

University of Gothenburg
Faculty of Arts, Department of Languages and Literatures

*Exaptation of the Nominal ŭ-Declension
in Old Church Slavonic*

DEGREE THESIS FOR THE LICENTIATE
IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES

Ann-Charlotte Gutsjö, 2017



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

Degree thesis for the licentiate in Slavic languages,

University of Gothenburg, 2017

The thesis was successfully defended at the Department of Languages and Literatures,
university of Gothenburg, on October 23, 2017.

Distribution:

Department of Languages and Literatures

University of Gothenburg

P.O. Box 200

405 30 Gothenburg

© Ann-Charlotte Gutsjö 2017

Contents

Abstract	06
Acknowledgements	07
Abbreviations	08
Font for reproduction of OCS/CS text and transliteration method	10
1. Introduction	10
1.1 The subject of this thesis	10
1.2 Main focus and aim	11
1.3 Limitations	12
2. Terminology	13
2.1 Text, manuscript, source, codex and monument	13
2.2 Canon	14
2.3 Slavonic, Slavic, OCS, CS, recension, redaction, Old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian	15
2.4 PS, Late PS and ComS	16
2.5 Noun and substantive	16
3. Previous research	16
3.1 OCS and CS	17
3.2 The ŭ-declension in OCS	19
3.3 Substantives belonging to the ŭ-declension in OCS	24
3.4 The origins of eight OCS substantives	25
3.4.1 ВОЛЪ <i>vol</i> " 'ox'	25
3.4.2 ВРЪХЪ <i>vr'ch</i> " (ВЪРХЪ, ВРЪХЪ) 'top'	26
3.4.3 ДОМЪ <i>dom</i> " 'house'	26
3.4.4 МЕДЪ <i>med</i> " 'honey'	27
3.4.5 ПОЛЪ <i>pol</i> " 'half'	27
3.4.6 СЫНЪ <i>syn</i> " 'son'	28
3.4.7 ГРѢХЪ <i>grĕch</i> " 'sin'	28
3.4.8 ДЛЪГЪ <i>dl"g</i> " 'debt' (ДЪЛГЪ)	29
3.5 Research on the eight substantives in OCS/CS sources	29
3.5.1 ВОЛЪ	30
3.5.2 ВРЪХЪ (ВЪРХЪ/ВРЪХЪ)	30
3.5.3 ГРѢХЪ	31
3.5.4 ДЛЪГЪ (ДЪЛГЪ)	33
3.5.5 ДОМЪ	33

3.5.6 МЕДЪ	34
3.5.7 ПОЛЪ	34
3.5.8 СЪНЪ	35
3.6 The Preslav and Ohrid schools	37
3.7 The scribes' changes	38
4. Theory	39
4.1 Exaptation	39
4.2. Exaptation and the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions	40
4.2.1 N.pl.	41
4.2.2 G.pl.	42
4.2.3 I.pl.	43
4.2.4 L.pl.	43
5. Method	44
5.1 Choice of substantives for the study	44
5.2 Choice of OCS/CS sources	44
5.3 Choice of 41 biblical verses	45
5.4 Method of excerption of OCS/CS text	46
5.5 Use of wordlists and electronic corpora	47
5.6 Method of data registration and analysis	48
5.7 Method of reproduction of OCS/CS text	48
5.8 Method of tests of statistical significance	49
6. Material	49
6.1 Types of texts	49
6.2 Biblical texts and the problems they present	50
6.3 The corpus of OCS and Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian CS	57
6.3.1 <i>Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092</i>	58
6.3.2 <i>Assemanian Gospel Lectionary</i>	58
6.3.3 <i>Dobromir's Gospel</i>	59
6.3.4 <i>Kochno Gospel Lectionary</i>	59
6.3.5 <i>Marianus Gospel</i>	60
6.3.6 <i>Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary</i>	60
6.3.7 <i>Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary</i>	61
6.3.8 <i>Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057</i>	61
6.3.9 <i>Sava's Book (Gospel Lectionary)</i>	61
6.3.10 <i>Turov Gospel Lectionary</i>	62
6.3.11 <i>Typograph Gospel</i>	62

6.3.12 <i>Undol'skij's Fragments</i>	63
6.3.13 <i>Vatican Gospel Lectionary</i>	63
6.3.14 <i>Vukan Gospel Lectionary</i>	64
6.3.15 <i>Zograph Gospel</i>	64
6.3.16 <i>Menaem of Dubrovskij</i>	64
6.3.17 <i>Putjatin Menaem</i>	65
6.3.18 <i>Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)</i>	65
6.3.19 <i>1073 Miscellany</i>	65
6.3.20 <i>1076 Miscellany</i>	66
7. Results	66
7.1 Results with comments	67
7.1.1 СЪИИЪ	69
7.1.2 ДОМЪ	72
7.1.3 ВОЛЪ	73
7.1.4 ГРѢХЪ	74
8. Summary and conclusions	76
8.1 Occurrences of the ŭ- and o-declensions	78
8.2 Parallel occurrences of case endings of both the ŭ- and o-declensions	78
8.3 Differences between Preslav and Ohrid	78
8.4 The findings in relation to R. Lass and A. Ch. Vostokov	79
9. Suggestions for further research	80
10. Material and references	81
10.1 Source material	81
10.2 References	83
Appendices	
Appendix 1. Occurrences	91
Appendix 2. Verses in 15 biblical sources	113
Appendix 3. Vostokov's thoughts on the use of ГРѢХЪ and ГРѢХОУЕЪ in the G.pl.	129
Appendix 4. Excluded occurrences	131

Abstract

Thesis for the degree of licentiate in Slavic languages at the University of Gothenburg, Faculty of Arts

Title: Exaptation of the Nominal ŭ-Declension in Old Church Slavonic

Author: Ann-Charlotte Gutsjö

Language: English

Department: Department of Languages and Literatures, University of Gothenburg, P.O. Box 200, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden

Key words: Old Church Slavonic, substantives, ŭ-declension

The aim of this thesis is to study six substantives that specialists agree belong to the ŭ-declension, and two substantives they agree belong to the o-declension, in order to find out more about the interplay between the two declensions in Old Church Slavonic. This is a period when it is difficult to say if some substantives were ŭ-stem substantives confused with o-declension case endings, or o-stem substantives influenced by the ŭ-declension case endings. 15 biblical and five non-biblical sources (menaea and miscellanies) from the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries have been used as sources for the study. The results were analysed in the light of R. Lass' theory on exaptation in language, and A. Ch. Vostokov's thoughts on parallel use of both the ŭ- and o-declension case endings but in different syntactic situations (Vostokov 2007:92 wordlist). In conclusion, even if few occurrences of ŭ-stem substantives with o-declensions case endings were found, these were all from very early sources, and were replaced by the ŭ-declension case endings in later copies.

Acknowledgements

The research for this thesis started in 2012, but took rather a long time owing to two fascinating jobs; one as a language teacher at an upper-secondary school in the town of Karlskrona, and the other as a substitute teacher in Old Church Slavonic (OCS) at the University of Gothenburg. Languages are of great interest to me, and in order to read the books and articles relevant for the field of OCS, I took the time to learn to read and understand text in languages that I earlier had little knowledge of, and time to improve the languages I had studied before, especially English.

However, the thirst for knowledge in the field of Old Church Slavonic, which is the reason for this thesis, would not have been possible to nourish without support and encouragement. Firstly, I am enormously grateful to my supervisors Antoaneta Granberg, Ph. D., and Elisabeth Löfstrand, Ph. D., for having in all phases of the thesis with interest and patience offered advice, comments and corrections, and given me important insights into the Old Church Slavonic language and literature. I am also grateful to all the specialists on language history of the Slavic languages and linguistics who have given me useful advice in seminars. I am deeply grateful to the librarians at the city library of Karlskrona, who managed to get hold of the required literature and sources in facsimile editions, even delivered by special transport from Stockholm, and I owe a debt of gratitude towards the librarians at the Lund University libraries UB and SOL (Languages and Literatures) for their help in finding the sources and literature I needed.

My ardent interest in Old Church Slavonic is the essence of the knowledge, advice, comments, corrections and help all these people have given me.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used for grammatical terms:

A.	accusative (case)
D.	dative (case)
G.	genitive (case)
I.	instrumental (case)
L.	locative (case)
N.	nominative (case)
pl.	plural
pp.	pages
sg.	singular

The following abbreviations are used for languages and linguistic varieties:

CS	Church Slavonic
ComS	Common Slavic
IE	Indo-European
OCS	Old Church Slavonic
OR	Old Russian
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PS	Proto-Slavic

Other abbreviations:

AD	Anno Domini
BC	before Christ
bis	twice
n.s.	not statistically significant
nr.	occurrence number

The following abbreviations and symbols are used in references to OCS/CS manuscripts:

- ‘a’ The first column on the recto page if there are two columns
- ‘b’ The second column on the recto page if there are two columns
- ‘c’ The first column on the verso page if there are two columns
- ‘d’ The second column on the verso page if there are two columns
- ‘r’ The recto page if there is only one column
- ‘v’ The verso page if there is only one column
- :
- A letter in the text cannot be reproduced by the font, or it is unclear if the letter is еръ or ерь
- *
- ⊙ Difficult to see what letter is written

The following abbreviations are used for references to sources:

ARC = *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*

ASS = *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary (also called the Vatican)*

DOB = *Dobromir’s Gospel*

DUB = *Menaem of Dubrovskij*

KOH = *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*

MAR = *Marianus Gospel*

MIR = *Miroslav’s Gospel Lectionary*

MST = *Mstislav’s Gospel Lectionary*

OST = *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*

PUT = *Putjatin Menaem*

SAV = *Sava’s Book (Gospel Lectionary)*

SUP = *Codex Suprasliensis (menaem)*

TUR = *Turov Gospel Lectionary*

TYP = *Typograph Gospel*

UND = *Undol’skij’s Fragments (Gospel Lectionary)*

VAT = *Vatican Gospel Lectionary Gr 2502 (not to be confused with the Assemanian Gospel, which is also called the Vatican)*

VUK = *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*

ZOG = *Zograph Gospel*

1073 = *1073 Miscellany*

1076 = *1076 Miscellany*

Font for reproduction of OCS/CS text and transliteration method

The font Altrussisch version Altsys Fontographer 4.1 04.07.1996 is used for reproduction of OCS/CS text. When transliteration has taken place it has been done according to Scando-Slavica's transliteration table with the exception of the nasal vowels; jus malyj (ⲁ) has been transliterated by the symbol -ę-, and jus bol' šoj (ⲛ) by the symbol -ǫ-.

1. Introduction

1.1 The subject of this thesis

The discovery which led to this thesis was the different case endings in the N.pl. of the substantive ⲥⲠⲛⲏⲗ in the *Vatican Gospel Lectionary*. The two variations in the N.pl. were found in the Gospel according to St. John XII:36, written twice on the same leaf but with different case endings: one on the recto page of leaf 14, and one on the verso page of leaf 14. The Old Church Slavonic (OCS) text on leaf 14r is ⲁⲛⲏⲗⲉⲗⲉ ⲥⲱⲉⲧⲏⲗⲓ ⲓⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲱⲉⲣⲟⲩⲏⲧⲉ ⲱⲗ ⲥⲱⲉⲧⲏⲗⲓ ⲁⲔ ⲥⲠⲛⲏⲗⲓ ⲥⲱⲁⲔⲉⲧⲉ and on leaf 14v is ⲁⲛⲏⲗⲉⲗⲉ ⲥⲱⲉⲧⲏⲗⲓ ⲓⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲱⲉⲣⲟⲩⲏⲧⲉ ⲱⲗ ⲥⲱⲉⲧⲏⲗⲓ ⲁⲔ ⲥⲠⲛⲟⲱⲉ ⲥⲱⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱ ⲱⲗⲁⲔⲉⲧⲉ. Why would a scribe use different forms of the substantive in the N.pl.? What had happened in the OCS language so that he did not react and change what he had written? Since I could not stop feeling excited or curious, the search for the reasons started.

The first obvious explanation was the interplay of the ŭ- and o-declensions in OCS, an interplay that led to the occurrences of parallel case endings, i.e. of both the ŭ- and o-declensions, for one and the same substantive, in one and the same source. The problem would then be to decide if the substantive belonged to the ŭ-declension, but was confused with the o-declension, and thus was found with the case endings of the o-declension, or if the substantive belonged to the o-declension, but was influenced by the ŭ-declension. This interplay could be

¹ “While you have the light, believe in the light, that you may become sons of light”.

the obvious explanation for the variations in the case endings in the N.pl. and for some time, this explanation was enough.

But as the search went on, a quite different possible reason for the parallel case endings appeared, inspired by R. Lass' theory on exaptation in language (Lass 1988:33-62). Roger Lass introduced the term *exaptation* as a way of describing the re-use of obsolete language forms, thus giving them new semantic roles in the development of languages. Could the use of different case endings be connected to this theory? It was also discovered that it is possible to link R. Lass' theory on exaptation in language evolution to A. Ch. Vostokov's claim on page 92 in *Остромирово Евангелие 1056-1057 года* that for the substantive **҃҃҃҃҃** both the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions were used in the G.pl., but in different syntactic constructions: **҃҃҃҃҃҃** with the ŭ-declension case ending when following a substantive and **҃҃҃҃҃** with the o-declension case ending following a preposition (Vostokov 2007:92 of wordlist). Linked to R. Lass' theory, could the ŭ-declension case ending in **҃҃҃҃҃҃** be an example of a re-use of the case endings of the ŭ-declension after the alleged demise² of this declension, but now with a new semantic role, in this case for a substantive that most specialists agree belonged to the o-declension? This is the subject of this thesis.

1.2 Main focus and aim

The main focus of this study is to study the parallel occurrences of substantives in chosen OCS and later Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic (CS) manuscripts, i.e. when one and the same substantive is found with case endings of both the ŭ- and o-declensions in one and the same manuscript.

The aim is to answer the following questions:

- 1) Having studied 20 selected manuscripts and searched for occurrences of eight chosen substantives, how many of the occurrences belong to the ŭ- or o-declension respectively? Does any source have a strikingly higher percentage in some way?
- 2) Are there parallel occurrences, i.e. case endings of both the ŭ- and o- declensions for one and the same substantive in one and the same manuscript?

