши ли 404v, хѣще 27v, 36v, 161v, 180v, 404v, хѣщемъ 44r 1pl, хѣщете 26r, 34v, 42r (2x), 53r, 164r 2pl; — 9. прѣиметь 36v, ѿиметъ сѧ 108r, прѣимете 107r, въспрѣимеутъ etc. 164r, 264v, 265v, не прѣимеутъ вы 137r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. йдоу etc. 29r, 29v (3x), 108r, 201r, 201v, йдеши 201r, йдетъ 44r, 45v, 180v, 257r, ѿ йде 179r, 181v, йдемъ 26r, йдоу 38r, не йдоу 38r; — 2. ймамъ etc. 30r, 33v, не ймамъ etc. 24v, 32v (2x), 35r, 201v, 256v (2x), ѿ не ймамъ 181v, ймамы бѣ 180r, ймаши etc. 26r, 27v, 32r (2x), 32v, 35r, 36r, 202r, ймать etc. 22r, 23r, 28v, 36v, 41v, 42r, 110v, 163v, 181v, 394r (2x), 394v, не ймать etc. 21v (2x), 28v, 35v (3x), 47v/48r, 139v, 201r, не йматъ ли 44r, ймамы 31r, ймате 45v (3x), 107r, 110v, 138r, не ймате 20r, 22v, 264r, ймоу 28v, 107v, 180r, 201r, не ймоу 23v, 180v, не ймоутъ бѣ 138r; — 3. ймеша 109v, не ймѣ 45v, 47r, ймемъ 21r, не ймете 30r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. вхѣдѣ 47v, прѣхѣдѣ 180r, ѿ ѿсхѣдѣ:~ 158v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. блѣзнить 25v, съблѣзните сѧ 24r; — 2. ѿйзбѣнить 37v; — 3. ни жѣнатъ сѧ 109r; — 4. да ни жѣжѣю 32v, въжѣжѣетъ сѧ 32r; — 5. съзѣжѣ 202r; — 6. не възѣдоу 27r; — 7. прѣемлетъ 34r, прѣемлю 109v; — 8. ѿ възѣщете 29v; — 9. коупимъ 36v, 138r, коупѣ 31v, 138r; — 10. люблю 52r, възлюблю 50v; — 11. молю 51v, молю тѣ 180r, молиши сѧ 264v, молите сѧ 181r (Lk. 11:2), молите сѧ 265r (Mt. 6:9); — 12. ѿ понѣсѣ 162v; — 13. прѣсѣши 32r, въспрѣсѣи 182r, прѣсѣте 50r, 54v, въспрѣсѣте 107r;⁵⁷ — 14. рѣшѣю 25v; — 15. слоужитъ etc. 44v (2x); — 16. стражѣшѣ 180r, стражѣ 110r; — 17. соужѣю 29r, не соужѣю 29r, да соужѣдоу 46v, соуждите 29r; — 18. не хрѣни 41r; — 19. ѿщѣтитъ 44r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. молиши сѧ 264v; — 2. постѣте сѧ 265v; — 3. не въпросѣте 54v (Jn. 16:23); — 4. страждѣю 180r (Lk. 16:24); — 5. съхранишь ю 44v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. не ѿщоу 35r, ѿщеши 33v, ѿще 27v (2x), 33r, ѿ ѿще 26v, ѿщете 27v, 31r (2x), ѿщоу 28r.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. нѣсмь 29v, нѣсми 29r, нѣсмь бѣ 179r, нѣсмы 31r, нѣсте 23r, 35r, нѣсте ли 109r, нѣсте ли 267r, нѣсте бѣ 39r; — 2. ѿврѣзетъ сѧ 182r (2x), ѿ ѿврѣзетъ сѧ 182r; — 3. вѣмъ 28v, 29r, 31r, 33r, 36r (2x), вѣмъ тѣ 158r, не вѣмъ 36r, 41r, 250r, 259v, вѣсть 27v, 28v, 180v, вѣсть бѣ 265r, не вѣсть 45v, 404v, ѿповѣсть 42r, оувѣсть 264v; — 4. дамъ 32r, 32v, 39r (2x), дѣсть etc. 21r, 21v, 181v, 182r, ѿ дѣсть 393v, ѿ дѣсть сѧ 108r, 181v, 182r, ѿ не дѣсть 181v, не дѣстъ ли 109r/v, въздѣсть etc.

⁵⁷ This lexeme is also attested in the AU ѿ въпрошѣю вы 260v; cf. section 6.8.3.2.

264v, 265r, 265v/266r, *подáсть* etc. 182r (3x), *предáсты| сá* 257r, *й дáмы* 138r; — 5. *рѣкѹ* 107r, *й рѣкѹ* 202r; — 6. *трѣ́плю* 110r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *бо́йм сá* 107v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. *ѣсмь* 29v, 30r (2x), 38r, 109r, 179r, *ѣсмь* 139r, *ѣсть* 35r, 42v, 394r, *ѣсть* 21r, 164v, 266r, *ѣсте* 29v, 34v, 39v, *ѣсте* 29v, 31r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *вѣмы* etc. 28r, 33r, 41v, 42r, 42v, *й вѣмы* 34v, *не вѣмы* 41v (2x), 42v, 107v, *вѣмъ же* 42v (Jn. 9:31) *вѣсте* 28v, 29r, *й вѣсте* 28v, *не вѣсте* etc. 28v, 33r, 33v, 42v, 43r, *да ѿвѣсте* 163v, *не вѣдатъ* 23v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ѣста* 404v 2du; — 2. *не вѣсте* 29r; — 3. *възгласѣть* 260r, *не възгласѣть* 250v; — 4. *ѿпоустѣть* 265v (2x); — 5. *наречѣт сá* 393v, *речѣмь* 107v, *речѣте* etc. 107r, 110v, *речѣвъ* 404v 1du.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *сѣлю́дѣ* 35v (3x); — 2. *соу́ть* 26r, 48r, *соу́* 26r, 48r; — 3. *й съврѣшѹ* 33v; — 4. *не вѣдаѹ* 42r 1sg (Jn. 9:25), *не вѣдаѹ* 250r; — 5. *грáдоу* 50r, *грáдѣ* 33r, *грáдоу* 50r; — 6. *поклѣ́нат сá* 33r; — 7. *съкрѣши́т сá* 108r; — 8. *въскрѣшѹ* 21v, *й възскрѣситѣ* 108v; — 9. *лѣститѣ* 27r; — 10. *мѣще́те* 39v; — 11. *да ѿмѣчитѣ* 179v; — 12. *мнѣ́т сá* 24r, 44r, 257r, *мнѣ́тъ* 109v, 249v, *мнѣ́тъ бѹ* 265r; — 13. *възмоу́тит сá* 24v; — 14. *подѣ́бит сá* 250r; — 15. *свѣ́тит сá* 3r; — 16. *достѣ́итѣ* 33r, *не достѣ́итѣ́ тѣ* 25r, *достѣ́ит ли* 267v; — 17. *сѣнѣ́сть* 22v, 267r, *не снѣ́сте* 22v; — 18. *тлѣ́тъ* 266r (2x); — 19. *йста́жѹ* 202r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ювѣ́т сá* 203r; — 2. *велѣ́тъ* 158v; — 3. *възвѣ́ститѣ* 33r; — 4. *погубѣ́тъ ю* 44v; — 5. *дивѣ́те сá* 28r; — 6. *поклонѣ́те сá* 33r (Jn. 4:21); — 7. *възнесѣ́те* 30r; — 8. *спѣ́ет сá* 38r; — 9. *й ро́дѣши* 393v; — 10. *да| сѣ́иѣ сá* 181r (Lk. 11:2); — 11. *не достѣ́итѣ* 267r; — 12. *оу́чиши* 42v.

Parallels to the accentuation of most AU belonging to CSI a.p. *a* are well attested in both ESI and SSI sources. As for *-бити*, (together with *-рѣсти* accentuated with *iso* on the prefixes *оу-* and *об-*, respectively, in F) accentuation on the ending is regularly attested in GrR sources, whereas MBlg sources show accentuation on the root.⁵⁸ Thematic accentuation of the lexeme *видѣти* is attested mainly in WGrR sources. In F thematic accentuation is attested once in the infinitive (cf. section 3.7.5.2).

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, what is worth noting is the absence of thematic accentuation of the lexeme *ходити* as attested in F 6a *й ѿсхѹдѣ́* (cf. 3.7.1.2), M here showing the expected accentuation on the root. Similarly, the present tense AU of *прити* accentuated on the prefix in F (cf. section 3.8.3.4) has no counterpart in M.

⁵⁸ Dybo 1983:26f, 39, Zaliznjak 1985a:365.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **страждоу** are attested mainly in GrR sources, whereas both Ukr and SSl sources show accentuation on the root in the first person singular.⁵⁹

In the AU **мѣлиши сѧ** the position of *kamora* coincides with the expected position of ictus, but parallels with accentuation on the ending—particularly in the second person singular—are attested in both WGrR and some SSl sources (cf. section 3.1.4.2.3).⁶⁰ The same applies to the AU **не въпросите**. Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **постите сѧ** and **съхранить ю**, on the other hand, are well attested in ESl sources, where these verbs belong to a group of CSI a.p. *b* verbs regularly showing accentuation according to a.p. *c* (cf. section 3.1.4.2.3). Note, however, that the accentuation on the ending in the present tense second person plural might be due to influence from the *imperative* second person plural, which in both ESl and SSl sources normally shows accentuation on the corresponding syllable.

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* M more frequently than F shows accentuation on the ending, thus better reflecting the CSI accentuation. Accentuation on the root in this category is mainly attested in MBlg sources. Note, however, that both **-мочити** (regularly) and **-свѣтити** (partly) in ESl sources show accentuation according to a.p. *b*,⁶¹ whereas **подобити** in both ESl and SSl sources is not unfrequently attested with accentuation according to a.p. *a*.⁶²

Parallels to the accentuation of both **поклѣнат сѧ** and **поклоните сѧ** are attested in ESl sources,⁶³ but the accentuation of the latter AU can perhaps also be explained by influence from the imperative. As for the prefixed verb **до-стоюти**, accentuation on the ending is mainly attested in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show accentuation on the root.⁶⁴ Consequently, in the AU **не достоить** *oksia* indicates the presence of a SSl component in the accentuation of M.

⁵⁹ Cf., for example, Čud. **стражю** 139a (Ušakov 1982:345), Smotr. 1648 213r **страждоу**, Polik. **страждѣ** (but **состраждѣ**), *Slovar'* 1847 IV:232 **страдати**, **стражду** as well as NT 1816 Luke 16:24 **страждѣ**, Smotr. 1619 1r, 94v **страждѣ**, Ber. 1627:122 **страждѣ**. Note, however, ОВа **страждоу**, -ѣши (Schweier 1987:105), D'jačenko 1899:669 **страждѣ**.

⁶⁰ Cf., for example, Is. Sir. 43v **помѣиши сѧ** (Dybo 1982a:258) as well as Zaliznjak 1981:153.

⁶¹ Cf., for example, ОВа **омѣтитъ**, МВ **свѣтитъ** (Schweier 1987:84, 87), Zaliznjak 1981:152, 154, 1985a:137, Bulatova 1975:130.

⁶² Cf., for example, МВ **подбѣит сѧ** etc. (Schweier 1987:85), Zaliznjak 1979:110, Stadnikova 1989:150, Is. Sir. 43v **да спѣбѣиши сѧ** etc. (Dybo 1983:12f).

⁶³ Zaliznjak 1981:159, 1985a:140, Bulatova 1975:130.

⁶⁴ Cf., for example, Zogr. sb. 262r **достоить** etc. (Dybo 1987:187), Zaliznjak 1981:159, 1985a:362. The non-prefixed **стоюти**, however, regularly shows accentuation on the ending in ESl sources, as well.

6.7.2. *Imperative*6.7.2.1. *aj-, ěj-, and ova-verbs**CSl stress on the root*

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **дѣлаи** 107v, **дѣлаи**те 20v; — 2. **почиѣаи** 202r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **рѣй** сѧ 393v, **възрѣи**те сѧ 163r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **не съкрываи**те 266r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣ**роуи^{те} 40r, 45v, **вѣ**роуи^{те} 45v; — 2. **по-**мѣлоуи 110r, **по**мѣлоуи **ма** 179v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѹ**готѣваи^{та} 256r 2du.

CSl stress on the thematic element

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **прѣбываи**те 137r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **дръз**аи^{те} 139r.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **не съкрываи**те, contrasting with the accentuation in F, are mainly attested in ESl sources. Note, however, that *kamora* with this root, as in the corresponding **съкрѣ**ваи^{те} **же** F 16a, in some ESl sources does not indicate ictus (cf. section 2.3.2.4).

The accentuation of the lexemes **радовати** сѧ and **-чивати** is identical to that in F, with parallels mainly in SSl sources.⁶⁵ The same applies to the AU **ѹ**готѣваи^{та}, whereas the accentuation of the remaining AU with CSl stress on the root has parallels in both ESl and SSl sources.

Parallels to the accentuation of **прѣбываи**те are mainly attested in SSl sources, whereas the accentuation of **дръз**аи^{те} has parallels in ESl sources.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Note, however, that both **рѣй** сѧ and **възрѣи**те сѧ probably constitute graphic clichés, with *oksia* not primarily indicating ictus.

⁶⁶ Cf., for example, ОВа **дръз**аи^{те} (Schweier 1987:65).

6.7.2.2. Other verbs

CSl *a.p.* a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣжѣ** 267r; — 2. **въврѣси** 109v (Mt. 17:27), **ѣврѣси сѧ** 107r, **ѣ въврѣсѣ|тє** 158v; — 3. **дѣйгни сѧ** 107r; — 4. **въ|стѧнѣтє** 52r, 403v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въстанѣ** 24v, 163v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣзбѧ|ви** 265r, **ѣзбѧ** 181v (Lk. 11:4) 2sg;⁶⁷ — 2. **боудѣ** 394r 3sg (Lk. 1:38), **ѣ боудѣ** 135v 2sg, **боудѣтє** 164v; — 3. **нє двѣжи сѧ** 179r; — 4. **ѣ|стѧви** 201v, **ѣ|стѧви** 181r, 265r; — 5. **стѧни** 267v, **въстѧни** 163v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **нє боудѣ** 264v; — 2. **ѣ видѣтє** 138r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **оумѣи сѧ** 40v; — 2. **плѧчитє** 262v, **нє плѧчитє** 262v; — 3. **прослѧ|ви** 45r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **по|вѣдѣтє** 404r (Mt. 17:9); — 2. **ѣчистѣи сѧ** 160v (Lk. 5:13).

CSl *a.p.* b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сѣтвѣри** 179r, **сѣтвѣритє** 36v; — 2. **възмѣ** etc. 109v, 262r, **възмѣ** 24v, 25r (2x), **ѣ възмѣ** 163v, **прѣймѣтє** 256v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣдѣ** 20v, 32v, 40v, 41r, 179r, **ѣ ѣдѣ** 26v, **сѣнидѣ** 20r, **прѣидѣ** 110v, **ѣдѣтє** 138r, **прѣдѣтє** etc. 33v, 137v, **нє ѣзидѣтє** 202v; — 2. **ходѣ** 201v, **ѣ ходѣ** 163v, **ѣ ходѣ** 24v, 25r (2x), **ходѣтє** 45v; — 3. **ѣмѣ** 33r (Jn. 4:21).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣцѣтє** 181v, 182r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вънѣди** 264v, **прѣидѣ** 179r, **прѣидѣ** 26v, **ѣзѣди** 159r, **ѣ ѣзѣди** 158r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **любѣтє** 164v (Lk. 6:35), **дѧ любѣтє** 23r (Jn. 15:17); — 2. **просѣтє** 53r, 181v, 182r, **въпросѣтє** 41v, 42r; — 3. **творѣтє** etc. 164r, 164v, 256v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **глѣ|тє** 181r (Lk. 11:2); — 2. **нє| рѣпшитє** 22r; — 3. **ѣ по|слѣ** 179v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **покажѣ** 49v; — 2. **помолѣ сѧ** 264v; — 3. **ѣсѧжѣтє мѧ** 47v; — 4. **соудѣтє** 28r, **нє соудѣтє** 28r; — 5. **нє въстрѣ|ѣи** 264r/v.

⁶⁷ Fol. 181v here reads **нѣ ѣзбѧ нѣ ѣ лоукѧваагѣ**.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **дѣѣѣ** 31v, 32r, 32v, 42r, 109v, 181v, 265r; — 2. **тлѣцѣтѣ** 181v, 182r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣ не въведѣ** 265r, **приведѣтѣ ми** 110r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **не бѣи сѣ** etc. 159v, 393v, **не бѣитѣ сѣ** 403v, **не бѣитѣ сѣ** 139r; — 2. **прѣмлѣчи** 158r; — 3. **рѣцѣ** 179r, 260r, **прорѣцѣ** 249v, **ѣ рѣцѣ** 1та 256r 2du.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **рѣцѣ** 39r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сѣсѣ мѣ** 45r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сѣблѣдѣтѣ** 50r; — 2. **веселѣ сѣ** 202r; — 3. **пригласѣ** 32v; — 4. **дадѣтѣ** 138r; — 5. **даѣтѣ** 164v; — 6. **помѣнѣ** 180r; — 7. **ѣпоустѣ** же 262r; — 8. **распѣнѣ** 262r; — 9. **ѣтрѣсѣтѣ** 137r; — 10. **наоѣчѣ ны** 181r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣждѣ** 33v, 202r.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *a* accentuation on the root, with parallels in ESl sources, is better attested than in F (cf. section 3.7.2.2). The AU with accentuation on the ending, however, indicate the presence of two components in the accentuation of the imperative in M, as well. This is particularly apparent in the AU **не боѣдѣ**, where *oksia* and *kamora* indicate the position of ictus typical of ESl and EBlg sources, respectively. In the AU **поѣвѣдѣтѣ** *oksia* probably pertains to the letter **ѣ**, thus conforming to the normal ESl accentuation of the imperative.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *b* accentuation on the ending is more frequent than in F. Worth noting is also the vacillation—already within corpus A, but without parallels in F—in the accentuation of **-творитѣ** and prefixed forms of **-итѣ**.

The AU **ѣшатѣ** has exact parallels in F 10b **ѣшатѣ**, notwithstanding the different interpretations of the functions of *iso* above initial vowels in F and M. In section 3.7.2.2 the phonetic basis for this accentuation in F was considered doubtful, but the presence of the same accentuation in M, where *iso* in this position cannot be disqualified as an indication of ictus, diminishes the probability of this analysis. On the other hand, the accentuation in M could as well just constitute a result of mechanical copying of a 'phonetic' or 'non-phonetic' accentuation in the protograph.

As for CSl a.p. *c*, the original accentuation is relatively well reflected in both F and M. The exceptions are partly similar, with e.g. both **прѣмлѣчи** and **тлѣцѣтѣ** having *oksia* above the sequence **лѣ**. Note, however, the non-standard accentuation in the AU **рѣцѣ**, leaving the sequence **рѣ**—at least in ESl sources probably in asyllabic position—

without accent mark. Parallels to the accentuation of the imperative of **БОЯТИ СЯ** are well attested in ESl sources, whereas MBlg sources normally show accentuation on the ending.⁶⁸ Final accentuation in the imperative of **-ПАТИ** is well attested in both ESl and SSl sources. As for the accentuation on the prefix in the AU **РАСП'НИ**, cf. section 6.8.2.4.

Comparing the accentuation of the imperative in M and F, some differences can clearly be seen: firstly, no general opposition between the singular and the plural can be discerned in M. Secondly, due to the accentuation of the root within CSI a.p. *a*, the accentuation of M conforms less to a MBlg pattern, and thirdly, *kamora* is less frequently used in M than in F,⁶⁹ which also indicates a less MBlg type of accentuation in M.

6.7.3. Present participle active

6.7.3.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSI stress on the root

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ВЪРОУА** 46r, 50r, **ВЪРѸ|АИ** 46r, **И ВЪРѸ|А** 22r, **И ВЪРОУА|И** 21v, **ВЪРОУЮЩЕ** 107r, **НЕ ВЪРОУЮЩЕИ** 26r; — 2. **ВЪ|СТРѢСАЮЩЕ** 267r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ПРОПОВѢДАА** 160r; — 2. **КЛАН|АА СЯ** 110r;⁷⁰ — 3. **СѢ|ТОУЮЩЕ** 265v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **СѢТЕЛ'СТВОУА|И** 29r.

CSI stress on the thematic element

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **СЪБИРА|И** 202r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **РАЗ'ВРАЩАЮЩА** 261v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **БОГАТѢА** 202r; — 2. **ЖЕЛАА** 261r.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **ПРЕБЫВА|И** 49v; — 3. **И ЗАПРѢЩАА** 160r (Lk. 4:41).

⁶⁸ Zaliznjak 1985a:355, Schweier 1987:75, Ivanov 1931:236. Note, however, Ev. 1355/56 85v **НЕ БОИТЕ СЯ ВѸ** (Matt. 28:5).

⁶⁹ Within corpus A only two AU, **ВЪСТАНИ** 163v and **ИДИ** 179r, show *kamora* above a final **-И** in the imperative second person singular.

⁷⁰ Note, that the lexeme **КЛАНЯТИ** is normally reconstructed with CSI stress on the root, although it is derived from **КЛОНИТИ**, belonging to CSI a.p. *c*; cf. Bulatova 1975:206, Zaliznjak 1985a:123, 133.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **развѣрацающа** can be attested in MBlg sources, whereas ESl sources show thematic accentuation.⁷¹ As for **богатѣа**, parallels are attested in ESl sources.⁷²

6.7.3.2. Other verbs

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣдаа** 40v, **вѣдааи** 22r, 265r, 265v, **вѣдааи** 264v, **и вѣдааи** 46r, **вѣдааще** 263v, **вѣдаащїи** etc. 180v, 404v nom du n; — 2. **славаѣа** 164r, **славааи** ма 36r

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вадааще** 261v; — 2. **гѣбляюще**. 20v (Jn. 6:27); — 3. **ненаваѣа** 23v, **и ненаваѣаи** 44v; — 4. **плачающеи** 162v **плачаущимъ** 46v dat pl; — 5. **слышащен** 136r; — 6. **сѣаи** 34r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и бл҃гославааще** 48v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣлчаущеи** 162v.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **любааи** 44v, 50v, **любаащаа** 164r; — 2. **мблааа** са 160v, **и мблааа са** 160v, **мблѣаащѣу са** 181r, **мблѣааще же са** 265r; — 3. **и прбсаа** 40v; — 4. **и страѣащѣущеи** 162r, 162v; — 5. **тврѣаа** 14v, **тврѣааи** 30v, **тврѣааща** 14v, **тврѣаащѣу** 264v, **тврѣаащѣомѣу** 108r, **тврѣааще** 111r, **тврѣаащїимъ** 164r dat pl; — 6. **хбдаа** 139r, **ѡхбдаа** 160v, **хбдааи** 28v, **и хбдааи** 45v, **схбдааи** 21r, **не въхбдааи** 37v, **ѣ въхбдааи** 37v, **хбдааща** 139r, **захбдаащѣ** 159v, **ми въхбдаащїихъ** 111r, **исхбдааще** 137r, **прихбдаащен** 137v, **и ѡхбдаащен** 137v, **прихбдааще** 179v, **и схбдаащемъ** 403v dat pl; — 7. **хотѣа** 262r, **хбтааще** 180r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **идѣуща** 137v, **идѣущѣма** 46v dat du m; — 2. **ицѣа** 35r, **и йцѣаи** 182r, **и йцѣуще** 108v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **любаащаа** 164r; — 2. **прѣсааи** 181v, 182r, **прѣсаащїимъ** 182v dat pl (Lk. 11:13).

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и жѣнааи** 34r (2x); — 2. **хвалааще** 48v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **гѣаи** 33r; — 2. **хотѣаи** 257r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ймы** 267v, **ймоуши** 24r Lsf (Jn. 5:2), **ймѣща** 261v nom du m.

⁷¹ Cf., for example, ОВА **развѣрацающа** (Schweier 1987:64).

⁷² Cf., for example, МВ **богатѣа** (Schweier 1987:63, 108).

CSl *a.p. c*

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **грѣды** 21v; — 2. **и зрѣ** 201v; — 3. **и тлѣ-коушомоу** etc. 182r (2x).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **оўчѣ** 28v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **оўчѣцѣ** 107r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сѣи** 43r, **соуца** 160r, **соуцоу** etc. 25r, 178v, 261r, **и соуцоу** 250r, **соуцѣи** 37v, **соуцаѣѣ** 159r, **и соуцимь** 267v dat pl m, **сѣ-це** 32r; — 2. **вѣды же** 25v; — 3. **скрѣѣѣ** 267v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **и пѣи** 25r; — 2. **сѣи** 43v, **сѣи** 31v, 39v, 179v, 263v.

Among the AU belonging to CSl *a.p. b* accentuation on the root is most commonly attested in both F and M. Contrasting with F, however, both **-любѣти** and **-просѣти** are in M also attested with thematic accentuation, paralleled in ESl sources.⁷³ As for **прѣсѣцѣи**, ‘double accentuation’ in this type of formation, although rare in M, has parallels in sources with various backgrounds (cf. section 5.4.6).

Among the AU belonging to CSl *a.p. c*, parallels to the accentuation of **оўчѣцѣ**—the corresponding AU in F has initial *iso*—are attested in both ESl and SSl sources. The same applies to **оўчѣѣ**, reflecting CSl initial ‘automatic’ stress (cf. section 3.7.3.2). In the AU with non-ictus final *varia* the accent mark is written above the vowel which, at least in the CSl period, and possibly also in the present scribe’s system, was stressed. Nevertheless, *varia* cannot be said to *indicate* ictus in these AU (cf. section 5.4.7).

6.7.4. Present participle passive

6.7.4.1. *aj-*, *ěj-*, and *ova-*verbs*CSl stress on the thematic element*

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **нарицаѣмагѣ** 161v.

⁷³ Cf., for example, ОВа **любѣщи**хъ, **просѣѣ**, **просѣи** (Schweier 1987:83, 86), Zaliznjak 1985a: 357.

6.7.4.2. Other verbs

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **да вѣдѣми** 264r; — 2. **знáѣми** 263v.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣдрѣжимь** 24v, **ѣдрѣжима** 159v.

Parallels to the accentuation of both **-видѣти** and **-знати** are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources. The verb **-дрѣжати**, on the other hand, normally shows accentuation on the suffix in ESl sources. Note, however, that *oksia* above **рѣ** cannot be considered as a wholly reliable indication of the position of ictus (cf. section 5.4.2.1).

