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Transliteration of the Cyrillic Alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyrillic</th>
<th>OCS</th>
<th>CES</th>
<th>Br</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>а</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>м</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>р</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>у</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ù</td>
<td>ù</td>
<td>ù</td>
<td>ù</td>
<td>ù</td>
<td>ù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ф</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>щ</td>
<td>šт</td>
<td>šč</td>
<td>šč</td>
<td>šč</td>
<td>šč</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
<td>ъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>я</td>
<td>я</td>
<td>я</td>
<td>я</td>
<td>я</td>
<td>я</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ё</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>э</td>
<td>э</td>
<td>э</td>
<td>э</td>
<td>э</td>
<td>э</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>ю</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ѕ</td>
<td>ѕ</td>
<td>ѕ</td>
<td>ѕ</td>
<td>ѕ</td>
<td>ѕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
<td>ј</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
<td>љ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
<td>ћ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
<td>џ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations used

A, acc.  accusative
act.  active
adj.  adjective
B  Bulgarian
Br  Belarusian
C  consonant
Ca  Cassubian
CES  Common East Slavonic*
Cz  Czech
ChSl  Church Slavonic**
CSBr  Contemporary Standard Belarusian
CSR  Contemporary Standard Russian
CSU  Contemporary Standard Ukrainian
Dan.  Daniel
D, dat.  dative
Deut.  Deuteronomy
dial.  dialectical
du.  dual
ed.  edition
ESl  East Slavonic
Exod.  Exodus
fem.  feminine
fol.\(^r\)  *recto* side of the folio
fol.\(^v\)  *verso* side of the folio
G, gen.  genitive
Gk  Greek***
Hab.  Habakkuk
I, instr.  instrumental
imperf.  imperfective
inf.  infinitive

* Following Pugh (1996: 2–9), the terms ‘Ruthenian’ and ‘CES’ (Common East Slavonic) are used in this thesis. The former refers to the uncodified written language used in the Ukrainian and Belarusian territories from the 14\(^{th}\) to the 17\(^{th}\) century. This term may be further qualified by either ‘Ukrainian’ or ‘Belarusian’ when a particular linguistic feature is characteristic of only one of the languages. The latter term is used to denote the period of linguistic development common to the three East Slavonic languages – Belarusian, Ukrainian and Russian – spanning approximately the middle of the 9\(^{th}\) to the beginning of the 14\(^{th}\) century.

It should be borne in mind that the nomenclature of East Slavonic languages both in relation to the earliest period of their development and their subsequent individual histories (especially with regard to Ukrainian and Belarusian), is a complex issue, a detailed examination of which lies beyond the remit of this dissertation. For a detailed discussion and references see, Danylenko (2006: 89–141) and Pugh (1996: 2–9).

** The term ‘OCS’ refers to the first written Slavonic language as attested in the manuscripts written in the Cyrillo-Methodian literary tradition in the period spanning the 10\(^{th}\) until the end of the 11\(^{th}\) century. The term ‘Church Slavonic’ (ChSl) is used to refer to the language in which manuscripts and texts, after the end of the 11\(^{th}\) century, were written (Schenker 1995: 186–190). This term may be further qualified by the words ‘Moscow or (Great) Russian’, ‘South-Western’ (i.e. Ukrainian/Belarusian), ‘Bulgarian’, ‘Macedonian’ or ‘Serbian’ to refer to a particular local redaction of Church Slavonic (for further details see, Schenker (1995: 190–193) and Uspenskij (2002: 355–364). The term ‘Synodal Church Slavonic’ is used to denote the present-day form of Church Slavonic that is used in the Russian, Bulgarian, Serbian and other Orthodox churches (Mathiesen 1972: 70).

*** Accentual marks are not used in this thesis when rendering Greek words.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>Codex Marianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N, nom.</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavonic**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostro. ev.</td>
<td>Ostromir’s Evangeliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pass.</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per.</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Polabian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.p.p.</td>
<td>past passive participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Proto-Slavonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev.</td>
<td>revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Russian; sonant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Ruthenian*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Slovene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam.</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sav.</td>
<td>Savvina kniga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Sorbian (Upper and Lower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>South Slavonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>sub verbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, voc.</td>
<td>Vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSI</td>
<td>West Slavonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

// line break
*
postulated form
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Preface

This thesis presents a comprehensive linguistic commentary on one of the fundamental liturgical texts in the Orthodox Church, namely the Oktoikh. As will become apparent in the following pages, *oktoikh* is simply a convenient label for several different types of service book used in celebration of weekly divine services. The text studied appears, on initial examination of its title page, to have been printed in Kiev, at Spiridon Sobol’s press in 1629. However, both the date and the place of printing may be called into question. Zernova (1965) in her article on Spiridon Sobol’s life and publishing history identifies three separate editions of the Oktoikh. All three, if we were to believe the information provided by the texts themselves, were printed in Kiev in 1629. Zernova, however, argues that only one of these was actually printed in Kiev in 1629, namely the Oktoikh in which the verses are separated from one another by small stars. The second and third editions appear to have originated in Belarus. The former was printed in Kutein or Bujniči after 1632 in which no special signs separating the verses are present. The later was published in Mogilev in 1638 where small crosses are used to break up the verses. *Prima facie*, the text under consideration seems to be the second edition as only punctuation marks are used to separate the verses. With that in mind, this text, for the sake of convenience, is referred to as either the Kievan or 1629 Oktoikh in the remainder of the dissertation.

Because of time restriction I have chosen to examine only the first two modes of the Kievan Oktoikh as well as the Preface comprising two short texts on the nature of prayer. The study consists of six chapters and an appendix that presents a transcription of the examined portions of the text. Every care was taken to render the text accurately and to preserve, as far as possible, its original orthographic conventions. Chapter I provides non-linguistic information pertinent to the 1629 Oktoikh. It gives a brief description of the Orthodox service and liturgical texts used in its celebration, the origin and types of *oktoikh*, as well as a detailed description of the contents and physical characteristics of the 1629 Oktoikh. Chapter II focuses on orthography. The first half of the chapter examines orthographic conventions of the Kievan Oktoikh, and explores issues such as spacing, punctuation, capitalisation, distribution of allographs, diacritical marks. In the second part, orthography is analysed from the point of view of its phonological significance; in other words, it considers what orthography may reveal about pronunciation. Chapter III gives a comprehensive analysis of nominal, adjectival and pronominal declension systems. This
chapter also discusses the use of numerals and adverbs in the 1629 Oktoikh. Chapter IV provides a detailed examination of the verbal morphology found in the text. Chapter V gives a short account of syntax in the 1629 Oktoikh – the focus here is primarily on syntactical features characteristic of Church Slavonic and those betraying vernacular influence. Chapter VI is a summary of the most important findings and their significance, as well as a conclusion.

The Kievan Oktoikh was printed little more than a decade later after one of the first comprehensive works on Church Slavonic grammar had been published, namely Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki slavenskija pravilnoe sintagma (1619). Comparison is therefore made, where relevant, between features of the text at hand and Smotryc’kyj’s newly codified version of Church Slavonic.
Chapter I: Preliminary remarks

1.0 The Oktoikh: its history and significance in the Orthodox liturgy

At its inception the Christian ritual must have been private in character. An individual prayed alone without intercession of a formally ordained minister. Since neither consecrated buildings nor a structured template for public worship was in existence, individuals could pray in places and ways that seemed appropriate to them. The Orthodox divine service has, with the passage of time, evolved into a public and highly systemised rite. This complexity permeates the whole monolith that is the Orthodox Church and everything pertaining to it: starting with the order of the divine services and types of service books used during their celebration to the architectural layout of the church building, the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the function and appearance of the sacred vestments, vessels and other objects. A detailed examination of Orthodoxy lies beyond the scope of this study; however, the following pages briefly describe the main liturgical books and practices to set a backdrop against which the importance of the Oktoikh, as one of the fundamental Orthodox texts, will become apparent.¹

1.0.1 Divine services of the Orthodox Church

The Orthodox liturgy comprises three distinct cycles: daily, weekly, and yearly. The daily cycle involves a celebration of divine services at fixed times during a twenty-four hour period, of which there are nine: Vespers, Compline, the Midnight Office, Matins, the First Hour, the Third Hour, the Sixth Hour, the Ninth Hour, and the Divine Liturgy. In the course of time, the practice of celebrating each service individually at a specific hour or time period was discontinued as the Church, having to condescend to the needs of ordinary Christians, began to celebrate several services at the same time. As a result, today only three services are celebrated during the course of a single day, namely, evening (the Ninth Hour, Vespers, and Compline), morning (the Midnight Office, Matins, and the First Hour) and daytime (the Third and Sixth Hours and the Divine Liturgy).

Both Vespers and Compline are services of evening prayer. The former, in which God is praised for the day that has passed, is celebrated just before the sunset. The latter, during

¹ The exposition in 1.0.1 is based on the information provided in Nemirovskij (2007), Slobodskoy (2001) and Wellesz (1961: 129–145) on the Orthodox liturgical rite.
which prayers are offered for the forgiveness of sins, is celebrated at 9 p.m. The Midnight Office, as the name implies, is held at midnight. Its focus is the prayer that Jesus Christ offers in the Garden of Gethsemane. Matins, a service of morning prayer, is celebrated at 3 a.m. during which God is praised for the night that has passed. The First Hour is celebrated between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. in which the day to come is blessed. The Third Hour encompasses a period between 9 a.m. and 12 p.m. which is dedicated to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles. The Sixth Hour is celebrated between 12 p.m. and 3 p.m. during which the Passion and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ is remembered. The Ninth Hour extends over a period of time between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. which recalls the death on the Cross of Jesus Christ.

The Divine Liturgy is the main divine service of the Orthodox Church and is celebrated before the midday meal. It is dedicated to the earthly existence of Jesus Christ and the Mystery of the Holy Communion.

The liturgical texts used for the daily services are the Clergy Service Book and the Horologion (Gk Ωρολογιόν).\(^1\) The order for Vespers, Matins and the Liturgy can be found in the former, whilst the latter includes those parts of the daily service that remain unchanged throughout the year.

On each day of the year, a service is held in the memory of a particular saint or recalls a sacred event that has an important place in the history of the Orthodox Church; divine services of this kind are, therefore, part of the yearly or annual cycle. Such events can be either fasts or feast days, which, in turn, are either movable or fixed. The Monthly Menaion (Gk Μηναίον) contains hymns and prayers used for the celebration of the fixed feasts. It is divided into twelve volumes, one for each month of the year. The Orthodox Church distinguishes furthermore between three types of fixed feasts: those held in honour of Jesus Christ, the Theotokos,\(^2\) and the great saints and the bodiless hosts of heaven (angels). The order of divine services for the movable feast days can be found in the Triodion (Gk Τριώδιον). The Triodion originally comprised a single volume but was subsequently divided into two books: the Lenten Triodion, containing services held during the Great Fast (Lent) and the Sunday services celebrated before Easter, and the Festal Triodion or Pentecostarion containing services celebrated from Easter to the feast of All Saints. The Bright

---

\(^1\) The book is named after its original contents, viz. the prayers of the ‘Hours’.

\(^2\) A word used in the Orthodox Church to refer to the Virgin Mary (from Gk ‘θεοτόκος’ meaning ‘God-bearer’ or ‘Birth-giver to God’). The equivalent term in Church Slavonic is ‘нёбогородица’.
Resurrection of Christ (Easter) is the most important fixed feast in the Church calendar, in relation to which the rest of the yearly cycle of divine services is structured.

The weekly or seven-day cycle encompasses divine services celebrated on each day of the week dedicated to the memory of a particular sacred event or saint. On Sunday the Resurrection of Christ is celebrated; on Monday prayers and hymns are offered in honour of the bodiless hosts; on Tuesday St. John the Baptist is praised; on Wednesday, which is a fast day, Judas’ betrayal of Jesus Christ is remembered; on Thursday the Apostles and St. Nicholas the Wonderworker are celebrated; on Friday, a fast day, the service is dedicated to the Passion and death of Jesus Christ; and on Saturday the Theotokos, Apostles, various martyrs and saints are celebrated, and the Departed remembered.

The Oktoikh contains liturgical texts for the entire weekly cycle, celebrated at Vespers, Compline, Matins and the Liturgy, as well as the Resurrectional material used for the Sunday services, namely at Small Vespers and the Midnight Office.\(^1\) It is composed of eight segments, each of which forms a complete hymnal for one full week. Each segment is sung in one of the modes or *echoi* (Gk ‘ηχοι’): the first segment is sung in the first mode, the second in the second mode, and so on.\(^2\) At the end of a fully completed cycle, that is, after all eight segments have been sung, the cycle starts anew with the first segment in the first mode.

The Oktoikh is used in the course of no less than forty weeks each year during the celebration of the weekday services, from Monday after the feast of All Saints until Saturday of the ‘meatfast week’, and for a further six weeks during the Sunday services, from Sunday following the feast of All Saints up to and including the fifth week of the Great  

---

\(^1\) This type of Oktoikh is not the only one in existence as scholars were able to identify several other varieties. For further discussion, see 1.0.2.

\(^2\) An *‘echos’* originally referred to ‘a liturgical designation of eight individual melodic patterns’ that ‘first, through constant usage, and later, by theoretical systems, were set into an invariant musical framework’, whereas the same term is understood today as ‘the Byzantine system of eight Church-tones’ (Werner 1948: 214, 255).

The link between music and worship, on the one hand, and the supernal suitability of the number eight, on the other, appears to derive from the calendaric system known as the Pentacontaconta, prevalent in the Near East amongst the Sumerians, Akkadians and other peoples of that region. The basic unit is a Pentacontaconta, a period of seven weeks plus one day, that is to say, fifty days; a full year comprises seven Pentacontacontades and fourteen intercalary days. This division is in turn rooted in the concept of seven seasons and seven winds where the seven winds are identified with seven gods over which presides a supreme deity. This calendric system, with its principle ‘seven weeks plus one day’, as well as the Gnostic idea of the Ogdoas, as an embodiment of the Supreme Being and a manifestation of the eight modes, finds a direct reflection in liturgical application of what is probably the first Oktoikh ever to be written, the Oktoikh of Severus of Antioch. This is a hymnal composed in eight modes for the main feasts of the ecclesiastical year; each mode was sung on one of the eight consecutive Sundays for seven weeks after Pentecost. The eight modes correspond to the eight Sundays, which in turn comprise a Pentacontaconta (Werner 1948: 211–255).
Fast. As previously mentioned, the Oktoikh lies at the heart of the Orthodox liturgy. It is the one liturgical book used most often in the celebration of divine services.

1.0.2 The Greek and Slavonic Oktoikh

The question concerning the original creator of the Oktoikh still remains an open one, although its composition is traditionally ascribed to St. John of Damascus (also John Damascene, Chrysorrhoas), an Orthodox monk and theological doctor of the Orthodox and Latin Churches (c. 675-749) (Parry et al. 1999: s.v. ‘John of Damascus’). His *Apologetic Treatise against those Decrying the Holy Images*, written in defence of the Iconodules, incurred the wrath of the Byzantine Emperor Leo III the Isaurian. The latter is said to have forged a letter in which John betrays caliph Abd al-Malik, at whose court John held a hereditary post of the chief councillor of Damascus. According to the legend the enraged caliph ordered that John’s hand to be cut off at the wrist, only for it to be healed whole again by the Virgin Mary. As a sign of gratitude, John is said to have written the Kanons that are the backbone of the Oktoikh.

It is known, however, that the Oktoikh of Severus (written or simply revised by Severus, a Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch [512–519]) had already been in liturgical use from the beginning of the 6th century. Further adjustments, rendering it suitable for the liturgical use in Orthodox churches and monasteries, were executed by the two famous hymnographers, Andrew of Crete (c. 660–740) and John of Damascus. Joseph the Hymnwriter (died 883), a monk of the Studios monastery in Constantinople, composed the weekday divine services. Over the course of time other important figures of the Orthodox Church have left their imprint on the Oktoikh: St Metrophanes of Smyrna (9th century), who wrote the Kanons of the Trinity for the Sunday Midnight Office; St Theophanes the Branded (775–845), the Bishop of Nicea, whose contribution includes the Kanons in all eight tones in honour of the bodiless hosts and the Departed; Theodore the Studite (759–862); the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII the Purple-born (905–959), and several others (Nemirovskij 2007; Wellesz 1961: 140).

The attempt to establish an exact date, or at the very least epoch, when the Oktoikh was translated from Greek into Church Slavonic is fraught with uncertainty: some maintain that it was first translated by St. Cyril and St. Methodius, although no evidence confirming

---

1 ‘Kanon’ is the term applied to a type of a Byzantine hymn consisting of nine odes. For a more detailed description of ‘kanon’ and other types of hymns, see 1.1.1.
this assumption is to be found in the oldest extant manuscripts; others claim that it was translated by Clement of Ohrid (c. 840–916) as a few references in the Vita of Clement of Ohrid point in that direction. More unequivocal references do not start appearing until the beginning of the 14th century when the translation is directly ascribed to Monk John, who lived in the Monastery of Great Lavra on Mount Athos, by one of his disciples. In all probability the complete Slavonic Oktoikh was not one man’s work; rather it was a product of a relatively slow process in which different parts of the book were translated by different individuals at different times (Nemirovskij 2007).

It is important to bear in mind that the name ‘Oktoikh’ can function, at best, as an umbrella term under which several other types are subsumed. Following Šelamanova’s work, Nemirovskij (2007) lists the following:

1. ‘The full or great Oktoikh’, or ‘Parakletike’ comprises the entire weekly cycle of divine services, that is to say, both Sunday and weekday services, for each of the eight tones.
2. ‘Paraklitik’ is a hymnal comprising only Kanons celebrated at Matins. The hymns are grouped according to tones, which in their turn are ordered according to days of the week.
3. ‘The anthological Oktoikh (Oktoix izbornyj)’ is a collection of hymns arranged according to hymnal types, which in turn are organised according to tones.
4. ‘The Resurrectional Oktoikh (Oktoix voskresnyj)’ includes divine services celebrated on Sundays only.
5. ‘The abridged weekly Oktoikh (Oktoix sokraščennyj nedel’nyj)’ is a hymnal for all seven days of the week, containing hymns in the second tone only.
6. ‘The six-day service book (Šestodnev služebnyj)’ includes all divine services celebrated on Sunday for each of the eight tones as well as weekday services, in which only one tone is assigned to each day.

1.1 Contents and physical characteristics of the text

1.1.1 Contents of the Kievan Oktoikh

The Kievan Oktoikh can be readily identified as ‘Šestodnev služebnyj’. It is divided into four parts. The first part is a short preface entitled ‘ИЗЛОГ ПОСТНИКА В ГЛАВИЧКѢ’ (‘from the chapters of Nil the Faster’) in which the reader of this book is given advice on how to pray
as well as how to understand the act of praying. The second part, comprising the main body of the text, contains the Sunday services for each of the eight tones. The third part encompasses the weekday services, from Monday up to and including Saturday, in which a different tone is sung on each day of the week, namely the first tone (ChSl ‘глась ḕ’) on Monday, the second tone (ChSl ‘глась ъ’) on Tuesday, and so on. свѧтины воскрєсны or Exapostilaria make up the fourth and final part. The term ‘свѧтины’ refers to verses read at Matins after the Kanon has been sung; they bear the name ‘свѧтины’ because their thematic content focuses on the idea of ‘spiritual light’. As is the case with the hymnal under analysis, such verses were traditionally placed at the end of the Oktoikh (D’jačenko 2007: s.v. ‘свѧтины’).

The appellation šestodnev originally pertained to Byzantine and Bulgarian literary Biblical narratives recounting the story of the creation of the world in six days. They were written for the purpose of spiritual edification, although some of them also contained scientific tractates. Amongst the writers associated with this genre of Old Russian and Bulgarian literature are Vasilij the Great, Severian Geval’skij, Georgij Pisida, and John the Exarch. Šestodnevь sluţebnyе, that is, ‘six-day service books’, began appearing in Russia in the 15th century although at that time they were not known by this name. For instance, the Synodal Codex on parchment, dating from the 15th century and donated to the monastery of St. Pantelejmon in Pskov by one Feodosija, her son Ilja and grandson Ivan in 1565, is an example of one such šestodnev sluţebnyj. The title-page however bears an inscription in which no reference is made to šestodnev: Начаło с Богою молебника имеа слушниѧ неразрѣшноѧ осми гласамъ творєніє преподоба отца нашего Иоанна Дамаскина. It is from the beginning of the 16th century that the term šestodnev, in the sense of ‘six-day service book’, is encountered, in hymnals written in Moscow. Hymnals with similar contents were produced in there throughout the 17th century. It is interesting to note, however, that no other Slavonic press in the 16th and 17th century, either in Vilnius, Kiev, Venice, Lvov or Serbian monasteries, printed this type of Oktoikh under the name šestodnev; rather service books of a similar type were called Oktoikh or Osmoglasnik (Nemirovskij 2007). This, indeed, is confirmed by the title-page in the Kievan Oktoikh, which has the following inscription: Октоихъ сиръчъ, осмогласникъ Воскрєны по ъ недель, Творєніє Иоанна Дамаскина ъ Дрѧкарии Спиридона Господь Срѧлѧ аѣкра (fol. 1’).

At this point we shall turn to the structure of the Sunday service, in the fist mode, as printed in the Kievan Oktoikh. We also examine, in some detail, the different types of
hymns found in it, namely sticheron (pl. stichera), apostichon (pl. aposticha), theotokion (pl. theotokia), kanon, troparion (pl. troparia), hirmus (pl. hirmi), and several others.

The Sunday service begins on Saturday evening with the evening service of Vespers. Slobodskoy (2001) explains that ‘following the example of Moses, who, describing the creation of the world by God, began the “day” with evening, the Orthodox Church begins the day with the evening services, Vespers.’ Vespers open with the three Resurrection Stichera (Gk ζτιχηρα, ChSl стихиры), hymns traditionally sung after a verse of a psalm. They belong to a Byzantine poetic form known as the troparion (Gk τροπαριον, ChSl трапары) that initially referred to short prayers written in poetic prose and inserted after each verse of a psalm, but in the 5th century troparia assumed a strophic form, became longer and were sung after the three to six last verses of a psalm (Wellesz 1961: 171, 243). These stichera are called ‘resurrectional’ since they celebrate the Resurrection of Christ. The first mode of the Kievan Oktoikh begins with three such stichera although a heading, which would normally indicate this – стихиры воскресны or simply воскресны – is omitted.

Following the Resurrection Stichera are Stichera of Anatolios, customarily four in number. In Church Slavonic these are usually called стихиры восточны or just восточны since ‘Anatolios’, from Gk ἀνατολη, means ‘East’. They are ascribed to one Anatolios who is thought to have been either the Patriarch of Constantinople in the 5th century or a monk of the Studios monastery, Theodore the Studite (Nemirovskij 2007). In the first mode of the Kievan Oktoikh the same order is followed with the omission of the heading стихиры восточны.

Next comes a hymn referred to as the Theotokion (ChSl богородични, often abbreviated to бо in the Kievan Oktoikh). The term denotes either the ninth ode of a kanon, or, as is the case here, a troparion in honour of Theotokos, the Virgin Mary (Wellesz 1961: 242).

Between the Stichera of Anatolios and the Theotokion the so-called слава or doxology is sung – the text of this short hymn is left out the Kievan Oktoikh.

Following the Theotokion in the 1629 Oktoikh are the Resurrection Stichera of the Aposticha (in our text, ChSl ’на сті (стиховня) стіра (стихиры) воскресны’) and the so-called Alphabetical Stichera (in our text simply referred to as ‘ны, стихиры’). The Aposticha are stichera sung between verses of selected psalms at Vespers and weekday Matins. They are singled out amongst other stichera as they begin with a hymn rather than a verse of psalm. With the exception of the first sticheron, they form an alphabetic acrostic following the
letters of the Greek alphabet – needless to say this idiosyncratic feature of the original Greek text has been lost in translation to Church Slavonic. There are twenty-four such stichera altogether, three for each of the eight modes (Nemirovskij 2007; Parry et al 1999: s.v. ‘aposticha’).

After the Aposticha the Doxology is sung as well as two Theotokia and the Resurrection Apolytikion. (The Church Slavonic term, also used in the Kievan Oktoikh, for the resurrection apolytikion is трапар воскресенье.) The apolytikion, also referred to as ‘troparion’, is a dismissal hymn sung at the end of Vespers (Nemirovskij 2007; Wellesz 1961: 140).

Following the service of Vespers is the Midnight Office that opens with the Kanon to the Holy Trinity, source of life. Before considering the description of the Kanon in the Kievan Oktoikh, it is necessary to take a closer look at the structure of this highly poetic Byzantine hymn. The kanon (Gk κανών, ChSl кáнонъ) consists of nine odes (Gk ωδαι, ChSl пêsnì), each of which is made up of three troparia.1 The nine odes are composed on the pattern of nine Biblical canticles and have the character of hymns of praise.2 It is traditional, however, to omit the second ode – the Ode of Moses in Exodus – because of its mournful tone; it is consequently sung only during the Lenten weekday Matins. The choice of nine odes, as opposed to any other number, seems to be steeped in both mystical and religious symbolism: the number nine is identified with the nine ranks of the bodiless hosts, namely Archangels, Angels, Principalities, Thrones, Dominions, Seraphim, Cherubim, Powers and Rulers, as well as seen to reflect the threefold nature of the Trinity (since three times three is nine) (Nemirovskij 2007; Wellesz 1961: 37–38, 198–199).

Kanons, in both manuscripts and printed texts of South Slavonic origin, usually bore a long descriptive name. Thus, for instance, the Kanon to the Holy Trinity, in the first mode, in the Montenegrin Oktoikh pervoglasnik printed in Cetinje in 1494 has the following title: Κανων, ε[ιν]ατρ οικον οικιανο τροπις τρενειεν λιτροφανοε ιτυε καε γραε ειε εε · έκνυε τε ποιο τριε[ι][ς][ν][ε][κ][ε][κ][κ][ο] · πες ο · α[ι] · αρ[ω] · τυρα[ε] · πωια[ε] · ποια[ε][ε](Fol. 4v). Byzantine kanons had the form of an acrostic, in other words, the initial letters of each

---

1 In this context the term ‘troparion’ denotes a single stanza of the ode. We should also bear in mind that the number of troparia does not have to be limited to three – the actual number varies considerably and is dependant on the date, day of the week, importance of the saint celebrated on a particular day, etc.

2 These are: (1) the Ode of Moses in Exodus (Exod. 15: 1–19), (2) the Ode of Moses in Deuteronomy (Deut. 32: 1–43), (3) the Prayer of Hannah (1 Sam. 2: 1–10), (4) the Prayer of Habakkuk (Hab. 3: 2–19), (5) the Prayer of Isaiah (Isa. 26: 9–19), (6) the Prayer of Jonah (Jonah 2: 3–10), (7) the Prayer of the Three Holy Children (Dan. 3: 26–56), (8) the Song of the Three Holy Children (Dan. 3: 57–88), (9) the Song of the Theotokos (Luke 1: 46–55), and the Prayer of Zacharias (Luke 1: 68–79).
troparion, when read consecutively, would form an acrostic phrase, the acrostic here being ‘έδινο τε ποσ τρί[ς] λη[φ]ί[σ]ιν κέ[τ][εί]βο’’. Once translated into Church Slavonic, these hymns naturally lost their acrostic character, but the tradition of retaining their names remained nevertheless (Nemirovskij 2007). Such acrostic catch-phrases are omitted in the first two modes of the Kievan Oktoikh.

In the 1629 Oktoikh, the Kanon to the Holy Trinity consists of eight Odes, where the second one was duly omitted and consequently not printed. Traditionally each ode is preceded by a hirmus (Gk εἱρμός, ChSl ἱρμῶς) – a model stanza that links the ode to the theme of the kanon and provides a metrical pattern for all troparia of an ode. There is a strong tendency to give only a few initial words of the hirmus rather than produce the entire text, with these usually placed after the number of the ode (Nemirovskij 2007). We observe an identical practice in the Kievan Oktoikh. Thus, for example, the abridged headings of the first and third Ode are as follows: (i) Να πρόθομηνικά Κανόνι ού τείχι, κινηναλημμένη· Τριγλή, Πάσχα, Ἄ· Ιρομο· Τέσσα πολεμίτησεν ἀς τείντα; (ii) Πάσχα, Ἄ. Ιρομο· Εδίνη ετείκάμοι·

The first, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth and ninth Odes of the Kanon have altogether four troparia, of which three are elementary whilst the fourth one is the Theotokion. The third and sixth Ode have a somewhat different structure: after the fourth troparion, the Theotokion, first the refrain ‘καὶ πολλὰ’ is sung, followed by a Kathisma (Gk Καθίσμα, ChSl σῆδάλνη)1 and another Theotokion, which concludes the service.

Following the text for Vespers in the Kievan Oktoikh is the Sunday service for Matins. It begins with an abridged heading, functioning as a kind of a priest’s manual, that indicates the order in which the hymns are to be sung: Να πρόθογη, Γάλλος τοῦ, Ἅ· καλέ σαλαντ, Ἄ. Ιρομο· πίσαντ, Βῆσσαυ σαλεμάνι · ποσεμό, σῆδαλνά · Βοσκέρεντα · Να Ἄ· στυχολον γάλα, Ἄ·. The service proper opens with two Kathismata of the Resurrection after which the Doxologies, Theotokia, Hypakoe (Gk υπακοή, ChSl σῆδαλνά) and three antiphons (Gk αντιφωνος, CSI αντιφωνά) are sung. The term ‘hypakoe’ denotes an ecclesiastical hymn whose central motif is the proclamation of the resurrection of Jesus Christ to the world, whilst antiphons (also known as the Anavathmoi, ChSl στεπεννίς αντιφωνά) are short troparia inspired by the ‘Songs of Ascent’ (Psalms 119–133). The latter are traditionally

---

1 The term ‘kathisma’ (pl. kathismata) refers to a troparion which is sung while the congregation is seated (Wellesz 1961: 240).
sung by two separate choirs performing alternately as separate groups and in unison (Nemirovskij 2007; Wellesz 1961: 239–240)

Another abridged heading, giving the order of the hymns, is placed before the text of the Matins Resurrection Kanon: Прокимен. гла. , ἀ. · Νυκ κοσμήμα γίέτς γάμ. · Στί. · Словеса γία. · Словеса чиста. · Τά. · Βέλακο δύνανη. · Сти. · Словеса Бг. · Βελιέ κοσμήμα. · Βοσκρήμε Χβ. · ψάλμια. ἵ. This Kanon comprises further four kanons of which three are printed here: the Resurrection Kanon (ChSl Κανόνις κοσκ[ε][ε]νῆ) celebrating the resurrection of Jesus Christ; the Kanon of the Cross and Resurrection (ChSl κανόνις κρεστοκοσκ[ε][ε]νῆ, in our text Κανόνις Κρεστῆ) celebrating the resurrection as well as recalling of the Passion of Christ; and the Kanon to the Mother of God (ChSl κανόνις προσ[κ][μ] τόκι β[ορόδ] [α][ι] τοκ) written in honour of the Theotokos, the Virgin Mary.

The Kanons are sung together, that is to say, all hymns of the first Ode of each of the three Kanons are sung first, followed by all hymns of the third Ode, then all hymns of the fourth Ode, and so on. (As mentioned earlier the second Ode, because of its mournful tone, is omitted.) Each Ode generally consists of three troparia, the third troparion usually being a Theotokion. However, the second, fourth, sixth, and eighth Odes of the Kanon to the Mother of God have only two troparia each.1 Further, the eighth Ode of the Kanon of the Cross and Resurrection is supplemented by an additional fourth troparion in honour of the Holy Trinity, namely τροιχόμενη. Only the Hirmi preceding the Odes of the Resurrectional Kanon in the 1629 Oktoikh are printed in full, all the others are given in an abridged form.

Following the sixth Ode two additional troparia are sung, namely the Kontakion (Gk κοντάκιον, ChSl κοντάκι) and Oikos (Gk οίκος, ChSl οικός). The former denotes a troparion that is sung after the sixth ode of a kanon and modelled on a hirmus different to that of the ode. A kontakion always precedes the oikos, a troparion that structurally and thematically differs little from the kontakion, except in its greater length (D’jačenko 2007: s.v. ‘κοντάκι’; Wellesz 1961: 240–241).

After the three Kanons follow the Resurrection Stichera (in our text χαλάντες στίχηρι, also χαλάντες, χαλάντης), other Stichera by Anatolios and the Beatitudes (ChSl βλαζένης, also βλαζένης). The term χαλάντης refers to stichera normally sung at Matins after the kanon and Psalms 149–150. Their name derives from the phrase that the Psalms usually begin with, for

---

1 The seventh Ode of the same Kanon has also two troparia. However this could simply be an errata since the seventh Ode of the Kanon of the Cross and Resurrection, printed right above it, has an additional fourth ‘βοσκρήμενη’ that in the Moscow Patriarchy’s 1962 edition of the Oktoikh is in fact one of the troparia belonging to the seventh Ode of the Kanon to the Mother of God.
instance, хвалите Бога во святых Его (D’jačenko 2007: s.v. ‘χαλάτε’). The text of these psalms is, however, not printed in the Kievan Oktoikh. The term блаженны denotes stichera read at the Liturgy and derives its name from the practice of reading these together with the Beatitudes from the Gospel (D’jačenko 2007: s.v. ‘блаженны’). The verses from the Gospel are not included in the Kievan Oktoikh.

The first mode concludes with the Sunday evening service which bears the following heading: Внёд [лю] вечеръ · Стихирь Покаянны · Курсъ Иосифа · На Г[о]е[по]ди возва́хь , Глась, á · Под[о]вь · Преколанный . It includes various hymns, namely the Stichera of Compunction (ChSl стихирь покаянны) and of the Bodiless Powers (ChSl стихирь безплотны́мъ), the Aposticha of Compunction (ChSl на стихови́к стихирь) as well as two Theotokia.¹

The structure of the second mode is identical to that of the first: the order of services and hymns follows the same pattern; only the texts themselves are different. There are minor differences, but these are not structural, rather they relate to factors such as the number of troparia in odes and whether or not a full text of a particular hirmus is given.

1.1.2 Physical characteristics of the text

The Kievan Oktoikh is presently part of Prof. Jan Ivar Bjørnflaten’s private collection. It is a medium-sized book with stiff covers, measuring approximately 15x20 cm. The back and front covers are each made of two thin wood boards, covered in brown leather. The book itself can be locked with two metal clasps. There are no flyleaves (it appears as if these were ripped out); there is a paste-down at the front (there are traces of handwritten text in black ink, however the ink has faded to such an extent that the text is no longer legible), and a paste-down at the back.

The description of the physical characteristics of the text block as well as the paper, on which the text is printed, is limited to the first page (fol. 1r), preface (fols. 1v–2r) and first two modes, namely, Глась á and Глась í (fols. 3r–28v and 29v–51v respectively). The paper, measuring approximately 18.5x14.5 cm, is cut to size and rather yellowed, stained, with what appears to be, water damage on a large number of pages. These however do not affect the legibility of the text. There appears to be no water mark designs on the paper.

¹ The various attributes – покаянны, пре́хваланны, безплотны́мъ – refer only to the thematic content, and not, to the type of hymn. The phrase ‘Под[о]вь · Преколанный’ indicates that the hymns below it are similar to the hymn, beginning with the word ‘пре́хваланны’, with regard to the thematic content, mode, metre, etc.
4. The Kievan Oktoikh 1629. Sample text fols. 32v–33r.
Furthermore the bottom right-hand corners of recto sides have been blackened owing to frequent leafing. Although the text, on the whole, is in excellent condition, the first four folios are rather damaged: the paper at the tail margin of fol. 1\(r\) has been thinned out, almost creating a hole, and white stripes of paper had been glued to the head, tail and fore-edge margins to prevent further disintegration and provide solidity; similar white strips of paper had been glued to the head, tail and fore-edge margins of fols. 2\(r\), 2\(v\), 3\(r\), 3\(v\), 4\(r\), 4\(v\); a single short paper strip had been glued to the fore-edge of fol. 1\(v\) and in the middle of fol. 2\(v\). As a result the white paper strip partially obscures the first line on fol. 3\(v\), whereas on fols. 4\(r\) and 4\(v\) some of the text is missing in the first two lines.

The block text, which is printed on fourteen gatherings, is complete. Five corrections in black ink had been made to the text on fols. 17\(r\):13 (a superscript ‘\(r\)’ with pokrytie is written above ‘димет’), 27\(v\):10 (where ‘\(r\)’ is added after ‘\(r\)’ in ‘именетца’), 34\(r\):4 (where the second ‘\(g\)’ in word ‘иненет’ is corrected to ‘\(h\)’), 36\(v\):7–8 (where the first ‘\(a\)’ in ‘ипаманис’ is corrected to ‘\(o\)’), and 51\(r\):5 (where ‘\(a\)’ in ‘раааааа’ is corrected to ‘\(u\)’) by one or several previous owners.\(^1\) Furthermore, there are traces of red and blue pencil on fols. 2\(r\), 13\(r\), 18\(r\), 20\(r\) and 40\(r\); however, whatever had been written is no longer visible. The text is justified and printed across the page, rather than in two columns as is the case in, for instance, the Oktoix pjaviglasnik, printed in Venice in 1537. There are eighteen lines on almost all folios, the exception being the first page, the preface, the first and last pages of each mode, and several others. The text is printed in black ink with the exception of the first four folios where the headings, first letters of each troparion as well as certain words are printed in red ink.

The text in the Kievan Oktoikh is foliated and only alphabetic numerals are used. The foliation most probably begins on fol. 3\(r\) (although the white paper strips glued at the head of fols. 3\(r\) and 4\(r\) obscure any the numeral). The first numeral is \(r\) on fol. 5\(r\) and the leaves to follow are numbered according to numerical value of each letter in the Cyrillic alphabet, e.g. \(r = 3, \(a\) = 4, \(e\) = 5\). In numerals 11–19, the unit is surmounted by a titlo and always precedes the ten, following the Old Russian norm, for example, \(u\), \(u\); in numerals 20 and above, it is the ten that is surmounted by a titlo and precedes the unit, for example, \(k\), \(l\).\(^2\) The numerals, used in foliation, are never preceded or followed by a point but always surmounted by a titlo, with the exception of ‘\(a\)’ on fol. 9\(r\). In addition to foliation, the last

\(^1\) On fol. 41\(r\):15 the following mark is written between the letters \(u\) and \(a\): \(\pi\). We cannot however be certain if the mark is supposed to represent varia (a type of diacritic mark) or if it was added for some other purpose.

\(^2\) There is an omission on fol. 41\(r\): only \(u\) was printed instead of \(\xic\).
line of each folio contains a catchword that anticipates the first word on the following page, with the exception of fols. 1r, 1v, 19v, where no such catchword is present, and fol. 13r, where the facilitating word, here the letter ‘Ã’, is not repeated on the following page.¹

One would expect that in an Orthodox liturgical book, such as the Kievan Oktoikh, the year in which the text was printed would be given according to the Byzantine era (a system of chronologically measuring the passage of time since the creation of the world – *Anno Mundi*) (Schenker 1995: 183). This system was widely in use until the 18th century when an alternative, namely *Anno Domini*, was introduced under Peter the Great. However, in fact the reckoning system used in the Kievan Oktoikh is *Anno Domini*: οκτοίχος ειρήνη, ὀσμόγλασινικ Βοσκρόνη πο ἔ ἧ νεδέλ, Τκρενέ Ἥοανιν Ἀδαμακίνα ἐ Ἀρδκάρην Σπιρίδόνα Σθρόν Ουκάθ εθοκά (fol. 1r).

¹ Schenker (1995: 184) explains the origin of this practice: ‘foliation … was not introduced until the advent of printing, and in many instances considerably later. The process of putting loose tetrads in order was facilitated by the catchword at the bottom of each page’. 
Chapter II: Orthography and Pronunciation

This chapter provides a detailed description of orthographic conventions in the Kievan Oktoikh. It focuses on such features as punctuation, spacing, capitalisation, the distribution of diacritical marks and superscript letters, distribution of allographs and lexical/morphological implications thereof, alphabetical inventory, as well as specific phonological characteristics, some of which may prove valuable in the final evaluation of the text at hand.

2.0 Spacing, punctuation and capitalisation

2.0.1 Spacing

Spaces are used to separate words and punctuation marks throughout the text. Since the text is justified, these spaces vary in size depending on the number and length of words in the line. It is, however, interesting to note that proclitics (such as the monosyllabic prepositions въ, изъ, съ, по, безъ, къ, въ, на, о, за, and о, and the particle не), enclitics (such as the particle же), and the reflexive particle са virtually always coalesce with the word they precede, in the case of proclitics, or the word they follow, in the case of enclitics and the reflexive particle.\(^1\) Instances of syntagmata written as a sort of a mini *scripta continua* are also attested: каякетвораи (9:5), воссениииса … спадетеиса (13:4), виердшатиса (30:5), прикаланитиса (47:6).

The title page and two parts of the Preface each start on a fresh page, as do the first two modes. Furthermore each hymn, including the complete hirmi, is begun on a new line; the headings and names of hymns are usually begun on a new line.

2.0.2 Spacing: beginning and end of the line

The first letter in the line, whether consonant or vowel, is never a superscript. On the other hand, the final letter in the line, if a consonant, tends either to be followed by a jer (<200x), or surmounted by a diacritical mark, which is usually a паерок (a diacritical mark

\(^1\) Coalescence occurs sporadically with the proclitic conjunction и and particle да, the interjection e-о/у, and enclitics such as the particle не and the pronoun forms ма, та, etc. The reflexive particle са precedes the verb only once: тхажет са покланямъ (29:13–14).
representing the front or back jer) (app. 100x), very occasionally a *superscript* и (6x) and one occasion the vowel letter а:

(1) *consonant + jer*, e.g. нёдоñì, нанò, нэвдò, нёжò, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì;  

(2) *consonant + paerok*, e.g. нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì;  

(3) *consonant + superscript и*, e.g. нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì;  

(4) *consonant + superscript vowel*, e.g. нанòçì.

As a general rule, a vowel letter occupies the final position in the line (<1000x) and these are very occasionally surmounted by a superscript vowel (3x) or a *superscript* и (9x). Supralinear consonants above the final vowel in the line occur often (115x). However, these may represent either a combination of consonant + jer or consonant + full vowel. The following is a selection of examples from each category:

(1) *final vowel*: нёдоñì, нанò, нэвдò, нёжò, нэнò, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì, нёжòçì;  

(2) *vowel + superscript vowel*: нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì;  

(3) *vowel + superscript и*: нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì;  

(4) *vowel + superscript consonant*: нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì, нозòçì;  

The analysis of final letters in or above the line yields an interesting fact: the line-final position is almost exclusively reserved for full vowels, also *paerok* or the jers. Although, at first sight, this might seem peculiar, it is in fact motivated by a graphic-orthographic precept espoused by both South and East Slavonic literary traditions, namely the so-called ‘rule for the division of words’. In this connexion Sidorov (1966: 26) writes that ‘в основе орфографического правила, допускающего при переносе на конце строки только гласную, лежала естественная тенденция переносить по слогам. При таком переносе само собой получалось, что строка оканчивалась гласной, поскольку слоги в

---

1 Cf. for example, приниòçì = приниòñì, приниòñì = мирò, нанòçì = нанасьì, etc. and тоеò = тоеò, сопростолòçì = сопростолòçì, etc.
древерусском языке были открытыми.' This rule, with regard to early manuscripts, is observed with a far greater vigour in CES than SSI (Golyshenko 2000: 9–10).

The exceptions in the 1629 Oktoikh are rare and can be divided into following categories: (1) lines in which headings or instructions are present (this may not always be the case as the headings/instructions themselves may end in a vowel) (see, for example, fols. 5°:15, 5°:7, 8°:5, 11°:5, 12°:11, etc.); (2) the abbreviated form of the word χριστος – ἥσ, attested 2x (12°:10, 29°:8); (3) superscript consonants not representing a combination of consonant + jer/full vowel, attested 3x, e.g. πριγβι/Δι (3°:11); ηαδβ/Δευ (19°:9); δβ/παβαβε (19°:11); (4) abbreviated forms of p.p.p. пропрославленъ - пропр, attested 2x (21°:6,17). An interesting example is the word οψυρα/Ανιαυ since, originally, the front jer followed z but with the insertion of the dental spirant d at morpheme boundary it should occur after zd, i.e. οψυραζνητι / οψυραζδνητι.

A special group of words comprise those showing the reflexes of Proto-Indo-European syllabic *-r-, e.g. οψυρα/τβη (3°:12), ιζαζβ/τβηξη (3°:15), ιζαμερ/τβηξη (5°:8), σεμερ/ηνιτι (11°:11), Νεστερ/πνκ (11°:18), λεμερ/τβη (11°:10), χερ/τσγ (24°:1), δερ/ιαβ (29°:2), οψυρα/τβιαλ (29°:17), ιζα/τβηξη (31°:5), βεζεμερ/τβηη (31°:5–6), σεμερ/τβηημ (43°:14), τβε/Αδνη (46°:11). What is intriguing about these examples where paerok/jer occurs together with the line-final r, is that the sequence -ερ/-ερη seems to represent the so-called second pleophony (-ър-). The examples with the superscript r seem to be a combination of r + jer. Alternatively, if only r was intended, r might have been seen as syllabic and therefore its placement at line-beak warranted. In all likelihood, however, these examples are neither instances of syllabic r nor of second pleophony. The decision to place r and/or jer/paerok was motivated purely by recourse to already established patterns of usage present in earlier manuscripts. Since it was a common orthographic practice to end the line in a vowel with the tendency to divide the word into syllables, sequences of the type -ър/-ър are frequently attested at line-break The sequence -ър/-ър appears, however, anomalous, seemingly breaking with the above outlined rule; such practice of word division may have arisen at an earlier stage when the sonant r had still had some of its syllabic quality (for examples and further discussion see Sidorov 1966: 24-26).
2.0.3 Punctuation marks

The following punctuation marks are attested in the Kievan Oktoikh: a single point, which may be placed either in the middle or at the bottom of the line (., or .); a multiple point (;); a comma (,); and finally a multiple punctuation mark resembling the modern semicolon (;).

No special punctuation marks are used to indicate either questions or direct speech, for instance:

questions: сь чьєсці: како смерть вквёс иже всёхъ жизнъ; (5r:5–7), Муроносица ... 

obрётова Птила скадца, чтву ичется; (26r:9–12), и кт сградетъ мертвеца, паке же и нага - (48v:15–16), etc.

direct speech: нжо мира просвёити, копиоца и гвёца - воскресъ измертвыхъ Господня тела ... (5r:7–9), апокамъ гвёкресъ Господь - подала миры велию мать - (5r:14–15), Муроносица ... образова Птила скадца ... зовица воскресъ Господь неплавитеса прочее (26r:9–13), и гвёлъ, рвёте икв нымъ спасимъ, прийдца огнени и скрадца его: (48v:13–15), etc.

As already mentioned, the alphabetical numerals referring to page numbers, contrary to the general practice, are neither preceded nor followed by a point. On the other hand the use of points with alphabetical numerals denoting modes or odes varies from page to page: at times the numeral is both preceded and followed by a point (rarely either preceded [Гласъ 1а8] or followed by a single point [Гласъ у .]); at other times the enclosing points are completely absent. 2

2.0.4 Capitalisation

Pennington (1980: 190–191) remarks that ‘[c]apital letters, in the modern sense, do not exist in the seventeenth century; large and small letters are merely calligraphic variants’, and indeed what is true of hand-written texts is also confirmed in the 1629 Oktoikh. Capital or, better perhaps, large letters are used in most words on the title page, as well as in the heading of the Preface. The initial letter of each new hymn, the two paragraphs in the Preface, and usually of words in headings and names of hymns, are large, sometimes with

1 Smotryc’kyj (1619: E7v) uses (.) as a question mark – in our text whilst it is only sometimes placed at the end of an interrogative sentence, it also regularly appears in nominal sentences.

2 Other combinations include a numeral enclosed by two commas, as in (Песни , в ), preceded by a comma and followed by a point and vice versa (Гласъ  - ; Песни , в .), or rarely followed or preceded by a single comma (Гласс  - ; Песни у .).
elaborate flourishes. No large letters are used to separate between new sentences except on two occasions: ἀθανατολογία ... (2:5), Λουκᾶς, ἀλλά ἐστι ... (2:11–12). In addition, large letters are used with nomina sacra, proper names, including names of ethnic groups and countries/cities, and possessive adjectives derived from these. The choice between a large and a small letter in such instances seems, however, to be arbitrary. In this respect, the 1629 Oktoikh both follows and ignores Smotryc’kyj’s (1619: B/1) first rule of orthography, namely that ‘Бы́шими писемны пишема быти начало стихов или вкра́шь ... Имень състьны; шу́, Бе́р, Гра́д, К, Хе ... Достоя́ннсть; шу/ Царь, Патри́арх.’

2.1 Diacritical marks and superscript letters

This section provides a description of supralinear signs found in the 1629 Oktoikh paying attention to such considerations as graphic representation, general historical information and distribution. A description of the functions of individual signs, with the exception of the titlo/pokrytie, paerok, superscript и and kratkaja will not be given in this study.

The following diacritic marks are attested in the Kievan Oktoikh: (1) oksia, acute, ostraja: [’]; (2) varia, grave, tjažkaja: [’]; (3) superscript и and kendema: [”]; (4) iso: [”] and its variants: [”], [”’]; (5) velikij apostrof: [”’]; (6) title (vzmet): [”’]; (7) pokrytie: [”’]; (8) kratkaja: [”’]; (9) horizontal spiritus: [”’]; (10) trema: [”’]; (11) psili, spiritus lenis: [’]; (12) kamora, circumflex: [”]; (13) paerok: [”’]; (14) point: [”’].

2.1.1 Oksia [’]

Oksia was originally one of the diacritic marks of the Polytonic Greek. It first appeared in the Čudovo New Testament 1355, and with time became one of the central diacritical marks in the staropečatnaja sistema. According to Smotryc’kyj (1619: B/3–4’), oksia should be placed above a short vowel in final and penultimate syllables, as well as above vowels, both short and long, in all other syllables. In the staropečatnaja sistema, oksia could be placed

---

1 Both forms with large and small letters are attested: Бы́шими писемны пишема быти начало стихов или вкра́шь ... Имень състьны; шу́, Бе́р, Гра́д, К, Хе ... Дстоя́ннсть; шу/ Царь, Патри́арх.

2 The following discussion is based on the description of diacritical marks in Steensland (1997); oksia (15–19); varia (19–26); kendema/superscript и (34–40); iso (57–58); velikij apostrof (61–62); title/pokrytie (70–72); kratkaja (45–47); horizontal spiritus (54–55); trema (63–65); psili (50–52); kamora (26–33); paerok (68–70); point (65–67).
above any syllable within a single accentual unit with the exception of the final, which implies that it could be found above a final vowel of a word that stands before an enclitic.

In the Kievan Oktoikh, oksia appears more than 4400x above the non-final vowels Α, Α, Ω, Ω, Ω, Ω, Ω, Ω, e.g. ηράξε, πυκάς, λέγε, πραγματικά, ηπώδες/τίτιςκα, ηπώδες, ηπώδες, ιστός, ιστός, ιστός, ιστός, ιστός, ιστός, ιστός, ιστός. It is also regularly placed above final vowels of a word followed by an enclitic or reflexive particle, following thus the norm established by the staropoečatnaja sistema, e.g. ηράξε, ηράξε, πριγκωζδάκα, τάμο, τάμο, τάμο, τάμο, τάμο, τάμο. The use of double oksia within a single word is attested 13x: ράδωκάξε (5:4), ηδέο/ναυάλαγ (6:13–14), πρελέκτής (7:9), Βγόροδίνής (7:1), ηδέοκεθίσα (11:6), ηδέοκεθίσα (11:10), ζάκέες (12:1:14), ηαι/χάουθα (12:16–17), λιούοσκιτίν (27:13), ηάμο/άμεν (46:8–9), Βγόροδίνής (51:4). In only two instances oksia is placed word-finally where the words in question are not followed by an enclitic: πρελέκτής (fol. 7:9), εκέ (fol. 42:9).