² The ŭ-declension was "moving towards its demise" by the time of OCS (Gasparov 2001:77) and the result was that the ŭ-declension disappeared as an independent type of declension (Eckert 1959:102) when the ŭ-stem class was completely absorbed by the o-stems (Nandriş 1965:64).

- 3) Are there any differences between the Preslav and the Ohrid manuscripts concerning the use of ŭ- and o-declensions in G.pl.?
- 4) Could the parallel occurrences in the OCS and its later CS manuscripts be a sign that the alleged demise of the ŭ-declension never fully took place in the plural, or could the parallel occurrences of case endings of both the ŭ- and o-declensions in one and the same manuscript be explained by R. Lass' theory on exaptation and A.Ch. Vostokov's thoughts on the parallel use of the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions in different roles, i.e. in different sentence situations?

1.3 Limitations

The following limitations were decided:

- 1) Only 20 manuscripts in OCS and the later Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian CS from the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries were studied. Therefore, the title of the thesis might be considered as too far-reaching. The reason for the decision to only include manuscripts from these centuries is that most scholars agree that the ŭ-declension was absorbed by the o-declension very early (e.g. Mirčev 2000:57, Nandriš 1965:64, Chaburgaev 1974:177), and the reasons for studying only the Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian CS are that these three are of particular interest in this study since they cover a large part of the OCS/CS area. Not only text witnesses of biblical texts in tetraevangelia and aprakos Gospels were included, but five other manuscripts, three menaea and two miscellanies; the reason was that not all eight chosen substantives occurred in biblical texts, but could be found in non-biblical texts.
- 2) Only eight substantives will be studied; firstly the six substantives that are generally accepted as belonging to the ŭ-declension in OCS, **врѣхъ** *vr'ch*" 'top', **волъ** *vol*" 'ox', **домъ** *dom*" 'house', **медъ** *med*" 'honey', **полъ** *pol*" 'half' and **сынъ** *syn*" 'son', and secondly two substantives that are classified among the o-stem substantives, **грѣхъ** *grěch*" 'sin' and **длъгъ** *dl'g*" 'debt', and occur in biblical and non-biblical texts.
- 3) Only case endings from four cases in the plural were studied. The reasons for this were that the ŭ- and o-declensions in the singular have already been studied (e.g. Thorndahl 1974) and there is an ongoing study in the field of the dual of the substantive stems at the

University of Gothenburg. The four chosen cases are the nominative, the genitive, the instrumental, and the locative. The dative and the accusative plural were excluded for validity reasons. The case-endings are identical for the ũ-stem substantives and the o-stem substantives, having taken into consideration the development of -н- into -о- in the dative. The vocative has been excluded considering that all but two substantives are inanimate. It should be noted that not all scholars consider the vocative to be a case; e.g. H. Lunt writes about six cases and that a vocative form exists for most masculine and feminine substantives in the singular. He considers the vocative to be a special form for calling or addressing, but not a case (Lunt 2001:52, 55).

- 4) In order to make the comparison easier, 41 biblical verses have been chosen from the four Tetraevangelia and 11 apokryphic Gospels. In the remaining five sources (three menaia and two miscellanies) the occurrences were excerpted without references to biblical verses.

2. Terminology

Different views are expressed by scholars on the interpretation of key terms in this study, and therefore a chapter on terminology has been incorporated, with information about what interpretations that were chosen for this thesis, and the reasons for these choices. The terms included are: 2.1 Text, manuscript, source, codex and monument, 2.2 Canon, 2.3 Slavonic, Slavic, OCS, CS, recension, redaction, Old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian, 2.4 PS, Late PS and ComS, 2.5 Noun and substantive.

2.1 Text, manuscript, source, codex and monument

When it comes to the Bible and its contents, the difference between the words *text* and *manuscript*, which are often confused, is very clear. The original texts of the Bible were written about 2000 years ago, mostly in Hebrew and Greek, and these texts were copied, and translated and copied, in manuscripts. A.S. Gerd illustrates this by writing that a manuscript is a piece of concrete text (Gerd 2008:07). The original translations could possibly be labelled as texts, since the biblical manuscripts, written in OCS or CS, are copies of these originals. However, these original translations have been lost. Chaburgaev states that even if the oldest Slavonic translations of Greek books for Church Service from the middle of the 9th century not survived until today, and are known only in copies from the 10th or 11th centuries, these copies are close

to the original translations, and can therefore be considered to be written in OCS (Chaburgaev 1974:05-06). The term *source* is used as synonym of *manuscript* and *codex*, even if there is a difference between the terms *manuscript* and *codex*; manuscript in the relevant aspect for this research is an old document that was written by hand, and codex is an ancient type of book which was written by hand, not just a document. Another synonym of manuscript is *monument*, a term that will not be used in this thesis.

2.2 Canon

The term *canon* is relevant in two different ways. Firstly, in defining which texts are biblical canonical to the Orthodox Church, i.e. accepted as being part of the Bible of the Orthodox Church; secondly, in defining which manuscripts could be accepted as being authentic or established as OCS manuscripts, i.e. belonging to the OCS canon. According to A. A. Alekseev, the Orthodox Church did not define the biblical canon in the Slavonic area. Instead it followed the Byzantine judgement. It was not until the 15th century that a special list of biblical canonical texts was defined for the Orthodox Church (Alekseev 1999:28-29). The scholars do not agree on what manuscripts belong to the OCS canon. This discussion will not be rendered in this context. But, A.S. Gerd and W.R.Veder confirm that it is worthy of attention, that the conception of *canon* is based on manuscripts and not on texts (Gerd and Veder 2003:05). Another problem is *OCS* in the OCS canon, i.e. scholars do not agree on when the OCS period ended. G. Nandriş writes that the year 1100 has been conventionally accepted as the borderline between OCS and the CS varieties (Nandriş 1965:02). Therefore, manuscripts written in the 11th century would be classified as OCS canon, but this is not the case. There are manuscripts from the 11th century classified as later varieties, e.g. the East Slavic *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* and *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*. G. Ziffer expresses that the OCS canon consists of a few classical codices that were produced earlier than the year 1100 and more or less seem to correspond to an alleged ideal norm of OCS, defined in orthographic and phonetic terms, e.g. the preservation of nasal vowels and *jers*. He continues that the majority of Slavists still focus their analysis of OCS on the canonical manuscripts, but that there is not one extant direct source relating to the Cyrillo-Methodian mission represented in the OCS canon (Ziffer 2003:630-631), and in *Граматика на Старобългарския Език* the OCS canon is defined as the collection of translations made by Cyril and Methodius (Duridanov 1991:531). However, for this study 20 well-known OCS and CS manuscripts have been chosen as sources

from the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries; the ongoing debate on what belongs to the OCS canon or not has not been taken into consideration.

2.3 Slavonic, Slavic, OCS, CS, recension, redaction, Old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian

Slavonic is found in the term OCS, never *Slavic*. But there seems to be some confusion in the use of “Slavonic” and “Slavic” with “proto-” and “Church”. Proto-Slavonic is used e.g. by G. Nandriš in “Common Slavonic (Proto-Slavonic)” (Nandriš 1965:02), and Proto-Slavic is used e.g. by A.M. Schenker in “Proto-Slavic words” (Schenker 1996:103). Together with “Church”, e.g. Gasparov uses Slavonic in “nationally specific Church Slavonic” (Gasparov 2001:11), and e.g. P. Ambrosiani Slavic in “varieties of Church Slavic” (Ambrosiani 2005:84). In this thesis Slavonic is considered to be a synonym of OCS, in contrast to Slavic, which also refers to the modern languages.

OCS is an abbreviation of Old Church Slavonic, but the term Old Church Slavic is found, e.g. in *Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic* by M.S. Flier (Flier 1974). In addition to OCS the terms Old Bulgarian and Old Slavic are used (Ziffer 2003: 629). OCS will be used in this thesis, accentuating the biblical connection.

OCS later developed into locally specific Church Slavonic languages, Gasparov mentions the **Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic** languages (Gasparov 2001:11). N. Marcialis refers to R. Mathiesen, who expresses that there was a plethora of different varieties of Church Slavonic (Marcialis 2007:66). Sometimes the term **recension of CS** is used, which should not be confused with **redaction** or editing. L.P. Žukovskaja clarifies the difference: redaction (редакция in Russian) primarily has to do with the text and only secondarily with the language, whereas recension (извод in Russian) only has to do with the language of the manuscript, the copy (Žukovskaja 1976:18). G. Ziffer explains that the local recensions are literary dialects of OCS (Ziffer 2003:630). A.S. Gerd claims, the different conceptions of the term Church Slavonic could be concluded as 1) a synonym of OCS, 2) a synonym of Bulgarian, Russian or Serbian Church Slavonic (he uses the term Middle Bulgarian), 3) a literary language for the south and east Slavs (Gerd 2008:115-116). In this thesis, the terms Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian Church Slavonic will be used as synonyms of local recensions of CS. The term **Middle Bulgarian** covers, according to K. Mirčev, the language in Bulgarian manuscripts from the 12th-15th centuries, thus the period of Bulgarian CS (Mirčev 2000:15). But Middle Bulgarian is a term for both religious and non-religious sources.

Therefore, Middle Bulgarian will not be used in this thesis. More information on the varieties and how to classify that manuscripts belong to different Church Slavonic varieties will be given in another chapter.

2.4 PS, Late PS and ComS

Various opinions have been voiced about the terms *Proto-Slavic* (PS), *Late Proto-Slavic* (Late PS) and *Common Slavic* (ComS). This discussion will not be rendered here. However, the views of two linguists have been chosen for these terms. T. Olander concludes in his *Proto-Slavic Inflectional Morphology. A Comparative Handbook* that PS ended around 600 AD and is the last stage of Slavic before the changes that are not shared by all Slavic dialects. Thus, ComS, around 600-1200 AD, refers to the Slavic dialect continuum during the period after the dissolution of the PS. Therefore, according to Olander, OCS is considered to be a dialect in the ComS period (Olander 2015:25-27). Olander explains in an email that the term Late PS, which is used by some linguists, has the same sense for these linguists as ComS to him (email correspondence July 31, 2017). L. Steensland declares in his *Slavisk språkhistoria (Language History of the Slavic languages)* that the linguistic changes, from around 500 BC to 800 AD, are called PS and ComS (Steensland 1985:40).

2.5 Noun and substantive

The term **noun** is sometimes used as synonym of **substantive**. However, according to H. Lunt, nouns are on the basis of their expression of gender and their declension types divided into the three groups: substantives, adjectives and pronouns (2001:52). Therefore, in this thesis the term substantive is used.

3. Previous research

The present chapter focuses on the previous research within the scope of the study. Section 3.1 is a brief presentation of the starting point of OCS and its later CS varieties. It is not a comprehensive presentation, since the subject OCS is not unknown to Slavists; the purpose is to accentuate that the chosen sources from the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries are written in the OCS and CS period. Section 3.2 looks at the endings of the ŭ-declension. Section 3.3 takes a

closer look at substantives belonging to the ŭ-declension in OCS. Section 3.4 examines the origins of eight OCS substantives, and section 3.5 presents other researchers' findings of the eight substantives in the chosen OCS/CS manuscripts. There is also a section 3.6 on the two chief monastic centres in Bulgaria in OCS time, The Preslav and Ohrid schools, and a section 3.7 on the changes made by scribes in the manuscripts they were copying.

3.1 OCS and CS

OCS, the first written Slavic language, was created in the Late Proto-Slavic (Common Slavic)³ period (Grković -Major 2011:39). According to M. S. Flier, the unity of OCS is a “generalized norm underlying the best translations” and he states that none of the manuscripts belonging to the OCS canon manifests this norm perfectly; each manuscript shows deviations and errors (Flier 1974:50-51). G. Nandriş says that OCS was a South Slavic dialect from the region of Macedonia, used in the 9th century by Cyril and Methodius in their missionary purposes in Moravia and Pannonia (Nandriş 1965:01). The OCS life span comprises approximately two centuries. The end of the OCS epoch is in the mid-11th century (Gasparov 2001:abstract, 11). According to G. Nandriş, the year 1100 has been accepted as the boundary between OCS and the later CS varieties (Nandriş 1965:02). T.A. Ivanova divides the OCS period into three parts: 1) the oldest part in the second half of the 9th century, and the work of Cyril and Methodius, 2) a later period at the end of the 10th and the 11th centuries, and the work of the followers of Cyril and Methodius in Ohrid and Preslav, 3) the period of CS (Ivanova 2005:13). Even the earliest Slavonic manuscripts show dialectal influences of the region where they were written (Nandriş 1965:01). A. Leskien (1919:einleitung, XLVII) and S.M. Kuljbakin (2008:39-46) mention three types of CS, viz. Bulgarian, Russian and Serbo-Croat CS; other scholars, e.g. N. Marcialis (2007:45) and I. Duridanov (1991:36), also mention other types.