6.7.5. Infinitive

6.7.5.1. *aj-*, *ěj-*, and *ova-*verbs

CSl stress on the root

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣровати** 46r, 108r; — 2. **дѣлати** 40r; — 3. **клáнати сѧ** 32v; — 4. **послоушати** 162v;⁷⁴ — 5. **ѣстáвати** 163v; — 6. **по-чрѣпати** 31v, 32v.

CSl stress on the thematic element

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **посылати** etc. 136v (2x).

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣлѣвати** 161v; — 2. **вѣпрáшати** 54r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **прикасáти сѧ** 162r.

Among the AU with CSl thematic stress only **прикасáти сѧ** has well attested parallels in ESl sources, whereas accentuation on the root is typical of EBlg sources.

⁷⁴ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **пѣслоушати** 25v; cf. section 6.8.2.4.

6.7.5.2. Other verbs

CSl *a.p.* a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣсти** etc. 21r, 22v, 33v (2x), 138r (2x), 256v (2x), 267r, **и ни ѣсти** 137v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣдѣти** 35v (2x), 44v, 180v, 261r, 261v, 405r, **вѣдѣтѣ**, 202v; — 2. **ѡстѣти** 139v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣзѣти** сѧ 21v; — 2. **оубѣти** etc. 14v, 26v, 27v (2x), 28r, 31r (2x), 263r; — 3. **вѣдити** 260v; — 4. **ненавѣдѣти** 26v; — 5. **ѡкрѣти** etc. 180v, 404v; — 6. **и моучити** 249v; — 7. **слѣшати** 34v, 42r, 160v, **и слѣшати** 180v, 405r; — 8. **насытити** сѧ 179v; — 9. **вѣсхѣти**ти 39v; — 10. **ѡчѣсти**ти 160v.

CSl *a.p.* b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **твѣрити** etc. 14v, 27v, 34v/35r, 41r, 42v, 267r, 267v, **не твѣрити** 264r, **сѣтвѣрити** etc. 36v, 136v, 161r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡти** 108v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣнѣти** etc. 111r, 138v, 138v, **прѣйти** 22r, 26r, 29v, 44r, 179r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **прѣложѣти** 181v; — 2. **творѣти** 267v, **сѣтворѣти** 257r; — 3. **вѣзѣти** 203r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣти** 26r, 404r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и не ѡблѣчити** сѧ 136v; — 2. **жѣти** 34r (Jn. 4:38).

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **искѣти** 257r; — 2. **моѣти** сѧ 181r, 264v, **помоѣти** сѧ 138v, 161v; — 3. **носѣти** 262v, **приносѣти** 53r; — 4. **и соудѣти** 30r; — 5. **ходѣти** 26v, 28v.

CSl *a.p.* c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **бѣти** 24v, 26v, 42v, 110v, 139r, 179v, 181r, 202v, 249v, 257r, 261r, 262v, 403v, **не бѣти** 108v; — 2. **сѣверѣти** 201v; — 3. **дѣти** 22v, 181v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **погрѣбѣти** 201v (2x); — 2. **погубѣти** 267v; — 3. **изгнѣти** 110v; — 4. **поклѣбити** 201v; — 5. **пѣти** etc. 31v (2x), 32r, 256v; — 6. **рѣши** 163v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **погоубѣти** 158r, 404v; — 2. **даги** 182r, 261r; — 3. **ѡпоустѣти** 262r; — 4. **посади́ти** 138r; — 5. **оучѣти** 136r137v; — 6. **ѡсцѣлѣти** 110r (Mt. 17:16).⁷⁵

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *a* are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b* the 'thematic' accentuation of most AU has parallels in ESl sources, whereas EBlg sources normally show accentuation on the root in this category. The AU **в'зати**, however, has parallels only in some EGrR sources, while other ESl as well as MBlg sources regularly show accentuation on the root.⁷⁶ The unrefixed **ѡти**, on the other hand, is attested with accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources.

Prefixed variants of **-ити**, providing the prefix ends in a consonant, regularly show accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources, whereas formations with prefixes ending in a vowel are normally accentuated on the root primarily in SSl sources. Root accentuations, however, also attested in some WGrR sources with definalization and—more generally—as 'specifically literary' accentuation in ESl source.⁷⁷ The same applies to the simple **ити** (cf. section 3.7.5.2).

The accentuation of most AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* has parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. Note, however, that parallels to the accentuation of **погрѣѣсти** are attested mainly in some WGrR sources whereas most ESl sources show final accentuation in the infinitive of **-гѣти**.⁷⁸

6.7.6. Aorist

6.7.6.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSI stress on the root

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **оу|готѣваша** 264r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡ повѣда** 25r; — 2. **вѣрова** 45v, **ѡ вѣрова** 20v (2x), **вѣровахѡ** 26r 1pl, **вѣроваша** etc. 30v, 34r, 34v, 46r, 108r, **не вѣровасте** 107v, **ѡ не вѣровасте** 108r 2pl; — 3. **знамена** 21r (Jn. 6:27); — 4. **ѡ вѣрадо-ва|са** 36r; — 5. **ра|стрѣса** 249v.

⁷⁵ In the corresponding text in F 3a:1 (cf. section 5.2) the original presence or absence of accent marks cannot be inferred, as the folio is cut (see Wesslén 1985:155f). Consequently, the AU in M must be considered belonging to corpus B.

⁷⁶ See Zaliznjak 1981:129, 1985a:352f, Hinrichs 1985:95.

⁷⁷ Zaliznjak 1985a:351, Schweier 1987:126, 130ff, 172f.

⁷⁸ Zaliznjak 1985a:354, Schweier 1987:126, 132.

CSl stress on the thematic element

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **разоумѣша** 108v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѿвѣщаша** 42v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѿвѣща** 22r, 32v, **ѿвѣщаша** 31r*.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **именова** 161v.

The verb **-вѣщати** shows accentual vacillation in M, not only in the aorist (cf. section 6.7.8.1). Parallels to the accentuation in **ѿвѣщаша** are also attested in F in the infinitive and the past participle active (cf. sections 3.7.5.1 and 3.7.8.1), probably constituting ‘specifically literary’ or ‘South Slavonic’ accentuations.

6.7.6.2. Other verbs

CSl *a.p. a*

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣдѣхъ** 31r 1s, **вѣдѣ** 40r, 137v, **и вѣдѣ** 36r, 36v, 138v, 158v, **вѣдѣхѹ** 164r 1pl, **и вѣдѣсте** etc. 21v, 49r 2pl, **вѣдѣша** etc. 139r, 264r, 403v, **и вѣдѣша** 137v, **и не вѣдѣша** 180v, 405r; — 2. **ѿверѣже** сѧ 250r; — 3. **исплѣни** сѧ 27r, **и исплѣниши** 164r, **и исплѣниши** 159r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡстаѡви** 20v, 108v, **и ѡстаѡви ю** 159v, **не ѡстаѡви мене** 30r (Jn. 8:29), **ѡстаѡви же** 33v, **пѡстаѡви е** 109v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **припадѣ** 159r, **падѡша** 403v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **възѡлка** 106v; — 2. **възненавѣдѣ** 23r, **възненавѣдѣша** мѧ 23v, **и възненавѣдѣша** 23v; — 3. **погѣбе** 51v; — 4. **и не познѡ** 49v 2s, **и познѡхѹ** 26r 1pl, **познѡсте** 49r 2pl, **и познѡша** 137v; — 5. **ѿкры** сѧ 45v, **сѣкры** сѧ 45v; — 6. **и помѡла** etc. 40v, 41r; — 7. **и помрѣче** 263r; — 8. **плѡка** сѧ 260r; — 9. **плѡноу** 40v; — 10. **ѡбрѣтѡ** 179r, 262r, **ѡбрѣтѣ** 106v, **и ѡбрѣте** 43r, **ѡбрѣте** бѡ 393v, **ѡбрѣтоша** 179r, **ѡбрѣтоста** 256r 3du; — 11. **и прѡслѡви** 45r, **и прѡслѡви** сѧ 51v, **прѡслѡви** 263v; — 12. **слѣшѡ** 30r, 31r, **оуслѣша** 43r, **слѣшѡхѹмъ** etc. 34v, 45r, 260v, **слѣшастѣ** 249v, **не слѣшастѣ** 42r, **и слѣшаша** 37v, **и не слѣшаша** 181r, 405r; — 13. **стѡ** 162r (2x), **ѡстѡ** 27r, **прѣстѡ** etc. 158v, 181r; — 14. **насытиши** 37r, **и насытиши** 138v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **низвѣсѣша** 163r; — 2. **не раскѡистѣ** сѧ 108r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣдѡша** 21r, **ѣдѡша** 25v.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *посла* etc. 21r, 28v, 34v, 178v, 178v/179r, 261r, *й посла* 39v, 404r, *посла ма* 25v; — 2. *сътвърй* etc. 28r (2x), 33v, 34r, 179r, *сътвърй* 23v, 25r (2x), 37r, 41r (2x), 108r, 262r, 267r, 393r, *й сътворй* 40v, *сътвърйша* 44r, 137r, *сътвърйша* 250v; — 3. *начаша* etc. 257r, 260v, *й начаша* etc. 163v, 249v, 267r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *пристоупйша* etc. 44r, 108v, 139r, 160v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. *йде* 20r, 43v, 138v, 163v, *й йде* 33v, *йдаша* etc. 26r, 136r, 137v, 159v, *й йдаша* 404v; — 2. *йша* 47r, *йша* 159r (2x), *не йша* 41v, *не йша* 46v, 47r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ѡдѣжди* 203r; — 2. *прійде* 3r, 20r, 26v, 31v (2x), 44v, 136r, 139r, 181v, 250r, *й прійде* 44v, *не прійде* 404v, *прійде ж* 45r, *прійде бо* 108r, *вънйде* 159v, 178v, 202v, 267r, *й вънйде* 139r, 267v, *ѡтйде* 160v, *възйде* etc. 24r, 27r, 27v, *йзйде* 161v, 203r, *й йзйде* etc. 36r, 110r, 158r, 250r; — 3. *ѡстѣпи* 48v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ѡгобзй са* 201v; — 2. *й не йде* 108r, *й снидѡша* 137v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *бл҃говѣлихъ* 403v; — 2. *йздѣше* 263v; — 3. *сѣмидѣ* 22r, *прійдѣ* etc. 29r, 34v, 37v, 45r, 46r, *й прійдѣ* 31v, *не прійдѣ* 28v, *йзйдѣ* 31v, 34v, 51v, *вънйдоште* 34r, *прійдаша* etc. 34r, 139r, 162r, 162v, *й прійдоша* etc. 159r, 160r, 263r, *възйдоша* 27r, *й възйдаша* 43v, *йзйдоша же* 33v; — 4. *кѡснѣ* 160v; — 5. *й полѡжй* € 264r; — 6. *възлюбйша бо* 46r; — 7. *оумрѣша* 35v, *й оумрѡша* 25v; — 8. *сѣмѡти са* 393v, *й сѣмѡтиша* 139r; — 9. *й понѡси* 47r; — 10. *послѣх* 34r, *пѡслѣх бо* 262r; — 11. *въсхѡтѣша* 180v, *въсхѡтѣша* 405r; — 12. *начѡтъ* 136r (Mk. 6:2); — 13. *пріѣхъ* 38v, *пріѣтъ же* 37r (Jn. 6:11), *й вѣзѡша* 138v, *й не пріѡша* 404r, *възѡша же* etc. 36r, 39v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *й прѣварйша* 137v;⁷⁹ — 2. *възвратй* 261v; — 3. *ймѣ* 267r*; — 4. *възложйша* 326v, *й възложйша* 327r; — 5. *мѡлй* 158v*, *й молайша* 159v; — 6. *не възмѡгѡхъмъ* 110v, *й не възмогѡша* 110r; — 7. *прѡси* 263v, *въпрѡси* 261r (2x), *й въпрѡсийша* etc. 40r, 41v, *й въпрѣсийша* 108v; — 8. *пѡсоудй* 262v; — 9. *не трѡудйште са* 34r; — 10. *съхранйша* 51r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. *не ѣтъ* 29v (Jn. 8:20).

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. *йсѣ* 106v.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. *дѣсть* etc. 21r (2x), 21v, 27v, 28r, 31v, 32r, 39v, 107r, *й дѣсть* 256v, 267v, *подѣсть* 37r; — 2. *рѣхъ* 39r, 40r, *рѣ* 23r, 29v, 39v,

⁷⁹ Note, however, that this lexeme in ESI sources shows normally a.p. c; cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:139, Steensland 1990:130, 138f.

рѣхъ 25r, рече 14v, 202r, 261r, рѣ 256r, 262v, рѣша 20r, 25v, 31r, 35v, 41r, 107v, 110v, 260v, ѿ рѣша etc. 20v, 30v, 31r, 35r, 37v, 42r, 42v, 44r, 109r, рѣша же 21r (2x), 26v, 28v, 42r, 260v, речеоста 42r, рѣста 404v, ѿ рѣста 3du 41v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. оубоаша 108v, ѿ оубоаша 403v, боаста са 42r 3du.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. даша 44r, ѿ предаша 250v; — 2. възвѣ 28v, 46r, призвѣ 136v, 161v, ѿ призвѣ 136v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. възгласи etc. 250r, 250v, 262r, възгласиша 41v, възгласиша же 42r; — 2. ѿцѣли 136v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. съблюдоша 23r; — 2. бѣсте etc. 23r, 29v (2x), 31r (2x), 31v, 34v, 37v, 49r, не бѣсте 37v, бѣша 3r, 180v, 403r, 404v, не бѣша 23v (2x), бѣша же 38v, ѿзбѣша 37r, бѣста 261v 3du; — 3. ѿзѣрахъ вы 23r, съѣраша 43r, 326v, съѣраша 137r, съѣраша же 37r; — 4. вѣдоша 41r, вѣдоша 250v, повѣдоша 262v; — 5. ѡбви 264r (Lk. 23:53); — 6. ѡврѣзе etc. 41v, 42r, 42v, ѿ ѡврѣзе 41r, 42v; — 7. ѿзгнаша 23r, ѿ ѿзгнаша 42v, ѿзгнаша 43r; — 8. раѣра са 263r; — 9. прозрѣ 41r, прозрѣ 41r, възрѣ 260r, оузрѣ 179v; — 10. възлѣже 256v, ѿ възлѣгша 138r; — 11. пѣть 32r (Jn. 4:12); — 12. ѡпоусти же 262v; — 13. распаша 263r; — 14. оутверди 404r, ѿ оутверди са 267v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. еѣжаша 20r; — 2. вѣдоша 260v; — 3. ѿ възвѣстиша 137r; — 4. ѿ погрѣдоша 179v; — 5. не дойша 263r; — 6. оу-корѣша 42v; — 7. ѡмлъчаша 264r; — 8. рече 20r, 20v, 21v, 22r, 25r (2x), 28v, 29v, 33v, 38r, 45v, 107v, 108r, 110r, 110v, 139v, 164r, 179v, 181r, 182r, 202v, 257r, 262r, 265v, 393v, 403v, ѿ рече 14v, 32r (2x), 137v, 139r, рече ми 33v, ѿ рече ми 41r; — 9. роди са 54v;⁸⁰ — 10. наоучи ма 30r, ѿ наоучиша 137r/v.

As expected the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *a* mainly show accentuation on the root in both F and M. Parallels to the accentuation of **-пасти** are, however, attested in ESI sources.⁸¹ The same applies to the AU **низвѣсѣша**, with thematic accentuation of **-вѣсити** well attested, particularly in WGrR sources.⁸² The verb **-каѣти са**, on the other hand, regularly shows accentuation on the root in the aorist in ESI sources.⁸³ In the AU **не раскаѣсте са**, however, *oksia* written above a vowel in post-vocalic position at the end of a line might not constitute a wholly reliable indication of ictus (cf. sections 5.4.3 and 5.4.5).

Among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b* quite a few show a different accentuation than in F. Worth noting is e.g. the AU **ѡгобзи са**, with a characteristically ESI accentuation, contrasting with the EBlg type of accentuation in F (cf. section 3.7.6.2). Parallels to the accentuation of **ѡдѣжди**, on the other hand, are mainly attested in EBlg sources, where-

⁸⁰ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **роди са** 41v (2x); cf. section 6.8.1.1.

⁸¹ Cf., for example, **Оба падѣ, на-, припадѣ са, рас-, нападѣша** (Schweier 1987:127). Zaliznjak, however, reconstructs for the infinitive system CESI a.p. *a* (Zaliznjak 1985a:139).

⁸² Zaliznjak 1985a:357f.

⁸³ Cf., for example, **Оба раскаѣсте са** (Schweier 1987:103), **Ev. 1627 98v не раскаѣсте са**.

as ESl sources regularly show final accentuation.⁸⁴ The same applies to **ѡстѣпи**, contrasting with the AU **пристоупиша** (4x), whereas parallels to the accentuation of both the prefixed and simple forms of **-ити** are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Also among the remaining aorists belonging to CS1 a.p. *b* some, e.g. **бл҃говѣлихъ**, **кѣснѹ**, **ѣ полѣжї є**, **възлюбѣша бо**, **смѣути сѧ** and **ѣ сѣмѣутишѧ**, **ѣ понѣси**, and **въсхѣтѣшѧ**, show an accentuation not typical of ESl sources. Aorists of the lexeme **-волити**, however, sometimes show accentuation on the root in ESl sources,⁸⁵ and the accentuation of both **кѣснѹ** and **ѣ понѣси** can at least theoretically be explained as reflecting the WGrR definalization. In the AU **нє възмо҃гѡхѡмь**, *oksia* and *kamora* probably indicate alternative positions of ictus.⁸⁶

Among the AU belonging to CS1 a.p. *c* both **-гласити** and **-цѣлити**, contrasting with F, show the characteristically GrR accentuation on the aorist element. The lexemes **-бл҃юсти**, **-лещи**, **-поустити**, and **-тврѣдити**, however, deviate from the GrR pattern, showing accentuation on the root, whereas parallels to the accentuation of the AU **ѣ прєдѣша** and **призвѣ** etc. are attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

To sum up, the accentuation of the aorists in M taken as a whole has a clear ESl character. As in the other categories, however, the presence of 'specifically literary' and/or 'South Slavonic'—genuine or imitated—accentuations gives an indication of the heterogeneous character of the accentuation in M.

6.7.7. Imperfect

According to the analysis in section 5.4.7, *oksia* written above the imperfect suffix **-аш-** must be considered as not indicating ictus, although it probably at least in some cases is written above a stressed vowel. As a consequence, the accentologically relevant material within the imperfect category is rather limited.

6.7.7.1. *aj-*, *ěj-*, and *ova-*verbs

CS1 stress on the root

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **прѣтрѣсаше же сѧ** 159r.

⁸⁴ Cf., for example, Nor. ps. 130r **ѡдѣжди** vs. Ev. 1627 315r **ѡдожди**, Čud. 36d **ѡдожди**.

⁸⁵ Cf., for example, ОВа **извѣлихъ** (Schweier 1987:80, 100).

⁸⁶ Both alternatives are already attested in Čud., cf. Zaliznjak 1979:118. Cf., however, ОВа **възмо҃гѡмь** etc. (Schweier 1987:127).

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **нѣ исповѣ**ꙗ довааху 46г; — 2. **вѣроваах**ѹ 26v, **нѣ вѣ**ꙗровааху 45v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **проповѣдаах**ѹ 137г; — 2. **свитаа**ше 264г.

CSl stress on the thematic element

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **бываа**ше 24v; — 2. **вѣз**ꙗрашааху сѧ 263v; — 3. **ѿвѣщаваа**ше 261v; — 4. **вѣз**ꙗглашааху 262г; — 5. **и** желааше 179v; — 6. **вѣпрашаа**ше 20v, **ѿпрашаа**ше же 261v, **вѣ**ꙗпрашааху 41г; — 7. **разараа**ше 14v; — 8. **саждаа**ху 203г; — 9. **оу**-жасааху сѧ 139г; — 10. **и** исцѣлѣвааху 137г.

6.7.7.2. Other verbs

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и** плакааху сѧ 262v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и** мѣшꙗлааше 201v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **юдаа**ху 202v, 203г.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и** славааху 164г.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **бѣ**аху 249v/250г; — 2. **пла**кааху 158v; — 3. **вѣдѣ**аше 36v, **нѣ вѣд**ааше 25г; — 4. **и** надѣаше сѧ 261v; — 5. **вѣлажаа**ше 24г; — 6. **и** мазааху 137г; — 7. **и** помышлааше 393v, **помышлаа**ху 107v; — 8. **и** тааше сѧ 393г; — 9. **и** чюждааху сѧ 33v.

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и** благааху сѧ 136г; — 2. **мб**лааху 34v, **мб**лааху 33v, **и** **мб**лаааху 44г; — 3. **и** **нѣ** мбжааше 136г; — 4. **хб**тааше 43v, 45г, **и** **хб**тааше 139г, **хб**тааху 37г.⁸⁷

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и**мааше 24v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **исхб**жааше 162г, 162v, **исхб**жааху 160г.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **и** **об**лачааше сѧ 179v; — 2. **ид**ааше etc. 20v, 178v; — 3. **имѣ**аху 108v; — 4. **мол**ааху 178v; — 5. **нѣ** можааху 46г; — 6. **сл**оужааше 159v; — 7. **хотѣ**аше бо 20г.

⁸⁷ This lexeme is also attested in the AU **нѣ хот**ааше бѹ 26v; cf. section 6.8.3.1.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣ възнѣшааше сѧ** 48v; — 2. **рѣптаахоу** 22r; — 3. **хѣжааше** 36r, 38v, 43v, **хѣжааше** 26v, 43v, **сѣхѣжааше** 24r, **не хѣжаахѣ** 26r, **ѣ сѣхѣжаахоу сѧ** 160v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **гѣаахѣ** 31r 1s, **гѣааше** etc. 14v, 30r, 33v, 36v, 38r, 40v, 161r, 267r, **ѣ гѣааше** etc. 136v/137r, 267v, **гѣаахоу** etc. 27r, 28r, 34v, 37r, 40v (2x), 41r, 45r, 267r, **ѣ гѣаахоу** etc. 27r, 44r, **гѣаахоу же** etc. 24v, 30r, 33v, 38v, 40v, 41r; — 2. **здаахоу** 203r; — 3. **ѣскааше** etc. 162r, 162v, **ѣскаахоу** 14v, 44r, 160r, 163r; — 4. **ѣблизаахѣ** 179v; — 5. **прошаахоу** 262v; — 6. **ѣ прохѣжааше же** 160v.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣѣ** 3r (4x), 35r, 137v, 138v, 158v, 159v, 160r, 179v, 262r, 263v (2x), **ѣѣ** 20r, 20v, 41v, 160v, 163r (2x), 264r (2x), **ѣ ѣѣ** 160r, **ѣѣ же** 24v (2x), 31v, 36v, **ѣѣ же** 31v, **ѣѣше же** 108v (Mt. 22:25), **ѣѣхоу** etc. 31v, 42r, 137v, 159r, 163r, 264r, **ѣ ѣѣхоу** 163r, **ѣѣхоу ѣѣ** 137v, **ѣѣхоу же** 44r, **ѣѣста** 261v 3du; — 2. **ѣдрѣжаше** 159r, **ѣ дрѣжаахоу** 160r; — 3. **лѣжаше** 163v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **стоаше** 158v, **не достоаше** 267r, **стоахоу же** 261v, 263v, **ѣ оустоахоу** 262v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѣ оучаше** 27v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **ѣ дааше** 136v, 138r; — 2. **прилежаахѣ** 262v; — 3. **ѣсцѣлааше** 160r, **ѣ ѣсцѣлааше** 162r, 162v, **ѣ ѣсцѣлаахоу сѧ** 162r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **днѣлаахоу сѧ** 109r; — 2. **сѣдѣше** 31v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **крѣплааше сѧ** 259v, **крѣплаахоу сѧ** 261r; — 2. **млѣчаахоу** 267v; — 3. **ѣ възмѣшааше** 24r; — 4. **пѣахоу** 202v, 203r; — 5. **чааше** 263v.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **ѣдѣхоу** are attested in some ESl sources.⁸⁸ On the other hand, the AU belonging to CSl a.p. *b* with accentuation on the root have parallels mainly in EBlg sources (cf. section 3.7.7.2).

Contrasting with F, the verb **-оучити** shows accentuation on the imperfect suffix, with parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. Most of the remaining AU belonging to CSl a.p. *c*, however, show accentuation on the root, as in F. As many SSl sources show accentuation on the suffix within this category, this type of accentuation in M can probably be interpreted as ESl ‘specifically literary’ accentuation (cf. section 3.7.7.2).

⁸⁸ Cf., for example, OBa **ѣдѣхоу** (Schweier 1987:129), Smotr. 1619 **ѣдѣхѣ**.

6.7.8. Past participle active 1

6.7.8.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs*CSl sstress on the root*

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **къ вѣровавшимъ** 30v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **спослѣдствовавшаа** 263v.

CSl sstress on the thematic element

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡвѣщавъ** 138r, **ѡвѣщавъ** 159r, **ѡвѣщавъ** | **же** 107r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡвѣщавъ же** 109r, **ѡвѣщавѣше** 107v.

Both **вѣровати** and **-слѣдствовать** regularly show accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources. The second *oksia* in the AU **спослѣдствовавшаа** probably indicates secondary stress. Among the *ova*-verbs this type of accentuation is attested in many sources from different areas.⁸⁹

As was mentioned in section 3.7.8.1, the verb **-вѣщати** normally shows thematic accentuation in the past participle active in both ESl and SSl sources. The AU with accentuation on the root in both F and M can therefore probably best be seen as examples of ESl ‘specifically literary’ accentuation.

6.7.8.2. Other verbs

CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣдѣвъ** 24v, 261r, **ѡвѣдѣвъ** 160v, 163r, **вѣдѣвъ же** etc. 159r, 263v, **вѣдѣвшѣ** 37r, 108r, 139r, **вѣдѣвши** etc. 250r, 393v, **ѡвѣдѣвши** 250r; — 2. **ѡповѣръгъ** 158r; — 3. **слѣшавъ** 20r, 261r, **ѡслѣшавъ** 45r, **слѣшавъ же** 178v, 179r, **слѣшавѣше** etc. 25v, 46v, **ѡслѣшавше** etc. 108v, 109r, 403v; — 4. **ѡстѣвъ** 159v, **въстѣвъ** 163v, 181v (3x), **ѡвѣстѣвшѣ** 260v, **въстѣвши** 159v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡпѣдѣши** 108r; — 2. **ѡстѣвлѣше** 159v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡвѣдѣше** 106v, **вѣдѣша же** 404v nom du m.