2.1.2 Varia [`]

In its standard form varia appears in the guise of reverse oksia. In the 1629 Oktoikh, it is rendered by a slightly different variant, having the form of a rather skewed, at times almost horizontal, line. Varia, like oksia, was one of the main diacritical marks of Polytonic Greek, which subsequently became part of the staropoečatnaja sistema. Its usage in ESI accentuated texts began with the Čudovo New Testament 1355, although it is rarely encountered there. From the late 1630’s one differentiates between use of oksia and varia: the former is placed above non-final syllables, whilst the latter above final open syllables. According to Smotryc’kyj (1619: Β/4–4’) varia can be placed only above ‘εανγγ κονδαλεμ κοστεκομ βάλκι/ χιστύς: ικω, τερώ/ ι/ βάλκι/ ι/ οχαμπιτένσε, ιτά/ τρί, ι/ πρό/ κ κοστεκομ χιστύς: ικω, λιακ/ ι/ τερώ/ ι/ ινέθ : κ πρό’. In the staropoečatnaja sistema, it was usually placed above the final vowel of the accentual unit, at times also above the final vowel of the word before the enclitic.

In the Kievian Oktoikh, varia is used more than 900x, in accordance with Smotryc’kyj’s precept, above the final vowels: Α, Α, Ω, Ω, Ω, Ω, Ω, Ω, τερώ, τερώ, τερώ, πριγκωζδάκα, πριγκωζδάκα, πριγκωζδάκα, πριγκωζδάκα, πριγκωζδάκα, πριγκωζδάκα. In an accentual unit comprising an autosemantic word and enclitic/proclitic, it is usual to find both elements accentuated, where varia, only sporadically oksia, is placed above the enclitic/proclitic, e.g. ηά ζεμάς, ηά
2.1.3 Kendema and superscript И [”]  

*Kendema* appears to be related to another diacritic mark, namely *trema*: both through its name, as the Greek diacritic κεντεμα has the graphic form of a double point [¨], and its function, since *kendema* often replaced *trema*. The two diacritics in question may also be written in the same way.

The use of *kendema* in non-accentuated ESl manuscripts is observed from the 11th to the middle of the 14th century above the letters ɪ and ϫ. In accentuated manuscripts, beginning with the Čudovo New Testament 1355, it is rarely encountered; from the middle of the 14th until the beginning of the 16th century, it is attested above monosyllabic autosemantic words. From the 16th century *kendema* slowly falls into disuse. It had never been part of the *staropečatnaja sistema*, nor is it mentioned in Smotryc’kyj’s grammar as one of the prosodic signs used in Church Slavonic.

In the 1629 Oktoikh, *kendema* is inconsistently used and encountered only 9x above ižica in words of foreign origin, e.g. мёроносица (3x), мёроносаиме (1x), мёро (2x), ϫα (1x), ершерлаи (1x), Мовея (1x). Generally speaking, a combination of ižica and kendema in loan words appears to be a staple occurrence in ESI texts, where this convention is also regularly observed in Smotryc’kyj’s 1619 *Grammatiki, Ostrožskaja biblija, Mesjaceslov* (dating from the 16th century) and Četveroevangelie (dating from the 16th century) amongst others.

The use of a kendema-like mark, [”], to denote a superscript И is attested in Russian manuscripts from the 16th century (with some examples already occurring in the 15th century, in *Efrosinovskij sbornik* and Gennadijevskaja biblija). When replacing the letter И it functions either as a non-syllabic ɨ or syllabic ʉ.

In the 1629 Oktoikh, the diacritic mark [”] serves the same purpose. It is attested 41x in positions that are particularly common for other texts: (a) word-finally (specially after ϫ) 22x e.g. Δαρθεи (4:v:6), поскрепы (5:v:8), ие (9:v:3), си (19:v:4), ρδκам (20:v:13), пётебе и/и (27:v:14–15); (b) word-medially after a vowel 5x, e.g.riers (15:v:11), пёте (36:v:14), ниаде

---

1 Cf. e.g. кепарик, энг, меропосида, аугтреи, сикой, керъ.
2.1.4 Iso [”, ”, ‘’ ]

Iso, in what can be taken as its standard form, is a combination of two diacritic marks, namely psili and oksia. Other combinations are also attested, two of which are present in the 1629 Oktoikh, [” ] and [’’ ]. The former, oksia with a horizontal spiritus, is used with large letters Η, Ι, ΙΙ, ΙΙΙ, ΙΙΙΙ, ΙΙΙΙI; the latter, a combination of point and oksia, occurs 3x in figures referring to the number of a gathering: 'р, 'ъ, 'ч, 'х. In all other instances the standard form, [” ], is used.

Iso was not universally acknowledged as an independent mark so some, like Smotryc’kyj, simply regard it as a combination of psili and oksia. Iso was part of the staropečatnaja sistema. It is common in ESl manuscripts, but its usage word-initially was not established until the 16th century.

In the 1629 Oktoikh iso appears more than 400x above the initial vowels ι, α, ω, ο, ω, and in a handful of examples is it placed word-medially (usually in prefixed or complex words): вообразили (6’:15), вообраш (33’:14), Бютообрасный 'сыф (37’:4), вообрашна (44’:13), 'коковъ (44’:14). As a rule, iso is not written together with other diacritic marks (cases with trema, kratkaja, paerok and titlo/pokrytie are not counted). The exceptions are few and far between, e.g. йа (1’:2), йымя (3х) (12’:4, 13’:2, 38’:13), ёлъ (15’:8), ёлъмь (16’:4), йа (19’:3), йръ (27’:11), Ивана (29’:1), вообрашы (33’:14), as well as in the words йДымъ (5х) and йомъ (app. 30х). In headings it seems that iso can appear more than once within a single word, word-finally as well as word-medially, e.g. йалъ 'постникъ йъ 'близъ (1’:1), йакъло о'трень (11’:6). Double iso is also present in the word йесъ (26’:13). The distribution of iso in the Kievan Oktoikh follows the general pattern observed in other texts, in which, as a rule, it was placed above initial vowels, seldom word-medially above open vowels, and only exceptionally in a word-final position.

2.1.5 Velikij apostrof [’] 

Like iso, velikij apostrof is a combination of two diacritical marks, psili and kamora. It was part of the staropečatnaja sistema; on the other hand it is not listed as a separate diacritic
mark in Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki. It becomes a common occurrence in manuscripts from the 15th century.

In the Kievan Oktoikh, velikij apostrof is attested 8x solely in combination with the interjection o (for examples see, 5.2.). Its shape, however, varies from example to example: kamora, in all examples, seems more like a pokrytie, whilst psili looks either like a horizontal spiritus, reversed letter c or superscript s. In one instance, velikij apostrof is entirely absent – Ø χάδει η νέβα γ (31r:13), in с-ξέκινη μικ (13r:3) only psili is present.

2.1.6 Titlo [Г]

Titlo has many different forms, but the one attested in the Kievan Oktoikh has its own name, namely vzmet. Its function is to indicate abbreviation, and it is primarily associated with nomina sacra and certain frequently used words. Vzmet is used more than 1000x above words where no superscript letters are present, whilst a combination of vzmet and superscript(s) is attested more than 80x, e.g. МЧ, ОФИК, БОГЕВОЛЪ, СОВСКЕРЬ, БАРОДАРСТВИЄ, БУДАТЬЕЛІЯ, ДІЙСТВІЯ, БІСОЧТІВ, ТРИСЛІЧ’Я, БІЗЬВАЄ. Vzmet is also used with alphabetical numerals.

The following abbreviations are attested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αγαλ-</th>
<th>агел-</th>
<th>мичк-</th>
<th>мичник-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>баг(о)-/баж-</td>
<td>благ(о)-/блаж-</td>
<td>ний-</td>
<td>нась-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бе/-бэ-</td>
<td>вое/-воз-</td>
<td>нэ/- нэс-</td>
<td>нев/- невес-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бе/-бэк</td>
<td>боже</td>
<td>нык</td>
<td>нынак</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бе</td>
<td>вогородицень</td>
<td>овж-</td>
<td>овож-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>би/-бэ</td>
<td>вогородиц-</td>
<td>оц-/-цч-</td>
<td>отєц/-отч-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бён</td>
<td>вожі-</td>
<td>полмё-</td>
<td>полимё-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>воскрес-</td>
<td>вострій</td>
<td>свт-</td>
<td>святитей-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ге-</td>
<td>глагол-</td>
<td>стль-</td>
<td>свячен-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ге-</td>
<td>господ-</td>
<td>сцін-/-сцін-</td>
<td>свячен-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ге-</td>
<td>господн-</td>
<td>смерт-</td>
<td>смерть-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дів</td>
<td>диви-</td>
<td>сій-</td>
<td>сонце-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ді-</td>
<td>дів-</td>
<td>сій-</td>
<td>спас-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дест-/-дэч</td>
<td>дивиц-/-дивич-</td>
<td>сий-</td>
<td>сън-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>деств-</td>
<td>дивеств-</td>
<td>трисліч-</td>
<td>трисолнечн-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ді-</td>
<td>ден-</td>
<td>трибітн-</td>
<td>трибогатн-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are several anomalous forms: ἠγόρασικ [7r:1], ἀγοραστροπαράκτης (27r:5), ιγίκ (23r:9), ἕταμ (33r:5) where vzmet had been omitted; τί [5r:12] where the vzmet is placed above the enclitic pronoun.

Uspenskij (2002: 314–315) observes that the custom of writing nomina sacra under a titlo had already been established in the period of the second South Slavonic influence, the origin of this practice ultimately harking back to the Greek language. Whereas prior to the second South Slavonic influence, there may not have been any significant semantic difference between full forms and abbreviated forms under a titlo, in its aftermath the titlo itself becomes a symbol of sacrality. Forms of the type ‘ἀγγέλθ’ and ‘ἀγγελθ’ are no longer perceived as equivalent: whilst the former denotes a fallen angel, only the latter can refer to an attendant or messenger of God. This principle of semantic juxtaposition becomes an orthographic norm promptly assimilated into Church Slavonic and as such is codified in Grammatiki (1619: Б/8о): ‘ΟΧποτρέπελαιντον ὁθ [titlo and pokrytie] Ὡ Χαλαράφ πυκαλα [и самы тоеу нменеу Божій, и Божіе чести саджаєй: ιακω Γδъ/ Бгъ/ Є вдъ/ Сгъ/ Ахъ С: ι/ Χе/ Сиъ/ δеъ/ άта/ Биа/ Λриа/ Ζракъ/ ечта/ Сиъе пръновеъ: и пръ.]’

From the list of abbreviations that appear under the titlo, it is clear that in the 1629 Oktoikh the concept of titlo as the marker of sacrality had been either ignored or, at the very least, applied without much regard for consistency as it is used in combination with both the sacred and the profane. Thus, we find that the words for the divine, such as богъ, дѣва, voskresenie and duxъ appear side by side everyday, non-sacred words like нащъ, ѣловѣкъ and tribogatiy. In this connexion it is interesting to note that an expression such as Биѣ Бѣновъ (47r:4) is possible, where both ‘God’ and ‘pagan deities’ appear abbreviated and under a titlo.
Pokrytie is generally regarded as a variant of *tilto* and is written above certain superscript letters, where the choice of letters varies from one historical period to another. In the Kievan Oktoikh, *pokrytie* is used with the following consonant letters:

1.  в (25x), e.g. видѣ, рѣдѣлѣса, дѣна, видѣши, сохрани, аѣдѣ, протиына, дѣвѣдѣ, прѣдѣ, сокрѣшномѣ;
2.  г (21x), e.g. ёдистѣнѣы, трислѣйпѣ, бо, сопрѣстолѣ, вѣлѣкѣ;
3.  к (3x), e.g. жжѣ (9й:10), тѣло (19й:18), напослѣдѣ (42й:2);
4.  л (28x), e.g. безначаное, всесійно, оѣскѣлѣ, родаѣницы, оѣновѣ, оѣмертѣлѣ, вѣлѣса, Оѣдѣ, сокрѣскѣй, сѣй;
5.  и (69x), e.g. ёди, нейзрѣшѣв, прарѣкѣлѣ, дѣствѣнѣю, оѣрѣшѣ, ёдистѣнѣй, едистѣнѣы, перездѣнаго, вѣгодартѣнѣю, нейзрѣшѣвъ;
6.  о (35x), e.g. тѣ, прѣкѣ, прѣческѣмѣ;
7.  п (2x), e.g. Трѣ (11й:7, 37й:2);
8.  р (8x), e.g. оѣметѣлѣ (3й:12–13), мѣтѣлѣ (3й:15–16), тѣлѣ (25й:1), мѣтѣлѣ (31й:5–6), іѣстѣлѣлѣю (32й:1), тѣлѣ (32й:18), мѣ (34й:2), тѣдѣлѣй (46й:11–12);
9.  с (< 500x), e.g. гѣи, поскрѣпѣлѣ, кѣтѣ, поскрѣпѣ, нѣймѣ, кѣрѣй, аѣловѣ, мѣтѣ, рѣства, еѣгѣ, оѣмѣлѣса, нѣ, соѣстѣтѣнѣй;
10.  ц (1x), e.g. чѣкѣлѣлѣ (4й:6);
11.  ч (1x), e.g. трѣлѣ (46й:14);
12.  ш (1x), e.g. прѣвишѣ (41й:3);
13.  щ (1x), e.g. вѣлѣсла (40й:16).

In addition, the consonant letters д, ж, з, м, т, х, the diagraph вѣ, the vowel letter о, and the consonant group ет appear as superscripts without *pokrytie*: ¹

1.  д (104x), e.g. вѣдѣ, рѣдѣдѣ, лѣрѣ, прѣныѣ, баѣти, сѣныла, вѣчествѣшѣи, посѣтѣлѣ, прѣстѣлѣнѣцѣ, Прѣстѣлѣт;
2.  ж (33x), e.g. зѣдѣлѣса, скѣдѣлѣлѣ, нѣдѣлѣ, рѣдѣшѣ, тѣ, естраѣдѣ, наслѣдѣнѣ, егѣ, прѣдѣ, прѣдѣлѣ;

¹ For examples of *superscript* и see, 2.1.3.
Instances where more than one superscript letter is present within a single word are also common: кътвън, ранимоеи, чта, кътвенитъ естъ въ, паначана, нейреч, etc. There are two anomalous forms, most probably errata: софти (30:10) most likely a misprint for ‘сърти’, and the pokrytie is missing in the following word ‘Глъ’ (4:7).

One of the main functions of superscripts is to allow the scribe or the editor of a printed text to shorten words and, in doing so, adjust the length of a line. With regard to the 17th century cursive writing and use of the superscript letters Pennington (1980: 196) writes that ‘[these] offer great scope for ornamental flourishes, but they are also functional, since they often take less space, often replace more then one letter, and also help to give words easily recognisable profiles’, an observation equally applicable to superscripts in printed texts. Most of the superscript letters in the 1629 Oktoikh differ little in graphic expression from their counterparts occurring in the line, with the exception of в, д, ж, з, т,  χ, and  α.

Words in which superscripts occur, with or without a pokrytie, can be roughly divided into two categories. In the first category supralinear letters are used in combination with an abbreviated word, having thus the same function as the titlo. In the second category supralinear letters appear either above unabbreviated words or above partially abbreviated words where the supralinear letter represents a combination of jet/full vowel + consonant.
Category I: Partly abbreviated/unabbreviated words with superscript letters

The first category is further divided into two subcategories – superscripts appearing word-finally and superscripts appearing word-medially – in order to provide a more lucid exposition. For a discussion and examples of superscripts which are attested at line-break see, 2.0.2.

Category Ia: Supralinear letters occurring word-finally

A supralinear letter in word-final position is usually a consonant, very occasionally a vowel, e.g. pröblinga, vsãka, ū'divi'was, hS¾ta, Bitsvo, vidêV¾, gla, na, òh, ïs, sláveõ, prînîdâe, hâi, vsã'höski, bg8odê'tölný, dsto'i, podâ', rádõ', õnovî, jenî, biyâ, síliâh. Most of the word-final consonant superscripts are a combination of consonant + jer (since all words in text ending in a consonant, where all letters are written in the line, are followed by a jer). In other instances they represent consonant + full vowel, e.g. ö'go (ögo<ö), slaV¾ (slava), ö'dinsvö'nna (ödinstvönnago), vsùbo (vßsùbotù). When an autosemantic word coalesces with an ensuing enclitic or the reflexive particle, the last letter of the word is sporadically written as a superscript, e.g. izbavixo, poöT, vosölãT, Ada<ö, têM<ö, āviL¾, naN¾<ö, voploQ¾, pröklonãüTtisã, vorãöT, radùüT.

Category Ib: Supralinear letters occurring word-medially

Word-medially superscripts are attested in the following positions:

(1) at the end of a prefix, in particular with the prefixes voz-, iz- and bez-, e.g. bøvedî, õpîvi, prêstâtelînie, bødvîje, bêneîktiøa, bødvi//tûnîvi, provõglavâše, bêstrástê, bêstrástär, bênîcîâa, nepîrêne, Prêstoâlt, bêskîmëno, bødvînsha, bøtvîbî, rásmotráeme, prebônicîmîyî, nepîrêkarîyî, bêvedê, pøáttê, õråshîyî;

(2) in a group of two or more consonants, in which the initial consonant or the consonant cluster is a superscript, e.g. Prîniel'vokîy, ošîpradînîy, bêdêk, sêdîné, mêtvîxîy, ôxîlûînîy, pênîmî, prêstêstîa, ôbêke, bødak, tômo, jînomeaîyî, jînîy, cîtê, sêdîâ, strêtê, çûdîâ, popôzîshîe;
(3) within a root or at the boundary between a root and suffix/desinence of words showing the reflex of the sequence *dj, where either d or ž can appear as superscripts, e.g. рóжвію, зайдітіе, скобділем, надіді, рóжін, радітіс, стрілі, забабдіме, насладініе, преде, надідю, скобділема, дâдъ, оцджей, синшдініе, прохлажаюци;

(4) between a root and a suffix/desinence where the final letter in the root is written as a superscript (it is particularly prevalent in words containing the suffix -ьн- and before the past part. act. suffix -ус-), e.g. вопсприіш, везначанос, оріано, Серафійски, прегрішеми, охріше, прийшю, протінья, роштінция, вопсприіш, пашемб, правік, всесіна, бяпмаго, безакоми, напа мы, первоздаго, пришіши, нелона, слао;

(4a) sporadically the initial letter of the past part. act. suffix -вус- is rendered as a superscript, e.g. рошшембса, видіше, воплотишагоса, сокрішшаго, пошіша;

(4b) in adverbs, adjectives and adjectivised participles that have acquired an extra suffix -ьн- in which the initial n appears as a superscript, e.g. бякінн, неизрінн, нескідно, припождіна, неизрінн, єднштінн, вячалствінн, нестастінн, нестрінн, шэлішно, невіщестінн, трисінаго, оц’мерцінене, окошьна, припождіна.

We should bear in mind that the superscript letters occurring word-medially most probably do not represent a combination of consonant + jer, where such a sequence would normally be attested in the root/at the morpheme boundary in OCS. Unlike those appearing word-finally, the word-medial jers, in our text, are rarely attested in fully written out words, that is to say, in words containing no supralinear letters. A possible exception might constitute superscripts occurring at the end of a prefix since in association with prefixes paерок is attested quite regularly.¹

¹ Other instances where the paерок occurs word-medially, not counting those at line-break, are exiguous.
Although an overwhelming majority of abbreviations used in combination with *pokrytie* are words embodying the notion of sacrality, there is still some inconsistency in usage, the most notable being with the word *strastь*. Curiously, *strastь* may be written with or without...
pokrytie and a superscript s irrespective of whether it denotes the Passion of Christ or simply ignoble human impulses. Compare, for instance the following sentences, ΟΤΡΤΙΟ ΤΕΟΘ ΧΙ, Ὡ ΣΤΡΑΣΤΗΣ ΕΚΕΙΝΗ //ΧΟΛΗΣ (4:8–9) or Ὡ ΣΤΡΑΣΙΑ ΕΚΕΙΝΗ ΛΑ ΠΟΙΑ//ΧΙ, Ὡ ΣΤΡΑΣΤΗΣ. (9:12–13), with what could be seen as sacrilegious, ΝΩ Ὡ ΝΗΤΣ ΣΤΡΗΣ ΛΑ ΝΒΑΙΝ ΜΔΧΑΙΝ (9:12) and Ὡ//ΣΤΡΑΣΤΗΣ ΕΣΤΡΑΣΤΗΣ ΠΡΙΔΕ (19:11–12).

2.1.8 Kratkaja, slitnaja, brevis [ ]

The diacritical mark [ ] denoted originally three separate signs. It was (a) a sign of ictus (perevernutaja kamora) based on the form of iso used in skoropis’; (b) a sign for shortness (kratkaja); (c) a variant of psili or dasia. The practice of writing kratkaja above ї was also part of the staropečatnaja sistema. It is listed in Smotryc’kyj’s (1619: Ѕй6–7й) grammar as one of the prosodic marks of Church Slavonic: САМТІЮ САМВАЄГЄCA : ИКУ, ΜΩЙ /ΜΑЙ / МОЄЙ/ ЗАЙ, Ν ПРД · … САМТІЮ ВСА СЛОГВКЬ МЄЄТА ПРИЄАЮТ : ИКУ, ЧЄЄТNYЙ / ЧЄЄТНЪЙ : Ν ПРД.

Kratkaja was primarily used in manuscripts dating from the 15th and 16th centuries. Its use in the function of psili or dasia stopped in the 16th century owing to its multiple functions. In the 1629 Oktoikh kratkaja is exclusively and regularly used above the vowel letter ї in the function of a non-syllabic ї (for examples and further discussion see, 2.2.7).

2.1.9 Horizontal spiritus [ ]

Horizontal spiritus, in addition to the standard form [ ], which differs from that of kamora in that it is narrower and less thickly defined, may be written as a form intermediate between a standard (vertical) psili and a horizontal spiritus. As such it is attested 1x in combination with the velikij apostrof, е – непостыжнала (10:8–9). Both horizontal spiritus and its intermediate variant may be seen as alternative graphic forms of psili. As a rule, horizontal spiritus is placed above open vowels, especially above broad letters such as ω, ο, ε, ι (use above closed vowels is attested but rare). In the Kievan Oktoikh, in its standard form, it is placed 7x above open vowels: ІҚІЙ (5:16), ІЮДІ (5:8), ІІЯЗРАІАКТАІАОМ (13:1), ІЮДІЄСТІІ (20:11), ІІЯКОЄ (21:3), ІІІІЄ (21:1), ΙЄ (47:6). As a part of the velikij apostof above the interjection о it occurs 4x (5:15, 5:2, 17:12, 23:11); above alphabetical numerals referring to gatherings 3x: 1, Ι, 1 χ; above closed vowels 3x: АІТІФІОМ (37:13), ІПІСІЬ (41:1, 45:6); and 1x above the preposition о: ΟΠОДОБІІ (35:7).
2.1.10 Trema [¨ ]

Trema is encountered in manuscripts from various epochs. It is found in the staropećatnaja sistema in combination with the vowel letter i. In many manuscripts trema was, as a rule, placed above the vowel letter i, but the practice of placing the complex grapheme į before vowels is regarded as emblematic of the second South Slavonic influence.

In the 1629 Oktoikh, the grapheme ĭ is encountered almost exclusively in pre-vocalic position, as well as before the non-syllabic ъ, e.g. трієлінне, прієднє, волоочені, вієсвобідна, волійцили, перніє, ісклішній, хоткілі, бжіє, єдареніє, скареніє, любовію. Exceptions are rare and can be divided into the following categories: (a) ĭ is sporadically encountered in words ‘миръ’ and ‘єдинъ’ (as well as in complex words formed thereof), e.g. волмиръ, волеирію, ѐдино, єдінюючілне, єдініче, єдіновлетчне; (b) trema is omitted where the vowel letter i is surmounted by another diacritical mark (here by oksia), e.g. волоніємъ, сія, сєфірлійію, прійдешні, сіє; (c) 9x i is used instead, i.e. Києкъ (1:7), волонідъ (5:8), волтрехъ (6:17), превезне (10:11), волоніцілі (23:2–3), волославшаго (26:12), волналъ (25:16), сілнію (25:17), дрівниї (32:15); (c) once in a foreign word where, in accordance with the orthographic conventions of our text, kendema instead of trema and ižica would have been expected,1 i.e. міропосища (19:16); (d) miscellaneous above i e.g. охівлялєсла, сєкініче, віередіненъ, волійцилъ, многімъ.

2.1.11 Psili, spiritus lenis, tonkaja [ ’ ]

Psili is one of the diacritical marks of the Polytonic Greek and it was included in the staropećatnaja sistema. It is attested in manuscripts at various times, but it is only from the middle of the 16th century that its use is circumscribed to mark aspiration or as a variant of iso to indicate stress. In general, psili is placed above open vowels. In the staropećatnaja sistema it is normally used above initial vowels, not so often above medial, and rarely above final. According to Smotryc’kyj (1619: Е/6’) psili should be placed ‘їнача лєченй вєч в гласнагу начинямь Slaveйскій, и нєкоихъ Грæческихъ и Латинскихъ: якъ, ённоў/ігній/ідвена’.

In accordance with both Smotryc’kyj and the staropećatnaja sistema, psili is attested more than 1000x above the initial vowels а, е/є, и, о/о, оқ, іа, e.g. їи, їбьчамвь.

1 The form in question may be explained by the fact that trema in combination with ižica in loan words is an attested phenomenon, bearing also in mind that trema and kendema are closely related.
Kamora is one of the three fundamental diacritical marks used in Greek. It was a part of the staropečatnaja sistema. Use of kamora is attested in manuscripts dating from the 11th and 12th centuries. It also appears in the Čudovo New Testament 1355 as well as later manuscripts, but it fell into disuse in the 17th century. According to Smotryc’kyj (1619: Б/4–5) kamora can occur in two places. First, above a penultimate long syllable before the short final one: ‘Прекончаемый слогъ естествъ догії/й/ы и ктё состояміи, кончаелый естествомъ картъ ... облажца’ : ακω, ἄκο, εἰμΙ/ε/)η/ε χάτε /тврійте’. Second, above final long syllables ending in -ί: ‘Речямь единосложна и многосложна на кончаелъ естествъ догі овдпеніе прикладцалъ и вточенна велажъ : аκω, ἄκο ... νυτъ/ ρκоαтъ’.

In the Kievan Oktoikh, however, kamora appears 174x almost exclusively above final vowels in monosyllabic words whose structure is of the type CV and CCV, e.g. νò, τὰ, μὰ, ἅ, τί, τύ, μί, γί, ιά, σί, βά, κό, τύ, τύ, κέ, κέ. This practice is also attested in many other Russian manuscripts and also in those of East Bulgarian origin. The sole exceptions in the 1629 Oktoikh are two polysyllabic words σάββα/σαβλά (26:4–5) and τεβε (40:10). The former form may be explained by the fact that in some manuscripts kamora was used above long open syllables. The vowels that were considered long varies from text to text, so that in the Čudovo New Testament kamora is frequently written above the letters χ, ψ, ς, whereas in the Prolog 1581 above ж, з, й. It is therefore possible that the final χ in сάββα/σαβλά was perceived as long. The latter form is harder to explain although it has been pointed out that in some manuscripts, amongst them the Čudovo New Testament, the use of kamora is extended to include the final vowels, i.e. it is used instead of varia. Indeed the pronoun τεβε, apart from a few exceptions where no diacritical mark is present, is consistently written with varia above the final vowel. (The particles υο and υs as well as the pronouns τι, μι, σι, τυ, τα, μα, κα, κω, κει, and the noun ταν are also written with varia.)
2.1.13 Paerok [’], [”]

Smotryc’kyj (1619: Б/5–6’) uses three different signs to represent paerok: ерикъ, паеркъ and маркъ. Paerk and erik are placed word-finally instead of е and ъ respectively, whereas majhkaja, above ‘soft’ consonants following a vowel. These rules are, however, generally ignored and paerok is usually placed between two consonants (or alternatively above one of them), less often after a vowel word-finally, in place of е or ъ. The custom of placing paerok above consonant clusters where etymologically neither er or еъ were present is also attested.

In the 1629 Oktoikh only paerok [’] is attested and it occurs approximately 400x: word-medially, above one of the consonants in the cluster app. 100x, and word-finally, only after consonants, in place of the jers app. 300x, e.g. црквъ, е, волкъ, нкъ, сълъ, оълъ//нылъ, олъшка//коса, льтъкъги, тьмъкъ, олъшка//, олъшка//те, Богатство.

A different graphic variant, namely [”], is used 5x: млдъ (7°:5), втождествѣ (8°:14), Дъя (9°:16), вктвъ//нылъ (9°:17–18), олъшагоса (11°:11). This variant is attested in some of the oldest extant manuscripts, such as Mstislav’s Evangeliary, but it only becomes prevalent at a much later stage.

Word-medially paerok may represent redundant or etymologically unjustified jers, the former being especially prevalent in complex words beginning with prefixes бзъ- and взъ-, e.g. ращдънчее, нейзгълъно, везеркъстидъ, воецъ//лъемъ, везелъ, везеркъстидъ, веззаркънъ, везпостнъмъ, елъмдънъ. In about 50% of the cases paerok is used in combination with the prefixes ob-, iz-, s-, pod-, bez-, raz-, voz- and v-, approximately 20% within the root or at the morpheme boundary, and finally around 30% of attested instances are present at line-break. (For discussion and examples of paerok both medially and finally at line-break see 2.0.2.)

2.1.14 Point [’]

As a diacritical mark point is attested at various times in history, although it was far more common in early than later writings. It was never part of the staropečatnaja sistema, nor is it mentioned by Smotryc’kyj. Point is normally written above open vowels, rarely above closed ones (these are usually either complex graphemes or were perceived as such). In the
Kievan Oktoikh, point is very rarely used, 5x altogether: 1 І (11v:17–18), Істебе (14r:11), Іднимерднаго (14r:12), Ізычи (20v:12), Іже (51r:17).

2.1.15 Absence of accentuation

A fairly commonplace phenomenon in the Kievan Oktoikh is full absence of accent marks. In an overwhelming majority of cases it is the presence of vzmet and/or superscript letters that precludes accentuation or because the vowel under stress is not present in the abbreviated word, e.g. воскрснэ, вдэ, мэйты, мё/тээхъ, мёрдо, вэсэ, хэ, прэныхъ, видэ, тэцэ, but щёстэб, чэлээнэтэ, коскенёлэтэ, элдтэтэ, ёттэо. In other instances it may be the presence of trema that prevents accentuation (cf. мïра/мïра; мïро/мïро). In connexion with this it can be mentioned that psili occurs on its own approximately 450x and approximately 550x with either varia or oksia. In addition, unabbreviated unaccentuated words are also attested – these are, however, rare, e.g. Лмнэ, волэю, прежэ, дарэа.

2.2 Description of alphabetical inventory and distribution of letters

2.2.1 Vowel and consonant letters

In the 1629 Oktoikh the following letters are attested (large variants are not included):

(1) Vowels: a, e, a, ë, e, ë, и, й, і, ï, v, ю, о, c−ɔ, ɔ, w, ō, ο, к, б, т.3

(2) Consonants: в, г, d, ж, з, s, к, л, м, н, п, р, c, т, ф, χ, ч, ч, ш, ψ, Ψ, α.

2.2.2 Orthography: distribution of letters

The aim of this section is to present a full description of orthographic conventions in the 1629 Oktoikh, focusing on the distribution of individual letters in the text, and, where applicable, on their lexical and morphological significance. (Phonological characteristics are discussed separately in 2.3.)

1 In several other instances it was impossible to decide whether the diacritic mark in question was a point or simply psili as the print was rather unclear.

2 ‘Accent marks’ have prosodic function and these are oksia, varia, kamora and iso; psili, trema, paerok and titlo, on the other hand, traditionally do not mark ictus. To the latter group we can also add kendema, superscript н, kratkaja, horizontal spiritus and point.

3 A truncated ‘ù’ is also attested 1x (the ChSl fonts used in this study do not have this particular variant).
When considering the question of inextricability between orthography, on the one hand, and morphology/lexical meaning, it is important to bear in mind the adoption of the antistoechum principle by Slavia Orthodoxa and its application to Church Slavonic. The impetus behind the antistoechum principle was the second South Slavonic influence whose principle goal was the revision and consequent creation of a Church Slavonic modelled closely on the pattern of Greek.

What, then, is antistoechum? Uspenskij (2002: 325) writes that in the Byzantine period the Greek orthographic norm was based on etymology, in other words, etymological differences that were no longer realised phonetically were preserved in spelling. In practice this meant that special attention was paid to the orthography of homonyms, of those words with identical pronunciation but different spelling – word lists of homonymic pairs, i.e. antistoecha (Gk ἀντιστοιχον, lit. ‘opposition’), were devised and learnt using a mnemonic technique.

This principle, first espoused by South Slavonic literary tradition, and from which it was introduced into the East Slavonic, acquires a different expression once transposed into and adapted to Church Slavonic. As Church Slavonic is by and large phonetic in character the ‘opposition’ between homonymic linguistic elements becomes merely functional, unlike in Greek where it is rooted in etymological considerations. If in Greek pairs of the type χειρα ‘hand’ (nom. sg.) – χηρα ‘widow’ came about as a result of phonological development where the spelling reflects older pronunciation, in the Slavonic literary tradition such differentiation is purely artificial as it is based on differentiation of homonyms (Uspenskij 2002: 325).

Konstantin the Grammarian’s work Сказание изъявавшее в писмене is, for example, a grammatical tract devoted to the problem of ‘oppositions’ between homonymic elements. The following is a summary of some of these ‘oppositions’: (1) ὰ : ἦ, ἦ to distinguish between nom./acc. pl. (προστ : προστ), and nom. sg./pl. in adjectives, confusion of which may result in the Nestorian heresy as in ενώροδον συ ςάκ (being the only-begotten one) and ενώροδον συ (the only-begotten ones); (2) ὶ : ἦ to separate between μύρῳ (pertaining to ‘myrrh’) and μῦρῳ (‘peacefully’, ‘calmly’); (3) ἀ : ἀ to separate between *attività stem and *ά-stem dat. sg., e.g. ποτέ (‘road’): ποτάκ (‘cord’), and ἄλαξ (‘already’) and ἄλακ (‘cord’); (4) ὰ : ὰ to differentiate between pl./sg. and masc./fem., etc. (Worth 1983: 24–25). It is clear that for Kostenečkij different graphic variants of the same letter may themselves function as the bearers of lexical meaning or morphological markers, where the confusion between
them may lead to the confusion and change in meaning of the linguistic item in question. He espouses the view that there is a necessary and causal connexion between a word’s graphic representation and the extralinguistic entity it denotes, where any change in orthography may lead to a shift in meaning.¹

We should note, however, that the revision of Church Slavonic, in particular the application of the antistoechum principle, was not meant to encompass the whole language but only to be applied when ambiguity, engendered by homonymy, could give rise to blasphemy or heresy. By the beginning of the 17th century the danger of heresy, posed by the confusion of homophonous linguistic elements, was absent from theological debate – the principle of antistoechum was nevertheless preserved, having now only orthographic significance (Mathiesen 1972: 61–62). With this in mind, it is of interest, in the present analysis of the 1629 Oktoikh, to investigate how rigidly the editors at Sobol’s press adhered to this principle, especially in relation to the rules for distribution of allographs outlined in Smotryc’kyj’s grammar.

2.2.3 Spelling of Greek words: distribution of ψ, υ, ς, θ, Ψ

With the second South Slavonic influence there is a revival in use of the letters ψ, υ, ς, θ, which were initially introduced into Church Slavonic to render Hellenisms but had by the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century nearly become obsolete. As one of the main precepts of the second South Slavonic influence was a thoroughgoing Hellenisation of Church Slavonic, bringing the orthography of Greek loanwords into line with the original Greek spelling was seen as no less urgent (Uspenskij 2002: 304–305). Indeed, the same idea is repeated in Smotryc’kyj’s (1619: Β/2) grammar in which according to the fifth rule of orthography ‘ὅταν Γρηγορίου ὁρθογράφιον Ἑλληνικόν / ἐς Λατινικὸν Λατινιστήν χρησιμολύβδυν· ᾧ τὸ Βυζαντινὸν Ἠλερίστειν· Δανίηλ / Δικετάλ / Μαρτυρία / Φιλοσοφία’.

In the Kievan Oktoikh, Greek loans may fully reflect the original spelling, e.g. μῆρο- (Gk μυρον), χερσιμ- (Gk χερουβιμ), αἰτί- (Gk αγγελος), εἰς (Gk Σιων), Κυρς (Gk Κυρος), τῆλε (Gk ευαγγελιον), Γαβριήλ (Gk Γαβρηηλ), λαμέα (Gk Λουσης), Υωικογ (Gk υπακοη), Κυπαρίσσι (Gk κυπαρισσος), Κεδρ (Gk κεδρος), θεα (Gk Ευα). At other times,

¹ Mathiesen (1972: 37) observes that ‘Church Slavonic was no longer simply another language, a vehicle of communication with men and God, but an icon of given theological truth as well. And this icon was primarily visual rather than auditory, for only the written form of Church Slavonic, with its system of antistoecha, was really capable of serving as such an icon; the spoken form of Church Slavonic, with its numerous cases of theologically dangerous homophony, would have to pattern itself after the written form to be able to serve in this capacity.’
however, spelling reflects pronunciation: for instance, πενγκ (Gk πενή) as ižica after vowels was pronounced as v, or in two curious examples where both the spelling and pronunciation are reflected: ἀρχαιά (γγ is pronounced as [ng]) and ἀρχαγλή. Other exceptions include words where (1) contrary to Smotryc’kyj’s prescription, the Greek diphthongs αι, ει, οι are not preserved, e.g., εγκαινία (Gk Αιγυπτιακος), λειτουργία (Gk λειτουργία), Ἰκανοί/Ικος (Gk οικος); (2) ει/ει is used instead of ižica, e.g., Μοῖσεος, καβαλοκά (Gk Βαβυλών), οίκος/Ικός (Gk οικος); (3) the Greek letter β is rendered as ižica, e.g., κοντά (Gk κιβωτος), εβραϊκός (Gk εβραϊκος); (4) o for Greek omega, e.g. Κανόνας (Gk κανων), Βαβυλών (Gk Βαβυλών); (5) miscellaneous, e.g. Εδώμ (Gk Εδώμ), Σιών, μιρονόκαθ. The letter ο is not attested, while α is only used in alphabetical numerals.

2.2.4 Distribution of a-letters

Traditionally in ChSl semi-uncial and in Cyrillic printing α was used word-initially, with the exception of αλφάκ (‘tongue in the anatomical sense’, and α word-medially and word-finally (Pennington 1980: 195). The same rule is codified in Smotryc’kyj (1619: A/7v): α, ι α, ράλλιστρόσκατ: ονομάς σοφρενιά, ονομάς κοσφέξ κ κ ιδίκη πολαγαός. Ιακώς, ιαβλάκασ.

In the 1629 Oktoikh we observe a somewhat different distribution. The vowel letter α appears only word-initially were it stands for both OCS α and α, e.g. Ιακώς, Ιακώμα, Ιεράμεν, Ιερίκα, Ιεράμενη, Ιερόστενη, Ιεράμπι, Ιεράμπινα, Ιακέ (nom. sg. fem. of the 3rd per. personal pronoun *α), Ιακέ (acc. pl. masc. of the 3rd per. personal pronoun *н). However, contrary to the ChSl practice, it is also used with the word jazyk in the sense of ‘tongue’.²

Uspenskij (2002: 195–196) observes that although in Proto-Slavonic the phoneme /a/ did not appear word-initially, exception being the conjunction α and its derivatives ακέ, ακέ, etc., vacillation in use between word-initial α/a is attested in ChSl texts. Words where α is present word-initially are more often than not loan words. In addition, in many South Slavonic dialects word-initial iotisation disappeared as a result of phonological change, and

1 Mathiesen (1972: 125) observes that although the Greek diphthongs in the modern Church Slavonic (first appearing either at the beginning of the 18th or in the middle of the 17th century (or even earlier) depending on whether only grammar or orthography is taken into consideration) are, as a rule, transliterated letter for letter, with the exception of the following diphthongs: αι > ε/ε, ει > ι, οι > ι, ου > ιοι > ιοι 8/ ση.

2 For a detailed discussion of this point see 2.2.6.
forms such as агнйць, азь, агода, that is, without word-initial iotisation, came to be seen as emblematic of ChSl in general. Such a trend is also present in the 1629 Oktoikh where the word-initial а is attested either (1) in loan words such as абы, алинь, адамъ, айвалы, азь, адвала, язылы, ялевою, Арханглы, Апаровы, дигл; (2) in words reflecting South Slavonic orthography such as анич, агнць; (3) with the conjunction а and its derivates, e.g. а (2x), пзм (1x).

The vowel letter а is attested word-medially and word-finally in post-consonantal and post-vocalic positions, representing OCS а, а or а, e.g. истрлкнйя, тол, распятй, зиждитель, та, носать, салать, вскъ, кана澎湃新闻, зарали, ятагчина, древал, окавихорь, продавшй, продается, иддарио, продавал. With regard to the post-consonantal position, if the preceding consonant is an affricate ч or ч, or sibilant ш, щ, ж, жа (<*dj), only а is possible e.g. блажничь, держацьаго, стрдь (nom. sg. masc. pres. part. act. indef.), подвижать, сдтать, зачатыми, причастны, длы (acc. pl. fem.), вйа (gen. sg. fem.), втрсовьина (gen. sg. fem.), Апивновы (nom. pl. fem.), пкцйа (acc. pl. masc.), длы (acc. pl. fem.), нйа (acc. pl. fem./masc.), сцца (acc. pl. masc.), покоцы (acc. pl. masc.). The only exception is the pres. part. act. indef. nom. sg. masc. палв (а is, however, written above the line).

The vowel letter а in a post-vocalic position is attested only in loan words, all of which are proper names, e.g. Иоанна, Адвала, Иаковъ, Апаровы.

In Smotryc’kyj (1619: O/2'; Ф/4', 6'–6') the opposition а : а is also used to differentiate between homonymous grammatical forms: (i) active participle forms in the gen. sg. masc. and acc. pl. masc., e.g. вишна ~ вишна, виноца ~ виноца; (ii) 3rd per. pl. aorist forms associated with neuter/masculine and feminine nouns respectively, e.g. чькар ~ чькар. This orthographic principle is not used in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. людйе вездаковйн ... честиваго оправдща (23': 11–13), чтыла жены ... и обрктыша (25':7), чйка ... истрлкншя (27':7–8), яже богорвй спца (41':17–18).

2.2.5 Distribution of e-letters

The vowel letter ф has a truncated variant ф that is attested 28x: it is used in combination with (1) varia (9x), e.g. крвт (8':13), ворлвйнн (9':3), ковилё (14':16), волтй (23':2), фт (24':13), гдт (25':3), тет (2x) (30':13, 31':4), горф (38':14); (2) and superscript letters (19x), e.g. товын (6':12), ф (7':11), теже (2x) (10':15–16, fol. 23':14), вндйе (12':7), ф (18':5), претерг (24':5), сращен (29':7), идкрф (30':14), радкно (33':10), Оф (37':3),
In the 1629 Oktoikh, the vowel letters ë and ë, representing OCS e and k, are both attested word-initially, the former appearing approximately 230x and the latter approximately 140x. In one third of instances the word-initial ë is used with the word edin- and its compounds. In the remaining examples e is associated with: (1) the present tense forms of the verb byti, i.e. esi and estë; (2) the oblique cases of the 3rd per. personal pronoun *u and the relative pronouns formed with the 3rd per. personal pronouns, e.g. ego, egëxe, eke, eëxe; (3) the word estëstbo and its compounds, e.g. estëstënnich, estëstëvë; (4) miscellaneous (majority of which are foreign loans), e.g. egëdëmß, egëdëmß, egëdëmß, egëdëmß, egësëmß, egësëmß, egësëmß. In the case of the word-initial ë, in approximately 55% of cases, this letter occurs with the present forms of the verb byti, in particular with 2nd per. sg. form esi. Other categories are also represented but to a lesser degree: (1) the word edin- and its compounds (42x); (2) the 3rd per. personal pronoun/the relative pronoun (46x); (3) the word estëstbo and its compounds (12x); (4) miscellaneous (6x), of which foreign loans – ëdömß – occur only 2x.

In the 1648 Moscow edition of Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki, as well as in Synodal Church Slavonic (for examples see, Mathiesen 1972: 126),¹ the opposition e : ë is purely functional: e is used word-initially, ë elsewhere. The distribution of these graphemes in the 1629 Oktoikh clearly does not reflect the RChSl orthographic practice since its occurrence in the word-initial position appears to be arbitrary.

In Ru texts, on the other hand, the grapheme ë was used to indicate iotised pronunciation, i.e. [je], and ë its absence, i.e. [e] (Pugh 1996: 22). If it is assumed that ë in the Kievan Oktoikh reflects iotised pronunciation, then its presence word-initially reveals some interesting facts about church pronunciation. Uspenskij (2002: 178–180) observes that from the 11th century two orthoepic norms were established in ESl ChSl with regard to the pronunciation of the word-initial e in native and foreign words. According to the first norm, which was adopted as normative in RChSl, iotised pronunciation was present in words of either origin. According to the second, which became the hallmark of the South-Western redaction, the palatal glide /j/ was present in native but absent from foreign words. In the 1629 Oktoikh, native words may be spelt with either grapheme but there is a strong

¹ Mathiesen (1972: 70) defines Synodal Church Slavonic as the present-day form of Church Slavonic that is used in the Russian Orthodox Church.
tendency to use \( \varepsilon \) with loan words (\( \varepsilon \) appears 12x whereas \( \epsilon \) only 2x). Assuming that \( \varepsilon \) indeed represents \([\text{je}]\), a tentative conclusion may be drawn, namely that the pronunciation of foreign words follows the RChSl orthoepic norm.

Unlike \( \epsilon \), instances of word-medial and word-final uses of \( \varepsilon \) are rare (17x): (1) in a post-vocalic position (7x) e.g. Киевê (1:7), припогдаё (9:v:14), разбойничие (12:v:1), поемъ (24:v:3), сознествен- (3x) (6:v:7, 7:v:15, 9:v:8); (2) with the voc. case (3x), e.g. Хê (17:v:13, 24:v:3, 24:v:9); (3) at line break (1x), e.g. прê/стая: (37:v:16–17); (4) miscellaneous (6x), e.g. Первый (fol. 3', heading), Вечернêа (3:v:6), ОУТРÈИИ (11:v:6), Первоûчномû8 (29:v:1), сîce (29:v:7), врëмëнлëк (40:v:10). The occurrence of the grapheme \( \varepsilon \) in post-vocalic position may be of Ruthenian origin in which the presence of \( \varepsilon \) in this environment signals iotised pronunciation (Pugh 1996: 27).

For Smotryc’kyj (1619: П/6') the opposition \( \varepsilon : \epsilon \) has also a morphological significance, differentiating between sg./pl. respectively: червöмû вóздûбëн падежë множественний ■ онëмëже единстëнëй сëлдëйаëк : íаку той кëйкрëт, тêкë кëйкрëт : той твëрë, тêк твëреë : тк твëдë : твë твëдë ... тк сëпëнëм : твë сëпëнëй. In the 1629 Oktoikh this rule is observed on one occasion only врëмëнлëк (40:v:10), otherwise the letter \( \epsilon \) is used in both sg. and pl.

2.2.6 Distribution of z-letters


Whereas prior to the second South Slavonic influence the letter зêлê may have been used to mark certain phonological changes, namely *z that is the result of the second or third palatalisation of *g, in its aftermath, it is primarily associated with the following seven words: зêлëзул, зêлëрêк, зëлëнê, зêлêкê, злëмë, зêлêвö, зêлêвö (and its compounds) (Mathiesen 1972: 130). An identical practice is observed in the Kievan Oktoikh, e.g. злëдêл, зêлê, злëйне, злëми, зêлëрак. The use of з to reflect the outcome of the second and third palatalisation, is singular, viz. норë, киëлê and зêлêвö; in all other instances the letter з is used, e.g. норëзêнê, врëзëнê, подвинызëтêа.

There are, however, three exception, злëонëмëя (2x) (11:v:7, 36:v:15); злëдêл (42:v:7).
An interesting and original use of the opposition ꙃ/ꙣ occurs with the word jazyk, where the two letters seem to be in complimentary distribution. As the word jazyk had several different but related meanings – it could refer either to a part of the body (‘tongue’), speech or people/nation – the reformers of Church Slavonic deemed it necessary to disambiguate the word’s senses, especially since Greek clearly distinguishes between ἑθνὸς ‘people/nation’ and γλῶσσα ‘tongue/speech, language’. Konstantin the Grammarian, for instance, in Сказание казанское о писменех, exploits the difference in graphic expression between the two vowels ε/η to differentiate between έζυκъ ‘people’ and ηζυκъ ‘language’ (Worth 1983: 27). Imitating the South Slavonic orthography, East Slavonic scribes introduce a parallel opposition азъкъ ‘tongue in the anatomical sense’ and азъкъ ‘people/speech, language’, differing from Greek in that азъкъ can only refer to the part of the body whereas азъкъ can stand for both ‘people’ and ‘speech/language’. This distinction was promptly adopted into Church Slavonic and became codified in grammars in the 17th century. It seems to be more characteristic of the Moscow redaction of Church Slavonic than that of South-Western Rus since it does not feature in the 1619 edition of Smotryc’kyj’s grammar but was included in the later 1648 Moscow edition. The distinction азъкъ/азъкъ does not appear to be wholly unknown in Kiev either as it appears in Pamva Berynda’s Лексикон словенорусского (Uspenskij 2002: 329).

In the 1629 Oktoikh the vowel letters а/а were not used as the means of disambiguation. It is plausible to assume that it was still felt necessary to preserve the distinction in some other way, namely by contrasting the forms with з on the one hand and those with ш on the other. The table below is a comparison between the 1629 Oktoikh, Archimandrite Ephrem’s English translation of Paraklitiki and the 1962 Oktoikh with regard to the opposition εθνὸς/γλῶσσα. It should be noted that the comparison is tentative as it is impossible to establish with certainty that the primary liturgical texts used in translation/copying were identical.
### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The letter šêlo</th>
<th>The letter ZEMAIÁ</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1629 Oktoikh</td>
<td>1962 edition</td>
<td>English translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çâzýk (fol. 41')</td>
<td>not found</td>
<td>çâzýki (fol. 48')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çâzýk (fol. 15')</td>
<td>çâzýki</td>
<td>çâzýki (fol. 20')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çâzýk (fol. 18')</td>
<td>çâzýki</td>
<td>çâzýki (fol. 13')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çâzýk (fol. 26')</td>
<td>not found</td>
<td>çâzýki (fol. 33')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çâzýk (fol. 41')</td>
<td>not found</td>
<td>çâzýkom (fol. 44')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çâzýk (fol. 47')</td>
<td>not found</td>
<td>çâzýkom (fol. 45')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of çâzýk to refer to ‘nation/people’ corresponds to a high degree with both the English translation and the 1962 Oktoikh, the single exception being çâzýk (fol. 18'). From the context – ДА ДВИЖЕТСЯ ВСАКЪ ЅАЗЫКЪ ЧÄНСКИЙ И МЫСЬ – К ПОХВАЛЪ ЧÄНСКОГО КОМСТИЯ ОТЕЧЕСТВА – it is possible to interpret ‘ВСАКЪ ЅАЗЫКЪ ЧÄНСКИЙ’ as ‘every human nation’, although ‘tongue’, in the anatomical sense, fits better with the word that follows, ‘thought’. On fol. 47 there is some ambiguity whether jazyk denotes ‘nation’ or ‘tongue’, since both interpretations appear plausible.¹

The use of çâzýk to denote ‘tongue’ is less consistent with the English translation and the 1962 Oktoikh. It is interesting that it may also mean ‘language/speech’, thus directly mimicking Greek, as on fol. 6, unlike the norm of the Moscow redaction in which the words ‘language’ and ‘nation’ are subsumed under the same lexeme çâzýk. The forms on fols. 33', 44', 45' unambiguously denote ‘tongue’ in the sense of body part. The forms on fols. 13', 20' and 48' are most probably errata as ‘nation’ rather than ‘tongue/language’ is a more likely reading; the form on fol. 6' is ambiguous as both readings are plausible. Although the opposition çâzýk/çâzýk does not appear to be unequivocally discrete, the evidence is sufficiently strong to support the assumption that the distinction εθνος/γλωσσα is preserved through the graphic opposition z : s.