Even if there is a link between different CS varieties and periods or centuries, it should be observed that stating the century and place of a manuscript is not enough in order to determine to what type of CS a manuscript belongs. But there are many examples of linguists who relate languages to periods. According to A.M. Seliščev, the OCS period stretched from the 9th to the 11th centuries, and the Middle Bulgarian epoch from the 12th century to 14th

³ See section 2.4

(Seliščev 1951:272, 279); H. M. Eckhoff writes that Old Russian⁴ existed in the 11th to the 14th centuries, followed by Middle Russian in the 15th to the 17th centuries (Eckhoff 2006:13, footnote). In order to analyse the linguistic characteristics of languages in the manuscripts, and decide what kind of language is used in the manuscript from these characteristics, a linguistic “tool” is needed, e.g. the method presented by S.M. Kuljbakin (Kuljbakin 2008:39-49). Kuljbakin comes to the conclusion that there are four groups in the period from the end of the 10th century to the 14th century. Firstly, there is a group of OCS manuscripts, from the end of the 10th to the end of the 11th century, written in Ohrid and Preslav⁵. Characteristic features are the almost correct use and spelling of the nasal vowels, the development of the letters ѣ and ѡ, and the reproduction of the PS -tj- and -dj- as -шт- and -жд-. Secondly, there is a group of manuscripts written in Bulgarian CS from the 12th century and onwards in Ohrid and Preslav. The nasal vowels are no longer used correctly, as in OCS manuscripts; they are interchanged, or only one of the two is used. Furthermore, the letters ѣ and ѡ are sometimes changed for other letters. The use of *jers* is different; sometimes one is changed for the other. There is also the process of vocalization of -ъ- into -o- in Ohrid, but in Preslav is -ъ- remaining. Kuljbakin gives the example **ѡнѣ**, corresponding to the **ѡнѣ** (Kuljbakin 2008:42). There are other changes as well, e.g. in the verb conjugations. Thirdly, there is a group of manuscripts written in the Serbian CS from the end of the 12th century and onwards. In these the nasal vowels ж and ѡ are written y and e; of the two *jers* only ѡ is used; ѣ has changed into и, the sound ѣ is reproduced in some dialects as e, и, je or ije etc. Another characteristic feature is the mixing of ѡ and ѣ at the beginning of words. There are also changes in the declension and conjugation systems, e.g. feminine substantives, ending in -a, changed the OCS ending -ѡж into -ѡ in I.sg. (**ѡдѡѡѡ** *vodov* ‘water’, **жѡнѡѡѡ** *ženov* ‘wife’), and the 1st pl. ending in the present tense of verbs into -ѡ (**ѡѡѡ**, *ѡѡѡ* ‘we are’, **ѡѡѡѡѡ** *vidimo* ‘we see’) etc. Fourthly, there is the group of Russian manuscripts from the 11th century and onwards, with the following characteristic features: the nasal vowels are written as ѣ/ѣ and ѡ/ѡ, and this this particular way of reproduction of nasal vowels is not found in Serbian, Macedonian or Bulgarian manuscripts. The OCS -ѡѡ, -ѡѡ corresponds to the Russian CS -ѡѡ, -ѡѡ, i.e. **ѡѡѡѡ** *grad* ‘town’ corresponds to **ѡѡѡѡѡ** *gorod*”, and **ѡѡѡѡ** *glava* ‘head’ corresponds to **ѡѡѡѡѡ** *golova* (Vinokur 2007:32-34). The PS -tj- and -dj- are reproduced as -ч- and -ж-, e.g. **ѡѡѡѡѡ** *svěča* ‘candle’ instead of **ѡѡѡѡѡѡ** *svěšča*, and **ѡѡѡѡѡѡ**

⁴ The history of the Russian language is not studied in this thesis; the examples are included to show how linguists connect languages to periods or centuries.

⁵ Kuljbakin writes Macedonia and Bulgaria; since the subject is about linguistics rather than politics, Ohrid and Preslav are used.

vižu ‘I see’ instead of **виждаж** *viždǫ*; the initial **к-** is sometimes reproduced as **о-**, e.g. **одинъ** *odin* ‘one’, **озеро** *ozero* ‘lake’ instead of **кдинъ** *jedin* , **кзеро** *jezero* etc. There were also changes in the morphology, e.g. the ending of verb 3rd sg. in the present tense, **-тъ** instead of **-тѣ** etc. (Kuljbakin 2008:39-49). It should be added that there are other ways to determine the date and place of a manuscript, e.g. the way of writing, the age of the parchment or paper, the kind of tool with which the words are written, references to historical events or places, ornaments, etc.

3.2 The ū-declension in OCS

The ū-declension was inherited into OCS from PIE via PS and ComS. In PIE the substantives belonging to the ū-declension were of all three genders; masculine, feminine, neuter. R. Eckert argues that the division of substantives into stems was older than the division into genders, and as a result of this ū-stem substantives of all genders spread into various IE languages e.g. Latin, where there are examples of the ū-declension in all three genders: *exercitus* ‘army’ (m), *manus* ‘hand’ (f), *genu* ‘knee’ (n). This rearrangement of substantives began as early as in the ComS period, a rearrangement according to the gender of the word, not stems (Eckert 1959:101). According to V.V. Kolesov, the earlier ū-declension substantives **кор(ова)** *kor(ova)* ‘cow’ and **ябл(око)** *jabl(oko)* ‘apple’, among others, fell out of this declension as a result of this process (Kolesov 2009:152-153). A. Vaillant writes that there had been two different ū-declension paradigms in PIE, firstly the *-ūs, G.sg. *-ous, and secondly the *-ūs, G.sg. *-oes, *-oos. They became contaminated and developed into one ū-declension paradigm and a consonant stem. The G.sg. *-oes is visible in the derivative **медвинъ** *medvin* ‘of honey’ (Vaillant 1958:114-115).

The universally accepted opinion is that the ū-stem class in OCS consisted only of a few masculine substantives, but various opinions have been voiced about the quantity, from only two substantives (Thorndahl 1974:14) to a hundred substantives (Kolesov 2009:163). P. Arumaa states that the ū-stems do not – as the i-stems do – fit into clear groups (Arumaa 1985:56). The influence the ū- and o- declensions had on each other makes it difficult to establish whether a particular substantive in OCS belonged to the ū-declension, and later became confused with the o-declension, and is therefore found with the case endings of the o-declension, or if the substantive belonged to the o-declension and was influenced by the ū-declension, and is therefore found with the case endings of the ū-declension in OCS sources.

There was a declension in PS that was not inherited by OCS: the jŭ-declension. There are traces of this declension in OCS, for example the word **конь** ‘horse’ which is said to belong to the masculine jo-declension, but in PS belonged to the jŭ-declension (Kolesov 2009:152).

According to R. Eckert, the following criteria of the ŭ-declension exist in the PS:

- 1) the preservation of the old root + ŭ, even if the case endings are not preserved,
- 2) the preservation of the case endings, characteristic of the ŭ-declension,
- 3) the preservation of the vowel in the form of -v- or -ov-,
- 4) the corresponding substantive belonging to the ŭ-declension in other European languages (Eckert 1959:103-105).

According to A.M. Schenker and T.A. Ivanova, the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions in the plural in PIE, late PS and OCS are as follows. In the nominative plural, the case ending of the ŭ-declension in OCS was **-овѣ**, in comparison to the PIE ŭ-declension case ending, which was **-ōu-ēs**. The case ending of the o-declension in OCS was **-и** in comparison to the PIE **-ō-es > -ōs, -ōi**. The loss of final consonants and the monophthongization of diphthongs in -u- caused the PIE thematic vowel and endings to blend into PS monomorphemic endings (Schenker 1996:123-124 and Ivanova 2005:130-131). See table 1.

Table 1. The nominative case plural

	ŭ-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ōu-ēs	-ō-es > -ōs, -ōi
Late PS	-ove	-i
OCS	-овѣ	-и

Masculine substantives had an identical form for the nominative and the vocative plural (Nandriş 1965:54).

This case ending **-овѣ** had a significant impact on the o-declension substantives. V.V. Kolesov expresses the view that in the clash between the ŭ- and the o-declensions was the ending **-овѣ**, which in the 11th century was found only on substantives belonging to the ŭ-declension, spread widely and was found on o-declension substantives denoting groups of

people, i.e. грековѣ *grekove* ‘Greeks’, жидовѣ *židove* ‘Jews’, or profession, i.e. поповѣ *popove* ‘priests’, врачевѣ *vračeve* ‘healers, doctors’, some animals and birds, i.e. воробьевѣ *vorob'eve* ‘sparrows’, дятловѣ *djatlove* ‘woodpeckers’ but it was still in use for the substantives that originally belonged to the ŭ-declension, i.e. сыновѣ, домовѣ (Kolesov 2009:171). According to G. Nandriš, the “N. pl. -овѣ appears as -ови, by contamination with the -и of the o-declension: N.pl. сынови, волови” (Nandriš 1965:65).

The case ending of the ŭ-declension in the genitive plural in OCS was -овѣ, in comparison to the PIE ŭ-declension case ending, which was -ōu-ōm. According to A.M. Schenker, the case ending of the o-declension in OCS was -ѣ, in comparison to the PIE -ō-ōm > -ōm (Schenker 1996:124). See table 2.

Table 2. The genitive case plural

	ŭ-declension	o-declension
PIE	- ōu-ōm	-ō-ōm > -ōm
Late PS	-OVѣ	-ѣ
OCS	-овѣ	-ѣ

It is interesting to note that the scholars do not agree on the importance of the ŭ-declension’s influence on the o-declension. V. B. Kryś’ko holds the opinion that a considerable number of examples of the influence of the ŭ-declension’s case ending -овѣ on the o-declension is found in the OCS sources (Kryś’ko 2000:27). H. Lunt⁶ expresses the view that the o-declension substantives may originally have had the ending -овѣ/-евѣ beside the normal ending -ѣ/-ѣ “although such forms are rare”, thus claiming that the ending -овѣ/-евѣ was not the expected ending. A.I. Izotov states that the ending -овѣ penetrated the o-declension and the original case ending for masculine substantives type рабѣ *rab* “slave” and духѣ *duch* “spirit” in the G.pl. was ousted out (Izotov 2007:35-36).

B. Gasparov says that there might be another reason for the prevailing of the ending -овѣ in the genitive plural: when the fall of the *jers* took place the original ending -ѣ

⁶ From Lunt 1955:42. There is a printing error in Lunt 2001:56, “Certain monosyllabic masculines occasionally have (beside the normal nom. pl -i and the gen. -ѣ/-ѣ) bisyllabic desinences, nom -ove/-eve, gen. -ѣ/-ѣ. Examples are attested for: *сынѣ* ‘son’, *домѣ* ‘house’...”.

was “turned to a zero” and the ending **-овѣ** was used instead (Gasparov 2001:84). It is also true that even before the fall of the *jer*s, the case endings of the nominative and accusative singular and the genitive plural of the o-declension were identical. For example, is this observation in the *Codex Suprasliensis* of the word form **длѣгѣ** in the accusative singular or in the genitive plural, or could it be an adjective? ...**ХОШТЕШИ БО СЕ НА ПЖТЬ ОТИТИ ДЛѣГѣ** (558:01)⁷. There are other illustrative sentences in the *Codex Suprasliensis*, showing the interaction between the two declensions. For example, **ОТЪ ЦВѢТОВѢ ВЪ ЦВѢТЫ ПРѢХОДАШТА·ОТЪ ПЛОДОВѢ ВЪ ПЛОДЫ ПРѢХОДАШТА·**(429:29-30)⁸. These substantives belong to the o-declension, and the genitive forms **ЦВѢТОВѢ** and **ПЛОДОВѢ** would normally have had the forms **ЦВѢТЪ** and **ПЛОДЪ**.

The dative and accusative plural have been excluded from this work for linguistic reasons; in the dative plural, the *jer*" **-ѣ-** in the case ending **-ѣмѣ** later developed into **-о-**, which is the case ending of the o-declension, thus making them identical, i.e. making it impossible to decide to which declension the occurrence belonged; in the accusative, the case endings were also identical, see Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. The dative case plural

	ǫ-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ǫ-mūs	-ō-mūs
Late PS	-ѣмѣ	-омѣ
OCS	-ѣмѣ	-омѣ

Table 4. The accusative case plural

	ǫ-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ǫ-ns	-ō-ns
Late PS	-у	-у
OCS	-ѣ	-ѣ

⁷‘because you want to walk a long way’ [My translation, ACG].

⁸‘passing from flowers to flowers, passing from fruits to fruits’ [My translation, ACG].

In the instrumental plural the case ending of the ū-declension in OCS was **-ѣми**, in comparison to the PIE ū-declension case ending, which was **-ū-mīs**. The case ending of the o-declension in OCS was **-ы** in comparison to the PIE **-ō-ōis>ōis**, see table 5 (Schenker 1996:124). The ending **-ѣми** spread into the o-declension and, as H. Lunt puts it, occurred beside the normal ending **-ы** (Lunt 2001:56).

Table 5. The instrumental case plural

	ū-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ū-mīs	-ō-ōis>ōis
Late PS	-ѣми	-y
OCS	-ѣми	-ы

The case ending of the ū-declension in the locative plural in OCS was **-ѣхъ**, in comparison to the PIE ū-declension case ending, which was **-ū-sū**. The case ending of the o-declension in OCS was **-ѣхъ** in comparison to the PIE **-ōi-sū**, see table 6. The suffix **-ov** may be used also in the locative plural, for example **родовѣхъ** *rodověch* ‘type, family, genus’ instead of **родѣхъ** *roděch* (Chodzko 1869:51). The **-o-** in the locative plural form **-охъ** is the development of the **-ъ-** into an **-o-**⁹ (Mirčev 2000:57).

Table 6. The locative case plural

	ū-declension	o-declension
PIE	-ū-sū	-ōi-sū
Late PS	-ѣ-хъ	-ě-хъ
OCS	-ѣхъ	-ѣхъ

⁹ Some scholars suggest that the locative form **-охъ** would be the normal case ending for the o-declension, but there is no **-o-** in the case ending of the the o-declension, it is **-ѣхъ**, eg. B. Gasparov, who states that “the **-ъ-** type were used concurrently with endings of the o- type. In a few cases, the forms of the **-o-** type had already prevailed, particularly in I.sing., D. and L.pl.” (Gasparov 2001:86).

3.3 Substantives belonging to the ū-declension in OCS¹⁰

There is a disagreement among specialists about the quantity of substantives belonging to this declension. Frequently this declension is said to comprise six substantives in the OCS period, but e.g. W. Thorndahl claims that there are 11 possible ū-stem substantives in OCS and CS, but only two of them did definitely belong to the old ū-declension, namely **сынъ** *syn*" 'son' and **домъ** *dom*" 'house' (Thorndahl 1974:14-15). A. L. Janda gives four lists of words in connection with the ū-declension; six substantives considered to be certain ū-stem substantives, additional six likely ū-stem substantives, 11 possible ū-stem substantives and over 40 substantives that are questionable ū-stem substantives (Janda 1996:85-86).