⁸⁹ Cf., for example, OBa **спослѣдствовавшаа** (Schweier 1987:70, 177).

дѣшѣ, the expected accentuation is on the first *jat*'.⁹⁰ Possibly, however, the position of the accent mark here has been influenced by the presence of the line-break (cf. section 5.4.5).

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b* and *c*, including the non-standard accentuated **нѣ оучѣв' сѧ**, are also attested in both ESl and SSl sources.⁹¹

6.7.9. Past participle active 2

Compared with F, where only one accentuated *l*-participle is attested, M yields plenty of material. All the additional AU, however, belong to corpus B, thus not indicating any differences between F and M in the accentual inclination within this category.

6.7.9.1. *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs

CSI stress on the root

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **бы вѣдала** 32r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ни почръпала** 32r.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **ни почръпала** are attested in ESl sources, whereas **-вѣдати** regularly shows accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources.⁹²

6.7.9.2. Other verbs

CSI a.p. a

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **вѣдѣлѣ** etc. 36r (2x), **и вѣдѣлѣ** 43r, **вѣдѣли** 40v; — 2. **и ѡкаменилѣ** 46r; — 3. **пристѣлѣ** 263v.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **знаѣли** 49r (Jn. 14:7).

CSI a.p. b

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **пришѣлѣ** 29v, **пришѣлѣ ѣси** 158r, **ѡшли бѣ-хоу** 31v; — 2. **нѣ мѡглѣ бы** 42v; — 3. **сѣтворилѣ** etc. 23v, 31r, **тѣворили** 31r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **имѣли** 23v (2x).

⁹⁰ Cf., for example, NT 1816 Mark 6:38 **и увѣдѣшѣ**.

⁹¹ Cf., for example, ОВа **оучѣв сѧ** (Schweier 1987:90), Zaliznjak 1981:143.

⁹² Cf., for example, ОВа **вѣдала, почръпала** (Schweier 1987:64, 74).

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **чѣли** 109r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ч'ли** 267r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **бы бѣлъ** 31v, 34v, 36r, **не бы бѣл** 42v, **да бы прѣбѣлъ** 34v, **бѣли** 23r, 31r, 37v; — 2. **и дал тѣ** | **бы** 32r.

Among the verbs belonging to CSl a.p. *a* the *l*-participle shows accentuation on the root in both ESl and SSl sources. In the AU **знаѣли**, both the geminated vowel and the accent mark are possibly written after the model of the imperfect, where a form ***знаѣху**, with non-ictus *oksia*, would fit well into the accentuation of M (cf. section 6.7.7.2).

Parallels to the accentuation of the verbs **имѣти**, **ити**, and **моуи** are attested in both ESl and SSl sources. As for **-творити**, accentuation on the root is characteristic of EBlg sources, whereas ESl sources normally show thematic accentuation.⁹³

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **ч'ли** are attested both in ESl and SSl sources. As for **чѣли**, this accentuation could possibly be explained by the presence of the line-break.⁹⁴

6.7.10. *Past participle passive*6.7.10.1. *aj-, ěj-, and ova-verbs*

Within this category no accentuated AU are attested in M.

6.7.10.2. *Other verbs**CSl a.p. a*

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡка́менено** 139r, **ѡ ѡка́менени** 267v; — 2. **ѡупра́вленъ** 201v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и вѣдѣнъ** 49r; — 2. **въверѣженъ** 262r; — 3. **расла́бленъ** 163r, **расла́блен'номоу** 163v; — 4. **слѣшано** 42v, **ѡуслѣшани** 265r.

⁹³ Cf. Dybo 1971a:66, Zaliznjak 1985a:327ff.

⁹⁴ Cf., however, Ev. 1545 146v **ни сѣго ли чѣли ѣсте** (Luke 6:3).

CSl a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **възлюбѣнъ** 50v, **възлюбленѣи** 403v; — 2. **послѣнъ** 3r, 40v, **послѣни** 179r; — 3. **сътворено** 262r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **въпрошѣнъ** 202r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **и развѣренъ** 110r; — 2. **полбженъ** 264r; — 3. **писано** etc. 21r, 29r, 39v, 48r, **писаное** 23v, **написанъ**, | 327r, **написанѣ**-**нымъ** 48r; — 4. **осуженъ** 47r.

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **расточѣнаѣ** 43v.

CSl a.p. c

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **гнѣнъ** 179v; — 2. **изгнаѣнъ** 45r, **и|згнаѣни** 46r; — 3. **предѣнъ** 110v, **дѣнаѣ** 136r, **дѣно** 26r; — 4. **роженѣи** 31r; — 5. **шѣтъ** 161r (Lk. 5:35).

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **възнесѣнъ** 45r; — 2. **по речѣнѣномуу** 257r; — 3. **роженѣнѣ** 42v.

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **речѣнаѣгѣ** 109r; — 2. **въсѣженѣнаѣгѣ** 262v.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU belonging to CSl a.p. a are well attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

In CSl a.p. b both EBlg and EGrR sources normally show constant accentuation on the root, irrespective of its etymological quantity, whereas WGrR sources, particularly among the *i*-verbs, generalize accentuation on the suffix, as with lexemes originally belonging to both CSl a.p. a and c.⁹⁵ Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **въпрошѣнъ** and **расточѣнаѣ**—not counting the non-ictus *varia*—are therefore expected mainly in WGrR sources, whereas the remaining AU have parallels in both EGrR and EBlg sources.

Among the AU belonging to CSl a.p. c participles of both *V*-verbs (**-ѣти**), *C*-verbs (**-нести**, **рѣши**), *i*-verbs (**гнѣити**, **родити**, **-сѣдити**), *a*-verbs (**-гѣнати**), and athematic verbs (**-дати**) are attested, with only the *en*-participles showing non-standard accentuation, whereas the *n*- and *t*-participles exclusively show standard accentuation. Parallels to the accentuation of the *en*-participles are attested mainly in WGrR and EBlg sources.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ Zaliznjak 1985a:340, 349f, Dybo 1987:198f.

⁹⁶ See Zaliznjak 1985a:335ff, Schweier 1987:151ff, Dybo 1987:198f.

6.8. Accentuated clitics

The AU with accentuated clitics in M are presented according to the same principles as in section 3.8.

6.8.1. AU consisting of main word plus enclitic

6.8.1.1. AU with 'plus' enclitics

AU with the particle бо: — 1. **бѣ бѹ** 139r (2x); — 2. **еси бѹ** 139r; — 3. **вѣсть бѹ** 265r; — 4. **глаголю бѹ** 256v; — 5. **ѿже бѹ** 14v; — 6. **мнѹжицею бѹ** 110r; — 7. **мнѣ бѹ** 265r; — 8. **нѣсмь бѹ** 179r; — 9. **снѹ бѹ** 404v; — 10. **се бѹ** 63r, 202r., **сего бѹ** 21r (2x); — 11. **оученици бѹ** 31v.

AU with the particle ли: — 1. **ѿще ли** 44v, 265v; — 2. **нѣ ли** 39v, **нѣст: ли** 267r; — 3. **хощеши ли** 404v.

AU with the verbform бѣ: — 1. **животъ бѣ** 3r, **и живѣтъ бѣ** 3r; — 2. **иже бѣ** 158v, 262r; — 3. **праведен бѣ** 263v; — 4. **сѣи бѣ** 3r; — 5. **и сила гнѣ бѣ** **ищѣлающе** 163r; — 6. **слѣпъ бѣ** 41v; — 7. **тѣ бѣ** **ча** 20v; — 8. **тѣ ж бѣ** **ѿхѣда** 160v; — 9. **и ни ѿсти ѿмъ бѣ** **коли** 137v.

AU with other 'plus' enclitics: — 1. **слово сѣ** 158v; — 2. **ѿви сѣ** 47r; — 3. **роди сѣ** 41v (2x); — 4. **мѡлю тѣ** 180r.

Among the AU with the particle **бо** there is in the majority of cases no phonetic basis for accentuation of the particle. Among the AU with **ли**, only in **ѿще ли** is ictus expected to fall on the enclitic, whereas in the remaining cases the main words originally were orthotonic, excluding stress on the enclitic.

The interpretation of the verbform **бѣ** as an accentual 'main word' or clitic is problematic. Irrespective of this there possibly exists a functional difference between accentuation with *kendema* and *varia*, respectively, where the latter perhaps constitutes a more reliable indication of the position of ictus (cf. sections 3.8.2.1, 3.8.4, 6.8.3.1).

The main words of the AU **роди сѣ** and **ѿви сѣ** were both CS enclitomena, which makes it possible that the accentuation on **сѣ** is 'phonetic', at least in a MBlg type of system (cf. section 3.1.4.2.4).

The lexeme **слово** also belonged to CSI a.p. *c*, and *kamora* in the AU **слово сѣ** indicates the reconstructed position of ictus. The occurrence of *oksia* on the first syllable of the AU, as well as attestations in other sources with *kamora* not indicating ictus in **се** (cf. section 3.8.2.1), however, makes a graphic interpretation more probable.

The lexeme **молити** belonged to CSI a.p. *b*, and *kendema* above **тѣ** can hardly indicate ictus.

6.8.1.2. AU with 'minus' enclitics

AU accentuated with kendema: — 1. **любѣщаѣ вѣ** 164r; — 2. **свободит вѣ** 30v.

AU accentuated with varia: — 1. **ѣста** 404v 2du.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣсмь** 29v, 30r (2x), 38r, 109r, 179r, **ѣсмь** 139r, **ѣсть** 35r, 42v, 394r, **ѣсть** 21r, 164v, 266r, **ѣсте** 29v, 34v, 39v, **ѣсте** 29v, 31r.

In neither of the two AU with **вѣ** (in many sources a graphic cliché) is ictus assumed to fall on the enclitic.

As is also the case in F, the occurrence of initial *iso* in various present tense forms of **бѣти** contradicts either the possibility of *iso* indicating ictus or the enclitic status of the word-forms in question (cf. section 3.8.2.2).

6.8.2. AU consisting of proclitic(s) plus main word

6.8.2.1. AU with accentuated prepositions

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **въ** | водоу 110r; — 2. **въ** | врѣмѣ ѡнѣ 36v, 44r, 260v, 404r, **въ** | врѣмѣ ѡнѣ 26v, **въ** | врѣмѣ 163r, 250v, 267r, 403r; — 3. **въ** | вѣкы etc. 39r (Jn. 10:28), 393v, **въ** | вѣкы 22v (Jn. 6:51), 106v; — 4. **въ** | миръ 46r, 47r **въ** | мирѣ 51v; — 5. **въ** | сѣѣ 45v; — 6. **за** | слово 34r, 34v; — 7. **къ** | другоу 158v; — 8. **на** | землю 159v; — 9. **на** | небо 138r; — 10. **пѣ** | что 110v conj.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **оѣ** | негѣ 32r, 182v.

Among the AU accentuated with *oksia* all main words reflect CSI enclitomena, which means that the accentuation of all these AU can be assumed to have a 'phonetic' basis. In the AU **оѣ** | негѣ, on the other hand, with an orthotonic pronominal form, *iso* can hardly indicate ictus.

6.8.2.2. AU with accentuated conjunctions

AU accentuated with kamora: — 1. **нѣ** | за безъѡчѣство 181v, **нѣ** | бѣ 109r, **нѣ** | брашно 20v, **нѣ** | вино 161v, **нѣ** | вода 32r, **нѣ** | бѣлю 21v, **нѣ** | ни йрѣ 262r, **нѣ** | народа радѣ | 45r, **нѣ** | шѣ 21r, **нѣ** | и ѡца 14v, **нѣ** | и шѣ 179v; — 2. **нѣ** | прѣ | вѣдныи 28r; — 3. **нѣ** | аще 107r, 180v, **нѣ** | ѡко 109r; — 4. **нѣ** | вѣ 39r; — 5. **нѣ** | ѡзбѣ | ви 265r, **нѣ** | ѡзбѣ 181v, **нѣ** | вѣмь 36r, **нѣ** | да ѡвѣсте 163v, **нѣ** | градѣ 33r, **нѣ** | ймѣ 28v, **нѣ** | йште 31r, **нѣ** | йде 43v, **нѣ** | шѣ 160v, **нѣ** | лѣстить 27r, **нѣ** | спасти 404v, **нѣ** | рѣ | и 179r, **нѣ** | рѣ 21v, **нѣ** | ѡбоуveni 136v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣ** | не вѣсь ѡзѣ | къ 43v (Jn. 11:50).

The occurrence of *kamora* in the conjunction **нѣ** probably has nothing to do with the supposed proclitic character of this word, but rather must be

seen as a graphic cliché, in this respect with parallels in some ESl sources (cf. section 5.4.2).

As for the conjunction *а*, the material is not sufficient for any conclusions about the function of *iso* in this word. Note, however, that other examples of this lexeme are written with *apostrof* (cf. section 5.4.1).

6.8.2.3. AU with accentuated noun prefixes

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **нѣрѣ** 36v, 262v, **нѣрѣ** 27v, 45r, 162v, **и нѣрѣ** 162r (2x), **нѣрѣ же** 45r, **нѣрода** 107v, **нѣрода** 108v, **нѣрѣда** 163r, **нѣродѣу** etc. 25r, 179r, **нѣрѣди** 109r, 160v, 263v, **нѣроди** 262r, **и нѣрѣди** 160r, **нѣрѣды** 27r, 138v (2x), **нѣрѣды** 158v acc pl, **въ нѣродѣ** 27r; — 2. **нѣкыи** etc. 24v, 107v, 110r, 181r, 201r, 259v, **нѣкыи** 179v, **нѣкоѣмѣ** 201v, **нѣкоѣго** 262v, **нѣцѣи** 26r, 28r, 41r, 249v, **нѣкоѣ** 261v, **за нѣкоѣю** 262r; — 3. **прѣтчю** 18r, 107v, 179v, 201v, **и прѣтчю** 161r; — 4. **сѣнмиша** 42r, **и сѣнмише** 178v, **зѣ сѣнмише** 267v, **на сѣнмиши** 25v, 136r, **ѡ сѣнмишѣ** 24r, **и зѣ сѣнмишѣ** 46r, **на сѣнмиши** 160r, **въ сѣнмиши** 264v, **въ сѣнмиши** 264v (*sic*) loc pl.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѣблакъ** 403v, **и зѣ ѣблака** 403v; — 2. **ѡ ѣласти** 261r, **ѣласть** 107r; — 3. **ѣбраза** 404r; — 4. **оѣжасѣ** 158v, **оѣжасѣ** 159r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **сѣнѣмѣ** etc. 43r, 250v, **на сѣнѣмѣ** 260r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **вѣзрасть** 41v, 42r; — 2. **въ зѣконѣ** 39v; — 3. **зѣпоѣѣ** 38v; — 4. **нѣкто** etc. 43r, 179v; — 5. **и пѣжи** 38r; — 6. **и пѣмѣ** 404r.

Among the AU with parallels in F most AU have parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. Interestingly, the lexeme **нѣродѣ** in M also exhibits a clear non-EGrR accentuation. The accentuation of the lexeme **сѣнѣмѣ**, on the other hand, here accentuated on the prefix, has parallels mainly in ESl sources, while the root-accentuation attested in F is characteristic of MBlg sources (cf. section 3.2.1.5).

The accentuation of most AU without equivalents in F is paralleled in both ESl and SSl sources. The only exception is the AU **въ зѣконѣ**, with parallels mainly in Ukr and SSl sources, whereas EGrR sources normally show accentuation on the root.

6.8.2.4. AU with accentuated verbal prefixes

Verbs belonging to CSl a.p. a

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и ѣсцѣлѣ** 110v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

AU accentuated with kamora: — 1. **пѣ|слоушати** 25v.

Verbs belonging to CSI a.p. b

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и|йзше** 260r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **пѣ|слань** etc. 160r, 393v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **начнѡу** 263r; — 2. **вѣзѣмѣ** 136v, **и|вѣзмѡу** 43r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡумрѣ** 108v, **ѡумрете** 30r, **и|ѡмрошѣ** 22v.

Verbs belonging to CSI a.p. c

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡзрите** 25v, **и|ѡзрите** 54r, **и|не ѡзрите** 202v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **сѣблюдѡу** 23r; — 2. **вѣзвѣсти|** 46v aor; — 3. **вѣзрѣвъ** 138r, **и|вѣзрѣвъ** 267v; — 4. **сѣзѣа** 178v; — 5. **и|вѣзѣпишѣ** 139r; — 6. **распнѣи|** **распнѣи** 262r; — 7. **и|прѣстре** 267v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **и|женеть** 37v, **и|женѡут** 24r.

Accentuation on the prefix in the present tense of prefixed verbs with *jers* in the root belonging to both CSI a.p. *b* and *c* have on ESl territory parallels mainly in WGrR sources. The accentuation of the AU **вѣзрѣвъ** and **пѣслань**, on the other hand, is paralleled mainly in EGrR sources.⁹⁷

The prefixal accentuation of the aorists **вѣзвѣсти**, **сѣзѣа**, and **и|прѣстре**, reflecting CSI enclitomena, is not characteristic of ESl sources, but has parallels in MBlg sources, particularly in some EBlg sources with archaic accentuation.⁹⁸ Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **и|вѣзѣпишѣ**, on the other hand, where ictus is expected on the aorist element **-и-**, have not been attested in the comparison material.⁹⁹

Accentuation on the prefix in the imperative as in **распнѣи|** **распнѣи** is normally not current in either ESl or MBlg sources. Sporadic occurrences are, however, attested in some MBlg sources. Dybo sees this type

⁹⁷ Zaliznjak 1985a:331f, 350.

⁹⁸ Cf. Zaliznjak 1985a:144, Steensland 1990:68. Note, however, the occurrence of initially accentuated aorists of **прѣстрѣти** in OBa, interpreted by Schweier as reflecting a SSl influence; see Schweier 1987:117f, 173.

⁹⁹ The occurrence of a similar accentuation (cf. section 6.8.3.1) contradicts the assumption of a scribal error.

of accentuation as an archaism, reflecting a presumed original enclitomenon character of the imperative second and third person singular.¹⁰⁰

As for the infinitive **пѣ|слоушати** it seems probable that *kamora* here functions as an allograph of *titlo* (the graphic difference between these two diacritical marks is sometimes quite minimal).

To summarize, it is interesting to note that in M accentuation on verbal prefixes is mainly restricted to verbs with a *jer* in the root. As we have seen, parallels to this type of accentuation are attested in both EGrR and WGrR sources, sometimes constituting 'literary' or 'South Slavonic' accentuation.

6.8.3. AU consisting of proclitics, main word, and enclitics

6.8.3.1. AU with 'plus' enclitics

AU with main words belonging to CSI a.p. a

AU accentuated with oksia, kamora, kendema, or varia: — 1. **ни брѣтѣа бѣ** 26v; — 2. **и вѣдѣсте мѣ** 21v; — 3. **никтоже бѣ** 33v; — 4. **помрачѣют бѣ** 265v; — 5. **на мѣсто сѣ** 180r; — 6. **и прѣбѣрази сѣ** 403r; — 7. **на позорѣ сѣ** 263v; — 8. **въ прѣзѣникѣ сѣ** 27r (2x); — 9. **на чѣстѣ сѣ** 45r.

AU with main words belonging to CSI a.p. b

AU accentuated with oksia, kamora, or varia: — 1. **и не сестры| лѣ** 136r; — 2. **нѣ послѣ|выи мѣ** 30r, **послѣ|вшааго мѣ** 21v (2x), **нѣ въ послѣ|вшааго мѣ** 46r, **послѣ|вшаа мѣ** 22r; — 3. **ѡ сѣм бѣ** 34r; — 4. **сѣтворѣ сѣ** 179r; — 5. **прѣймѣте сѣ** 256v.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѡбыдоша| же** 38v.

AU with main words belonging to CSI a.p. c

AU accentuated with oksia, kamora, kendema, or varia: — 1. **не вѣдаѣт бѣ** 263r; — 2. **и горѣ сѣи** 107r, **въ горѣ сѣи** 32v, **ни в горѣ сѣи** 33r; — 3. **прѣдаѣщаго мѣ** 257r; — 4. **и днѣ бѣ** 264r; — 5. **и поклони сѣ** 43r aor; — 6. **въ мѣрѣ сѣ** 37r; — 7. **и не оу|сѣмниѣте сѣ** 107r; — 8. **вѣ|зѣпиша же** 262r; — 9. **и слѣво| бѣ** 3r; — 10. **и ты лѣ** 42v; — 11. **не хотѣше бѣ** 26v.

'Phonetic' accentuation on the enclitic is expected only after enclitomena. This condition is fulfilled by the AU **и горѣ сѣи**, **въ горѣ сѣи**, **ни в горѣ сѣи**, **и днѣ бѣ**, **и поклони сѣ**, **въ мѣрѣ сѣ**, **и слѣво| бѣ**, and **и ты лѣ**, whereas the remaining AU all comprise CSI orthotonic main words. The occurrence of *oksia* above some of the CSI enclitomena, however, makes a phonetic interpretation of the presence of accent marks on enclitics here rather unlikely.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Dybo 1989:106f. Additional examples are quoted in Steensland 1990:113f.

6.8.3.2. AU with ‘minus’ enclitics

AU with main words belonging to CSI a.p. a

AU accentuated with kamora: — 1. **покрынте нѣ** 263r.

AU with main words belonging to CSI a.p. b

AU accentuated with oksia, kendema, or varia: — 1. **разлоучѣ| вѣ** 162v; — 2. **въпрошѹ вѣ** 107r, **ѣ въпрошѹ вѣ** 260v, **ѣ въ|просѣша ѣ** 41v; — 3. **съ-хранѣтъ ѣ** 44v; — 4. **ѣ сънемѣ ѣ** 264r.

AU with main words belonging to CSI a.p. c

AU accentuated with oksia, kamora, or varia: — 1. **ѣѣноут вѣ** 24r; — 2. **нѣ въскрѣшѣ| ѣ** 21v.

In AU with ‘minus’ enclitics, even in the position after an enclimenon ictus is as a rule not supposed to fall on the enclitic. Consequently, for all occurrences of accentuated enclitics in this category ‘graphic’ motivations have to be assumed.

6.8.4. AU consisting exclusively of clitics

6.8.4.1. AU with ‘plus’ enclitics

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **на ѣа** 39v, **на ма ли** 28r; — 2. **на та** 39v, 394r.

AU accentuated with kamora: — 1. **въ ма** 21v, 46r (3x), 50r; — 2. **за ма ѣ за сѣ** 109v (Mt. 17:27).

AU accentuated with kendema or varia: — 1. **ѣ бѣ** 16r; — 2. **не| бѣ** 263v, **не бѣ** 264r.

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU of both the type **на та** and the type **въ ма** are attested in both ESl and SSl sources (cf. section 3.8.5.1). As for the AU in the phrase **за ма ѣ за сѣ** both pronouns probably were in positions of logical stress. The accentuated AU with **бѣ** also have parallels in sources from most areas. Note, however, a possible distinction between the use of *varia* and *kendema*, respectively, with this word (cf. sections 3.8.5, 6.8.1.1).

6.8.4.2. AU with ‘minus’ enclitics

AU accentuated with oksia: — 1. **вѣ нѣ** 34r; — 2. **вѣ нѣжѣ|** 20v, **вѣ нжѣ** 203r (2x); — 3. **на нѣ** 28v, 36r, 249v, 250r, 260v, 261v, 262r, 262v, 326v, **на нѣ** 40r.

AU accentuated with varia, kendema, or kamora: — 1. **за вѣ** 256v, **за вѣ** 257r, **на вѣ** 48v.

Accentuation on the prepositions **ѣ** and **на** in connection with the asyllabic accusative singular **нѣ** is structurally trivial, with parallels in sources from most areas (cf. section 3.8.5). As for **на ѣ**, ES sources appear normally to show accentuation on the pronoun. Possibly, however, the accentuation in M is not significant, as the 'normal' accentuation might have been blocked by the letter above the line.¹⁰¹

Parallels to the accentuation of the AU **за ѣ**, **за ѣ**, and **на ѣ** are well attested both in ES and SS sources (cf. section 3.8.5.2). Note, however, the 'phonetic unreliability' of accentuated forms of this and other pronoun forms in enclitic position, as already discussed above.

6.8.5. *Sequences consisting of two enclinenomen main words*

In M no accentuated AU consisting of two enclinenomen main words have been found.

6.8.6. *Conclusions*

Among the AU with accentuated clitics in M a 'phonetic' basis can be attested at least for the AU with accentuated proclitics, whereas the accentuated enclitics in most cases seem to have a purely 'graphic' motivation. Indirectly this is supported by the relatively limited number compared to F of occurrences of proclitics accentuated only with *iso*. In addition, no occurrences of *oksia* above *ї* in the prefix **при-** are attested in M (cf. section 3.8.7).

Provided the accentuation on proclitics really is 'phonetic' in M, the accentuation in M must be considered linguistically more archaic than in F, particularly as concerns the accentuated prepositions.

6.9. The accentuation of words of Greek origin

The accentuated AU of words of Greek origin attested in M are, as in section 3.9, presented in relation to the accentuation of their Greek counterparts.

¹⁰¹ Cf., for example, OBa (Schweizer 1987:348), Ev. 1627 246г ѣ нѣмъ, 259г по нѣмъ, 163г ѣ по нѣмъ, 250г на нѣмъ.

6.9.1. Nouns

6.9.1.1. *o-* and *jo-*stems*Accentuation similar to Gk*

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ἀρχιῆρεϊ* же 249v nom sg, *ἀρχιῆρεϊ* 267r loc sg, *ἀρχιῆρεε* etc. 107r, 108v, 250v (2x), 260r, 260v, 261v nom pl, *κτ̃ ἀρχιῆρεω̃* 261r, *ἀρχιῆρεα* 261v acc pl; — 2. *ἰωάν'ν'ς* 3r, *ἰωάν'нь* 181r, 404v, *ἰωάν'нь* *κῃ*тителъ 108r, *ω̃ ἰωάν'на* 14v, 110r, *ἰωάν'на* 107v, *ἰωάν'на* 161v, *ἰωάν'на* 159v, *ἰωάν'н'а* 403r; — 3. *ἰάκωβ'ς* etc. 31v, 404v, *ἰάκωβ'а* 394v, *ἰάκωβ'у* 136r, *ἰάκωβ'а* 159v, 161v (2x), *ἰάκωβ'а* 40r; — 4. *ἱερῆεви* 160v dat sg; — 5. *μωϋ̃си* etc. 21r, 108v, 160v nom sg, *ἰμ̃ μωϋ̃σε̃ви* 403v dat sg, *μωϋ̃се̃а* etc. 180r, 180v acc sg; — 6. *πέτρ'ς* 109v, 159r, 250v, 259v, 403v, *πετ'рови* 20r, *κτ̃ πέτ'рови* 109r, *πέτ'ра* 250r, *πετ'ра* 161v, *на πετ'ра* 260r; — 7. *πῖλ'ат* 261r, *πῖл'ат же* 261r (2x), 261v, 262v, *πῖл'ат'у* 250v, *κτ̃ πῖл'ат'у* etc. 260v, 260v, 261v, 263v; — 8. *φ'αρ'ῖсе̃* 161r, 163r, *ἰ φ'αρ'ῖсе̃* etc. 108v, 111r (2x), 163v, 267r, *ἰ φ'αρ'ῖсе̃и* 161r Npl, *ω̃ φ'αρ'ῖсе̃и* 202r.