#### 2.2.7 Distribution of i-letters

According to Smotryc’kyj (1619: A/7v–7v) ‘и: н начниати речениа и кончить, и вовêчь речениа срêтвлиый и соглашна помé начинайсцй словê полагатиса ... и: н начниати речениа нн

¹ The line in which the word appears is: и ЅАЗЫКЪ ВСАКЪ БОГОСЛОВИЧЬЕ ВЕЛИЧАЄТ ТА.
The exceptions are: (1) foreign loan words that either begin or end in i; (2) the prefix pri- where one should write u even when the ensuing letter is a vowel; (3) with adjectives and active participles in the gen. sg. fem. to distinguish between the gen. sg. and nom./voc. pl., cf. славна ~ славиа, ниця ~ ниция, чудица ~ чудция.

In the 1629 Oktoikh, the opposition i/i is preserved, in line with Smotryc’kyj’s recommendation, where i/i is regularly attested in pre-vocalic position word-medially, and u elsewhere (for examples and exceptions see 2.1.10). It is also encountered word-initially and elsewhere within a word in pre-consonantal position in words of foreign origin, e.g. Ісія, Іропіє, Пентіфон, Іаков, Іосіф, Іванна, Іаков, Іхдае, Інна, etc. The rule regarding the prefix pri- as well as use of i in gen. sg. fem. is ignored, e.g. пріат, пріємна, прійдйтє, Пригом, д в л е в в я с л а д к і я, егіпетська а с т и р д к н і а, г а д в і н а м уд р о с т и г ї ї д а, etc.1

The opposition i/i is also exploited to differentiate between two senses of the word mir, namely миръ (peace) and миръ/мръ (cosmos, universe). It is not, however, until after the second South Slavonic influence that the semantic differentiation between two meanings, through graphic juxtaposition of two variants of the letter i, occurs and becomes relevant in East Slavonic literary tradition. It first becomes entrenched in the orthographic system of the South-Western Rus, to which entries in the dictionaries of Lavrentij Zizanij (1596) and Pamva Berynda (1627), as well as the grammar of the Gerboveckij monastery (dating from the first half of the 17th century), testify. In the Moscow redaction of Church Slavonic this juxtaposition remains unknown, or is at least of little significance, until the church reforms instigated by Patriarch Nikon, after which it is readily adopted and codified in the Moscow redaction (Uspenskij 2002: 330–333 ).

Since the 1629 Oktoikh is of Ukrainian/Belarusian provenance, the opposition миръ: миръ/мръ would be expected. Out of 38 occurrences of mir, 28 are spelt in accordance with the above principle. The letter u instead of i/i appears 7x, whereas the opposite, i/i for i, is attested 3x. In adjectives/abstract nouns (8x) derived from the word mir, the vowel letter i is used 3x in words pertaining to cosmos: премирнъ (17:8), мирска (17:13), всемирна (21:16).

1 The sole exception with the prefix pri- is the word несприимниа (22:8). (Mathiesen (1972: 129) observes that the prefix pri- spelt with u is regularly encountered in Synodal Church Slavonic before the vowel letters a, 8, and w.)
The vowel letter ɪ in combination with kratkaja is regularly used in post-vocalic position throughout the text to represent the palatal glide /j/ – an orthographic practice that accords well with Smotryc’kyj’s usage in the 1619 grammar. This Ukrainian/Belarusian feature, which was present in the South-Western redaction of ChSl, was absent from the Great Russian redaction where only ɪ, pronounced as /i/, was written. The grapheme ɪ and its pronunciation as /j/ was, however, adopted by the Great Russian redaction with Nikonian reforms in the middle of the 17th century (Uspenskij 2002: 442).

The grapheme ɪ occurs word-finally in the following positions: (1) in nouns of all three genders in the gen. pl., e.g. strástей, látiě, nastolâniї, òbrârgîšenîї, líjúї; (2) in adjectives and pronouns in the dat./loc. sg. fem., e.g. âkotóřój, svoéй, něj, sťěj, âdějēї, tâòej; (3) in the 2nd per. sg. imperative forms, e.g. pòmolâj, ârđēj, râdâjëa, pòj; (4) in nouns, adjectives, pronouns and participles in the nom./acc./voc. sg. masc., e.g. bøgâjťj, bâdjânyj, rasnînyjì, sîdâj, prolavâjëa, vospîâjëmîї, vospîkâjtyj, tōj, sēj, mój, zâdějēї, ârâї, ħođotaíї. A lone example of the gen. pl. in -ɪ is attested in the word chîjîniâlîї (17r:8) and is most likely an error.

In word-medial position /j/ is attested in a variety of lexemes and always following a vowel, e.g. prîjíї, proyâd, ħođotaâjstjîїjì, âratovîeyîїnîї, Râzâbînícejі, Dostûtîno, razbînjîjëї. Exceptions are rare and most often appear in connection with the words voin- and -tai(n)-, e.g. tâjîno (8v:10) but tâînstvo (17r:7), ôtâîjëa (17r:8), tâînstvo (f23r:17), tâînstva (31v:11), ôtâîjînîsîa (37v:4); wîñi (25v:4) and wînî (47v:11) but wînjûj (5v:8), wînnî (11v:10), wînî/âstva (19v:8–9), wînî (30v:16), wînîstva (2x) (35v:5, 38v:12). Other examples include îêâjîno, Troîjîmyj, sêjîstînîї, proîjîjâdë, Přeuîkânlîjî, etc. It is interesting that in two instances, wînîjûj and proîjîjâdë, psîlî is used instead.1

2.2.8 Distribution of o-letters

The opposition between two graphic variants of the vowel letter o, namely ø : w has, according to Smotryc’kyj (1619), several functions in Church Slavonic.

First, this juxtaposition is exploited to differentiate between homonymous case forms in the instr. sg. and dat. pl. in nouns belonging to *ð-stem where ø is written in the instr. sg and w in dat. pl., e.g. ðløvetêkmû vs. ðløvetêkmû, ðînîmû vs. ðînîmû (1619: 107). Second, to differentiate between adverbs and nom./acc. sg. short forms of neuter adjectives,

---

1 It is possible that the presence of another diacritical mark prevented the use of kratkaja.
where $\sigma$ is associated with adjectives and $w$ with adverbs, e.g. $\nu\n
One of the ChSl writing and Cyrillic printing conventions for the distribution of various u-letters is codified in Smotryc'kyj (1619: A/7) where ‘о́ у́ начале́ речений, 8/ же и χ/ серед́ и ё конци́ о́гметевалема́ укривё̀тсё’. According to another orthographic principle, followed in a number of printed Muscovite texts dating from the late 1730s to mid-50s, χ was used in initially, but also medially and finally when under stress, whilst 8 in unstressed syllables (Černyx 1953: 152–161).

The 1629 Oktoikh follows the orthographic convention recommended by Smotryc'kyj: the vowel letter 8 regularly occurs in word-medial and word-final positions, e.g. пре́предвёд, лёкъ, с́дь, ко́вездевёд, не́дёвачны́, разрё́винь, съ́девствь, кревь, whereas χ word-initially, e.g. о́хопевани́й, о́храпедно, о́хмеривени́й, о́гльь, о́гнёв, о́гмь, о́гтварь, о́гзь.

The seeming exceptions are complex words (15x) beginning with blago-, ne-, na-, brato- and чёловêко-, e.g. багоостросёй (5r:4–5), наноци (7r:11), наноци (8r:10–11), нео́доп (8r:9), багоосро́бь (9r:11), багоостросёйным (20r:7–8), багоофици́аль (22r:11), пагоостросёй (27r:5), наноци (32r:2), наноци (36r:7), чакоофици́ца (38r:7), чакоофици́ца (44r:2), пагоостросёйна (48r:3), пагоостросёй (49r:10), наноци́о (50r:4). As all prefixes end in a vowel, the use of χ may have been motivated by the presence of a preceding vowel; an identical orthographic convention is also attested in Ostrožskaja biblija (Bulič 1893: 136). On one occasion the letter 8 is attested word-medially following the prefix na-, viz. нанять (14r:17). The letter χ is used for OCS χ and ж, e.g. о́гтварь, о́хнековъ, о́гзь, о́оооутросё; the letter 8 for χ and ж, e.g. рóкмь, путь, зо́кмь, зовё́о, чóо, эмъже, эмжаке, раздёвчеса.

The vowel letter ъ occurs initially, medially and finally, representing OCS χ and ж, e.g. рóкмь, путь, зо́кмь, зовё́о, чóо, эмъже, эмжаке, раздёвчеса. In addition, ъ after the affricate ч is attested 1x with the adjective чёственны́а (11r:4). The vowel letter ъ for OCS ж is attested 4x: (a) in adverbs внюдо́же (27r:2) and внюдò (38r:4); (b) with the noun in the acc. sg. стёси (39r:15); (c) with the adjective внюдённы́а (27r:17).

Smotryc’kyj (1619: Φ4r–5r, 6r–6r) furthermore uses the opposition 8 : ъ to separate between participle forms in the dat. sg. masc./neut. and acc. sg. fem., e.g. внишь ~ внишь, внюдь ~ внюдь. This rule is not observed in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. Гаврила́ престо́вавши́ (5r:15), еврькнови́в, о́гтасити́ молимса, пе́м (23r:8–9), тевь гра́дом (46r:13–14), мбрь ... нёрнок поеси́ (31r:14–15).
2.2.10 Distribution of jers

The front and back jers are in an overwhelming majority of cases written word-finally, as a rule, indicating the softness or the hardness of the preceding consonant. The sole exception is the word стихолён (11:9) where absence of the back jer may be seen as an erratum. This is in accordance with Smotryč’kyj’s (1619: A/7v) recommendation which states that ‘ї самь такий жонь копно речення охоп rebelяемо писати’ ю охоп, також варшнє п’яхъ, що дебелення схлася на речення качалаго ю же во втоШенї’.

Word-medially, at line break, the back jer is attested 8x whilst the front jer 1x, e.g.


In addition, the jers are also sporadically attested in accentual units where the autosemantic word coalesces with an enclitic/reflexive particle, e.g. охopedовься, рожьса, тварьжъ, содатъса, адамомъже, покаламьсяса, ткляже. (In this environment the jer is usually either absent or replaced with a paerok.) Word-medially the jers are attested 12x, e.g. гдѣтвство (7:10), Инздрикътаномъ (13:1), сѣльствомъ (15v:1), доседыше (25v:6–7), сектостыми (27v:17), гдѣтвста (33v:4), рождышыа (49v:7), гдѣтвбіа (50v:16), подвизайса (1v:3), гѣлъи (15v:10), пѣопрѣтъныа (44v:11), йымъже (48v:4).

2.3 Orthography and pronunciation

The previous section explored orthography from a functional and/or morphological perspective; in this section the focus shifts to purely phonetic considerations. The features discussed have been selected for their dialectical and/or literary relevance. They are grouped according to the type of phonological phenomenon rather than chronologically.

This section considers the following:

1. Reflexes of diphthongs in liquid sonants
2. Presence/absence of second (progressive) palatalisation
3. Yodisation
4. Treatment of е and ѣ
5. Dispalatalisation of consonants
6. Loss of word-initial j before rounded vowels
7. Loss of jers and attendant consequences
8. Rise of the “new a’/akan’e
9. Palatalisation of velar consonants and further developments
10. Assimilations in and simplification of consonant clusters
11. Mutation ‘a > ‘e
12. Treatment of ѵ, Ѹ, ѹ, ѷ in environments adjacent to j
13. Suffix ťănß/ĕnß in OCS and ESI ChSl

2.3.1 Reflexes of diphthongs in liquid sonants

2.3.1.1 Elimination of jer-diphthongs

The reflexes of the sequences *CŭRC/*CǐRC yielded across the ESl linguistic territory the CъRC and CьRC groups respectively, in which a further development of the jers coincided with that of jers in the strong position, i.e. Ѳ > ọ and Ѳ > ę.1 By contrast, in the SSl languages, namely Bulgarian and Macedonian, the same sequences resulted in CRъC and CRьC forms with the jers following the sonant. In both languages, however, the jers in these groups had a merely graphic function, as they were obliterated before the general loss of jers, the syllabicity thus being transferred onto the sonants (Shevelov 1964: 467–468; 476–478).

With regard to ESI ChSl texts, written before the loss of jers, orthography follows the church pronunciation,2 which in turn does not differ from the living pronunciation of the time: SSI forms of the type търгъ, съмъръ are regularly rendered in ESI as търгъ, съмъръ, where the jers precede the sonant in question. SSI spellings are also attested in the earliest extant texts, but as these, on the whole, merely reflect the orthographic practice of a protograph, such spellings became obsolete as the SSI influence waned. Changes engendered by the loss of jers duly affect the ecclesiastical pronunciation and are mirrored in the orthography: where the jers were vocalised they are pronounced as [o], [e] and written as ő, ę; where the jers disappeared they are no longer pronounced and consequently not

---

1 A further development, idiosyncratic to the ESI territory and to a large extent limited to the Northern Russian territory, is the rise of the so-called “second pleophony” where an additional jer is present in CъRC/CьRC forms so that a sonant is flanked on both sides by a jer, e.g. торог, верест (gen.pl.), одерень (Shevelov 1964: 468).
2 Uspenskij (2002: 118) defines ecclesiastical or literary pronunciation as the orthoepic norm of Church Slavonic. Ecclesiastic pronunciation may at times coincide with the living pronunciation, that is to say, not stand in direct opposition to it.
written (Uspenskij 2002:137–139, 150–151). The same tradition is observed in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. мертвых, оутверди, смерть, держайте, державъ, скорбей.

The development of the *CRŭC/*CRYC groups within the ESl languages where the sequences -ъr-, -ъl-, -ъl- stand for a sonant + jer is significant. In Russian the jers were subject to vocalisation irrespective of whether they were in the strong or weak position, i.e. krьвъ yields krov’ but krьvi (dat. sg.) also becomes krovi. In Ukrainian and Belarusian, on the other hand, the jers were treated in the same manner as regular weak jers where a further development took place beginning in the 13th–14th centuries, namely, an additional vowel, [y], was inserted after the sonants r, l (Shevelov 1964: 469–470). Pugh (1996: 34) identifies this trait as one of the peculiarities present in Ru, citing two examples from Meletij Smotryc’kyj’s written corpus, e.g. дрижачи, задрижёмъ. In the 1629 Oktoikh lexemes with the *CRYC/*CRYC root, where the original jer was in the weak position, show Russian reflexes, e.g. воскрёсёнъ (3r:5–6), воскреси (4v:17), воскресъ (5v:7), Крестъ (13v:16), бёзпластнымъ, плёти (gen. sg.), Бопластика.

2.3.1.2 Elimination of sonant diphthongs

The elimination of the Proto-Slavonic sequence #ăRC yielded different results in ESl and SSl areas: although the short diphthongs, giving rise to circumflex vowels, were resolved through metathesis in both areas, compensatory lengthening of the vowel only took place in the SSl area, e.g. *ălkút (PS) > lakьт (OCS), lokотъ (R), lokít’ (U dial), lokáč’ (Br). (The long diphthongs, giving acute vowels, were resolved through metathesis and accompanied by vowel lengthening in all areas.) The resolution of liquid diphthongs word-medially, that is of CēēRC and CăăRC sequences, took place at a later stage and was achieved through two different strategies, namely metathesis or pleophony. In SSl metathesis and vowel lengthening took place, whereas in ESl, where CēēRC and CăăRC fell together, the liquid diphthong was resolved through insertion of an epenthetic vowel which gave rise to sequences of the type CV_1RV_2C, e.g. *báltá- (PS) > balto (OCS), boloto (U), boloto (R), balota (BR) (Schenker 1995: 93–95).

Lexemes with word-initial ra-, la- as well as metathetic forms were adopted into and made the literary norm of the ESl Church Slavonic – Uspenskij (2002:193) suggests that that the absorption of such lexemes might have been facilitated by already existing ESl forms such as bratъ, or where metathetic forms coincided with pleophonic as is the case with the lexeme gradъ, which could be perceived either as a metathetic counterpart of ESI
gorodъ or an everyday designation for a meteorological phenomenon gradъ. In the 1629 Oktoikh, only forms that show metathesis are attested, e.g. Равенстѣймъ, ракъ, прє-, краа, градъ, глазовъ, созмяжане, власти, младенецъ, сладкѣ, крази.

The sole exception is the word Человъ/чнеческа (40:15–16). It is difficult, however, to regard this isolated instance as an unconscious intrusion of the vernacular since the tradition of writing pleophonic forms at line-break in order to abide by the rule for the division of words, when the words do not exactly fit the register of the line, is attested from earliest times. With regard to this particular lexeme, in Izbornik 1076 the spelling Человъ is observed with utmost rigor, only to be violated on a single occasion at line break Человъ/чнечекъ (Kandaurova 1968: 8–18).

2.3.2 Presence/absence of second (progressive) palatalisation of velar consonants

Broadly speaking, the phonological change whereby the velar consonants k, g, x mutated into c, dz (simplified to z in most Slavonic languages), s in ESl and SSl and š in WSI languages, before the front vowels ě, i, (< PIE diphthongs *oi, *ai), took place in the 6th/7th century. Although the change was pan-Slavonic in character, the evidence of modern Slavonic languages shows that there was, on the whole, a strong impulse to eradicate the results of this mutation. Thus, with respect to declensional forms as well as imperative forms in the 1st per. sg ending in a velar consonant, the original results of the second palatalisation had been completely obliterated in CSR, owing to the analogical levelling, but preserved in CSU and CSBr in the loc. sg. and in the dat. sg. of feminine nouns (Pugh and Press 1999: 33; Shevelov 1964: 294–297, 1979: 55–56, Wexler 1977: 68).

Mutation of velars in the dat./loc. of feminine nouns and the loc. sg. of masculine nouns appears to be a regular feature of Ruthenian. In non-literary texts, on the other hand, the *ď-stem nom. pl. ending in -y, written as -i after velars, appears to be the preferred standard (the original desinence -i with the ensuing mutation appears in biblical passages and similar) (Pugh 1996: 50, 53, 71–72). The desinence -ax is common in the loc.pl. of masculine nouns although the endings -ěx/-ex are attested in a number of words (Pugh 1996: 75–76). With regard to Russian, a complete absence of effects of the second palatalisation is attested in Novgorod-Pskov dialects as evidenced by the birch-bark gramoty, e.g. кѣла.

1 Carlton (1991:124) argues, however, that owing to the lack of evidence of second palatalisation in non-literary written sources, namely the birch-bark gramoty, the problems with time scale as well as the complete absence of even the slightest trace of this mutation in the present-day dialects, it would be more logical to assume that the velar had not been reintroduced through levelling but had never been lost in the first place.
In Great Russian dialects where palatalisation was present, non-mutated forms start appearing as a result of analogical levelling in manuscripts from the 14th century (Uspenskij 2002: 202).

The guardians of Church Slavonic were, as a rule, averse to any changes, be they morphological or phonological, and in this instance, the gradual disappearance of the effects of the second palatalisation from the vernacular had not been allowed to penetrate the sacred language. It is therefore of little surprise that the 1629 Oktoikh preserves these mutations in all positions, e.g. äšýci (nom. pl. masc.), Øtroci (nom. pl. masc.), mh8nci (nom. pl. masc.), pobz8ê (loc. sg. masc.), nošê (nom. du. fem.), Ds8ê (loc. sg. masc.), rcêtö (imper. 2nd per. pl.). The apparent exception is the word (на) пövgê (loc. sg. masc.) (41v:13). It is possible to ascribe the absence of palatalisation to vernacular influence, however, it is unlikely that a Greek loan word, in competition with the already established ‘воръ’, would have widespread usage. It is more plausible to assume that this Hellenism became part of the Church Slavonic vocabulary at a rather late stage, by which time the second palatalisation had undoubtedly ceased to operate. (Indeed, the word does not feature in the Staroslavjanskij slovar’ (1999), whilst the sole entry in Sreznevskij’s Materialy dates from the 15th century.)

The reflexes of the consonant cluster *sk and *zg before the front vowels ě, i, which differ not only with respect to the reflexes of k, g before these vowels, had also yielded disparate sequences across the Slavic linguistic territory. Shevelov (1964: 297) observes that ‘[t]he presence of s, z operated as a conservative factor or, more often, it prompted special changes’. In the following, only the outcomes of *sk-mutation in the predesinential position are discussed, since these are the examples attested in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. arľaстїн (4x), Иоаїнеctїн (1x).

In OCS, the mutation of *sk engendered, apart from the anticipated sc, dissimilated forms in st, particularly emblematic of such canonical manuscripts as Codex Assemanius and Codex Supraslensis, e.g. ljudstii ~ ljudskъ, pastē ~ paska, дъстē ~ дъска. The presence of dissimilation may therefore point to the South-East Slavonic origin of the text in question: the st-reflexes are not only attested in the present-day Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects, but they are also prevalent in Middle Bulgarian/Middle Macedonian manuscripts (Shevelov 1964: 297).

---

1 It is a moot point whether the lack of palatalisation shows that the original velar had been preserved, implying that the mutation had never taken place and the velar had only softened, or whether it is a case of a three-stage development, namely kê > cê > kê, where the last stage, cê > kê, shows a north-western dialectical feature whereby c passes into k. For further debate see, Bjornflaten (1983, 1988, 1990) and Schuster-Šewc (1993) in defence of the three-stage argument and Zaliznjak (1991: 218–228) for the opposite view.
The development of sk before ē, yielded, however, a different result in the ESl languages: generally speaking, the sequence sk remained unchanged in this environment (where k, whether preserved from the period before the second palatalisation of velars or introduced through a secondary development se’ > st’ > sk’, represents [k’]) (Shevelov 1964: 297–300; Uspenskij 2002: 197; Wexler 1977: 68–69). The sk-reflex is attested in birch bark gramoty, e.g. Полтъскъ (loc. sg. masc.), смердънскъ (nom. pl. masc.) (Zaliznjak 2004: 410, 668), as well as in 11th–12th century texts from the Kiev-Polessie region, e.g. въ чачъкь дни, золотъ женскъ, въ боурп ... морскъ, очи чачскъ, погъскъ, апостольскъ цркви (Shevelov 1979: 58–59).

In the 1629 Oktoikh only the st-reflexes are attested, reflecting thus the OCS influence. In Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki (1619: 1/6’), however, both the mutated and non-mutated forms are codified as normative in the nom. pl. masc., viz. русийскъ ~ русейскъ.

2.3.3 Yodisation

2.3.3.1 Epenthetic l

Sequences with labial (b, p, m, v) + j resulted in an optional mutation labial + l’, i.e. bj > bj or bl’, pj > pj or pl’, mj > mj or ml’, and vj > vl or vl’. In all Slavonic languages the so-called epenthetic l is present in word-initial syllables, e.g. ‘I spit’ плюю (OCS), плюю (R), плюю (U), плюю (Br), плуę (P), pliji (Cz), pliejem (SC), плювам (B). In non-initial syllables, that is, at morpheme boundary, the epenthetic l is retained only in Central Slavonic languages (R, U, Br, SC) but lost in B, M, WSl languages, e.g. земя/купенъ (OCS), земія/куплен (R), земля/куплены (U), зямля/куплены (Br), зиemia/kupiony (P), земě/купен (Cz), zemlja/kupljen (SC), земя/купен (B). Its absence from B, M, WSl languages is most probably engendered by instability of a fixed phonemic identity of j, which, in turn, facilitated loss of the epenthetic l through analogical levelling (Schenker 1995: 84–85; Townsend and Janda 1996: 90–91).

In the 1629 Oktoikh the epenthetic l at morpheme boundary is, on the whole, well preserved: (1) in present tense forms, (cf. 1st per. sg. vs. 3rd per. pl.), e.g. слабослабъ, слабъ/ слабъ; (2) in past part. act. of Class IV verbs (javiti ~ javl’-), e.g. непустна, престъпшемъ, оспособълъ, невозлюбъше, ынлъ, излюбълъ, излъвъюса, обніличе, состаляще, ыстваль; (3) in verbal nouns and nouns formed with the suffix -j-a, e.g. престъпшнълъ, соконшнейлъ, оспособнъ, стъпленълъ, землъ, ыствалине, ыславлнъ, обноблнъ, ычавлнъ; (4)
in past part. pass. and adjectivised forms, e.g. økroplöna, sovokùplöna, örkplöna, araavlonß, ødow8övlöno, bg8oãvlöno; (5) in imperf. verbs derived from Class IV verbs as well imperfect forms the same class, e.g. potröblãötß, nöposramlãömsã, izbavlãã, udïvlãwösã, obnovlãötsã, nastavlãömi, divlãxù. Vacillation between labial + j: labial + l’ are attested in the following words: (1) Umörqvönïö, umörqvönïi, umörqvö, but umörqvlãömýj; (2) ãzvönnýã, uãzvönago, but uãžvlönß, uãzvlönß; (3) zömlönïi (1x) but zöm (ö)n- (8x); препрославен- (6x) but препрославленъ (1x). The epenthetic l is never attested in the past part. pass./adj. благословёнъ (15x).

Evidence from CES texts of Ukrainian origin suggests that, unlike the sequences bl’, pl’, and ml’, there was a tendency to restrict the use of vl’ or for the cluster not to develop in the first place under certain conditions. Of relevance here is that in clusters of the type C + vl’, l was lost or did not develop, which in turn may explain the alternations ujazy-/ujazvl- and umerščv- and umerščvl- (Shevelov 1979: 70–72). On the other hand, forms such as blagosloven-, препрославен- might have been influenced by corresponding forms in Bulgarian manuscripts, in which the loss of the epenthetic l is attested from the 13th century. Presence of the epenthetic l in земленъ is curious since there is no phonological reason why it should develop on morpheme boundary, i.e. земъ < * zêm-in- . A most likely explanation is that the adjective was derived from the noun zemljá < * zêm-j-á.

2.3.3.2 Reflexes of sequences *dj and *tj

A salient characteristics of the East Slavonic redaction of Church Slavonic, which established itself as a literary norm especially in the 11th to 14th centuries, is the presence of ж as the reflex of the Proto-Slavonic sequence *dj. Here orthography mirrors the church pronunciation: forms showing reflexes of this sequence were pronounced as [ž] as a result of influence exerted by the vernacular (the sequence *dj yielded ż in East Slavonic but żd in South Slavonic). On the other hand forms with ч, instead of çh, шт or ич, where çhč are reflexes of Proto-Slavonic *tj in ESl and SSl respectively, were regarded as specifically non-literary elements (Uspenskij 2002: 128, 1994, 33–34).

In the 1629 Oktoikh ж is attested in only a handful of instances, e.g. оутверженén (4v:3–4), рохкствé (16v:1), прекé (19v:17), нáдже (26v:2), забáдышаго (27v:1), посáджé (27v:6), нáджé (29v:2), вёдженé (33v:4), вёкýнê (47v:12), стрáжé (48v:12), согражéн (51v:2), whereas жд appears to be the preferred standard (app. 70x); çh, on the other hand, is always written for the ESl reflex ч, except for a single past part. act. врáбвёнч (2v:7). The
participle does not however appear in the liturgical text proper but in the preface where several other dialectal features are observed.\footnote{Another seeming exception is the word *škráh* (37*:2). Uspenskij (1994: 26) observes that forms with čužd- cannot be regarded as true vernacular, non-literary forms of the type svéča. It is the case that in the East Slavonic redaction of Church Slavonic the form čouž (čoužd-, čužd-, čužd-) becomes the established written norm, whereas in the OCS and South Slavonic redaction the corresponding form is štoužd (from PS *tjudj*). The reason for the presence of č- in this particular word does not seem to be rooted in phonological considerations; spellings with č appear to be a result of contamination of the words svéča and svédo. Thus in the same way that the ESI form with č- is most likely occasioned by the spelling of the word čudo, in SSI one observes cases where čudo is also written as štoudo.}

2.3.4 Treatment of ẻ and ė

This section addresses the use of ẻ and ė in the 1629 Oktoikh. In both OCS and CES the vowels e and ė stood for two distinct phonemes. However, in many manuscripts, both literary and non-literary and dating from various periods, confusion between the two letters is common. The evidence from modern East Slavonic dialects, namely that the reflexes of these two vowels have a different impact on the preceding consonant, seems to reflect a much earlier linguistic situation. Whereas in modern Ukrainian dialects the consonant remains hard, or is only partially softened, before the reflexes of e and is soft before those of ė, in the majority of Great Russian dialects the consonant is softened before the reflexes of both e and ė. This difference in pronunciation occurred in the past, where the opposition [C’ē ~ Ce] rather than [C’ě ~ C’e] (a pronunciation based on an old Kievan dialect in which such a correlation was present) was adopted as the orthoepic norm of Church Slavonic. In the South-Western Rus therefore the ecclesiastical pronunciation was not opposed to the living and indeed reflected further developments such as the fronting of e (< PS ė well as the so-called “new ė”) into i. By contrast, in the Great Russian territory the literary pronunciation was divorced from the living and retained in the Orthodox Church as normative until the beginning of the 19th century. This orthoepic tradition has been preserved to present day by the priestless Old Believers (*staroobrjadcy-bespopovcy*) (Uspenskij 2002: 163–173).

In the 1629 Oktoikh a number of instances where the original ė is replaced with e, rarely i, or where ė occurs instead of the original e has been attested. The remainder of this section discusses likely reasons for such alternations. For the sake of clarity the section has been further subdivided into two subsections: (1) spellings of e for ė and (2) words showing the results of passage of e > i.
2.3.4.1 Spellings with e for ĕ

The confusion between ε and ū is present in literary texts although it is largely kept to specific lexemes: (1) spelling of OCS τῆλες as ΤΕΛΕΣΣΕ as well as ΤΕΛΕΣΣΙΤΗ; (2) frequent substitution of ū with ε in the loc./dat. endings of personal pronouns, i.e. ΤΕΕΕ, ΣΕΕΣ for ΤΕΕΗ, ΣΕΕΗ; (3) rendition of the suffix -ᾶλα as -ελά, i.e. ΠΥΒΕΛΑ, ΟΠΙΤΕΛΑ, etc. for ΠΥΒΕΛΑ, ΟΠΙΤΕΛΑ, etc.; (4) ū is almost always supplanted by ε after the sonant r, more rarely after the sonant l, in metathetic forms (in the reflexes of the Proto-Slavonic sequences *CerC and *CelC), i.e. ΠΡΕΔΗ, ΒΡΈΜΑ, etc. for ΠΡΕΚΑ, ΒΡΈΜΑ, etc. and ΠΑΝΗ for ΠΑΝΗ (Uspenskij 2002: 170).

Shevelov (1979: 111–112) observes that the systematic appearance of e-spellings in oblique cases of the forms like τῆλα is best explained in terms of positional shortening which occurred in the pre-pretonic syllable of trisyllabic forms. Whereas positional shortening is thus responsible for the alternation τῆλα : ΤΕΛΕΣΣΑ, the substitution of ū with ε in adjectival forms is in all likelihood based on analogical levelling since positional shortening does not occur in pretonic syllables. Furthermore, for Shevelov (1979:193–194), the regularity with which the substitution occurs during the CES period, in the forms listed under (2) and (3), is a direct reflection of the influence exerted by South Slavonic pronunciation: ‘The Bg pronunciation in which they heard the word had ĕ realised as an open sound of the ae type as was usual in Bg of the time. That pronunciation to the OU [Old Ukrainian] scribes could not be associated with their native ĕ, it was closer to their ε. Hence it was grasped as e and so spelled’.

Uspenskij (2002: 170–171) rejects this hypothesis. In his view, factors other than the difference in ecclesiastical pronunciation are responsible for the resultant alternation in orthography. Substitution of ε for ū in forms listed in (1) and (2) may be a result of assimilation – regressive in the forms like ΤΕΛΕΣΕ and progressive in the forms like ΤΕΕΕ, ΣΕΕΣ. Here the fact that lexemes, both with the original ĕ and the substituted e, are accepted as normative seems to indicate that the distinction literary : non-literary is not based on the opposition ū : ε but is engendered by entirely different considerations. The significant factor may be the choice of the stem, so that the form ΤΕΛΕΣΣΕ is not juxtaposed with τῆλες but with the non-literary τῆλα, i.e. *s-stem vs. *ō-stem, or the existence of multiple forms where one set is perceived as specifically vernacular, as is the case with the personal pronouns τοῦθ, τοῦθ, whereas the other as common to both vernacular and literary sphere, as are the pronouns ΤΕΕΕ, ΣΕΕΣ.
With regard to the metathetic forms Uspenskij agrees with Živov in that ESl ChSl forms were born out of the scribe’s dependence on the living pronunciation: to insure the correct spelling the scribe abided by the rule which stated that one wrote ê where in living pronunciation one heard [ë], and ö where one heard [e]. Indeed in order to produce a metathetic form, such as дрêво, the scribe would rely on the pronunciation of the corresponding vernacular pleophonic form дörövo, where he would hear [e]. The distinction between literary : non-literary pronunciation was thus based not on ê : ö but metathesis : pleophony. The same precept could not be used in production of *CelC reflexes as the pleophonic form mlêko in the vernacular corresponded to moloko which could not guide him in his choice between ê or ö. For this reason the substitution in *CelC reflexes is not systematic and is limited to specific lexemes (such as in roots ослëй-, ёлëй-) (Uspenskij 2002: 173–175; Živov 1999: 777–791).

In the 1629 Oktoikh the distribution of ö and ê in these environments follows, on the whole, the patterns described above. No substitution of ö for ê is present in personal pronouns – төбê is consistently written in the dat./loc. sg. and төbö in the acc./gen. sg. The feminine suffix -êlì is rendered as -ölì in the sole lexeme of this type attested in the text, namely доброëлòвëнìх and тëлëнëх (19v:8, 26v:11). In the metathetic forms the sequence rê- is consistently written as rö- but the original ê is preserved in reflexes of *CelC, e.g. прорëздёнìх, преславнёе, прерёд, прорёдёнìх, стрёгûмîлъ, дрёвëмъ, врёменъ, охлопредно, нерёдна, посрёд, прорёдъ, нажрёйи, потрёд, непострёдна, потрёделъ but пâкнëмъ, пакнîнъ, пакнîнъ.

In the Kievan Oktoikh побёдēтëлòна (19v:14) occurs 1x but otherwise побёдîтъ, побёдëтëлòла (2x), побёдîдëтса, Побёдîсä. This spelling might reflect the influence of dialects in which unstressed ê was regularly supplanted by ö as the two vowels fell together in one sound e. This phonological change took place in the central East Slavonic territories: in today’s Belorussia, Northern Ukraine and Southern Great Russian territories. It is believed that the fusion of these two phonemes occurred in the 12th–13th centuries (Shevelov 1979: 431–432; Filin 2006: 160–178). Owing to its singular occurrence, however, it might simply be an error.

Furthermore stressed ê is rendered by the grapheme ö in the following two lexemes: фëзрëйîнъ, нейзрëйîнъ (cf. ёрëкти OCS) betraying possibly a Belarusian influence where stressed è was lost and fell together with e (Filin 2006: 160–178). Similarly, the spelling of
the word нёдэ́ль, Bнёдэ́ль (I:4, 49:v:8) for нёдэ́ла may be ascribed to the influence of the official administrative language, Belarusian-Ruthenian, and possibly to the influence exerted by the Bulgarian church pronunciation. The substitution of ъ by ε in this particular lexeme was widespread in URu texts (Shevelov 1979: 433).

In the 1629 Oktoikh forms such as велёніє (3x), повелёніє, нёвдёніє, досвятогрёніє. These forms however, although rather unusual, were emblematic of the Ruthenian period and are well represented in the texts of time. They are pseudo-Slavonicisms which the scribes introduced in nouns derived from Class IV verbs ending in -ектніо. The impetus behind this reform was twofold: it was partly driven by a desire to expurgate from the written language what they erroneously believed to be instances of the “new ъ”, partly reflected the influence of the official administrative language (Shevelov 1979: 434).

The form велёніемошь (23:8), OCS and CES have сворёп-, might be seen an instance of anticipative misspelling: the occurrence of the vowel letter ъ in the first syllable only anticipates the same letter which occurs in the next syllable. On the other hand, this substitution may reflect the general tendency to confuse ъ and ε in unstressed positions.

2.3.4.2 Fronting of e > i

According to Shevelov (1979: 425–431, 437–439) the fronting of e (deriving from PS ĕ as well as the so-called “new ĕ”) into i is restricted to Ukrainian – there being no corresponding phonological change in neighbouring or co-territorial languages. This change, which emanated from South-Western Ukraine northwards did not initially extend to those areas, i.e. Northern Ukraine, where ĕ was phonetically realised as a diphthong [ĕ]. The earliest attested examples began appearing in the late 13th century. In Northern Ukraine the passage of e into i, on the other hand, is twofold: the stressed ĕ ([ĕ]) is gradually ousted by the South Ukrainian i, a process which started no later than in the 17th century, whilst the passing of the unstressed ĕ, through monophthongisation, into e/i began in the early 15th century.

Indiscriminate use of the letters ъ/и, more often и for ъ, prevalent in Ukrainian texts dating from the 15th to the mid-16th century, is a reliable indicator of the alternation in question, abating with the appearance of grammatical works concerned with the codification of language, such as Zizanij’s Grammatika Sloven'ska (1596), Smotryc'kyj’s Grammatiki (1619) and Berynda’s Leksikon slavenorosskii i imen tolkovanie (1627), where the
standardisation of orthography was perceived as no less important (Shevelov 1979:425). In the 1629 Oktoikh no such confusion is present save for a lone example testifying to the fronting of e into i, viz. церковное (23°, 8).

The presence of i for ē in the oblique cases of the totalising pronoun ves’, viz. вй (dat. pl. masc.) (19°:14) and всим (dat. pl. masc.) (20°:1), does not, according to Danylenko (2006: 111), reflect the fronting of e into i but the influence of the adjectival paradigm on the pronominal, a trait that is present in Belarusian and the Polissian dialects.

2.3.5 Dispalatalisation of consonants

2.3.5.1 Dispalatalisation of r’

In the East Slavonic territory the development of r’ proceeded down the road of dispalatalisation – the process, which can be dated to the 10th–13th centuries, yielded variegated results in the three East Slavonic languages. In Russian the correlation r ~ r’ has been preserved, but as the dispalatalisation of r’ occurs as a result of complementary distribution it is restricted to specific lexical items. In CSBr and an overwhelming majority of Br dialects (with the exception of far north-eastern and eastern dialects) r’ dispalatalised in all environments. Lastly in CSU dispalatalised r occurs in word- and syllable-final position but r’ is preserved before front vowels. The situation in the dialects is rather heterogeneous: the original distribution of r : r’ is preserved in the Carpathian but lost in Volhynian-Podolian region, whilst mixed reflexes are present in Lvov area and the Southeast. Evidence of the written material indicates that the confusion between soft and hard r, in texts of both Ukrainian and Belarusian provenance, began at a very early stage: in the former the two are confounded already in the 11th century and the trend continues into the 18th century; in the later the first examples hail from the 12th century becoming abundant in the 15th and 16th centuries (Filin 2006: 314–319; Shevelov 1979: 189–192, 636–641; Wexler 1977: 152–154).

In written texts two mutually exclusive tendencies may make themselves apparent: the desire to retain the archaic orthographic system of OCS, that is to say, to maintain sequences of the type ρο, ρα, ρβ, and the inability to prevent the intrusion of living pronunciation into the text resulting in sequences ρ δ, ρ α, ρ β. In Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki only spellings of the type ρο, ρα, ρβ are codified as normative (see, for instance, the declensional paradigms for lexemes матери и пастырь (1619: 5°/1°, 4°–5°)). In the 1629 Oktoikh, the vacillation
between the hard and soft r is rarely attested and is limited to direct cases: рь ~ ръ, e.g. црь (2x) but Црь (1x) (in oblique cases only soft desinences are attested црь, црьи, црьа); твърь (8x) but тварь (8x); Мтвърь (2x) but Мтварь (2x); възръ (1x). In addition two instances of confusion between и and ы are attested after r (such examples may also testify to the coalescence of etymological *y and *i): whereas the etymological *y is present in ръданиньыть, сокрыла, закры, in шестокрылатий the letter ы appears instead of и and in острызениымь и is replaced with и.

2.3.5.2 Dispalatalisation of postdentals

Being the results of either the palatalisation of velars or elimination of j-clusters through yodisation, the sibilants š, šč, ž, žd as well as the affricates c, č were originally palatalised. Their further phonological development is, broadly speaking, a history of gradual dispalatalisation, where somewhat different results obtain in the three East Slavonic languages. In CSR only the affricate č and the sibilant šč have retained their initial softness, whilst the sibilants š and ž had been hardened in the course of time (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 2006: 152–155).1 In CSU, on the other hand, the dispalatalisation process has affected all three postdentals except when these occur in a specific morphological/phonetic environment.2 The affricate c has been completely dispalatalised in CSR, although its initial palatalised character has been preserved to this day, chiefly in cokan’e-dialects; the situation in CSU and its dialects is more complex since the affricate has undergone only a partial dispalatalisation.3 In Belarusian, on the other hand, the dispalatalisation process was all-embracing affecting both the postdentals and the affricate c (for further details and examples see Wexler 1977: 154–157).

---

1 The affricate č has become dispalatalised in some Russian dialects, in particular those that had been characterised by cokan’e but since have lost it.
2 The postdentals become palatalised in the following positions: (a) before i (that originates from e or ē), e.g. žinka ‘woman’, šest’ ‘six’, ključi ‘keys’; (b) in neuter nouns ending in -a, which are not expanded with the suffix -at in oblique cases, where the postdental in question may be long or short; (c) in the instr. sg. of feminine nouns ending in a consonant with a long postdental. With regard to the Ukrainian dialects, the question of dispalatalisation and/or retention of palatalised postdentals is more complex. Generally speaking, palatalisation is preserved in two dialect clusters, the first comprises Bukovyna and Pokuttia, Huc and Bojk, the other the south-western part of the West Polissian dialects. In the remaining dialectical zones – South-East, North and around 50% of the South-West – the distribution of palatalised/dispalatalised postdentals is (virtually) identical to that in CSU. For further details see Shevelov (1979: 549–556).
3 In CSU the palatalised c ’ is found in the following positions: (a) word-finally; (b) before word-final -a, -у, -і; (c) in nouns formed with suffixes -ec’, -yc’ (а), etc.; (d) in roots we observe a mixed formula, both c and c ’ are present, although before e and y only a hard c can occur. In dialects, word-finally, palatalisation is found in Bojk and Central Transcarpathian dialects, whilst it is absent from the North Ukrainian dialects, Sjan, Lemk, Dniester, West Podolia, Pokuttia, Bukovyna and Hucul. For further details see Shevelov (1979: 619–622).
In manuscripts and printed texts, dating from earlier epochs, the dispalatalisation, or alternatively the lack of it, might be to a lesser or greater degree of certainty signalled by the choice of vowel letters immediately following ж, жд, ѣ, ɰ, ц and ч. One can tentatively posit that the so-called ‘simple’ letters а and є/щ, as opposed to the ‘iotised’ letters á (Ь) and ѽ, the back jer instead of the front jer, as well as ɰ instead of ѣ, when written after the postdentals or the affricate c indicate that these had hardened (Shevelov 1979: 551). The remainder of this section explores this hypothesis relative to the forms attested in the 1629 Oktoikh.

The spelling of ѣ for i after the sibilants š, šč and affricates c, є occurs rarely and is attested in the following words: величайшихъ, чистымъ (instr. sg. neut.), зовцы, сокрушшаго, съддаемь, нынѣшняшымъ (3x), любовныхъ, видыяны, лицы (instr. pl. neut. of лицо) (2x), лазьцы (nom. pl. masc. of лазькъ), концы (nom. pl. masc.), встрицъ (loc. sg. fem.), лицы (nom. pl. masc. of лицо), страстотерпцы (nom. pl. masc.). Such orthographic practice may be a reliable indicator of dispalatalisation of postdentals/affricate c where a clear phonological demarcation between the vowel letters i and ѣ, as is the case in Russian, has been preserved. The attested examples do not, however, lend themselves to such a simple interpretation for several reasons. To begin with, the 1629 Oktoikh’s Ruthenian origins should be taken into consideration. Since in Ukrainian the distinction between ѣ and ѣ had been obliterated, the vowel ѣ should not be automatically taken as an indicator of postdental’s hardness. Shevelov (1979: 552) points out that this is notably the case with ѣ-spellings encountered in URu texts. On the other hand, bearing in mind that the ѣ-spellings are few and far between and that apart from a single exception (непостъкно (21r:11) but непостък- (9x)) no other cases of confusion between ѣ and ѣ are attested, these indeed seem to be authentic examples of dispalatalisation. Similarly, the occurrence of ѣ after the affricate c points to the same fact, namely, that the affricate in question had hardened.

It is interesting to observe that Smotryc’kyj (1619: 6/4т, 5т–6т) does not allow the ending -ы in the nom. pl. of the *jů-stem neuter and masculine nouns ending in -це and -ецъ respectively (nor, for that matter, in the nom. pl. of *dů-stem masculine nouns ending in a velar where the second palatalisation occasions the mutation k > c), listing the original ending -и as grammatically correct (cf. лазьцы nom. pl. masc. of лазькъ, страстотерпцы nom. pl. masc., etc.). On the other hand, in the instr. pl. of *jů-stem nouns the original ending -и is relinquished in favour of either -ами or -ы, the latter indicating the dispalatalised nature of the affricate (cf. лицы instr. pl. neut. of лицо) (Smotryc’kyj 1619: 66
In a similar vein, the correct ending in the instr. sg. for *jā-stems is -и (cf. вострик loc. sg. fem.) (Smotryc’kyj 1619: Δ/2′–3′).

An additional complication is caused by the fact that the opposition ы : и may be exploited for morphological reasons, namely to demarcate between the plural and singular forms respectively. Such orthographic practice is typical of Synodal Church Slavonic (Mathiesen 1972: 136), e.g. секты (nom.pl) vs. секты (loc. sg.). Furthermore Smotryc’kyj (1619: Φ/4′–7′) uses this antistoechum to separate between the instr. sg. and dat.pl. of past and present tense participles, e.g. пьоъиымъ (instr. sg.) vs. пьоъиымъ (dat.pl.); вицйыъ (instr. sg.) vs. вицйыъ (dat.pl.). Consequently, the participle селдйыъ (25′:16) as well as the attested nom. pl. forms are potentially ambiguous, allowing initially both interpretations: ы as the morphological marker of number or as the indicator of dispalatalisation. Owing, however, to the uncommonness of such spellings, the later interpretation seems more plausible: even if applied inconsistently, had the antistoechum ы : и been adopted as an orthographic principle, we would expect to find a greater number of such occurrences.

The spellings with ъ as opposed to ъ, in the same positions, predominate, although a few isolated instances with the front jer are also attested (5x), e.g. рождйшаго (1x) but рождыша and рожде; (по/пре)дажы (5x) but дады (1x); припожды (1x); скопожды (1x); чиды (1x); дожды (1x); икъ (1x); ийы (14x); вополоьы (2x); пещ (5x); ады (1x); серфы (1x); разпонычы (1x) but чычы (1x); вйы (2x); чыколюньы (9x); муръыны (1x); жыбдывы (1x); въычы (1x); накончы (1x); всывычы (1x); Творы (1x); младычы (1x); агеычы (1x). Bearing in mind that the Kievan Oktoikh had been printed some ten years after the first publication of Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki, the ъ-spellings can, in this case, serve as a reliable sign of dispalatalisation since, as Shevelov (1979: 552 observes, ‘[o]nly after the regularisation of spelling by Meletij Smotryc’kyj (1619) did the palatalizing value of ь as a letter resume crystallizing’. The infrequent ъ-spellings might be an echo of an earlier, Euthymian/Serbian, orthographic convention in which the front jer was perceived as nothing more than a sign indicating the end of a word.

With the exception of two lone examples, spellings with ‘iotised’ letters after the postdentals or the affricate c are not encountered (for examples and exceptions see, 2.2.4 and 2.2.9). The purported evidence of dispalatalisation furnished by use of ‘simple’ letters after the postdentals should be accepted with utmost caution for several reasons. First, even in OCS the choice between ъ and ‘iotised’ letters after palatalised consonants, on the one hand, and ъ and ‘simple’ letters after non-palatalised, on the other, appears to be arbitrary in
many instances so that “ju” prevailed over u, and b over ё, but a over “ja”; yet there was much variety which depended on a particular scribe, the character of the postdental (“čju” more often than “žju”), etc.’ (Shevelov 1979: 551). Indeed, the apparent exception, чественный (11:4), may be an example of an influence by a particular orthographic convention adhered to in the texts which served as the basis for the 1629 edition. Second, with regard to the Ukrainian texts dating from the mid-11th to the 14th century, one observes a general decline in use of ‘iotised’ letters (e.g. in charters published before 1450 one can find documents where only u is attested, similarly texts where solely a appears are attested from 1388 (Shevelov 1979: 552)).

2.3.6 Loss of word-initial j before rounded vowels

A phonetic change whereby the word-initial j was eliminated before the vowels e and u is typical of ESI linguistic community. (There is some doubt, however, whether the passage e > o was limited to ESI languages as the reflex o is attested elsewhere, cf. ещё (R) and още (B) (Bjørnflaten 2005b: 76).) With regard to the sequence je-, the change came about in two stages, the initial passage of je- into e- is further attended by that of e- into o-. Whereas the loss of j before u occurred irrespective of what might follow in the remaining syllables of a lexeme, the change e- > o- took place when the word-initial je- was under stress or before a syllable with an acute vowel. This change was seemingly precluded if the stress fell on the third syllable, in enclitics as well as if the following syllable contained the front jer. However, the rule does not account for all instances of word-initial o in ESI, e.g. élè, élъ (< *ježь), óльхá Since the ‘iotised’ u and the sequence je/e- became characteristic of Church Slavonic of Bulgarian, Macedonian and Serbian redactions in particular, an antithesis literary : non-literary, in the context of ESI literary tradition, became established at an early stage. The forms with the word-initial j were perceived as being saliently literary. Furthermore, in the wake of the second South Slavonic influence, with respect to the ju-spellings, absence ofiotisation was circumscribed to (a) lexemes with the prefix от-, e.g. отборъ, (b) words such as отшё, отста, отмъ, отъ, отчитъ, (c) lexemes that lack iotisation in SSI languages, e.g. отрыва, отъ (Jakobson 1929; Uspenskij 2002: 310–311).

The SSI orthographic model is observed with utmost consistency in the 1629 Oktoikh relative to both the word-initial e- and ju-, e.g. юноша, единственное, единъ. In addition, no hypercorrect forms of the type jutroba are attested, e.g. коштурё, ошьь, Огльь.
2.3.7 Loss of jers and attendant consequences

2.3.7.1 Changes in ecclesiastical pronunciation after the loss of jers

After the loss of jers the scribe could no longer rely on his living pronunciation to determine with any degree of certainty where the etymological jers and where the vowels \( e, o \) should be written. The impact on the Church Slavonic orthography and in turn on the ecclesiastical pronunciation was significant: since the jers in weak position were obliterated these were neither pronounced nor written, and where in strong position they were subject to full vocalisation that found expression both orally and orthographically. The jers’ disappearance from the phonological canvas signals thus the demise of an earlier tradition where, in accordance with the established rules, the letters \( ь \) and \( щ \) were pronounced as \([e]\) and \([o]\) respectively.¹ As a result two orthoepic norms were established: in the South-Western Rus the jers were no longer pronounced having only an orthographic function, and in the Muscovy Rus where the jers were pronounced as reduced vowels (this tradition has been preserved until the present day by the staroobrady-bespopovcy). Revision of these rules and the concomitant changes took place no earlier than the 14th century. However the earlier practice of rendering weak jers as full vowels continues in certain environments even after their elimination, as the loss of jers unleashed a host of undesired attendant phonological changes, namely the rise of different types of consonantal assimilations at morpheme boundaries, syncopal forms, devoicing of word-final consonants, etc. In order to preserve Church Slavonic from degradation and contamination from the vernacular, \( ь \), for example, continues to be written and pronounced as \([e]\) in suffixes such as \(-ьстф-\) and \(-ьск-\) when these follow after the hushing sibilants or consonant clusters. In the following, the old ecclesiastical pronunciation becomes embedded in certain grammatical markers so that the suffixes such as \(-ьстф-, -ьск-\) may now be written as \(-стф-, -ск-\) (Uspenskij 2002: 150–155). Examples of this kind abound in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. \( ивчеснихъ, велческими, чвческое, лвжецк, пришедство, естества.\) Lexemes with the \(-ьстф-\) suffix, which appear in the line, are on a handful of occasions spelt with \( ъ \) or \( паерок, e.g. гвдстф, гвдстф, Богатство, Тайнство (but also Тайнство (2x) and Тайнество).\)

¹ Šaxmatov (1969: 34–35) argues that provenance of such pronunciation is rooted in South Slavonic influence: since the loss and vocalisation of jers occurred earlier on the SSI territory than on the ESI, the East Slavonic clergy must have interpreted pronunciation of \( ь, щ \) as \([e]\) and \([o]\) as an overtly marked sign of literary pronunciation. As, at that time, it was impossible to distinguish between the weak and strong jers, from the point of view of one’s own living pronunciation, the principle of rendering strong jers as full vowels unfurled to include the weak ones as well. For a more detailed discussion on orthographic practice of writing and ecclesiastical pronunciation of jers see Uspenskij (2002: 139–150).
Other words whose spelling reflects the old ecclesiastical pronunciation include: the spelling of the word прêдстöва (OCS) as прêдстöва, prefixes/prepositions съ, въ, къ, въ as со, бо, ко, въ, and words such as описъва- (Uspenskij 2002: 147,149).