Therefore, in order to solve the problem of deciding which substantives to include in the thesis, a study was performed on the views of some recognized specialists on OCS and OR in order to establish what substantives are considered by them to belong to the ū-stem class¹¹. All specialists claimed that the following substantives belonged to the ū-declension: **врѣхъ** *vr'ch*" 'top', **сынъ** *syn*" 'son', **волъ** *vol*" 'ox', **медъ** *med*" 'honey' and **полъ** *pol*" 'half'. Everyone except G.A. Chaburgaev and A.I. Izotov expressed the views that **домъ** *dom*" 'house' belonged to the ū-declension; G.A. Chaburgaev voiced that it belonged to the o-declension, and that it is a misunderstanding, based on a misinterpretation of the Latin word "domus" (Chaburgaev 1974:16) and A.I. Izotov that it was found with the case endings of the ū-declension, not that it belonged to this declension (Izotov 2007:35). Thus, these six substantives

¹⁰ According to I. Dobrev, OCS substantives are connected to the old IE and PS myth about the Thunderer, the god Perun. He finds that the following substantives show traces of the old ū-stem class or are found with some of the case endings of the ū-declension as a result of their connection to the myth: **полъ** since heaven and earth are the two halves of the Thunderer's world; **врѣхъ** since the Thunderer lives at the top of the tree of the world; **волъ** because it was the Thunderer who released the cattle; **зми** *zmi*' or **змеи** *zmei* 'serpent or dragon' since the serpent or dragon of the world, which lives at the foot of the tree of the world, is the Thunderer's enemy; **долу** *dolu* 'down' and **низу** *nizu* 'bottom' because they show the case ending of the ū-declension in the L.sg. and are related to the myth; **миръ** *mir*" 'world', **чинъ** *čin*" 'rank' and **рѣдъ** *rěd*" 'row' since they relate to the Thunderer's victory over the serpent of the world; **олъ** *ol*" 'kind of beer' because the victory over the serpent is celebrated with a drink; **ледъ** *led*" 'ice' and **ядъ** *jad*" 'poison' since the most important means for the serpent of the world, and important symbols of death and chaos, are ice and poison; **сынъ** because the first person is the son of the original bisexual being; **домъ** since this is the earthly place to live in; **санъ** *san*" 'rank' because heavenly decent has to do with rank. I. Dobrev also claims that the roots of the following substantives show a relation to the ū-stems: **дѣбъ** *děb*" 'oak', **богъ** *bog*" 'god', **небо** *nebo*" 'heaven', **дѣждъ** *d'zd*" 'rain', and **знои** *znoi* 'sweat' (Dobrev 1982:129-141).

¹¹ The chosen specialists are as follows (arranged in alphabetical order): G.A. Chaburgaev, P.Ja. Černych, I. Duridanov, V. Gasparov, A.P. Ignatenko, A.I. Izotov, T.A. Ivanova, L.P. Jakubinskij, L.A. Janda, V.V. Kolesov, P.S. Kuznecov, A. Leskien, H. Lunt, K. Mirčev, N.S. Možeiko, G. Nandriš, A.M. Schenker.

were chosen for this study, due to the fact that the majority of specialists considered them to belong to the ŭ-declension.

Two additional OCS substantives were chosen: **грѣхъ** *grěch* "sin" and **длъгъ** *dl'g* "debt", as a result of the various views expressed about them. A.L. Janda claims that **грѣхъ** is a possible ŭ-stem substantive (Janda 1996:86), T.A. Ivanova states that it is a ŭ-stem substantive (Ivanova 2005:130), G.A. Chaburgaev writes that it is a probable old ŭ-stem substantive (Chaburgaev 1974:65), and G. Nandriş that it belonged to the o-declension (Nandriş 1965:60). A.L. Janda claims that **длъгъ** is a questionable ŭ-stem substantive (Janda 1996:86), and G.A. Chaburgaev claims that **длъгъ** was inherited with the thematic vowel -o- by PS (Chaburgaev 1974:176). The most interesting aspect of these, however, was to learn more about how their case endings changed as a result of the influence from the ŭ-declension.

3.4 The origins of eight OCS substantives

Even if this study focuses on eight chosen substantives in OCS and in the Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian CS, a short information on specialists' views of the origins of these substantives will be given below.

3.4.1 **вѡлѣ *vol* "ox"**

Various opinions are voiced about the origin of **вѡлѣ**. R. Eckert (1959:100) claims that **вѡлѣ** belonged to a group of originally Slavic words. M. Vasmer states that **вѡлѣ** is an old ŭ-stem substantive, but according to him the link between **вѡлѣ** and the Polish *wolać* 'ox' is not convincing, and the similarity to the Syriac *völ* an accidental circumstance. He argues that a derivation from the Chuvash *vylix* 'cattle' and the Cheremis *volik* 'cattle', which are related to the Turkish *ulag* 'beast of burden or riding', is phonetically dubious (Vasmer 1953:216). A. Preobraženskij considers a link to **вѡлѡхъ**, **вѡлѡхъ**, **вѡлѡхъ**, *voloch*", *valach*", *voluch*" 'gelding' from the Germanic *walah*, *walh*, to be plausible, but he also writes about the opinion that it could be a loan-word from a Ural-Altai language. **вѡлѣ** is one of the five substantives that according to A. Preobraženskij indisputably belonged to the ŭ-declension (Preobraženskij 1958:131-132, 821).

3.4.2 **врѣхъ** *vr'ch'* (врѣхъ, врѣхъ) 'top'

According to M. Vasmer, **врѣхъ** is of the same origin as the Lithuanian *viršius* 'upper part, height, hill', the Latvian *viršus* 'upper part', the Sanskrit *várṣma* 'top, peak', *várṣiṣṭhas* 'highest, uppermost', the Latin *verrūca* 'height, hill' (Vasmer 1953:190). A. Preobraženskij writes that **врѣхъ** is one of the five substantives that without discussion belonged to the ŭ-declension and he claims the root is *ǵers- 'rise' from IE ǵer- (Preobraženskij 1958:78, 821). R. Eckert says that **врѣхъ** was one of the substantives that definitely not could be classified as IE or as Slavic, since these substantives are found only in a few groups of IE languages (Eckert 1959:100-101). The substantive is spelt **врѣхъ** in e.g. *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*, but **врѣхъ** in e.g. *Typograph Gospel Lectionary* and *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*, and **врѣхъ** in e.g. *Marianus Gospel* and *Zograph Gospel*.

3.4.3 **домъ** *dom'* 'house'

There is a disagreement when it comes to the substantive **домъ** and to what declension it belonged. On the one hand, there are scholars claiming it belonged to the ŭ-declension, such as A. Leskien (1919:118), B. Gasparov (2001:77), K. Mirčev (2000:77), G. Nandriš (1965:64) and T.A. Ivanova (2005:130). On the other hand, there are scholars stating that it belonged to the o-declension, e.g. A.I. Izotov, V.B. Krys'ko and G.A. Charburgaev (Izotov 2007:35, Krys'ko 2000:34 and Charburgaev 1974:176). M. Vasmer claims that it is an old ŭ-declension substantive (Vasmer 1953:361), and P.S. Kuznecov even uses **домъ** as the illustration of the ŭ-declension (Kuznecov 2004:38). O.N. Trubačev and J. Pokorny¹² state that the word **домъ** belonged to both the ŭ- the o-declensions like PIE *domu-s and *domo-s (Trubačev 1978:73). A. Preobraženskij states that the PIE root of the word is *dema (long -a), to build (Preobraženskij 1958:228), and M. Vasmer that in the Avestan language the root was dam- (Vasmer 1953:361). G.A. Chaburgaev claims that it would be a misunderstanding to consider the word **домъ** as belonging to the ŭ-declension, as a result of an uncritical usage of the facts of the Latin language. He continues that **домъ** in PIE was *dōmōs, and thus passed into PS with the thematic vowel -ō, not -ŭ. **домъ** belonged to the o-declension even in Latin, which is seen in the genitive singular domi and the dative singular domo (Chaburgaev 1974:176). But even if

¹² <http://indo-european.info/pokorny-etymological-dictionary/dem- demə.htm>

the word **домъ** in Latin sometimes is seen with the case endings of the second declension (the o-declension), it is clear from grammars on Latin that the word does belong to the 4th declension (ŭ) and was of feminine gender. T.A. Ivanova states that there are other Indo-European parallels showing the old ŭ-declension (Ivanova 2005:130-131).

3.4.4 медъ *med*" 'honey'

According to P. Arumaa, **медъ** is a substantive of neuter gender, belonging to the ŭ-declension in PS (Arumaa 1985:57). It is related to the Vedic *mádhu* 'honey' and the Greek *μέθυ* 'wine'. R. Eckert states that **medhu* belonged to the ŭ-declension already in PIE, and was inherited by PS (Eckert 1959:100-107). A. Preobraženskij writes that **медъ** was one of the five substantives that definitely belonged to the ŭ-declension (Preobraženskij 1958:821). A.S. L'vov argues that **медъ** originally had two meanings, one referring to a food product, the other to an intoxicant, but that the only meaning in OCS was as a food product (L'vov 1975:169). However, in Old Russian (OR) there are occurrences found of **медъ** meaning intoxicant, e.g. in a story about Boris and Gleb:

“Что бо приобретае преже братия отца моего или отць мой? Къде бо ихъ жития и слава мира сего, и багряница и брячины, серебро и золото, вина и медове, брашна чьястная и быстрии кони, и домове красьнии и велиции, и имения многа...”¹³

3.4.5 полъ *pol*" 'half'

R. Eckert says that **полъ** is one of the substantives that were originally Slavic (Eckert 1959:100). A. Preobraženskij agrees, stating that corresponding words in related languages do not exist, that there might be a link to the IE **pel-* 'beat, hit', and that it is one of the five substantives that unquestionably belonged to the ŭ-declension (Preobraženskij 1958:821). M. Vasmer also claims that **полъ** belonged to the ŭ-declension, and that there could be a link to the Albanian *pal'e* 'side, separation, part' from **polnā* (Vasmer 1955:390).

¹³ *Съказание и страсть и похвала Святою Мученику Борису и Глеба*, <http://ppf.asf.ru/drl/bg.html>

3.4.6 сѣнѣ *syn*" 'son'

According to A.M. Schenker and R. Eckert, сѣнѣ existed in PIE as **sŷn-ŷ-s* in N.sg., was inherited by PS, ComS and finally by OCS as сѣнѣ (Schenker 1996:123-124 and Eckert 1959:100-102). N.A. Kondrašov writes that the form сѣнѣ is the result of the loss of the labialisation of the PIE root vowel -ŷ-, changing it into the Slavonic 'ѣ', and the loss of the final consonant -s, which took place in all words ending in -t, -d, -n and -s, due to the open syllable sound law (Kondrašov 1962:30, 36). R. Eckert, G.A. Chaburgaev and M. Vasmer agree that сѣнѣ belonged to the ŷ-declension (Eckert 1959:06, Chaburgaev 1974:176, Vasmer 1958:57). It should be noted that the word сѣнѣ has a number of meanings, for example as 'son, male child' in both abstract and concrete senses (e.g. Sreznevskij 1903:872-874), and there is also a homonymy 'сѣнѣ' 'tower'. However, according to T.A. Lysaght, the homonymy сѣнѣ 'tower' belonged to the o-declension, not the ŷ-declension, as did the word сѣнѣ 'son' (Lysaght 1987:402). The interpretation of сѣнѣ in St. John XII:36 is "someone having a close connection with something" (Sreznevskij 1903:872-874).

3.4.7 грѣхѣ *grěch*" 'sin'

The scholars do not agree on the PIE origin of the word грѣхѣ. O.N. Trubačev writes that the word грѣхѣ was a new word formation in the PS language, and that there are no corresponding words in other Indo-European languages. He continues that there might be a possible link with the Latin *peccatum*, which has the same meaning as грѣхѣ (Trubačev 1980:114-115). A. Preobraženskij argues that the root of the word грѣхѣ is **ghro-so* (Preobraženskij 1958:202). J. Pokorny¹⁴ mentions the possible link with the PIE word **g^whrē-* as in the OCS word grěti, 'to warm'. M. Vasmer also mentions this link to the word grěti. He states that грѣхѣ in OCS shows traces of the ŷ-declension but does not state which they are (Vasmer 1953:307). The scholars also disagree to which declension грѣхѣ belonged. G. Nandriş states that грѣхѣ is a probable ŷ-declension substantive (Nandriş 1965:65). T.A. Ivanova is certain that грѣхѣ belonged to the ŷ-declension (Ivanova 2005:130). But several scholars express the view that грѣхѣ instead belonged to the o-declension, e.g. A.I. Izotov, A. Leskien and G.A. Chaburgaev (Izotov 2007:35, Leskien 1919:118 and Chaburgaev 1974:170). In *Граматика на*

¹⁴ (<http://indo-european.info/pokorny-etymological-dictionary/gwher.htm>)

старобългарския език грѣхъ is said to belong to the o-declension; it is given as the example of the o-declension paradigm (Duridanov 1991:139).

3.4.8 длъгъ *dl''g''* 'debt' (дългъ)

G.A. Chaburgaev says that длъгъ was inherited with the thematic vowel -o- by PS (Chaburgaev 1974:176). M. Vasmer expresses that the PS **dylgъ* is related to the Gothic *dulgs* 'guilt, fault' (Vasmer 1953:359), but A. Preobraženskij writes that there is no reason to conclude that the Slavic дългъ is a loan-word from Gothic; instead it is possible to conclude that the substantive длъгъ and the adjective дългъ, -ѣи are one and the same word (Preobraženskij 1958:226). The substantive is spelt длъгъ in e.g. *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* and *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* but дългъ in e.g. *Vukan Gospel Lectionary* and *Typograph Gospel*.

3.5 Research on the eight substantives in OCS/CS sources¹⁵

The present chapter aims at presenting the researchers' findings on the substantives волъ, врѣхъ/вѣрхъ/врѣхъ, грѣхъ, длъгъ/дългъ, домъ, медъ, полъ and сынъ in the N., G., I. and L.pl. in 20 sources; in the four tetraevangelia *Dobromir's Gospel*, *Marianus Gospel*, *Typograph Gospel* and *Zograph Gospel*, in the 11 full or short aprakos Gospels *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*, *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*, *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*, *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*, *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, *Sava's Book*, *Turov Gospel Lectionary*, *Undol'skij's Fragments*, *Vatican Gospel Lectionary* and *Vukan Gospel Lectionary* and in the five non-biblical texts of the three menaea *Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)*, *Menaeum of Dubrovskij* and *Putjatin Menaeum* and the two miscellanies *1073 Miscellany (Svjatoslav's or Simeon's)* and *1076 Miscellany*.