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. *ἄгг'ε|λ'ς* etc. 393v, 393v, 394r (2x), *ἄгг'ε|л',* 393v, *κτ̃ ἄгг'ε|λ'у* 394r, *ἄ|гг'ε|ли* 109r nom pl, *ἄгг'ε|лы* 179v instr pl.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ἰουδ'ε̃ω̃* 14v, 20v, 111r; — 2. *с'ἰм'ω|н'ъ* 159r, *с'ἰм'ε̃ω̃на* 394v, *κτ̃ с'ἰм'ω̃ноу* 159v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *ἄβρα'ам'ς* 31r, 180r (2x), *ἄβρα'ама* 179v, *ἄβρα'аме* 179v, 180v voc sg (Ἀβραάμ); — 2. *ἀπρ'ῖль* 394r (ἀπρίλιος); — 3. *γавр'ῖл'ς* 393v, *γавр'ῖла* 394r (Γαβριήλ); — 4. *γεώρ'γ'ῖа* 394v gen sg (Γεώργιος); — 5. *δι'άβ'ола* 34v gen sg (διάβολος); — 6. *ἰ ἱε'ροσ'али'ма* 162r/v gen sg, *в'ъ| ἱε'р'л'им'ъ* 404r, 404v, *в'ъ| ἱε'р'л'им'ѣ* 261r (Ἱερουσαλήμ); — 7. *καπερ'на'ούμ'ς* 178v, *в'ъ| каπερ'на'ούм'ъ* 178v, *в'ъ| каπερ'на'ούм'ѣ* 20r (Καπερναούμ); — 8. *λά'зар'ς* 179v, *ла'з'ара* 179v, *ἰ ла'зар'а|* 179v (Λάζαρος); — 9. *μά'и* 394v (μάτις); — 10. *ма'рка* 394v, *ω̃ ма'рка* 136r, 136v, 137r, 250v (Μάρκος); — 11. *ματ'θ'ε̃а* 161v acc sg (Ματθαῖος); — 12. *с'ἰке'б'та* 394v gen sg (referring to the city of Σικυών);¹⁰² — 13. *ста'т'и'р'ς* 109v (στατήρ); — 14. *х'ε̃',|* etc. 160r, 260r, *ἱε̃ х'а̃`* 404r Gs, *х'а̃`* 42r, 160r, 261r acc sg (Χριστός).

Accentuation different from Gk

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. *гал'ἰλε'άν'ни'нь* 250r, 259v, 261r; — 2. *ἰουδ'ε̃е* 14v nom pl, *ἰουδ'ε̃ω̃* 21v, 261r, *ἰουδ'ε̃ω̃* 108r.

¹⁰² Liddell, Scott 1925–1940 II:1598 Σικυών. Referring to St. Theodore of Sikion, cf. *The book of saints* 1989:534.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѿ сѣмѡнѡу** 136r, **ѿ сѣмѡна** 161v; — 2. **тѣктѡнѣ** 136r nom sg.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѿлектѡръ** 250v (ἀλέκτωρ); — 2. **ѿ гѡмѡръѡ** 137r dat pl (Γόμορρα); — 3. **ѿ ѡуѣлѣста** 394v gen sg (εὐαγγελιστῆς); — 4. **ѿѡснѣ** etc. 263v, 393v, **ѿѡсѣѡу** 31v (Ἰωσήφ); — 5. **ѿ ѡѡлмѣхъ** 48r (ψαλμός); — 6. **сѡдѡмѡ** 137r dat pl (Σόδομα).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѿръѡ** 261v, 262r, **ѿръ же** 261v, **кѡ ѿръѡу** 261r (Ἠρώδης).

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **ѿ варѡѡломѣа** 161v acc sg (Βαρθολομαῖος); — 2. **матѡѣа** 404r gen sg; — 3. **сѡдѡукѣ** 108v nom pl (σαδδουκαῖος, pl. σαδδουκαῖοι).

As in F, most of the attested AU among the *o*- and *jo*-stems show accentuation similar to that of the corresponding adjectives in Greek. Normally, parallels to these accentuations are attested in both ESl and SSl sources.

Among the AU with accentuation different from Greek **ѿлектѡръ**, **гѡмѡра**, **сѡдомѡ**, and **тѣктѡнѣ** are all attested with corresponding accentuation in ESl sources.¹⁰³ Note also that the accentuation on the suffix in **гѡлѣлѣѡнѣнѣ**, attested once—with doubt—in F, here is unambiguously paralleled.

As for the personal name **ѿръѡ**, this lexeme normally shows accentuation on the second syllable both in ESl and SSl sources. Initial accentuation is, however, also attested.¹⁰⁴

6.9.1.2. *ā*- and *jā*-stems*Accentuation similar to Gk*

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡѣ гѡлѣлѣѡ** 20r; — 2. **ѿ ѿѡдѣѡ** 136r dat sg, **ѿѡдѣѡ** 162r acc sg; — 3. **пѡсѣѡ** 43v, **пѡсѣѡ** 43v, **пѡсѣѡу** 256r (2x), 256v, **пѡ пѡсѣѡѣ** 14v, 21v, 30v, 38r, 39r, 44r; — 4. **нѣлѣ пѣры** 136v; — 5. **сѡѡѡѡѣѡ** 136r.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡ трапѣзѣ** 179v, **на трапѣзѣѣ** 257r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **варѡѡѡѡѡ** 262r acc sg (Βαραββᾶς); — 2. **ѿ ѿѡѣлѣ** 136r dat sg (Ἰωσήφ); — 3. **ѡ ѿѡдѣѡ** 20r, 20v, **ѿѡдѣлѣ** 261r dat sg (Ἰουδαῖα); — 4. **кѡѣѡѡѡ** 43r (Καῖάφας); — 5. **ѡ лѡукѣлѣ** 159v, 160r, 160v, 181r,

¹⁰³ Cf., for example, OBa **ѿлектѡръ** (Schweier 1987:205), Slavin. 423 **ѿлектѡръ**, SLS I:7 **ѿлектѡръ**; D'jačenko 1899:127 **гѡмѡрра**; D'jačenko 1899:631 **сѡдѡмѣ**, Ber. 1627:233 **сѡдѡмѣ**, Deschler 1987:190 **сѡдѡмѡ**; for parallels to the accentuation of **тѣктѡнѣ** see section 3.9.2.1.

¹⁰⁴ Cf., for example, D'jačenko 1899:225 **ѿръѡ**, Gil'tebrandt 1882–1885/1988–1989 I:808f **ѿръѡ**, Ev. 1355/56 10r **кѡ ѿръѡу** besides 9r **ѿръѡѡ**.

182r, 393r, 404r, *ѡ* лѡукѣ 161v, 180v (Λουκάς); — 6. мѧн'нѡу 25v, мѧн'н'ѡу 21r, 22v acc sg (μάννα); — 7. ѡ ѡѡмѡу 161v acc sg (Θωμάς).

Accentuation different from Gk

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. соубѣта 24v, 41r, 267v, ѡ соубѣта 264r, соубѣѡта 25r, соубѣтѣ 267v, соубѣтѡу 14v, 46v, въ соубѣтѡу 28r (2x), въ соубѣты etc. 267r, 267v (2x) acc pl.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. къ вѣѡсайѣтѣ 138v (Βηθσαιδά(ν)); — 2. въ пор'ѣѡроу 179v (πορφύρα); — 3. въ сѧндаліѡ 136v (σανδάλιον).

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. ѡ ѧнреѧ 161v acc sg (Ἄνδρέας).

In this category, as well, most of the attested AU are accentuated as in Greek. The accentuation of the lexeme **соубѣта**, however, with *oksia* on the first (1x) or *kamora* on the second syllable (12x), as well as one occurrence with both accent marks, shows a clear ESl character as compared to F. As for the AU **къ вѣѡсайѣтѣ**, parallels to the accentuation in M are found in both ESl and SSl sources, whereas the lexemes **пор'ѣѡра** and **сѧнѣдалиѡ** both are normally attested with accentuation on the second syllable, at least in ESl sources.¹⁰⁵

6.9.2. Adjectives

Accentuation similar to Gk

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. зеведѣѡва 159v; — 2. іѡудѣискы 327r nom sg m, іѡудѣиска 263v gen sg m, іѡудѣиска 43v nom sg f, іѡудѣискыѧ 178v; — 3. сѣмѡновѣ 159v, сѣмѡноѡва 159v.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. ѧвраѧмѣ etc. 30v, 31r, 179v, ѧвраѧмѧ 31r (2x) (pertaining to Ἀβραάμ); — 2. ѧвраѧмовѣ 109r (pertaining to Ἀβραάμ); — 3. архіѣрѣѡѣѣ 250r gen pl (Mk. 14:66, pertaining to ἀρχιερεύς);¹⁰⁶ — 4. ѡ архіѣрѣѡстїи 262v (referring to ἀρχιερεύς); — 5. генисарѣт'ѣтѣ 158v (referring to Γεννησαρέτ); — 6. іѡѧнн'ѡви 161r, іѡѧнновѡ 107v (pertaining to Ἰωάννης); — 7. ісѧіѧковѣ 109r (pertaining to Ἰσαάκ); — 8. іѧкѡвѣ 31v, 109r, іѧкѡвли 393v, іѧкѡвѧ 162r (pertaining to Ἰάκωβος); — 9. ѡ іѣрлѣмскыѧ 163r (referring to Ἱερουσαλήμ); — 10. ѡ сѣѡѡн'ска etc. 162r, 162v (referring to Σιδών); — 11. сѣлѡѧмѡ

¹⁰⁵ Cf., for example, Ev. 1627 168r къ вѣѡсайѣтѣ, Dov. 24r вѣѡсайѣда, Ber. 1627:228 пор'ѣѡра, 111 сѧнѣліѡ, and ОВа в сѧнѣліѡ (Schweier 1987:194).

¹⁰⁶ With a pronominal ending, attested also in the corresponding text in e.g. F 13a єдина ѡ раѡынѣ архіѣрѣѡѣѣхѣ.

41r (pertaining to Σιλωάμ); — 12. **сѣлѡ́амстѣ** 40v (referring to Σιλωάμ); — 13. **соломѡни** 38v (pertaining to Σολομών, Σολομών).

Accentuation different from Gk

ACCENTUATION SIMILAR TO F

Standard accentuated AU: — 1. **сѣлѡмѡновѣ** 158v.

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѿ ѿудѣискыѧ** 163r; — 2. **марѣїи́нь** 136r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **захарѣї́на** 393r (pertaining to Ζαχαρίας).

AU accentuated only with initial iso: — 1. **ѿрѡдовѣ** 261r gen sg f (pertaining to Ἡρώδης).

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **галѣ́ленскыѧ** 163r (referring to Γαλιλαία); — 2. **ѿскарѣї́ѡтскаго** 162r (referring to Ἰσκαριώθ, Ἰσκαριώτης).

Among the possessive adjectives ending in **-овѣ** most AU show accentuation similar to Greek. The vacillation in the accentuation of the lexeme **симѡновѣ** is paralleled in F. As for **ирѡдовѣ**, the initial accentuation conforms with the accentuation of the proper name **ирѡдѣ**, cf. above.

Among the adjectives ending in **-ьскѣ**, **-ьскыи** the Greek accentuation is properly reflected in most cases. The occurrences of *oksia* above the second vowel in some of the AU of **иудѣискѣ**, **-ыи** are probably to be seen as allographs of *psili* (or *iso*).

The accentuation of most of the attested AU of the remaining adjectives also reflects the Greek accentuation. As for **марѣїи́нь** and **захарѣї́на**, however, a 'graphic' explanation of the occurrence of *oksia* above the second vowel cannot be excluded, perhaps in order to avoid an accent mark above the letter **ї**. Note also the occurrence of a line-break in **марѣїи́нь**.

6.9.3. *Indeclinable lexemes*

Accentuation similar to Gk

ACCENTUATION DIFFERENT FROM F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѧмѣи́нь** 107r, 108r, 109v, 137r, 264v (2x), 265v, **ѧмѣи́нь** 139v, 265v, **ѧмѣи́н бѡ** 110v, **ѧмѣи́нь ѧмѣи́н'** 14v, **ѧмѣи́нь ѧмѣи́н** 21r.

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **ѡ ѧрѣмаѡѣа** 263v (Ἀριμαθαία); — 2. **ѧлѣї́ ѧлѣї́ма савѡхѡѧни** 327v (ἡλὲ, σαβαχθάνι) (Mt. 27:46); — 3. **марѣї́амѣ** 393v (2x), 394r (Μαριάμ).

Accentuation different from Gk

ACCENTUATION WITHOUT EQUIVALENTS IN F

Standard and non-standard accentuated AU: — 1. **Ѡ ѣдѣса** 404r (Ἑδεσσα);¹⁰⁷ — 2. **рѧвѣѣ** 33v, 40r (ῥαββί, ῥαββεί).

AU accentuated only with non-ictus accent marks: — 1. **кѠ|рїтѣѧ** 262v (Κυρήνη); — 2. **мѣсїѧ** 33r (Μεσσίας); — 3. **Ѡ самарїѧ** 31v (Σαμάρεια).

Among the indeclinable lexemes most AU—with the exception of the AU with final *varia* not indicating ictus—show accentuation similar to that of their Greek counterparts. Particularly, differing from F, the lexeme **ѧмнѣ** shows accentuation on the second syllable. Parallels to the accentuation in **Ѡ ѣдѣса** are attested in Modern Russian.¹⁰⁸ This accentuation can be explained either with the quantity-based rule proposed by Kolesov (cf. section 3.9.1), or as reflecting the accentuation of the oblique cases in Greek.¹⁰⁹

6.9.4. Summary

As is also the case in F, the accentuation of most words of Greek origin in manuscript M has well-attested parallels in both ESl and SSl sources. In contrast to F, however, nothing prevents the assumption that *iso* above initial vowels indicates ictus in this category, as *iso* in this position is attested only with the lexemes **ѧнгѣлѣ**, **иродѣ**, and **иродовѣ**. Some AU, however, differing from F, show a characteristic GrR accentuation. To this category belong e.g. the AU of the lexemes **ѧлектѣрѣ**, **сѣу-бѣта**, **тѣктѣнѣ**, **тѣрапѣѧ**, and possibly **ѣдѣс(ѣ)ѧ**.

6.10. AU without accent marks

In the discussion in Chapter 4 the unaccentuated AU in manuscript F were seen in two aspects: firstly, possible connections between the choice of certain letters and the position of ictus were treated; secondly, the accidental coefficient of both manuscript F as a whole and of certain categories was discussed.

As for M, the general impression is that prosodic factors do not influence the choice between different letters. As more direct work with the manuscript itself is needed to decide which variants of letters occur in

¹⁰⁷ *Thesaurus* 1831–1865 III:157.

¹⁰⁸ See *Bol'shaja Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija* 1950–1958 48:324 Эдѣсса.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Modern Greek ἡ Ἑδεσσα, τῆς Ἑδέσσης (cf., e.g., *Νεωτέρων Ἑγκυκλοπαιδικὸν Λεξικὸν* [1957–1960] 6:364f).

which positions, at the present this will have to suffice. It is, however, not to be excluded that a future more thorough investigation would give another result.

As for the accentual coefficient in M, calculated in the same way as for F, the general accentual coefficient is approximately 50–60%, that is, clearly higher than in F. As in F the accentual density varies between different morphological categories etc. In order to make a correct comparison with F, the figures in Tables 8–11 refer to the occurrences in corpus A of the same lexemes as in F (cf. section 4.2). In this way the two objects of comparison are practically equivalent.

Table 8: The accentual inclination of primary *o*-, *jo*-, *ā*-, and *jā*-stem nouns in M

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSI a.p. <i>a</i>	32 (74%)	0 (0%)	11 (26%)	43 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>b</i>	12 (33%)	5 (14%)	19 (53%)	36 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>c</i>	36 (55%)	2 (3%)	28 (42%)	66 (100%)
Total	80 (55%)	7 (5%)	58 (40%)	145 (100%)

Table 9: The accentual inclination of fem. *ā*- and *jā*-stem nouns (28 lexemes, 53 AU)

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSI a.p. <i>a</i>	20 (77%)	0 (0%)	6 (23%)	26 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>b</i>	2 (25%)	1 (12%)	5 (62%)	8 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>c</i>	4 (21%)	2 (11%)	13 (68%)	19 (100%)
Total	26 (49%)	3 (6%)	24 (45%)	53 (100%)

Table 10: The accentual inclination of masc. *o*- and *jo*-stem nouns (26 lexemes, 62 AU)

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSI a.p. <i>a</i>	6 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	9 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>b</i>	9 (43%)	2 (10%)	10 (48%)	21 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>c</i>	21 (66%)	0 (0%)	11 (34%)	32 (100%)
Total	36 (58%)	2 (3%)	24 (39%)	62 (100%)

Table 11: The accentual inclination of neut. *o*- and *jo*-stem nouns (16 lexemes, 30 AU)

	Accentuated AU		Unaccentuated AU	Total
	on the root	on the ending		
CSI a.p. <i>a</i>	6 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	8 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>b</i>	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	7 (100%)
CSI a.p. <i>c</i>	11 (73%)	0 (0%)	4 (27%)	15 (100%)
Total	18 (60%)	2 (7%)	10 (33%)	30 (100%)

Compared with F, the overall accentual density in the categories in question is slightly higher in M, 60% vs. 53%. The accentual density within both a.p. *a* and *b* is about the same in both manuscripts, whereas the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *c* show a considerably higher accentual density in M than in F, 58% vs. 44%.

Further, among the AU belonging to CSI a.p. *b*, the proportion between AU accentuated on the root and the ending, respectively, differs considerably between the two manuscripts. In M, the relation is 5 to 12, which is to be compared with only 1 AU in this category accentuated on the ending vs. 17 on the root in manuscript F. This clearly indicates the more distinctive character of the accentuation of lexemes belonging to CSI a.p. *b* in M than in F.

6.11. Summary

Generally speaking, manuscript M—compared with manuscript F—is characterized by the greater role played by the mainly GrR component of the accentuation. This can be seen for example in the higher number of non-standard accentuated AU among the underived nouns originally belonging to CSI a.p. *b* (cf. sections 6.2.1.1, 6.2.2.1, and 6.2.3.1) as well as the higher frequency of accentuation on the root in the imperative of verbs belonging to CSI a.p. *a*, clearly indicating a non-EBlg component of the accentuation of M (cf. section 6.7.2.2).

Nevertheless, the SSL component of the accentuation of M can in no way be neglected. This is shown, for example, by the not insignificant number of AU among the *aj*-, *ěj*-, and *ova*-verbs with CSI thematic stress in M accentuated on the root (cf. sections 6.7.1.1, 6.7.3.1, 6.7.5.1 etc.), as well as other cases with accentuation on the root. It is, however, important to remember that this type of accentuation can often also be found in ESl sources other than M, normally explained as reflecting either definalization or specifically literary or ‘South Slavonic’ stress (cf. sections 3.1.4.1.1–5).

Among the AU with accentuation on the root it is interesting to note the similarity to F, for example in the accentuation of the lexemes **владыка**, **вдовница**, and **рабыни**, all normally showing thematic accentuation in both ESl and SSL sources (cf. sections 6.2.3.3–4). This similarity most probably reflects the general tendency towards accentuation on the root discernable in both manuscripts. More speculatively, however, it can be taken as an additional indication of a particularly close relation between the manuscripts, not restricted to belonging to a com-

mon type, but perhaps even being parts of the same chain of protographs and copies.

To sum up, notwithstanding the differences in details, the general character of the accentuation in M is the same as in F, comprising both a SSI and ESI component. Given what we know about the time and place of origin for M, it can be assumed that the SSI component reflects the accentuation of the protograph, whereas the ESI component most probably reflects the orthoëpic norms of the scribe.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSIONS

As has been shown in the preceding chapters, manuscripts F and M share some significant features: they are both written in Russian Middle Church Slavonic, in similar hands, showing both ESl and SSl orthographic as well as accentographic features. In the orthography, although both manuscripts have a clear Russian Church Slavonic character, M shows some additional typically ESl features, compared with F. Conversely, in F a greater number of typically MBlg features are attested than in M. The same tendency can be discerned in the accentuation. In F, while the accentuation of most AU can be considered characteristic for both ESl and MBlg sources, there nevertheless exist a certain number of both 'typically ESl' and 'typically MBlg' accentuations (cf. section 3.10). In M, on the other hand, the 'typically ESl' component of the accentuation dominates over the 'typically MBlg' against a background, as in F, of accentuations acceptable to both types of systems (cf. section 6.11).

According to Steensland, the presence of two or more accentuation layers in a manuscript can be explained in at least two fundamentally different ways. On the one hand, a manuscript with heterogeneous accentuation can have been written in a monastic environment either with different, coexisting norms of accentuation, or else with in some respect 'mixed' accentuation norms. Such environments probably could be found for example in late medieval Moldavia. On the other hand, the various components forming a heterogeneous accentuation can be assumed to reflect subsequent stages in the 'biography' of a text being copied and re-copied in new manuscripts.¹

In an isolated analysis of the accentuation in manuscript F both interpretations would in principle be equally possible, although the Moldavian character of the writing (cf. section 2.1) rather constitutes an argument in favor of the former explanation. As a result of the comparison with M, however, 'biographical' explanations of the accentuation in both F and M become more plausible. According to this line of reasoning, F and M can be seen as reflecting subsequent stages in a process of 'Russianization' of both orthography and accentuation, which fits well into the picture of the general cultural evolution in Russia at the end of the fifteenth and begin-

¹ Steensland 1990:205f.

ning of the sixteenth century, with a growing reaction against the Second South Slavic Influence.²

Within the framework of this kind of process it is interesting to note the relative conservatism of the accentuation compared with the orthography. This is not a conservatism in the *linguistic* sense that it would better reflect the CSI accentuation, but rather a *historical* conservatism. As is well known, the tradition of accentuating ChSl manuscripts originated in the South Slavic area, in the beginning, naturally enough, mainly reflecting Bulgarian and/or Serbian Church Slavonic stress. This type of stress, however, was in some respects *linguistically* more distant from the CSI stress than the type of stress reflected in the accentuation of the earliest known ESl manuscripts. Paradoxically, therefore, the historically innovative 'Russianization' of the accentuation, characterizing the reaction against the Second South Slavic Influence, led to a linguistic archaization of the accentuation in the ESl manuscripts of the period in question.

As we have tried to show in the present investigation, the accentuation in Church Slavonic manuscripts and early printed books cannot simply be considered 'right' or 'wrong', 'phonetic' or 'graphic' with reference to some *vernacular* language or dialect, or to a Common Slavonic or Common East Slavonic reconstructed by linguistic means. On the contrary, Church Slavonic accentuation must be studied as an integral part of standard Church Slavonic within its own rights, with its own history, basically distinct from but continuously interwoven with the history of the various Slavonic vernaculars.

² Cf. Uspenskij 1987:228ff.

ABBREVIATIONS

Sources referred to in the accentological discussion

- Ber. 1627 Berynda, P.: *Leksikónъ slavenorósskij*, Kiev 1627 (Zapasko, Isajevyč 1981:44f, No. 159). Quoted from the edition by Nimčuk 1961:1–244. The figures refer to the pagination in Nimčuk 1961.
- Berl. Tetraevangelion, Serbian MS, end of the 14th–beginning of the 15th century, Universitätsbibliothek, Tübingen, Wuk 3, (Jacimirskij 1921: 264ff, No. 5 [3], Günther 1960:326ff). Quoted from Kul'bakin 1904: 34–44.
- Čud. *Čudov New Testament*, ESI MS, middle of the 14th century, present location unknown (cf. Lehfeldt 1989:1). Quoted from the edition by Lehfeldt 1989 as well as from Dybo 1975, 1981, Zaliznjak 1979, and Ušakov 1982.
- Dov. *Dovoljsko jevandlje*, Tetraevangelion, Serbian MS, second quarter of the 16th century, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Belgrade, No. 638 (Bogdanović 1982:134, No. 2087, Štavljanin-Đorđević *et al.* 1986:311ff, No. 155).
- Ev. 1355/56 Tetraevangelion, MBlg MS (Tärnovo area), 1355/56, BL, Add. MS 39627 (Cleminson 1988:121ff, No. 78). Quoted from the edition by Živkova 1980 as well as from Scholvin 1884 and Talev 1973.
- Ev. 1545 Tetraevangelion, MBlg (Mold?) MS, 1545. Quoted from excerpts published in Jacimirskij 1906a:21ff.¹
- Ev. 1548 Tetraevangelion, Serbian MS (from the Slepče monastery), 1548, Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Belgrade, No. 102 (Bogdanović 1982:130, No. 1984, Štavljanin-Đorđević *et al.* 1986:206ff, No. 93). Quoted from Ohijenko 1932 and Schweier 1987.
- Ev. 1627 Tetraevangelion, Moscow 1627 (Zernova 1958:34, No. 64). Quoted from the copy at the KB. There are two series of pagination, the first referring to Matt., Mark, and Luke, and the second to John.
- Ev. No. 34 'Short' Gospel lectionary, MBlg (Mold?) MS, 16th century, Library of the Zograph Monastery on Mount Athos (Kodov *et al.* 1985:73f, No. 34, Il'inskij 1908:258, No. 18). Quoted from a microfilm obtained from the Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, Thessaloniki.
- Ev. No. 8619 'Long' Gospel lectionary, ESI MS, 1506/07, GBL, Fond 178 [Muzej-noe sobr.], No. 8619. Parts of this MS are in the present investigation referred to as 'M'; cf. section 5.1.