Such orthographic rendition of the word прêдстöва as well as the preposition/prefixes is especially emblematic of South-Western literary tradition. In Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki (1619: Б/6*, Е/7) sequences ё, ё, ё, corresponding to со, бо, ко, as well as the aforementioned spelling of прêдстöва are attested. Examples of this kind, spelt either with a paerok or o, are numerous in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. вспоямъ, возрадъёта, всползъятъ, во исповêдали, вовêки, вомêрê, воведе, вмêнйходя, катоêй, впорêлъ, ё похвалê, ёимъ, сочáки, совершили, соэздали; in addition, прêдстöва (16*:12) is also attested.

Spellings such as описъва- (from описъва-), in the period prior to the loss of jers, occurred as a result of the scribe’s inability to apply the rule which stated to write ё and ё where in the corresponding CES lexemes one heard the sounds [ъ] and [ъ], and о and е where one heard [о] and [э] (Durnovo 1933: 64 in Uspenskij 2002:149). Since words like описъвати were not part of the vernacular and belonged solely to the literary sphere the scribe could not rely on the living pronunciation to produce the correct spelling. It seems that this particular form became the orthographic norm as in the 1629 Oktoikh we find the following examples: описъвавъ (23*:5–6), описъваъ (38*:8), описъвлъвъ (47*:4).

2.3.7.2 The new ū

In general terms, the rise of the “new ū” from e is limited to syllables occurring before another syllable where etymologically a weak, front jeron would have been present. This change, entailing a narrowing of e into é in Southern Ukraine and diphthongisation of e into īe in Northern Ukraine, also comes to expression orthographically so that the original e in such positions is written as če. The “new ū” is ultimately engendered by the loss of jers: the new spellings are already attested in the 12th century and confined to the newly closed syllables.1 In other words, with the loss of jers, the opposition e : če arises where the latter features in open syllables, e.g. peči (gen. sg.), and the former in the latterly closed ones, e.g. peč < pečь (Shevelov 1979: 303). The evidence of Ukrainian texts from the 15th to the mid-16th century indicates a visible decline in the use of the “new ū”, a tendency partly induced by the reactionary attitude to orthography that ignored the existing phonetic reality and

---

1 For an overview of most typical lexemes in which the “new ē” appeared as well as commentary see, Shevelov (1979: 303–313).
changes taking place therein. However its presence is attested in sufficiently large number of instances, in the majority of original positions, to warrant the assumption that the “new ê” was still very much a feature of the Ukrainian phonetic landscape (Shevelov 1979: 435–437).

Amongst other word groups, the “new ê” was present in the 3rd per. sg. of the e/o or Class I verbs – in the 1629 Oktoikh it appears on one occasion only, in the following verb: (ads) стêнëтъ (19v:20). It is peculiar, however, that “new ê” is attested in this particular environment: beginning in the 13th century, spellings with the “new ê” in the 3rd per. sg. are on the wane being replaced with the original -e-, a process most likely engendered by morphological levelling with respect to verbal forms in the 2nd and 3rd per. sg. (berêtъ ~ bereši > beret’ ~ bereši) as well as multiplicity of forms in the 3rd per. sg. (berêt’ ~ bere ~ beret with subsequent reintroduction of beret’). By the 14th century such spellings are virtually eradicated (Shevelov 1979 :303, 304). Its singular occurrence in the 1629 Oktoikh allows for nothing more but conjectural inferences: the form is either an erratum or betrays influence of an older text (which was perhaps used as one of the primary sources in the preparation of the 1629 edition).²

The “new ê” was also present in nouns and adjectives with a suffix beginning in -ь. In the 1629 Oktoikh the “new ê” is attested in only one such adjective/adverb, namely тримëвкин- (6x) that alternates with e-spellings тримëвкин- (5x) and тримëвкинвава (1x).

2.3.7.3 Development of o before syllables with weak jers

With the loss of jers, a new phonological change, which gave rise to the opposition between the “open o” and “closed o” (from the CES и and o) affected virtually the whole ESI territory. The passage of и into the “open o” was uniform across all dialects. The reflexes of o, on the other hand, yielded different results in the ESI dialects. In South Ukrainian dialects, o passed to the “closed o”, /ɔ/, in pre-weak-jer syllables, and was subject to further development: by the 17th century, it passed to u, eventually yielding i in CSU and i, ɨ, or u in the dialects. In Northern Ukraine, o in the same environment passed to a diphthong “о. The diphthongal reflex is still present under stress in a large number of North Ukrainian

---

¹ The presence of the first ê may be due a general confusion between e and ê in unstressed syllables, cf. стêнатъ ~ стêнëтъ (OCS).
² It should be pointed out that the presence of the “new ê” in liturgical writings was not perceived at all times as intrusion of the vernacular. The phonetic change in the spoken language was allowed to influence the church pronunciation, which was as a result reflected orthographically (Uspenskij 2002: 175–176). It seems that only later, under the sway of the Second South Slavonic influence, such spellings were deemed as undesirable and the vowel e was reinstated, sometimes erroneously.
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dialects as well in Southern Belarus. In the Great Russian dialects, on the other hand, the
distribution of “open o” and “closed o” depended on the presence or absence of autonomous
stress: the phoneme /ô/ developed where o was under autonomous stress and the “closed o”
elsewhere. Both South-Western and Great Russian church orthoepic norms adopted this
change as normative, which could also be expressed orthographically. In the former the
grapheme w was used to represent “open o” and o for “closed o”. Such spellings occur, for
example, in comments written in the margins of Venskij Oktoix (end of the 13th beginning of
the 14th century), Bybel’skij apostol (first half of the 14th century) and in galicko-volinske
evangelie (first half of the 14th century). In texts of Russian origin, the same opposition is
expressed in several different ways (combinations of these are also possible): (1) o is used to
express “open o” and w “closed o”; (2) o and w represent “open o” but the same letters
surmounted by kamora (’ “closed o”; (3) a narrow variant of o represents “closed o” and a
broad variant of the same letter stands for “open o”; (4) a narrow variant of o represents
“open o” and a broad variant “closed o” (Zaliznjak 1985: 173–179, 208–211; Shevelov

In the Kievan Oktoikh, the grapheme w is used less frequently than o. In majority of
instances, the presence of w is restricted to traditional environments where the opposition w : o, in all likelihood, carries no phonological significance.1 It is used as a morphological
marker, to separate between declinable and indeclinable morphological classes and with
certain prepositions/prefixes (for examples see, 2.2.8). Possible instance of /ô/, graphically
rendered with Greek omega, are attested in the following lexemes: пьюткъ (21v:10),
вечерачний (49v:5), вчарь (34v:5), грядка (5v:11). The grapheme w appears in pre-weak-
syllables in the first three examples, which suggests that the distribution of “open o” :
“closed o” follows the South Ukrainian principle outlined above. Since the text examined
dates from the 17th century, it is further possible to analyse the phonetic value of w as [u].
The last example – грядка – is, however, more ambiguous as omega occurs in the open
syllable. Such spellings are indeed attested in Smotryc’kyj’s writings; they should, however,
only tentatively be taken as representing [u] since the presence of Greek omega in this

---

1 It should be borne in mind, however, that Russian texts belonging to the Northern type are characterised by
the presence of /ô/ in the element -go, which can be either stressed or unstressed, in the gen. sg. of pronouns
and adjectives. Similarly, with respect to nouns, /ô/ is present in the dat. pl. desinence -омъ in several Russian
texts of Southern type (Zaliznjak 1985: 175). The latter is also characteristic of some Ukrainian dialects (Pugh
1996: 76). Although the possibility that the corresponding examples in the 1629 Oktoikh reflect the presence
phoneme /ô/ cannot be excluded, I believe that the initial analysis of such forms, as having purely orthographic
significance, is more plausible.
environment is analogical, that is, influenced by the spelling of the same grapheme in closed syllables (Pugh 1996: 41).

2.3.8 Rise of the “new a”/akan’e

In the 1629 Oktoikh an instance of what, on the first glance, appears to be akan’e is attested in the following lexeme گیدانماحی ( = گوسپداناهاشیش ) (36:7–8).1 This example is peculiar since akan’e, as a phonetic phenomenon present in both Br and R, is absent from U save for several small areas usually referred to as Northern Černihiv, North-East Sumy and Čornobyl’ (for further details see, Shevelov 1979: 86–88). Although we cannot exclude the possibility that a Russian, indeed even Belarusian, typesetter or scribe may have been responsible for this slip, it is also possible that this is an instance of vowel assimilation across syllable boundary which, in Ukrainian, gave rise to the so-called “new a”. The passage of o into a was incomplete and unsystematic, and in relation to certain groups of lexemes piecemeal at best, its occurrence usually limited to the pretonic syllables followed by a (stressed) a in the next syllable. The change, originating in the north and halting at the Lithuanian-Polish border before 1569, can most likely be attributed to the influence the Belarusian akan’e exerted on the Ukrainian linguistic territory. It is first in the 16th century that the evidence of written records may be used as a reliable indicator of this change, owing to the sheer number of spellings with the “new a”, a trend which continued well into the 18th century (Shevelov 1979: 507–517).

In Slavonic verbs the Proto-Slavonic quantitative distinction between ā : ā , yielding the alternation o : a, may serve as an aspectual marker where o marks the perfective and a the imperfective aspect. Such alternations are regularly found in OCS, e.g. ро́дити ~ ра́ждати, ра́зорити ~ ра́зарати, ра́створити ~ ра́стварати, ра́съёмряті ~ ра́съятрати. In CSU the alternation is present in a handful of verbs, e.g. -мо́ты ~ -махати, скочы́ть ~ скакати, кроя́ты ~ края́ти (in South-Western dialects it is still productive and has contaminated verbs with pleophony oro, olo) (Shevelov 1979 :512). In CSR the same alternation is present in a number of verbs and is ‘still sufficiently alive’ to generate new aspectual pairs (Vlasto 1988: 47), e.g. спроси́ть ~ спра́шива́ти, промо́чить ~ прома́чива́ти, отопи́ть ~ ота́пливать, вдольби́ть ~ вдалби́вать, облагоро́дить ~ облаго́ржива́ти, etc. It is interesting to note that in the 1629 Oktoikh a number of imperfective forms have o where the imperfective marker -а- would be expected – such hypercorrect spellings may have been motivated by

---

1 The apparent mistake was indeed corrected by a later hand to o.
the knowledge of the “new a’/akan’e, e.g. овновлаєтса (12\textsuperscript{v}:17–18), вонраєча (19\textsuperscript{v}:15), евонраєла (19\textsuperscript{v}:13), ронстрадьв (20\textsuperscript{v}:2–3), пронстрадьв (30\textsuperscript{v}:14), проклятаг(ти)са (47\textsuperscript{v}:6) but also роклаєтса (13\textsuperscript{v}:16), покананєвса (7\textsuperscript{v}:1–2). In addition to the imperfective verbs, hypercorrections are attested in the following lexemes: покананй (13\textsuperscript{v}:8), холостайстявоцьн (19\textsuperscript{v}:5–6), холстай (2x) (40\textsuperscript{v}:15, 41\textsuperscript{v}:7), нехолстиственищым (50\textsuperscript{v}:7).

2.3.9 Palatalisation of velar consonants and further developments

Sequences *kū and *gū are assumed to have existed in early PS and consequently the passage of *ū to ы yielded Slavonic sequences кы and ы. In addition the Slavonic sequence χы was also possible, e.g. ρσкы (nom. pl.), дълын (nom. sg. masc.), ытры, вывет. On the other hand, the combination of velar + front vowel, such as ки, ги and χи, was not possible since any such sequence would have been eliminated through palatalisation of the velars. In the 12\textsuperscript{th}–13\textsuperscript{th} centuries both the velar consonant and the back vowel had undergone a phonological change whereby the former is palatalised whilst the latter is fronted, giving rise to previously impossible ки, ги and χи (Filin 2006: 304–307; Schmalstieg 1995: 28).

Of significance, in this context, are further developments after ky, gy, hy > ki, gi, hi in Ukrainian. Already towards the close of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century the sequences k’i, g’i, x’i became the preponderant norm on the Russian/Belarusian speaking territories – such pronunciation now being standard in the CSR.\textsuperscript{1} Ukrainian, on the other hand, was subject to a further phonological process, taking place in the 13\textsuperscript{th}–14\textsuperscript{th} centuries, that neutralised the effects of this change, namely the coalescence of i and y, where \(i > y\), i.e. kysl- > kisl- (12\textsuperscript{th} c.) > kysl- (13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} c.). The phonetic result of this change in CSU and most of its dialects is an intermediate vowel of high-mid front-mid row, usually rendered as y.\textsuperscript{2}

Shevelov (1979: 230–236) observes that as a result of this coalescence some texts reflect ‘a general confusion of the letters for y and i which was setting in from the 15\textsuperscript{th} on and became widespread in the 17\textsuperscript{th} c.’ In Kiev, most of Volhynia and northern Ukrainian dialects, where the distinction between i and y was obliterated, the choice between н and ы after velars, or in any other position, was arbitrary as it was not rooted in any real phonological considerations. It seems that those versed in grammar and literary language preferred to use ы after velars (and in doing so were consciously harking back to the OCS

\textsuperscript{1} Exceptions are exiguous and limited to certain positions – at word junction especially after the preposition к, e.g. к yzbam, к ygrorodi, tak y nado, etc. and with the interjection kys!; in modern dialects the sequence ky is encountered in individual words, e.g. kysa, kyska, kyka, and others (Filin 2006: 307; Ivanov 1961: 112–113).

\textsuperscript{2} For further details see Shevelov (1979: 379–385).
usage), whereas ɺ in the same position smacked of popular taste. Even amongst the educated elite there was little agreement with regard to the orthographic practice of spelling ɻ after velars: for instance, in St. Zizanij’s Казанье святого Кирила патриарха (1596) the sequences ɺы, ɺы, ɺы are encountered for the most part, Adelphothis (1591) has both ɺовъ, ɺесъ, ɺы and ɺовъы, ɺесъы, ɺыs, and still Smotryc’kyj (1619: ɻ/ɻ”) in relation to the feminine nouns ending in -gа/-kal/-ha recommends specifically that in the gen. sg. and acc.pl. ɺ should be used and not ɻ.¹

Given this state of affairs and keeping in mind that the text’s Ruthenian origins, it is still more remarkable that the editors of the 1629 Oktoikh adhered with an unfailing consistency to just one orthographic convention, namely that velars should be followed by ɺ, e.g. ɺовъыки, ɺелечеыихъ, ɺизъыки, ɺерафьыски, ɺаки, ɺавраы, ɺмогылъ, ɺы.

It is, however, a matter of speculation why ɺ is used after velars in the 1629 Oktoikh. It is possible that Smotryc’kyj’s rule of writing ɺ after velars had a direct bearing on the orthography. Or perhaps, that the raison d’être was born out of more pragmatic and democratic considerations, as the Oktoikh in question was intended for the Ukrainian everyman.² A further, equally plausible, reason is that the spelling reflects Russian/Belarusian influence.

2.3.10 Assimilation in and simplification of consonant clusters

2.3.10.1 Simplification of consonant clusters in l-participles

Simplification of consonant clusters in l-participles of the type рекълъ, могълъ, умерълъ, etc. with the loss of final l, engendered ultimately by the loss of jers, can be observed in written manuscripts from the 13ᵗʰ–14ᵗʰ centuries. In Church Slavonic, however, the old forms are retained (Uspenskij 2002: 214). As expected no such simplifications are attested in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. рекъл есн (6ᵛ:2), простеръл есн (10ᵛ:13–14), воздвигъл есн (14ᵛ:17), всердалъ есн (25ᵛ:5), возднесъл есъ (43ᵛ:10–11).

¹ Although I was unable to find any other references with regard to the spelling of y/i after velars, the principle of using ɺ and not ɻ is consistently applied throughout the text and therefore does not seem to extend only to feminine nouns with a root in velar.
² Shevelov (1979: 232) mentions that ‘Žuh 1569, in adapting the Bible by F. Skarya to U[krainian] readers, substituted [y] for [i] after these consonants.’
2.3.10.2 Syncope

Syncope is attested on one occasion only, namely the plosive \( t \) is omitted between the fricative \( s \) and the nasal \( n \), e.g. *samovlasno* (48\(^{14}\):16), reflecting pronunciation which is found in all three East Slavonic languages,\(^1\) otherwise only full -сти- spelling is present, e.g. "

2.3.10.3 Assimilations in consonant clusters

The only examples of consonant unvoicing in the 1629 Oktoikh are reflected in unvoicing of /z/ when this phoneme occurs finally in the prefix/preposition из and prefixes воз, раз followed by an unvoiced consonant, e.g. *истеь* (14x), *искорени* (2x), *испера*, *испосаблен*, *иследов*, *исучив*, *востраните*, *воспомин*, *воспомбир*, *восход*, *воспя*, *распростирал*, *распадесал*, *растерзал*.\(^2\) On the whole the etymological spelling is preserved in words with the prefix/preposition из or those with restored emphatic consonants, e.g. *расмотрёл*, *равшири*, *нейчтено* (2x) but also *Ненечтенъ*, *ненечтено*, *ненечтей*, *нейз*/*сатёнъ* (but only *нейзъ*, *нейзъна*, *нейнеплемлю*); *взпримирени*, *везклен*, *везпоостном*, *везтелесных*, *везкленном*, *везпомое*, *везячие*, *везбачисленное*, *везконечнюю*.

The presence of emphatic or long consonants as well as the sequence здри at morpheme boundary is also attested. Their occurrence in a seventeenth century, albeit liturgical, text can only be interpreted as a sign of conscious archaisation.

The loss of jers gave rise to sequences of identical consonants, whether original or through assimilation, which were now in a position adjacent to each other. The syllabic structure of Proto-Slavonic did not admit double consonantal clusters, so we find, for instance, that in OCS these were regularly simplified to single consonants, viz. *bezzakonie > везакни*, *izcèliti > цчàнти*, *bezstrastie > вестрастик*, etc. (Vlasto 1988: 59–60). The opposing tendency towards their restoration, engendered in all likelihood by the presence of prefixes/prepositions which retained their unvoiced consonants, is observed in literary manuscripts from the 13\(^{th}\) century (Sobolevskij 2005: 146–148). In the 1629 Oktoikh an attempt had been made to reinstate the lost consonants, e.g. *везстрастина*, *вёстрастё*, *вёстрасти*, *вездмёртцы*, *вёстрастны*, *вездмёрти*, *везаконный*, *везаконъцаго*, *возсмьлёнъ*, *возстави*. but contracted forms are also sporadically encountered, e.g. *весмрти*.

---


\(^2\) Only other example is the words *рёк* (4x) and *везак* (2x) but these spellings had been standardised both in the secular and sacred texts by the 17\(^{th}\) century.
Similarly, spellings with a dental stop between a spirant and a following \( r \), whose occurrence had already become a rarity by the end of the 13th beginning of the 14th century, is only present in the verb \textit{razdrùšiti}, e.g. \textit{razdrùšinß}, \textit{razdrùšinwis}, \textit{razdrùšínik} but also \textit{razrùwi}, \textit{razdrùwivwi} but also \textit{razrùwiwasã} (cf. \textit{Îizrailìtãnomß} ~ OCS \textit{izdrailitêninß}; \textit{razrêwi}, \textit{razrêwaã}, \textit{razrêwönïö} \textit{razrêwiti} ~ OCS \textit{razdrêwiti}; \textit{neizrêchennòb}, \textit{neizrêchêno} ~ OCS \textit{neizdrecêni}).

2.3.11 Mutation ’\( a \) > ’\( e \)

A curious spelling of the word \textit{plaqanica} in the 1629 Oktoikh as \textit{plaqöni’cöü} (37\( ^{r} \):5) may possibly indicate a mutation of \( a \) > \( e \), a change that occurs after \( j \), postdentalis or other soft consonants. The geographical borders of this phonological phenomenon, which can be dated to the late 14th or early 15th, coincide by and large with the territory of the pre-1569 Moldavian-Polish Ukraine save for the Carpathian region. The occurrence of umlaut after postdentalis is typical of the South-Western dialects from Bukovyna to Sjan where the vowel \( a \), irrespective of its origin, undergoes a mutation in both stressed and unstressed syllables after any palatalised/soft consonants (Shevelov 1979: 542–547).

Since this is an isolated incident it is impossible to make any assumptions regarding its general significance: what seems to be an instance of vernacular influence might in fact be nothing more than a misprint.

2.3.12 Treatment of \( ì, ÿ, ý, i \) in different environments after \( j \)

2.3.12.1 Development of \( i \) in word-initial syllables

A feature typical of Ruthenian, at the time when the 1629 Oktoikh was published, was the loss of word-initial *\( j. \) This phonological development, starting in the late 13th century, was in all likelihood engendered by the coalescence of the prepositions/prefixes \( sì \) and \( iž \). After the loss of jers, \( s \) yielded its voiced counterpart \( z \) before voiced consonants, whereas \( iž \) was rendered as \( is \) before voiceless consonants. The two forms \( s/z \sim iž/is \) were now understood as one where the initial \( i- \) became optional. In the 15th century it spread to the preposition \( k \) that functioned as a cluster-breaker. In the following the word-initial unstressed \( i- \) may be dropped in lexemes with an original \( (j)i- \) and a small number of foreign loanwords (Carlton 1991: 168–171; Pugh 1996: 31–32; Shevelov 1979: 268–272). The only example of this
change is attested in the second part of the Preface and not in the liturgical text proper, e.g. знасъ (4:3).

2.3.12.2 Treatment of word-medial post-vocalic i (ji)

Word-medially and word-finally in post-vocalic position i yielded e in the strong position whereas it was eliminated in the weak position – these reflexes are present, amongst other Slavonic languages, in Ukrainian, Russian and Bulgarian (although the last two also show i-reflexes). In OCS, on the other hand, such sequences usually yielded i. (Carlton 1991: 171; Lunt 2001: 37–38; Shevelov 1979:272–273). In the 1629 Oktoikh, in addition to those instances where the influence of Church Slavonic orthography is obvious недостойны, таинство, воинство, a strong tense jer is almost without exception rendered as e in past part.

2.3.12.3 Treatment of suffix -ij-: development of i before j

After the elimination of jers, the suffix -ij- is realised in the strong position in texts of Ukrainian provenance as -ij-, in Russian or RChSl as -ej-. In the 1629 Oktoikh two such examples are attested заминю (27r:13) and житейский (28r:2). The former reflects either Ukrainian or OCS spelling, the latter being more likely given the literary context, whereas the latter may show an influence exerted by Russian or RChSl. Before the loss of jers and when in the weak position the spelling of this suffix was not of a particular significance owing to the flexibility in choice between i or ё before j in OCS orthography. After their elimination however the vowel i disappeared from both Ukrainian and Russian, a development which was also reflected in spelling: the suffix -ije was rendered as -бе (Shevelov 1977: 273–275). In the 1629 Oktoikh only the expected spelling -ije is attested: вставление, воскресение, распятие, оскорбление, прераждение, цртвие, чажколюдие, проречение.

2.3.12.4 Treatment of ъ + j at morpheme boundary

A rather curious spelling of y for i, at morpheme boundary, is observed after the suffixes iz- and ob-; the following examples are attested: дваиѣкте, вѣшлое, изыдѣ (2x), произиѣдѣ (2x), сѣэйидае (2x), изытѣ, двѣйде, изыдѣ. On first glance it seems as if the spelling might reflect the fact that i in position after hard consonants is pronounced as y – a phenomenon observed in ESI manuscripts from the 13th century (Schmalstieg 1995: 46). Such pronunciation is preserved to the present day in CSR, e.g. в избу is phonetically realised as
[výzbu], etc. On the other hand, in Ukrainian the distinction between vowels \( i \) and \( y \) was obliterated in 13\(^{\text{th}}\)–14\(^{\text{th}}\) centuries, making it unlikely that \( y \) should be specifically used to signal the hardness of the preceding consonant. Another explanation is forthcoming, namely, that prefixes in \(-ь\) followed by roots with initial \( j\)- gave rise to the so-called tense jers, i.e. the back jer was subject to the general phonological process whereby \( njV > yjV \). Since prefixes ending in \(-ь\) regularly appeared elsewhere, a tug-o-war between the two forms ensued from which prefix + \( y \) emerged victorious: during the Ruthenian period \( y \) was generalised as a link between the prefix and the root beginning with \( j\)- or in consonant clusters. The change \( ь > y \), affecting in the beginning only prefixes ending in \(-ь\) (\( \breve{sь}, \breve{podь}, \breve{nadь}, \breve{peredь} \)), eventually encompassed both those prefixes that ended in an optional \(-ь\) (\( otь \sim ot\) ) and those that never had it (\( вьz, roz, bez, iz \)) (Shevelov 1979: 275–278).

### 2.3.12.5 Treatment of \( b + j \) at morpheme boundary

In the gen. pl. of *\( \acute{i}\)-stem nouns the expected ending \(-ii < *b\acute{j}i\) is attested once, viz. \( \text{sonмiдь} (38^v:7) \), and in all other examples the desinence \(-ej ( < *bjи) \) is present, e.g. \( \text{скорьей, запоькдей, страстей, напастей, мьтей} \). In OCS the spelling was optional, \(-ii \) or \(-ьi\), but \(-ii\) was given preference in OCS of Bulgarian redaction. In URu texts the vacillation between the two endings was present throughout the entire period; however, the distribution was not entirely random since the \( ej\)-spellings occurred as a rule in texts originating from eastern and northern regions of Ukraine, whereas the \( ii\)-spellings were prevalent in the West and the Poltava region (Shevelov 1979: 278–282). The ending gen. pl. \(-ej\) is also typical of both Russian and RChSl (for examples see, Bulič 1893: 164–165).

### 2.3.13 Development of the sequence \( an + n \)

In Proto-Slavonic the sequence \( an + n \), used especially in formation of denominal adjectives denoting substance, yielded in OCS \(-\acute{e}нь, \) or \(-ань/-ань after \( j \) and postdentals; in CES, however, only the latter form is encountered and it appears in all environments. The ESl Church Slavonic texts use almost exclusively the \(-\acute{а}нь/-\acute{а}нь suffix, in which the presence of \(-\acute{а}нь\) is, as a rule, explained by an influence of an OCS protograph (Shevelov 1979: 141; Uspenskij 2002: 190). Following this tradition such adjectives are duly rendered with the suffix \(-\acute{а}нь\) in the Kievan Oktoikh as well, e.g. \( \text{икрьмяттаньомь} (13^v:1), \text{мьдань} (30^v:7) \).
Chapter III: Nominal morphology

This section examines the declensional categories of noun, adjective, numeral and pronoun as well as adverbs, as attested in the 1629 Oktoikh. Where appropriate these have been given a tabular form with illustrative examples and compared to the forms codified in Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki. Where several competing desinences/forms were recorded only those deemed anomalous or seemingly anomalous are discussed in further detail. In addition, soft adjectival and nominal desinences are also listed (for those case forms encountered in the text) and separated from the hard declensions by a double slash (///). Since nouns were grouped according to the stem, for the sake of brevity and to avoid repetition, different stems are sometimes grouped together where endings are identical (see Tables II and IX). Furthermore, no examples of *nt- and *r-stem nouns in the plural have been attested.

3.0 Declension of nouns in singular and plural

3.0.1 Singular declension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I: *ŏ-/*jŏ-stems (incl. nouns with suffixes -telь- and -arь-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary to Table I.

Remarks. All desinences in the above table are Church Slavonic (the underlined flexions will be discussed separately). The presence of the back for the expected front jer in the nom. sg. of nouns such as пчёла and Пчела may signal the dispalatalised nature of the consonants in question (for further discussion and examples see 2.3.5). Similarly -омь/-омь in the instr. sg. for the expected -омь/-омь shows that the word-final labial had hardened (for further details see Filin 2006: 329–331). In the loc. sg. the * о- stem nouns with a root-final velar undergo a mutation.

1. A pan-Slavonic phenomenon – animacy – is also attested in the 1629 Oktoikh: in the acc. sg. animate nouns have the same flexions as in the gen. sg. whilst inanimate as that in the acc. sg. (for examples see, Table I). Furthermore, the nouns ада, Мертвецъ, едемъ, писеръ are also treated as animates in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. ада непробереже че (12v:10), Мертвецъ воскресъ есть (17v:16), едемъ воскрѣешь (19v:1), рѣдишь писеръ многочѣнаго че (22v:1–2).

2. The flexion -u in the gen. sg. (from the Proto-Slavonic *ů- stem) is attested only once, viz. пость (2v:9). It is of significance that it only occurs in the preface rather than the liturgical text proper: forms with the *ů- stem genitive ending were perceived as markedly non-literary and consequently have never been a part of Church Slavonic literary tradition. In Ru, on the other hand, the -a:/u distinction may be contextually determined – the a-endings naturally pertaining to the higher style – although in the 16th and 17th centuries the former were generally used with the inanimates, as in the example attested in our text, whilst the latter with the animates (Pugh 1996: 51–52; Uspenskij 2002: 205–206).

3. In the dat. sg. of the *о- and *ъо- stems two desinences are attested -u/-ju and -ovi/-evi, the former being etymologically expected whilst the latter a variant historically inherited from the *ů- stem. In the 1629 Oktoikh it is encountered rarely – only four examples are attested цревъ (23v:4), чинъ (27v:15), Петровъ (28v:9–10), Гинъ (39v:16) – and the -u/-ju desinence is clearly the preferred norm. The occurrence of this ending in the dat. sg. of the *о-/*ъо- stems, usually in connexion with animate nouns and personal names, has been recorded from the earliest times. Even in OCS manuscripts such as Codex Supraslensis it looms relatively large, but its subsequent history in ESI is rather variegated. Broadly speaking, in the north this flexion was always secondary to the standard-u/-ju where it became virtually obliterated in the 14th and the 15th centuries; the form was limited to a small number of lexemes, i.e. бог, дом, господь, муз, змий, каръ, that appear in literary/liturgical contexts. In the south on the other hand, that is on the Ukrainian and Belarusian territory, it became
firmly established especially in the masculine animate nouns appearing in both secular and literary/liturgical writings. This desinence is still present in CSU and can be found in Belarusian dialects although CSBr generalised the \( u \)-ending. Its persisting longevity in the south may be ascribed to the influence of Polish in which the same ending has been preserved (Filin 2006: 366–377; Kolesov 2005: 265; Pugh 1996: 55–56).

4. Two collective nouns belonging to the *j\( ȯ \)-stem are attested denoting inanimate objects: \( \text{ведалні} \) (16\( ^c \):7, 45\( ^c \):10), \( \text{камені} \) (20\( ^c \):9). The predicate associated with the collective is in the singular, e.g. \( \text{червено плотть везли здали ведалні, ведалні червено носа, камені разпалєся} \).

Table II: \(*\=\text{-}\text{*\=j\( ȯ \)-, *\=i-stems}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>(-=a/-=a/-=)</th>
<th>слава, вака // єдиница, земли, п'єстини, предотече</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>(-=y/-н/-=a/-=y)</td>
<td>ўтли, мёки // ўтрыца, тла, єдиницы</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(-=k/-н)</td>
<td>горь // земли, лчні, Ісйні, б'єстини</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(-===y/-=====y)</td>
<td>вакі, клатві // д'їві, д'їв, кож, волю</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(-=о/-=о/=о)</td>
<td>псічіоо // б'єттієоо, брат'єоо, надъєдво</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>(-=k/-н/-=y)</td>
<td>богачинк // ветвердьні, земли, втрыцы</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>(-=о/-=о)</td>
<td>горо, вако // л'єстивце, лріе</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table II.

Remarks. All flexions in the above table are Church Slavonic (underlined forms are discussed separately). The desinence in the gen. sg. of *\=a-stem nouns with a root-final velar is \(-i\) (see 2.3.9). After postdentals and the affricate \( c \) the ending for the gen. sg. is represented by the grapheme \(-\=a\) rather than \(-\=\=\=a\) reflecting in all likelihood dispalatalised nature of the consonants in question, viz. \( \text{утрица} \) (see 2.3.5).\(^1\) Similarly, the loc. sg. ending \(-\=y\) in the word втрыцы may be seen an instance of the same phenomenon. Examples of the *\=i-stems in the 1629 Oktoikh are exiguous – all three instances have been included in the table above.

1. A singular occurrence of a collective noun belonging to the \( ja\)-declension is the lexeme \( \text{братыні} \) (1\( ^\text{v} \):2). In addition four nouns denoting male persons but belonging to the feminine declension are also attested, namely \( \text{владыка, Ісіна, Исаїа, оцвййца} \).

\(^1\) It is interesting to note that Smotryc’kyj allows two alternative orthoepic norms after postdentals and the affricate \( c \), in the acc. sg. ending of soft masculine nouns, and the gen. sg./acc. pl. endings of soft feminine nouns, where \(-\=a\) may be pronounced as either \( a \) or \( ja \); however only \(-\=\=\=a\) as may be written after these consonants (Smotryc’kyj 1619: 6/6\( ^\text{v} \)).
2. The gen. sg. ending -ы in the lexeme Ѣдачицы (33v:8) appears to be anomalous since the ending -а would be expected in the soft feminine declension (or following the orthographic practice in the 1629 Oktoikh -а). Several alternative interpretations offer themselves. The ending -ы is attested on this occasion only and may therefore be a misprint. On the other hand, it may be of Ruthenian origin since the most common desinence for feminine nouns with both hard and hardened stems is -ы (Pugh 1996: 48–49). A further possibility is that the desinence may be seen to represent results of coalescence between soft and hard feminine declensions in which the endings were generalised on the pattern of the hard stems, a process which affected both Russian and Belarusian (Filin 2006: 360–366). Since conflation yielded alternations of the type voda (R)/vada (Br) ~ vody (R)/vady (Br) and zemlja (R)/zjamija (Br) ~ zemli (R)/zjamli (Br), the form Ѣдачицы may be seen as an instance of this where у for the expected i reflects the hardening of the affricate in question. The ending -ы after the affricate т in soft nouns eventually becomes codified in RChSl (Bulič 1893: 193–194).

Table III: *і-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masc.:</th>
<th>fem.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>ГѢть, ογнь, ΟУγль</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-а/-а</td>
<td>ГѢвь, ογживь, печати</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>ГѢтъ, космрти</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-а/-о</td>
<td>ГѢдъ, ογнь, пѣнь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-йо</td>
<td>ПлѢтію, СтрѢтію, горстію</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>no examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>ГѢди</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table III.
Remarks. All desinences in the above table are Church Slavonic (the flexions of the lexemes Ѣвкърь, ογнь, Господь are discussed separately). Vacillation between the front and the back jer
in lexemes with a word-final r, e.g. тварь ~ тварь, may be seen as a result of hardening of this consonant (see, 2.3.5).

1. The standard Church Slavonic desinence for the voc. sg. in nouns belonging to this stem is -и; the presence of the nom. instead of the voc. ending is highly irregular in liturgical contexts and should be therefore viewed as non-standard (for other examples see, 5.2). Further developments and changes in the vocative case, in fact its very existence as a separate form, met different destinies in the three ESl languages. The vocative case had been, generally speaking, obliterated from living pronunciation of the Great Russian dialects by the 14th century, its use circumscribed in the time that followed to a handful of words of address, namely gospodine, gospože, brate, knjaże, and certain liturgical expressions such as Bože, otče, Gospodi, Xriste. By contrast, Ukrainian has preserved the vocative case – its use, for instance, in the 16th century was not limited to religious contexts but it regularly, though less frequently, occurred in non-literary contexts as well; such forms have also been present in Belarusian throughout time – in CSBr the vocative case has been preserved to a lesser degree than in CSU (Filin 2006: 384–390; Sobolevskij 2005: 190–193).

2. The lexemes švêrì, ognì, Господи even in OCS showed a mixed inflectional formula: švêrì and ognì frequently had the *jô-stem gen. sg. desinence whereas Господи was even more heterogeneous appearing with the *ô-stem gen. and dat. sg. endings as well as the *û-stem dat. sg. fronted counterpart -evi (Lunt 2001: 75; Schmalstieg 1983: 86). The desinences attested in the 1629 Oktoikh coincide with such a mixed distribution. In Smotryč’kyj’s Grammatiki (1619:3/6) Господи is not listed with other ‘regular’ *ï-stem nouns but the following paradigm is given as normative in the sg.: nom. -и, gen./acc. -а, dat. -у or -в(е)ви, instr. -е, loc. -ě, and voc. -и. (The presence of the hard rather than the soft desinence in вонëмра is most likely brought about by the dispalatalised nature of this consonant.)

Table IV: *û-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>-о</th>
<th>сйеь</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-а</td>
<td>Сйа, Ймра</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-оу, -ъ</td>
<td>мири, сий, сйовже, починъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-о, -а</td>
<td>миъ, йдомъ, мра, Сйа</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-омъ</td>
<td>чиомъ, сиоиомъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-къ, -ъ</td>
<td>вомиръ, Водомъ, Ьйъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-е</td>
<td>сие</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Commentary to Table IV.

1. The *ŭ-stem originally comprised a small number of masculine nouns of which the lexeme сывь is best attested. As a stem it was not productive showing from early times a tendency towards decadence: this declensional pattern loses its separate identity through coalescence with the *ŏ-stem (Vlasto 1988: 91–94). That by the 17th century various *ŭ-stems nouns were no longer perceived as belonging to the same group is exemplified in Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki (1619:67/7, 68/6) where the lexemes сывь and домь are treated separately, each paradigm conflating its own blend of *ŏ- and *ŭ-flexions. The former has the following endings in the sg.: nom. -ъ, gen./acc. -а, dat. -у or -овь, instr. -омь, loc. -е and voc. -е, whereas the latter nom./acc. -ъ, gen. -у, dat. -у or -овь, instr. -омь, loc. -у and voc. -е. It appears that сывь preserves the etymological endings only in the instr. and dat. sg. (even here it is given as an alternative ending), whilst in the word домь, apart from in the dat. and voc., the original endings are present elsewhere. The same lexemes attested in the 1629 Oktoikh follow the declensions outlined in Smotryc’kyj – we should note however that the dat. sg. -овь occurs only once with the lexeme сывь (13r:9) being far more common with the word мирь (13x).

2. When appearing in the acc. sg. the lexeme сывь is always treated as animate having thus the gen. ending -а; it is however curious that the same quality of animacy is also extended to the word мирь when it denotes ‘universe, creation’ (see for instance fols. 5r:7, 19v:11, 20r:4, etc.; compare also with the 1962 Moscow Patriarchy edition of the Oktoikh where мирь in all these examples is rendered with the standard acc. ending).

Table V: *r-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ОМИ, МѢТИ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-ε</td>
<td>БѢГЪМАТЕРѢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>МѢТѢРИ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-ъ/-ъ</td>
<td>МѢТѢРѢ, МѢТѢРѢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>no examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>no examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>СѢ-ѢГѢОМѢТИ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table V.

1. All desinences in the above table are Church Slavonic. It should also be noted that the original nom. sg. in both ОМИ and МѢТИ is preserved rather than supplanted by the acc., as
was usual in the consonant stems (Vlasto 1988: 99–100). The vacillation in the acc. between the front and the back jer may be motivated by the hardening of this consonant.

Table VI: *ū-stem

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-И, -І</td>
<td>цркви, Любовь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-Є</td>
<td>Любовь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-І</td>
<td>цркви</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-Ъ/ѯ</td>
<td>црковь, кровь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-Ю/Ю</td>
<td>црквью, любовью, кровью</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-І</td>
<td>цркви</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-І</td>
<td>цркви</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table VI.
1. All desinences in the above table, with the exception of -(Ъ)Ю, are Church Slavonic. It should be borne in mind that from earliest times there was a tendency to supplant the original consonant stem endings, especially in the singular, with those from the *й-stem – an instance of this is the form цркви with the loc. sg. in -І rather than the expected -Є. Furthermore the loc. sg. ending -І is codified in Smotryc’kyj as normative for both *ū- and *й-stem declensions (1619: 9/1v). The form цркви for the original цркы in the nom. sg. is a hybrid, whilst Любовь for the original любы in the nom. sg shows a rather common replacement of the nom. with the acc. sg. form (Lunt 2001: 74; Vlasto 1988: 100–101). The vacillation between the front and the back jer, e.g. црковь ~ кровь may be seen to reflect the hardening of the word-final labial (Filin 2006: 329–331).
2. Bearing in mind that the sequence Ь + Ј followed by a vowel yielded different reflexes in ChSl and ESl, where in the latter it gives rise to -iju and in the former to -ju, the form цркъю stands out as markedly non-literary and as such is attested only in the preface to the Oktoikh.
Table VII: *s-, *n- and *nt-stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-о, -і, -а</td>
<td>слово, чудо, шко; корень, паламень, камень, отроча,</td>
<td>словарь, тъля, чудеси, словеси; безъмене, безъмен, Искорен, паламен, камене; обчате</td>
<td>нѣ, словй, кѣси; Камени</td>
<td>чудо, тѣло, слово; вopalамь, камень; обча/обчате</td>
<td>накамении, водни</td>
<td>слове, нѣд</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table VII.

Remarks. All desinences in the above table may be considered as Church Slavonic (peculiarities in declensional patterns will be discussed separately for each of the stems).

1. Nouns belonging to the *s-stem, in virtue of the fact that their nom. sg. ending is identical to that of the hard neuter declension, show at an early stage a tendency to adopt the neuter *о-stem endings. This process was complete by the 16th century and as a result both declensions, the older with the -ес- suffix as well as the newer based on the neuter *о-stem, are codified in Smotryc’kyj’s grammar. There seems to be no difference in register, in other words, the forms тѣла ~ тѣлеси are interchangeable. The only exception is the lexeme слово which must follow the *о-stem declension when it denotes the Second Hypostasis of the Trinity: in the acc. and voc. sg. it has the masc. endings -а and -е respectively but may be treated as neuter in the nom. (Smotryc’kyj 1619:ж/2⁵). In the 1629 Oktoikh the same practice is observed, e.g. слово же совеезначное, соественны сий (6:6–7), опрашалуй сінь смртію бойчию жизнь, стртію своею слове бйн (21:7–9). The presence of the gen. sg. ending -н for the expected -е in the lexeme чудеси shows, as noted earlier, the intrusion of the *и-stem endings (this ending is not codified in Smotryc’kyj who retains the original -е).

2. The *n-stem acc. sg. forms of паламень, камень ousted the expected паламь, камь. The gen./loc. sg. ending -н is taken from the *и-stem and is not codified in Smotryc’kyj (1619: ж/1¹) who gives the etymological -н in these cases.

3. The lexeme обча is treated as both animate and inanimate although it is always used metaphorically to denote a misguided, sinful human being (cf. Иже насвое ральо запаыданіе обча вѣлеси (fol. 15¹:13–14) and запаыданиаго обчата возвести (27¹:1)). The spellings with а rather than Ё in lexemes like отроча, обча most probably reflect dispalatalised nature of the postdentals.
### 3.0.2 Plural declension

#### Table VIII: *о-, *о- (incl. nouns with suffixes -телъ- and -аръ- and with stem in -ан-)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>-н, -ы, -овъ, -а // -ы, -не, -лъ/-лъ, -э</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: пъзъцы, Герафимы, вонцы, врази, свѣтова // Иудей, Копцы, страстотерцы, мѣжѣ, стражѣ, согражане, зрителье, neut.: Колѣна // Реченіа, сѣца</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>-о, -окъ, -й</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: рабъ, аглѣ, грѣховъ // вѣщу, neut.: окусть, вѣдъ // беззаконій, Иудей</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>-омъ/-омъ // -емъ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: грѣхомъ, дѣломъ // вѣлемъ, Иудеомъ; Израилатланомъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut.: зданіемъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>-н/-ы, -а // -лъ/-лъ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: грѣхи, враги, рабы // пѣвца</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut.: свѣтила // прегрѣшенія, сѣца</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>-ы/-ы, -ъмы // -ми/ -и, -ы</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: гласы, беззаконіки, гѣлы</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut.: сѣдествы // сѣдилы, сѣпени, нѣлицы</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>-ѣхъ, -ѣхъ // -ѣхъ, -ѣхъ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: состѣва // колѣтвенѣхъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut.: вѣкѣре, вовратѣхъ // вопрѣгрѣшенѣхъ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>as nom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: бѣрѣвія // Иудей</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut.: началла // ченованія</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary to Table VIII.**

**Remarks.** The majority of plural endings in the table above are standard and can be readily identified as Church Slavonic; the underlined examples above may or may not be seen as normative, from the point of view of literary usage, and these will be discussed separately in the remainder of this section. Spellings with -ъ instead of -ъ after the affricate в, viz. in the nom. pl. of words such as Концы, страстотерцы, пъзъцы, лицы (nom. sg. ликъ) or in the instr. pl. of words such as нѣлицы, as well as with -а for -лъ in the acc. sg. of the soft masculine declension after the same consonant, viz. пѣвца, may be seen to indicate the hardness of the affricate in question. The presence of the back for the front jer in вѣщу (gen. pl.) is in all likelihood motivated by the same reason. In addition, in accordance with the orthographic practice in the 1629 Oktoikh, the grapheme ы is always written after the velars, hence its presence in the acc./instr. pl. of *о*-stems with a root-final velar, e.g. грѣхи, враги, беззаконіки. In the nom. pl. the latter also undergo a mutation, e.g. врази.
1. In the 1629 Oktoikh a lone example with the desinence -ove is attested, namely свѣтвь (35:12) (in a similar syntagma attested in the First Tone we find the etymological nom. pl. ending, i.e. свѣтвь видающимъ втори (27:2)). In Smotryc’kyj (1619: 6/7v) not only this but other oblique etymological endings from the *ū-stem are allowed as alternative desinences in the hard masculine stem declensions for both animates and inanimates. The intrusion of the *ū-stem nom. pl. ending -ove and its fronted counterpart -eve in the *ō-/*jō-stem paradigms is attested from the earliest times, more often, although not exclusively, in association with animate nouns. Desinences of this kind are, for instance, encountered in OCS manuscripts, Codex Supraslensis amongst others, e.g. духовь, сдѣневь, змѣвь, etc.

The frequency with which these endings appear in written materials varies relative to the three East Slavonic regions; in modern East Slavonic languages the flexions are no longer productive. Spanning the period from the 11th to the 18th century the desinences -ove/-eve are frequently encountered in the southern and western territories of the East Slavonic zone, pertaining not only to the literary genre, hagiographic works for instance, but also to more secular quotidian texts like chronicles and gramoty, which leads to the conclusion that these were very much a part of the living language. In the east the situation was rather different; such forms were doubtlessly present but are encountered less frequently. Towards the second half of the 16th century the endings -ove/-eve were in all likelihood obliterated from the vernacular although they seem to have been petrified in certain lexemes (more often than not in proper names especially when referring to national groups). Otherwise their presence in written text very often exuded a specifically literary flavour (Filin 2006: 390–394; Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 77–85).

The nom. pl. forms мѣни, стражи show the results of conflation between *jō- and *ī-declension where the desinence -и is taken form the *ī-declension. Such examples are attested throughout the CES period (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 116–117) and Smotryc’kyj (1619: 6/5v) allows it as a normative alternative to the etymological -и of *tel-, *ар- and *jō-stems.

A single lexeme with the nom. pl. ending -мь, конны (11v:10), is also attested. Although it is difficult to say to what extent, if any, such forms stood out as non-literary, since these are also attested in Church Slavonic texts of both South and East Slavonic provenance. However, the fact that such a substitution is attested only once might indicate that the desinence -мь was not perceived to be on equal footing with the etymological ending. In addition, the nom. pl. desinence -мь is not codified in Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki as an
alternative normative ending in any of the hard masculine declensions (the only exception is the nom. pl. of the lexeme същ). This phenomenon – syncretism in the nom./acc. pl. of hard masculine stems whereby the nom. desinence is ousted by the acc. – makes itself conspicuously apparent from the 13th–14th centuries encompassing the whole East Slavonic territory (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 160–191; Kolesov 2005:266–268). Specifically relative to the Ru texts this desinence was rather common in non-literary writings, whereas the etymological ending -у might be encountered in literary contexts (Pugh 1996: 69–70).

2. As the gen. sg. ending -ov (originally from the *ǔ-stems declension) is attested on two occasions, viz. архитектура (8r:11), греческая (32r:10), it is clear that the ø-ending is the preferred norm. The expansion of this desinence as well as its fronted counterpart -еви within the *ð/*jо-stem paradigms at the expense of -у/-ь is well attested in manuscripts from the 11th–14th centuries across all genres, literary as well as non-literary, and the entire East Slavonic territory (for examples see, Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 85–92). Towards the end of this period the ø-ending is, generally speaking, emblematic of literary writings rooted in Church Slavonic tradition. In Smotryc’kyj these endings are given as normative alternatives to the ø-desinence in both the hard and the soft masculine declensions (for individual paradigms see 1619: 6/3v, 2/5v).

3. The dat. pl. desinence -омъ in Израиломъ, for the expected -емъ, is imported from the *ǔ-stems. The attestations of this ending in nouns of the original consonant *an-stem feature in earliest extant CES manuscripts – it is, for example, regularly used in Izbornik 1076 with the word крестосания; however, already in the writings from the 12th–13th centuries the desinence -омъ dominates in the *an-stem declensions (see Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 47–48, 113–114). The difference between -омъ and -омъ is in all likelihood purely functional; here Greek omega acts as an indicator of the dat. pl. whereas endings withomicron of the instr. sg. Both the ending -омъ in the *an-stems and the antistoechum о : w are codified in Smotryc’kyj.

4. The instr. pl. ending -ъми in грамми reflects the intrusion of the *ǔ-stem into the hard masculine declension. Although the desinences -ъми/-ъмъ are abundantly attested during the CES period across different genres, the original -ы nevertheless remains dominant. This flexion is also seen as specifically characteristic of South-Western texts and is preserved today in some Ukrainian dialects (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 91–92). In the 1629 Oktoikh грамм (15v:10) is the only example of this kind, in all other instances the original -ы is attested.
In the instr. pl. of soft neuter nouns two competing desinences are attested: the expected -м and the abovementioned -мм from the *ǔ-stem e.g. сиёмнн, сивлмнн. Their distribution suggests slight preference for the latter which appears 5x whilst the former 3x.

In Smotryc’kyj’s writings -мн is for the most part present in masculine and neuter soft stems, but it is also used in the consonant *тл-stems and with high frequency in the lexeme лод- (Pugh 1996: 77–78, 81). In a similar vein, in Smotryc’kyj’s Church Slavonic the desinence -мн is present in the same categories, including the *арь-stem, but it is absent from the *δ-stems declensions in which the alternatives are either -мн or -мн/-.мн.

5. The loc. pl. ending -къ for the original -къ in ломртвмкъ (20:13), лмткъ (36:15) may be indicative of the loss of distinction between the hard and soft masculine/neuter declension, a tendency that makes itself already apparent during the CES period (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 143). Alternatively since the affricate c had hardened the lexemes лертвмъ and лмс may have been reinterpreted as belonging to the hard *δ-stem and declined accordingly. In Grammatiki masculine and neuter nouns belonging to the hard *δ-stem declension have two endings in the loc. pl.: both historically justified -къ and -къ (taken from the *и-stem) are presented as normative. Similarly for the soft masculine/neuter declension original -къ and borrowed -къ are recognised as correct. In the 1629 Oktoikh the desinence -къ is attested only once in the lexeme бркдм (19:15) otherwise the expected -къ is attested in both masculine and neuter *δ-stem nouns.