Despite the large number of linguistic studies on these sources, only a few scholars consider the ŭ-declension as a grammatical category in these manuscripts. Of those scholars who have written about the ŭ-declension, most have avoided defining which substantives belonged to it in OCS or CS, thus avoiding to discuss whether the substantives, found in the texts with ŭ- or o-declension case endings, originally belonged to the ŭ-declension and were confused with the o-declension case endings, or belonged to the o-declension but were

¹⁵ Some of the findings, which will be discussed in chapter 7, have been excluded from this study; there is a list of excluded occurrences in the appendices.

influenced by the ů-declension case endings. Nothing was found regarding studies on the ů-declension or its case endings regarding the chosen substantives in the *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*, *Dobromir's Gospel*, *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*, *Menaem of Dubrovskij*, *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*, *Putjatin Menaem*, *Typograph Gospel*, *Vatican Gospel Lectionary* or *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*.

3.5.1 ВОЛЪ

S.M. Kuljbakin classifies ВОЛЪ among the ů-stem class substantives, and finds one occurrence ВОЛОВЬ in the G.pl. (199a:18-19) in *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary* (Kuljbakin 1925:50). According to V. Papazisovska, there is one occurrence in the N.pl. written ВОЛОВИ instead of ВОЛОВЕ but to which declension it belonged has not been taken into consideration (Papazisovska 1970:312). C. Koch and A. Marguliés do not express to what declension ВОЛЪ belonged, and find no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. (Koch 2000:766, Marguliés 1927:156-201). M.M. Kozlovskij, P. Lieli and L. Moszyński also classify ВОЛЪ among the ů-stem class substantives, and agree that there are no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. (Kozlovskij 1885-1896:72-76), Lieli 1991:14, Moszyński 1975:186-189). ВОЛЪ is not discussed by A. Minčeva, R. Pavlova or T. Rott-Żebrowski, and the study by U. Sill does not include ВОЛЪ. Only the wordlist¹⁶ of *1073 Miscellany* presents an occurrence ВОЛОВЕ in N.pl. (208b:26). There are no occurrences in plural G., I., L. anywhere.

3.5.2 ВРЪХЪ (ВЪРХЪ/ВРЬХЪ)

S.M. Kuljbakin and P. Lieli consider ВРЪХЪ as belonging to the ů-declension, but find no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. (Kuljbakin 1925:50-51, Lieli 1991:14). L. Moszyński and M.M. Kozlovskij also claim that ВРЪХЪ belonged to the ů-declension, but is confused with o-declension case endings in the singular, and they find no occurrences in the plural (Moszyński 1975:186-189, Kozlovskij 1885-1895:67-76). T. Rott-Żebrowski notes that ВЪРХЪ is found with the case endings of the ů-declension, but does not discuss whether the substantive belonged to this declension or not, and finds no occurrences in the plural (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:149-150). According to C. Koch, there are no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl., and nothing is written

¹⁶ The wordlists of the *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*, *Marianus Gospel*, *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* and *1073 Miscellany* were used in this section.

about the declension (Koch 2000:768). **врѣхъ** in the plural is not mentioned by A. Marguliés, A. Minčeva, R. Pavlova or V. Papazisovska, and the study by U. Sill does not include **врѣхъ**. No wordlist¹⁷ finds occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl.

3.5.3 **грѣхъ**

According to C. Koch, there are fourteen occurrences of **грѣхъ** in the N., G., I. or L.pl. in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* (Koch 2000:210). Eight are in the N.pl. (39b:18, 39c:03, 51b:12, 51c:04, 76a:01, 76a:22, 120a:16, 120a:22). The three occurrences in the G.pl. are all different; **грѣхъ** (131b:05), **грѣховъ** (137b:23) and **грѣхоховъ** (28c:18). Footnote 47 gives the explanation that **грѣхоховъ** is composed of **грѣхо-ховъ**. There are no occurrences in the I.pl., and three occurrences in the L.pl. (18a:06, 18a:10, 25d:21). M.M. Kozlovskij finds no occurrence in the plural N. in *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, but four in the G.pl.; three occurrences of **грѣховъ** (159, 255, 258), despite the classification among the o-stems, and one **грѣхъ** (248), adding that this form also is found in *Zograph Gospel, Assemanian Gospel Lectionary, Marianus Gospel* and *Sava's Book*. No mentioning is made of any occurrence in the I.pl. but two in the L.pl. (28, 40) (Kozlovskij 1885-1895:67-76). P. Lieli states that **грѣховъ** is found twice in *Marianus Gospel* (in Luke I:77, Luke 24:47) (Lieli 1991:16-17), and A. Marguliés also finds three occurrences of **грѣховъ** in *Codex Suprasliensis* (353:09, 390:25, 493:25) (Marguliés 1927:156-201). According to L. Moszyński, there are nine occurrences in the N.pl. in *Zograph Gospel* (not stated in which folios) and that both **грѣхъ** and **грѣховъ** are used in the G.pl. (Luke I:77; Luke III:3) (Moszyński 1975:161-162). V. Papazisovska mentions one occurrence **грѣховъ** in the G.pl. (146b) (Papazisovska 1970:311). R. Pavlova finds two occurrences of **грѣховъ** in *1073 Miscellany* (30a:22-23, 45a:11) (Pavlova 1991:158). T. Rott-Żebrowski finds that **грѣховъ** in the G.pl. occurs 12 times in *1076 Miscellany* (26r:03-04, 98v:01, 197r:06, 207r:01, 210v:01, 212r:07-08, 221r:12, 223v:07, 226v:07, 226r:02-03, 226v:01, 241r:05, 242r:13) and that the occurrence of **грѣцѣхъ** on 209:12 is a scribal error and should have been in the G.pl. Furthermore, it is claimed in the paragraph on plural I., that there are 25 occurrences of **грѣхы** in *1076 Miscellany*. 11 occurrences of **грѣцѣхъ** in the L.pl. are also detected, without reference to where they are (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:147-149). **грѣхъ** in the plural is not discussed by S.M. Kuljbakin or A. Minčeva, and it is not included in the study

¹⁷ See footnote 16.

by U. Sill. The wordlists¹⁸ specify forms in the plural. According to the *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092* there are eight occurrences of **грѣси** in the N.pl. (32v:08, 32v:14, 47r:07, 49r:18, 79r:16, 79v:06, 131r:18, 131v:01), four occurrences of **грѣховъ** in the G.pl. (14r:12, 94v:19, 150r:15, 151r:06), and one occurrence of **грѣхъ** in the G.pl. (142v:18), no occurrence of the I.pl., but one in the L.pl. **грѣсѣхъ** (10r:16). In *Marianus Gospel* there are nine occurrences of **грѣси** in the N.pl. (25:9, 25:15, 120:17, 121:4, 212:19, 212:27, 225:16, 225:20, 127:28), two occurrences of **грѣховъ** in the G.pl. (195:30, 312:11) and one **грѣхъ** in the G.pl. (3:10); the occurrences in the A.pl. and I.pl. are not separated but put in one group; there are three occurrences of **грѣсѣхъ** in the L.pl. (349:9, 349:11, 356:04-05). In *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* there are eight occurrences of **грѣси** in N. (67a bis, 91a, 91b, 130b bis, 223d bis), in the G.pl. there are three occurrences of **грѣховъ** (159a, 255c, 258a) and one of **грѣхъ** (248a). It is claimed on page 92 that **грѣхъ** is used after a preposition, and **грѣховъ** after a substantive. There are two occurrences **грѣсѣхъ** in the L.pl. (28c, 40d). In *1073 Miscellany*, there are 12 occurrences of **грѣси** in the N.pl. (28c:2, 44c:24, 44d:08, 86c:15, 99c:27, 101c:09, 103b:24, 106d:13, 123a:29, 139d:17-18, 141c:05, 193d:24), in the G.pl. there are 23 occurrences of **грѣховъ** and one of **грѣховь** (30a:22-23, 37a:06, 37d:26-27, 45a:11, 53a:22, 63b:22, 63d:07, 69b:29, 70a:25-26, 70a:28, 70b:04, 70b:08, 70b:10, 70b:15, 70d:11, 107a:14, 144d:04, 156a:06, 176b:08-09, 176c:15, 188b:23-24, 193b:08, 247d:25), 12 **грѣхъ** (28c:12, 33c:14, 44c:19, 46a:06, 48b:18, 54a:09, 59d:03, 99b:29, 99c:29-99d:01, 99d:29, 103a:17, 147b:21-22) and one with the spelling **грѣховь** (50r:02-03). There are also four occurrences of **грѣхы** in the I.pl. (171d:10-11, 200b:28, 211a:15, 44c:16) one with the spelling **грѣховы** (193c:21), and in the Lpl. there are 20 occurrences **грѣсѣхъ** (29a:03-04, 32b:08, 36b:13, 42b:04-05, 44a:22, 48a:01, 48c:04, 50a:29, 50d:15-16, 56c:12, 56c:28-29, 56d:13, 70d:22, 83a:22-23, 91c:29-91d:01, 99d:07-08, 102d:16, 146d:08, 159c:06, 82c:18).

¹⁸ See footnote 16.

3.5.4 ДЛЪГЪ (ДЪЛГЪ)

According to C. Koch, there are no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. of ДЛЪГЪ in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, and to what declension the substantive belongs is not discussed (Koch 2000:162). L. Moszyński classifies ДЛЪГЪ among the o-stem substantives, and finds no occurrences in the plural in the *Zograph Gospel* (Moszyński 1975:160-164). T. Rott-Żebrowski does not mention ДЛЪГЪ among the substantives found with the case endings of the ũ-declension in *1076 Miscellany* (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:149-150). M.M. Kozlovskij, S.M. Kuljbakin, P. Lieli, A. Marguliés, A. Minčeva, R. Pavlova or V. Papazisovska do not mention ДЛЪГЪ in the plural in relation to *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*, *Marianus Gospel*, *Codex Suprasliensis*, *1073 Miscellany or Sava's Book*, and to what declension the substantive belongs is not discussed. The study by U. Sill does not include ДЛЪГЪ. None of the wordlists¹⁹ shows occurrences in the plural N., G., I. or L., only in A.

3.5.5 ДОМЪ

C. Koch finds one occurrence ДОМОУХЪ in the L.pl. (143a:13a) in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* (Koch 2000:167). M.M. Kozlovskij agrees about the one occurrence ДОМЪХЪ in the L.pl. (267) in *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, and adds that the spelling is ДОМОУХЪ in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, *Marianus Gospel* and *Zograph Gospel* (Kozlovskij 1885-1895:75). There is no discussion on the declension of ДОМЪ. S.M. Kuljbakin considers ДОМЪ to belong to the ũ-stem substantives and finds two occurrences of ДОМОВЪ in the G.pl. (128a:16, 136b:17), and one occurrence of ДОМОУХЪ in the L.pl. (71b:12) in *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary* (Kuljbakin 1925:50-51). P. Lieli too holds the opinion that ДОМЪ belongs to the ũ-stem substantives, and claims that the spelling ДОМОУХЪ in L. (St. Matthew XI:08) in *Marianus Gospel* is the only form that "deviated from the norm of the ũ-stems", with the probable explanation of vocalization of the reduced vowel. There is also one occurrence of ДОМОВЪ in the G.pl. (not stated where) (Lieli 1991:13-14). A. Marguliés writes that the ũ-stem class remains in *Codex Suprasliensis*, giving the example ДОМОВЪ in the G.pl. (only stated folios 427-439). He adds that there is a contamination between the ũ- and o-declensions (Marguliés 1927:191). L. Moszyński also considers ДОМЪ to belong to the ũ-stem substantives but finds no occurrences

¹⁹ See footnote 16.

in the N., G. or I. pl. in *Zograph Gospel*, and only one occurrence of **ДОМОУХЪ** in the L.pl. (St. Matthew XI:08) (Moszyński 1975:187). A. Minčeva and R. Pavlova do not deal with **ДОМЪ** in the plural in relation to *1073 Miscellany*, nor does V. Papazisovska regarding *Sava's Book*. T. Rott-Žebrowski classifies **ДОМЪ** among the ů-stem class substantives, but finds no occurrences in the plural in *1076 Miscellany* (Rott-Žebrowski 1972:149-150). **ДОМЪ** is not one of the substantives studied by U. Sill. All four wordlists²⁰ include forms in the plural. In *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092* there is one occurrence in the L.pl. of **ДОМЪХЪ** (158:13). In *Marianus Gospel* there is one occurrence in the G.pl. of **ДОМОВЪ** (156:26) and one in the L.pl. of **ДОМЪХЪ** (34:19). In *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* there is one occurrence in the L.pl. **ДОМЪХЪ** (267b). In *1073 Miscellany* there are three occurrences in the N.pl., two of **ДОМОВЕ** (79c:26, 116b:09) and according to the wordlist also one occurrence of **ДОМЪ** (134d:03). In the L.pl. there are two occurrences of **ДОМЪХЪ** (69b:08, 84c:08).

3.5.6 МЕДЪ

P. Lieli and L. Moszyński consider **МЕДЪ** to be a ů-stem substantive, but find no occurrences in the plural in *Marianus Gospel* or *Zograph Gospel* (Lieli 1991:15, Moszyński 1975:186-189), neither does C. Koch in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* (Koch 2000:361), or T. Rott-Žebrowski in *1076 Miscellany* (Rott-Žebrowski 1972:149-150). **МЕДЪ** in the plural is not mentioned by M.M. Kozlovskij regarding *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, by S.M. Kuljbakin regarding *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*, by A. Margulíés concerning *Codex Suprasliensis*, by A. Minčeva and R. Pavlova with reference to *1073 Miscellany*, or by V. Papazisovska regarding *Sava's Book*, and it is not studied by U. Sill. None of the glossaries of *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*, *Marianus Gospel*, *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* or *1073 Miscellany* notes occurrences in the plural.

3.5.7 ПОЛЪ

S.M. Kuljbakin, P. Lieli and L. Moszyński classify **ПОЛЪ** among the ů-stem substantives, but find no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. regarding *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*, *Marianus Gospel* and *Zograph Gospel* (Kuljbakin 1925:50-51, Lieli 1991:14-15, Moszyński 1975:186-

²⁰ See footnote 16.