¹ Unfortunately it has not been possible to determine the present location of this manuscript. Jacimirskij gives the following short description: 'Рукопись Киприановского мон-я в Бессарабии, 1545 года, написанная по повелению господаря Петра Рареша.' (1906:21), 'Четвероевангелие в лист (7 1/2 x 5 верш.), на 276 пергаменных листах. Полуустав четкий, красивый, типичного молдавского письма. Правописание тырновское.' (1906:LXIff).

- F Parts of a 'long' Gospel lectionary, ESI (?) MS, 15th century (Wesslén 1985:153), the main object of the present investigation. For details see section 2.1.
- Is. Sir. Sermons of Isaak the Syrian, MBlg (WBlg) MS, 1381, GBL, Fond 304 [sobr. Troice-Sergievoj lavry], No. 172 (Šelamanova 1966:219, No. 541). Quoted from Dybo 1982a, 1983.
- Lex. 1722 *Léksikonъ*, Suprasl' 1722 (Halenčanka *et al.* 1986:134, No. 203). Quoted from the excerpts published in Nimčuk 1961:261–271. The figures refer to the pagination in Nimčuk 1961.
- Lit. 1519 Liturgy, Venice 1519 (Pozdeeva *et al.* 1980:29f, No. 5). Quoted from a copy at the UUB (Kjellberg 1951:1, No. 1).
- M see Ev. No. 8619.
- MB Bible, Moscow 1663 (Zernova 1958:93, No. 306). Quoted from Schweier 1987.
- Mer. *Merilo pravednoe*, ESI MS, 14th century, GBL, Fond 304 [sobr. Troice-Sergievoj lavry], No. 15 (Šelamanova 1966:224, No. 639, Zaliznjak 1985a:216ff). Quoted from the edition by Tichomirov 1961.
- Nil. T Lives of Saints, ESI MS, beginning of the 16th century, GBL, Fond 304 [sobr. Troice-Sergievoj lavry], No. 684 (Zaliznjak 1985a:233). Quoted from Bogatyrev 1989.
- Nor. ps. *Norovskaja psal'tyr'*, MBlg MS, first half of the 14th century, Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Muzej, Moscow, Fond 4911, 80269, 80270, 80271 [sobr. Uvarova], No. 285 (Šelamanova 1966:208, No. 344). Quoted from the edition by Češko *et al.* 1989.
- NT 1816 *Novyj Zavět Gospoda Našego Iisusa Christa*, [St. Petersburg 1816]. Quoted from a copy at the KB.
- OB Bible, Ostrog 1580/81 (Zapasko, Isajevyč 1981:27, No. 13). Mainly quoted from Schweier 1987 (OBa), where two copies in German libraries are used as sources. In some instances (OBb) quoted from a copy at the KB. When referring to OBb, figures indicate the pagination of the folios in the section containing the New Testament, with 'a', 'b', 'c', and 'd' referring to the respective columns.
- Peresopn. *Peresopnickoe evangelie*, Tetraevangelion, ESI (Ukr) MS, 1556–1561, Central'na naukova biblioteka Akademiji Nauk Ukrajin's'koji RSR, Kiev, No. 15512 (Nimčuk 1980:289). Quoted from the edition by Žiteckij 1878.
- Polik. Polikarpov, F.: *Leksikón trejazýčnyi*, Moscow 1704 (Zernova, Kameleva 1968:15, No. 42). Quoted from a copy at the SUB.
- Ps. 1495 Psalter, Cetinje 1495 (Karataev 1878:18ff, No. 8). Quoted from Novaković 1877:62–147.
- Ps. No. 3 Psalter, MBlg MS, end of the 14th century, Narodna Biblioteka „Kiril i Metodij“, Sofia, No. 3 (Conev 1910:2ff, No. 3 [560]). Quoted from Hinrichs 1985 (P).
- Ratn. *Kniga učenija chitrosti ratnago stroenija pechotnych ljudei*, Moscow 1647 (Zernova 1958:66, No. 201). Quoted from Stang 1952.
- Sb. 1348 Miscellany, MBlg MS, 1348, GPB, F.I.376 (Šelamanova 1966:217, No. 505). Quoted from Kuev 1981.
- Sb. 1509 Miscellany, Serbian MS, 1509, GPB, Fond 182 [sobr. Gil'ferdinga], No. 56 (Bulatova 1975:14ff). Quoted from Bulatova 1975.

- Sb. 1536 Miscellany, Venice 1536 (Stojanović 1903/1982:408). Quoted from Novaković 1877:14–61.
- Sb. No. 1735 Miscellany, fols. 301–309, MBlg MS, first half of the 16th century, Skopje, Filozofski Fakultet (FF) I-1/1735 (Bogdanović 1982:40, No. 371). Quoted from Koneski 1954.
- Slavin. Slavineckij, E. and Koreckij-Satanovskij, A.: *Lexikon sloveno-latin-skij*, ES1 MS, 17th century, Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, Slave 6 (Birgegård 1985:136f). Quoted from the edition by Nimčuk 1973:423–540. The figures refer to the pagination in Nimčuk 1973.
- SLS Sparwenfeld, J.G: *Lexicon Slavonicum*, end of 17th–beginning of 18th century, UUB, Slav 37–40. Quoted from the edition by Birgegård 1987–1990.
- Služ. No. 323 Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, ES1 MS, third quarter of the 15th century, Biblioteka Srpske Lavre Hilendara, Mount Athos, No. 323 (Bogdanović 1978:134f, No. 323, Steensland 1990:12f). Quoted from the edition *Codex* 1977.
- Služ. Evf. Liturgy of patriarch Euthymius of Tărnovo, MBlg MS, 1370 (?), Library of the Zograph Monastery on Mount Athos (Il'inskij 1908:270, No. 121, Syrku 1890:XIII). Quoted from the edition by Syrku 1890.
- Služ. Sol. Liturgy of patriarch Euthymius of Tărnovo, MBlg (Mold) MS, 1532, GPB, Fond 717 [sobr. Soloveckaja biblioteka], No. 709 (1015) (Granstrom 1953:91, Solov. 1124/1015, *Opisanie* 1898:35ff, No. 709 [1015]). Quoted from the edition by Syrku 1890.
- Smotr. 1619 Meletij Smotrickij: *Grammătiki slavěnskija pravilnoe sýntagma*, Ev'e 1619 (Halenčanka *et al.* 1986:92f, No. 89). Quoted from the edition by Nimčuk 1979. The pages are referred to according to their designations in the original, viz. gathering, folio, r/v (e.g. x4r).
- Smotr. 1648 Grammar, Moscow 1648 (Zernova 1958:67, No. 206). Quoted from a copy at the UUB (Kjellberg 1951:7, No. 52).
- Sof. služ. Liturgy of patriarch Euthymius of Tărnovo, MBlg MS, the 1380s, Narodna Biblioteka „Kiril i Metodij“, Sofia, No. 231 (Conev 1910:149ff, No. 231 [97]). Quoted from the edition by Koceva 1985.
- Stich. No. 307 *Sticherarium Chiliandarcum*, ES1 MS (Novgorod area), end of the 12th century, Biblioteka Srpske Lavre Hilendara, Mount Athos, No. 307 (Bogdanović 1978:131, No. 307). Quoted from Störmer 1987.
- Vas. ps. Psalter, ES1 MS (Novgorod area?), 16th century, GPB, F.I.7 (Zaliznjak 1985a:213f). Quoted from Vasil'ev 1929/1972.
- Vas. sb. Miscellany, ES1 MS (Novgorod area?), 16th century, GPB, Fond 728 [sobr. Sofijskaja biblioteka], No. 1460 (Zaliznjak 1985a:214). Quoted from Vasil'ev 1929/1972.
- Zogr. sb. Miscellany (*Synaxarion, prolog?*), MBlg MS, 14th century (?), Library of the Zograph Monastery on Mount Athos (Il'inskij 1908:274, No. 171, Dybo 1987:182f). Quoted from Ivanov 1931 and Dybo 1987.
- Ziz. Zizanij, L.: *Leksis*, in Zizanij, L., Zizanij, S.: *Nauka ku čitanju*, Vilna 1596 (Halenčanka *et al.* 1986:75, No. 43). Quoted from the edition by Nimčuk 1964:23–89.

Other sources

- Ass. *Codex Assemanianus*. Quoted from the edition by Kurz 1955.
- B *Manuscript B*, ESI (Novgorod?) MS, second half of the 14th century. Quoted from the edition by Wesslén 1985:16–97.
- Ban. *Baniško evanĝelie*, MBlg MS, 13th century. Quoted from the edition by Dogramadžieva, Rajkov 1981.
- Čajn. *Čajničko jevanĝelje*, Bosnian MS, end of the 14th–beginning of the 15th century. Quoted from Jerković 1975.
- Dobr. *Dobromirovo evanĝelie*, MBlg MS, beginning of the 12th century. Quoted from the edition by Velčeva 1975.
- Eg. Tetraevangelion, ESI (Novgorod area) MS, c.1500. Quoted from Stadnikova 1989.
- Ev. No. 3 Tetraevangelion, Serbian MS, 13th century, GPB, Fond 182, No. 3. Quoted from Widnäs 1970.
- Kochn. *Evanĝelie Kochno*, MBlg MS, second half of the 13th century. Quoted from the edition by Kossek 1986.
- Kz. The *Fourth Novgorod Chronicle* (Karamzin copy), ESI MS (Novgorod area), end of the 15th century. Quoted from Kolesov 1962a.
- Ljub. Missal, Cr glagolitic MS, beginning of the 15th century. Quoted from Vrana 1975.
- Mar. *Codex Marianus*. Quoted from the edition by Jagić 1883/1960.
- Mst. *Mstislavovo evanĝelie*, ESI MS, end of 11th–beginning of 12th century. Quoted from the edition by Žukovskaja 1983.
- Muz. Tetraevangelion, ESI (NGrR) MS, first half of the 16th century, GBL, Fond 178, No. 3650. See Zaliznjak 1985a:233.
- O pism. Konstantin Kostenečki: *O pismenech*. See Kuev, Petkov 1986.
- Om. Missal, Cr glagolitic MS, beginning of the 14th century. Quoted from Vrana 1975.
- Ostr. *Ostromirovo evanĝelie*. Quoted from the edition by Vostokov 1843/1964.
- Sav. *Savvina kniga*. Quoted from the edition by Ščepkin 1903/1959.
- Vukan. *Vukanovo evanĝelie*, Serbian MS, end of the 12th–beginning of the 13th century. Quoted from the edition by Vrana 1967.
- Zogr. *Codex Zographensis*. Quoted from the edition by Jagić 1879/1954.

Libraries and archives

- BAN Biblioteka Akademii Nauk SSSR, Otdel redkoj i rukopis'noj knigi, Leningrad.
- BL British Library, London.
- GBL Gosudarstvennaja Biblioteka SSSR im. V.I. Lenina, Otdel rukopisej, Moscow.
- GPB Gosudarstvennaja Publičnaja Biblioteka im. Saltykova-Ščedrina, Otdel rukopisej i redkich knig, Leningrad.
- KB Kungliga Biblioteket (the Royal Library), Stockholm.
- RA Riksarkivet (the National Record Office), Stockholm.
- SUB Stockholms Universitetsbibliotek (Stockholm University Library), Stockholm.
- UUB Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek (Uppsala University Library), Uppsala.

Other abbreviations

acc	accusative	m	masculine
a.p.	accent paradigm	MBlg	Middle Bulgarian
adj	adjective	MChSl	Middle Church Slavonic
adv	adverb		
AU	accentual unit	Mold	Moldavian
Blg	Bulgarian	MS(S)	manuscript(s)
CESl	Common East Slavonic	nom	nominative
comp	comparative	n	neuter
conj	conjunction	NEBlg	Northeast Bulgarian
Cr	Croatian	OChSl	Old Church Slavonic
CSl	Common Slavonic	pl	plural
dat	dative	postp	postposition
du	dual	prep	preposition
EBlg	East Bulgarian	pres	present (tense)
EGrR	East Great Russian	pron	pronoun
ESl	East Slavic	r	recto
f	feminine	sg	singular
gen	genitive	SSl	South Slavic
Gk	Greek	Ukr	Ukrainian
GrR	Great Russian	voc	vocative
instr	instrumental	v	verso
interj	interjection	WBlg	West Bulgarian
loc	locative	WGrR	West Great Russian

Symbols

[]	indicate interpolated text
{ }	(referring to MS M) indicate text belonging to corpus B
*	1. (referring to MSS F and M) indicates an uncertain accentuation 2. (elsewhere) indicates a reconstructed form
+	(referring to MS F) indicates that the relevant accent mark is not reproduced in the edition by Wesslén 1985
	line-break
	page-break
◇	'the corresponding simple form belongs to'; cf. section 3.3.1
x	'times' (in numerical expressions)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, K., and Aland, B. 1989. *The text of the New Testament*. An introduction to the critical editions and to the theory and practise of modern textual criticism. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Grand Rapids–Leiden.
- Bauer, W. 1957. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago.
- Birgegård, U. 1985. *Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld and the Lexicon Slavonicum*. His contribution to 17th century Slavonic lexicography (= Acta Bibliothecae R. Universitatis Upsaliensis XXIII). Uppsala.
- _____. ed. 1987–1990. *Sparwenfeld, J.G.: Lexicon Slavonicum*. Vol. 1–4 (= Acta Bibliothecae R. Universitatis Upsaliensis XXIV:1–4). Uppsala.
- Birnbaum, D.J. 1986. 'On the methods of analyzing accented Slavic manuscripts.' *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* XXXIV, pp. 123–142.
- _____. 1989. Review of Schweier 1987. *Russian Linguistics* XIII, pp. 319–324.
- Birnbaum, H. (Бирнбаум, Х.) 1961. 'Стокгольмский отрывок древнерусского евангелия-апракос.' *Scando-Slavica* VII, pp. 203–232.
- Bogatyrev, K.K. (Богатырев, К.К.) 1989. 'Акцентологическая система автографов Нила Сорского.' *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, pp. 176–200. Москва.
- Bogdanović, D. (Богдановић, Д.) 1978. *Каталог ћирилских рукописа манастира Хиландара*. Београд.
- _____. 1982. *Инвентар ћирилских рукописа у Југославији (XI–XVII века)* (Српска Академија Наука и Уметности. Зборник за историју, језик и књижевност српског народа, I одељење, књига XXXI). Београд.
- Bol'shaja Sovetskaja Enciklopedija* 1950–1958. *Большая Советская Энциклопедия*. Изд. 2. Москва.
- Briquet, C.M. 1923/1977. *Les filigranes*. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier. Tome I–IV. Deuxieme edition. Leipzig. (Reprint: Hildesheim–New York 1977.)
- Brozović, D. 1970. *Standardni jezik*. Zagreb.
- Bubnov, N.Ju. et al. (Бубнов, Н.Ю., Лихачева, О.П., Покровская, В.Ф.) 1976. *Пергаменные рукописи Библиотеки Академии Наук СССР*. Описание русских и славянских рукописей XI–XVI веков. Ленинград.
- Bulatova, R.V. (Булатова, Р.В.) 1972. 'О надстрочных значках и акцентных системах трех книг Мардария — сербского печатника середины XVI века.' *Исследования по сербохорватскому языку*, pp. 38–85. Москва.
- _____. 1973. 'Надстрочные знаки в южнославянских рукописях XI–XIV вв.' *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. Выпуск I, pp. 76–114. Москва.
- _____. 1975. *Старосербская глагольная акцентуация*. Сборник 1509 г. как памятник истории сербского штокавского ударения. Москва.

- _____. 1977. 'Акцентуация приставочных поствербал а-основ в сербохорватском языке.' *Славянское и балканское языкознание*. Античная балканистика и сравнительная грамматика, pp. 273–301. Москва.
- _____. 1979. 'Работы советских исследователей по славянской исторической акцентологии на материале древних памятников письменности.' *Зборник за филологију и лингвистику* XXII, 1, pp. 73–85. Нови Сад.
- _____. 1981. 'Акцентуация непроизводных имен существительных а-основ в древнесербских рукописях XIV–XVI вв.' *Славянское и балканское языкознание*. Проблемы морфологии, pp. 60–89. Москва.
- _____. 1982. 'Акцентуация приставочных поствербал δ-основ в сербохорватском языке.' *Советское славяноведение*, 4, pp. 82–97. Москва.
- _____. 1989. 'Акцентуация непроизводных существительных δ-основ мужского рода в старосербском.' *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, pp. 201–224. Москва.
- Bulatova, R.V. et al. (Булатова, Р.В., Дыбо, В.А., Николаев, С.Л.) 1988. 'Проблемы акцентологических диалектизмов в праславянском.' *Славянское языкознание*. X Международный съезд славистов, София, сентябрь 1988 г. Доклады советской делегации, pp. 31–66, 389. Москва.
- Chaburgaev, G.A. (Хабургаев, Г.А.) 1986. *Старославянский язык*. Издание второе, переработанное и дополненное. Москва.
- Cejtlin, R.M. (Цейтлин, Р.М.) 1977. *Лексика старославянского языка*. Москва.
- Češko, E.V. et al. eds. (Чешко, Е.В., Бунина, И.К., Дыбо, В.А., Князевская, О.А., Науменко, Л.А.) 1989. *Норовская псалтырь*. Среднеболгарская рукопись XIV века. Ч. I–II. София.
- Cleminson, R. 1988. *A union catalogue of Cyrillic manuscripts in British and Irish collections* (The Anne Pennington catalogue). London.
- Codex 1977. *Codex 323. Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* (= Ohio State editions of Hilarian manuscripts. Series A: Facsimiles. No. 1). Columbus.
- Conev, B. (Цонев, Б.) 1910. *Опис на ръкописите и старопечатните книги на Народната библиотека в София*. [Том I.] София.
- Damjanović, S. 1984. *Tragom jezika hrvatskih glagoljaša* (= Znanstvena biblioteka Hrvatskog filološkog društva 15). Zagreb.
- Deschler, J.-P. 1987. *Kleines Wörterbuch der Kirchenslavischen Sprache* (= Slavistische Beiträge 206). München.
- Diels, P. 1932. *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*. I. Teil: Grammatik. Heidelberg.
- D'jačenko, G. (Дьяченко, Г.) 1899. *Полный церковно-славянский словарь*. Москва.
- Dogramadžieva, E., and Rajkov, B. eds. (Дограмаджиева, Е., Райков, Б.) 1981. *Банишко евангелие*. Среднобългарски паметник от XIII век. София.
- Dybo, V.A. (Дыбо, В.А.) 1968a. 'Акцентология и словообразование в славянском.' *Славянское языкознание*. VI Международный съезд славистов (Прага, август 1968 г.). Доклады советской делегации, pp. 148–224. Москва.
- _____. 1968b. 'Фрагмент праславянской акцентной системы (Формы-еп- clinomena в аористе i-глаголов).' *Советское славяноведение*, 6, pp. 66–77.
- _____. 1969. 'Среднеболгарские тексты как источник для реконструкции праславянского ударения. (Praesens).' *Вопросы языкознания*, 3, pp. 82–101.

- _____. 1970. 'Фрагмент праславянской акцентной системы (Ударение прилагательных с суффиксом -ък-).' *Советское славяноведение*, 5, pp. 46–57.
- _____. 1971a. 'К классификации среднеболгарских акцентных систем (Предварительные итоги).' *Исследования по славянскому языкознанию*, pp. 63–70. Москва.
- _____. 1971b. 'Закон Васильева—Долобко и акцентуация форм глагола в древнерусском и среднеболгарском.' *Вопросы языкознания*, 2, pp. 93–114.
- _____. 1971c. 'О фразовых модификациях ударения в праславянском.' *Советское славяноведение*, 6, pp. 77–84.
- _____. 1973. 'Материалы по исторической акцентологии болгарского языка. I. Именное ударение в восточно- и среднеболгарских текстах XIII—XIV вв.' *Известия на Института за български език XXII*, pp. 151–210. София.
- _____. 1975. 'Закон Васильева—Долобко в древнерусском (на материале Чудовского Нового Завета).' *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics XVII*, pp. 7–81.
- _____. 1977. 'Именное ударение в среднеболгарском и закон Васильева—Долобко.' *Славянское и балканское языкознание*. Античная балканистика и сравнительная грамматика, pp. 189–272. Москва.
- _____. 1981. *Славянская акцентология*. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском. Москва.
- _____. 1982a. 'Праславянское распределение акцентных типов в презенсе тематических глаголов с корнями на нешумные (материалы к реконструкции).' *Балто-славянские исследования 1981*, pp. 205–261.
- _____. 1982b. 'О некоторых акцентологических исоглоссах словенско-кайавской языковой области.' *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik VI*, pp. 101–134. Zagreb.
- _____. 1983. 'Праславянское распределение акцентных типов в презенсе тематических глаголов с корнями на нешумные (материалы к реконструкции).' *Балто-славянские исследования 1982*, pp. 3–67.
- _____. 1987. 'Праславянское распределение акцентных типов в презенсе тематических глаголов с корнями на нешумные (материалы к реконструкции).' *Балто-славянские исследования 1985*, pp. 181–209.
- _____. 1989. 'Акцентологический комментарий к Норовской псалтыри.' *Норовская псалтырь*. Среднеболгарская рукопись XIV века. Часть I, pp. 93–114. София.
- Fält, E. 1990. *Compounds in contact*. A study in compound words with special reference to the Old Slavonic translation of Flavius Josephus' *Περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου* (= Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Slavica Upsaliensia 28). Uppsala.
- Garde, P. 1976. *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*. Paris.
- Gil'tebrandt, P. (Гильтебрандт, П.) 1882–1885/1988–1989: *Справочный и объяснительный словарь к Новому Завету*. Книга I–VI. Петроград. (Reprint, München 1988–1989 [= Sagners Slavistische Sammlung 14, I–VI].)
- Granstrem, E. E. (Гранстрем, Е.Э.) 1953. *Описание русских и славянских пергаменных рукописей*. Ленинград.
- Günther, K. 1960. 'Slawische Handschriften in Deutschland.' *Zeitschrift für Slawistik V*, pp. 317–355.

- Gustavsson, S. 1969. *Accent paradigms of the present tense in South Slavonic*. East and Central South Slavonic (= Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Slavic Studies 3). Stockholm.
- Görner, F. 1968. 'Ergebnisse einer Untersuchung der mittelbulgarischen Akzentverhältnisse.' *Bulgarische Jahrbücher* 1, pp. 79–100.
- _____. 1974. 'Urslavische Akzentverhältnisse im Spiegel mittelbulgarischer Texte des 14.–16. Jahrhunderts.' *Bulgarische Jahrbücher* 2, pp. 71–97.
- H. Tóth, I. (X. Тот, И.) 1988. 'К вопросам изучения русской редакции древнеболгарского языка.' *Hungaro-Slavica* 1988, pp. 301–308. Budapest.
- Halenčanka, H.Ja. et al. (Галенчанка, Г.Я., Непарожная, Т.В., Радзевіч, Т.К.) 1986. *Кніга Беларусі. 1517–1917. Зводны каталог*. Мінск.
- Hill, P. 1988. 'The origin of standard colloquial speech.' *Standard language in the Slavic world* (= Slavistische Beiträge 235), pp. 80–97. München.
- Hinrichs, J.P. 1985. *Zum Akzent im Mittelbulgarischen*. Amsterdam.
- Horbatsch, O. 1964. *Die vier Ausgaben der kirchenslavischen Grammatik von M. Smotryckij* (= Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik 7). Wiesbaden.
- _____. ed. 1974. *Meletij Smotryckij: Hrammatiki slavenskija pravilnoe syntagma*, Jevje 1619. Kirchenslavische Grammatik (Erstausgabe) (= Specimina philologiae Slavicae 4). Frankfurt am Main.
- Houtzagers, H.P. 1985. *The Čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres*. Amsterdam.
- _____. 1988. 'On the Kajkavian dialects of Hidegség and Fertőhomok in the northwest of Hungary.' *Dutch contributions to the Tenth international congress of slavists, Sofia*, Linguistics (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 11), pp. 329–363. Amsterdam.
- Il'inskij, G.A. (Ильинский, Г.А.) 1908. Рукописи Зографского монастыря на Афоне. *Известия Русского археологического института в Константинополе XIII*, pp. 253–276. София.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M. (Иллич-Свитыч, В.М.) 1963. *Именная акцентуация в балтийском и славянском*. Москва.
- Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) 1931. *Български старини из Македония*. Второ, допълнено издание. София.
- Ivanova, K. (Иванова, К.) 1981. *Български, сръбски и молдо-влахийски кирилски ръкописи в сбирката на М.П. Погодин*. София.
- Ivić, P. (Ивић, П.) 1985. *Дијалектологија српскохрватског језика*. Увод и штокавско наречје. 2. изд. Суботица.
- Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский, А.И.) 1906. *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV—XVII вв.* Введение к изучению литературы у румын. Тырновские тексты молдавского происхождения и заметки к ним (= Памятники древней письменности и искусства. Том CLXII). СанктПетербург.
- _____. 1921. *Описание южно-славянских и русских рукописей заграничных библиотек*. Том I. Вена. — Берлин. — Дрезден. — Лейпциг. — Мюнхен. — Прага. — Любляна. (= Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности Российской Академии Наук. Том XCLVIII). Петроград.
- Jagić, V. (Јагић, И.В.) 1879/1954. *Quattor evangeliorum Codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*. Berlin. (Reprint, Graz 1954.)
- _____. 1883/1960. *Мариинское четвероевангелие с примечаниями и приложениями*. Памятник глаголической письменности. Berlin. (Reprint: *Quat-*

- tuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae Codex Marianus glagoliticus*. Graz 1960.)
- _____. 1896/1968. *Codex slovenicus rerum grammaticarum*. Berlin. (Reprint, München 1968 [= Slavische Propyläen 25].)
- Jerković, V. (Јерковић, В.) 1975. *Палеографска и језичка испитивања о Чайничком јеванђељу*. Нови Сад.
- Karataev, I. (Каратаев, И.) 1878. *Описание славяно-русских книг, напечатанных кирилловскими буквами 1491–1730*. Выпуск первый. С 1491 по 1600 г. С-Петербург.
- Kiparsky, V. 1962. *Der Wortakzent der russischen Schriftsprache*. Heidelberg.
- Kjellberg, L. 1951. *Catalogue des imprimés slaves des XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles conservés à la Bibliothèque de l'Université Royale d'Uppsala*. Uppsala (typescript).
- Knutsson, K. (Кнутссон, К.) 1937/38. 'О нескольких древне-русских пергаментных отрывках евангельских чтений в Швеции.' *Slavia* XV, pp. 53–72.
- Koseva, E. (Коцева, Е.) 1985. *Евтимиев служебник*. Софийски препис от 80-те години на XIV век. София.
- Kodov, Chr., and Rajkov, B. (Кодов, Хр., Райков, Б.) 1976. 'Принципи и методи на описване на славянските ръкописи с оглед на съставяне каталог на българските ръкописи от X до XVIII век.' *Известия на Народната библиотека "Кирил и Методий" XIV (XX)*, pp. 55–80.
- Kodov, Chr. et al. (Кодов, Хр., Райков, Б., Кожухаров, С.) 1985. *Опис на славянските ръкописи в библиотеката на Зографския манастир в Света гора*. Том I. София.
- Kolesov, V. V. (Колесов, В. В.) 1962. '[ô] (о закрытое) в древненовгородском говоре.' *Ученые записки ЛГУ*, 302. Серия филологических наук, выпуск 61, pp. 149–161. Ленинград.
- _____. 1965. 'Об одной древнерусской диалектной системе ударения.' *Вестник Ленинградского Университета. Серия истории, языка и литературы*, 8, выпуск 2, pp. 116–128. Ленинград.
- _____. 1969. 'Ударение производных имен существительных в праславянском языке.' *Советское славяноведение*, 2, pp. 42–51.
- _____. 1972a. *История русского ударения*. Именная акцентуация в древнерусском языке. Москва.
- _____. 1972b. 'Ударение заимствованных слов в русских памятниках XVI–XVII вв. (к вопросу об акцентологической адаптации заимствованной лексики).' *Русская историческая лексикология и лексикография*, pp. 28–45. Ленинград.
- _____. 1973a. 'Надстрочные знаки «силы» в русской орфографической традиции.' *Восточнославянские языки. Источники для их изучения*, pp. 228–257. Москва.
- _____. 1973b. 'Знаки ударения и надстрочные знаки в русских рукописях XIV–XV вв.' *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. Выпуск I, pp. 115–131. Москва.
- _____. 1974. 'Просодические диалектные признаки в истории русского языка.' *Вопросы языкознания*, 1, pp. 76–90.
- _____. 1976. 'Надстрочные знаки в русской орфографической традиции. «Времена» и «духи».' *Источники по истории русского языка*, pp. 60–74. Москва.