6. The lexeme лоднг has a peculiar declensional pattern, indicating that it was perceived to some degree as identical to *тл-, *ан- and *арь-stem nouns. For instance, the following cases have the expected *йо-stem flexions: gen. pl. лодр (5:8), nom. pl. лодн (17:16), but nom. pl. лодн (47:11), dat. pl. лодвмъ (22:11), voc. pl. лодн (25:9, 49:1) seem to be taken from the consonant-stem declension (compare also with the declension provided in Smotryc’kyj according to whom the nouns in -мн/-мн have the following flexions in the plural: nom./voc. -е, gen. -и, dat. -емъ, acc. -а, instr. -имн/-мн, loc. -къ (1619: 5/6–7)).
Table IX: *ä-/*jä- and *ū-stems

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-ъ // -а</td>
<td>сили // диш, мйроносиц, юноша</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-ъ</td>
<td>въдъ // лвч, мйроносицъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-амъ</td>
<td>дишамъ, лвчамъ; црквамъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-ы // -а</td>
<td>мйты // дйй</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-ами // -ами</td>
<td>сослазами // лвчами, зарами</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-хъ</td>
<td>дишхъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>as nom.</td>
<td>горы</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table IX.

Remarks. All desinences in the above table are Church Slavonic. The occurrence of the back jer and the grapheme ə after the postdentals and/or the affricate ć is probably due to the hardness of these consonants.

1. The presence of the * ā-stem ending -амъ for the original -ёмъ in црквамъ reflects the conflation of *ā- and *ū-stems. This process whereby the *ū-stem had been transferred either to the *и- or *ā-stem declension took place at a very early stage so that forms with *ā-stem endings are already attested in OCS manuscripts (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 145–147; Lunt 2001: 76). Smotryc’kyj does not recognise this “innovation” as normative and opts for -ёмъ which may be seen as an archaising feature (1619: §/2’).

2. The lexeme ‘ray’ (OCS лвча) is treated as a feminine in the 1629 Oktoikh.

Table X: *i-stem

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-и, -и́</td>
<td>людйе, печати, двери, дкти</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-й</td>
<td>стрстей, людй</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-емъ</td>
<td>стрстемъ, людемъ, дктемъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>болъеън, людй</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-ми</td>
<td>пъами, съкълостъми</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-хъ</td>
<td>ёлнастехъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>as nom.</td>
<td>людйе, власти</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table X.

1. All desinences in the table above are Church Slavonic and have the original endings. The gen. pl. ending -йй is attested on one occasion only in the lexeme людйй, otherwise the regular ending is -йй (see also 2.3.12.5).
2. In the 1629 Oktoikh the lexeme печать is treated as feminine (in OCS the same lexeme is treated as masculine).

Table XI: *ǔ-stem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-ове, -и</th>
<th>чинове, Чини</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-умъ</td>
<td>чинумъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-ы</td>
<td>чины</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table XI.
1. In the 1629 Oktoikh the nom. pl. of *ǔ-stems has two variants: it can be either -и or -ове. As in the singular, the same tendency towards coalescence with the declensions of the *ǭ-stem paradigm is thus present in the plural; during the CES period intrusion of the *ǭ-stems endings is attested in the nom./gen./instr. pl. (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 74–92). Smotryc’kyj gives an extremely mixed declensional formula in the plural paradigm for the lexemes сынъ and домъ; it suffices to look at the desinences for the nom. pl.: синъ/сийнъ and домъ. Not only is the original ending present but both the acc. and nom. pl. of *ǭ-stem nouns are accepted as normative.

Table XII: *s- and *n-stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-а</th>
<th>нёса; племена</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-ъ</td>
<td>нёсь, ч̣ъдесъ; времень</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-емъ, -емъ</td>
<td>ки̣мемъ; временемъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-а</td>
<td>нёса, ч̣ввесъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>no examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-къ</td>
<td>нанёскъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>as nom.</td>
<td>нёса</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table XII.
1. With the exception of the ending -къ, all other desinences are not only Church Slavonic but also etymologically justified. The evidence of CES texts suggests that the dissolution of the original *s-stem paradigm and consequent intrusion of the *ǭ-stem flexions was more gradual in the plural than in the singular. The presence of *ǭ-stem desinence -къ is attested in the CES manuscripts but seems to be absent from OCS (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 74–92).
133–140). This ending is also absent from Grammatiki where such lexemes are declined according to their original pattern showing the s-marker (1619: Ж/2′).

2. The use of the grapheme е instead of е reflects in all likelihood the orthographic convention whereby the dat. pl. forms are in such a manner distinguished from those in the instr. sg.

3.1 Declension of adjectives in singular and plural

3.1.1 Singular and plural declension of short adjectives

Table XIII: Short adjectives (singular and plural)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Nsg</th>
<th>Gsg</th>
<th>Dsg</th>
<th>Asg</th>
<th>Lsg</th>
<th>Vsg</th>
<th>Npl</th>
<th>Apl</th>
<th>Lpl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nsg</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-κ</td>
<td>-ε</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-αχь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-κ</td>
<td>-ε</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-αχь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-κ</td>
<td>-ε</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-αχь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-κ</td>
<td>-ε</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-ν</td>
<td>-αχь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table XIII.

Remarks. All desinences in the above table are standard Church Slavonic (the underlined forms which are discussed separately). As noted previously, after velars the grapheme ñ is always written as н, viz. мѣрски (acc. pl.), дѣчески (gen. sg.). When modifying animate nouns or acting as nouns in the acc. sg. the adjective has the gen. sg. ending, e.g. падшаго.
By the 16th–17th century the short adjective pretty much ceased to function attributively now appearing in predicative constructions only. In relation to the 17th century Russian, Pennington (1980: 253) observes that possessive adjectives are regularly attributive and have short forms, whereas, with other types of adjective, short forms are used in a handful of fossilised expressions or Church Slavonic. Generally speaking, the latter appear only in the predicate, in the nom. sg./pl., and short forms in oblique cases are virtually non-existent. Similarly, Pugh’s (1996: 90–92) investigation into the language of Pamva Berynda, Smotryc’kyj and Vyšenskyj reveals an identical trend – short adjectives in oblique cases in the singular are rarely attested and they do not appear to be present in the plural. When such short forms do appear in oblique cases the context is more often than not literary and/or ecclesiastical.

It is therefore no surprise that a liturgical text such the 1629 Oktoikh should exhibit a far richer spectrum in the use of short forms in both the sg. and the pl. In addition, short adjectives appearing in the nom. sg./pl. may also be used attributively, although for the most part these are confined to the predicate, e.g. Верахь дьк страхъ вединъ (13v:5), вѣстникъ строитель высокъ (20v:2), вски преславны: твоа же таинства: читатою запечатлѣнина (31v:10–11). Процесила естъ ... искры нищимъ цѣхи (40v:5–6), высокъ валаень воѣннагъ естъ (43v:10–11).

2. All suffixes used in formation of possessive adjectives, namely *-ov-, *-in-, *-ĭnj-, *-j-, and *-ĭj-, are attested in the 1629 Oktoikh (Pennington 1980: 254; Schenker 1995: 113, 120, 122):

(1) the suffixes -ov-/-ev- were used in derivation of desubstantival possessive adjectives from masculine nouns belonging to the *-ŏ/-jŏ-stems: Давидовъ (e.g. 13v:5, 24v:10), христовъ (e.g. 13v:14, 19v:21, 20v:12, etc.), адонъ (e.g. 19v:15, 41v:17, etc.), апеловъ (e.g. 20v:6–7), Блажевъ (21v:1), адамовъ (21v:9), ададонъ (22v:6), спасовъ (25v:8), Митрофановъ (31v:16), довой (38v:9), краниевъ (46v:5), мѣчительвъ (47v:12), мятаревъ (51v:15);

(2) the suffix -in- was used in formation of denominal possessive adjectives from nouns belonging to the *-ă/-jă-, *t-stems and feminine consonant stems: Елинъ (16v:14), исланъ (5v:16), зимйнъ (27v:13);
(3) The suffix -ьн- is a combination of the suffixes *-ин-, used in derivation of denominal adjectives, and *-й: матерень (7.5–6, 31.1), господень (13.3, 21.5, 22.3, etc), владычень (25.14);

(4) The suffix -ь- was used in formation of desubstantival possessive adjectives from masculine nouns: разподень (12.1, 49.6), членънь (27.2), отеч (30.15, 34.5, etc.).

(5) The suffix -ьн- was used in formation of denominal possessive adjectives from masculine nouns: божий (4.6, 11.16, 25.10, etc.), вражий (3.7, 25.1, 38.16).

3. An interesting feature recurring several times in connexion with the possessive adjective адовъ is absence of agreement with the noun this adjective qualifies, e.g. вратници адовы (nom. pl. masc.) (30.6), адовы врата (acc. pl. neut.) (43.3–4), but also showing correct agreement in врата адовы (acc. pl. neut) (19.15), адова врата (acc. pl. neut.) (42.14) and вратници адовы (nom. pl. masc.) (44.1). Such examples may be interpreted as instances of syncretism in the nom./acc. plural. It seems that the tendency towards obliteration of gender distinction in the direct cases, reflected in the use of the acc. pl. endings in the role of the nom., and more tentatively the opposite substitution where the nom. forms appear in the role of the acc., had already become prevalent on the East Slavonic territory by the 13th–14th centuries. The presence of such new endings in adjectives and participles is particularly telling. Since these, in attributive usage, are not the true bearers of the category of gender, gender and case distinction ceases to be significant and such lexemes become more susceptible to acquisition of new endings. In CES manuscripts nominative-accusative syncretism is attested not only in modifiers associated with feminine nouns, where these acquire the masculine nom. pl. flexions, but also in modifiers accompanying masculine nouns where the acc.pl. ending supplants that of the nom. In addition, the emergence of ‘genderless’ endings -ый/-я in modifiers qualifying neuter nouns are encountered from the 12th century. The introduction of the desinence -ь in adjectival declensions in the nom./acc. pl. neut. and nom. pl. masc. might have been supported by the presence of the identical segment -ь- in oblique cases (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 160–191).

4. Two indeclinable adjectives are also attested, viz. сёдб (17.1), свободъ (25.9).
### 3.1.2 Singular declension of long adjectives

#### Table XIV: Long adjectives (singular)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Example Forms</th>
<th>Gender/Mood</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-ýí//ýí</td>
<td>masc.: праведный, трисостоянный, пррческий//вышний</td>
<td>neut.: совезначное</td>
<td>Church Slavonic. As a rule singular adjectival forms in the 1629 Oktoikh appear in the contracted form, namely in those cases where the simplification process took place (for further details see Lunt 2001: 64–67). Such forms are present in OCS manuscripts as well early Church Slavonic texts like Ostromir’s Evangeliary; by the 13th century contracted endings became standard and were neutral with regard to register (uncontracted forms on the other hand remain markedly literary) (Lunt 2001: 64–67; Vlasto 1988: 113). Whenever the initial desinential element -ý- occurs after velar consonants it is written as -i- in accordance with the orthographic rule followed in the 1629 Oktoikh, viz. пррческий (nom. sg. masc.), пррческая (gen. sg. fem.), пррческий (instr. sg. neut.), etc. Where followed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-аго//аго</td>
<td>masc.: благословенного, живого //вышнего</td>
<td>neut.: трисостоянного, незаходнаго, чеческаго</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-омъ // -омъ</td>
<td>masc.: благословенного, вселанаго, вктветнаго, непостоатнаго, житейскаго // древний</td>
<td>neut.: незреченномъ // незреченнымъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-ывъ/аго, -ый/ий</td>
<td>masc.: трисостоянаго, вселанаго, вктветнаго, непостоатнаго, житейскаго // древний</td>
<td>neut.: всельянномъ, стбюю, вгтюю // незреченной</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-ымъ // -имъ</td>
<td>masc.: соестетвеынаго, вктветнаго, незреченнаго</td>
<td>neut.: всельянномъ, вктветнаго, незреченномъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-ымъ, -овъ</td>
<td>masc.: сттклъ, хрбвилскомъ</td>
<td>neut.: всестаинномъ, кртнклъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-ый/ий</td>
<td>masc.: стый, прреблйш</td>
<td>neut.: Незреченное</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary to Table XIV.**

**Remarks.** All desinences in the above table are Church Slavonic. As a rule singular adjectival forms in the 1629 Oktoikh appear in the contracted form, namely in those cases where the simplification process took place (for further details see Lunt 2001: 64–67). Such forms are present in OCS manuscripts as well early Church Slavonic texts like Ostromir’s Evangeliary; by the 13th century contracted endings became standard and were neutral with regard to register (uncontracted forms on the other hand remain markedly literary) (Lunt 2001: 64–67; Vlasto 1988: 113). Whenever the initial desinentional element -ý- occurs after velar consonants it is written as -i- in accordance with the orthographic rule followed in the 1629 Oktoikh, viz. пррческий (nom. sg. masc.), пррческая (gen. sg. fem.), чеческий (instr. sg. neut.), etc. Where followed...
by front vowels, such as the case in the loc. sg. fem., the velar consonant in question undergoes mutation. As elsewhere in the text the grapheme ă is written for ă after postdentals and the affricate č (ђč意义 voc. sg. fem.). Similarly, -m- in the instr./loc. sg. of masculine and neuter nouns is followed by a back rather than front jer reflecting the hardness of the consonant in question.

1. The pronominal loc. sg. desinence -отъ is in competition with the older OCS -ĕтъ – it appears however that the latter is preferred as it occurs 5x whereas the former only 2x. There seems to be no difference in register, or at the very least, -отъ is not perceived as a vernacular feature since both endings are codified in Smotryć’kyj (see, for example, 1619: 3/7v and 3/8v).

2. Anomalous spellings in the following adjectival forms are in all likelihood misprints: -ы for -ъ in во оотрвк дыви (35v:6); -къ for -нъ in the soft adjective присподень, viz. Вротк ьте присподдкъ (41v:15); -о for -оо in ловъпию вжтвнй (50v:14) (the two last examples are probably retardative misspellings under the influence of ћо in ловпию and ѣ in Вротк).

3.1.3 Plural declension of long adjectives

Table XV: Long adjectives (plural)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masc.: недостойнъй, вкряй, йудействъй, вторый // ниций</th>
<th>neut.: земная, чаческая</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>fem.: нѣйная, чтнъй</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ынъ//-ынъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ънъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>-ынъ//-ынъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>измертвыхъй, дѣческыхъй // древнихъй</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-ымъ/-ымъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>безпластнымъй, пажннымъй, мнгймъй</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-ымъ//-ымъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ымъ//-ымъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ымъ//-ымъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: непотрѣнная, мертвыхъй, мнрскъй</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut.: землана, великая, погребателна // вопресподнала</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fem.: мирозданыя, желѣзныя // Вечерныя</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-ымъ//-ымъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>вджрдыли, охалныли, нпрщитъымныли, пррческими</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-ынъ//-ынъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>возначалыхъйй // вопресподныхъйй, вышныхъйй</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>as nom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc.: вѣззаконнйй</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table XV.

Remarks. All desinences are standard Church Slavonic (the underlined forms are discussed separately). Plural adjectival forms, in the same way as those in the singular, appear in the contracted form (for further details see Lunt 2001: 64–67). Whenever the initial desinential
element -y- occurs after velar consonants it is written as -i- in accordance with the orthographic rule followed in this text, viz. пръческими (instr. pl.), дъческими (gen. pl.), etc. Where followed by front vowels, such as in the nom. pl. masc., the velar consonant in question undergoes mutation.

1. The masc. pl. form втвръди (35r:12) may not be necessarily seen as an overt deviation from the Church Slavonic norm although as such it is not codified in Smotryc’kyj (possibly since -yi desinences in the nom. pl. masc. were also present in the 17th century Ruthenian) (for examples see, Pugh 1996: 96–97)). By the 15th century the desinence -ьи appears side by side the traditional -и in Church Slavonic literary texts. The introduction of -ьи in the nom. pl. masc., whether a result of vernacular influence or independent parallel development within the literary establishment itself, reflects a more universal tendency towards removal of gender distinction, in which the acc. pl. ending -ы assumes the role of a generalised indicator of plurality (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 169–170; Živov 2004: 408–410).

2. Two anomalous forms in the plural have been attested in врата ко мкданина со кръщъ еси, и верѝ жмѣкзца бол ри еси (30r:8–9) and оциє крто́й своимь мирскага конца (17r:13–14), where for the expected acc. pl. fem./masc. ending -ы the acc. pl. neut. desinence -а is present instead. Apart from the fact that gender distinction became less significant in adjectives and participles, a further determinant might have facilitated the conflation of neuter with feminine and masculine declensions. In ESI ChSI texts, generally speaking, conflations of this kind might have been produced by the very equivocality of the last inflectional segment -а in the nom./acc. pl. of neut. adjectival declension. Since this element subsequently coincided with the OCS soft desinence -я in the nom./acc. pl. fem. and nom. pl. masc., artificial analogical levellings could have appeared even in the hard declension where the masc./fem. ending was -ы. An example virtually identical to ours is also attested in Sil’vestrovskij Sbornik XIV, viz. съкръшни врата мкданина и вери жмѣкзца сломи (Iordanidi and Krys’ko 2000: 172).

Lack of agreement in Намп вчи пѣмну сръчни (37v:14) where the ending -и is used instead of the expected acc. du. neut. -ки was in all likelihood brought about by the scribe’s inability to determine the correct gender of the noun in question (Živov (2004: 412) cites similar deviations in connexion with the lexeme вчн that are attested in the Moscow Menaion 1691).
3.2 Comparative forms and superlatives

Two Proto-Slavonic comparative suffixes *-jь/*-je and *-ějь/*-ěje and the common comparative oblique stems *-jьš/*-ějьš were used in formation of both long and short comparative adjectives, which were declined on the pattern of soft adjectives. Furthermore, in OCS/ChSl comparison is not expressed morphologically but through a comparative construction ‘person/thing something is compared to + comparative adjective + object of comparison in the genitive case’ (Lunt 2001: 60–61, 68–70, 77–78). Today this construction is present only in CSR. The following is a sample of examples from the 1629 Oktoikh: пависа пространнѣйша нѣсь (6º:1–2) (nom. sg. fem.), и жизни душнѣй безведи (fol. 33º:7) (dat. sg. fem.), Чребо пространнѣйше нѣсь востоев (40º:12), Гѣйьѣ сутѣйше та раздѣкемѣ (44º:5), болшаго насѣ чѣдече сподобиетѣ (48º:11–12), etc.

Already, however, in the 12th century the first signs of decadence became apparent signalled by the lack of agreement between comparative adjectives and the nouns they qualify (Buslavovskij 1958: 328–330; for examples see, Sobolevskij 2005: 227). In the 1629 Oktoikh the absence of agreement is present in the direct cases in the sg. as well as the pl.: Всѧцы дѣти бѣлы чистѣйши … златы (21º:2–3) (nom. pl. fem.), Влады вѣтвѣйни, хѣй лѣтѣса (27º:14–15) (voc. pl. fem.), храмѣ гѣй преѣйше сѣ (41º:2–3) (nom. sg. masc.). The oblique stem is also generalised in nom. sg. by the 17th century hence we encounter forms of the kind Иже всѣхъ вѣйшѣ Шѣ (40º:3) (nom. sg. masc.).

OCS and ChSl do not have any special means thorough which superlative forms could be expressed; the standard practice was addition of the intensifying prefix прѣ-/прѣ- to a positive adjective and examples of this kind abound in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. новы и преславное чѣдѣ (5º:13–14), прѣбѣдая едѣнцице (7º:13), тѣца пресовѣрѣнна (10º:9), сѣдѣла прѣмѣрѣы Гѣмъ (17º:13). In addition, прѣ- is attested with comparative adjectives as well, e.g. Прѣвѣйшыя еписа, чѣта прѣо Дѣо, всѣ вѣдимы и невѣдимы твари (39º:8) (nom. sg. fem.), Иже врѣмѣн прѣвѣйшѣ всѣческихъ (40º:9). At times, however, comparative adjectives with the suffix *-ѣjьш may carry a superlative, e.g. Влады вѣтвѣйни, хѣй лѣтѣса, и душнѣй жѣ и совершѣннѣйшѣ внидѣ сѣнь (16º:11–12), една вѣдѣшемѣ далѣ еси раздѣкти новѣйшѣ чѣдѣ (24º:17–18).

3.3 A note on the dual

Although by the 17th century the grammatical category of dual had become obsolete in the living languages in the whole East Slavonic territory, it nevertheless remained present in the
written word; it is important to emphasise that such forms pertained exclusively to the higher style and when used smacked of overt Slavonicisms.\(^1\) This part of the OCS heritage is preserved in *Grammatiki 1619* in which Smotryc’kyj reconstructs dual forms for all nominal and verbal categories in which dual originally occurred. In the 1629 Oktoikh the dual forms are naturally present and appear only in association with the numeral *два* and nouns denoting parts of the body as well as live human beings that come in pairs. The following examples have been attested:

(1) the numeral *два*: в о днóй счётствé (14\(^{1}\):12–13);

(2) living beings/body parts: но иако сего отворowego счóима рóкама носившиа (5\(^{v}\):4–5), ёрныльма очима добреть швистати (7\(^{v}\):10), рóкама прйтыма … иеперва созда ма (13\(^{v}\):3–4), р̀кн̀к распросставъ еси на кртк (13\(^{4}\):4–5), ткже вовеселян рóкама плей (14\(^{r}\):7), прозорливыма явикиым осямотрй очима (16\(^{3}\):3–5), на нейже стоастк прйтин ностк (22\(^{r}\):5–6), надреи кѫтвениций у̀къ далани прострошаса (22\(^{r}\):6–7), и нардек носои (31\(^{r}\):15), егже иако ланца прйла нардек скосо носивши (31\(^{r}\):17–1), Наибё еси пѫмао ернны (37\(^{r}\):14), и совестлакомилем на древк пригодалесь (42\(^{r}\):7–8), Нккже нардек исхитиль еси (47\(^{r}\):10).

Even though the use of the dual is circumscribed to the above named categories, the rule is applied somewhat inconsistently since dual forms may be supplanted by the plural, viz. р̀ками да восплёруть пѧцыци (4\(^{r}\):13), и р̀кай да восплёруть (20\(^{r}\):13), Вовелакөими р̀кн̀к скои́х (38\(^{r}\):17). In addition, when functioning as the subject of the sentence the predicate associated with a dual form may be either in the dual or pl., viz. стоастк … ностк ~ далани прострошаса. Adjectives/pronouns qualifying the noun in the dual usually agree in number but the exception appear to be long adjectival forms in the nom./acc. case where the dual ending is replaced with the nom. pl., i.e. Наибё еси пѫмао ернны, надреи кѫтвениций у̀къ далани.

### 3.4 Numerals: Cardinal and ordinal numbers

With regard to *one* only the Church Slavonic variant with the word-initial (j)e- is attested; in the 1629 Oktoikh it is used in the sense ‘sole’, ‘the only one’ rather than having the meaning ‘number 1’. The singular paradigm is incomplete and no plural forms have been attested: N:

\(^{1}\) For further discussion on the category of dual see Živov (2004: 77–92) and Žolobov and Krys’ko (2001).
Other numerals appear rarely so the paradigms are incomplete, viz. two: двух (loc. du. neut.); three: трь (acc. masc./neut.), трём (instr. neut.), Ветрёхъ (loc. neut.)/Триехъ (loc. masc.). The form Триехъ is formed on the nom. masc. form трие (Bulič 1893: 309). Both variants, трячась and Триехъ, are codified as normative in Smotryc’kyj (for the paradigm see, 1619: Κ2°).

Similarly, ordinal numbers, whose declensional pattern follows that of the hard adjectives, are attested in a handful of instances: Вторыі (nom. sg. masc.), Первыі (acc. sg. fem.), Втретыі (acc. sg. masc.), Первые (acc. sg. neut.), На Перваго/Перваго (gen. sg. masc.); Первій, Вторыі/Вторыі (nom. pl. masc.). In addition to Вторыі a competing expression Другиі і is encountered once in the heading Другиі Короні (39°:13). From the perspective of Ruthenian language, the former may be considered as a Church Slavonic lexeme limited to literary/ecclesiastical contexts, whereas the latter appears in environments of more quotidian nature. Furthermore, whilst both adjectives mean ‘second’, Другиі і may also be used in the sense ‘other’ (Pugh 1996: 151–152). It is in this sense that Другиі і is used in the phrase Другиі Короні; in all other instances the pronoun инъ is attested (see, for example, 38°:10, 40°:8, 45°:6, etc.).

3.5 Pronouns

The main pronominal categories attested in the 1629 Oktoikh include the following: personal and reflexive, demonstrative, possessive, interrogative, relative and indefinite. Each of these, as well as several other, will be discussed in turn in the remainder of this section. For the most part however the paradigms are incomplete and very little deviation from the Church Slavonic standard is present.
3.5.1 Personal and reflexive pronouns

Table XVIa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st sg</th>
<th>2nd sg</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>1st pl</th>
<th>2nd pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>ты</td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Мы</td>
<td>вы</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>мене</td>
<td>Истеве</td>
<td></td>
<td>насъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>мнё/ми</td>
<td>тебё/ти</td>
<td>себё/си, собё</td>
<td>намъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>мене/ма</td>
<td>тёбо/та</td>
<td></td>
<td>насъ/ны</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>тобою</td>
<td>собою</td>
<td></td>
<td>инами</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ётебё</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>йнасъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary to Table XVIa.
1. All desinences in the above table are standard Church Slavonic with the exception of the form собё (27:6) which was current in both Ruthenian and Russian in the same period (Pugh 1996: 111; Vlasto 1988: 124); like other non-literary characteristics observed thus far, this particular form is consigned to the Preface of the 1629 Oktoikh. Note also the presence of enclitic acc./dat. forms.
2. For examples of the dative of possession where enclitic forms мн, ти, си are used to express this relation see Section 5.7.

Table XVIb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| G     | еро      | изнёа   | нуь/
| D     | емь/кнемь|          | нувъ   |        |
| A     | еро/его/ерв/ерв, наже |          | вие   |        |
| I     | сий      | сеньже |        | сили   |
| L     | внемь    | на ней  |        |        |

Commentary to Table XVIb.
1. The above desinences are standard Church Slavonic. Whenever a third personal singular or plural pronoun is preceded by a preposition the epenthetic н- is introduced; in Smotryс’къйж the presence of the epenthetic н- in this environment is optional. The masc. sg. acc. form нь is attested 3x, кръта же ради разбойника вобеде нь 96 (25в:16), наже (32в:16), вонь же всела (33в:13–14).
2. The gen. sg./pl. of these pronouns functions as the 3rd per. possessive pronouns, e.g. низложималъ древомъ прегрѣшения егь, вѣ нѣсколько колосимъ (15г:14–15), своею державою разарѣшиевъ егь силою (18г:14–15), молвишь бы идѣроты тѣла нами дарѣй (26г:10–11), Зѣболъ нѣкъ непредаляъ сипъ своею раба (38г:8).

3.5.2 Demonstrative pronouns

Four demonstrative pronouns are attested in the 1629 Oktoikh, namely variants of the Proto-Slavonic *тǔ, *онǔ, *овǔ,*сǐ:

1. *тǔ: той (nom. sg. masc.) (e.g. 3г:3/7, 4г:6), томъ (dat. sg. masc.) (e.g. 18г:4), того (gen.-acc. sg. masc.) (e.g. 27г:2); та (nom. sg. fem.) (e.g. 4г:17, 4г:1), тѣю (acc. sg. fem.) (2г:6), тое (gen. sg. fem.) (4г:3); тѣ (gen. pl) (50г:1);

2. *онǔ: оного (gen.-acc. sg. masc.) (51г:16);

3. *овǔ: овъ (nom. sg. masc.) (48г:8);

4. *сǐ: сей (nom. sg. masc.) (48г:9), сего (gen. sg. masc.) (42г:9); сей (acc. sg. neut.) (43г:16, etc.); сла (nom. sg. fem.) (18г:2), сла (gen. sg. fem.) (18г:17); сла (acc. pl. neut.) (17г:8), слвъ (dat. pl. masc./fem.) (15г:12, 19г:17), сихъ (gen.-acc. pl. masc.) (39г:9).

After the loss of jers the demonstrative pronouns съ and тѣ became either reinforced through addition of the 3rd per. sg. relative pronoun, i.e. nom. sg. той (< *тѣйъ), тое, таа and nom. pl. тинъ, таа, тыы, or through reduplication i.e. тотъ (< *тѣтъ), сесъ (< *съсъ) with remaining forms unchanged. The latter is typical of the northern whilst the former of the south-western ESl territory (Vlasto 1988: 311–312). As expected in the 1629 Oktoikh the reinforced forms predominate in the nom./acc. of both soft and hard pronominal declension, e.g. той, тѣю, сей, сла (Apln/Nsgf) but ивъ and таа. In Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki (1619: A/3г–8г) such forms are listed as normative side by side more traditional variants, e.g. той, таа, сей/си, сла/с (Nsgf), сла (NAPln). The remaining forms have standard ChSl endings (in Smotryc’kyj the acc./gen. sg. endings -агъ/-агъ in the pronouns овъ/онъ are borrowed from the masculine/neuter adjectival declension). Note also the presence of the acc. suppletive form with the stem in си/-, viz. сей (acc. sg. neut.). In addition the pronoun такъ is attested 1x in the Preface, e.g. стакого початъ (2г:8–9).

The gen. sg./pl. forms of these pronouns may also function as a possessive pronoun of the 3rd person, e.g. тое овъ нѣмы вѣрное ощущеніе (4г:3–4), сего очевидніе ризы (16г:4–
### 3.5.3 Possessive pronouns

#### Table XVII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>нашъ, твой, мой</td>
<td>твоя, наша</td>
<td>наше, твое, моё</td>
<td>твои, мои (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>твоя (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>твоего, нийегъ, своего</td>
<td>твоя</td>
<td>твоего, твогъ, своего, нашегъ</td>
<td>нашихъ, своимиъ, твоихъ, моихъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>своёй, нашемъ, твемъ</td>
<td>котвоеи, моей</td>
<td>твоемъ, своемъ, кнашеи, моемъ</td>
<td>нашимъ, твоимъ, своимъ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>своего, твой, нашъ</td>
<td>своёо, нашёи, твоя</td>
<td>твоёе, наское, наше, мое</td>
<td>наша, твоя, моа (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>нийа, своя (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>твоя, своя (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>своимъ, твоимъ</td>
<td>твоею, своео</td>
<td>твоимъ, своимъ</td>
<td>своими, твоими, моими</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>твоеи, своеи</td>
<td>твоеи, своеи</td>
<td>твоеи, своеи</td>
<td>своиеи</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>нашъ, мой</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary to Table XVII.**

1. The endings in the above table call for no special comment as all are standard Church Slavonic.
2. A short excursus on usage of *sвоj* vs. *твоj*, *моj* and *sвоj* vs. *ego*, *eja* may be of interest here since in the wake of the Nikonian reforms use of the reflexive possessive pronoun *sвоj* became circumscribed. Its presence was limited to the 3rd person, whilst in the 1st and 2nd per. sg. the possessive pronouns *моj* and *твоj* became *de rigueur* and a new literary standard. Consequently *sвоj* is reanalysed as the possessive pronoun of the 3rd person hence the dutiful substitution of the gen. forms of personal pronouns *ego*, *eja* with *sвоj* in this environment. This syntactic innovation was clearly rooted in and influenced by parallel Greek use in which possessive pronouns are available only for the 1st and 2nd person; *sвоj*, on the other hand, became equivalent to the Greek *αυτο*. Earlier attempts to regulate the use *моj* and *твоj*, corresponding to the Greek *μου* and *σου* respectively, in those environments where *sвоj* would have otherwise been present, may be traced to Maksim Grek. He
maintains this distinction in several liturgical texts but subsequently abandons the practice, with svoj carrying the victory over the literal rendition of Greek originals (Uspenskij 2002: 459–461).

It is interesting to note that the same rule regarding the use of svoj vs. ego, eja is codified by Smotryc’kyj (1619: II/6): Ввєстць Вірватителй /егь, ед, и прочихъ во всѣхъ падежей/ охоптребляют славян етогоіхъ Притжатенныхъ свой, свой, свое.

In the 1629 Oktoikh the rule concerning svoj vs. moj, tvoj is clearly ignored as the former is regularly attested in the 2nd person, e.g. о’утверди православ’ямъ црковъ свого Хе (3°:16–17), лътвы своему ражь котоё цркви принесимы ти непреди но цикъ богоутрънаго свялдь рѣкала несившила, на своа ражы охмъдрись (5°:3–6). On the other hand, in line with Smotryc’kyj, only svoj is attested with the 3rd person, e.g. прагрѣнцва намь щиалъ есть, основя страпании путь свого кровь (16°:9–11), акку домь першаго падшаго адама, чьз соткена бысть, и свойму содѣтала родиценища (17°:4–6), своему крѣпостию ожиала мертвица воскрѣсилъ есть (17°:15–16), и восходитъ свѣтло соплотию свого Хе коийдь (18°:2–3).

3.5.4 Miscellaneous

Relative pronouns. In the 1629 Oktoikh ике, еже, иже are regularly used in the direct as well as oblique cases in both the sg. and the pl., e.g. далъ еси нали рагой … ввѣтцы сійсітелныя … иже соврѣшити сподови (11°:9–12), ѣдино трисоставное начало. Герарфими немолчумъ славяты … еже и всѣя падны п’єрнъ поеть п’емолью (6°:9–12), нєтвоимъ сев’етодателыми думалъ нъ призирати ніко, иамже насв’я́цса славы твоемъ сладкага (10°:3–5), равоюже твоему ГДи исц€к’дьч’д еже даны оусвьленъ бысть Хе (18°:10–11), Воплотиса ике прежде сый вез’опотень сьмо оште всѣчаля, нєке всческала волю творый (19°:6–8), Чртогъ сев’етоянданій, изн’эже всѣч вака, иаку жени произыде Хе, восп’валъ еси непрестанномъ глилице (22°:13–15), etc. In addition the relative pronoun который is attested 1x in the Preface (see also Section 5.6).

The isolative pronoun. The pronoun самъ occurs only 4x in the nom. sg. masc.

Distributive pronouns. In the whole body of the text the pronoun къдажо/къдаже is attested 4x: three times in the Preface where the declensional ending replaces the word-final о/e, e.g. къдажомъ, къдажый (2x) (2°:1, 3, 5) and on one occasion in the liturgical text proper where the original indeclinable particle -дё is preserved and the initial element declined, e.g.
In addition the pronouns всѧкъ and всѧческъ are attested 19x and 10x respectively. The former has both long and short declensions, where the short forms are preferred in the preposited position whilst the long forms in the postposited position e.g. всѧка тваръ, всѧкъ іазъ, пѣснь всѧкѣ. всѧкъ похвалю тъ законъ, навсацъ часъ, всѧчестѣшь всѧческими, всѧческѣ црѣ, гди всѧческѣ.

The totalising pronoun. The pronoun всѣ is frequently encountered in the text. All desinences are standard Church Slavonic (for the discussion of the form всѣ see 2.3.4). In the nom./acc. sg. the pronoun is written with the back instead for the front jeр, i.e. всѣ, possibly reflecting the hardness of the word-final consonant.

**Table XVIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>всѧкъ</td>
<td>всѣ</td>
<td>всѣ (m), всѧ (n), всѧ (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>всѧкъ</td>
<td>всєго</td>
<td>всѧчъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>всѧкъ</td>
<td>всє</td>
<td>всѧмъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>всєю</td>
<td>всє, всєго</td>
<td>всє/ всєчъ (m), всѧ (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>всєй</td>
<td>всєчъ</td>
<td>всєчъ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>всѧкъ</td>
<td>всѧ</td>
<td>всѧ (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interrogative pronouns.** These are attested rarely, e.g. что окаяветаете сієоко востаний, всёзакини люде (25:7–9), піце не гдѣ, былъ бы внась, и кто довольнь цѣль сохранень быти, иврара кѣпи и чиъкохвища (38:5–7), кто крәдетъ мертвецъ, паче же и нага (48:15–16). всєю ти достойнѣю пѣсень, наше приноси неложеніе (14:15–16).

The indefinite pronoun. Only никѣто is attested 1x: Иже всєчъ выйши Хѣ, оулучиша малымъ никѣчымъ патцаго естества: страстію плотскою · (40:3–4).

### 3.6 Adverbs

By far the most common adverbial forms attested in the 1629 Oktoikh are deadjectival adverbs amongst which those formed by addition of the acc. sg. neut. desinence -о (-w) predominate (the difference between -о and -w spellings is purely orthographic and was discussed in 2.3.8); over a hundred such forms are attested, e.g. вѣрно/вѣрно, неложенъ/неложи, нетачино, достойнъ, вѣчесчины, неложенъ, вѣлакино, ненавѣктино, сланъ/сланъ, непрестанъ/непрестанъ, согласино/соглаш. Adjectives formed by addition of the loc. sg. neut. ending -к and those derived from adjectives with the suffix -єск- with the
instr. pl. desinence -ы are encountered rarely (the latter forms are consistently written with i for y), e.g. with -е: нераздѣлнѣ, лѣ, вѣдѣтелнѣ, дѣловнѣ, свѣтовиднѣ, теплѣ, чистѣгѣ,
лостѣ, вѣдѣвенѣ, якѣвѣнѣ, всесиленѣ; with -у: терапѣско, пѣрмѣско, всѣческѣ (2x). Here can also be included other nominal adjectival forms such as: кѣпно/кѣпнѣ/кѣпѣнѣ, дѣло, 
пѣвнѣ/пѣвѣ, дрѣвѣ.

The remaining adverbs can be grouped in the following categories:

1. Adverbs of time and place:
   (a) adverbs with the suffixes -дѣ-, -(ж)гѣ and -ду: вѣдѣ/вѣдѣк, гѣ, вѣдѣ, вѣдѣдѣ, вѣдѣдѣ, вѣдѣду,
   Вѣдѣ, всѣдѣ, едѣ, тогда, иногда, идѣже/идѣ жѣ, прежѣ/премѣ;
   (b) miscellaneous: дѣ, долѣ, горѣ, низѣ, нѣѣ, тамо/тамѣ, вымѣ;

2. Adverbs of manner: такѣ/тако (the former is a general Slavic form whereas the latter is Church Slavonic; the former however is attested in the Preface and not the liturgical text proper), такожѣ, костинѣ, вѣра, наконѣ, началѣ (a feature of East Slavonic but does not pertain to ChSl, consequently it appears only in the Preface; see also Pugh 1996:189),
   никакожѣ, такожѣ, сице, посолѣдѣ;

3. Adverbalised comparatives and numerical adverbs: свыше, перѣже, ниже, паче, прочѣе;

Перѣе, исперѣа.
Chapter IV: Verbal morphology

This chapter examines the verbal system of the 1629 Oktoikh, which is virtually identical to that of OCS. The following verbal categories are discussed: (1) infinitive, (2) present/future tense, (3) imperative, (4) compound and simple past tenses, and (5) active and passive participles.

4.0 The Infinitive

The infinitive marker in the 1629 Oktoikh is always written as -ти, e.g. просвєтити, сїєти, воплотитись, облєгчити, славити, призирати, скорбнити, воспіватити, охутити. This desinence is present in OCS and may be regarded as pan-Slavonic in character: it was emblematic of Ruthenian as a whole whilst for Russian the 17th century appears to be a watershed with regard to its spelling. Infinitives with shortened desinence, namely -ть where the final unstressed -i disappears leaving behind a palatalised t’, were still a rarity in the written word even in the 16th century. A century later in standard Church Slavonic works and liturgical texts of Russian provenance the predominance of infinitives in -ти remains unchallenged. The situation in hybrid texts and well as those of more quotidian nature is rather different: whilst the former show an overt preference for the new truncated forms, compared to older texts, the presence of the full infinitive in the latter is sporadic at best (Živov 2004: 131–184). In standard contemporary East Slavonic languages -ти has been preserved in Ukrainian (-ти, e.g. читати, знати) but lost in Russian (-т’, e.g. читать, знать) and Belarusian (-ц’ < -т’, e.g. чытаць, ведаць) (Pugh 1996: 249–250).

4.1 The Present/Future Tense

The forms of the imperfective present tense and the perfective future tense will be discussed together as the desinential elements denoting person and number are identical and none specifically encodes either the present or the future tense. The thematic verbs are furthermore divided into two conjugational categories: the 1st Conjugation which encompasses verb classes characterised by the stem vowel -e-, e.g. nestи ~ nes-e- (e/o class), kрикнути ~ krik-n-e- (ne/no-class), знати ~ zna-j-e- (je/jo-class) and the 2nd Conjugation which is characterised by the stem vowel -i- and only comprises verbs from the half-thematic class, e.g. славити ~ slav-i-, просити ~ pros-i- (see Table I below).
Athematic verbs occur rarely. The 2nd per. sg. of the verb быти is the most frequently encountered form. The following verbs are attested:

(1) быти: esi/ösi (22x) (2nd per.sg.); estь/есть/есть (7x), есть (3x), иёй/иёсть (2x) (3rd per. sg.); естемь (1x) (1st per. pl.); сёть (2x) (3rd per. pl.);
(2) имети: имашь (3x) (2nd per. sg.), имамь (2x) (1st per. pl.), имамъть (1x) (3rd per. pl.);
(3) (по)дати: пода'/дась (2x) (3rd per. sg.); дадать (3rd per. pl.);
(4) свѣдѣти: свѣмь (3x) (1st per. pl.).

Table I: Conjugation of thematic verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>1st Conjugation</th>
<th>2nd Conjugation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-8/-ъ</td>
<td>зовь/пою</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>насьряся/славославль</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-и</td>
<td>вѣчествѣши</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-ть</td>
<td>бываетъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Повѣдѣть</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>1st Conjugation</th>
<th>2nd Conjugation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>-мй</td>
<td>востѣваемъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Принимать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>-тй</td>
<td>нимѣте</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Превозносить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>-тй/-тъ</td>
<td>востѣваетъ/востѣйтъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Славать</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The desinences in 1st and 2nd pers. sg. and pl. of both conjugations call for no special discussion as these are Church Slavonic. In the 2nd Conjugation, 1st per. sg. verbal forms, where a mutable consonant is present, show the results of *j*-palatalisation, and specifically in the case of labials the epenthetic l, e.g. насьряся, славославль, превозношь, славь. It is interesting that Smotryc’kyj (1619: 0/1, 2/2’) allows unmutated forms as normative: both the 1st per. sg. verbal forms without the epenthetic l, viz. ’На/ую, и ядь кончацься/ ойй оставалъ/ ж. оньй /л: мордцый обаче то и в самоль дадати иставити: на/ою, или спю, спинь, славъ, или/славъ, вишь’ and those where the root-final d does not undergo the expected mutation dj > 2/2d, viz. ’Нечитое едино/ койкадо мала согласнымъ шненицаемъ: на/оу, … нау/ гнѣдю/ дождю/… слезю’.1

1 Generalisation of j instead of l in the 1st per. sg. of the half-thematic verbs took place in several Ukrainian dialectical regions the largest of which are Sjan, Bojk, Dniester, Western Podolia, Eastern Hucul, Bukovyna and Pokutitya; the process can be dated to the early 17th century. The absence of mutation in sequences *dj in the same environment is also present in the Ukrainian dialects, namely in Central and West Polissia, Northern Slobоžаnsьyna and the whole South-Eastern Ukraine; however the chronology of this change is obscure having possibly taken place either in the mid-18th or the mid-19th century. It doubtful however that the such elements in Grammatiki, even if we allow for the sake of argument that forms bdju, slezu, etc. were present in the Ukrainian vernacular at that time, are representative of the living language. As the sole purpose of Grammatiki was to codify and standardise the usage of Church Slavonic, a conscious decision to include non-literary elements seems very much at odds with Smotryc’kyj’s undertaking. In all likelihood Smotryc’kyj
The 1st per. pl. desinence in -мы is associated only with the athematic verbs in the 1629 Oktoikh. This ending is attested in OCS manuscripts, e.g. вьломы in Codex Zorgaphensis, ξτολόμοι in Codex Marianus, and in CES manuscripts dating from the 11th century the same ending is sporadically present in both thematic and athematic verbs. Already by the end of the 14th century, -мы is well established in the role of the 1st per. pl. desinence amongst the athematic verbs; its presence in the thematic verbs in the 12th–14th centuries is noted but to a much lesser extent (Ivanov 1982: 39, 43, 58–59). The same distribution can be observed in Grammatiki (1619) where the endings -емь/-имь are associated with the thematic verbs, whilst -мы is reserved for the athematic class (for paradigms see, О/1v; Т/2r, 6v, 8v; Û/7r). The form эстомы (2f:2) is a pure Polonism (jestesmy) and occurs once in the Preface to the Oktoikh.

It is, however, more difficult to interpret the exact status of desinences in the 3rd per. sg. and pl. with respect to Church Slavonic. The desinence -ть is undoubtedly the preferred norm in the 1629 Oktoikh as only two thematic verbs have -ть, namely всполютъ (4v:13) and беровъестовъ (19v:20); even among the athematic verbs there seems to be a stronger preference for the unpalatalised t.

The standard OCS ending in the 3rd per. sg. and pl. is -тъ, although the zero ending in various verbal classes, as well as -тъ (more often than not attested in athematic verbs), is also sporadically encountered. In CES, on the other hand, the standard ending was the etymologically justified -тъ < *тъ, which was accepted at least in the early ESI ChSI as the literary norm. Therefore, the verbal forms in -тъ, encountered in early CES texts of various genres, are in all likelihood Old Church Slavonicisms. From the 13th century, however, the number of forms with an unpalatalised t in CES steadily increased, becoming especially prevalent from the end of the 13th and throughout the 14th century. Since these occurred in such everyday writings as gramoty it is no longer possible to ascribe their presence to the South Slavonic influence; rather, the change in spelling must reflect the phonologic reality of everyday speech. The desinence -тъ is characteristic of 15th–16th century manuscripts of Central and Northern Russian origin, and it is almost the only desinence present in those dating from the 17th century (Filin 2006: 438–449; Ivanov 1982: 35–67). Pugh’s (1996: 258–259) analysis of Smotryc’kyj, Berynda and Vyšenskyj’s language reveals that the unpalatalised variant is the norm where the palatalised ending is emblematic of athematic

includes these elements as normative alternatives in the belief they are ChSI (unmutated forms of this kind are attested in Bulgarian texts from the 13th century) (Shevelov 1979: 504, 735–736).

1 For discussion on the zero ending in U, R and Br see Filin (2006: 438–449).
verbs only.\footnote{In Grammatiki (1619: 0/2–2, T/6) the same divide is present: palatalised endings are solely found in athematic verbs whereas thematic verbs of both conjugations have the unpalatalised -т.} He concludes furthermore that although palatalised endings are attested in URu and BrRu, on the basis of evidence provided by these three writers, the ending -тъ appears to be a natural alternative amongst others rather than an archaising feature.

Bearing all this in mind, how should the data regarding the 3rd per. sg./pl. desinences from the 1629 be interpreted? It is possible to see the unpalatalised endings of both thematic and athematic verbs as a direct reflection and continuation of the OCS tradition; but given the fact that the 1629 Oktoikh has Ruthenian origins, it is also possible to assume that -тъ simply reflects the Ruthenian norm. The palatalised endings may be seen as an archaising feature reflecting an older CES usage, especially the forms of the verb быть since the desinence -тъ is seldom used either by Smotryč’kyj, Berynda or Vyšenskyj’s, in whose writings -тъ predominates, and as such is marked as the literary alternative in relation to the unpalatalised desinence.

In contemporary East Slavonic languages there is the following distribution:\footnote{The distribution of various endings in the dialects of all three languages is rather complex and will not be discussed here (see Filin (2006) for further discussion on the distribution of 3rd per. endings in the dialects: for Russian 438–440, for Belarusian 440–442, for Ukranian 442).}

1. In Russian, the desinence in the 3rd per. is -т for all verbal classes in the sg. as well the pl. with the exception of a handful of athematic verbs in which the palatalised -тъ is preserved, i.e. est’, (bog) vest’, nevest’ čto, sut’.
2. In Belarusian, the opposition -c’ (< -t’) ~ -т is not present. Here the choice between a zero ending and -c’ in the sg. is dependent on the type of conjugation to which the verb belongs – the zero ending is present in the 1st conjugation whereas -c’ predominates in the 2nd; only -c’ is present in the pl.
3. In Ukrainian, the distribution is similar to that in Belarusian: the zero ending predominates in the singular of verbal forms belonging to the 1st conjugation, whereas in the pl. of both conjugations and the singular of the 2nd the desinence -тъ is present.

\section*{4.2 The Imperative}

The CES imperative forms, which were initially identical to those of OCS, had undergone a series of changes by the 17th century.\footnote{For changes in imperative forms see Belousov (1982: 132–153) for CES and Russian, and Pugh (1996: 267–269) for Ruthenian and CMU/CMBr).} In the 1629 Oktoikh, however, virtually all forms conform to the OCS conjugation pattern. The 2nd per. sg. forms are preponderant – these represent 160 of the 232 imperative forms attested altogether.
The imperative forms in both CES and OCS were formed on the basis of the present tense stem to which the Indo-European optative *-oi- (which passed to the Slavonic -i or -ě) and the personal endings (the o-ending in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} per. sg., -mь in the 1\textsuperscript{st} per. and -тe in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} per. pl.) were added. The suffix -i is present in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} per. sg. of verbal Classes I–IV including the two athematic verbs byti and imēti; the remaining athematic verbs, i.e. dati, ēsti, vēdēti, use the suffix -iь- in the formation of singular forms. This suffix is also present in the pl. forms of Classes III–V with the exception of the verb byti where the ending -ē- is used. The ending -ē- is furthermore used in plural forms of Classes I and II. Common to both OCS and CES is the analogical substitution of -ē- for the expected -i-, in verbs belonging to Class III (Lunt 2001: 98–99; Schmalstieg 1982: 107–108).

The imperative endings attested in the 1629 Oktoikh are presented in Table II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II: Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes I, II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the imperative forms in Table II are identical to those in OCS with the exception of видкте (29:\textsuperscript{v}:12). This form might reflect the trend prevalent in early Ruthenian whereby the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. endings of Classes III and IV, that is -im-, -ite, were replaced with those from I and II, that is -ēm-, -ēte (Kernyckyj 1967: 248, 250). Alternatively, this is an isolated spelling it may simply be a retardative misspelling under the influence of the preceding
imperative’s suffix -े: प्रि/आौ ते and क्षां ते ना जे लेका गा। In addition all plural forms of Class III verbs have the original endings -नान्य, -नंते/-न्ते.

4.3 The three past tenses: imperfect, aorist and perfect

A common trait in all three East Slavonic languages concerns the development of the past tense system where the imperfect and aorist were ousted and at a relatively early stage supplanted by the elliptic perfect. Already by the 14th century the perfect tense in CES had lost its original meaning, that of an action begun in the past but pertinent at the moment of utterance, and become the sole means of expressing any past action. The fact that both the perfect and the aorist may be used indiscriminately to encode a past action testifies to this development (Ivanov 1982: 97–107; Uspenskij 2002: 215–220). On the other hand, the difference between the aorist and imperfect in Church Slavonic contexts is reanalysed in aspectual terms: if the aorist may be freely interchangeable with the perfect forms of the type javib esi, the imperfect is seen as its counterpart alternating with the perfect forms of the type javljab esi. Thus there are now two different means through which aspectual difference may be expressed: the perf. aspect can be encoded either by the aorist or perfect forms of the type javib esi, whereas the imperf. by the imperfect or perfect forms of the type javljab esi. The presence of such doublets gave rise to mutual contamination – a phenomenon that is well attested in Church Slavonic grammars from the 16th century. In these works perfect forms may intrude in the 2nd and/or 3rd per. sg. of the aorist and imperfect paradigms, and there may be a complete absence of differentiation between aorist and imperfect as their 3rd per. pl. forms are presented as normative alternatives in either of the respective paradigms (Remneva 2003: 183–186; Uspenskij 2002: 225–230).

Of interest is the appearance of ‘contaminated’ paradigms in the 2nd per. sg. of imperfect and aorist tenses, the main impetus behind which seems to be rooted in desire to resolve the problem of homonymy in the 2nd and 3rd per. sg. especially since homonymous verbal forms were not present in Greek (Uspenskij 2002: 236). The same tendency is reflected in Smotryc’kyj’s grammar (1619: O/2–3’) amongst others, namely prexodjaščee: чтогъ, чеаъ/ чеад/ чеа, чте; nepredêlnoe: прочохъ, прочеъ/ чла/ чала, проче; predšedšee: чита, читаъ/ читаа/ ао, читаши; mimošedšee: читат, читалъ/ ада/ ада, читаши.