189). T. Rott-Žebrowski writes that **пoлѣ** is one of the substantives found with case endings of the ū-declension in *1076 Miscellany* but finds no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. (Rott-Žebrowski 1972:14). C. Koch finds no occurrences in the plural in the *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* (Koch 2000:496), nor does V. Papazisovska regarding *Sava's Book*, but an example of **пoлѣ** in the singular is given as illustration of the contamination between the ū- and o-declensions (Papazisovska 1970:311). **пoлѣ** is not mentioned by M.M. Kozlovskij, A. Marguliés, A. Minčeva and R. Pavlova in connection with *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057, Codex Suprasliensis* and *1073 Miscellany* and it is not one of the substantives studied by U. Sill. The glossaries of *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092, Marianus Gospel, Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* and *1073 Miscellany* have no occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl.

3.5.8 **сѣинѣ**

The occurrences of **сѣинѣ** below have not been divided into groups of abbreviated and unabbreviated forms, since the way the substantive is abbreviated – or not – is not considered to be of importance in this study. Even if U. Sill studies ways of abbreviating **сѣинѣ** and there is no information on occurrences in unabbreviated forms, this research has been included in this study. According to C. Koch, there are 11 occurrences of **сѣиноѿе** in the N.pl. in the *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* (19b:18a, 27b:24a, 27c:03a, 33d:21a, 37d:20a, 42c:28a, 52a:18a, 113d:05a, 126b:15a, 126b:16a, 127b:18a), there are three **сѣиноѿѣ** in the G.pl. (42c:22a, 107b:20a, 148a:28a); no occurrences in the I. or L.pl. are mentioned (Koch 2000:653-654). M.M. Kozlovskij also expresses the view that **сѣинѣ** belongs to the ū-stem substantives, and that **сѣиноѿе** is used in the N.pl. and **сѣиноѿѣ** in the G.pl. in *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, without writing where, and there is no information on the I. and L.pl. (Kozlovskij 1885-1895:67-77). S.M. Kuljbakin agrees that **сѣинѣ** belongs to the ū-stem substantives, finding ten occurrences of **сѣиноѿе** in the N.pl. (30b:13, 154a:06, 106b:23, 83a:20, 83a:21, 170b:09, 187a:07, 238a:02, 195b:08, 195b:16) and one occurrence of **сѣиноѿѣ** in the G.pl. (286a:18) in *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*. No occurrences in the I. or L.pl. are mentioned (Kuljbakin 1925:50-51). P. Lieli describes **сѣинѣ** as the “most important and most frequently occurring substantive with an ū-stem”, stating that **сѣиноѿе** occurs 17 times in the N.pl., and **сѣиноѿѣ** occurs three times in the G.pl. and **сѣинѣ** once in *Marianus Gospel* (no information is given about where) (Lieli 1991:12-14). A. Marguliés uses **сѣиноѿѣ** as illustration of the remaining ū-

declension in *1073 Miscellany* (246 and 438), but he does not state the total number of occurrences (Margulíés 1927:178, 191). L. Moszyński also agrees that **сѣинѣ** belongs to the ū-stem substantives, and finds that in the N.pl. there are fourteen occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** (not stating where) and one of **сѣини** (St. John XII:36) in *Zograph Gospel*. In the G.pl. there are three occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** (not stating where); there are no occurrences in the I. or L.pl. (Moszyński 1975:186-189). A. Minčeva and R. Pavlova do not mention **сѣинѣ** in relation to *1073 Miscellany*, nor does V. Papazisovska in relation to *Sava's Book*. T. Rott-Żebrowski also classifies **сѣинѣ** among the ū-stem substantives, finding four occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in the N.pl. (14:11, 49:06, 225:11-12, 251:09), one occurrence of **сѣинѣ** (17:11) in the I.pl., one occurrence of **сѣинѣхѣ** (168:06) in the L.pl. in *1076 Miscellany* (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:150). U. Sill studies ways of abbreviating **сѣинѣ** in *Zograph Gospel*, *Marianus Gospel*, *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, *Ohrid Folios or Fragments*, *Sava's Book*, *Codex Suprasliensis*, *Undol'skij's Fragments*, *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, *Turov Gospel Lectionary*, *1073 Miscellany* and *1076 Miscellany*. U. Sill finds fourteen occurrences in the N.pl. of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** and one of **сѣини** in *Zograph Gospel*, 16 occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Marianus Gospel*, 19 occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, no occurrences in *Codex Suprasliensis* or *Undol'skij's Fragments* but four occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Sava's Book*, six occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, one occurrence of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Turov Gospel Lectionary*, 16 occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *1073 Miscellany* and one occurrence of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *1076 Miscellany*. The findings in the G.pl. are: one occurrence of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Zograph Gospel*, three occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** and one **сѣинѣ** in *Marianus Gospel*, and three occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*. There are no occurrences in *Codex Suprasliensis*, *Turov Gospel Lectionary*, *Undol'skij's Fragments* or *1076 Miscellany*. There are two occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Sava's Book*. There are four occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* and four occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in *1073 Miscellany*. U. Sill's views on occurrences in the I.pl. cannot be presented, since A. and I.pl. are placed in one joint column. In the L.pl. there is one occurrence of **сѣинѣхѣ** in *1076 Miscellany* (1972:115-116 and a foldout). All four wordlists note occurrences in plural. In *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092* there are 11 occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in N. (1v:03, 12v:03, 12v:08, 25r:07, 30v:10, 37r:17, 50r:09, 87v:21, 178r:21, 178r:22, 128r:06), and three of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in G (37r:14, 106r:10, 116v:09). In *Marianus Gospel* there are 18 occurrences of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** in N. (10:13, 85:26, 218:18, 291:13, 14:01, 22:24, 26:24, 39:15, 46:03, 46:04, 60:21, 122:11, 248:07, 271:28, 291:19 (twice), 226:16, 369:20). There are four occurrences in G., three of **сѣиноѡѡѣ** (60:18, 190:24, 272:01) and one of **сѣинѣ** (105:23). In

Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057 four occurrences of **сѣиноѡе** in the N.pl. were found (30c, 43a, 58b, 266c) and one in the G.pl. of **сѣиноѡѣ** (278c). In *1073 Miscellany* there are 28 occurrences of **сѣиноѡе** in the N.pl. (14c:14, 30b:10, 51d:28-29, 56b:11, 67c:27, 80a:04, 103d:06, 107a:16-17, 123c:06, 134d:08, 135a:02, 135a:15, 135b:05, 137d:27, 138a:09, 138a:10, 138b:10, 138c:02, 138c:03, 138d:15, 139a:10-11, 139a:11-12, 147a:20, 184a:09-10, 202d:14-15, 206c:20, 209d:16, 216d:06), four occurrences in the G.pl. of **сѣиноѡѣ** (50b:10, 137c:01, 189d:24, 103a:24) and one of **сѣинѣхѣ** in the L.pl. (94a:05).

3.6 The Preslav and Ohrid Schools

There were two chief monastic centres in Bulgaria in OCS. The Ohrid school was founded by Clement, one of Constantine's and Methodius' disciples, and it was marked by linguistic conservatism and fidelity to the Glagolitic tradition. Here the translators were skilful in finding adequate Slavic translations to the complex Greek structures. The Preslav school was founded by Tsar Symeon himself, supported by Naum, another of Constantine's and Methodius' disciples. Here the translators introduced the Cyrillic alphabet, and the school is best known for the skilful adaptations from Greek (Schenker 1996:188, 198). The monk Chabr, who wrote the well-known 'On the letters', worked at the Preslav monastic centre (Chaburgaev 1974:26). According to J. Kurz, the Tetraevangelia *The Marianus Gospel* and *The Zograph Gospel* and the aprakos Gospel *The Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* were copied in Macedonia, and the aprakos Gospel *The Sava's Book* and the Menaicum *The Codex Suprasliensis* copied in East Bulgaria (1966-1983:LXII). Schenker clarifies that *The Marianus Gospel*, *The Zograph Gospel* and *The Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* all belong to the Ohrid scriptorial tradition (Schenker 1996:178-179).

OCS was a language created in order to translate biblical texts from Greek into Slavonic, and the Greek language had much influence on both the vocabulary and the structure of the sentences, i.e. on the lexicon and the syntax. The words used in the translation process were frequently formed on Greek patterns, and many Greek words were even used without translation. However, later scribes changed some words and phrases into the local language, and in Preslav in Tsar Symeon's time even greater changes were made in the lexicon (Ivanova 2005:46-47). According to A.M. Schenker, there are some important differences in scriptorial practices even if the Preslav and Ohrid schools were linguistically very close. The differences between them were both phonological, lexical and grammatical. In phonology, the two schools

differed in the treatment of the PS -ъ- and -ja. In Ohrid these were often rendered by -o- and -ě-, but kept as they were in Preslav. This, according to A.M. Schenker, is an important isogloss between the Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects. The lexicon offers the clearest evidence of the differences between the Ohrid and the Preslav monastic centres²¹, e.g. the words *life* and *large* being *životъ* and *velii* in Ohrid, but *žitie* and *velikъ* in Preslav (Schenker 1996:188). Furthermore, according to H.M. Eckhoff, the possessive dative is often considered to be a Bulgarianism (Eckhoff 2006:65).

3.7 The scribes' changes

Since this thesis studies case endings of substantives in a period when linguistic changes took place, is it interesting to look into what kind of changes scribes, copying the manuscripts, made and why (from Alekseev 1999:43-47).

According to A. A. Alekseev, five types of changes were common when copying the manuscripts:

- 1) The scribe used his language and alphabet when writing. This could lead to mistakes when transliterating the Glagolitic letters into Cyrillic letters, e.g. when transliterating letters denoting numbers.
- 2) Scribes used their own local orthographic system when writing. This makes it possible to determine where and when the manuscripts were copied. But it happened that scribes were influenced by the text being copied, if he did not know how to write the letters, if he did not know the alphabet well or if he for some reason felt strongly for the way the letters were written in the text being copied.
- 3) Lapses, lapsus calami, due to fatigue, lack of concentration, led to the following:
a) dittography (something written twice) of letters or syllables
b) haplography, omission of letters or syllables
c) writing of another letters or omission of parts of letters, e.g. parts of ѡ or ѣ or omission of passages with summarizing endings.
- 4) Errors due to problems when reading or understanding words, e.g. mistaking **БУДЕТЬ** *budet'* 'will, will be' for **БОЛАТЬ** *bolet'* 'to ache' and **ВОЛ** *vol* 'ox' for **БОЛЕ** *bole* 'more, more than', etc., or errors in connection with dictations, e.g. **ПАЧЕ** *pače* 'more, more than' for **ОБАЧЕ** *obače* 'but, however' etc.

²¹ For more information on the differences between the Preslav and Ohrid schools, see Slavova 2012 (1989), where 125 lexemes typical of the Preslav school are studied.

5) Differences in the scribes' linguistic competence and the linguistic changes that took place, leading to hesitations what to write, e.g. the changes in declensions, the number dual, the development of animacy, leading to the use of the genitive in the masculine accusative, the alternation between aorist, imperfect, perfect and participles, etc. (Alekseev 1999:43-47).

4. Theory

This study aims at gathering evidence about the case endings in the plural of eight chosen substantives in four cases in order to investigate if the alleged demise²² of the ŭ-declension never fully took place in the plural, or if the parallel occurrences could be explained by R. Lass' theory on exaptation and A.Ch. Vostokov's thoughts on the parallel use of the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions in one and the same source but with different syntactic roles. According to C. le Feuvre, the ŭ-stem paradigms were no longer productive in OCS (le Feuvre 2009:54). Exaptation of the ŭ-declension case endings could be that these endings started to be re-used again, after once having been replaced by the o-declension case endings for substantives belonging to the ŭ-declension, and possibly also being used for substantives belonging to the o-declension. This chapter consists of two sections: 4.1 deals with exaptation, and 4.2 looks into exaptation in relation to the ŭ- and o-declensions' case endings.

4.1 Exaptation

The term "exaptation" as a way of describing the re-use of obsolete language forms, thus giving them new semantic roles in the development of languages, was introduced by R. Lass. In his article "How to do things with junk: exaptation in language evolution" he writes: "Historical junk, in any case, may be one of the back doors through which structural change gets into systems by idle material getting re-employed" (Lass 1988:52). The American linguist E.C. Traugott explains in the article "Exaptation and grammaticalization" the three possibilities arising when a form loses its function or is marginalized within a language system: it can be lost, it can be kept as marginal garbage or it can be reused for something else (exaptation), and she expresses the opinion that the key to R. Lass's conception of exaptation is the observation

²² See footnote 1.

that some forms lose their function because of phonological or other changes, leaving them “idle” junk, ready to be reused in a new grammatical function (Traugott 2004:03).

It is necessary to define the differences between analogy and exaptation: analogy is the process when the ū-declension class was absorbed by the o-declension class, and exaptation is the process of re-use of the lost case endings in new functions. The reduction of inflection and change of declensions must be analogy. According to D. Crystal, analogy is a grammatical change when irregular patterns are changed in accordance with the already existing regular ones; analogy is a reasoning process that grammatical usage is regular, a kind of process of imitation (Crystal 1987:234, 330). Thus, analogy is a process in order to imitate and simplify the grammar, when regular forms influence less regular forms and extend the regular patterns which already exist, but there is no re-use or functional change of the grammatical functions being excluded.

Exaptation is the conscious or unconscious re-use of something that no longer has the former meaning or function it once did. R. Lass clarifies that there is no need for something exapted to have fallen completely out of use; instead it has to do with re-functionalisation in general. He gives the example of the Finnish element *n which has meanings like locative in Proto-Uralic, an element which later, when the case system developed, became a marker of being or existence (email correspondence, September 16, 2015).

It is possible to link R. Lass’ theory on exaptation in language evolution to A. Ch. Vostokov’s thoughts on the use of case endings from both the ū- and o-declensions of one and the same substantive, in one and the same source, but with different grammatical roles. On page 92 in the word index of the *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* it is claimed, in connection with the word **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** in the genitive plural, that **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** from the ū-declension, here termed the long form, is used after substantives, and from the o-declension, here termed the short form, is used after prepositions. This is to say that case endings of both the ū- and o-declensions could be found in one and the same substantive, in one and the same source, but with different roles. The declensions have their special use in different situations.