- Koneski, B. (Конески, Б.) 1954. 'Акцентите во еден текст од почетокот на 16 век.' *Македонски јазик* V, 1, pp. 80–101.
- _____. 1966. *Историја македонског језика*. Београд.
- Kosseck, N.V. (Коссек, Н.В.) 1986. *Евангелие Кохно*. Болгарский памятник XIII в. София.
- Kuev, K. (Куев, К.) 1981. *Иван Александровият сборник от 1348 г.* София.
- Kuev, K., and Petkov, G. (Куев, К., Петков, Г.) 1986. *Събрани съчинения на Константин Костенечки*. София.
- Kul'bakin, S.M. (Кульбакин, С.М.) 1904. 'Материалы и заметки по славяноведению.' *Журнал министерства народного просвещения*, седьмое десятилетие CCCLIV, 7 (июль), pp. 18–47.
- Kurz, J. ed. 1955. *Evangeliiář Assemanův*. Kodex Vatikánský 3. slovanský. Díl II. Praha.
- Lampe, G.W.H. 1961–68. *A patristic Greek lexicon*. Vol. 1–5. Oxford.
- Lehfeldt, W. 1984. Review of Ušakov 1982. *Russian Linguistics* VIII, pp. 167–174.
- _____. 1986. 'Zur graphischen Wiedergabe und zur Distribution von zwei Phonemen des "Typs o" in einer Russisch-Kirchenslavischen Handschrift aus der Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts.' *Slavistische Linguistik* 1985. Referate des XI. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens, pp. 133–145. München.
- _____. ed. 1989. *Neues Testament des Čudov-Klosters* (= Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven 28). Köln–Wien.
- Lehfeldt, W., and Berger, T. 1984. 'Zur Rekonstruktion des Altrussischen Akzent-systems.' *Wiener slavistischer Almanach* XIII, pp. 141–160.
- Leskien, A. 1910. *Handbuch der Altbulgarischen (Altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*. 5. Auflage. Weimar.
- Lichačev, N.P. (Лихачев, Н.П.) 1899. *Палеографическое значение бумажных водяных знаков*. Часть 1–3. СанктПетербург.
- Liddell, H.G., and Scott, R. 1925–1940: *A Greek-English lexicon*. New edition, Oxford.
- Lindgren, N. (Линдгрэн, Н.) 1990. *Акцентологическая характеристика севернорусской рукописи XVII века* (= Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Slavic Studies 20). Stockholm.
- Lysaght, T.A. 1983. *Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) – Middle Greek – Modern English dictionary*. Wien.
- Mathiesen, R. 1984. 'The Church Slavonic language question: an overview (IX–XX centuries).' *Aspects of the Slavic language question*, I, pp. 45–66. New Haven.
- Miklosich, Fr. 1862–1865. *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*. Vindobonae.
- Mirčev, K. (Мирчев, К.) 1978. *Историческа граматика на българския език*. Трето издание. София.
- Mošin, V. (Мошин, В.) 1963. '„Револуције“ у историји старог српског правописа.' *Библиотекар* XV, pp. 465–475.
- _____. 1966. *Палеографски албум на јужнословенското кирилско писмо*. Скопје.
- _____. 1973. 'Палеографическо-орфографические нормы южнославянских рукописей.' *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. Выпуск I, pp. 43–75. Москва.
- Музејное собрание* 1971. *Музейное собрание. Ф. 178 – русская (и славянская часть)*. Опись. Т. V, №№ 8462–9500. Москва (typescript).

- Newtéron Eγκυκλοπαίδικὸν Λεξικὸν* [1957–1960]. *Newtéron Eγκυκλοπαίδικὸν Λεξικὸν*. Ἀθήναι.
- Nevolin, Ju.A. (Неволин, Ю.А.) 1973. 'Описание украшений южнославянских и древнерусских иллюминированных рукописей по XIV век включительно.' *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. Выпуск I, pp. 164–179. Москва.
- Nikolaev, S.L. (Николаев, С.Л.) 1989. 'Балто-славянская акцентуационная система и ее индоевропейские истоки.' *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, pp. 46–109. Москва.
- Nimčuk, V.V. (Німчук, В.В.) ed. 1961. *Лексикон словенороський Памви Беринди* (= Пам'ятки української мови XVII ст. Серія наукової літератури). Київ.
- _____. ed. 1964. *Лексис Лаврентія Зизанія. Синоніма славеноросскаѧ* (= Пам'ятки української мови XVII ст.). Київ.
- _____. ed. 1973. *Лексикон латинський Є. Славинецького. Лексион словено-латинський Є. Славинецького та А. Корецького-Сатановського* (= Пам'ятки української мови XVII ст. Серія наукової літератури). Київ.
- _____. ed. 1979. *Мелетій Смотрицький: Граматика* (= Пам'ятки української мови XVII ст.). Київ.
- _____. 1980. *Староукраїнська лексикографія в її зв'язках з російською та білоруською*. Київ.
- Novaković, St. (Новаковић, Ст.) 1877. 'Акценти штампаних српско-словенских књига црногорских и млетачких.' *Гласник Српског ученог друштва*, књ. XLIV, pp. 1–152. У Београду.
- Novum Testamentum Graece* 1990. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle communiter ediderunt Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, Allen Wikgren. 26. Auflage, 11. Druck. Stuttgart.
- Ohijenko, I. (Огієнко, І.) 1925. 'Наголос, яко метод означення місця виходу стародрукованих книжок. Замітки з історії наголосу на послугах палеотипії.' *Записки наукового товариства імени Шевченка*. Том CXXXVI–CXXXVII. Праці фільольогічної секції, pp. 197–224. Львів.
- _____. 1928. 'Український наголос в XVI віці.' *Збірник статей в честь академіка Алексея Івановича Соболевського*, pp. 444–451. Ленінград.
- _____. 1932. 'Akzentzeichen in mittelbulgarischen Sprachdenkmälern.' *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* IX, pp. 395–399.
- _____. (Митрополит Іларіон) 1952. *Український літературний наголос*. Вінніпег.
- Opisanie* 1898. *Описание рукописей Соловецкого монастыря, находящихся в библиотеке Казанской Духовной Академии*. Часть III. Отдел первый. Казань.
- Picchio, R. 1980. 'Church Slavonic.' *The Slavic Literary Languages*, pp. 1–33. New Haven.
- Pozdeeva, I.V. et al. (Поздеева, И.В., Кашпарова, И.Д., Леренман, М.М.) 1980. *Каталог книг кириллической печати XV–XVII вв. Научной библиотеки Московского университета*. Москва.
- Пуцко, V.G. (Пуцко, В.Г.) 1988. 'Новые книги о славянских рукописях.' *Советское славяноведение*, 4, pp. 90–94.

- Rehder, P. 1985. 'The concept of the norm and the literary language among the glagoljši.' *The formation of the Slavonic literary languages* (= UCLA Slavic Studies 11), pp. 183–191. Columbus.
- Ščerkin, V.N. (Щепкин, В.Н.) ed. 1903/1959. *Саввина книга* (=Памятники старославянского языка. Том I, вып. 2-й.). Санктпетербург. (Reprint, Graz 1959.)
- _____. 1967. *Русская палеография*. Москва.
- Scholvin, R. 1884. 'Einleitung in das Johann-Alexander-Evangelium.' *Archiv für Slavische Philologie* VII, pp. 1–56, 161–221.
- Schweier, U. 1987. *Zum Flexionsakzent in der großrussischen Literatursprache des 16. und des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Beschreibung und vergleichende Einordnung der Akzentsysteme der Ostroger Bibel (Neues Testament) von 1580–81 und der Moskauer Bibel von 1663 (= Specimina philologiae Slavicae, Supplementband 22). München.
- Šelamanova, N.B. (Шеламанова, Н.Б.) 1966. 'Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописей XI–XIV вв., хранящихся в СССР (для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР, до конца XIV в. включительно).' *Археографический ежегодник за 1965 год*, pp. 177–272. Москва.
- Sjöberg, A. (Шеберг, А.) 1980. 'Некоторые замечания о лексическом варьировании в переводах первоучителей Кирилла и Мефодия.' *Palaeobulgarica* IV, 2, pp. 37–42.
- Skljarenko, V.G. (Скляренко, В.Г.) 1969. *Історія акцентуації іменників а-основ української мови*. Київ.
- Sköld, H. 1927. *Aperçu sur un texte de lectionnaire en vieux slave de la Bibliothèque Royal à Stockholm*. Lund.
- Slovar'* 1847. *Словарь церковно-славянского и русского языка*. Том I–IV. Москва.
- Slovník* 1966–. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. 1–. Praha.
- Sophocles, E.A. 1957. *Greek lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods*. Vol. I–II. New York.
- Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский, И.И.) 1874. 'Сведения и заметки о малоизвестных и неизвестных памятниках. 41. Финляндские отрывки из памятников древнего Русского письма XI–XV вв.' *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии Наук*. Том XII, 1, pp. 1–37. Санктпетербург.
- Stadnikova, E.V. (Стадникова, Е.В.) 1989. 'Материалы к изучению двух фонем «типа о» в старовеликорусском.' *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, pp. 135–175. Москва.
- Stang, Chr. S. 1952. *La langue du livre Учение и хитрость ратнаго строенія пѣхотныхъ людей 1647. Une monographie linguistique* (= Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. II. Hist.-Fil. Klasse. No. 1.). Oslo.
- _____. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation* (= Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. I. Hist.-Fil. Klasse. No. 3.). Oslo.
- Štavljanić-Dorđević, Lj. et al. (Штавланић-Ђорђевић, Љ., Гроздановић-Пајић, М., Цернић, Л.) 1986. *Опис ћирилских рукописа Народне Библиотеке Србије*. Књига прва (= Опис јужнословенских ћирилских рукописа II). Београд.
- Steensland, L. (Стенсланд, Л.) 1987. 'Дистрибуција различних о-графем в одной церковнославянской рукописи XV века.' *Palaeobulgarica* XI, 3, pp. 41–56.

- _____. 1990. *Акцентировка и акцент*. Акцентологический анализ служебника XV в. *Chil.* 323 (= *Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Slavic Studies* 19). Stockholm.
- Stojanović, Lj. (Стојановић, Љ.) 1903/1982. *Каталог Народне библиотеке у Београду. IV. Рукописи и старе штампане књиге*. У Београду. (Reprint, Beograd 1982 [= Српска Академија Наука и Уметности, Народна библиотека Србије, Матица српска: фототипска издања 3].)
- Störmer, O. 1987. *Die altrussischen Handschriften liturgischer Gesänge in sematischer Notation als Hilfsmittel der slavischen Akzentologie* (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 209). München.
- Syrku, P. (Сырку, П.) 1890. *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке*. Том I. Литургические труды патриарха Евфимия Терновского. Выпуск II. Санктпетербург.
- Talev, I. 1973. *Some problems of the Second South Slavic influence in Russia* (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 67). München.
- The book of saints* 1989. *The book of saints*. Sixth edition. London.
- Thesaurus* 1831–1865. *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, tomus I–VIII, Parisiis.
- Tichomirov, M.N. (Тихомиров М.Н.) ed. 1961. *Мерило праведное по рукописи XIV века*. Москва.
- Tolstoj, N.I. (Толстой, Н.И.) 1988. *История и структура славянских литературных языков*. Москва.
- Ušakov, V.E. (Ушаков, В.Е.) 1982. *Акцентологический словарь древнерусского языка XIV века*. Москва.
- Uspenskij, B.A. (Успенский, Б.А.) 1969. *Из истории русских канонических имен*. Москва.
- _____. 1987. *История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)*. München.
- Vajs, J. 1935. *Evangelium S. Matthaei paleoslovenice* (= *Kritické studie staroslovenského textu biblického. III. Evangelium Sv. Matouše. Text rekonstruovaný*). Praeae.
- Vasilev, V.P. (Василев, В.П.) 1980. 'Правописната реформа на Евтимий и отражението и в произведения на негови следовници и на българските дамаскинари.' *Търновска книжовна школа* 2, pp. 405–421. София.
- Vasil'ev, L.L. (Васильев, Л.Л.) 1929/1972. *О значении каморы в некоторых древнерусских памятниках XVI–XVII веков*. К вопросу о произношении звука о в великорусском наречии (= *Сборник по русскому языку и словесности* I, 2). (Reprint: Васильев, Л.Л.: *Труды по истории русского и украинского языков*, München 1972 [= *Slavische Propyläen* 94], pp. 465–628.)
- Vasmer, M. (Фасмер, М.) 1986–1987. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Изд. 2. Москва.
- Velčeva, B. (Велчева, Б.) ed. 1975. *Добромирово евангелие*. Български паметник от началото на XII век. София.
- Vlasto, A.P. 1986. *A linguistic history of Russia to the end of the eighteenth century*. Oxford.
- Vostokov, A. (Востоков, А.) ed. 1843/1964. *Остромирово евангелие 1056–57 года*. с приложением греческого текста евангелий и с грамматическими объяснениями. СанктПетербург 1843. (Reprint, Wiesbaden 1964 [= *Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. Fontes et dissertationes* 1].)

- Vrana, J. (Врана, Ј.) 1967. *Вуканово еванђеље* (= Српска академија наука и уметности: Посебна издања CDIV, Одељење литературе и језика 18). Београд.
- _____. 1975. *Najstariji hrvatski glagoljski evanđelistar* (= Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti: Posebna izdanja CDLXXXIV, Odeljenje jezika i književnosti 24). Beograd.
- Vzdornov, G.I. (Вздорнов, Г.И.) 1980. *Искусство книги в Древней Руси*. Рукописная книга Северо-Восточной Руси XII–начала XV веков. Москва.
- Wesslén, S. 1985. *Slavonic parchment fragments in Sweden*. II. Gospels (= Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Slavic Studies 17). Stockholm.
- Widnäs, M. 1970. 'Étude sur quelques feuilles complémentaires à l'Évangélaire de la Bibliothèque Royale de Stockholm KB A 787 a 10 et 6.' *Scando-Slavica* XVI, pp. 205–224.
- Wijk, N. van 1931. *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache*. Erster Band: Laut- und Formenlehre. Berlin–Leipzig.
- Zagrebín, V.M., and Švarc, E.M. (Загребин, В.М., Шварц, Е.М.) 1990. 'Водяные знаки бумаги XIV и XV вв. (Обзор).' *Методическое рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописных книг*. Выпуск III, pp. 6–94. Москва.
- Zaliznjak, A.A. (Зализняк, А.А.) 1979. 'Акцентологическая система древнерусской рукописи XIV века „Мерило Праведное“.' *Славянское и балканское языкознание*. История литературных языков и письменность, pp. 47–128. Москва.
- _____. 1981. 'Глагольная акцентуация в южновеликорусской рукописи XVI в.' *Славянское и балканское языкознание*. Проблемы морфонологии, pp. 89–174. Москва.
- _____. 1985a. *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*. Москва.
- _____. 1985b. 'Дополнительные замечания об омеге в "Мерило Праведном".' *Советское славяноведение*, 4, pp. 97–107.
- _____. 1989. 'Перенос ударения на проклитики в старовеликорусском.' *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, pp. 116–134. Москва.
- Zapasko, Ja.P., and Isajevuč, Ja.D. (Запаско, Я.П., Исаевич, Я.Д.) 1981. *Пам'ятки книжкового мистецтва. Каталог стародруків, виданих на Україні*. Книга перша (1574–1700). Львів.
- Zernova, A.S. (Зернова, А.С.) 1958. *Книги кирилловской печати изданные в Москве в 16.–17. веках*. Сводный каталог. Москва.
- Zernova, A.S., and Kameneva, T.N. (Зернова, А.С., Каменева, Т.Н.) 1968. *Сводный каталог русской книги кирилловской печати XVIII века*. Москва.
- Žiteckij, P.I. (Житецкий, П.И.) 1878. 'Текст Евангелия Луки из Пересопницкой рукописи.' *Труды третьего археологического съезда в России* 2, приложения, pp. 43–111.
- Živkova, L. (Живкова, Л.) 1980. *Четвероевангелието на цар Иван Александър*. София.
- Živov, V.M. (Живов, В.М.) 1984. 'Правила и произношение в русском церковнославянском правописании XI–XIII века.' *Russian Linguistics* VIII, pp. 251–293.
- _____. 1986. 'Еще раз о правописании *цич* в древних новгородских рукописях.' *Russian Linguistics* X, pp. 291–306.

- _____. 1988. 'Роль русского церковнославянского в истории славянских литературных языков.' *Актуальные проблемы славянского языкознания*, pp. 49–98. Москва.
- Žukovskaja, L.P. (Жуковская, Л.П.) 1973. 'Рекомендации для определения языка (извода) древних славянских рукописей.' *Методическое пособие по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. Выпуск I, pp. 1–42. Москва.
- _____. 1976. *Текстология и язык древнейших славянских памятников*. Москва.
- _____. ed. 1983. *Апракос Мстислава Великого*. Москва.

GLOSSARY

THE glossary lists all lexemes in manuscripts F and M treated in the present investigation. The spelling follows the principles of the normalized orthography of the *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. As the latest fascicule available at the completion of the present book has been No. 42 (сѣма-теренти, Prague 1989), the dictionaries by Lysaght 1983 and Miklosich 1862–1865 have also been used. Prefixed and/or reflexive verbs are referred to by their respective non-prefixed and non-reflexive counterparts. Simple and/or compound forms of adjectives are indicated in accordance with the attested forms in the manuscripts. The figures indicate sections. Figures in italics indicate sections where the accentuation of a certain lexeme is treated.

- а 2.3.1, 3.8.3.2, 5.4.1, 6.8.2.2
- абиѣ 3.4, 3.10, 6.4
- авиѣ аръ 2.2.2.5, 2.2.3.2, 2.3.3.2, 2.3.4.1, 3.9.2.1
- авити 6.7.1.2, 6.8.1.1
- авѣ 3.4, 3.10, 6.4
- авраамъ 6.9.2
- авраамовъ 6.9.2
- авраамъ 5.4.3, 6.9.1.1
- адъ 6.2.1.1
- азъ 2.3.1, 2.3.2.3, 3.5, 5.3.3, 5.4.2.1, 5.4.2.2, 6.5, 6.8.3.1, 6.8.4.1
- аиѣ 2.3.3.2, 3.2.2.4, 3.10, 6.2.2.4
- алекторъ 6.9.1.1, 6.9.4
- алъкати 5.4.2.1, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2
- аминь 3.9.4, 4.3.4.1, 5.4.2.1, 6.9.3
- ангѣлъ 3.9.2.1, 5.4.2.1, 6.9.1.1, 6.9.4
- андрѣя 6.9.1.2
- апостолъ 3.9.2.1
- априль 6.9.1.1
- ариматѣя 6.9.3
- архиереи 2.3.3.2, 2.3.4.1, 3.9.2.1, 4.3.1, 6.9.1.1
- архиереискыи 6.9.2
- архиереовъ 4.3.1, 6.9.2
- ашѣ 3.4, 3.8.3.2, 3.10, 5.4.2.1, 6.4, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.2.2
- бавити 2.3.4.1, 3.7.2.2, 3.8.3.2, 5.3.3, 6.7.2.2, 6.8.2.2
- безъ 2.2.3.1
- безочъство 2.3.2.1, 3.8.3.2, 6.8.2.2
- безоумикъ 6.2.2.3
- бесѣда 4.2, 6.2.3.1
- бирати 2.2.2.1, 3.7.3.1, 6.7.1.1, 6.7.3.1
- бити 3.8.3.4, 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.7.2
- благо 6.2.2.1
- благъ 2.2.2.2
- благоволити 6.7.6.2
- благославити 6.7.3.2
- блаженъ 6.3.2.1
- блзунити 3.7.7.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.7.2
- близъ 6.4
- блюсти 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.8.2.4
- бо 2.3.1, 4.3.4.1, 5.3.1.3, 5.4.2.1, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.3.1
- богаты, -ыи 3.3.2.1, 5.4.3, 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2
- богатѣти 2.2.2.1, 6.7.3.1
- богородица 5.3.1.1, 5.3.6
- богочъць 6.2.1.6
- богъ 2.2.2.2, 6.2.1.1, 6.8.2.2
- божи 2.2.6, 6.3.2.1
- болии adj comp 3.3.3, 6.3.3

- бѡути** 2.2.2.3, 2.2.6, 2.3.3.1,
2.3.4.1, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.6.2,
3.8.4, 5.4.2.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2,
6.7.6.2
- братия** 6.2.3.4, 6.8.3.1
- братъ** 6.2.1.1
- брачѣныи** 6.3.1.2
- брашьно** 6.2.2.1, 6.8.2.2
- брьник** 6.2.2.3
- бъвати** 3.7.1.1, 5.3.1.2, 6.7.2.1,
6.7.3.1, 6.7.7.1
- быти** 2.2.2.2, 2.2.6, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.3,
2.3.5, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.5.2,
3.7.7.2, 3.7.8.2, 3.8.2.1, 3.8.2.2,
3.8.4, 3.8.5, 3.8.6, 3.10, 4.3.1,
4.3.3, 4.3.4.1, 5.3.3, 5.4.2.1, 5.4.4,
6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2,
6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.7.9.2,
6.8.1.1, 6.8.1.2, 6.8.3.1, 6.8.4.1
- бърати** 2.4, 3.7.5.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2
- бѣжати** 6.7.6.2
- бѣлъ** 6.3.2.1
- бѣсъ** 2.3.5, 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
- вадити** 6.7.1.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2
- вараава** 6.9.1.2
- варити** 3.7.5.2, 3.10, 5.3.1.2,
6.7.6.2
- варюти** 6.7.1.1
- варюти (затварюти)** 3.7.1.1,
6.7.1.1
- варѣтоломѣи** 6.9.1.1
- вашъ** 3.5, 6.5
- велии** 6.3.2.2
- великомъченикъ** 6.2.1.6
- великъ, -ѣи** 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2
- велѣти** 6.7.1.2
- веселити** 6.7.2.2
- вести** 2.2.3.2, 3.7.2.2, 6.7.2.2,
6.7.6.2
- ветѣхъ, -ѣи** 5.4.3, 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2
- вечерь** 4.2, 6.2.1.1
- вечерю** 3.2.3.1, 4.2
- видѣникъ** 6.2.2.2
- видѣти** 2.2.3.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.2,
3.7.5.2, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.8.2, 3.10,
5.3.1.4, 5.4.2.1, 5.4.3, 6.7.1.2,
6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.4.2, 6.7.5.2,
6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.7.9.2, 6.7.10.2,
- 6.8.3.1
- вина** 4.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.3.1
- вино** 6.2.2.1, 6.8.2.2
- виноградъ** 3.2.1.6, 6.2.1.6
- вити** 6.7.6.2
- витѣсанда** 5.2, 6.9.1.2
- владѣка** 3.2.3.4, 5.2, 6.2.3.4, 6.11
- владѣчица** 5.3.1.1
- власть** 3.2.4.1, 5.3.3, 6.2.4.1
- вначити** 3.8.4, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.7.2
- влѣши** 2.3.2.1, 3.8.3.4, 6.7.8.2
- вода** 6.2.3.1, 6.8.2.1, 6.8.2.2
- водити** 3.7.7.2
- воденосъ** 6.2.1.6
- воинъ** 2.3.3.1, 3.2.1.4, 5.3.1.3,
6.2.1.4
- волю** 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.3.1,
6.8.2.2
- ворити (затворити)** 3.7.10.2,
6.7.8.2
- врагъ** 3.2.1.1, 4.2
- вразжда** 6.2.3.1
- вратити** 3.7.8.2, 3.8.4, 6.7.1.2,
6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.7.10.2
- вращати** 6.7.3.1, 6.7.7.1
- врѣзати** 6.7.1.1
- врѣшити** 6.7.1.2
- врѣдити** 3.7.8.2, 5.3.3
- врѣма** 6.2.4.1, 6.8.2.1
- врѣсти** 2.3.2.1, 2.3.5, 3.7.1.2,
5.4.1, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
- врѣши** 2.2.3.1, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.5,
3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.8.2,
5.3.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.6.2,
6.7.8.2, 6.7.10.2
- въ** 2.2.2.2, 3.8.3.1, 5.2, 6.8.2.1,
6.8.4.1, 6.8.4.2
- въз** 2.2.3.1
- възрасть** 6.8.2.3
- възъпити** 5.3.3, 6.8.2.4, 6.8.3.1
- въкоупѣ** → **коупѣ**
- вънъ** 2.3.2.1, 3.4, 5.3.3, 6.4
- вънѣгда** 6.4
- вънѣтръ** 2.2.2.1, 2.2.6
- въскрьсєникъ** 6.2.2.2
- въспоминаникъ** 3.2.2.2
- въспать** 2.3.2.1
- въсхожденіе** 3.2.2.2, 6.2.2.2
- въторѣи** 6.3.2.2