In the 1629 Oktoikh no such substitutions are present. The 2nd per. sg. aorist forms, and on a single occasion an imperfect form, are regularly used throughout the text, e.g. imperfect: Нетерпаше вако зркти (43:14); aorist: якв ражнате приат и смрть безгркише да
4.3.1 Imperfect

Of the simple past tenses comprising the early CES preterite inventory the imperfect tense was the first to disappear from the East Slavonic vernacular. Its conspicuous absence from 12th–14th century works pertaining to delavoj jazyk as well as gramoty testifies to this development. The imperfect nevertheless survives during this period and later in the written word, becoming now characteristic of the ecclesiastical-literary genre (Ivanov 1982: 79–84).

It is thus no surprise that imperfective forms are present in the 1629 Oktoikh, although significantly fewer numbers than the aorist. The imperfective is attested 25x; all forms appear contracted according to the CES pattern with the characteristic imperfective marker -а(-a-). The secondary suffix -тъ is not present in the 3rd per. With the exception of a lone 2nd per. sg. form, namely Несограше вако зрěти (43v:14), the remaining forms are 3rd per. sg. or pl., e.g. радеохаса, конохас (2x), трепт̆ах, овидиаше, проповѣд̆ах, проповѣдаше, глаз̆е, несограше, сълѧох, сказаше, излъкнашеа, поал̆х, Зраше, радѣл̆аше, глаз̆е (2x), коноше (2x). The morphonologic alternations are also preserved, e.g. ослъялашеа, плаох̆да, вооображаше, дивл̆ах, вооображах, with the exception of Несограше where the epenthetic / is not present.

4.3.2 Aorist

The number of attested aorist forms (these, as a rule, are formed on the pattern of the productive aorist) in CES manuscripts of the 11th–15th centuries is significantly greater than that of imperfective forms. Furthermore, these appear in a variety of genres, not only in texts of literary, Church Slavonic character, but in gramoty (albeit rarely), legal and administrative documents. Such evidence warrants the conclusion that the aorist vanished from the vernacular at a later stage than the imperfective and that unlike the latter it was part of the living language. However, aorist’s longevity in the written word should not be seen as reflecting its presence in the spoken language: the fact that in the manuscripts of the 12th–14th centuries one encounters examples where imperfect is used instead of aorist, where the
aorist forms do not agree in person/number with the subject of the sentence or are incorrectly formed unequivocally points to the fact that aorist had already by that time become alien to the spoken language (Ivanov 1982: 74–79, 89–92).

In the 1629 Oktoikh aorist tense is frequently used – such forms are attested more than 300x; in all instances they are formed on the pattern of the productive (see Table III below). Amongst the athematic verbs the following forms are encountered: вёк, выша, вьсть (4x), предаста, прьвьсть. In addition a lone 3rd per. du. form is attested, namely на невяке стоят ы прьсть носъ (22:5–6); the ending -стк for the expected -стъ or even -стъ may have been influenced by later SSI protographs in which this desinences is sporadically encountered with feminine and neuter nouns (Cejtlin, Večerka and Blagova 1999: 840). The same desinence for 3rd per. du. aorist forms, but only in association with feminine nouns, is codified in Grammatiki (see 1619: 0/2–3’). As expected the secondary desinence -тъ/-тъ is attested in verbs with stems in etymological nasals and -r-, e.g. прйдётъ (4’5), распачъ (5’2), нёгъ (31:5), проспётъ (43:11), прййть (49:9). The secondary ending -тъ, modelled on the corresponding SSl ending -тъ, may be seen as an artificial innovation within ESl Church Slavonic literary tradition (Uspenskij 2002: 188–189). The same desinence is codified in Grammatiki (1619: 0/2’): ‘Нёкъ гви котрёймъ прэходящаго лицъ прийлъ /тъ, изрёнъ на/ о, то кончацъ: ви ил/ или ивъ, ви гви емъвъ: и севъ сложенъ.’

Table III: Productive aorist

| Singular | 1st | -ъ | ousóvaxъ, ouvslyha, proslavi | no examples |
| 2nd | -о, -е | izvolya | | pogrevéca, voskëce |
| 3rd | -о, -е | prigvolia, darova, provétsa | | vóvedë, òwerve, voskëce |
| Plural | 1st | -(o)хомъ | svobódivxomъ, izvbávixomъ | wévrótoxomъ |
| 2nd | -(o)ste | isprosístê, oklevétsístê | vóznécostête |
| 3rd | -(o)sha | própisasha, onúmértviša | dostigósha, prívdoša |

1 The unprefixed verb byti has two aorist forms, one formed from the stem be- and the other from by-; the former is known as the imperfective aorist whilst the latter as the perfective aorist. Prefixed forms, such as prebyti, are formed only use the stem by- (Lunt 2001:108).
4.3.3 Perfect

The perfect tense was originally a compound tense comprising the present tense forms of the auxiliary verb *byti* and resultative *l*-participle, which expressed an action that took place in the past but whose consequences were still pertinent at the moment of utterance (Lunt 2001: 113). In the CES manuscripts from the 11th–12th as well as 13th–14th centuries perfects with the auxiliary verb are rarely attested; on the other hand elliptic forms are preponderant in texts from the same periods regardless of their genre. In the later period the presence of the auxiliary verb is probably nothing more than obsequiousness to tradition as the perfect no longer carried its original meaning, that of resultative action; rather the participle itself begins to act as a verbal form expressing past actions in general (Ivanov 1982: 92–95, 97–107).

In ChSl texts, at least early ones, the presence of the auxiliary verb was obligatory and its absence was an overt deviation from the ChSl standard. Nonetheless, elliptic forms in the 3rd per. sg. are indeed attested in *Codex Supraslensis* and several ChSl manuscripts of ESl provenance such as *Izbornik 1037* and *The Pandects of Antiochus*. In the following the elliptic forms become codified in various Church Slavonic grammars, amongst them in *Grammatiki* (1619) (see 2nd per. sg. in aorist and imperfect paradigms 0/2f–3f), as normative forms (Uspenskij 2002: 247–249).

In the 1629 Oktoikh the perfect always occurs in its original analytic form, e.g. родила еси, пребыла еси, кончилась еси, отвердился еси, состаилась еси, создала еси, удвоила еси, избавила ны есть, воскресенье есть, опенков есть, родила есть, with the exception of a lone elliptic form in Хе вдалихъ питъ чади впростель, прегрённымъ нымъ виначь есть, опенковъ страненъ питъ свою кровью (16в:9–11).

### 4.4 Past and Present Participles

#### 4.4.1 Past and Present Passive Participles

In the Kievan Oktoikh past passive participles are formed with the following passive formants: *-n/-nn- (-n- + adjectival suffix -un-)* is present in verbs whose stem ends in a vowel but *-en/-enn-* if the stem ends in a consonant, the formant *-t-* is used with the verbs пёти, итверсти, покрести, e.g. итверсты (25в:8), итверсты (45в:1), покрести (45в:17–18). The distribution of these formants does not differ from that in OCS (Lunt 2001: 110–111).
In the 1629 Oktoikh both long and short forms are attested but the former are more common:


The formant -(e)n- deserves further comment as p.p.p. in the 1629 Oktoikh may be spelt with either single or double n. The ‘double n’ was an innovation idiosyncratic to Church Slavonic literary tradition that in all likelihood harks back to OCS where such forms are sporadically attested, e.g. повелкывать in Savvina Kniga; неизлагалень, неисписаны, осужденьи in Sinajskij Trebnik (Sobolevskij 2005: 262); similar forms are also attested in Church Slavonic texts of ES1 origin (for examples see, Sobolevskij 2005: 262–263). In contrast to Ruthenian, where -(e)n- forms were preponderant and stylistically unmarked, and subsequently only those survived in CSU and CSBr (Pugh 1996: 273–276), the evidence of Russian texts from 14th–18th centuries suggests that -(e)nn- forms gradually lose their markedly literary character and become the established orthographic norm where the -(e)nn-formant is used in long whilst -(e)n- is used in short participle forms (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 380–381).

In Smotryc’kyj (1619: Β/2–2γ), however, the opposition -(e)n- : -(e)nn- is exploited for different purposes, namely to separate participles proper from adjectivalised participles respectively: ‘именем на чистый/ный, кочаицеля приличны быти два ни: цвк, стравний / смёркенный / истинный /закленный / укзанный и пр; причастейже едино; цвк, читанный / смёркенный / чтенный / укзанный / видения: и пр’. The same practice is observed in the 1629 Oktoikh with only a handful of exceptions: of approximately 70 adjectivalised participles attested only nine have the -(e)n- suffix, e.g. нерожденный (6:5), удивителну (16:18), прелей (19:9), непроданный (25:6), созданы (38:12), сотворены (40:1–2), осужденого (44:1), расточенны (46:3–4), сваданных (42:11); with regard to participles proper only four
out of 28 attested use the formant -(e)nn, e.g. постаялённымъ (13v:6), запечатлённая (31v:11), обложенна (43v:18), насаждённо (46v:5).

In OCS, past passive participles were, as a rule, formed from perfective verbs, those from imperfectives occurring rarely; similarly, in the 1629 Oktoikh an overwhelming majority of p.p.p. is perfective (see examples of short and long forms above) although imperfective forms are also attested. It should be taken into account that such imperfective passives only have attributive function or act as substantivised adjectives, e.g. в земле бы́лъ тёмный и тёпл (


In the 1629 Oktoikh, present passive participles are attested 64x and have the following suffixes: -овъ, -овъ and -имъ. In OCS the formant -имъ is used with half-thematic verbs, -овъ with verbs of Classes I and II, and -овъ with Class III verbs (Lunt 2001: 99–100). The same distribution of suffixes is found in the 1629 Oktoikh, e.g. славимый, возносимый, незаходимаго, некопьола, живома, распинаемый, сказанное, омерщинемый, сооображаема, непомянуты; the exception is Class III verb простира́ться which has -имъ instead of -овъ, viz. простира́ться (50v:15). Of athematic verbs, only two forms are encountered Въдомо въди and неждованого.

The participle forms may be either short or long, and are for the most part formed from impf. verbs (see examples above) although instances with perf. verbs as well those of both perf. and imperf. aspect are also attested, e.g. невидимый (perf./imperf.), среди́ (perf./imperf.), порсга́ем (perf./imperf.), неисполнимъ (perf.), несподви́м (perf.). A relatively large number of present passive participles from perf. verbs is attested in texts of ESl origin; these are by and large derived from prefixed verbs and have completely lost their verbal character (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 369). Furthermore the participles occur either in their proper verbal role or have an attributive function, e.g. на хрё́щёвскомъ престолъ несмый всамь цъ́й, и воокряемъ твою жизнь всёмъ вселье прь́л (10v:6–8), лиши ослёни невечерени свя́сти, твоими а́дами Бихе … озра́емы выжали (35v:11), но возлею сво́димъ бысть (44v:15); знаемаго си́я (14v:13), къпима же́лома (15v:10), Образъ чистаго ржества твоего, распала́емъ къпимы, яви несподви́м (23v:6–7).
Active participles, both sort and long forms, are frequently used in the 1629 Oktoikh. Their function does not have to be purely verbal as these may also be attributive or act as substantivised adjectives.

In both CES and OCS the past active participle had the suffix -ъ- to which inflectional endings were added; the short and long paradigms follow the declensional pattern of soft adjectives. The former suffix was used with verbs whose infinitive stem ends in a vowel, znati ~ znав(ъ)-, the latter with those ending in a consonant, nesti ~ нesi(ъ)-. Originally the nom. sg. masc. and neut. short and nom. sg. masc. long forms have endings in -ъ, -ь and -ъ (reflecting the underlying ə-ending). In OCS half-thematic verbs, such as voplotiti, slaviti, were regularly formed with the suffix -ъ- that was accompanied by the attendant j-palatalisation of the stem-final consonant, viz. voplotiti ~ voplot-i + -ъ- > voplot-j- + -ъ- > voploščъ-. In CES this verbal class was treated as any other verb with a stem-final vowel, using thus the suffix -ъ-.1 This suffix was also used with Class II verbs in which the sequence -nu- would be lost (Lunt 2001: 108–109; Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 294–295).

In the 1629 Oktoikh the past active participle is attested approximately 230x, e.g. тa преграждение вражды раздробивши лёръ воведе (4р:1–2), смерть сукверніє и жизнь намъ дарова падшаго адама всердна воскреси, якій чйколюбецъ- (4р:15–16), Гаврилы пропълнівшъ ти дбь же радъй са, и согласомъ вспоміна всѣхъ каякъ етнекъ стълькъ кустѣ (5р:15–17), какиса пространніыша нѣсъ, носивша здіцтва свого ва вселеневъ ѣта · слава пропълнівшемъ истеве: слава святошемъ нa (6р:1–4), произвйдже прелѣтни, ухоженовъ нaмъ (7р:8–9), изе насое радо зарябшие огна вънемевъ, и низложившемѣ древомъ прргълешниа егъ, ѣхъ бръ вожзіемъ (15р:13–15). With regard to half-thematic verbs, there is a slight preference for the older OCS variant – approximately 60 verbs are formed with -ъ- and 40 with -ъ-. Furthermore there seems to be no stylistic difference between the two forms although the suffix -ъ- is almost exclusively used with certain verbs. For example, rožd- (roditi) is attested 15x but rodiv- 1x (дбь истеве низрѣчени родиневъ, молна (9р:2–3)); voplošć- (voplošćitja) 11x but voplovit- 1x (къ же годѣствѣ родила еси, истеве вспоштѣ шиговдъ пригода (14р:10–11)).

1 Such forms are also sporadically attested in OCS manuscripts such as Codex Marianus and Codex Zographensis but are standard in Supraslensis (Lunt 2001: 109).
Present active participles are frequently used in the 1629 Oktoikh – altogether such forms have been attested approximately 240x. Present tense participles are formed on the basis of the present stem to which the derivational suffix -⁰uencia or -üq- is added, followed by inflectional endings. These, like past tense participles, are declined on the pattern of soft adjectives. The former suffix is present in Class I, II, III and V verbs, whilst the latter occurs in the half-thematics. The nom. sg. masc./neut. of verbs in stem-final consonant, Classes I and II, have the suffix -⁰uencia; Classes III and IV use -ã (Lunt 2001: 99–100). Examples include: no ancockexa ыволи ырек въсветинъ, ыниоца и гъдъца (⁰5r:8), пребъдъла ыдници, приложи малъи конъцийъ, непрестанийъ (⁰7r:13–14).

Typical examples are: ига въки хотъйнимъ, своемъ ыакъ ыъна составила есъ. ыниоца (⁰8r–⁰9r:17–1), ыто съй съй исъ изъ ыдемъ пришедъ гънецы носъ треновъ, очерекъ гънъо номъ (¹⁶r:7–9). In the liturgical text proper, only the ChSI suffix -⁰uencia/-ã is present; its CES alternative -ã/-ą is attested only once in the Preface to the text, viz. ытакъ спрать съръ тъво книжицы, ысь въ своей цъки вездъ, ыпрекъчи на ней каноны, ыъа жинаго ыхалъъ (⁰²r:5–⁰8).

Although most participle forms show agreement with the noun they qualify, a relatively small number of anomalous forms is attested, which are discussed in the remainder of this section. A number of changes affected the original CES active participle paradigm. These can be roughly divided into the following categories: (1) changes in the nom. sg. masc./neut. short forms ultimately giving rise to the formation of indeclinable participles – gerunds; (2) the presence of analogical levelling in formation of past participles from Class II verbs and those ending in the stem-final -m, -n, or -d on the pattern of verbs in stem-final vowel; (3) the presence of etymologically unjustified endings in singular and plural short forms; (4) generalisation of the oblique stem and intrusion of adjectival desinences in the long form.

1. 

Indeclinable participles. In works of CES origin apart from gerunds of the type idja and vставъ, ыедъ, forms in -i and -e are also encountered. These suffixes are not limited to gerunds associated with masc. nouns in the nom. sg. but also with those in oblique cases (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 323–351). In the 1629 Oktoikh only the gerunds in -i/-e are attested and their number is exiguous, e.g. (1) nom. sg. masc. forms with -i/-e живъетъ бо 

ъ живетъ ты пропышъ (⁰32r:5–⁰6), 

мъты пикинъ ненсъпледъ, 

съущественъ ыакъ накъ: тежъ 

канъоляция ысыръ и съй, 

ыакъ чъюолъецъ. (⁰31r–⁰32r:1⁰8–³), 

Ненсъпледъ ыдемъ 

акъ: и строцъ олъдъцы пъсть моръ, 

тыое сказать ръкъо чистъ (⁰3⁰r:1¹–1⁰³), 

мость 

ыкътный, 

ныье ыдемъ приходъцы всегда ытомъ (⁰51r:7–⁰8); (2) oblique cases in both the
2. Analogical levelling in formation of past active participles. Verbs whose stem ends in -м, -н, or -д, e.g. взял ~ взялъ, захвали ~ захвали, пасты ~ падь, start being analogically modelled on the pattern of verbs with a stem-final vowel, thus in CES texts we find взялъ, захвали, падь. Class II verbs undergo a similar development where the suffix -ню-, originally absent from participle forms, is now present (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 296, 298). In the 1629 Oktoikh, verbs of the type взялъ, захвали, пасты always show the underlying consonant that is made obscure in the infinitive, e.g. растягивался (3ў:14), приимва (4ў:10), падягло, Зачинни (12ў:14), взялишь, Падь (19ў:9) всекриемо (3ў:2), предзвишу (4ў:10). The Class II verbs, on the other hand, in all instances but one, are formed on the older pattern, e.g. ведяшаго (19ў:16), подлигса (27ў:4) but ведяшагого (15ў:15–16).

3. Presence of etymologically unjustified endings in singular and plural short forms. In the 1629 Oktoikh the nom. pl. fem. of short participles, both past and present, has the desinence -ö instead of the expected -а (in Smotryc’kyj (1619) the short participle declension has been to a certain extent fused with the long, see Φ/4–7υ). As such spellings are encountered in all examined examples, the desinence in question appears to have a normative character, e.g. мёронеса (5ў:10), заря (18ў:10), глосе (21ў:4). Рыдадым (25ў:6), плачыгса (26ў:9); восприимо (5ў:4–5), необристи (5ў:12), огледикше (5ў:13), оръаше (12ў:6), видаше (12ў:7), шедше (12ў:9). Anomalous forms of this kind were, however, a common occurrence in CES and can be explained in terms of tendency towards generalisation of inflectional participle endings on the pattern of masculine declension where -е functions as an indicator of plurality (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 313, 316).

A lone nom. pl. masc. ending in -и, instead of -е which is encountered in all other cases, is attested in the following sentence: Кровй твоё юре, оверлено пасты твоей зрачии явлёнъ · трепетъ дивляе́ са, мно́гомъ ти долгогреки́му, агъасты́ чинъ зовшье (45ў:9–12). This anomaly may be explained in terms of analogical levelling on the pattern of soft nominal declensions, such as nouns of the type комь belonging to the *jó-stem (nom. pl. кони), feminine nouns like kostь, mati, svekry whose nom. pl. also has -i (Kuz’mina and
In the plural, a single acc. masc. form in -ö is also attested, namely prödö bo natã Gd Spresso ràrazoriti egöö pötskïã lsti rùkopisanïã, i prosvêtiti simß slù (15v:11–13). The presence of this ending can be explained in terms of generalisation of e-forms as an indicator of plurality, coupled with and further supported by a general tendency in ESl language for syncretism of the nom. and the acc. case (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 358).

In the singular forms the following etymologically unjustified endings are attested: (1) -ö instead of -i in the nom. fem. appears 4x, e.g. испрошамшë (8v:2–3), имдë (8v:13, 33v:9), иерашоимшëса (13v:3), обидë (13v:2), тершë (41v:1); (2) -a for -i in the nom. sg. fem., e.g. Древле огвò кластвë бист землî, апелено очерзнишьса крпою (20v:7). The former may generally be considered in the light of the competition between desinences -ö and -i already observed in the masc. and fem. pl. forms. The latter was in all likelihood motivated by the presence of other elements with the ending -a which occur in the same sentence, i.e. КЛАСТВÊ, ЗЕМЛА. This ending may also be analysed in terms of analogical development since the preponderant ending -a is present in the nom. sg. of both nouns and adjectives (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 318–320).

4. Generalisation of the oblique stem and intrusion of adjectival desinences. The generalised oblique stem in the nom. sg. masc. of long participles, namely substitution of forms like рëкън with рëкшнн, is a phenomenon well-established in CES manuscripts (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 364). In the 1629 Oktoikh, however, all long nom. sg. masc. forms appear in their original form, e.g. ишаëй (3v:3), извёлй (3v:4), създывй (6v:8), създывй (14v:10), имьй (16v:3), Просвёцй (17v:12), извёлй (18v:5–6), извёлй (34v:13); only the long nom. sg. neut forms appear with the generalised stem, e.g. КОПААЗШСА (39v:16), ПОПОААЗШЕСА (47v:16).

In addition, the analogical levelling takes place in the nom. pl. masc. and nom. sg. fem. long forms where the original desinences -и and -а are replaced with the respective adjectival endings -ин and -аа. The latter two forms are already preponderant by the end of the 14th century (Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1982: 364). In the 1629 Oktoikh -ин and -аа are almost exclusively used in the nom. of short forms, e.g. притемнйн (25v:3), строацйн (25v:4, 47v:12), ИДАВСШС (38v:14), жинвйн (38v:1), ноаива (5v:5), освйв (8v:13); съвйв (9v:6), сëвйв (9v:6), зачина (15v:8), прёлошна (34v:9–10), рёжшна (41v:14–15). The only exception is рёжшнî (35v:2).
Chapter V: Syntax

A complete examination of the syntax of the Kievan Oktoikh is not undertaken in the following commentary; rather, the focus is primarily directed towards those syntactical features which are most characteristic of Church Slavonic, many of which are syntactical Hellenisms, or those betraying the influence of spoken, non-literary language.

5.0 Single vs. double negation

In all modern Slavonic languages negating any part of the sentence (except the predicate) requires obligatory negation of the predicate (cf. *nikto ne znaet, nikuda ne exal, ničego ne znaju* [R]; *nit(t)ko ne zna, nikuda nisam išao, nista ne znam* [SC]; *nobeden ne ve, nikamor nisem šel, nič ne vem* [S], etc.).\(^1\) Double negation is attested furthermore in the oldest extant Old Church Slavonic manuscripts: *егда никтоже неможет дѣлати, аще не би отъ бѣ́ была сѣ́ · нѣ́ могъ би творити ничеъгоже* (Mar. John 9: 4 and 33 respectively); *отъ кьма не немашь области на мнѣ́ нікоаъгже* (Sav. John 19: 11).\(^2\)

Uspenskij (2002: 319–321) observes that the attested use of single negation in Church Slavonic texts, prior to the second South Slavonic influence, is occasional in character. In other words, its use cannot be seen as reflecting the Church Slavonic norm, which was double negation, but stands out as an idiosyncratic feature of individual texts imitating the Greek original (the Greek language requires single negation in negative sentences). With the second South Slavonic influence, this syntactic Hellenism becomes firmly rooted in Church Slavonic: its usage is no longer seen as facultative but normative.\(^3\) As a result, a contrast arises between what is now perceived as a native colloquial form – double negation – on the one hand, and a literary normative expression – single negation – on the other. Smotryc’kyj (1619: 31/2–3)\(^4\) emphasises namely this point; he expressly warns against use of double negation in negative sentences, since two negative elements cancel each other, implying an affirmative sentence: ‘… И паки, Ни едмѣ́ здѣлѣ́ть твое нёсториѣ́хъ : но, Ни едмѣ́ здѣлѣ́ть твою сесториѣ́хъ … И Слава́нѣ́ во о́тъ бѣ́е́ Фрицаніе творѣ́ ожѣ́бинѣ́’.\(^5\)

---


2 In Bjørnflaten (2005a: 16, 18, 22).

3 For an opposing view, maintaining that single negation in ESl is a result of parallel development see, Borkovskij and Kuznecov (2006: 401–406).
Only a single negative sentence, with negated elements other than the predicate, is attested in the Kievan Oktoikh. Following the established norm, the negated proclitic *ne* is omitted: *и́же ника́коме подвижатса на́памъ вражи́мы* (38:15–16).

### 5.1 Genitive of exclamation

The genitive of exclamation, or the use of genitive in word groups after the interjections *o*, *ole* and *uvy* is another syntactical calque from Greek, which became preponderant in Church Slavonic as a result of the *second South Slavonic influence*. Prior to its introduction, the interjection *o* was used with two cases: either the nominative (*o duša*), which was associated with the *o* of lamentation and surprise, or the vocative case (*o duše*), which was used with the *o* of calling and exclamation. In the aftermath of the *second South Slavonic influence*, the genitive assumes the function previously ascribed to the nominative case (Jordal 1973: 149; Uspenskij 2002: 321–322). In Smotryc’kyj (1619: Щ/7) this distinction is duly observed: ‘*ѡ, сопътванїѧ : щ, оздиванїѧ : родителномъ сочинається : Іакѡ, щ мене якщальнаго чайка : щ прємдарь сѓѧдєть твєнухь ḥе *… є–ѡ, званїѧ : щ восклонїѧ : звательномъ сочинається : Іакѡ, щ Іванне : є–ѡ габвінъ богатства и прємдарости и радйма Божїѧ …’.

Different diacritical marks as well as different allographs of omega are used to distinguish between the following types: Ṛ for ‘lamentation’, Ṣ for ‘surprise’, and Č for ‘calling and exclamation’.

In the Kievan Oktoikh the interjection *o* is scarcely ever used – it is found only 9x. The *o* of surprise with the gen. case is attested 4x: Č Ṣ чєдєсєн 5:5–6, Č ɨрєкшіымъ мъкъ 13:4, ɨлнєчє ɯємъ чєдєсєн 24:15, ɯє чєдєсєн нєкаго 31:13; the *o* of calling and exclamation with the voc. case 5x: Č ɜєгєлєтєн 5:2–3, Č нєпєстєккієлъ 10:8–9, Č йєгатєсє и гєбєнєа мєдєрости єїїѧ 17:12, Č ɜєккє єєдє вєзєєзкєнєіє и нєпєєпєнєієнъ 23:11, Č Хє мої 37:17. No distinction is made between the two allographs of omega – Č and є – nor is it possible to discern a pattern in the use of diacritic marks.

On the other hand, the voc. of calling and exclamation without the interjection is prolifically used – it is attested more than 350x. It is interesting that the nom. instead of the voc. case, with this meaning, is attested 5x, as this might reflect the influence of the vernacular from which the voc. case disappeared at an early stage (for further discussion see p. XXXX): Радєєєа блєти істочинє, радєєєа лєствеє и дєєръ єєїѧ, радєєєа свєєцєинє и рєчєо зєлатлѧ и горє нєєєкомлѧ 13:12–14, Č йєгатєсє и гєбєнєа мєдєрости єїїѧ 17:12, пѹє єєдѧ всє тєвєръ 45:11, 46:10; пѹє єєдѧ всє тєвєръ 45:17.
5.2 Dative absolute

In OCS/ChSl the dative absolute construction was a common literary device that was used to render ‘a participial subordinate clause expressing various types of attendant circumstance’ is the (Lunt 200: 149). Both the subject and the participle in this construction are in the dative case. A further proviso requires that the subject of the main clause should not be identical to the subject of the relative clause; however this condition was frequently ignored. The dative absolute appears to be absent from both CES and contemporary Russian dialects (Vlasto 1988: 215–216).

There is some uncertainty regarding its origin. Uspenskij (2002: 254–255) sees it as calqued on a parallel Greek construction, in which the genitive instead of the dative case is used, but explains this difference in terms of the basic functions of the Greek genitive and the Slavonic dative, which, in his view, are almost identical. Jordal (1973: 154), on the other hand, perceives the Slavonic dative absolute as structurally further removed from the Greek genitive absolute and Latin ablative absolute than the latter two are from the Gothic dative absolute. He stops short of speculating further on their origins but suggests that the use of the dative absolute in Church Slavonic may have been motivated by the existence of the Greek genitive absolute.

In the Kievian Oktoikh the dative absolute construction occurs 8x: камени знамени въ людей, и кошоло стргъшьмь, прьтосе тъло твоё: вожкрьє ётъртъй дйн си́се (5:8–10), Гаврило провкъшшь ти дйо еже радиса, и сгласомь воплоша всѣхь въка ётъркь стъкль късотъ, какь жерчъ праведный дйдь (5:15–18), тамо еже прътовасть поставлиши, едатыся всѣка племена земля и языцы (13:5–6), Прыйде єки землида вълти приийши (30:16–17), всѣдъ бо разоришься, выше естества вса ли даръ (41:16–17), снимиже твѣкъ градыш покламалыся величалъ (46:13–14), Господь распестиша плотію и языки всѣхъ богословіюме величает та (47:8–9), рѣкъ макь намъ спашимы, прийдша оуши и оукрадша его (fol. 48:13–14).

5.3 Noun in nominative case as object of infinitive

The use of a construction in which a noun, acting as the apparent direct object of an infinitive, is found in the nom. rather than the expected acc. case, e.g. вода пiti, trava kositi, was a frequent occurrence in ESl. An overwhelming majority of these are fem. sg. nouns ending in -a/-ja. The noun in the nom. case can either precede the infinitive, or follow after it, occurring thus in the position a direct object is normally expected to occupy. Countless
instances of this syntactic phenomenon can be traced in writings dating from about the 13th up to the 18th century. It typified the Muscovite legal and administrative language, as well as the speech of North-Western Russian dialects, especially the Novgorod dialect where it still persists. It is also encountered in the modern Ukrainian and Belarusian dialects.¹ Such a turn of phrase is generally not present in literary texts pertaining to the high style, i.e. those written in Church Slavonic, nor in Central or South Russian dialects (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 2006: 418–422; Filin 2006: 476–491; Uspenskij 2002: 261; Vlasto 1988: 220–221; Schmalstieg 1995: 146–148).

Vlasto (1988: 220–221) suggests that this is ‘an elliptical construction, stating the category word first irrespective of what follows.’ He also observes that its occurrence was motivated, if not engendered, by a Finnic substratum in Novgorod, a language in which a similar syntactic phenomenon is encountered, and further reinforced by ‘the instability of declension in Northern dialects where a nom./acc. developed in *a*/*ja*-stem nouns parallel to the nom./acc. identity in all other sg. nouns’ (for further discussion see also, Timberlake (1974)).

In the Kievian Oktoikh, the construction inf. + nom. is unequivocally attested only once, namely: Ствомъ Духъ чтъ и поклоняй, славя въ Держава, также въ Достой и синовиже принести (13:8–10). In all other instances the acc. case is used: ерныша очиямъ добретъ видястать (7:10), бразами и просвети, творити воно твою ствю, багюю, верности совершению (8:3–5), славити та ... едныя надѣлахъ радою твоимъ (9:5–6), и нык напась, напастей скерпинцеръ, огъстися молнюсъ, нькъ (23:7–9), и послъ болдыки проповѣдати слава твою (26:4–5), видяти содеи, безнамию и едныя заро трислѣнчю (34:12–13).

5.4 Verb *imeti* vs. nominal sentence

Generally speaking, the transitive construction *imeti* + direct object, giving way to the nominal sentence of the type *u menja* + nom., did not become obsolete in ESL but, with time, its functions were circumscribed to certain contexts. The latter is infrequently

¹ Lomtev (1956: 83–84) writes that the construction inf. + nom. is present in the Ukrainian, Belarusian and South Russian dialects where the noun, acting as the subject of the infinitive predicate, is at the same time an object of a presupposed experiencer of the action, which can be coded in the dat. case. Thus expressions of the type ‘derevnja vidat’, in addition to ‘derevnja vidna’, can be also analysed as ‘derevnju vidat’ vsjakomi’. Unlike the phrase *voda piti*, the noun in the nom. case is not the direct object of the infinitive, nor does the latter express an action that presupposes a direct object. ‘Voda piti’ and ‘derevnja vidat’ are both regarded as instances of ‘объектное сказуемостное употребление инфинитива при именительном падеже подлежащаго’. Filin (2006: 484–485), on the other hand, is not convinced, in the light of the available material, that inf. + nom. has ever been native to the Ukrainian language. With regard to Belarusian, the examples are scarce and largely confined to the administrative language (14th–17th centuries); Filin notes that such constructions are not present in the modern Belarusian dialects.
encountered in OCS as an alternative to the dative of possession, as well as in the ChSl manuscripts, dating from the 13th and 14th centuries, where it almost invariably features in the context of family relationships. The transitive construction with *imeti*, on the other hand, remains a staple syntactic vehicle for rendering the idea of ‘having something in one’s possession’ in the ChSl texts and the high style generally (Danylenko 2006: 195–217; Vlasto 1988: 189–190).

In the Kievan Oktoikh the transitive construction with *imeti* is attested 14x; there are no instances of the nominal construction, e.g. *toa okeb imùqe vyrnoe uotverkàni*: *pòbornika imàmy* (4v:3–4), *ni bo lMaria imàmi* *posòamùca* *tboò molòmy* (7v:4–5), *Ravnostóalelùi* *soòb ãbb imùqe* (8v:13), *tewe bo imàmy* *grùmmi* *prestatelıniç* (12r:2–3), *učerelùi* *riçnoe imàly* (16r:8–9), *i mtrne dzerzovënié ënësì ìmàmi* (31v:1–2), *màti pùnimô* *nènicënaeûli*, *èçvestenû* *ãbb mailómi* (31v–32r:17–1).

5.5 Function of *kotoryj*

The form *kotoryj* originally functioned as an interrogative pronoun having the meaning ‘which of the two?’ or ‘which in a series?’, which has survived in modern Russian and Ukrainian in expressions such as *kotoryj čas?*/*kotoryj ty v klasse?* and *kotra hodina?* respectively. In CES, as well as in OCS and ChSl, it was used in the generalised sense ‘which (if any)?’, ‘whichever’; in the former the function of this pronoun eventually broadens so that it operates as a relative conjunction, a role it never assumes in either OCS or ChSl. In modern Ukrainian, in contrast to Russian, the use of this relative pronoun is rather circumscribed – it most often refers to something in particular, in addition to its previously mentioned usage in reference to a series (Pugh and Press 1999: 180–181; Vlasto 1988: 195–196).

In the Kievan Oktoikh, *kotoryj* is attested only once, in the following phrase: *Vêdomo* *vùdi koçãdôm ô* ... *nik àstëëмы црìêö *Îa jìîagà koçãdôm znàcë, vùkòtôriô ... pòtrëva na koçãdôm àçàs uòkàzëë* (2r:1–5). Here it clearly functions as a relative conjunction, which from a Church Slavonic perspective cannot be seen as reflecting anything else but vernacular usage. It is significant, however, that it occurs in the preface rather than in the liturgical text proper, where in addition to this non-literary element several others have been attested.
5.6 Expression of possession

Common to both ChSl and non-literary CES texts was the restricted use of the genitive of possession. Instead of the gen. case, possession was expressed either through possessive adjectives, a syntactic feature shared both by ChSl and CES, or through the dative of possession, this latter occurring primarily in ChSl (or CES texts strongly influenced by ChSl). The genitive of possession was used, in turn, only when the possessor was further modified by one or several qualifiers (Schmalstieg 1995: 148–149, 155–156; Uspenskij 2002: 451–458; Vlasto 1988: 213–215).

The rules governing expression of possession are also codified in Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki (1619: Š/2–3). In relation to possessive adjectives, he observes that ‘обична служба’ на Гречески діалект своєство есть/Оцишвителинъ в родителнъ полагаемъ/Прилагателна сочинена себъ немощимъ, у Прилагательне притажателъ своелъ Оцишвителинъ в родъ числъ и падежи согласуюмъ/предтворатися.’ The rule is illustrated with the following examples: ‘Начаło премьдрости страау Гдіь, влъкств страау Гдда и, Книга рѣства Еч єба: влъкств Ёа Ѵа.’ Smotryc’kyj limits the use of the genitive of possession to three particular cases. First, where the possessor is modified by other words: ‘Обич налице немь влъкст Прилагательне сочиненъ/нбда есть/ родителъ пребяти немощимъ: іаку, Гдъ Гдда пресціалошагу палменъ огна: Гдда ане Гдіь.’ Second, when a possessor and a pronoun, referring to it, occur in the same syntagma: ‘равнъ и ко послѣднимъ Вѣшественномъ/Предишагу естество притажачий родителный немощимъ хранимо быти держитъ: іаку … Кто раздѣкъ огномъ Гдіь; или кто совѣтникъ воь бысть; Гдда, ане Гдіень.’ Third, with the combination of two nouns referring to two separate things or concepts: ‘Двоя Оцишвителинъ разными вещи стеклёнце/дѣлне ихъ в родителномъ полагаемо вывати обычне: іаку, … Дѣхъ премьдрости и раздѣла: Жало смерти: Мати ѣдротъ.’

Of particular interest is the third case since it is exactly here that we expect the dative of possession, rather than the gen., to be used. Smotryc’kyj (1619: Š/3) is careful to point out elsewhere that ‘влъкстъ родительнагъ многажды дательный Оцишвителинъ Оцишвителинъ своєство сочинаетца: іаку, Гдіъ и Бяко живото лоемъ: влъкстъ/ животъ лоемъ: и, Бяко и Гдіъ сидамъ всела твари совѣтъ: влъкстъ/ симъ.’ We are left wondering why the dative of possession had fallen into disuse.

1 That is, ‘what is a usual occurrence in Church Slavonic, in contrast to the Greek dialects: a noun in the gen. case that does not combine with other adjectives is changed into a possessive adjective that agrees with the noun it modifies in gender, number and case’.
The driving force behind a series of orthographic, orthoepic and syntactic changes taking place in Church Slavonic in the 17th century, of which broadening the function of the gen. case to include possession at the expense of the dat. is but one example, was the so-called third South Slavonic influence. This entails, broadly speaking, the opening of the Great Russian literary tradition to the influence of the literary tradition of the South-Western Rus’. Its main objective was further Hellenisation, rather than archaisation, of the language; this was to be achieved through bringing the Great Russian reduction of ChSl closer to that of the South-Western, as well as by introducing a greater number of Greek calques. The third South Slavonic influence finds its most concrete expression in the linguistic reforms initiated by Patriarch Nikon in the latter part of the 17th century.\footnote{For a more detailed discussion on the origin and impact of the third South Slavonic influence, as well as the changes it engendered, see Uspenskij (2002: 411–471).}

It is thus of interest, in this context, to examine the treatment of possession in the Kievan Oktoikh, which was printed merely ten years after the publication of Smotryc’kyj’s grammar and some twenty years before Patriarch Nikon’s reforms.

The dative of possession is attested 54x, e.g. \textit{вовêк вêкмə}, \textit{пастырã овцамß}, \textit{умörtвã} \textit{бг 8ß}, \textit{наконöç вêком 6}, \textit{крêпкаã помоqниö }\textit{вêком 6}, \textit{сп8сß мirovi}, \textit{прavдê slн 8cö}, \textit{tvoröcß <ivotß hl 8komß}, \textit{potoki qödrotamß}.

Possessive constructions with the dat. case in which the possessor is accompanied by one or several qualifiers are rare – altogether twelve such instances are attested: \textit{сп8сö dw 8amß nawimß} (4:12), \textit{единù надö > дù рабом6 tvoimß} (9:6), \textit{на sîcesîe всêм ãмß пэлòcö} (22:7–8), \textit{нёным ãчмòcö }\textit{радованиë} (28:1), \textit{спîсò дüыл ìнîл6} (29:6), \textit{на сп8сòнïö vsêmß hl8kømß} (22:11–12), \textit{нёным ãчмòcö }\textit{радованиë} (28:1), \textit{изнавитель рôдё чáчëскòмò и }\textit{нэлаêинòмò жêвòтò начàлëниë} (39:3–4), \textit{элëстиëлë ... дрëвè жизнëнòмò} (43:2–3), \textit{спîcesîe всêм ãмß} (45:4–5); \textit{пëргрëкòнëемò мëнòмò разрëкòнë} (50:4). In addition, possessive constructions with the enclitic pronouns \textit{ti}, \textit{ми}, \textit{си}, which the Nikonian reforms made obsolete, are attested 29x, e.g. \textit{живòпрëйнòмò ти гровê}, \textit{тëйнòмò ли тêлò, возвесëмì ли ãа дêê}, \textit{сраçêë ìмì сá çфе, во чрèêò ти, мòлëтëвëмì сì.}

Constructions with the genitive of possession, irrespective of whether the possessor is further modified by other elements, are far more numerous than those with the dat. case, the number of instances exceeding a little over 200. Of these, the construction of the type \textit{вêк ãм ìнëх} occurs 109x, whereas the construction of the type \textit{бêë ãм ìнëх 97x}.\footnote{1 For a more detailed discussion on the origin and impact of the third South Slavonic influence, as well as the changes it engendered, see Uspenskij (2002: 411–471).}
These figures indicate that the genitive is clearly preferred to the dative of possession since one is twice as likely to come upon the former than upon the latter. Seen from a broader historical perspective, such distribution seems to reflect the language situation of the times: although at that point the dative of possession had not yet been ousted from Church Slavonic (one has to wait for twenty more years before Patriarch Nikon’s reforms came into force) its usage was clearly being slowly marginalised. It is, however, difficult to discern the reason governing the choice between the gen. or dat. case (sometimes identical expressions or those with corresponding structure may be coded by either case, e.g. 

A mixture of the gen. and dat. in the same possessive construction is attested 4x: 

Possession is also expressed through possessive adjectives, which are for the most part derived from proper names, e.g. 

5.7 Neuter plural expressing abstract nouns

In Greek, adjectives and pronouns in the neut. pl. can be used to express an abstract noun – a parallel construction is found in ChSl (Jordal 1973: 152; Uspenskij 2002: 258). The same construction is codified in Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki (1619: Å/v–2) and its presence in Church Slavonic justified on the grounds of its occurrence in Greek. Following are the examples from the Kievan Oktoikh: 

The use of neut. pl. is also attested with substantivised participles: 

5.8 Passive constructions with ot

In an overwhelming number of instances in CES, as well as in modern CSU and CSR, the agent of passive constructions is encoded by the instrumental case. In ChSl agency may be may also be expressed by the construction ò + the gen. case. Needless to say, this is another
calque modelled on the Greek prepositional construction υπο + gen (Jordal 1973: 150; Uspenskij 2002: 258). In the Kievan Oktoikh the construction with the gen. case is attested 3x (‘―’ in the first two constructions may also be interpreted as ‘from’): НАСАЖДЕНО … ТРЕБОВАТЕ ДРЕВО … ИЗОБИЦ УСТРИЧИ ОСИБРЕ РЕВРЬ ТВОИХЪ ХЕ НАПАДАЛО (46¹:5–9), ДА … ОФЭГНЕМЪ ТВОЙ СТРАСТЕЙ … ПРЕВРАШЕМЪ ИС КВТЪ ВО СВКТЪ (50¹–51¹:17–2), КАМЕЛИ ЗНАМЕНАИ ИОДЙ (5¹:8).

5.9 Substantivised participles

A frequent syntactic phenomenon in Greek is substantivisation of participles. The substantivised participle loses its verbal meaning, that is, it no longer denotes a process but a person or thing involved in the process. The verbal meaning is thus converted into a meaning characteristic of the category of noun. A parallel construction is present in Church Slavonic (Uspenskij 2002: 255).

Substantivised participles are regularly used in the Kievan Oktoikh. Following are examples from the 1629 Oktoikh: И АДАЙТЕ СЛАВЪ ВНЕМЪ ВОСКРЩЕЛЪ ИЗМЕРТВЫХЪ (3¹:2), ПАСТЬЮ ВОЛЕЮ РАССЕНШАСЯ НАСЪ РАДИ … РОССМЪ (3¹:14–16), НАШЕГО АДАЛА ВЕРОДНА ВОСКРЕС (4¹:16–17), СЛАВА ВЕСЕНИМЪ ША ЭТЪ (6¹:2–3), ДЕВО ИСТЕБЕ НЕИЗРЕЧНЬЮ РЕШИМЪСЯ, МОЛЯСЪ ОБЕЧИТИ НАША СФЪЦА (9¹:2–3), ТЫБО РОДИЛА ЕСИ НАМЪ … ЦВКТЫ ЗЕМЛЮ ОУКРАШИШАГО (22¹:7–9).

5.10 Balkanism da + indicative

Unlike the constructions already discussed in this section, the use of da + indicative in final clauses or with the exhortative meaning is not a syntactic Hellenism. Since the presence of this construction, traditionally regarded as an exclusively Balkan feature, is also attested in East Slavonic – it is encountered in modern dialects of the central Polesie region, as well as in Novgorod birch bark gramoty¹ – Uspenskij (2002: 259–260) does not perceive it as a salient literary form. However, it may be juxtaposed and contrasted with an analogous, and expressly vernacular, East Slavonic variant, namely inf. + dat. case.

¹Tolstaja (1984–1985: 783–785) observes that although da in Polesie-dialects is primarily used in coordinative constructions, da-constructions with exhortative (in combination with imperatives and in indirect speech) or purposive meaning are also present, e.g. НЕМА ДАЖДУ. ДЛЯ КИ, ДА ВУ САБИРАЙЦЕСА ДА ПАВАРУЙЦЕ КУШЫНЬ; КАЖУТЬ, ШОБ МАЗНИЦЕ, ПЕРШЕ ДИЯТ, ГРИЗ ЗУБАМИ, ДА ОНО ИЗДЕ. Zaliznjak (1986: 160–161) points out that in a number of gramoty the word dat в combination with pres. and past verbal forms (also rendered as dati or dad before by) functions as a purposive conjunction, e.g. а четъ ОМЫЯК ПРИШЛО, И ВЫ ИМЬ КЪНЕ МЫ ГОЛУБЫЙ ДАНТЕ СЪ ЛЮДМИ, ДАНЕ СЪХЪ НЕ КЛАДЕ; А НЕ ВЪЗМЕ И ВЫ ВО СТАДЪ ПЕДЬ ЛЮДМИ (NO. 142, XII/XIV).
In the Kievan Oktoikh *da* + indicative appears 39x in both purposive clauses and independent clauses expressing exhortation. With regard to the latter, the present tense form of the verb, for the most part, occurs in the 3rd per. sg./pl., although the 1st per. pl. and 2nd per. sg. forms are also attested. The following is a sample of this construction: Da чи́мваль единственно́е триси́аниное тво́е цвиши бя́тво (6т:13–14), da та боё воясче вёк (10т: 18), da багвый тварь ве́ла Гаа, и превозносить воясче вёки (11т:1–2), во дя́кь везж ви́ца воплоще́са, da дэмныя опожит (11т:4–5), da плаче́ца людие йодейстiéй ... изыщи же да веселáса и рóкаги да всплецрьї и да ко́поют (20т:11–14), da та вёд непрестаннь ве́личаёмь (23т:9–10), и нык ки извáки, нёшоньы мньшителены рóки, da та вси ийвалэлы ве́личаї (47т:11–13), etc.

Furthermore, in the preface to the 1629 Oktoikh, the conjunction *abý* + *l-*participle occurs twice: и́кь естельмь цриқьё Бга жи́наго ко́жадь знáсь, вькоторой абý мы пёних вёдч в́иравёлымь эм8; и́такь спра́ве севт тво книнчнн8, абýсь ё своёй црикь вездк, вь привьчи на ней каноны, Бга жи́наго ́хвалы́вь (2т:2–4, 5–8).

Like the conjunction *da*, which was characteristic of older texts, *daby* + *l-*participle was used at a later stage in the high style as a variant of and alternative to native conjunctions modelled on *čto*, such as *čtob/čtoby*. The orthographic variant *abý*, which is still used in CSU and CSBr, may have been influenced by or directly borrowed from Polish, *aby*.

The presence of personal endings based on the present tense forms of the auxiliary verb ‘to be’ in *l-*participles is a Ruthenian feature, i.e. *абысь ... хвалы́вь, бысь ... постёнихсль* (2т:8–10). These endings, as the examples demonstrate, are frequently detached from the main verb and appended to other elements in the sentence such as pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions (Pugh 1996: 260–263).

**5.11 Construction еже + infinitive**

The use of the neut. sg. anaphoric pronoun *еже* in combination with the infinitive is frequently encountered in ChSl texts. The pronoun may be seen as having the function of a generalised article, potentially designating any gender. Since a parallel construction is found in Greek where the addition of the article ‘ро’ in neut. sg. to an infinitive results in consequent nominalisation of the verb, some scholars consider the ChSl *еже* + inf. as an instance of a syntactic Hellenism. Uspenskij (2002: 258) cites the following example:
It is interesting that Potebnja (1958: 348 cited in Jordal 1973: 156) uses the same example only to reach a diametrically opposed conclusion, namely that εκείνο + inf is not calqued on the corresponding Greek expression, since εκείνο, in the ChSI construction, functions neither as an article, as it does in Greek, nor as an anaphoric pronoun, but as a conjunction similar to the modern conjunction ēto. The phrase ἢ εὐωνυμων οὐκ ἐστιν ημον δουναι is not analysed as a nominalised verb but a pure verbal form a ēto sest'.

This construction is also present in the 1629 Oktoikh where it is attested 4x: 
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combination with verbs ‘εἰμί’ and ‘ὑπονοοῦμαι’ appeared in the nom case. In the 1629 Oktoikh there is a clear preference for the nom. case, possibly owing to its Greek origin: 

1 On the basis of evidence provided by CES manuscripts, the choice between the predicative instrumental and the predicative nominative seems to be motivated by semantic distinction: the former denotes a transient characteristic, whereas the latter a permanent one (Schmalstieg 1995: 168).

2 It is interesting to note that the verbs ‘родить’ and ‘назвать,’ take the instr. case on two separate occasions: дёво во родила еси (5:16–17) and и назвали дёво раздана (7:14) (cf. тако и дея родила есть (30:1) and тао цвика Небо и црни (4:17–18)).

3 E.g. ‘а ныне слышно боленому естество’ (garmota no. 705, beginning of the 13th century) and ‘рекъ былъ в свой селъ верши вск добры’ (gramota no. 195, beginning of the 14th century) (Zaliznjak 1995: 139); дёлаете с ними коего црл поставлять (1 Nov. let., 133); поставляю много ныне и ретвь обладающа нами (Lavr. let., 78); хорш помати дичь твою севк женъ (1 Pskov. Let., 177), etc. (Sprinčak 1960: 182–183).
5.13 Genitive of negation

A truly pan-Slavonic trait is the use of genitive of negation, attested in OCS, ChSl and CES texts. It involves ‘a transitive verb that normally takes an accusative direct object, [which] when the verb is negated (or is subordinate to a negated verb) … is [found] in the genitive’ (Lunt 2001: 164). The presence of a lexical item in the acc., functioning as the direct object of a negated verb in ChSl texts, may be ascribed to Greek influence (Jordal 1973: 149).

In the Kievan Oktoikh, negated transitive verbs are generally followed by a direct object in the gen., with the exception of negated imperatives where the nom. case is used. The negated object is found in the following instances: Жены … необъятное прьчаго твяго (5v:10–12), сохраний ма совлады, да не огнь мене опалить гръховный (12v: 14–16), ¹ евреине … твояя власти невьдаще (30v–31v:17–1), и нксть ста паче твье гьм (32v:7), неоскдйть, твые любящыхь (35v:4), ² непредадъ сйже сэвоаго раба (38v:8), ³ Всезакониий роисъ своиыхь : да непрострьт бжтвенй животиийь : не дасть бо Хе же жезла, нажрений сэовь (38v–38v:17–2), Мёрзокъ же непроповѣдь ядинааго дбьлы сбйа (44v:17–18), ⁴ почтъ бо камень несохранн камене жизни (47v:12–13). Examples with the acc. case include: мѣты своиыхь рать ботовые цркии приносимыя непрезри (5v:3–4), прошеныя вѣрно просачиющи вспятаал непрезри (17v:7–8), непрезри молад нашв (33v:13), непрезри стадо свое (35v:1–2), не прелбное ти, и бжтвенное естество не измѣнивъ (36v:4–5), заповѣдь твюо непослѣшеше (38v:16), Иже земныя сладости невозлюбше (51v:17–18), ⁵ etc.

¹ This example is admittedly ambiguous as the gen. and acc. forms of ‘дзь’ are identical.
² This example is ambiguous as the form ‘любящихь’ may be in the gen.-acc.
³ See footnote 2.
⁴ See footnote 2.
⁵ It is possible to interpret ‘земныя сладости’ as gen. sg. fem. although acc. pl. fem. seems more likely.
5.14 Word order

5.14.1 Position of copula

Enclitics in Indo-European, according to the so-called Wackernagel’s Law, tend to occupy second position in a sentence, following immediately after the first accentual unit\(^1\) in that sentence. The enclitics in CES – such as the particles же, ли, бо, the verbal form бы, or the pronoun forms мы, ты, се, ехь, ты, са – generally behave in accordance with the above rule.