4.2 Exaptation and the case endings of the ū- and o-declensions

A brief investigation is necessary into the morphological and phonological basis of the case endings of the chosen four cases N., G., I. and L. in the plural. It is important to separate the

case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions from orthographic changes in later varieties of Church Slavonic, but it seems that there is no case ending where there is a risk of confusing a change of declension with orthographic changes in the N., G., I. and L. plural. In the A.pl. the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions were identical. In the D.pl there also could be a risk of confusion, since the case ending in the D.pl. was **-ѣмъ** for the ŭ-declension, and **-омъ** for the o-declension. It is difficult to decide whether the vowel **-о-** is due to the vocalization of the reduced vowel **-ѣ > -о** in a strong position or if it is the **-о-** from the o-declension.

4.2.1 N.pl.

The case ending in the N.pl. was **-овѣ** for the ŭ-declension, and **-и** for the o-declension. The contamination between these declensions led to the occurrences of the case ending **-ови** in the N.pl., e.g. **сѣиновѣ** and **волѣи** (Nandriš 1965:65). Thus, the **-ov-** morpheme is important. Scholars express different opinions about the **-ov-**. R. Eckert argues that there are other suffixes with **-ov-** that are not related to the ŭ-declension (Eckert 1959:106), and H.M. Eckhoff writes that the **-ov-** suffix is relatively young and probably comes from derivatives in **-o-**, **-a** from the ŭ-declension (Eckhoff 2006:27). The development of **-ov-** from PIE to OCS does not give a definite answer either. According to G. Nandriš, the diphthong **-au-** developed into **-ou-** when the PIE short **-a-** became Slavonic **-o-** (Nandriš 1965:13), A.M. Schenker writes that the PIE thematic vowels and endings blended into the PS monomorphemic endings, which is the explanation how the PIE **-ou-** in the ŭ-stems had become **-ov-** in late PS (Schenker 1996:123). This explains the **-ove** in the N.pl., deriving from PIE **-ou-es** of the PIE ŭ-declension. A.M. Seliščev says that **-ou-** developed into **-ov-** if followed by a vowel, e.g. **сѣинове**, but into **-u** if followed by a consonant or appearing at the end of a syllable (Seliščev 1951:198, 255). According to A.L. Janda, the generalization of the **-ov-** infix took place in plurals in South Slavic, and therefore constitutes a difference between the South Slavic and North Slavic. The **-ov-** infix increased the morphophomic alterations as a non-singular stem enlargement for monosyllabic stem. In the N.pl ending **-ove**, the **-ov-** was a non-singular marker, and **-e** was a marker of plural (Janda 1996:91, 96, 98, 171). The morpheme **-ov-** found in verbs forms, e.g. the infinitive **-ov-** in **вѣровати** or the aorist 1st person dual ending **-ově**, seems also to be related to the ŭ-declension. R. Eckert says that verb forms with **-ov-** without a doubt are connected with substantives belonging to the ŭ-declension (Eckert 1959:106). A.L. Janda writes regarding “paradigm loss” that it could be re-used if it expressed a new type of meaning, and that the N.pl.

ending **-овѣ** expresses a “figure”, an object with definitive shapes or is alive, i.e. son or ox (Janda 1996:203-204).

The occurrences of the case ending **-ови** was described above as a contamination between the *ǔ*- and *o*-declensions. It is not impossible that the **-ови** instead is created by exaptation of the *ǔ*-declension **-ov-** morpheme, together with the case ending **-и** of the *o*-declension. In this case, it is not a question of contamination, but of re-use of the **-ov-** morpheme.

4.2.2 G.pl.

The case ending in the G.pl. was **-овѣ** for the *ǔ*-declension, and **-ѣ** for the *o*-declension. Two conclusions can be drawn regarding these case endings: 1) the only difference is the **-ov-** morpheme, 2) the *o*-declension case ending in the G.pl. is the same as the ending in the N.sg. and A. sg. The **-ov-** morpheme was discussed above, in the section on the N.pl. According to A. Vaillant, the *o*-declension case ending **-ѣ** is a zero-ending, which is not sufficient as a case marker. Therefore, **-овѣ** is found in the G.pl. for substantives that are not distinguished from the N.sg. and A.sg. form by the accent, e.g. **грѣхѡвѣ** (Vaillant 1958:127). However, this does not explain the parallel occurrences of both **грѣхѡвѣ** and **грѣхѣ** in the G.pl. in one and the same source. A. Ch. Vostokov’s thoughts are that **грѣхѣ** is used after prepositions and **грѣхѡвѣ** is used after substantives, thus giving the different forms in the G.pl. different syntactic roles. The exaptation of the **-ov-** morpheme would here be for an *o*-declension substantive (Vostokov 2007:92 wordlist). A.L. Janda says regarding “paradigm loss” that it could be re-used if it was more distinctive than the ordinary paradigm, e.g. the **-овѣ** in the G.pl. (Janda 1996:203-204). The form in the G.pl. for animate substantives is identical to the form in possessive adjectives derived from masculine substantives, e.g. **сынѡвѣ** *сынѡвѣ*, ‘son’s’. Also this morpheme **-ov-** comes from the *ǔ*-declension. R. Matasović argues that the origin of the suffix **-ov-** is unclear, but that it probably originated in thematic adjectives, built from *ǔ*-stems, on the model of, e.g. OCS **сынѡвѣ**, ‘son’s’ (Matasović 2011:06-07). H.M. Eckhoff holds the opinion that there are few examples of mistaking denominal adjectives in the N.sg. with the G.pl. of substantives (Eckhoff 2006:297-298), but it is clear that it must sometimes be difficult to decide whether an occurrence of e.g. **сынѡвѣ** is a possessive adjective or the substantive in the G.pl. The occurrences of the G.pl. with the ending **-овѣ** instead of the *o*-declension case ending **-ѣ** could

be the result of the exaptation of the -ov- morpheme, together with the case ending -ъ of the o-declension.

4.2.3 I.pl.

The case ending in the I.pl. was -ъми for the ū-declension, and -ы for the o-declension. The case endings in the A.pl. and I.pl. are identical, and this could possibly be a reason for the spreading of the -ъми to substantives in the o-stem class. This could also be the reason for the use of the -ov- morpheme in the I.pl. as well: the ending -овы is found in the manuscripts. A. Chodzko writes that the case ending -ы is a result of the loss of the nasal consonant -m-; as -ъми >-ъи >-ъи >-ы and he gives examples of o-stem substantives found with the ū-declension case ending: грѣхъми, плодъми, and others (Chodzko 1869:53), and V.B. Kryś'ko gives the examples апостолъми, сѣпостатъми (Kryś'ko 2000:29). A.L. Janda states regarding “paradigm loss” that it could be re-used if it had parallels in other paradigms, e.g. the -ъми in the I.pl. (Janda 1996:203-204).

4.2.4 L.pl.

The case ending in the L.pl. was -ъхъ for the ū-declension, and -ѣхъ for the o-declension. The PIE -*sū in the L.pl. had changed into -хъ for substantives belonging to the ū-, i- and o-stem classes (Seliščev 1951:185, 187). G.A. Chaburgaev gives the example сынѣхъ < *sūn-ŭ-sū as the development of *s>[x] after *-i- and *-u- in the L.pl. (Chaburgaev 1974:192). The -ov- morpheme is also found in the L.pl., e.g. родовѣхъ, потовѣхъ (Chodzko 1869:53). Sometimes scholars say that the case ending -охъ is a result of a contamination between the ū- and o-declension, but more plausible is the vocalization of the reduced vowel in a strong position. P. Lieli finds one домохъ in the L.pl. in *Marianus Gospel*, and clarifies that it seems to deviate from the norm of ū-stems, but that the old form домъхъ can be supposed as a starting point (Lieli 1991:13-14). According to R. Eckert, there is a difference in geography relating to the use of -ъхъ and -охъ. The case ending -ъхъ in the L.pl. was found in South Slavic and East Slavic manuscripts, and -охъ in West Slavic manuscripts (Eckert 1959:103), but this is not relevant for this study since no West Slavic manuscripts are included.

5. Method

5.1 Choice of substantives for the study

Section 3.3 dealt with substantives belonging to the ŭ-declension in OCS. Most scholars agree that the following six substantives belong to this declension: *врѣхъ* *vr'ch*" 'top', *сынъ* *syn*" 'son', *волъ* *vol*" 'ox', *медъ* *med*" 'honey' and *полъ* *pol*" 'half', and therefore these substantives were chosen for this study. Two additional OCS substantives were chosen: *грѣхъ* *grěch*" 'sin' and *длъгъ* *dl'g*" 'debt', as a result of the various views expressed about them.

5.2 Choice of OCS/CS sources

Twenty sources from the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries, written in four linguistic varieties (OCS and the Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian CS), were chosen for this study. Some considerations are in place here:

- 1) It is important to understand the difference between a text and a manuscript; a text might originally have been created a long time ago, but the extant copy is just a few hundred years old. Therefore, efforts have been made to use only sources and even parts of sources that belong to the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries. One example of such an exclusion is *Sava's Book*, where the first 24 folios were written at the end of the 13th century, and thus were excluded. There is only one source that by specialists is placed "between the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th century", the *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*.
- 2) There is a difference between the linguistic variety in a manuscript and its place of origin; e.g. *Marianus Gospel*, an OCS codex, written in Macedonia and showing influences of the Serbian CS (Kurz 1966:LXII and LXXII, Lunt 2001:09, Ivanova 2005:14).
- 3) It is also important to consider that there are differences between linguistic changes that are orthographical, and what makes a text written in CS. The views of the specialists are used in order to decide to what linguistic variety the manuscripts belong.

The south-east Slavic area is represented in sources written in Macedonia and Bulgaria, the south-west Slavic area by sources written in Serbia, and the east Slavic area by sources written in Russia. The west Slavic area is not included in this study, since there was a change to the Latin alphabet very early in these countries. The sources chosen are presented in chapter 6

Material, but some information about them is presented here, since it influenced the reason for choosing them:

- *Marianus Gospel* and *Zograph Gospel* are the two oldest manuscripts, both written in Glagolitic,
- *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*, *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*, *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, and *Sava's Book* are four of the earliest aprakos Gospels; *Turov Gospel* is also by some considered to be a very early aprakos Gospel,
- *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* is the oldest dated Slavic manuscript, but excluded from OCS by specialists due to the change of nasal vowels,
- *Putjatin menaeum* is one of the oldest manuscripts in the Russian CS,
- *Codex Suprasliensis* is the largest OCS manuscript and one of the oldest Cyrillic manuscripts.

5.3 Choice of 41 biblical verses

In order to make the comparison between the sources more correct, 38 biblical verses were chosen in order to register in what folios the occurrences were found. These grew into 41 verses at the end of the study, see table 7 and Appendix 2.

Table 7. The document "Findings of occurrences" for documentation of findings.

41 biblical verses in tetraevangelia and aprakos Gospel Lectionaries

OCCURRENCES IN: (manuscript)

SOURCE: (facsimile edition, edition, e-corpus, PDF file)

(N.pl. волове / воли), G.pl. воловъ / волъ = folios and lines

(I.pl. волъми / волы, L.pl. волъхъ / волъхъ)

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (number of occurrences)

St. Matthew IX:2 = folios and lines, IX:5 = folios and lines

St. Mark II:5 = folios and lines, II:9 = folios and lines, IV:12 = folios and lines

St. Luke V:20 = folios and lines, V:23 = folios and lines, VII:47 = folios and lines, VII:48 = folios and lines

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (number of occurrences)

St. Matthew I:21 = folios and lines, XXVI: 28 = — folios and lines,

St. Mark I:4 = folios and lines,

St. Luke I:77 = folios and lines, III:3 = folios and lines, XXIV:47 = folios and lines,

(I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы) L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (number of occurrences)

St. John VIII:24 (x2) = folios and lines; IX:34 = folios and lines

(N.pl. **домове** / **доми**), G.pl. **домовъ** / **домъ** (number of occurrences) St. Mark X:30 = folios and lines

(I.pl. **домъми** / **домы**),

L.pl. **домъхъ** / **домѣхъ** (number of occurrences) St. Matthew XI:8 = folios and lines

(N.pl. **полове** / **поли**) G.pl. **половъ** / **полъ** (number of occurrences) = St. Mark VI:23 = folios and lines

(I.pl. **полъми** / **полы** L.pl. **полъхъ** / **полѣхъ**)

N.pl. **сынове** / **сыни** (number of occurrences)

St. Matthew V:9 = folios and lines, V:45 = folios and lines, VIII:12 = folios and lines, IX:15 = folios and lines, XII:27 = folios and lines, XIII:38 (x2) = folios and lines, XVII:26 = folios and lines XXIII:31 = folios and lines,

St. Mark II:19 = folios and lines,

St. Luke VI:35 = folios and lines, XI:19 = folios and lines, XVI:8 = folios and lines, XX:34 = folios and lines, XX:36 (x2) = folios and lines,

St. John IV:12 = folios and lines, XII:36 = folios and lines,

G.pl. **сыновъ** / **сынъ** (number of occurrences)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = folios and lines, XXVII:9 = folios and lines,

St. Luke I:16 = folios and lines, XVI:8 = folios and lines

(I.pl. **сынъми** / **сыны** L.pl. **сынъхъ** / **сынѣхъ**)

5.4 Method of excerption of the OCS/CS text

- All of the excerpts from the biblical texts in tetraevangelia and aprakos Gospels are from the chosen 41 biblical verses found in the four Gospels. The phrases excerpted from the five non-biblical texts were selected as a result of occurrences found of the eight substantives in the plural N., G., I. and L. cases. Occurrences in headings, inscriptions in the upper or lower margins, word index et cetera have therefore been excluded; and so have occurrences that were difficult to understand due to errors in spelling, lost folios, etc.
- The excerpts differ in length. As a rule, so much text has been excerpted from each sentence as is required in order to understand the syntactic role of the substantive studied. Since the scribes sometimes change the contents, the excerpts from one and the same biblical verse from different sources differ in length.