- вѣ** 2.3.1, 2.3.2.3, 3.5, 3.8.2.2, 3.8.5,
 3.8.6, 4.3.4.1, 5.4.2.1, 6.5, 6.8.1.2,
 6.8.2.2, 6.8.3.2, 6.8.4.2
вѣшѣннѣи 3.3.1.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.3.1.2
вѣдовѣца 3.2.3.3, 6.2.3.3, 6.11
вѣсѣгда 6.4
вѣсь noun 2.2.2.3, 4.3.3, 6.2.4.1
вѣсь pron 2.2.2.2, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.5, 3.5,
 4.3.4.1, 6.5, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.2.2
вѣсьнѣкѣ 2.2.2.1, 2.3.2.1, 4.3.4.1, 6.5
-вѣдати 6.7.6.1, 6.7.9.1
-вѣдѣти 2.3.2.3, 2.3.5, 3.7.1.2,
 3.8.3.2, 5.3.1.1, 5.3.6, 5.4.5,
 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.7.2,
 6.7.8.2, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.2.2, 6.8.3.1
вѣкѣ 4.2, 6.2.1.1, 6.8.2.1
вѣнѣць 5.3.1.4, 6.2.1.2
вѣра 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.2.3.1
вѣровати 3.7.3.1, 5.4.3, 5.4.6,
 6.7.1.1, 6.7.2.1, 6.7.3.1, 6.7.5.1,
 6.7.6.1, 6.7.7.1, 6.7.8.1
-вѣсити 6.7.6.2
-вѣстити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.8.2.4
вѣстьникѣ 3.2.1.3, 6.2.1.3
вѣтрѣ 2.2.2.2, 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
вѣчьнѣи 6.3.1.2
-вѣщавати 6.7.7.1
-вѣщати 3.7.2.1, 3.7.5.1, 3.7.8.1,
 6.7.6.1, 6.7.8.1
-вѣзати 3.7.8.2
вѣс(с)онѣ 2.2.2.5, 2.3.1, 3.8.3.4,
 3.9.2.1, 3.10
гавриилѣ 6.9.1.1
галилеѣ 3.9.2.2, 6.9.1.2
галилеѣнинѣ 3.9.2.1, 6.9.1.1
галиленскѣи 5.4.3, 6.9.2
гѣнисаретѣскѣ 6.9.2
гѣоргѣи 2.3.3.2, 6.9.1.1
глава 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 5.3.1.1, 6.2.3.1
глаголати 2.2.2.1, 2.2.6, 4.3.4.1,
 5.4.2.1, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.7.2,
 6.8.1.1
глаголь 2.2.2.2
-гласити 3.7.1.2, 3.7.6.2, 3.8.3.4,
 3.10, 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2,
 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
-гласовати 6.7.1.1
гласѣ 6.2.1.1
-глашати 6.7.7.1
глубокѣ 6.3.2.1
гноити 6.7.10.2
гнѣвати 6.7.1.1
гнѣвъ 6.2.1.1
гнѣздо 4.2, 6.2.2.1
-гнѣсѣити 2.2.3.1, 3.7.6.2, 5.3.2,
 6.7.6.2
гомѣра 6.9.1.1
-гонити 5.4.4, 6.7.1.2
гора 2.3.5, 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 5.4.2.2,
 6.2.3.1, 6.8.3.1
горѣи adj comp 6.3.3
горѣница 6.2.3.3
горѣти 5.3.1.1, 5.3.6
горѣшьнѣ 6.3.1.1
горѣ 3.2.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1
господѣ 2.2.2.2
господѣнѣ 6.8.1.1
-готовѣати 5.4.2.2, 6.7.2.1, 6.7.6.1
-готовѣити 3.8.3.4, 4.3.3, 5.4.2.2,
 6.7.1.2
готовѣ 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.1
градѣ 'city' 6.2.1.1
-грѣти 2.3.2.1, 5.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.7.5.2,
 6.7.6.2
гребѣ 6.2.1.1
громѣ 6.2.1.1
грѣхѣ 2.3.5, 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
грѣшьникѣ 2.3.5, 3.2.1.3, 6.2.1.3
грѣшьнѣ 2.2.2.3, 6.3.1.1
грѣсти 3.7.3.2, 3.8.2.1, 6.7.1.2,
 6.7.3.2, 6.8.2.2
-грѣсѣити 2.2.3.1, 4.3.3, 6.7.1.2,
 6.7.5.2
-гѣнѣти 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.10.2,
 6.8.2.4, 6.8.3.2
гѣбѣати 5.4.3, 6.7.3.2
-гѣбѣнѣти 6.7.1.2, 6.7.6.2
да 2.3.1
дажѣ 3.4, 6.4
далѣчѣ 6.4
данѣ 6.2.4.1
дарѣ 6.2.1.1
-дати 2.3.1, 2.3.3.5, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2,
 3.7.5.2, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.8.2, 3.8.3.4,
 5.3.1.2, 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2,
 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.9.2, 6.7.10.2

- даюник 6.2.2.2
 -даѹти 2.3.2.2, 3.7.7.2, 6.7.2.2,
 6.7.5.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.8.3.1
 -двигнѹти 3.7.2.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.8.2
 двисати 3.7.2.2, 6.7.2.2
 дворъ 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 дверь 2.2.2.3, 6.2.4.1
 дверьникъ 6.2.1.3
 дѣвѣтъи 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.2
 дѣсница 6.2.3.3
 дѣсныи 6.3.2.2
 дѣсѣтъ 2.2.2.2, 2.3.5, 3.6, 5.2, 6.6
 дивити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.7.2
 дивьнъ 6.3.1.1
 днюволъ 6.9.1.1
 длъгъ 6.2.1.1
 длъжьникъ 6.2.1.3
 добръ 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.1
 добръѣ 6.3.2.1
 доити 6.7.6.2
 доколѣ 3.4, 5.4.2.2, 6.4
 домъ 3.2.1.1, 3.8.3.1, 4.2, 5.2,
 6.2.1.1
 донѣдеже 6.4
 достоинъ 2.3.3.1, 2.3.5, 3.3.2.1,
 3.10, 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.1
 другъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 5.4.2.1,
 6.2.1.1, 6.8.2.1
 другъ, -ѹи 2.2.1, 2.2.3.1, 3.3.2.2,
 4.3.3, 5.3.4, 5.4.2.1, 5.4.3, 6.3.2.1,
 6.3.2.2
 -дръжати 2.3.2.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.7.2,
 3.8.3.4, 5.4.4, 6.7.4.2, 6.7.7.2
 дръзати 2.3.2.1, 5.4.2.1, 6.7.2.1
 доухъ 2.2.2.2, 3.2.1.1, 3.8.2.2,
 3.8.6, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 доуша 6.2.3.1
 дѣва 2.3.2.2, 3.6, 6.6
 -дѣждити 2.3.2.1, 3.8.3.4, 6.7.6.2
 -дѣхнѹти 6.7.6.2
 днь 2.2.2.2, 6.2.4.1, 6.8.3.1
 -дѣрати 6.7.6.2
 дѣлати 3.7.2.1, 6.7.1.1, 6.7.2.1,
 6.7.5.1
 дѣло 6.2.2.1
 дѣти pl 6.2.4.1
 -дѣѹти 6.7.7.2
 евангѣлистъ 6.9.1.1
 евангѣликъ 2.2.3.2, 2.2.3.1
 егѹптъѣныи 2.2.2.5, 5.3.1.1
 еда 2.3.2.3, 2.3.4.1, 3.4, 6.4
 едѣ(с)а 6.9.3, 6.9.4
 еи interj 6.4
 ели 5.4.2.1, 6.9.3
 елисаветъ 3.9.4
 же 2.2.4, 2.3.1, 6.8.3.1
 желаниѣ 3.2.2.2, 6.2.2.2
 желѣти 6.7.3.1, 6.7.7.1
 жена 4.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.3.1
 женити 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2
 животъ 5.4.2.1, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.1.4,
 6.8.1.1
 животънъ, -ѹи 5.4.2.1
 живъ, -ѹи 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2
 жидовинъ 6.2.1.1
 жито 4.2, 6.2.2.1
 житъница 6.2.3.3
 жьзлъ 2.2.2.3, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 -жадати 6.7.1.2
 жати, жьнѣж 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2
 жѣтва 6.2.3.4
 ѣ 2.2.3.1
 сѣло 2.2.3.1, 2.3.2.4, 3.4, 3.10,
 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.4.2.2, 6.4
 за 2.2.3.1, 3.8.5, 6.8.2.1, 6.8.4.1,
 6.8.4.2
 заѣтъ 6.2.1.5
 заимъ 2.3.3.2, 3.2.1.5, 6.2.1.5
 законооучитель 5.4.2.2, 6.2.1.6
 законъ 5.3.1.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.1.5,
 6.8.2.3
 законъникъ 3.2.1.3
 занѣ 6.4
 заповѣдати 3.8.3.2
 заповѣдъ 6.8.2.3
 затварѹти → -варѹти
 затворити → -ворити
 заоутра 5.3.3, 6.4
 захаринъ 5.4.5, 6.9.2
 зачало 6.2.2.4
 здравъ → съдравъ
 зевѣдѣвъ 2.2.3.1, 3.9.3, 6.9.2
 зеленъ 6.3.2.1

- земля** 2.2.3.1, 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.2.3.1, 6.8.2.1
земльскыи 5.3.3
зилотъ 5.3.2
зима 6.2.3.1
змию 4.2
знаменати 6.7.6.1
знаменик 5.4.2.1, 6.2.2.3
-знати 5.3.1.4, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.4.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.9.2
зръно 2.3.2.1, 3.2.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1
-зъвати 2.2.3.1, 3.8.3.4, 3.10, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
зълодѣи 5.3.1.4, 6.2.1.6
зълъ, -ѹи 2.3.2.3, 3.3.2.2, 6.3.2.1
зѣданиѣ 6.2.2.2
-зѣдати 2.2.1, 2.2.3.1, 5.3.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.7.2
-зѣрѣти 2.2.2.2, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.3, 3.7.3.2, 3.8.3.4, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.8.2.4

и conj 2.3.1, 3.8.3.2, 3.8.5, 6.8.4.1
и pron 2.3.1, 2.3.2.4, 2.3.4.1, 3.5, 3.8.5, 3.10, 4.3.3, 5.4.1, 5.4.2.1, 6.5, 6.8.2.1, 6.8.3.2, 6.8.4.2
иѡ 3.4, 3.10, 4.3.4.1, 6.4
идежѣ 3.4, 3.10, 4.3.4.1, 6.4
ижѣ 3.5, 3.10, 6.5, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.4.2
из 2.2.3.1, 2.3.4.1
издалече 6.4
излиха 3.8.3.3
изжтрѣждоу 2.3.2.1
или 3.4, 6.4
илию 3.9.2.1
-имати, -имѣ 5.4.3, 6.7.1.2
именовати 6.7.6.1
-имѣти, имамъ and имѣѣ 2.2.6, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.7.2, 3.10, 5.4.2.1, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.7.9.2, 6.8.2.2
имѣ 3.2.4.1, 3.10, 6.2.4.1
инѡгда 6.4
инъ 2.2.2.3, 3.5, 4.3.3, 6.5
иоановъ 6.9.2
иоанъ 2.3.1, 2.3.3.1, 3.9.2.1, 4.3.2, 6.9.1.1
иосифъ 6.9.1.1
иосию 6.9.1.2
иродовъ 6.9.2, 6.9.4

иродъ 6.8.2.2, 6.9.1.1, 6.9.4
иса(а)ковъ 6.9.2
искариотъскыи 5.4.2.2, 6.9.2
-искати 2.2.6, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.2, 3.10, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.8.2.2
искони 5.3.3, 6.4
искоушеник 3.8.3.3, 6.2.2.2
исплънь 6.3.2.1
исповѣдовати 6.7.7.1
истина 3.2.3.2, 3.10, 5.3.3, 6.2.3.2
истиньнь, -ѹи 5.3.3, 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2
источьникъ 6.2.1.3
исѡсовъ 5.4.2.2
исѡсъ 2.2.3.2, 2.2.2.5, 3.8.2.1, 3.9.2.1, 5.4.2.2
исъхнѣти → -съхнѣти
-ити 2.2.2.2, 2.2.2.5, 2.2.3.2, 2.2.6, 2.3.2.3, 2.3.3.1, 2.3.4.1, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.2, 3.7.5.2, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.7.2, 3.8.3.4, 3.10, 4.3.4.2, 5.3.1.2, 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.7.9.2, 6.8.2.2, 6.8.2.4, 6.8.3.1
июда 2.3.3.2, 3.9.2.2, 6.9.1.2
июдѣи 2.3.3.2, 2.3.4.1, 3.9.2.1, 6.9.1.1
июдѣискъ, -ѹи 2.3.3.2, 3.9.3, 6.9.2
июдѣѣ 6.9.1.2
иѣковъ 6.9.2
иѣковъ 2.3.3.1, 2.3.3.2, 3.9.2.1, 6.9.1.1
икреѣи 3.9.2.1, 6.9.1.1
икроусалимъ 6.9.1.1
икроусалимьскыи 6.9.2

-казати, -жж 2.2.3.1, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.5.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2
-казати, -зѣѣ 6.7.1.1
каиѣѣѣ 6.9.1.2
како 3.4, 6.4
каковъ, -ѹи 6.3.2.1
-каменити 3.8.3.4, 6.7.9.2, 6.7.10.2
каменик 5.4.3, 6.2.2.3
камо 6.4
камъ 3.2.4.1, 3.10, 6.2.4.1

- каперънаоумъ 6.9.1.1
 -касати 6.7.5.1
 -каяти 6.7.6.2
 кланяти 6.7.1.1, 6.7.3.1, 6.7.5.1
 класъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 -клонити 5.4.2.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.5.2,
 6.7.8.2, 6.8.3.1
 когда 6.4
 коли 6.4, 6.8.1.1
 коликъ 6.3.2.1
 кольми 6.4
 колѣно 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 3.2.2.1, 4.2,
 6.2.2.1
 коньць 3.2.1.2, 5.3.1.4, 6.2.1.2
 -коньчавати 4.3.3
 -копавати 3.7.1.1
 корабль 2.2.3.2, 2.3.5, 3.2.1.1, 4.2,
 5.4.2.1, 6.2.1.1
 -корити 6.7.6.2
 коснжти 6.7.6.2
 кость 6.2.4.1
 которын 6.3.2.2
 кошъ 6.2.1.1
 крамола 6.2.3.1
 красти 2.3.5, 3.7.1.2, 6.7.1.2
 кратъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 кровъ 4.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.1.1
 -кроушити 6.7.1.2
 кръвь 2.2.2.2, 2.3.2.1, 6.2.4.1
 -крывати 2.2.3.2, 2.3.2.4, 3.7.2.1,
 6.7.2.1
 -крыти 2.3.2.4, 5.3.3, 5.4.2.2,
 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.8.3.2
 кръстителъ 6.9.1.1
 кръпити 6.7.7.2
 -крѣсити 6.7.1.2, 6.8.3.2
 коупити 'buy' 6.7.1.2
 коупъ 6.2.1.1
 -коусити 3.8.3.4
 къ 2.2.2.2, 6.8.2.1
 къдѣ 2.3.2.3, 3.4, 6.4
 къждѣ 6.5
 кънйгы pl 6.2.3.1
 кънйжъникъ 2.3.5, 3.2.1.3, 6.2.1.3
 кънасъ 6.2.1.1
 къто 3.5, 5.4.2.1, 6.5
 кын 2.3.2.2, 3.5, 3.8.2.2, 3.8.6,
 5.4.2.2, 6.5
 кжпѣль 6.2.4.2
- кѹриния 6.9.3
 -лагати 5.3.1.2, 5.4.1, 6.8
 лазаръ 2.2.3.1, 6.9.1.1
 -лазити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.7.2
 ланита 6.2.3.1
 -лежати 2.2.2.1, 3.7.3.2, 3.7.7.2,
 6.7.7.2
 лема 5.4.2.1, 6.9.3
 -лѣщи 3.8.3.4, 6.7.6.2
 ли 2.3.1, 5.4.2.1, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.3.1,
 6.8.4.1
 -ливати 3.7.1.1, 6.7.5.1
 -лизати 6.7.7.2
 листвикъ 3.2.2.3, 6.2.2.3
 лись 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 литѹргия 3.8.3.2
 лицѣ 3.2.2.1, 3.8.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1
 лицѣмѣръ 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 3.2.1.6,
 5.4.6, 6.2.1.6
 -личати 6.7.1.1
 лишѣ adv comp 6.3.3
 лишии adj comp 5.4.3, 6.3.3
 ловитва 3.8.3.1, 6.2.3.4
 ложѣ 3.2.2.1, 4.2
 -ложити 2.3.5, 3.7.5.2, 3.7.8.2,
 5.3.1.2, 5.3.3, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.8.2, 6.7.10.2
 лоза 6.2.3.1
 лозынъин 5.4.2.2, 6.3.1.2
 лотовъ 3.9.3
 лоука 2.2.2.5, 6.9.1.2
 лоучини adj comp 5.4.3, 6.3.3
 лъбънынъ 5.4.3, 6.3.1.2
 лъжа 6.2.3.1
 лъжѣ adj 6.3.2.1
 лѣстити 6.7.1.2, 6.8.2.2
 -лѣсти 2.2.3.2, 6.7.8.2
 лѣто 3.2.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1
 лѣха 6.2.3.1
 -любити 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.2,
 3.7.10.2, 3.8.2.2, 4.3.4.1, 6.7.1.2,
 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.10.2,
 6.8.1.2
 любодѣица 2.3.3.1, 3.2.3.3,
 6.2.3.3
 любодѣяникъ 6.2.2.2
 людикъ pl 6.2.1.1
 людскъ, -ын 2.2.2.1

лжквѣтъ 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.2
-лжчити 6.8.3.2

-мазати 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2
маи 6.9.1.1
мало 6.3.2.1
маль 3.3.2.1, 6.3.2.1
маньна 6.9.1.2
-манжти 2.3.5, 3.7.6.2
марию 2.3.1, 2.3.3.5, 5.3.1.1, 5.3.6,
6.9.3
мариинъ 3.9.3, 5.4.5, 6.9.2
марѣкъ 6.9.1.1
масло 6.2.2.1
мати 5.3.1.1
матѣѣи 6.9.1.1
месия 6.9.3
метати 6.7.1.2
-миловати 6.7.2.1
милосръдъ 6.3.2.1
мимо 6.4
минжти 3.7.5.2
миръ 6.2.1.1, 6.8.2.1, 6.8.3.1
млънии 2.3.2.1, 3.2.3.1, 4.2,
6.2.3.1
-млѣчати 2.3.2.1, 3.7.2.2, 5.3.1.2,
6.7.2.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2
мои 2.3.3.1, 2.3.3.2, 2.3.3.3, 3.5,
4.3.1, 5.4.3, 6.5
моиси(и) 2.2.2.5, 2.3.1, 2.3.3.5,
3.9.2.1, 6.9.1.1
молити 3.7.3.2, 3.7.7.2, 5.4.2.1,
5.4.2.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2,
6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.8.1.1
морк 2.3.5, 3.2.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1
-моши 3.7.1.2, 3.7.7.2, 5.4.2.2,
6.7.1.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.7.9.2
-мочити 6.7.1.2
-мрачати 6.8.3.1
-мръкнжти 6.7.6.2
мрътвъць 2.2.6, 2.3.2.1, 3.2.1.2,
6.2.1.2
мрътъвыи 2.3.2.1, 3.3.2.2, 6.3.2.2
мръѣжа 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 5.2, 6.2.3.1
-мръѣти 6.7.6.2, 6.8.2.4
мъного adv 3.3.2.1, 6.3.2.1
мъногоглаголаник 5.4.2.2,
6.2.2.2

мъногъ 2.2.3.1, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.4,
2.3.5, 3.3.2.1, 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.1
мъножицеѣж 5.4.2.2, 6.4, 6.8.1.1
мъножество 3.2.2.4, 5.4.2.2,
6.2.2.4
мы 2.3.1, 2.3.6, 3.5, 6.5, 6.8.3.2
-мыслити 2.3.1, 2.3.2.3, 2.3.2.5,
3.7.7.2, 6.7.7.2
мытарѣ 2.3.1, 6.2.1.4
-мыти 6.7.2.2
мышьца 6.2.3.4
мъзда 2.3.2.1, 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.2.3.1
-мънѣти 2.2.2.2, 2.2.6, 3.8.4,
6.7.1.2, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.3.1
мѣдъ 3.2.4.1, 6.2.4.1
мѣсто 3.2.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1, 6.8.3.1
мѣсць 6.2.1.1
-мѣтати 3.7.7.1
мѣхъ 6.2.1.1
мжжъ 2.2.6, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
мжка 'torment' 4.2, 5.3.1.1, 6.2.3.1
-мжтити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2
мжчити 6.7.5.2
-манжти 6.7.2.2

на 3.8.5, 6.8.2.1, 6.8.3.1, 6.8.4.1,
6.8.4.2
назарѣнинъ 3.8.2.1
напастъ 6.2.4.2
народъ 3.8.3.3, 3.10, 4.3.4.2,
5.3.1.2, 5.3.1.3, 5.4.2.1, 6.2.1.5,
6.8.2.2, 6.8.2.3
наставъникъ 2.3.5, 3.2.1.3, 5.3.3,
6.2.1.3
нажщъныи 6.3.1.2
начало 5.3.1.1, 6.2.2.4
начати → -чати
начатѣкъ 5.3.1.1, 6.2.1.4
нашь 3.5, 5.3.1.1, 5.3.6, 6.5
не 2.3.1, 6.4, 6.8.4.1
небесъныи 2.3.2.1
небо 6.8.2.1
невъзможно 3.3.1.1, 5.4.2.2,
6.3.1.1
невѣрънъ 2.2.2.3, 3.3.1.1, 6.3.1.1
невѣръствиѣк 2.3.2.1, 2.3.5,
3.2.2.3, 5.3.3, 6.2.2.3
недѣлю 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2
неджъ 6.2.1.5

- НЕДЖЪНЪ**, -ѹи 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2
-НЕНАВИДѢТИ 6.7.1.2, 6.7.3.2,
 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2
НЕПЛОДЫ 3.2.4.2, 5.3.1.3, 6.2.4.2
НЕРЖКОТВОРЕНЪИ 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.2
-НЕСТИ 6.7.1.2, 6.7.10.2
НЕЧИСТЫИ 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 3.3.2.2,
 6.3.2.2
НИ 2.3.1, 6.4
НИВА 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 5.3.3, 6.2.3.1
НИЖЪИИ 6.3.1.2
НИЗЮ 6.4
НИКАКОЖЕ 6.4
НИКОГДА 6.4
НИКОЛИ 6.4
НИКЪТОЖЕ 5.4.2.2, 6.5, 6.8.3.1
НИКЪИИЖЕ 6.5
НИЦЪ, -ии 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2
НИЦЪ adj 3.2.2.1, 6.3.2.1
НИЧЪТОЖЕ 2.2.2.3, 2.3.2.1, 3.5, 5.2,
 5.3.3, 6.5
НОВЪ, -ѹи 3.3.2.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.1,
 6.3.2.2
НОГА 6.2.3.1
НОЕ 3.9.4
НОЕВЪ 2.3.3.1, 3.9.3, 5.4.3
-НОСИТИ 5.4.2.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.5.2,
 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2
НОЩЬ 2.3.5, 3.2.4.1, 3.8.3.1, 6.2.4.1
НОЩЪНЫИ 3.3.1.2, 6.3.1.2
НЪ 2.2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.3, 3.8.3.2,
 5.4.2.1, 5.4.2.2, 6.8.2.2
НЪИНЪ 6.4
НѢКЪТО 6.8.2.3
НѢКЪИИ 3.8.3.3, 3.8.4, 4.3.1, 6.8.2.3
НѢСМЪ → **БЫТИ**
НАЖДА 6.2.3.1

О 2.3.4.1, 3.8.3.1
ОБ 2.3.4.1, 3.8.3.1
ОБА 2.2.2.2, 2.3.2.2, 2.3.4.1, 3.6,
 3.10, 5.2, 6.6
ОБАЧЕ 3.4, 3.10, 6.4
ОБИТѢЛЬ 6.2.4.2
ОБЛАКЪ 3.8.3.3, 6.8.2.3
ОБЛАСТЬ 3.8.3.3, 6.8.2.3
ОБЛАЧИТИ → **-ВЛАЧИТИ**
ОБНОВЛЕНІИ 6.2.2.2
ОБОИ 6.6

-ОБРАЗИТИ 5.3.1.2, 6.8.3.1
ОБРАЗЪ 3.8.3.3, 5.3.3, 6.8.2.3
ОБРАТИТИ → **-ВРАТИТИ**
ОБРѢСТИ → **-РѢСТИ**
ОБРѢТАТИ → **-РѢТАТИ**
ОБЮТИ → **-ЮТИ**
ОБЪЩНИКЪ 3.2.1.3
ОБѢТОВАНИИ 6.2.2.2
ОВЪ 6.5
ОВЪЦА 5.4.2.1, 6.2.3.1
ОВЪЧИИ 6.3.2.2
ОГНЪ 3.2.1.1, 3.10, 6.2.1.1
ОДРЪ 3.2.1.1, 6.2.1.1
ОКО 2.2.2.4, 3.2.2.1, 3.10, 6.2.2.1
ОКРЪСТЬ 3.8.3.3, 6.4
ОКРЪСТЪНЫИ 5.3.1.2
ОНЪ 2.3.2.4, 2.3.4.1, 3.5, 5.4.2.2,
 6.5, 6.8.2.1
ОНЪДЕ 3.4, 3.10, 6.4
-ОРИТИ 3.7.1.2, 6.7.1.2
ОСМЪ 6.6
ОСЖДЕНІИ 3.8.3.3, 6.2.2.2
ОТРОКЪ 2.3.4.1, 3.2.1.5, 3.8.3.3
ОТРОЧИЩЪ 6.2.1.4
ОТРОЧА 6.2.4.2
ОТЬ 2.2.2.4, 2.2.4
ОТЪКЪДОУ 3.8.4, 6.4
ОТЪРАДЪНЪ 6.3.3
ОТЪСЕЛѢ 6.4
ОТЪСЖДОУ 3.4, 6.4
ОТЪТЪДОУ 6.4
ОТЬЦЪ 3.2.1.2, 3.10, 6.2.1.2, 6.8.2.2
ОТЬЧЪ 3.3.2.1, 3.10, 6.3.2.1
ОТЬЧЪСТВИИ 2.2.3.2, 2.2.6, 2.3.2.1
ОЧИЩЕНІИ 5.3.1.4, 6.2.2.2