Evidence provided by the Novgorod birch bark *gramoty* indicates that present tense forms of the verb *быть*, with the copular function, also tend to occupy the position immediately after the first accentual unit, the fact which, in Zaliznjak’s opinion, confirms that the copula, i.e. *есмь*, *ести*, *есть*, *евхъ*, *еста*, in this particular dialectical system was indeed an enclitic. The exception here are the sentences that begin with a direct request, господине, Ивану еси молвилъ, or where two or more accentual units are placed at the start of the sentence, а боле того не виновть есмь никому ничымь (Janin and Zaliznjak 1986: 154–157).

In ChSl manuscripts, however, the second-place rule is frequently violated: whilst one generally adheres to it when the required word order is of the type *далъ есмь*, *единъ еси*, the same word order is also observed when the copula should be brought forward. For the purposes of illustration, Zaliznjak (1986: 158) provides data from the *Uspenskij sbornik*. The analysis of the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) per. sg. shows that when the rule demands a word order of the type *далъ есмь*, it is observed in 46 out of 48 cases, whereas in only 50% of cases is the copula brought forward. These findings suggest that the word order *далъ есмь* is preferred, irrespective of whether it is sanctioned or not.

The dichotomy thus established between literary and non-literary placement of the copula was most probably engendered by differences in rhythm and stress. Whereas in CES the copula operated as an enclitic, in ChSl, which is a language independent from and weakly susceptible to vernacular influence, this function was seen as facultative, allowing for a greater freedom of placement of copula within a sentence.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) An accentual unit usually comprises an autosemantic word that may be preceded by one or more proclitics and/or optionally followed by one or more enclitics.

\(^2\) Zaliznjak (1986: 154–155, 158) further observes that when forms of the verb *быть* (especially 3\(^{rd}\) per. sg. form *естъ*) carry the meaning ‘to exist, be’, they function as autosemantic words free to occupy any position in the sentence. The literary language had, therefore, used already existing accentual variants of *быть* and expanded their usage to a new area, namely to enclitic verbal forms. Copulas with such a meaning will not be analysed in this study.
In the Kievan Oktoikh the present tense forms of the verb бъти, in the 2nd and 3rd per. sg. are attested app. 120x – the word order of the type далъ есмь is observed in every single instance, even when the copula should have been brought forward, e.g. дѣбъ бо родила еси (5⁴:17), рѣць распрострѣлъ еси на крѣтъ (13⁵:4). Оумерившіе прійддъ еси мене ради (13⁵:7), распатаѣмъ же возвѣдѣнъ мѣ еси (14⁵:16–17), Ты разорилъ еси сокрѣшѣнннъ хѣ (21⁵:12), тыко родила еси ёдина (37⁵:6).

5.14.2 Position of attributive adjectives

A large number of linguistic studies have been dedicated to a highly problematic question concerning the original position of attributive adjectives, both ‘short’ and ‘long’, in CES. Although a complete description, taking into account all perspectives on this subject, lies beyond the remit of this investigation, of particular interest are findings obtained by Maria Widnäs (cited in Jordal 1973: 151–152). The examined linguistic material was sorted into two groups: on one side, the texts belonging to the CES literary tradition (legal codices and the works of Vladimir Monomakh) and, on the other, those classified as Church Slavonic. In the former, the preposition of adjectives was generally preferred, in contrast with the latter, where postposition normally occurred. There can be little doubt that postposited adjectives were adopted into ChSl from Koiné Greek, in which the same order is observed (Classical Greek requiring preposition of adjectives). Once introduced into ChSl, postposition remains one of its staple syntactic traits.

In the Kievan Oktoikh, postposition of one or several attributive adjectives, modifying the same noun, is attested 260x, whereas preposition, contrary to what is expected, is more frequent, occurring 387x. It is difficult to see what, if any, semantic difference there is between postposited and preposited adjectives. It has been observed that the possessive adjectives вожнї and господїны are always postposited, e.g. вожнї вїйї, людї вїйї, слово вїйї, атръ вїйї, водаоры гїїї, словеса гїїї. Where two nouns in the same syntagma, modified by one or several attributive adjectives, stand in close proximity to or follow after each other, if the set of adjectives associated with the first noun is postposited, there is a strong tendency for the second set of adjectives to be preposited, and vice versa, e.g. слово же совѣзначаное, соеественный сїє (6⁶:6–7), единогв вїїї вдѣтриостовавшїї, покланаемса крны (7¹:1–2), Трцѣ вседѣтельна, и пребытъ единице (7¹:13), помысли гда непотрѣбныѧ своя рады, трцѣ пребытъ (9⁵:14–16). Просвѣтъ вриначальный свїтъ, поощралъ твои свїтъ трислѣпчивый (10⁵:1–2), далъ еси най рабой твоимъ трислѣпчѣ и единомнѣчное всѣйне Бїїї, врѣтвы
5.15 Forms of verb ‘byti’ with present active participle

Emblematic of ChSl texts is the use of ‘continuous tenses’ where the verb byti is combined with a pers. part. act. Such constructions were directly calqued on a corresponding Greek analytic periphrastic construction (Uspenskij 2002: 256; Vlasto 1988: 173).

In the 1629 Oktoikh only one such form is attested: Øbýdö nasß poslêdnãã bözdna, nêS Tizbavlããi, v6mên ixom6sã āko ovca nazakolönïö (18r:5–7).

5.16 Relative vs. demonstrative pronouns

A possible syntactic Hellenism and one typical of ChSl texts is the use of relative anaphoric pronouns, namely iñe, eñe, iñe, in a sentence-initial position, instead of the demonstrative pronouns tß, sì, and similar. The same construction is frequently attested in the 1629 Oktoikh: iñe áñułowéiñ yñtêwnýmã dîw8 lì mî bîlwignë, I ëûrëñign ñêçînaxh ñùñçu (13r:8–10), ññu tì dostojñsîñ pëcîñ, nâce prïñsîñ nêlwignë, tëñçîñ pëcîñ ràdë”ññù (14r: 15–16). The mixed formulae, where a noun is modified by both postposited and preposited adjectives, are also attested, albeit infrequently (17x): padâna adama vêròana vòskrësi (4r:16–17), mirôdarñyã pòstiðá aðçã i spësènnù (33r–34r:17–1), ýëdiñôchãññâ Tríçë cëllá (34r:10), ÿtëmîñëmë çraçt ðàovù (44r:6–7), etc.
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6.0 Phonology, morphology and syntax

The analysis of the language of the 1629 Oktoikh, that is, of the liturgical text proper, does not on the whole reveal any radical departures from the ESI ChSi standard, be it in the field of phonology, morphology or syntax.

With regard to phonology, a set of common ESI ChSi features, which are shared by OCS, is also characteristic of the 1629 Oktoikh: (1) metathetic forms; (2) presence of the results of the second palatalisation of velars; (3) absence of the epenthetic l in lexemes blagosloven- and preproslaven-; (4) SSI reflexes of the sequences *tj and *dj, i.e. šč and žd respectively (with a strong penchant for žd over ž); (5) presence of (j)e- and ju- word-initially for the ESI o- and u-; (6) absence of simplification of consonant clusters in l-participles; (7) preservation of i before j in neut. nouns of the type raspjatje, and in the instr. sg. desinence -iju in fem. *i-stem nouns, strastiju.

In addition to these, a number of ESI features deemed as normative, at least at some stage, in the ESI redaction of ChSi is also attested: (1) ecclesiastical pronunciation of the jers as [o] and [e] in the prepositions vo, so, ko, in the suffixes -ìstv- and -ìsk-, and in the lexemes upovati and prödotöha; (2) ecclesiastical pronunciation and spelling of reflexes of the sequences *CǔRC and *CǐRC as CъRC > CoRC and CьRC > CeRC (where the jers were in the strong position); (3) spelling of reflexes of the sequence *CerC as CreC, lexemes such as têlösö as tölösö, the suffix -êlì as -ölì; (4) presence of the ‘new ŏ’; (5) pronunciation of o as ô; (6) presence of the formant -án- in formation of denominal adjectives.

The same adherence to standard forms is present in nominal morphology. Virtually all substantival, adjectival and pronominal desinences are not only Church Slavonic but in an overwhelming majority of instances also historically justified. Anomalous examples are rare when compared with the apparent standard in the 1629 Oktoikh. The most common departures from historically expected forms show conflation of different stems, some of which can be listed here: (1) intrusion of *ǔ-stem desinences in both the sg. and pl. of the *ǭ-stem, e.g. -evi/-ovi in the dat. sg., -ove in the nom. pl., -ov in the gen. pl., -mi in the instr. pl. (also present in the *jǭ-stem); (2) intrusion of *ǭ-stem desinences in the sg. and pl. paradigms of the *ǔ- and *s-stems; (iii) presence of *i-stem endings in the *jǭ-stem
declensions, e.g. -ie in the nom. pl. masc.; (iv) intrusion of *i-stem endings in the consonantal declension especially in the gen./loc. sg. where -i is attested for the expected -e; (v) influence of the *ō-/jō-stems on the paradigm of *i-stem, especially in connexion with the lexemes gospod’, zver’ and ogn’. In adjectives, there was a tendency towards nom./acc. syncretism as well as the presence of the neut. pl. desinence -aja for the expected fem./masc. pl. in -yja. Furthermore, there was a lack of agreement between adjectives and the nouns these qualify in the dual and comparative degree of adjectives. These deviations, most of which had been engendered by changes that had already taken place either during the Proto-Slavonic or early CES period, should not be seen as expressly vernacular. Just as the selection, at times arbitrary in nature, of codified desinences in Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki shows a particular blend of these changes, which for Smotryc’kyj represent the final, unadulterated version of Church Slavonic, any pre-Nikonian Church Slavonic text is likely to exhibit a different combination of its preferred flexions (see for example Bulić’s (1893) comparison of three RChSl texts, namely Ostrožskaja biblija (1581), Pervoćečatnaja Moskovskaja biblija (1663) and Novaja biblija based on the 1751 and 1756 editions of Elizavetinskaja biblija). Thus, it is not the presence of anomalous elements but a conspicuous absence of marked vernacular features that is characteristic of the 1629 Oktoikh: the so-called ‘second’ genitive and locative in -u/-ju, the personal pronoun dat./loc. sg. forms sobě, tobě, the adjectival endings -ogo in the gen. sg. masc./neut., -oi/-ei in the dat./loc. sg. fem., amongst others, are never used in the liturgical text proper.

Verbal morphology is similarly characterised by conservatism: (1) the infinitive marker is always -ti as is the 2nd per. sg. ending -ši in present tense forms (no instances of infinitives in -t’ or present tense forms in -š were attested); (2) the imperative desinences for the sg. and pl. are identical to those in OCS; (3) the text abounds in past tense verbal forms long lost from the vernacular such as the aorist and the analytic perfect (the imperfect, with the characteristic CES imperfective marker -ã-, is also present, although it occurs much less frequently than the aorist); (4) the nom. sg. masc./neut. desinence in present active participles is always -y rather than the CES -a; (5) the nom. sg. masc./neut. active participle forms retain their o-ending rather than being supplanted by a generalised forms modelled on the oblique cases.

Syntax in the 1629 Oktoikh is characterised by a number of common ESI Church Slavonic constructions, some of which were introduced into the language under the influence of corresponding Greek syntactic expressions. The most notable of these include: (1) single instead of the characteristic Slavonic double negation; (2) genitive of
exclamation; (3) presence of dative absolute constructions to express various types of attendant circumstance; (4) use of the dative case to express the relation of possession; (5) construction ‘da + indicative’; (6) constructions of the type ‘eže + infinitive’; (7) presence of the predicative nominative with past tense forms of the verb byti as well as the double accusative with transitive verbs; (8) word order of the type daš estь; (9) on a single occasion, a syntactic construction with a present active participle with the verb byti.

Although the text is not entirely free of vernacular influence, non-literary elements occur rarely and are for the most part confined to phonological phenomena: (1) absence of the second palatalisation of velars is attested once in na něvgț; (2) spelling of stressed and unstressed ũ as ę in the following six lexemes nědělъ, vnedělъ, povědětelъda, veleně, poveleně, něvijěně; (3) the reverse phenomenon of spelling ę for ũ in the lexeme cěkrěnkopušćio; (4) presence of fronting e > i in cěkrěnkopušćio; (5) possibly the influence of adjectival declension on the totalising pronoun ves’ bej, vsimъ; (6) dispalatalisation of r’, e.g. tvarъ (8x), Mтъrъ (2x), ĕveškër (1x), nшетокрылатъtъ, огътризенъemъ; (7) a lone example of the ‘new a’ or possibly akan’e in the adjective gŭšanučâmmisio; (8) a single instance of syncope in the adverb саловласно; (9) a single instance of mutation ‘a > e’ in the word плaценицею; (10) substitution of the 2nd pl. imperative desinence -ite with -ěte in вида̀те; (11) use of the nominative for the vocative case is observed 5x, namely Радâšica бâti источниче, радâšica лâствице и аверъ нёналъ, радâšica сеќцниниче и ръчко залтаа и геро несъкомла, сӰ богостък и га̀бина мъдрости ђкъла, пой гда вса тваръ (2x), пой гда вса тваръ; (12) presence of the noun in the nominative case as a direct object of the infinitive, namely гûмомъ Дълъ ђътъ и покламаниє, сла̀ба и держа̀ва, какиже єдъ достой и синоніже приносити.

With regard to the two short introductory texts, the second, beginning with ‘Вдâово бъди’, deserves a special comment. As a foreword intended for the lay readership, it is characterised by a number of expressly non-literary features, all of which occur within no more than fifteen lines. Some of these may be seen as generally ESI such as the absence of i in the instr. sg. desinence -iju, namely цркъо, the use of the reflexive personal pronoun сеобръ, the presence of the indeclinable participle ūпранђени with the ESI reflex of the sequence *tj > ė, the use of the gen. sg. desinence -u in the lexeme стакаго поча̀ткъ, or the adverb зачѝмъ (cf. R зачемъ, U (dial.) зацимъ). Others have a specifically Ruthenian flavour such as the absence of the word-initial *jъ in the preposition iz, viz. зна̀сь, or the tendency for the personal endings, here -sъ, not to be appended to the main verb but to some other element in the sentence, such as a pronoun, adverb or conjunction, such as єдъ … постъплиъ, єдъ …
6.1 Great Russian or South-Western redaction of Church Slavonic?

The presence of Ruthenian features in the foreword, as well as other Ukrainian/Belarusian characteristics, whether or not deemed normative, in the liturgical text proper (e.g. the dispalatalised nature of r, č and šč, mutation ‘a > e’, fronting of e > i, pronunciation of o as u < ů in the pre-weak-jer syllables, presence of the historically expected ending -i in the loc. sg. of *jō- and *jā-stems or -ja in the gen. sg. of *jā-stems after the affricate c,¹ consistent use of ū throughout the text) suggest that the text may be classified as belonging to the South-Western redaction of ChSl. Further support is provided by the accentuation pattern present in accentual units comprising enclitics/proclitics. Whereas in pre-Nikonian Great Russian ChSl only a single accentual mark would be present in such a unit – usually oksia rather than varia, such as vō imja, vō vēki, vrazumi mja – where the stress would fall on the enclitic, according to the South-Western orthoepic norm the accentual mark is placed either above the noun (vo vē’ki) or both the noun and the preposition (vo’ vē’ki). Similarly, the evidence of South-Western ChSl texts suggests that the particle bo as well as the personal pronouns mja, mi, tja, ti, se may be accentuated in the same way as prepositions (Uspenskij 2002: 359–360, 439–442). In the 1629 Oktoikh, the South-Western accentuation pattern is the norm. The accentual mark is placed above the noun/adjective more than 100x, but cases with accentuation on both elements in the accentual unit also occur sporadically, e.g. ве́рвь сти́стый (8v:5), настасьо (9v:17), напервьйо (9v:17), на своя (5v:6), на щербовьсколькь (10v:6), вовьки (10v:7), на сие́йни (16v:6), волы́вки (26v:4), нарькь (31v:17), на купары́къ, и на певькъ (41v:13), вострасти (40v:8), Накамени (32v:3), ведворы (13v:3), наконецъ (25v:14); (but also неземлю (23v:10), неземл (28v:1), ведни (7v:3, 34v:18), нарькь (31v:15)). Accent marks are, as a rule, also placed above the particle bo and personal pronouns, e.g. вовь (4v:14, 5v:16, 5v:1, 6v:14, 10v:11, 12v:2, etc.), вовь (13v:5), Гё (5v:16, 41v:2), Гё (28v:1, 9, 12), Гё (25v:15, 28v:9, 10, 37v:15, 40v:16, etc.), та (16v:3, 19v:12, 22v:6, 34v:1, 36v:10, etc.), ти (4v:2, 4, 5v:4, 14v:14, etc.).

¹ Compare, for instance, with the Russian redaction of Church Slavonic where the ending -ě after the affricate c in the loc. sg. fem./masc. and -y in the gen. sg. predominates (Bulič 1893: 193–194, 195–196, 230–231). See also Bulič (1893) for a comprehensive description of other features of RChSl and the 1648 Moscow edition of Grammatiki.
6.2 Smotryc’kyj’s Grammatiki and the 1629 Oktoikh

Comparison of various aspects of the 1629 Oktoikh with recommendations and explicit rules codified in the 1619 edition of Grammatiki presents a variegated picture. For instance, with regard to the distribution of allophones only the most typical antistoecha were used: (1) ḥ : ḵ where the former is used word-initially and the latter elsewhere; (2) h : ɨ where the former is as a rule used word-initially and in other positions, and the latter in the post-vocalic position word-medially; (3) Ɪ : ɬ where the grapheme Ɪ is used word-initially and ɬ elsewhere. On the other hand, many rules are simply ignored, or little or no attempt is made to implement them with any degree of consistency. Thus, the analysis shows that (1) the spelling of foreign words only at times follows Smotryc’kyj’s precept urging literal transcription; (2) the use of h : ɨ in adjectives to distinguish between the gen. sg. from other cases has not been attested; (3) various rules with respect to the opposition e : ə are implemented only partially; (4) the opposition e : ə in nouns to separate between the sg. and pl. forms occurs only once; (5) the occurrence of ɪ after r does not accord with Smotryc’kyj’s usage, where ɪ is the norm. With regard to diacritical marks, an important difference between Smotryc’kyj’s conception and actual usage in the 1629 Oktoikh concerns accentuation of enclitics such as bo and personal pronouns mi, mja, ti, tja. As discussed in the previous section, such proclitics bear accentual marks, although Smotryc’kyj (1619: Ε/5–5') warns against this practice. Rules governing capitalisation, punctuation and the use of titlo and pokrytie met similar fate: they are either overlooked or, at best, partially followed. There are also differences in flectional morphology. Substantival endings, that which according to Smotryc’kyj ought to be considered as correct ChSl desinences, do not always accord with the forms attested in the 1629 Oktoikh (see for example the consonantal declension). Similarly, in verbal morphology, the ending -ɪ in the present forms of the verb byti is, on the whole, less common than -ɪ; nor is the substitution of aorist/imperfect forms in the 2nd per. sg. with perfect present. In the field of syntax, the construction ‘eže + infinitive’ is present despite the fact that Smotryc’kyj deems it unintelligible.

It is curious that despite the importance of Smotryc’kyj’s seminal work on Church Slavonic grammar, the publication of which must have made a significant impact on the educated elite of the time, no conscious effort had been made to align the 1629 edition with the precepts outlined in Grammatiki. Uspenskij (2002: 360–361) mentions two important factors responsible for the lack of uniformity within the South-Western literary tradition.
First, South-Western ChSl was characterised by and subject to a significantly lesser degree of codification than the Great Russian ChSl. This difference is primarily engendered by the fact that Muscovy Rus had only one cultural centre, Moscow, whereas several such centres existed in the South-West, a fact that became more important with the advent of printing. Moscow became a publishing epicentre where divine books were subject to correction and editing (for an overview of different printing centres and their production see, Mathiesen (1972: 64–66)). No such centralised, unifying mechanism was present in the South-West: the publication of books took place in several different places (in Kiev, Vilnius and Lvov amongst others), that contributed to and engendered a much greater variety in Church Slavonic. Second, the production of liturgical texts did not necessarily have to be overseen or regulated by the Church authorities.
APPENDIX: The Kievan Oktoikh (transcribed text)
Фолио 1′

ИЛИЙ ПОСТНИКЪ ОГЛАВИЗНЬ

1. Йли окувъ со врятію молишиа, ны на едінкъ: подъвизаисе не въычаисе.
2. Но чѣствие помолишиа: чѣство же есть ма́ть: моланіе, со
3. Боговъкіе и огліальня
4. Емъ, и волкѣнио душа,
5. Во исповѣданіи сорѣ
6. Шеній, сооздзы
7. Ханиемъ везъ
8. Гласны
9. Мы

Фолио 1′′

ВѢДОЛО ВѢДИ КОЖДОМѢ БѢГОЧЕСТВѢ

1. Читателю, ижъ естемы цркви ГѢ.
2. Живаго кождый знѧсь, въкоторойѧны
3. Мы пѣлѣ вѣдѣ, вѣрѣвали емѣ, потреба
4. На кождый часъ оглѣдал. Атаѧ спраѣвъ
5. Соѣц тѣю книжицы, аѣсь въ своей цркви
6. Вѣдѣ, вѣрѣющи на ней канона, ГѢ.
7. Живаго увлѣвѧ: зачиѧмъ въсь стакого
8. Печатки добр�тєлей волѣни вѣлѣ дѣ
9. Свищисѧ вѣней, поставленъ въ совершѣ
10. Нѣю мацѣ добрътєлей Любовь,
11. Тожѣ естъ саѧмъ ГѢ. емѣже
12. Слава, честъ, и поклонъ,
13. Возвѣки вѣчнымъ.
Folio 2°

Глась, Пёрвый

line 1 Вечерень нами молитвы,
line 2 прийми стьй гдан, и по
line 3 дахъ нами ставленіе
line 4 грѣхомъ: якв ты эды
line 5 еси, яалей волѣф во
line 6 скречение.
line 7 ¹

Folio 3°

line 1 Свящдкте людие еси, и свидмѣтне¹
line 2 егд, и дадите слабы внемъ вскрѣшемъ
line 3 измѣртыыхъ: якв той есть бы нынь,
line 4 избавлен нысь вѣ бѣззаконии нынькъ.
line 5 Прийдкте люддѣ поемъ и поклонися хв,
line 6 славаше егд измѣртыыхъ вскрѣшении: якв
line 7 той есть бы нынь, иже вѣ лести врежкъ.
line 8 миръ избавлен.
line 9 Веселтеса нѣса, вострѣбйте всншаннѣ
line 10 землѣ, возопйтьте горы совозѣлѣмъ, ево
line 11 еламснѣлъ грѣхи ныща на врѣмѣ пригвд
line 12 дй, иживотъ нами даровѣ: смертъ оймѣ
line 13 твй, и адама вскрѣси, иакв чнболнѣдцѣ.
line 14 Плотио волкъ распѣншагоса нысь раднъ,
line 15 пострадавша и погребѣнна и вскрѣша измѣ
line 16 твыхъ, вспопѣлъ глидсъ: оутвердй пра
line 17 вславѣлъ цѣковъ свою Хвъ, и оймрй
line 18 жыынь

Folio 3v

line 1 жыынь нышк яаку ............²

¹ The diacritical marks in line 1 are obscured by the white strip of paper glued to the top of the page.
² The text in line 1 is obscured by the white strip of paper glued to the top of the page.
Живоприёменном[...]

Предосторежение, славословие принесихъ не

И зреенном[...]

Всей дарь и смерть безгрѣшн[...]

А даровы дарцѣ воскрѣ[...]

Иже вѣт[...]

Слава, и Небъ: Бородинъ;

Всеемѣрнѣ славъ[...]

И вѣкъ презрѣлѣщ[...]

Мрію дѣйства: всплотнымъ пѣсы и крѣв[...]

Ныны о_Tagm_оврѣніе[...]

Тыно хвала Неб[...]

А и Церкви

---

Въ Апостолѣ 10:26...

Слава, и Небъ: Бородинъ.

Всѣмѣрнѣ славъ[...]

И вѣкъ презрѣлѣщ[...]

Мрію дѣйства: всплотнымъ пѣсы и крѣв[...]

Ныны о_Tagm_оврѣніе[...]

Тыно хвала Неб[...]

А и Церкви

---

1 The text in line 2 is obscured by the white strip of paper glued to the top of the page.
2 The text in line 1 is obscured by the white strip of paper glued to the top of the page.
Глаўна лѣка

1. Црь са́й нёё и зёмли непостижиме бо
2. лею распáтца за чáпоколлóйне, егóже ады
3. срётъ долькó горчика, и прывых днá во
4. спре́шее радова́цыла. Адáлы же видé тá
5. зикадитель воронспóдыбнихъ, востá сээ
6. чáдеси: кáкн смерть бáсн éже всëхъ
7. жызьнъ; но íжко»е изкóли мира просьё
8. тóти, вопиоца и глóица, воскрéэй измёр
9. тьыхъ Гáди слáва тейъ.
10. Жены му́ронсонца, му́роносали сотца́
11. нётъ и нятадиёмь гра́ва тьего́ достиго
12. ша́ и непорéтше прóтаго тьёлл тьего́
13. ò агáллаке офáкáкквие. Небо́е и преслáвное
14. фáдо: áпáламъ лâхи воскрéе Гáди поддаа
15. ми́рови нáлйо мать. Слáва, и нёё уо.
16. Се исприоности Ісáнио проречении đою во
17. родиля еси, и порóтвъ иакже прежде
18. Б ржтва

Folio 5r

Воскрéны

1. рж́тва препыла́ еси, Đëгъ во ёх рожеи́са
2. тéлаке и эс́гтво дновиса. Но сээбо
3. мёти, мётвы сво́ыхъ рать вотвое цркви
4. приносикы́ла ти непребри́: но ёакн я́го
5. остврёнаго сво́йдя рóкêлла носившалла,
6. на своа раввы омáрдисал, й моли сти́т
7. днá наша. Тропár, воскрéсень, гáа, а.
8. Кáлени знаменáнá в Íйдэй, и вóйном
9. стря́щимъ, прптое тёло твоё: вострее
c10. впторгáй днс си́ес, дарсä ми́рво жызнь:
11. серд рáди сильы нёэмы вонна́чэ ти жи
12. зноядвчье: слáва воскрéнио ти хé, слáва
13. цртков ти, слáва смортрнйо твóлвë,
14. эйдне чáпоколквчье. Вогорóдичень.
15. Гавро́йл прёрцàнвáй ти дбо ёже рáдын
16. са, и соглáсомъ воплóсса всëхъ вóкà,
17. втевит стúкъвъ квóтъ, я́кк же рече пра
18. веднà
Folio 5v

§§§§§

Гла ·а·

line 1 ведный Дёдъ, иви́ца пространн'йшад
line 2 нись, носи́шад зидитеа сво́его : слá
line 3 на всёшнем вёлъ · слáва прошедше́м
line 4 истиъ : слáва събодше́е нă , рождествó
line 5 твоимъ · На подношениці Кано́нъ · съки,
line 6 живонача́лъ · Тро́йца · Писънъ, а · Иросъ · Тевл
line 7 похвдителна десница · запкъ · Пртвá тро́йце
line 8 Ыке нашъ слáва твёкъ.
line 9 Едино трисостáнове начáло , Серафілм
line 10 немóчных слáвлять , безначáнное присчó
line 11 цно , творителное всёхъ , непостижное
line 12 еже и вскъ язы́къ вёрни поет птимъ
dline 13 да ча́квымъ ёдинственное трискáнове
line 14 твое́ иви́ши вётво : создавъ во чвакла,
line 15 по вбразв своёмъ вобрвразилъ есі , оымъ
deэ и слово и дхъ дай, іков ччоловыхъ ·
line 16 свыше показавъ ёдинственное втріе́х
line 17 Ей и его

Folio 6v

§§§§§

Тро́йцы

line 1 в'оначальноыхъ составъ державъ , Вичъ ·
line 2 рёкли есі равномъдательномъ сиь своёмъ
deэ и дхъ : прийдъте сошедше язы́кі ихъ
deэ размакимъ ·
line 5 Оўмъ оьви нерождённый · Вичъ , образно
line 6 мёрдрыми провьдрача : слово же сове́зна
deэ чвое , со ёстственний сиь : и дхъ стый ,
deэ дёйки вселова создавый воплощеніе ·
deэ Писънъ, а · Иросъ · Едино емкдый ·
deэ Ты дрёвале иви́ вбралв иков вивса три
line 11 составень , ёдинственнейшее ёсттоволь
line 12 вжества , в'ословія истинн'йшее обрáно
line 13 ивилъ еси , и вёрно поэ́ль та · Едино
line 14 начальнаго Бгъ и трисоччаго ·
deэ исте в'ёжъ в'оалкъ неглънно Вичъ ,
deэ проскл сръть в'есв̄та сиь непремчнй ·
line 17  "ДѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢ_${4}$
Фолио 7

Глась, ἦ.

Фолио 8

Трёйцыны

1 The diacritical mark above И in Ποκωιε cannot be clearly seen.
2 The diacritical mark above Е in Εδиновластітєліаль cannot be clearly seen.
Folio 8v

Глаз

1. Бгага составила еси - гневших нености.
2. жила в трясе - также и вела создала еси.
3. но и нигд всакаго изсвялован овестован.
4. Безначалила и сопрестояла в трее стая.
5. вее и сие и дие - вславоствовращи, и всл.
6. стаизмала, и всл еписованала, - единого еси.
7. лоо, та слава хервими, и мы недосто.
8. них хвал ти воздаемъ - Елярдичень.
9. Славца незахолимаго хралъ былъ еси.
10. создавшаго и оночинившаго спавтила ве.
11. лика веесили, прутла дей бгонев.
12. сто, но и нигд стртей мла ишакъ мвчен.
13. Ги помолди, и - отдаде, гла и Пд. Грькъ ткий.
14. Припадаё ти въ крою весира воплоите, полм.
15. Ай на непотребных своев равы, трее при.
16. Бгага вее и сие со Дхолъ: оумардиса ве.
17. мятида, настадо еже совра аръ, непре.
18. В ста.

Folio 9v

Тройны

1. станина славаис твою бать. Бг.
2. Дей исте неизреченъ родившемесла, ло.
3. лисла обленика ныша сра вогласивъ въ.
4. чалнина втасчена прегшлеи - и воведи.
5. моисынна тажкихъ, славити та все.
мативает, едино веро убеждено, твоим.

Письмо, а. Трад. Тебе мудрениве бише пенье.

Глово виже со естественным образом все.

держителе Бтга, искаже веркисла : еже
сохраниешь, сотвори я.

же вложоюрёван го, сохрани тем им и

Адом, и страшна вбесом моложе.

ж и страстьем.

Да твоего благосердимо вако, покажешь,
пышней ным, Сина своего княшение по
славь смирение, пока возбразили еси
наперед страхствость : но и нез ветвей
нимъ.

nymб.

Folio 9v

Глаз - и.

nymб мол враздоши душом.

Треми счётнень едино, Баст во славить.

Сила веернаного, Сия же сопрестольна
и душа равно славить, воедино держа
втк : вище наш виже благовение еси в.

На херувильском престоле носильный.

вселенскы църв, и воохторов втоо дйствь
вку всея вселяса притрал, всѯъ йзвавлала.

Втад икх чаколоезец : но и нэ втоо
ли мол матвали сохран.

Письмо, а. Трад. Чадо превение рославцъ.

Маненъ вогодетельны гди всѢъ : три
составные и вседержителе, ниса простержъ.

еси икх кокв : также и земли фалайяти.

esi гладбиси, всесильно ты горестъ, тѢ
же и равны своё охрани : любовней и вѢро.

ю твоего чаколоуче, да тѢ поє восед вѢ.

ВѢ Про

Folio 10r

Троищны

Проскъти вееначальный святё, поццад
твої свят триславичны лисы, еднестъ

159
нных же существъ, итвоимь свѧтъ
дателныхъ душамъ, призирати прѧно,
иимже насущѣса славы твоѧ слѧдѧ,
и свѧтодѧтенѧй и всевогатѧй, и пре
возносъ тѧ вѣрно вовѣкки.
Прилъ хвалѣ и чтѣ, вохмѧ нишвгъ, съ-
непостижимѧй, вѣрно пресовершѧнѧ,
всѧ озванѧнѧй и оумь просвѧтиѧнѧ,
областю и силою своею... тѧ вѣрно вовѣкъ
нейшѧ силы: имѧ землѧншн неомлѧно
воилъ и превозносн тѣвѣ вовѣкки.  
Вознесѣ нанѧса: чѧческо прѣмѧ естѧнво
непрѧдно, сить твой претъдал Бѣ, пре
мноѧством вѧти, избавлѧ дрѣна
тлѧ: емже и блѧдлярѧвѣнш всѣтѧвѧ
емъ.

Folio 10v

Гла, а

емъ: дѣвѧбѧтъ тваръ всѧ Гѧдѧ, и пре
возноситъ вовсѧ вѣкки.
Пѣсьнѧ, а · Изм.: вѣрно чтаго рождествѧ.
Гписъ сѣпитѣло твари, чѣстѣнныя и оумъ
ныя равнѧ сволѧ, итѧвѧскаго навѣтта и
созвѣшѧнѧ, претад вѣрно вѣдинѣшца.
и созвѣддѧ свѧвѣ стѧдо вѣнѣ ненащѧнно.
Дѧ гавънх не извѣнѧшно, сѣнѣстѣнныя
покажшѧ вѧгости, даѧ иѧ нѧвъ рѧвѣлъ
твоимъ трислѣннѣ иѧдинаналѧнѣ вѣсѣ
не Бѣ, вѣкѣ сѣпитѣлныя · иѧже соевѣ
шиты снадовѣ.
Призрѣ Ѳнашшмъ молѣвѧмъ, втроѣшъ
пѣсовѧлыѧхъ составѣшъ, едише всѣтѧдѧ
слѣвимъ Бѣ, и подѧдъ равѣлъ тво
имъ ощѣшѣнѧн: мѣтовѧ прѣтѣлѧ въ всѣ
пѣтѣлѧ пѣволѧтерѧ.

Folio 11r

Нестер

1 The diacritical mark above и cannot be clearly seen.
Воскрѣны

line 1 Нѣстѣрѣвъ ёстествѣ зѣлнаго зрѣлѣо во
line 2 таѣніе вѣдѣшла, преосвященемъ первоздѣ
line 3 наго, на прелонѣ ницѣ снѣдѣ, нераздѣлѣ
line 4 са: во дѣвѣй везѣ вѣдѣ воплощенъ, да зѣ
line 5 мыхъ вѣдѣжѣть.
line 6 НАЧАЛО ОУТРЕНИ.
line 7 Нѣтъ вѣкъ Гѣдъ. Тро: гла, а: калѣе знамѣ,
line 8 а, и бо: егъ, писанъ, Вѣдѣвѣ Навѣчѣннѣ. Посѣлѣ
line 9 Сѣдѣлѣ: Воскрѣсѣнъ. на а: стихослѣ гла, а.
line 10 Гробъ твоѣ спасъ, вонны страгюще, мѣр
line 11 тви вѣ овистанѣ пѣванагоса агѣла
line 12 вѣшелъ, проповѣдѧющаго женѣмъ воскрѣ
line 13 снѣвѣ, тѣвѣ слѣвымѣ таѣ потревѣлѣла:
line 14 тѣвѣ проповѣдѧвъ востребѣлѣ изъ гроба,
line 15 ёдѣнѣмѣ Гѣдъ наѣшѣмѣ. Слава, и вѣк.
line 16 Мѣрѣ тѣ вѣчно свѣлѣ всѣ, дѣвѣ востѣ
line 17 нѣтъ

Folio 11v

§§§§§

Глажѣъ: а.

line 1 нѣ и прорѣжѣвъ вѣлѣнѣоса, любовѣй при
line 2 вѣлѣющѣ котвоѣй вѣянъ: тѣвѣ бо иѣлѣ
line 3 мѣ дѣвѣшѣ престѣлѣнѣцѣ, тѣвѣ свѣлѣ
line 4 жѣкъвѣ вѣслѣтѣ свѣнѣнѣ, едѣнѣ всѣ не
line 5 перѣчинѣ: нѣ вѣ. стѣлѣ. Сѣдѣлѣ гла: а.
line 6 Жѣнѣ котѣвѣ твоѣвѣ прѣдѣвѣ оѣрѣвѣ
line 7 и вѣлѣвѣ свѣвѣнѣ вѣдѣѣѣ трѣпѣтѣ.
line 8 гробѣ овистѣвѣ жѣнѣ, чѣдѣ оѣдѣвѣлѣ.
line 9 шеса аѣлѣ: сърѣ ради шѣдѣвѣ оѣчѣвѣлѣ.
line 10 проповѣдѧвѣ востѣвѣ: ада вѣпрѣвѣжѣ хѣ,
line 11 йѣкъ едѣнѣ зѣлѣвѣкѣ у сѣлѣвѣ, ѵ совѣстѣ
line 12 вѣ оѣмѣрѣвѣ всѣ, оѣзѣдѣнѣвѣ вѣдѣ у рѣ.
line 13 дѣвѣшѣ сѣлѣвѣ кѣтѣ: Слава, и вѣкъ: бо.
line 14 Зѣчѣвѣ неѣпѣвѣ ѵѣмъ вѣкѣвѣнѣнѣ,
line 15 и рѣдѣвѣ вѣѣскѣмѣ нѣстѣника жѣнѣ
line 16 Гѣда: офрадѣвѣвѣлѣ Бѣлѣ: свѣвѣтѣ вѣлѣ
line 17 вѣлѣвѣстѣ.
line 18 Въ Рѣвѣ

Folio 12v
Воскрес

line 1 Разбовинничек показаин , раки вверзкъ : паач
line 2 же мроноциицъ радость возвесци ; икв
line 3 воскре Гдъ : пода мрвои велио мать.
line 5 Внегдъ сконбить мы : охланишка мод бо
line 6 людии , Гдъ ктебъ вос.
line 7 Постинныкъ непрестанно пятиное
line 8 желание въяетъ , Вміра сієтнаго промѣк
line 9 Стовъ дэй чтъ и слава : иквже втй по
line 10 дбаетъ : кижеъ и сй , сего ради пёй
line 11 трыи единодержавятъ : Антифонъ : тот .
line 12 Бгры твоихъ вознесе мы зокой добръ
line 13 телей : просвяти Боже да посъ ти.
line 14 Десніу ти рскую пребъ ти славь : сохрани
line 15 мы сонлоддъ , да не сгнь мене опалить
line 16 грчастый.
line 17 Стымъ дхрмъ всѣка твръ опиолвала
line 18

Folio 12v

Гласъ .а .

line 1 етса . паки вбраціующеса на псрое , раю
line 2 моиъ бо естъ втй и слобдъ : Антифонъ : тот .
line 3 е-рккий мнкъ , вийдемъ водоры Гдъ
line 4 вознеселица дѣль , сралетмиса срче .
line 5 Водомд дѣй стрѧхъ великъ ; таиу вб
line 6 прстаымъ поставлвнномъ , сдалăтса
line 7 всѣка племена землдя и иазицы.
line 8 Стовъ дѣй чтъ и поклонѣннъ , слава и
line 9 держава , иквже втй достой и сбвнкъ
line 10 приноситъ : еднство бо естъ Трца естъ
line 11 ствоылъ , а неалыцъ . Прокимей : глдъ , а .
line 12 Никъ воскрнъ гласть Гдъ : Стять : слобдъ глдъ , слове
line 13 сд чиста : Татъ , всѣка дыханіе : сть , хвалите Бога .
line 14 Еванъ воскрнное : Воскрннъ Хлдъ : псаломъ и
line 15 Каннъ , воскрнъ : глдъ , а : Псалъ , а Ипомъ .
line 16 Твож поѣдителна десницы : Бого
line 17 акисо вокрѣчки прославица , тата
Воскресенье

1. сотрё, Иисусовы дни,
2. ветхозаветный Новый год,
3. проповедь воскресная,
4. истинное создание мира,
5. ветхозаветный Новый год,
6. возвышение мира,
7. проповедь воскресная,
8. возвышение мира,
9. Иисусовы дни,
10. ветхозаветный Новый год,
11. проповедь воскресная,
12. возвышение мира,
13. Иисусовы дни,
14. ветхозаветный Новый год,
15. проповедь воскресная,
16. возвышение мира.

Гласъ 2

1. возносятся славословия: Христос васкресе,
2. дарственное проповедь,
3. ветхозаветный Новый год,
4. Иисусовы дни,
5. ветхозаветный Новый год,
6. Иисусовы дни,
7. ветхозаветный Новый год,
8. Иисусовы дни,
9. ветхозаветный Новый год,
10. Иисусовы дни,
11. ветхозаветный Новый год,
12. Иисусовы дни,
13. ветхозаветный Новый год,
Воскръны

Або · мьти везньвестнаа ·
Прио дёць и мьри црл вьшнихъ силь ,
вьчаго срца вьрокъ вьрніи возопіемъ : 
радьисла биво або , мьти везньвестнаа ·
Не искола вездна , тьвергъ непостикь 
мого ржтов вьсцаал , вьрокъ неслъкъно 
ошъв , чистъ припадѣлъ ти глющ , ра 
дьисла биво або , мьти везньвестнаа ·
Пѣсень , г - Ирод .
Едгъ свѣдчаго чьческаго същества не 
можени и мативю ви вьбролъса ,
преполазъ мд вьшше силовъ воспѣвати 
ти стыль , цркви дишнаал - не изрѣчены 
славы ти чьколяпче .
Быъ сый мой вѣже падшаго охьдерилъ 
ѣси , и сняти комыкъ вагойзвольвъ : ра 
сплатѣлъхъе воздвигъа мдъ еси , во ёже 
вопити
Возведение, пройдя огонь непостижимый.

Инь, Ьромос - Первовычнола ® в щада -

Иже насиё бало завандише овчà в земле

мñ, и низложившем дрёвомъ прегрё

Шёна ерв®, ¢® Бёэ возопиелъ : вёди

гнёвный рогъ нашъ стъ еси Гди.

Возведшемъ пастыря великаго нёзада

Г т ®

Весны

хай, и стальствомъ ерв® ипавы ипв® ипны

ки охпёшее, истинною и бёжтвёнымъ

Ахомъ, вкрйй дё послёжимъ - Бро.

Иже ® дёвы вёлъе воплощённым® бёсклее

ни ¢®, и рёдию порожтвъ бёжтвенною

силою, чт®ю вёс® сохранённом® иже над

всём® Бёэ возопиелъ : стъ еси Гди.

Инь, Ьромос - бдимъ свёдный.

Эбликъ та лёгкии неёжн® Дёо имен®

емъ, прёчекимъ наставляэемъ гв®ли.

преде вё натла Гль разорити египетск®

лести рёкописани®, и просвётити силъ

слёжимъ. Бёрёжчиён.

Теве запечатлённый источникъ, и за

клавёнию дёвы всётвала, лики прёче

сёй войстин® нарёчё, свёктовиди® нём

дёства твоё® обрёзы пишёце, еже и по

рёжтвён.

Глассъ х®

рожествён соколола еси -

Пкень, х® - Ьромос.

Гёрп та бёгдати, вёйно пресёхин®, про

зораивыми аёвакёдмъ охмотрёй очи

ма истеве ёзьйти Илева, провёглашашё

стаго, на сип®нне наше и овновлённе.

Кто сый сийъ иже вёдемъ прихода,
Folio 16v

§§§§§

Воскресе

line 1 занё, нё живота просвещения наслаждение
line 2 нё, на сие ние и обновление
line 3 Инъ, Ирмосъ. Же зять искорени.
line 4 Итъ еси крашен изъедемъ, и севъ обрделъ
line 5 нё ризъ въ винограда воскреска; крашенъ
line 6 икокъ Бытъ, икокъ злень жъ кровию, плотъ
line 7 есце отъ доне обрдело носа: емьже по
line 8 емъ въ кривии слава силь твоей Господня,
line 9 Хе въдзящихъ бластъ въдление первостъпъ, предъ
line 10 грешенья наль згиль есть, обновля.
line 11 стражень псть своего кровию: и душою жъ
line 12 и совершенъвъвъ ввао сень, предзвѣчный
line 13 наль восстааль и Беродинен.
line 14 Бытнъ дремній долгъ просили еси все
line 15 пъталъ, иже нассъ ради вѣданиагоса нова
line 16 го Ідама: соединивъ въ сеѣ чистымъ
line 17 зачатиемъ плотъ мѣсяцнію и вѣдѣвлѣ
line 18 ніо :

Folio 16r

§§§§§

Гласъ А.

line 1 ніо : иствѣ пройдѣ Хе, едйнъ сѣдѣнъ со
line 2 вѣрѣніемъ . Инъ, Ирмосъ. Господню полгий.
line 3 Гласи чудесъ ніо , и винши земле,
line 4 икокъ дннъ перстнаго паѳшаго Ідама , вѣдѣ
сотворёна бысть, и своею содѣтела роди тѣница, на еписеини нѣше и оновление. Бцв.
Пѣемъ великое и страшное твоѣ таинство:
премирныхъ бо оѣтависа чинопачаѣни
ната, сый сніде, якв дождь на рѣн, всепѣдала, насипенѣ наше и оновление.
Пѣсен, е, Ірмосъ.
Простѣйшѣй сіянѣ пришествія твоєвъ
Хе, и оей крѣто своїмъ миркела
конца сѣча просѣтъ свѣтела твоєвъ Бцв.
раздѣліа, правовѣрныхъ исплѣчимъ тѣ.
Пастьры оѣцамъ велика и Гдъ, Юдѣн
дрѣвомъ крѣнымъ оѣмертвѣша. нѣв
самъ якъ оѣца мертвыя воѣдѣ погре
Д вѣнныя

Folio 17v

Воскрѣсы

бѣнныя, державы смртныя иззвѣи.
Крѣво своимъ смиренѣе благовѣстивъ,
и проповѣдаль еси сисе мой, плаѣннымъ
стоялѣнѣ: державаго же посрамлѣ Хрѣт,
нага и отчинаяша показалѣ еси, Бжѣ
ствѣннѣмъ сѣ востанѣлѣмъ.
Прощенѣлъ вѣрно просѣщихъ всепѣдал
непрѣзри, но приими, и снѣ доношаш сиѣ
своѣмъ приѣла, Бцвъ единомѣ бѣгодѣте
лю: тѣне бо представлѣннѣ стражахомъ.
Інѣ Ірмосъ: бѣть сый мира вѣкъ.
сѣ вѣгатство и гледѣнѣ мѣдрости вѣкѣ:
бѣзды премѣры Гдѣ, въ ковѣрства ихъ
иззвѣальнѣ ны есть: пострадаѣ бо вѣлѣн
нѣмощию плотскою, своею крѣпостію
оживлѣа мертвецѣ воскрѣсылѣ есть.
Бѣть сый примѣшивается плотію нѧсть радѣ
и раби

Folio 17v

§§§§§
Глаў — 51

1. И распинаетса — и оумираетъ, и погребён.
2. Кътатъ, и диве вострасть, и востъдѣ святло.
3. Сопоставъ своею Хс ковѣцы, снѣкоже прийдется.
4. И снѣсѣ влагостепнѣ толѣ послаживший — Богъ.
5. Стѣвы стѣлъ двѣ чталъ, стѣвы стѣло ро.
6. Дѣла еси всѣческая всѣдующаго Хс изва.
7. Вида: тѣмѣ тѣ црѣй и вѣчѣ всѣхъ.
8. Іаковъ вѣръ дѣйдитела тѣрежь пропо.
9. Вѣдѣлѣ. — Имѣтъ Ирмосъ. Пресвятій.

10. Веселаетъ нѣмыя силы зраце тѣла, рѣ.
11. Дѣется снѣмъ всѣческая составленія.
12. Ійо рѣстомъ твоимъ совокупшася дѣло.
13. Бѣде, тѣмѣ тѣ достойно славимъ.
14. Дѣ движетса всѣкъ изыскѣ всѣческой и.
15. Мыслѣ — и поихва всѣческаго войстинѣ.
16. Оздорѣнѣ: дѣла бо прийде извѣстенисѧ.
17. Славники прѣдо есл всѣгѣбаловци чудеса.
18. А И слави.