ПАЖИТЬ 6.8.2.3
ПАКЪ 3.4, 6.4
ПАМЯТЬ 6.8.2.3
-ПАСТИ, **-ПАДЪ** 2.3.2.2, 3.7.1.2,
 3.7.6.2, 3.7.8.2, 3.10, 5.4.2.1,
 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
-ПАСТИ, **-ПАСЪ** 3.8.3.2, 6.7.1.2,
 6.7.2.2, 6.8.2.2
ПАСТЫРЬ 6.2.1.4
ПАСХА 2.3.5, 3.9.2.2, 6.9.1.2
ПАЧЕ 6.4
ПЕТРЪ 3.9.2.1, 5.3.3, 6.9.1.1
ПЕЧАЛЬ 5.3.1.1, 6.2.4.1

- пилать 3.9.2.1, 6.9.1.1
 пира 3.9.2.2, 6.9.1.2
 писаниѣ → пьсаниѣ
 -писати → -пьсати
 -пити 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.7.2, 6.7.8.2
 плаваніѣ 2.2.6, 3.2.2.2, 5.2,
 5.3.1.4, 6.2.2.2
 плавь 6.3.2.1
 плакати 3.7.7.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2,
 6.7.3.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2
 пламы 6.2.4.1
 плащаница 6.2.3.3
 плодъ 2.3.5, 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 -плънити 2.3.2.1, 2.3.4.1, 3.7.6.2,
 3.8.4, 5.4.2.2, 6.7.6.2
 плъть 2.2.2.4, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.4.1
 плюновениѣ 6.2.2.2
 плюнѣти 6.7.6.2
 побѣдоносѣъ 3.8.3.2
 повиннь 6.3.1.1
 погрѣбѣти → -грѣти
 подобити 5.4.2.2, 6.7.1.2
 подобьнь 5.4.2.2, 6.3.1.1
 позоръ 6.8.3.1
 полъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 польса 6.2.3.1
 помориѣ 6.2.2.3
 поръфѣра 6.9.1.2
 послѣдъ 3.4, 6.4
 послѣдньи 6.3.1.2
 посрѣдѣ 5.3.3
 постити 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2
 постъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 потъчениѣ 5.2, 6.2.2.2
 почѣто 6.8.2.1
 поюсъ 3.2.1.5, 6.2.1.5
 -правити 3.8.3.4, 6.7.10.2
 правда 6.2.3.4
 правдѣнь, -ѣи 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2,
 6.8.1.1, 6.8.2.2
 праздниѣ 5.3.3, 6.2.1.3, 6.8.3.1
 прахъ 6.2.1.1
 -прашати 6.7.5.1, 6.7.7.1
 прилежнь adv 6.3.1.1
 приставленіѣ 6.2.2.2
 притворъ 5.3.3, 6.2.1.5
 притъча 3.8.3.3, 6.8.2.3
 причастьниѣ 3.2.1.3
 пропасть 6.2.4.2
 проповѣдати 6.7.3.1, 6.7.7.1
 пророкъ 5.4.2.2, 6.2.1.5
 -прѣсити 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.2,
 3.7.10.2, 5.4.2.1, 5.4.6, 6.7.1.2,
 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2,
 6.7.10.2, 6.8.3.2
 прѣтивнь 2.2.2.3, 6.3.1.1
 прошениѣ 6.2.2.2
 прѣвыи 2.3.2.1, 3.3.2.2, 6.3.2.2,
 6.3.3
 прѣси pl 6.2.4.1
 прѣстъ 6.2.1.1
 прѣдатель 5.3.1.2
 прѣдъ 5.3.1.2
 прѣдъдворикъ 5.3.1.2
 прѣжде 6.4
 прѣмждрѣсть 5.3.1.2, 5.4.2.2,
 6.2.4.2
 прѣнесениѣ 5.3.3, 6.2.2.2
 прѣподобьньи 5.3.1.1
 прѣсвѣтъи 5.3.1.1
 прѣславьньи 5.3.1.2, 6.3.1.2
 прѣстолю 2.2.2.3, 5.3.1.2, 5.4.2.2,
 6.2.1.5
 -прѣтити 2.3.5, 3.7.6.2, 3.10, 5.4.3,
 6.7.3.1
 псалъмъ 6.9.1.1
 -поустити 3.7.1.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2,
 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2
 поусть 6.3.2.1
 поустьинѣ 6.2.3.4
 -поушати 3.7.5.1, 5.3.3
 пѣтица 4.2, 6.2.3.1
 пѣръ 5.4.2.1, 6.2.3.1
 пьсаниѣ 6.2.2.2
 -пьсати 6.7.10.2
 пьсъ 5.4.2.1, 6.2.1.1, 6.8.2.2
 пьшеничьнь 6.3.1.1
 пѣнасъ 5.3.2, 6.2.1.1
 пѣтель 2.2.2.1, 2.2.6, 5.3.1.1
 пѣшь adj 6.3.2.1
 -пѣти 6.7.2.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.8.2.4
 пѣть 6.6
 пѣть 2.2.2.3, 6.2.4.1
 раба 4.2
 рабъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 рабыни 3.2.3.4, 6.2.3.4, 6.1.1

- равви 6.9.3
 равѣнь, -ѣи 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2
 ради 3.4, 3.9.2.2, 3.10, 5.4.2.1,
 5.4.2.2, 6.4, 6.8.2.2
 -радовати 2.2.2.5, 3.7.2.1,
 3.7.10.1, 6.7.2.1, 6.7.6.1
 радость 6.2.4.2
 радъ 6.3.2.1
 раждати 2.3.1, 2.3.3.5
 раз 2.2.3.1
 разарюти 6.7.7.1
 разбоинникъ 5.4.2.2, 6.2.1.3
 различьни 6.3.1.2
 разорити → -орити
 разоумѣти 2.3.5, 3.7.6.1, 4.3.4.1,
 6.7.6.1
 рало 3.2.2.1, 4.2
 рана 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.2.3.1
 распатиѣ 6.2.2.3
 -рѣши 2.2.4, 2.3.2.1, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2,
 3.7.6.2, 3.8.3.2, 5.2, 5.4.2.2,
 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.8.2, 6.7.10.2, 6.8.2.2
 риза 6.2.3.1
 -рицати 5.4.2.2, 6.7.4.1
 родителъ 6.2.1.4
 родити 5.4.1, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.10.2, 6.8.1.1
 родъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2
 рождикъ 6.2.2.3
 рождество 6.2.2.4
 розга 6.2.3.1
 рѣпѣтати 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.7.2
 рыба 3.2.3.1, 3.8.3.2, 4.2, 6.2.3.1
 рыбаръ 2.2.6, 6.2.1.4
 -рѣсти 3.8.3.4, 4.3.4.1, 6.7.1.2,
 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
 -рѣтати 2.3.4.1, 2.3.5, 3.7.1.1,
 3.8.3.4, 6.7.1.1
 ржка 4.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.2.3.1

 саваѣтани(и) 5.4.2.1, 6.9.3
 -садити 5.4.2.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.10.2
 садокѣи 5.4.3, 6.9.1.1
 -саждати 6.7.7.1
 самарию 6.9.3
 самъ 5.4.2.2, 6.5
 санъдалию 6.9.1.2
 свитати 6.7.7.1

 -свободити 6.8.1.2
 свободѣнь 5.3.3, 6.3.1.1
 свон 5.4.2.2, 5.4.3, 6.5
 свѣтѣти 2.2.6, 2.3.2.1
 свѣтити 6.7.1.2
 свѣтъ 6.2.1.1, 6.8.2.1
 свѣтъль 2.2.2.3, 6.3.2.1
 свѣтити 6.7.1.2
 се particle 2.2.3.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.4,
 4.3.4.1, 6.5
 себе → сам
 седмѣи 5.4.2.2, 6.3.2.2
 седмь 6.6
 село 5.3.1.2, 6.2.2.1
 сестра 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.8.3.1
 сидоньскъ 5.4.2.2, 6.9.2
 сикнотъ 2.2.3.2, 6.9.1.1
 сила 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.2.3.1, 6.8.1.1
 силоуамль 6.9.2
 силоуамьскъ 6.9.2
 симоновъ 2.3.1, 3.8.3.4, 3.9.3,
 5.4.2.1, 5.4.2.2, 6.9.2
 симонъ 2.3.2.4, 3.9.2.1, 5.4.2.1,
 5.4.2.2, 6.9.1.1
 сиръ adj 6.3.2.1
 сице 6.4
 сицевъ 6.3.2.1
 сквозѣ 2.2.1, 2.2.3.1
 скотъ 6.2.1.1
 скръбѣти 6.7.3.2
 скждѣль 6.2.1.1
 -слабити 6.7.10.2
 слава 6.2.3.1
 -славити 3.7.3.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2,
 6.7.3.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2
 слово 3.2.2.1, 3.8.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1,
 6.8.1.1, 6.8.2.1, 6.8.3.1
 слоуга 4.2, 6.2.3.1
 слоужити 3.7.7.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.7.2
 слоужба 2.2.3.2, 6.2.3.1
 слоухъ 6.2.1.1
 -слоушати 3.7.2.1, 6.7.1.1, 6.7.5.1,
 6.8.2.4
 -слѣшати 2.2.3.2, 3.7.8.2, 5.3.3,
 6.7.1.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.8.2, 6.7.10.2
 -слѣдствовати 5.4.6, 6.7.1.1,
 6.7.8.1
 слѣпъ, -ѣи 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2, 6.8.1.1

- содома** 5.4.2.2, 6.9.1.1
содомляне 2.3.5, 3.9.2.1
соломонъ adj 5.4.2.2, 6.9.2
сподъ 6.2.1.1
среда 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2
-ставити 2.2.2.5, 2.3.2.1, 3.7.2.2, 3.8.3.4, 3.8.4, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
-ставляти 6.7.1.1, 6.7.5.1
старость 3.2.4.2, 6.2.4.2
старъць 3.2.1.2, 6.2.1.2
-стати 2.3.5, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.8.2, 3.8.3.4, 5.3.1.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.7.9.2
статиръ 6.9.1.1
-стояти 2.3.3.1, 2.3.3.2, 3.7.3.2, 3.7.7.2, 5.3.1.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.7.2
страдати 3.7.3.2, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.3.2
стража 3.2.3.1, 4.2
страна 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.2.3.1
страхъ 4.2, 6.2.1.1
-стрѣти 6.8.2.4
стыгна 6.2.3.1
-стылати 3.7.10.2
-стѣпити 3.7.6.2, 3.10, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
сѹровъ 6.3.2.1
сѹхъ 6.3.2.1
съ 2.2.2.2
съблюденіе 2.3.2.2, 2.3.5, 3.2.2.2, 6.2.2.2
съборъ 5.4.2.2, 6.2.1.5
сѣвѣдѣтельствовати 6.7.3.1
сѣвѣтъ 6.2.1.5
сѣвѣтъникъ 6.2.1.3
сѣгрѣшеніе 6.2.2.2
сѣдравъ 6.3.2.1
сѣказаник 6.2.2.2
сѣкровище 3.2.2.4, 3.10, 6.2.2.4
-сѣлати 2.4, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.10.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.5, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.7.10.2, 6.8.2.4, 6.8.3.1
сѣмрътъ 6.2.4.2
сѣньмище 3.8.3.3, 6.8.2.3
сѣньмъ 2.3.2.1, 3.2.1.5, 6.8.2.3
сѣнѣдати 2.3.1, 2.3.3.5, 3.7.1.1, 6.7.1.2
сѣпасеник 6.2.2.2
сѣпасти → **-пасти**, **-пасж**
сѣродѣство 3.8.3.3, 5.3.3
сѣсъць 6.2.1.4
сѣто 6.6
сѣтъникъ 2.3.2.1, 6.2.1.3
-сѣхнѣти 2.3.2.1, 3.7.6.2, 5.4.2.1, 6.7.6.2
-сѣлати 2.2.2.5, 2.2.6, 3.7.5.1, 6.7.5.1
сѣнь 2.2.2.2, 4.3.4.1, 5.4.2.2, 6.8.1.1
сѣропоустънын 6.3.1.2
-сѣтити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2
сѣ pron 2.2.2.1, 2.2.3.2, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.3, 2.3.3.3, 2.3.3.4, 3.5, 3.8.2.1, 3.8.4, 5.4.2.2, 6.5, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.3.1
сѣдѣ 2.2.3.1, 2.3.2.3, 3.4, 6.4
сѣдѣти 6.7.7.2
сѣмо 3.4, 6.4
сѣма 6.2.4.1
-сѣнити 2.2.2.3, 3.8.3.4
сѣнь 5.2, 6.2.4.1
сѣтовати 6.7.3.1
сѣяник 2.3.3.1, 3.2.2.2, 6.2.2.2
сѣяти 6.7.3.2
сѣ 2.3.1, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.3.1, 6.8.4.1
-сѣсати 6.7.2.2
сѣбота 2.2.2.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 3.9.2.2, 5.4.2.2, 6.9.1.2, 6.9.4
-сѣдити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.10.2
сѣдънын 6.3.1.2
сѣсѣдъ 6.2.1.5

тайна 2.3.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.10, 6.2.3.2
такѣ 3.4, 6.4
такожде 3.4, 6.4
тамо 3.4, 6.4
татъ 2.3.2.2, 3.2.4.1, 6.2.4.1
-таяти 6.7.7.2
твои 2.3.3.3, 3.5, 5.3.3, 5.4.3, 6.5
-творити 2.2.2.1, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.2, 3.7.5.2, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.8.2, 3.8.4, 5.3.3, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2, 6.7.9.2, 6.7.10.2, 6.8.3.1

-тврѣдити 2.2.2.2, 2.3.2.1, 6.7.6.2
 тектонъ 3.9.2.1, 3.10, 6.9.1.1,
 6.9.4
 тиронъ 3.9.2.1
 тлѣщи 2.3.2.1, 3.7.2.2, 3.7.3.2,
 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2
 тогда 3.4, 6.4
 толикъ 3.3.2.1, 6.3.2.1
 -точити 5.4.3, 6.7.10.2
 трава 6.2.3.1
 трапѣза 2.2.3.1, 3.9.2.2, 3.10,
 6.9.1.2, 6.9.4
 трѣтии 6.3.2.2
 трѣтищѣ 6.4
 триъ 3.6, 6.6
 трѣудити 6.7.6.2, 6.7.8.2
 трѣудъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 6.2.1.1
 -трѣгнѣти 6.7.1.2
 -трѣзати 2.2.3.1, 2.3.2.1, 3.7.3.1,
 3.7.7.1, 6.7.3.1, 6.7.6.1, 6.7.7.1
 трѣникъ 6.2.2.3
 трѣпѣти 2.3.2.1, 3.7.1.2, 6.7.1.2
 трѣсть 6.2.4.1
 -трѣти 2.3.3.1, 3.7.1.2, 4.3.1, 5.4.1
 трѣбованикъ 3.2.2.2, 6.2.2.2
 -трѣбовати 4.3.1, 5.3.3
 -трасти 6.7.2.2
 -трѣбити 6.7.2.2
 тѣу 2.3.2.4, 3.4, 6.4
 тѣ 2.2.2.2, 2.3.2.3, 3.5, 6.5, 6.8.1.1
 тѣкъмо 2.3.2.1, 3.4, 6.4
 тѣщѣно 2.3.2.1, 3.3.1.1, 6.3.1.1
 тѣ 2.3.1, 2.3.2.3, 3.5, 3.8.2.2, 3.8.5,
 5.3.3, 6.5, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.3.1
 тѣсѣща 6.6
 тѣлити 6.7.1.2
 тѣлю 2.2.2.1, 2.3.2.3, 3.2.3.1,
 6.2.3.1
 тѣма 6.2.3.1
 тѣмьница 6.2.3.3
 тѣща 2.3.2.1, 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 6.2.3.1
 тѣло 4.2, 6.2.2.1
 -тѣсати 2.2.3.1, 2.3.3.1, 3.7.7.1,
 6.7.1.1, 6.7.1.2

 тѣу prep 2.3.4.1, 6.8.2.1
 тѣу adv 5.4.1
 тѣуниство 6.2.2.4
 тѣуѣ 3.4, 3.10, 4.3.4.1, 6.4

тѣугодѣныи 6.3.1.2
 тѣударити 3.7.3.2
 тѣудѣѣ adv 6.3.3
 тѣужасати 3.7.7.1, 3.10, 6.7.7.1
 тѣужасѣ 3.8.3.3, 4.3.4.1, 6.8.2.3
 тѣужѣ 3.4, 3.10, 6.4
 тѣуста 6.2.1.1
 тѣусѣпеникъ 3.8.3.3, 5.3.1.1, 6.2.2.2
 -тѣути 3.8.3.2, 3.8.3.4, 6.8.2.2
 тѣутрикъ 3.2.2.3, 3.10
 тѣутрии 5.4.3, 6.3.2.2
 тѣутрины 2.2.2.5
 тѣуѣшитѣль 5.2, 6.2.1.4
 тѣученикъ 3.2.1.4, 3.10, 4.3.3,
 6.2.1.4, 6.8.1.1
 тѣученикъ 6.2.2.2
 тѣучитѣль 3.2.1.4, 6.2.1.4
 -тѣучити 2.2.2.1, 3.7.3.2, 3.7.7.2,
 3.10, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2,
 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.7.8.2

 фѣарисѣи 3.9.2.1, 6.9.1.1

 хѣвала 4.2, 6.2.3.1
 хѣвалити 6.7.3.2
 хѣлъмъ 6.2.1.1
 хѣлъбѣ 2.3.5, 3.2.1.1, 3.8.3.1, 4.2,
 6.2.1.1
 -хѣдити 2.3.4.1, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.2.2,
 3.7.3.2, 3.8.3.4, 3.10, 4.3.4.2,
 5.3.1.2, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.4.2.1,
 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2,
 6.7.7.2, 6.8.1.1
 -хѣтѣти 2.2.6, 3.7.1.2, 3.7.3.2,
 3.7.7.2, 5.4.2.1, 6.7.1.2, 6.7.3.2,
 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.8.1.1, 6.8.3.1
 хѣрамина 2.3.5, 3.2.3.2, 6.2.3.2
 хѣрамъ 6.2.1.1
 -хѣранити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.6.2
 хѣристѣсѣ 2.2.3.2, 3.8.2.2, 3.9.2.1,
 6.9.1.1
 хѣромыи 6.3.2.2
 хѣула 6.2.3.1
 -хѣтити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.5.2

 ѡ interj 2.2.2.4, 2.3.1, 5.4.1

 -ѡѣтити 6.7.1.2
 ѡѣуждѣи 6.3.2.2

царь 6.2.1.1
 цѣсарьствикъ 2.2.6, 2.3.2.1,
 5.3.1.4, 6.2.2.3
 -цѣлити 3.8.3.4, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.7.2
 цѣль 6.3.2.1
 -цѣлѣвати 6.7.7.1
 -цѣлѣти 3.8.3.4, 6.8.2.4
 -цѣлюти 6.8.1.1
 часъ 3.2.1.1, 4.2, 5.3.1.1, 6.2.1.1,
 6.8.3.1
 чаша 3.2.3.1, 4.2, 5.3.1.1, 6.2.3.1
 чаяти 2.3.3.1, 3.7.3.2, 5.2, 6.7.7.2
 четвъртъи 2.2.2.2, 2.3.2.1,
 3.8.3.1
 чѣтыре 6.6
 -чивати 3.7.2.1, 6.7.2.1
 -чинити 3.8.3.4
 чисти, чѣтж 2.3.2.1, 3.7.9, 6.7.9.2
 -чистити 6.7.1.2, 6.7.2.2, 6.7.5.2
 чловѣкъ 2.2.2.2
 чловѣчьскыи 2.3.2.1, 5.4.2.2,
 5.4.3, 6.3.2.2
 чръвь 2.3.2.1, 3.2.4.1, 6.2.4.1
 -чръпати 5.4.2.1, 6.7.5.1, 6.7.9.1
 чръво 4.2
 чьсть 2.3.2.1, 2.3.5, 3.2.4.1
 чьстьнъ 2.2.2.3
 чьто 5.4.2.1, 6.5
 чоудити 3.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2
 чоужди → цоужди
 чадѡ 3.2.2.1, 4.2, 6.2.2.1
 чѣсто 6.4
 -чѣти 2.3.2.1, 2.3.5, 3.7.6.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.8.2, 6.8.2.4
 шѣстыи 6.3.2.2
 шоуи 6.3.2.2

явити → авити
 явѣ → авѣ
 язвина 3.2.3.2, 3.10, 6.2.3.2
 яице → аице
 яко 3.4, 3.10, 4.3.4.1, 5.4.4, 6.4,
 6.8.2.2
 якоже 3.4, 3.10, 6.4
 яможе 6.4

-ясти 3.7.5.2, 3.7.7.2, 3.10, 6.7.2.2,
 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2, 6.7.7.2, 6.7.8.2,
 6.8.1.1

егда 3.4, 3.10, 6.4

егда → еда

единъ 2.2.2.5, 3.5, 3.10, 6.5

єзеро 2.2.2.5, 2.2.3.1, 4.2

єликъ 3.3.2.1, 3.10, 6.3.2.1

єще 3.4, 3.10, 6.4

жжика 2.2.1, 6.2.3.4

языкъ 2.2.6, 3.2.1.1, 3.10, 5.3.3,
 5.4.4, 6.2.1.1, 6.8.2.2

язычьникъ 6.2.1.3

-яти, -имж 2.2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.3,
 2.3.3.1, 2.3.4.2, 2.3.5, 3.7.1.2,
 3.7.2.2, 3.7.5.2, 3.7.6.2, 3.7.8.2,
 3.8.3.4, 3.10, 4.3.2, 5.2, 5.3.3,
 5.4.1, 5.4.2.1, 5.4.3, 6.7.1.2,
 6.7.2.2, 6.7.3.2, 6.7.5.2, 6.7.6.2,
 6.7.8.2, 6.7.10.2, 6.8.2.4, 6.8.3.1,
 6.8.3.2

ѡ 2.2.3.2

ѡсѡдоръ 2.3.3.2

ѡма 6.9.1.2

18. INGEGERD NORDLANDER: Real Estate Transfer Deeds in Novgorod 1609–1616. Text and Commentary. Stockholm 1987. 186 pp.
19. ЛАРС СТЕНСЛАНД (Lars Steensland): Акцентировка и акцент. Акцентологический анализ служебника XV в. Chil. 323. (Accentuation and Accent. Accentological Analysis of the 15th-Century Missal Chil. 323.) Stockholm 1990. 232 pp.
20. НЕЛЛИ ЛИНДГРЕН (Nelly Lindgren): Акцентологическая характеристика севернорусской рукописи XVII века. (An Accentological Study of a 17th Century North Russian Manuscript.) Stockholm 1990. 163 pp.
21. PER AMBROSIANI: On Church Slavonic Accentuation. The Accentuation of a Russian Church Slavonic Gospel Manuscript from the Fifteenth Century. Stockholm 1991. 215 pp.

Stockholm Slavic Studies

Published by Stockholm University

Editor: Peter Alberg Jensen

Subscriptions to the series and orders for single volumes should be addressed to any international bookseller or directly to the publishers:

ALMQVIST & WIKSELL INTERNATIONAL, P O Box 638

S-101 28 Stockholm, Sweden.

Universities, libraries, learned societies, and publishers of learned periodicals may obtain the volumes of the series and other publications of Stockholm University in exchange for their own publications. Inquiries should be addressed to Stockholms Universitetsbibliotek, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden.

1. SVEN LINNÉR: Dostoevskij on Realism. Stockholm 1967. 212 pp.
2. NILS ÅKE NILSSON: Studies in Čechov's Narrative Technique. 'The Steppe' and 'The Bishop'. Stockholm 1968. 110 pp.
3. SVEN GUSTAVSSON: Accent Paradigms of the Present Tense in South Slavonic. East and Central South Slavonic. Stockholm 1969. 145 pp.
4. IRENE MASING: A. Blok's "The snow Mask". An Interpretation. Stockholm 1970. 100 pp.
5. NILS ÅKE NILSSON: The Russian Imaginists. Stockholm 1970. 117 pp.
6. VELTA RŪKE-DRAVIŅA: Place Names in Kauguri County, Latvia. A Synchronic-structural Analysis of Toponyms in an Ancient Indo-European and Finno-Ugric Contact Area. Stockholm 1971. 158 pp.
7. BARBRO NILSSON: Old Russian Derived Nominals in -nie, -tie. A Syntactical Study. Stockholm 1971. 158 pp.
8. FIONA BJÖRLING: Stolbcy by Nikolaj Zabolockij. Analyses. Stockholm 1973. 112 pp.
9. DAG SVEDSTEDT: Position of Objective Personal Pronouns. A Study of Word Order in Modern Russian. Stockholm 1976. 200 pp.
10. SVEN GUSTAVSSON: Predicative Adjectives with the Copula byt' in Modern Russian. Stockholm 1976. 399 pp.
11. VELTA RŪKE-DRAVIŅA: The Standardization Process in Latvian. 16th Century to the Present. Stockholm 1977. 130 pp.
12. BIRGITTA ENGLUND: Yes/no-questions in Bulgarian and Macedonian. Stockholm 1977. 143 pp.
13. BARBRO NILSSON: Personal Pronouns in Russian and Polish. A Study of their Communicative Function and Placement in the Sentence. Stockholm 1982. 204 pp.
14. HAGAR SUNDBERG: The Novgorod Kabala Books of 1614-1616. Text and Commentary. Stockholm 1982. 210 pp.
15. CARL-ERIK LINDBERG: Text and Content. A Text Linguistic Interpretation of a Major Aspect of "Content" in Vladimir Tendrjakov's Novella "Črezvyčajnoe". Stockholm 1983. 124 pp.
16. ELISABETH LÖFSTRAND: Slavonic Parchment Fragments in Sweden. I. Paroemiaron, Triodion, Psalter. Stockholm 1984. 201 pp.
17. SIW WESSLÉN: Slavonic Parchment Fragments in Sweden. II. Gospels. Stockholm 1985. 320 pp.

(continued on previous side of cover)

ISSN 0585-3575
ISBN 91-22-01446-2