— СССССС

Боскрясны

1. Славятъ нѣсень всѣкъ прѣрыхъ поихвалы.
2. Дѣлѣ вѣри вѣй приносилѣ, ибо сіѧ хра.
3. В/feed славы превѣстѣнныя, вѣже достой.
4. Ихъ славилѣ. — Нѣсень И, Ирмосъ.
5. Сѣдѣе мѣстъ послѣднихъ вѣлана, нѣсть и.
6. Зевавлѣй, влѧнѣномъ яко оцца.
7. Назаяленіе, снѣсѣ люди свѣдъ вѣже нынѣ тѣ.
8. Во красост нѳмоцныхъ еси, и исправленіе.
9. Согрѣшѣлѣй превоздвѣнаго лотѣ ожѣви.
10. Хомса: рѣюкоже твою Глѣ идѣцѣдѣхи.
11. Еѣже зѣны осѣдзвѣлѣе вѣстѣ хѣ тѣво.
12. Красост нѳмоцныхъ еси и исправленіе.
13. Воззваны ны еси изѣлда Глѣ, китя пѣста.
14. Сотвори всѣдца всѣйлане, снѣо держѣ.
15. Во снѣ раздѣшшѣсть егѡ сиѣ: тѣво жиўотъ.
16. Еси, свѣтъ, и всѣкрѣніе. Бѣрѣдѣнѣ.
17. Веселаетъ отвѣтъ двѣ чтѣ рода нашего прѣ.
18. А И.
Фолио 18

Гла а

1. дядя, бедная воспришё в топо ёг прест.
2. палине подъышша: тыко чтал перед ряя.
3. и порялек ёси. Имь Имоль: Отропа йыми.
4. Оймъ сы вострате и невестствъ, приям.
5. шаета Хе Бый оймъ чачкомъ, ходотай.
6. стяжим вятвенны есть всъ и дебелством.
7. плодъ, и весть ли приложе, веъ ли прелъи.
8. са, да сипенне ли пашемъ пода ращинае.
9. Падь превзейдъ Адамъ и сокрушиа, наде.
10. део согаи бысть дереве возженъ: но бо.
11. стает приявшимъ словесе впожалъ, и.
12. страсть вострастие приел: на прътъ яку.
13. сый слай, съдамъ со юциемъ и дколъ ибо.
14. НКар неставъ пъникача родаиела, вък.
15. дръ гтыла втрёковица ввордесца, и выде.
16. ветренъ преде вятчи впассмаеи, иже пръ.
17. дъ цвртвыай Хе: сего не исчтей страшен.
18. А г родъ.
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Воскр

1. родъ и нейрече. Имъ Имоль: съзвайде насъ.
2. Престолъ раболкно ряя твоелъ, чино.
3. ве нынъ, дивакеса достойны твоелъ ве.
4. съдемона ряя пръо дюо: ты во чтал,
5. и прежде ряя и порялек ёси. Бго.
6. Восподиса иже прежде сый безплотень.
7. слово истебь всетала, иже всачесал.
8. волю творай: иже безтелесныхъ вони.
9. ства приведы унебытна, яку всесилъ.
10. Искакъ Гла, а. Въкресь ёси яко въть игроа восл.
11. въ, и мра сожерза еси ветъ во чъйческо, яко Бга бо.
12. пъвае та и срътъ ючезе падже анведят вако, и въла.
13. нычъ въ съдъ пребоддаема раджеста зовщи, ты еси иже.
14. вей подадъ же воскрънъ. Икосъ, Воскршаго триедин
15. воспоминъ яко Бга всенна и пратъ доса соенышиаго.
16. и иже въ въка игроа вдившиаго, лифонесцца явлпо.
17. гося яко же вдъйвонъ есть преде сий еже раджитеса ре.
Гласъ "и"

Гласъ "а"

Наго халѣва жи́зни, имѣнѣ́й та́ же.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 1</th>
<th>Line 2</th>
<th>Line 3</th>
<th>Line 4</th>
<th>Line 5</th>
<th>Line 6</th>
<th>Line 7</th>
<th>Line 8</th>
<th>Line 9</th>
<th>Line 10</th>
<th>Line 11</th>
<th>Line 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Наго халѣва жи́зни, имѣнѣ́й та́ же</td>
<td>Мѣ́сто сиже́й пртоль высо́къ, наземъ</td>
<td>же І́же почивать ёсть, пряхва́льный · пре</td>
<td>возносимы́й во́вѣ́ки</td>
<td>Иже І́рмосъ · Втры́цы ковйоче́сти воспита́ні</td>
<td>Дѣ́реве сі́ўва кла́твена выстъ землѧ, дѣ́</td>
<td>левою охра́вѣ́лица́ крѣ́вио, бра́тоо́вны́й</td>
<td>ственною рѣ́къою: пѣ́сточно́ю же твою́ кръ</td>
<td>ві́дъ, бла́гвѣ́сла вкропленѧ, нѣ́ игра́ющи по́</td>
<td>вѣ́цъ нѣ́шаихъ Бжѣ́ барвень ѐсѧ</td>
<td>Дѣ́ла плѣ́втеса лѣ́дѣ́ Іовѣ́йстѣ́н вѣ́гспроти́й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
нин дёрзости о́лыннэ Xĕл : ызыцы жë дà
весьлância , й рëлами дà воспëвнëёт , й дà вó
пóтë , òци нàшëхë Бижë вëвнë éсë .
На крëк привëдёсл вòлео нàсь рàди чëко
вёвнë , й прайëцë âдàма рëкоописание рà
стёрзàль éсë · тëмëнë кëниë непрëстàннë
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поëмë , òци нàшëхë Бижë вëвнë éсë .
Бëфòлчень .
Тà вëцë аëсëциë , йàковë пёрëчки рàзë
мëвàëтë · тëвë ñò рàди прëвëзносëмнëй
на землë âвëсã , й сочëкë поживë , йëк
вàйёзёнë , востëтë òцëлë Бígë ѣ прëпð .
Инë , ùлëсë . Тëвë мëсëмнëй Бижë пëцë .
Рàдëйса ùтлë , ëстëвë прòйдë пàстëрг .
ййë войëдàмовë кòжë òпòльсë войëсëнë .
пëвëзносëмнëй всëг ñà òвëчëтë · зàмë
лосëрдëп непëстëжкëо , востëтëй òцëмëлë .
Бógë ѣ прëпòслëвленëп .
Рàдëйса истоённë пëрпòживë вòлë :
рàдëйса рàю сëлëдсëти : рàдëйса сëтëно .
вëрëнмëп : рàдëйса не иëксëовëрëчнëлë :
рàдëйса всëмëрнëл рàдсëти , еëжë рàди
на вòсëл ñ востëтëй òцëлë Бígë ѣ прëпð .
Фолио 21г

Воскрëны

Пëсень

Боцëмëн

Пëсень ё , ùлëсë .
Воцëцы дëки ñëлëвë , ñйкëжë вòгорñи
лë , дòбрòтëо вàëчëшëл чистëйшнë .
зàлëтë , вëлëцыëцë гëёчë : баãвëтë всëл
дëл îлë Гûл , Гûл пòйтë у прëвëзносëтë
ëгò вòвëкëи .
Вòлео всëл творàй ѣ прëтòврàйжë : óврë

1 The diacritical mark above ë in ñээëи cannot be clearly seen.
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ця́лі сънь смёрти мяю вовчнию жизнь, 
стъпію своёю слове виж: теве непрестано, 
всё дѣла икв Бі́а пойотъ і превозно 
cать вовчками. 
Ты разорилъ еси сокращение хе і нка’ 
не, пократь’ку і вотвердённи’ да, во 
скры’ изътрёба триданквино: теве непре 
стани ввсё дѣла икв Бі́а пойотъ і пре 
возносятъ вовчки. — Бѣрдичинъ. 
Иже1 вѣсѣмвеме і паче эстества, Вѣбли 
станила.
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Folio 21v 

Гла́ ә 

Станила вѣтвеннаго роздилю висера мно 
госцкнаго х'а, воспомі глюа: багните 
всѣ дѣла гіа Гда пойте і превоносиете егогда 
вовчники. — Ишь, ірмось’ і шдо превёдите’ 
Прийдъете людие поконоимець мєсть, на 
нѣже стост'кт пртятин ность: надрѣвѣт 
вѣтвенный х'а дланні прострошла, на 
сипеніе всемъ ц'квомъ: і гробы живота 
остоаце пѳемъ, да багнитъ тварь всѣ 
кал Гда, і превоносићь егода вовчкі. 
Сњалина вѣоуфійцали ѣдезомъ, за 
конопрестпиме навжденіе: егожке бо ле 
ц'а нарекоша, воста икв сіленъ, нард 
гайса везъмымъ, печатемъ: т'елъ ра 
дноцесла пѳемъ, да багноитъ тварь всѣ 
Гда і превоносићь егода вовчкі. 
Вотрѣхъ сиеннихъ вѣославаче і едимъ 
Гда 
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Воскрѣны 

gатвѣ 

gатве слабою, Серафими пречистїн со 
страхомъ раболкнно, трисостояно слѣ 
катъ вѣтва, сіимиже вѣоуфійны бо 

1 The diacritical mark above И in Иже cannot be clearly seen.
Глассь,  

Гласьъ,и

къриыхъ стъкио,ёюже съкъть сдцимъ
востакъ восиъъ хсъ:тевё блажимъ и бо
пинъимъ всел дкъла гиъла гдадпойтё и пре
возносите егъ воъки

Пдень.к.ярмось.

Сердзъ чистаго ржтва твоего,распа
ладимъ кдпиисъ,и ве не опалимъ:и
нитъ наасъ:напастье свърхпноси,вотъ
cити молимса,пѣцъ:датѣ тѣ виъ непр.
стоинъ вевичамъ.

С-зикакъ людѣй беззаконнымъ,и непокорнымъ
вѣнъ аскавал соотвѣкваше лстиваго и не
честиваго оправдіша:праведна же надрѣ
вѣдѣдѣвша:гадъ ёдіа славѣ,ёгоже до
стоинъ вевичамъ.

Гнѣвѣ агнѣ непорочне,ѣзналѣй грѣхѣ
мѣрѣ,тевѣ славимъ вскоршаго тридѣ в

Folio 22v

Folio 23v
Воскрны

line 1  кио, со щемъ и ятвённымъ ахотъ ,
line 2  и гда сица славъ , шословаше величаемъ .
line 3  Си си лици своя гди , иже стьмагъ чтною
line 4  си кропио : навраи кръпость цреви дарди :
line 5  и црквами твоимъ чаколлече , подад
line 6  миръ вида матьвами  йи , Йрдъ  тайпество .
line 7  Прослависе не изреченное силою твою
line 8  кръ твои гди , твоё бо немощное наче
line 9  силы всакоа ависа , иже силанъ оцвъ
line 10  низложиваса наземлю  и нощи нибиси
line 11  возводимы вывыйкот .
line 12  Оумертвился мерзска наша смерть , из
line 13  мертвыыхъ воскрненъ , тьбо ависа сц
line 14  цияль вола въ дарствъ : тже жинк
line 15  тла , и воскрение , и свкъ составень , по
line 16  ище величаемъ .
line 17  Не изреченное дбны тайпество , тбо пре
line 18  столь

Folio 23v

Гласъ . А .

line 1  столь цербвикй , и свктоносный чер
line 2  тгъ показанъ , щБ гна всержитель :
line 3  кже бягочестю икъ вищ величаемъ .
line 4  Йианъ , Йрмосъ  образъ чтаго ржтв твоегъ .
line 5  Всакъ похвалный причаал зкъ вовъ
line 6  жадаетъ , величестволъ славы твоегъ :
line 7  не ванче , йранъ недостойны твоихъ ,
line 8  въсердца же твекъ принесись , приимъ
line 9  вице собогостей пкъснъ .
line 10  Йскорени дбды прозвала еси , прноека
line 11  го дъво и беохскаго : не ё дбды икъи во
line 12  истинны ты прославила еси , икъ во рдци
line 13  просраженаго гда славъ , егоже достой
line 14  ны славилы .
line 15  впаче оула вдесъ твоихъ ; твобо дъво
line 16  едина пласцемъ далѣ еси раздълѣть но
line 17  всйше въдо , всетлда недовкдулаго ,
line 18  Гъ  егоже
Voskry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ἐγόζην ῥαδὶ τὰ ἑκ νεῖλα λέειμὸν ·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ναυβάντας, ἔτηχίρι, Γλασί, ά.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Πολέμι τῳδὲ Χὲ σιεσδίδει στήρε· ἕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>σλάβιλλ ὑπὸ τὸν κορισένιήσ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ῥασπάττε πρετερπῇ, ἵ κυριάκον ὑπάδονι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ἰ κορισί ἰδεμέμφτα ὑπίμαρη τὸ ἑκνύ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Γάδι, ἰὰκω ἑδύνη κεκοίλαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ἰ ὂδα πανόμον, ἵ ὑφα κορισίδιν. ὑ εν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>σκρίπει κοὶ λειμός τῷ ἥκε ὑπδοξό ἡ μὴ πν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>στῶμα σψερλ. τὴν ὑπὲ ὑλάβιν ἵ κυρίωστ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Βγόλλησο τῷ ὑπὸ σεμερίενε κελάκε. ὑ εν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>πεῖλα τῷ ἥκε ὑπόδις ἐδώκαν ἵ ὑπεραλέζη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Γάδι ὑ ὅεδα ὑ ὑστράδα ῥακω ἵ ὑκύκ. ὑ ὑδέο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>πρετερπῇ Ῥασπάττε: κορισί ὑζγρόβα. ῥακω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>στερτόμη προς ἐδέ, ἵ σείκεσίμη μίρα : Γάδι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>σλάβα τῇ ἵ. ὑνή Ἐτρι : κορισί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ἀγάδ πριγκαδίσε κατά ἡράκτε ἐρτίκλης.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>τογὸ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Glası, ā · ᵀᵍ
Воскрсы

cлаба тев

Любоматежный роє еўрейскій йнды

tе , гдѣ сѣть кпилатѣ пришеций . дѣ

раєтѣ стреґзции войни гдѣ сѣть печ

tи гробныя , гдѣ преложица погребень

йный . гдѣ продажъ въсть непроданный ,

како охрдено вѣ сокровище . что оке

ветасте сиповъ востаніе , веззакони

йдее . воскрѣе йже волмртьхъ свводь ,

dарда мірови вѣліо мать .

Слаба . Стихира ебласка . й Нѣк , Препаґена .

Виелю . На втѣргйн , Божѣны . Глдс , з .

Скдди рыдѣ изведѣ израва врагъ адама ,

кртла же рыдѣ развииника воведѣ це вд ,

помлни мѣ вопйоца , егда прийдещи во

cртвй сѣ .

Распастс беиерѣшне , й вогровъ поло

жилса

Глдс , з .

жилса есть волею , нѣ воскрѣе икв вѣ , со

воздвйжект веозданныого , помлны мѣ

взвакмоа егда прийдешь ввртвй сѣ .

Покланосьа стртвмъ твоимъ , слабо

cловао вострые твоѣ : со адомолвжек ѣ срд

боинокъ , согласомъ свѣтвмы во

пид ; помлны мѣ Гдѣ егда прийдешь во

сртвй сѣ .

Мѣрвногоа прийдоща плвчмеса , на

gрѣбъ твой Хѣ Бйе зѣло рйно , ввѣлукъ

ризацъ брѣтова етла сѣдца , чтв

ймете ; зовдца воскрѣе Гдѣ неплчите

cл прочее .
Црковь свой телесию, тридиєвный во
скрещив еси погребением, создалиомъ же
и я же въ Адама воскреилъ еси Хе Ваке: по
мали насть воплощения, егда прыйдеми во
Ж е цртѣй

Folio 26r

Покл竞赛

цртѣй си.
Ап съ твои гдѣ, нагорд идѣже повелъ ий
прийдоща сотвоаниемъ, и видѣшь тѣ
поклоныша, идѣже и послѣ возгласы.
проповѣдати славѣ твою: Троица.
Господ поклонился, е и славословилъ,
y и прѣтагоatha вѣрнымъ воспой, воспию,
илюцию: престала трце сіеи всѣхъ на: иго.
Мѣшъ твою приводимъ тѣ волатѣш.
любѣ твой Хе, моленіемъ ед цероты.
tволя нами дарѣ, вдѣ прославлѣш.
iѣгроса нами вославшаго.
Нагѣ возвѧхъ, Главъ, г: и: Преклонны.
Госче превѣлѣ: своєго сія послѣдѣ еси пре
Батаго гдѣ: Блѣшаго сія нарѣмо взл.

Folio 26v

Глѣ а

ти: заблѣшаго сѣянѣе возвести: и
возвести того вѣкду спадѣ: воѣдадѣ.
веѣ твоихъ: непребѣтныхъ сіль.
Госѣ превѣлѣ, многого подвига своєго
вагосѣ троиша вѣрныя: приведѣ вѣкду.
циѣ иквѣтъ всѣческаго посѣкдѣнамъ соз.
дѣвь чѣка рѣвотъ своевъ подвѣдѣ своѣмъ.
рѣже истѣкѣ престѣплѣніемъ зѣпѣ.
дѣй: назвалъ еси иквѣтъ чѣкаловѣцѣ.
Чѣкалѣчѣ гдѣ: сѣй свѣй всѣстинный
иѣнаго родителя: іѣвѣлѣса еси понѣсъ
line 12 сы́й сий чи́чъ дá ла́ чáка прецёна ле́
line 13 стиё змийно́ , йквже овча нара́мс своё́
line 14 влёмъ возведи́шь воШрадб нь́нйо́ .
line 15 Йны Сёрны, Бесплóтными́ пò , тóйке́ .
line 16 Бесплотни́й агълэ́ вя́йю птлэ́ престо́
line 17 áшу́ ё вёндоными свёктольствыми óбак
line 18 Ж ё стаёми

Folio 27²

§§§§§

Поклóны

line 1 стаёми ё свёктолятйн вёнными сийо
line 2 це , ё свёктывывхоже втро́й · чё молй
line 3 теса́ даровати давалъ нáшимъ , мёр
line 4 ё вёлйо милтост .
line 5 Бесплóтный агълэ́ , живóтъ войстиннй
line 6 бесплóтный . Ынêркаго преймже животá
line 7 всевогáтйн , прюсёцынны и чны слáвы
line 8 зрите́ле , вы всёдà показа́стеса́ свёк
line 9 та ё исполнáёми , ё свёцза сообрацáёмди
line 10 совокнáнёймёлъ и мёндётса .
line 11 Ðрхагълэ́ , и пейлэ , началá , пьтлэн ,
line 12 гатйл , и серафилы шестокрылатйн , и
line 13 множество , херёйли вётвеннй , пре
line 14 мрости соедди · сиаъ - власти вётвенкй
line 15 ши , хêн свёклэс - дароват дейалм шйлм
line 16 мёр и вёлйо мать - Салэ , и Нёр - Бйс .
line 17 Чётное Бжие жирице бывши чт содержа́в , со́вёс
line 18 пла́нны
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§§§§§

Гла́сь л

line 1 пла́нными воли́ца \чнё совершити ми́
line 2 пётъ житейскй , йкв дà непрêвартъ
line 3 вечеръ смртий негодова , ё свёлэтъ ла́
line 4 вопламенъ огненный мёчтиса · нё ты
line 5 ла вессо юхтиви́ .
line 6 на стиховнй стихуры · Гла́сь л
line 7 Йкв пччина вёлйо согрёнёнй моихъ
cйс , и лётц погрêвяоса беаколь вой
Folio 28v

Поклаж

line 1 Нінольть чинимъ радованиє · и наземли
line 2 чаквымъ крьпкад польници.
line 3 пртаал Дюо циси на иже кт.
line 4 вѣ прииагаиныхъ.
line 5 айкъ натъ огно
line 6 ванне , повзвт
line 7 Били возло
line 8 жйчж ·
line 9 Тъ , Никъ Мъ
line 10 млашни · и
line 11 виндт ·

Folio 29r

Творение Іванина · Дамаскина · Гласъ , и ·

line 1 Перковъемномъ въ оца , ровъ
line 2 шеса вййо словъ · воплоѣ.
line 3 шеса въ дый мря , прийақ
line 4 те покланиска · расплятіе
line 5 вѣ претергѣвъ , и погревѣнію
line 6 предаетска айкъ сальъ всхостъ · и впере
line 7 извртвахъ , епіе вша вадамаго чака ·
line 8 Хе

Folio 28r

Ніноль

Поклажы

line 1 Нінольъ чинимъ радованиє · и наземли
line 2 чаквымъ крьпкад польници.
line 3 пртаал Дюо циси на иже кт.
line 4 вѣ прииагаиныхъ.
line 5 айкъ натъ огно
line 6 ванне , повзвт
line 7 Били возло
line 8 жйчж ·
line 9 Тъ , Никъ Мъ
line 10 млашни · и
line 11 виндт ·
Воскресенье

line 1  Хъ сѣсть нѣжнѣ - ёже наны рѣкописаннѣ при
line 2  гробиць - накрѣтъ растерзаны, ё смрти дѣр
line 3  жалѣ оѣпразднѣлъ ёсть, покланѣлся
line 4  тридѣвномѣ его восстанію.
line 5  Госпяратѣлъ воспоеѣлъ хѣо воскрѣшенье - тѣ
line 6  вѣ ёсть избавите, и сѣсть дышам нѣйми.
line 7  и вославѣ страшнѣ й крѣпцѣй сплач, па
line 8  ки градѣть едити мирѣ, егоже создан.
line 9  Ины Стихіры, Востонны.
line 10  Тевѣ воспѣнішагосв я погребѣннѣ - агѣлъ
line 11  проповѣдѣлъ вѣкъ. и гласе женалмъ, прѣ
line 12  дѣте и видѣте и дѣже лежѣ Гадь - воскрѣсе
line 13  во ймуже рѣче йкнъ всесилень - тѣмжеет
line 14  са покланѣлъ едіномѣ веибрѣномѣ.
line 15  живодачче хѣ помилъс нѣсть.
line 16  Вртомъ своимѣ оѣпразднѣлъ еси в дрѣ
line 17  ва клѣтвѣ, погребѣннѣлъ свойымѣ оѣмѣр
line 18  твѣлъ.

Folio 29v

Гласъ , й .

line 1  твѣлъ еси смрти державѣ - восстанѣлмѣ
line 2  же своими просвѣтилъ еси родъ чистеснѣй.
line 3  сего ради вознѣмѣ тѣ, благодателю хѣ вѣже
line 4  нашъ слава тѣмѣ.
line 5  свершашися - Где стрѣхомъ врата
line 6  смертила, врѣнициже адова видѣвше
line 7  тѣ оѣжасошася, врѣвая мѣшанала сѣ
line 8  крѣпилъ еси, и верілъ желаѣла естьла
line 9  еси и ивѣдѣ насъ вѣтмы и сѣни смертилѣ
line 10  и оѣзы наша растерзала.
line 11  Сизению пѣнь поѣцѣ, и оѣсть войськъ
line 12  лѣвѣлъ - приидѣлѣ всѣ ѣдомъ Гадъ при
line 13  подѣлѣли гласце, иже надѣбѣ растнѣннѣ
line 14  са, и изсмрѣвѣхъ воскрѣсы сый вѣдѣрѣ
line 15  вѣчы, очии тѣ жѣхій неѣлъ, сѧ и нѣлъ бѣ.
line 16  Прѣдѣ сѣнь закононалъ бѣкти пришѣ
line 17  ши: тѣкже вѣ ноѣнна несокрашѣ
Воскресны

распалалá

Глáн

просиша, твоеá власти неведацице, но
завещанное майдие твоé, приалъ еси
погребение, твое и тридцатино воскряе: Гáн
слава тебе.

Живодавче Хé, боиндо стрсть полять мë
твыхъ ради, вадьже сошёдъ якъ сë
лень, иже таль приществища чашими твоé
го, исхитилъ еси: якъ взвера держав
на, рай явлëсто ada жити даровáлъ еси:
тëлъ янамъ славлëшимъ, тридцатёне
твое восстане, дады убиение грехòлъ,
и вëлйо матй: Слава Христó. 181
Господи небо, паче вся го древнихъ
ччесть, кто бо поznà лябрь безмй
яла рёдахь, и хардкъ носаць, иже вsec
тварь содержалаго, вже есть слово рёда
еса, егже якм ланца правдал хардкъ
с в свою

Folio 31v

LLLL
Троицны

line 1 сюяю носиши, и лябрь державе же име
line 2 мй иммии, непрестай молши шчтв
line 3 црих та оймьерти и сьсти дйш нйяд
line 4 Тропарь глазе, и, Гёже и нанъ Глы
line 5 Егда сици коемрти животе безмернь
line 6 тнй и тогда ада оймертвй вси веста
line 7 нёмъ вкщта; егдаже оймершал в прей
line 8 сяни всккрвй, вся сильы неных вопйчахь:
line 9 жизнодавче хе вже слава твтк Бого
line 10 Бсв паче смыслала, всв преславна твдя
line 11 вие танства: читчто замччаткйна
line 12 и дджомъ хранима: мтн развмсв не
line 13 абна: Бг яркимъ истиинаго, тогдмо
line 14 лй систйса дййаль найшаль
line 15 Каномъ Откй и живомачальнй Трпн творение
line 16 Мтрожданко глазб Икн, Икак, Ипрк, Богданик
line 17 Троицное единоначалное естьво вкщта
line 18 пкено воспомъ гдже: мтн пмий не
line 19 исчерпй

Folio 31v

LLLL
Глб

line 1 исчепалмь, еднественио якм иммии:
line 2 твтк кананемьха оймидри и сйси, якп
line 3 чйкеловецк
line 4 Иже: истчникъ, и корень вциций сынъ
вено: иже во Ойк и сткимъ твдяля Дсж
line 6 соестственного вкщта, трисччинный ецц
line 7 моемь просвети свкть, и причастйвмъ

1 The diacritical mark above И in Иже cannot be clearly seen.
9. Трисві́тві́мъ є́диное бігоначална , ве́сь 
10. разори́ гра́вьтъ мо́йхъ стра́тей мра́къ , 
11. свегі́тами заралма твоільи , й сладки 
12. ли прича́дениами : й сотвори́ тво́еа непри 
13. косновениыми славы , црковъ й скинь ода 
14. шевалёндіо . Біго́ндичнъ . 
15. Токъ дрэ́вны́ є́стества на́у́нэв , постра 
16. днавше неподобнъ : й ктли по̀пдышесеа 
17. прі́геа . вопло̀щеа йо̀островъ тво́еа . 

Folio 32' 

Гласы й 

1. тва́ри , боостврбъ ти́ о̀є́дьєствованъ ,
Folio 33'

Τροίχνυ

1 The diacritical mark above η cannot be clearly seen.
Гласс brero

1. Спесённыя, црьо смирениї: сооблюди мол.
2. Блёрт твоём, тьбо еси животь и ли,
3. всёмеском.
4. Мойсей вкёнинб, якв ивицал возицкии.
5. Втненг, дятль накрепеся, учее слово,
6. кнамь твоё пролавала принществие, ям;
7. же всемь ивъ возпиший еси, держа
8. въ вопоначало еднаго, трисоставицию.
9. Естествиено, сопривосцению славы пре
10. лождаль, единоначална Трие стдал, во
11. спбвённемъ та православю върою.
12. твоё славы видаше сподовди, всзнача
13. ибо и еднаг здро трислипцию. Гео;
14. Содеркителиемъ посвященъ ей Всъ сло
15. бо, всемь въкимъ Дйо мтн, вожреек
16. твоемь ы/держа неизреченъ чаки при
17. зьва/а есновоплаенію еднаго гтва.
18. Зъ пѣнь

Троичны

1. Пѣнь, з, Имь. Вовездик граховик водржей.
2. Волкитею мтнн, полмади, втл врдю.
3. цнчу, Бйче трислище: и прергкищений
4. избыви и величествей и вѣдъ сици.
5. Нейгланной пчуюю багост: не обмысли
6. мбю твоего элпнда, и трислнаго втва,
7. свтодателию свтадарды ми. Го;
8. Не изгланино Дйо вышнй, чаккъ бывъ.
9. истеи, ячка всемекси овдекса: и свк
10. толмъ мк трислинымъ възари.
11. Сфгдйна, Галъ з, Пдъ, Вышинымъ има.
12. Хѣ Бйце еднин превлгий, яже крови сво.
13. насъ рдн излйовый: на кртъ помощей.
14. совтткомъ вйда твоего и Дхс: сего радин
15. деразноше зовемъ: полмади стдъо сво.
16. чакколвч.
17. Дйо ттдал полмади рабы сво, и имйн

Folio 34r
line 18  огна и вскъдъ мъки : виоци и вднъ
line 19  зовдцых

Folio 34v

§§§§§

Глъ б

а г

line 1  зовдцыхъ сидъ твоеимъ пртдал : непрецир
line 2  стадо свое , матери Хе теве рохшда
line 3  Пкснъ , зъ Ірмъ . 0 тѣлъ златъ
line 4  Оуставлдешъ прнвъ , аглскдл вднства
line 5  кнепрелженшо , еднн съ нейлдлнне й три
line 6  состаим Гдн : покажи оъвъ й мош съцъ не
line 7  приобдоо всегдъ , во ежъ салвити та тѣ
line 8  паъ , й воспввдтъ поаочнъ
dline 9  Лпци оъмнн невестсянны оосьствъ
line 10  твоими ачами Бйе , еднновлстнн е три
line 11  слднн дардеми вывдлтъ , положеншемъ
line 12  втбрнн сбкътв : чйже и мене сйлнмъ
dline 13  въ придтдемъ покажи сбкътъ , йкв сък
line 14  теддтель трисдлннъ
dline 15  Трисдтвъ дардлми освцдлмъ Трне
line 16  пртдал . въ едннй державъ , храни свол
line 17  пвца Впртвенъхъ напастей : дъ тад
line 18  3  в непре

Folio 35v

§§§§§

Троинны

line 1  непрестанно слвыйтъ , вче й сне , й пртнъ
dline 2  дшнъ : велйшъмъ вкѣпъ . бтрордичнъ
dline 3  Напрвдлча нсть й [в]озвышал кйсемъ
dline 4  не оскдкй , тевъ любдиыхъ , йже зани
line 5  изреченое нсколгне , быъ члкъ во острвък
line 6  дывнъ й обжнчъ члкъ й напртакъ слвъ со
dline 7  влицъмъ вкладъ . Пкснъ , йъ Ірмъ . нподъшн
line 8  Непрстшналъ Трнъ , сопрподцдалъ , со
dline 9  везнщална , вгонщална , не излвй
line 10  иал возскхъ , крмъ сбктомоснъхъ
dline 11  своизствъ , бесъ асквый оупразднъ соо
dline 12  сттныхъ соькъ , й смущнл пксоль
dline 13  нврдна твордъ ма прно , гдн вскческъ
Промудро и всемощно, неописанное, три
славное единачалие, составляющее мир.
И согласающее твою силу, чиною все
совершенном, вселенная воле серце, п'ти
и слави

Глас 6

И славить та неимычно слыхи адласка
ли вясла в'ккис.
Прецисти вьяла, непостижне, неизрече
не вкйй славе : не преодносе ти, и вктяей
ное естетво не излагнень, етьтво чаче
ское восприялъ еси и единственнъ трцг
чести всех наоучилъ еси: іакв гидана
чалию вясла в'кки. Бгродиченъ.
Правосъсть и мьдрость, иже всехъ напра
вашцала, воздови подостольио, та
всвтсво дзв и святоносндо : несказано
прдтда, втла вселиса: иже п'сно слава.
цес, поемъ зовице, багвите вса д'кдла
гид Г'да, п'ете и превъносите егда повкки.
П'сень, д. Ирлосъ, иже прежде слизца.
Осв'кта венчала, соозвячалъ сбыт
свтъ просида, и со естественый свтъ.

Троицыны

Ахъ изыде, не изглъдно б'лоп'ниу, не
tакнъ ркть о'кр'л'ями, воскр'же
не не изреченномъ несохаждено.
Восцдъ восцда трикальное вктьво, восп'к
в'ностихъ т'да, трисв'нымъ св'здомъ
ти. и даца раздоль еже восв'хъ разд
м'кти, и зр'т' втво хот'кнжъ, бл'ге и
совершенное, и величати и славити та.

1 The diacritical mark above в'ккис cannot be clearly seen.
 line 9  Не ишчётенъ естествъ сый яйкъ Биъ, не
 line 10  ишчечнію пычишъ цедрость яйкъ ямъ 
 line 11  окумердаль труце прѣжде тѣ, тако и насъ ощюе
 line 12  дри равы своѣ, и щиергъшнй изваби,
 line 13  и напастенъ и пѣдъ.
 line 14  Гісіи ла гіе мобы, йвеакаго искіше
 line 15  піла нозловленія, іже вострѣхъ лицѣ,
 line 16  востівяленный, нексазаный едѣствѣнны.
 line 17  вѣй всесильный, итвоѣ стадо сохраннѣ.
 line 18  вѣд

 Folio 36v

 §§§§§

 Глѧсть, вѣд.

 line 1  вѣд лѣтвыами.
 line 2  На вѣтъ Гдѣ - Трѣ - глѣ, вѣд - Ведъ - вѣчѣръ - {}
 line 3  сійде; і нѣчо - ітчо - По ак стѣ, Гдѣ Воскрѣ - Глѣ.
 line 4  Блого щерваный Іосифъ, соцрѣва съмѣтъ.
 line 5  прѣтвор тѣло твоѣ - плаценицею чѣтою
 line 6  оевиѣй, и вонылѣ - вогробѣ нѣчъ закры.
 line 7  положи; вмѣтр иесмѣсѣ. гѣй, по
 line 8  далъ миро вѣлію матѣъ - Глѣ, і Нѣчъ - Бѣ.
 line 9  Препрославена еси вѣчъ поѣмъ та: крѣтом
 line 10  вѣ сіа твоѣго низлежица щдѣ: и смрѣть
 line 11  ѐщерваны, ѐщерзвѣнѣй востаѣомъ,
 line 12  и животѣ сподновѣкомъ, рѣй воспріѣх.
 line 13  дрѣвнаго наслажденія - тѣлѣже вѣгода
 line 14  рацѣ вомѣлѣ тѣ, раѣдѣса вѣгода вѣдѣла
 line 15  гѣстовѣо. на е стихоѣ, Гѣлѣ. Глѣ. ў.
 line 16  Мировоистомъ весмѣлъ, при гровѣ прѣ
 line 17  стаѣтъ агѣлъ вомѣѣшъ - мѣро мѣртвѣалъ
 line 18  і ѐстъ Folio 37v

 §§§§§

 Воскрѣны

 line 1  ѐстъ достоино, Хѣ же истаѣнію явиѣ.
 line 2  чѣдѣлъ: вмѣетъ вологѣ востѣгъ гѣй,
 line 3  подадъ миро вѣлію матѣъ - Глѣ: і Нѣчъ.
 line 4  Законъ ѐщерзванца естествѣнныхъ.
 line 5  вѣкѣвѧннымъ рѣѣомъ, дѣство совокѣнѣ.
 line 6  ла еси: тѣйо родила еси ѐдина, іже прежѣ
Folio 37v

Гласъ Ѣ Ѣ Ѣ Ѣ

Воцрѣна

Воззвѣшенно живаціи і не дай бо Хв жеазла
накрѣпнѣй свой.
Сѣкщѣ дѣломъ, тѣснитъ всѣкая премѣ
Folio 38v

Гласъ й

Folio 39r

1 The diacritical mark above И in Избавитель cannot be clearly seen.
Воскресны

line 1  и нетакних о́цмёрших вясть це Биё , 1йже
line 2  постъй стрять твоёл : 1йже прослави́емъ  .
line 3  цтвёнды падннй о́вра́з , 1й 1овнов сокръ
line 4  шенный , содътель Бгъ 1й 1инноматнй :
line 5  о́цмёртивиса всёць 1оживъ , 1йкв про
line 6  слáвиса .  Бородичевъ .
line 7  Чиини а́итлстин , ржтвъ твоёмъ 1аче естъ
line 8  ствённомъ , слáжать 1радъошиса 1чтола :
line 9  свъть во роднла еси Бгя 1й Гда .
line 10  Инь Каноны .  Пртъй Бцн .  Гл а .  1ямъ-1той .
line 11  Неве́ществнна дрёве лёствница : 1й старъ
line 12  но оладъкшни путь мо́ра , твоё 1каза́
line 13  ие ржтвъ чистла , 1же поёмъ Вачце ,
line 14  1йкв просла́виса .
line 15  Гладь вышнаго същества 1совершённое ,
line 16  вкил 1реты , воплоошиса 1чтола 1иствё ,
line 17  кочцокъ привили́йса : 1йкв просла́виса .
line 18  Прёде

Folio 39v

Гласъ Ь

line 1  Прйтде сквоздъ дверъ непроходндо , затво
line 2  редню о́цтрнвы твоёл , правдъ снше чн
line 3  стдал , 1й мири вооидь : 1йкв просла́виса .
line 4  Пёнь , 1й .  1ямъ-ось .
line 5  Прочвилъ естъ пёстьни 1йкв крий гдй ,
line 6  1азьнна непалооцщал цркви прпшн
line 7  стйёй 1ти .  1онйже о́цтрудиса моё о́це .
line 8  Тврвъ 1ростъ 1твоэй 1оальнншеса .
line 9  зра́цъ 1тъ вниирлтн 1овра́зъ , 1везако
line 10  ники 1ордгвлемъ , 1йже 1овноваошго всё
line 11  1твённымъ мановённёмъ ,
line 12  1й персти пообра́зъ 1дъ рскъ своо воо сдадъ ,
line 13  1й 1соврдёнжкъ 1аки вопёрсъ смёртнй
line 14  грякво 1хе , соше воадъ сокаооооо еси .  1йво :
line 15  Чиини 1цдившиа а́итлстн пртталя 1й чео

1 The diacritical mark above ы cannot be clearly seen.
Воскресенье

Адит сокрушила силных державою ти
Хе, и силуо неимонить прпополасшасла.
Йже ве'хъ выйши Хе, охманисла ла
ламъ н'ччмъ юттскаго ёстества: стра
стию плотекою.
Мертву совѣзаконными волчница.
силъ женимъ красенъ добротою Хе иави
са воскреснителъ. Инъ Ирмосъ, тойже.
Йже времямъ превышши вселечихъ.
Адикъ временимъ Тврежъ, истеъвъ Адо бо
лео младенецъ созданъ.
Чрѣво пространкишше нысъ восвой, егож
же ра ди адамъ, намистъ радьска живет.
Писень, А, Ирмосъ.
Пришѣ вовѣбъ вѣбѣ, ны ходотаи ны абть.
не ть сальъ гдѣ воспосла, и сипе всего ла
чакъ. т'кмъ вопио ти, слава сила твоей.
Престол

Гласъ в

Престол сьдящъ, адикъ дсажей иже мологъ.
вопиа Гдѣ, сдѣ низноса взяковъ, идже
стратую свою, велелинныъ содѣлъ сисени.
Статую твою Хе, брать искдѣкиша србѣ.
же прптивнымы же еже войдъ сходже.
нимъ ти гради разрусшислъ, и смѣрти.
держава разорена выесть. Безродичи.
Тъ пристанище сисениу, и стѣнь недвиж.
мѣ, быча всѣ свѣмы. твѣо молитвѧ.
ли си, явваласи вѣръ дѣш нѣдѣлѧ. Инъ, Ирмос.
Оуслыша Гдѣ, славно твѣе смотрѣнѧ, и про
слави мѣрде, непостижимо сила твоѧ.
The diacritical mark above \( e \) in \( \text{estöstva} \) cannot be clearly seen.
Поститиса .phi.vresela слашъ, ыкэшатъ.
смртношаго дрэвль пёрвге : нё сэгэ ыдзы.
п PeyваДъ, ычнсэлас вторый слашъ.
вьствъ câчэски, стратьже ыпь мёртвъ бы.
вемъ, ыжэ вьствъстный невывестнъбы.
вьствъ : вэшновъ ыэ ычэшмвиенноче ыке.
риль ыдобы востьрсвътъ : йрмсэсъ тымъ.
вьстави вчэліла сладость кропите счъ.
наземлъ : ыквъ отрочч дасътъ, сэйп прьде.
вёкъ, вэды воплодъсла ыгъ нытъ.
И ы. ыкъ ындъио.

Фолио ::

Восторсны

Жытъио ы плоти моэй свъ восьла, ы дрэходъ.
грэшъ разръшъ, напослэдкъ вэды вьстъле.
не воплодъсла вышимъ. Пёнсъ, ы йрмсъ.
вьствъ дрэходъ ыгрэшовихъ ыдэрхъ ы не ызъ.
съвдэнъ ымардагъ твоего призываль вэдъ.
нэ. ы талъ. Ыкъ моэь вовзеды ыла.
ыкъ злодъки пръникъ ыдысъла: ы совъзъ.
закъникома на дрэвъ привбдълетъ. повъ.
ныхъ вьщмиве своо дарбюца ырбю.
эдяньаго ошъвъ ради чыка пёрваго слашъ.
дрэвле ылнъръ вникъе смертъ: ы эдяньаго рэ.
dи еъда вэдъ, яывисъ востьрсввъ. ыгъ.
нейкъсъвмънъ дэо рэдъла ыэй, ы вёнчъ.
эдъ дэоо ыявлъисъла, истинными въствла.
эдъ ы ыгъ твоего ыбрасъ. ынъ, ырмсъ.
эдъ ыласъ гыль. мольвъ, йвоавъзеньыла ывъкъ.
эдъ ошъльшъвъ: ыълътыъхъ молкъ ызвъви.
эдъ.

Фолио 42в

Гласы въ.

1 The diacritical mark above е in вьствъ cannot be clearly seen.
2 The diacritical mark above е in эдяньаго cannot be clearly seen.
Folio 43v

§§§§§

Воскресные

line 1 Ты еси свѣтъ хмрачнѣнномъ, ты еси воскресѣнѣй
line 2 всѣхъ я животь чѣколяй ... всѣхъ сословіе воскре
line 3 сильь еси ... Смертию держаю Госе разорѣть, я адова
line 4 прѣти сокрышаю еси сладе, я мертвию озерѣвше чѣдо
line 5 еси озерѣвашася ... всѣ тѣло пѣнно радиетца въвоскре
line 6 еси тѣломъ чѣкаловѣне ... Тѣлѣже еси сладила и во
line 7 синаятъ еси снѣдѣннѣнѣй и мирь Госе мої воскрѣва
line 8 еста присновъ ... Ппсень, зв... Ірмосъ...
line 9 Бѣготивное велѣнѣ ... вѣдакондоцца
line 10 го амбітела, высокъ пламень воэ
line 11 носъ естъ ... Хже прострѣтъ бѣготивны
line 12 дѣтелъ хладъ ... снѣй блгвѣнѣй и
line 13 препрославѣнѣнѣй Бгъ вѣцъ нѣшихъ...
line 14 Нетерпѣше вѣдо зрѣти, грѣхомъ слѣд
line 15 тнымъ чѣка амбима ... но пришедѣ снѣй
line 16 еси своєю крѣйдо, чѣкъ быкъ ... снѣй блгвѣн
line 17 и препрославѣнѣнѣй Бгъ вѣцъ нѣшихъ...
line 18 Вѣдѣнѣшся та озерѣвашаса оставчнѣна во
line 19 ідекад

Folio 43r

§§§§§

Воскрѣсны

line 3 вѣлъ, я дѣвѣ жизмѣнномъ не видѣкъ
line 4 ше тѣ дѣри озерѣвашаса, вѣййвоса пѣть
line 5 творѣ разпоинникъ ярвай.
line 6 Пѣсть адъ и опровержень высть, смртню
line 7 едина, же въ много вогательство собрѣ:
line 8 едий вѣч на хе истоци ... Ірмъ, тонкѣ
line 9 вѣстество чѣче работнююе грѣхъ ... вѣнище
line 10 чгала: товѣо свѣводѣ озерѣвъ: товѣ вѣ
line 11 сѣй якъ аднѣцъ, завекѣ закладѣтся.
line 12 Вопѣлъ тѣ еси, істинѣній вѣомѣти,
line 13 прозгѣкавшад рабы изваи: едина вѣ
line 14 держовѣнѣ ко сѣй ямашъ ... Кв: Глазъ, з
line 15 Воскрѣсалъ еси легона Госе вексіемъ, я адѣ видѣ
line 16 чѣдо еси озерѣаса и мертвию востанша тварыже ви
line 17 адны, раднѣса стовѣо Іадамъ вѣнѣ вексиѣтца.
line 18 и мѣтъ Госе мої, востикаваетъ тѣа присновъ ... Іось.
line 19 и Гъ Ты еси
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Фолио 44

Воскресны

Гласъ и
§§§§§

Гласъ ἀ

Folio 44v

1. Δέχασται εἶνα, ἧπερεν κτύπω τρίζα· καὶ ἤπειρο
2. ήν θέρσας, ἤ γάζακαμον χωπίδα· πρεβάζει·
3. στεβέννυν ὤμε τής σοντού Εᾶκ, βαλβέννυ ἐς ἀγό
4. Πέσες ἦ, ἤ ζράλδος·
5. Πάμ αὐγήνα, ἕνογα δοβαλιών κ, ἅ
6. τελε ἡσαλάσσα, δύκιν τοιελείες·
7. χάδεα ὑπαλάυνι, ἤ τὰρνα προχλαζά
8. ὰμιμ πούμα, βαλβίτε κελ ἄκα γῆα γᾶ α·
9. Κρόβυο τζούεμ ἄε, ὅκελεν ἐνο πολτι τζούε
10. ἰράζοι υδάθαμπν· τρειςτούς διαλάχσ
11. εα, Ἥνογομι το δολοτερτικίνιο, ἅταλ
12. στίγ κίνι ζοῦμαε· βαλβολοβίτε κελ ἅκ
13. δα γῆα Γᾶ α·
14. Τὑ μ Readonly γέρμενννού, ὀδὰλλ κει τεάρνε
15. πεζοέρτεο Βοστάνιέμκ α γι· σερὸ ράδι νεες
16. λαςκεα βαλγαρτεένιο νοστήβαλοῦ τι·
17. ἵσβράννιίτι λουδίε ἄε· ζοῦμαε τεέεκ, θο
18. Κ
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§§§§§

Βοσκότανα

1. ἴερτα βύεε σάρτα πούδάνδακτα· καὶ ἃο:
2. Τὑ ἤνε ντυς ἤγεραδάμνατο, βοοῦτρόνθ
3. πεζκάλλενε σακέννη, καὶ βογόδάκης νούκ
4. ὀὰ: νείσρεθσίσ α πορόδια τῷ βνεροάκτε
5. λισε πρύταλ· τζπαίκε τᾶ σκέννε νεκάλ
6. λάμα νοστήβαλκακτ· ἰγκτ, ἤροςκτ.
7. Τζπασ δαλασ ϊνοκαλίκασα τριγά
8. τνυα νούσκα· τνέρλεκάνι νόιβλμ τζκτί
9. υσβαράζ βιδάκκας· ποκέρδθ πόλεμι κο
10. σπκβάκας, ἰβεθεστίκασα νόι γᾶ θα κα
11. τβάρκτ κα πενεζονοέτε ένο βαβκκτκ.
12. Βιδάκκτ βύεε νακόφκ προβοκάκακτκ,
13. ἤνε βογάττας βομάτι· βάλευ πορεβέςκα
c
14. κα τριδέθσν βοκόρκας· ἴβζβνια τά νόι κα
15. σέμνκκα νάκολκκκκ· κακός ποδοκνήκ
16. νόι γᾶ κα τβάρκτ κα πενεζονοέτε ένο
Извáти изчáствá, прошédь вопрe
испóнáл слóве бáййй, éгóжé создáлъ écí
че́, сильóю твóéó бáннáёнóо, й вéнстаъ
нáл́ сотвори́, слáвы прясáрныя твóéó
причáстника содéлáлъ. ãá ñòé гáл всé твáрь,
ý превознóсите éгów вовé́ки. òрмóс, то .
Ивáсá назéмлý теé вáдэ, ý сочáки по
живé: вóтнó нейзрённых и си́льо. éм8же
пóэалъ всí вýннн зовéчье. вéдáннýтн
áлэ пóй гáл всé твáрь, ý превознóсите
ätв вовé́ки.
Войстинн тá ñтáл, проповéдáюще сáл
ýмлъ Биý. òымó едýнаго перóдáл écí
вóнца воплощéна. éгóжé сò Вéлм и дéмóл
всí пóэалъ. ãá ñòé гáл всé твáрь, ý
превознóсите éгów вовé́ки.
Пêснь, 9. òрмóсъ .
К е́ Бéнначá

Бе́нначáна родíтелa cíý Бéт и гáб ,
воплóвцéлъ òу дýы наýмъ ивáсáлъ , ú
манчáла просёктáти, ã сёрáтн рáстó
чéнáлъ: têñá всëвáлнýмó виý вêнчáвáлъ .
óк увра нáсëждëнн во кра́нёввс сíйс ,
трéвогáйтнё дрёвó, твóéó прóчagо кртá-
вóдóй и крóйнó бáннáённóо, òáк у òв́ истó
чиннá бáннáённых рéбвр твóйхъ чèг нáпá
лóмо, жìвóтн наýмъ прозáвáлъ ëстъ .
Низлёжí си́льныя распáнýслá, òáк у всé
céлнý, ã èже низó лежáюще воáдóвъ твé
dýннн, êстéстнó чàческó вóznéслý écí .

1 The diacritical mark above и in вéнстаъ cannot be clearly seen.
Гла́съ Ῥ
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Гла́съ Ῥ

Folio 47v

Во́скрё́сны

1 The diacritical mark above in Ῥ cannot be clearly seen.

2 The diacritical mark above in Ῥ cannot be clearly seen.
Днілъ єси· да покажерши людемъ ёже иё зъ мртвыхъ твоє воскресініє· іаково ёдино
чвяколчвєцъ·
Да рёкніть людє , како воїни погребно
斯特гній цріа· почтбо вё калень нєсо
храни калеме жызні· іли погребньаго
дадатъ· ілі востресємъ дая поклонѧса·
глаголе снали· слава множеству ѣдро
твоїхъ· Сієс накъ слава твоїх·
Радітєса людє и вассалтєса· агьлъ сє
дай

Folio 47v

Гласъ б

Сдай накалеми гробылькъ , той нами
лаговъети рекъ· ḳе востресе сієс мірові :
і исполин вєлєнєла багоустаніа· ра
дітєса людє и вассалтєса·
ітъ оєбъ еже радітєса· прежде твоєго
зачатіа Гды· багоантьй принесе· агты
же калень славнаго гроба твоєго , востове
востресє сієлъ , съєбъ оєбъ вопѣлами
место , вассалы вѣрьды вострастъ сєп
же востми местъ вакъ жынодывща про
повтдамъ нами , тємъже вопѣлъ тї·
багоантаю вєлъ Гды слава твтъ·
Іны стихіры востонъы·
Возлатъа муєро сослездани напрёб тво
жены· і исполинъша радости оєстъ і,
єнєддъ гласти вострє Гды·
Да похвалатъ вазцы и людє зд а вєд на
Къ шего,

Folio 48r

Востресны

шего , іже волєо нась радє распітіе прє
tерпѣвана· в востлъ тридєвноіваща·
і поклонѧтєса ієвъ тридєвнолв вострє
нєо· ілъже просвѣтішилась всєгд мира
вее 1. Воскрес Иисус Господь Мой.

2. Распятием и погребением, Иисус Изволен.

3. Ли, плача Тебя, И воскрес Воссия.

4. Воскрес Иисус. И воскрес Воссия.

5. Воскрес, и воскрес Воссия. Господь Иисус.

6. Войско везде, запечатали.
Поклонны

Folio 49v

§§§§§

Гласъ в

дръть , и мътемъ и бягостйни : тълъже
молямышъ та къ съ сво я ность , и прислаждъ
ме завежъ пръв въ просвйце . даръх равбъл
свободъ , прергъшйненъ многимъ разрѣ
шенъ : и пропшненъ всѣмъ и пръв соргъви
хъ вси , иакъ въ и пръв ность , и чяколъбецъ.
стихотъ всѣ съ сво я ность , иакъ въ и пръв
рдъ вомычнисъ , извйсъ ейъ чакъ списъ
нъ покланяюцъ ся твоимъ заповѣ
дъ непришельъ бо ейъ чакълъбецъ првъ денъ
ни систй , но иже въ преръшйненъъ око
въ свъмъ мно гъмъ гръхъ : разрѣшъ
tи взтъ , кръсненъ стъгъ и иакъ цѣдръ ,
ъ и чакълъбецъ .
ны стыры , Стъмъ апълъ . Гла въ ной , тойке .
Птръли херебили и серафими , гъстйва.
же и сильы , и влйсты чтнымъ апълъ :

1 The diacritical mark above И in Икоже cannot be clearly seen.
Воскресные

line 1 ἀρχιτέλιν, ἕνεκ τ' ἐνετάκη
line 2 οὐκ ἐστείλτο κοστᾶταισμός - πέξεν νέπρε
line 3 στάντιον συγκάςον ποιότην, ἐνδι κοτρός
line 4 σώματος, οὐλα ρήσοντας χειθο, σφάσεα
line 5 μ ε ἐνδικτιόν και σοπτόλανο -
line 6 Πέρα π ναμνάτων ἀλίσ σα, πανάρχ
line 7 στίλα κάράδ, ἡςα δοτάστεννας σαλά
line 8 τελμείοντας, ψαίνον μας πόλεα
line 9 βάλοντα, βαθύνσει σκέφτος, οὐλι
line 10 σατ γκάλι σιχ λοβώντας σάκωλο
line 11 ποδοστόλανιο τάκοζε, κράτος η χοίκι
line 12 δε χότετ το συ ελεγάνιμον -
line 13 Γορκ κάνοντας διάδ, Γορκ ερνοντάο, οὐ
line 14 ομλώσα στρατδένοι λοβώντα βαθύνσο
line 15 μάθος, ὑμο διάδας σανά χοίριαδά
line 16 όσερά, οἶκω δὲ οἶκ ῥίδας αίχαλας ὕπαθ
line 17 σταέμει, ομδαγκέλος τομά στράατες, χαίο
line 18 ομε

Folio 50v

Гласъ θ

line 1 ομε σο αγάλας πρεσσάται στράατος πρόςθλ
line 2 σιζχαλαστα, ου πρεβραζασελ ως σκέλα
line 3 ωσ сκέμα -
line 4 σιαλ γαρκ, ου νήκ : έγρο -
line 5 Κρύσεστα στράατα, σά ἐγκ αστάρτα,
line 6 ἐνεπακέντας τριστά μάλα γασά - οἶκω πρε
line 7 στοάς θαμάς σεμάς ονομαζόχεις, ου πολάτα
line 8 ως σκέμας ματάνθες μόστρα βαθύνσι, οὐκε
line 9 ως τέρμα προοδότις όσερά δκολά, οἶκω πρε
line 10 σο αρχιτέλομα Γαβρήλομα, οἶκω ρόθηνι
line 11 ισθοντικόν σάδοστι -
line 12 Να στιχούν, Στυτές σκάλιλες - Γλάσε, ομ

1 The diacritical mark above Α in ἀρχιτέλι cannot be clearly seen.
line 13 Согрѣвши ти сиѣ смѣки вѣдѣнный сиѣ . прѣй
line 14 мѣ мѣ смѣ кѣ вѣдѣса , и помѣдѣ мѣ вѣ .
line 15 Вопиѣ тѣ хѣ сиѣ , мытарѣвшѣ гласомъ : ойш
line 16 сти мѣ тѣкѣ шногото , и помѣдѣ мѣ вѣ .
line 17 Іже земныя сладости невозлюблаше стра
line 18 Λ Ἐ сто

Folio 51v

§§§§§

Поклаіны

line 1 стотерпцы · нѣымъ вѣгомъ сподобиша
line 2 са , и агѣламъ согражане быша : гдѣ мо
line 3 литвами иѣ помѣдѣ и сиѣ нѧсъ .
line 4 Глѧва , и Нѣмъ · Бѣгородиченъ .
line 5 Радѣйся Лѣѣ Бѣ , цркви недори
line 6 мда , пѧчкже стѧдо , тѣкѣже
line 7 вопиѣть прѣкъ : стѧ цѣр
line 8 кви ткодѧ дѣвна
line 9 вопраѣдъ .

line 10 Бѣдобѣд

Folio 51v
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