5.5 Use of wordlists and electronic corpora

If the editions had wordlists, these were used. However, not all occurrences turned out to have been stated in the wordlists. Not only facsimile editions or printed editions of the manuscripts were used, but also the following electronic corpora: the Portal Manuskript²³, Titus Corpus²⁴, the Sofia Trondheim Corpus²⁵. These portals were also used to find information on the sources, together with the following portals: Biblioteka Frontistesa²⁶, the homepage for *Codex Suprasliensis*²⁷ and the Corpus Cyrillo-Methodianum Helsingensiae (CCMH)²⁸.

Since not all corpora had search engines for biblical verses, a special document was produced in order to facilitate the search and take every change of the consonants as a result of palatalizations into account, see table 8.

Table 8. The 110 word forms of the chosen eight substantives searched for in the electronic corpora

The 110 word forms searched for in the e-corpora:

Source: _____

Web address: _____

Excerpted on (date), inscribed on computer on (date), checked on (date), changes inscribed on (date), 2nd check on (date)

ВОЛОВЕ, ВОЛОВЪ/ВОЛОВЬ, ВОЛЪМИ, ВОЛЪХЪ/ВОЛЪХЬ

ВОЛИ, ВОЛЪ/ВОЛЬ (G.pl.), ВОЛЫ (I.pl.), ВОЛЪХЪ/ВОЛЪХЬ

ВРЪХЪ/ ВЪРХЪ/ ВРЪХЪ/ ВЪРХЪ/: ВРЪХОВЕ, ВРЪХОВЪ/ВРЪХОВЬ, ВРЪХЪМИ, ВРЪХЪХЪ/ВРЪХЪХЬ

ВРЪСИ, ВРЪХЪ/ВРЪСЬ (G.pl.), ВРЪХЫ (I.pl.), ВРЪСЪХЪ/ВРЪСЪХЬ

ГРЪХОВЕ, ГРЪХОВЪ/ГРЪХОВЬ, ГРЪХЪМИ, ГРЪХЪХЪ/ГРЪХЪХЬ

ГРЪСИ, ГРЪХЪ/ГРЪСЬ (G.pl.), ГРЪХЫ (I.pl.), ГРЪСЪХЪ/ ГРЪСЪХЬ

ДЛЪГЪ/ ДЪЛГЪ: ДЛЪГОВЕ, ДЛЪГОВЪ/ДЛЪГОВЬ, ДЛЪГЪМИ, ДЛЪГЪХЪ/ДЛЪГЪХЬ

²³ <http://www.manuscripts.ru>.

²⁴ <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm>.

²⁵ <http://www.hf.ntnu.no/SofiaTrondheimCorpus/index2.html>.

²⁶ <http://ksana-k.narod.ru>.

²⁷ <http://csup.ilit.bas.bg/> and <http://csup.ilit.bas.bg/sites/ms>.

²⁸ <http://www.helsinki.fi/slaavilaiset/ccmh>.

длъзи, длъгъ/длъзь (G.pl.), длъгы (I.pl.), длъзѣхъ/длъзѣхъ
 домовѣ, домовъ/домовъ, домъми, домъхъ/домъхъ
 доми, домъ/домъ (G.pl.), домты (I.pl.), домѣхъ/домѣхъ
 медове, медовъ/медовъ, медъми, медъхъ/медъхъ
 меди, медъ/медъ (G.pl.), медты (I.pl.), медѣхъ/медѣхъ
 полове, половъ/половъ, полъми, полъхъ/полъхъ
 поли, полъ/поль (G.pl.), полты (I.pl.), полѣхъ/полѣхъ
 сынове, сыновъ/сыновъ, сынъми, сынъхъ/сынъхъ
 сыни, сынъ/сынъ (G.pl.), сынты (I.pl.), сынѣхъ/сынѣхъ
 + снѡве, снѡвѣ, снѡвъ/снѡвъ, снѡвъ/снѡвѣ, снѡми, снѡхъ, снѡхъ, снѡи, снѡъ (G.pl.), снѡты, снѡѣхъ, снѡѣхъ

5.6 Method of data registration and analysis

All instances of substantive phrases, where one of the chosen eight substantives is found, were excerpted if the number was plural and the case was one of the nominative, genitive, instrumental or locative. The excerpted phrases were then analysed with regard to what declension the substantives belong and what case is used, the structure of the sentence in order to establish the role of the substantive in the sentence, and also to in what biblical verse (if a biblical source was studied) the occurrence was found. There could be up to five occurrences of one and the same biblical verse in one aprakos Gospel.

5.7 Method of reproduction of OCS/CS text

The OCS and CS excerpts are written in different orthographic features, diacritics et cetera, and as a simplification a system of reproduction is used throughout, which sometimes makes the reproduced excerpts differ from that of the manuscripts in the following ways:

- the text is divided into separate words,
- the abbreviation sign, which is written in different ways in the manuscripts, is in the reproduced excerpts always rendered as [̄],
- [i] is written и and њ in the manuscripts, but written only as и in the reproduced excerpts,
- [n] is written њ and н in the manuscripts, but written only as њ in the reproduced excerpts,

- the letter **ϣ** is used also for **ш**,
- the chosen font does not allow the use of some diacritics or letters written above the words,
- there are several ways of writing *jery* in the manuscript, but in the reproduced excerpts only **ѣ** is used.

5.8 Method of tests of statistical significance

Tests of statistical significance were performed in order to determine how high or low the probability was that the results were due to chance or not. The chosen method is the “One-sample frequency comparison” presented in the project *Statistical Interference: A Gentle Introduction for Linguists (SIGIL)* by Marco Baroni and Stefan Evert, accessed November 20-22, 2016 at <http://sigil.collations.de/wizard.html>.

6 Material

This chapter presents the manuscripts used in this study. Section 6.1 deals with different types of texts. Section 6.2 deals with biblical texts and the problems they present. Section 6.3 examines the manuscripts used in this study.

6.1 Types of texts

20 manuscripts from the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries are used as sources in this study. Of the 15 manuscripts of biblical texts are four tetraevangelia and 11 aprakos Gospels lectionaries or evangeliaria. Of the manuscripts of five non-biblical texts are three menaea and two miscellanies. Both tetraevangelia and aprakos Gospels contain text from the New Testament; tetraevangelia are full versions of the four Gospels, whereas aprakos Gospels are the Gospels arranged in lessons to be read during church service. According to A. A. Alekseev, there are three different types of aprakos Gospels. Firstly, the long (or full), secondly, the short (or brief), and thirdly, the feast (or holiday) aprakos Gospel (Alekseev 1999:14-17). The differences between them are most easily explained by the two cycles of the Orthodox Church.

The fixed or solar cycle is from the Roman and Byzantine churches. It starts on the New Year’s Day, which in the Julian calendar (old style) falls on September 1. The reading in the fixed yearly cycle is called menology (**мѣсяцесловъ**). There are nine feasts in this cycle. The movable or lunar cycle comes from the Hebrew calendar and starts on Easter Sunday. It is

divided into five periods: 1) from Easter to Pentecost, 2) from Pentecost to the New Year, 3) from the New Year to the Lent, 4) the Lent and 5) Easter week. The reading in the movable cycle is the synaxarion (СИНАКСАРЬ) (Schenker 1996:258-259 and Alekseev 1999:14-17). According to A. A. Alekseev, the differences between the long, short and feast types of aprakos Gospels are the readings. In the second and third periods, there are readings on every day for long aprakos Gospels, but only on Saturdays and Sundays for short aprakos Gospels (Alekseev 1999:14-17).

Furthermore, there are two different types of long aprakos Gospels, the Mstislavov type, and the Miroslav type, for which the readings start one week earlier. The feast aprakos Gospel was discovered, named and described by L.P. Žukovskaja. In contrast to long and short aprakos Gospels is the reading in the first period only on Saturdays and Sundays, when both long and short aprakos Gospels have readings on every day. It seems that there are not two feast aprakos Gospels that are alike (Alekseev 1999:15-17). No feast aprakos Gospels are included in this study.

The three menaea are texts for each month of the year. Thus, there are 12 different. They contain hagiographic and martyrological works for the fixed feasts of the months, and also homilies for the movable feasts in the liturgical year²⁹. Two Miscellanies are also used as sources, containing Encomium or compendia of articles³⁰.

6.2 Biblical texts and the problems they present

The use of biblical texts for research on grammar presents some problems. When using OCS and CS manuscripts of the four Gospels, the following points must be taken into consideration, since they could all influence the result of the study: the time of origin, i.e. the chronological classification of the manuscripts; the place of origin; the transmission of the Gospels from one generation to the next, i.e. the topographical classification of the manuscripts; the condition of the manuscripts: stains, lacunae, later additions, palimpsests, fragments. And, as D. Crystal declares, “Indeed, in many cases the scribes did not know the language or dialect of the manuscript they were copying”, and this lack of knowledge could lead to problems in the apographs (Crystal 1987:187).

²⁹ see information on *Codex Suprasliensis* on <http://csupilit.bas.bg./node/5>.

³⁰ www.hf.ntnu.no.

Is the chronological classification of manuscripts meaningful? The answer must be that it depends on what one wants to study. If one wants to study the process of linguistic changes in OCS time, it is essential that the manuscripts studied belong to the OCS canon. Scholars sometimes express different opinions about the date and the place of origin of a certain manuscript. In order to identify *when* and *where* a certain manuscript was copied, and find its antigraph and its later copies, it is necessary to use some kind of “tool” on linguistic development and differences. Choosing another “tool”, another conclusion might be the result. With the word “tool” is here meant a way of analysing and classifying e.g. manuscripts. It is well known that there is an ongoing discussion about the OCS canon and in what ways manuscripts could be said to belong to this canon. This discussion will not be reflected here.

As mentioned earlier, this study of the ŭ-declension case endings in 20 OCS/CS sources gives preference to the concept expressed by S.M. Kuljbakin in *Славянская Палеография* (Kuljbakin 2008:39-51), see sections 2.2 and 3.1. But this theory also has problems. Kuljbakin writes that one important criterion, which separates OCS from its later Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian CS, is the presence of nasal vowels. But in the *Marianus Gospel*, claimed to be one of the oldest extant south-west OCS tetraevangelia (Garzaniti 2001:110, 327), copied directly from the Moravian archetype, created by Methodius (Vrana 1961:143) there are signs of denasalization. However, all manuscripts published as facsimile editions, printed editions or as electronic corpora, have information about their date and place of origin, and these conclusions have been used in this study.

If studying the linguistic signs in the manuscript in order to decide when a certain manuscript was written is one method, deciding the date of a manuscript by using time periods in general is another. This was also mentioned earlier, see sections 2.2 and 3.1. This method is problematic since scholars sometimes place a manuscript’s date on both sides of the year 1100; e.g. the *Menaem of Dubrovskij*, which by some is considered to be from the 11th century, but by some from the 12th century (Tot 1985:44), in Russian CS³¹. Another aspect is the possibility that the manuscripts are dated. H. Lunt points out that none of the OCS manuscripts is dated, and that chronologies established on grounds of palaeography are not reliable (Lunt 2001:04). However, East Slavic manuscripts are often dated; of the 12 extant manuscripts from the 11th century, seven have information about the dates: the two aprakos Gospels *Ostromir Gospel* *Lectionary of 1056-1057* and *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*, the two Miscellany 1073

³¹ <http://www.hf.ntnu.no/SofiaTrondheimCorpus/index2.htm>.

Miscellany and *1076 Miscellany*, and the three *menaea 1095-1096 for September, 1096 for October* and *1097 for November* (Lěvočkin 1997:11). Thus, studying the linguistic evidence in manuscripts is more reliable. In relation to this study, a chronological classification of manuscripts would be meaningful, since the time of origin and place of origin of the manuscripts are important for the conclusions.

Is the topographical classification of manuscripts meaningful? In other words, is it important in a study that the apograph is correctly copied in relation to the antigraph? As already has been mentioned, D. Crystal points out that the scribes did not know the language or dialect of the manuscript they were copying (Crystal 1987:187), and this could lead to unintentional changes in the apographs. According to A.S. Gerd and W.R. Veder, some changes made by the scribes were intentional, i.e. revision and editing. Revision is collating, modernization and updating, eliminations of defects, writing notes and explanations, commentary, all of which are deliberate changes, not mistakes (Gerd and Veder 2003:116-117). According to W.R. Veder³², there are different types of text transmission:

- the direct transmission, which gives a faithful copy of the antigraph, and which should be a correct transmission of biblical texts, but as reality shows, this is not the case,
- the contaminated transmission, i.e. copied from at least two antigraphs, which is often the case for biblical texts, and the indirect or open transmission, where everything can happen in the text, which can be augmented. One example is the *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*, which, according to A. A. Alekseev, is copied from two antigraphs, partly from a short *aparakos Gospel*, and partly from a long *aparakos Gospel* (Alekseev 1999:16).

There are probably very few examples of completely exact transmissions to later copies. Firstly, there were many changes and errors when recoding the Glagolitic texts into Cyrillic. Secondly, there were other changes and errors when copying from Cyrillic into Cyrillic. Research results of course differ depending on what copies the study is based, and this is related to what one wants to study, but errors and other changes have a direct impact on the research results. When recoding from Glagolitic into Cyrillic, the following eight errors and changes are possible³³:

³² From a series of seminars on Textual Criticism by Professor Emeritus William R. Veder, in the autumn of 2016, at the University of Gothenburg.

³³ Ibid.

- 1) The retention of Glagolitic characters in Cyrillic text,
- 2) Confusion of Glagolitic and Cyrillic numerical values,
- 3) Confusion in marking jotation and palatality,
- 4) Confusion of nasals,
- 5) Confusion of consonants,
- 6) Confusion of vowels,
- 7) Confusion in epenthesis,
- 8) Parablepses.

Would these changes and errors have an influence on the research results in this study? Some of the sources were originally written in Glagolitic, and later transcribed into Cyrillic. The observations below are limited to the case endings, comprising the following ten letters:

Glagolitic letters	ѡ	Ѣ	Ѥ	Ѧ	Ѩ	Ѭ	Ѯ	Ѱ	Ѳ	Ѵ	Ѷ
Cyrillic letters	Ѡ	Ѣ	Ѥ	Ѧ, ѧ	Ѩ	Ѭ	Ѯ	Ѱ	Ѳ	Ѵ	Ѷ
										(loan-words from Greek)	(Slavic)

When using electronic corpora, occurrences could be missed if there is a retention of Glagolitic characters in the Cyrillic text. This is true about the scribes who wrote the manuscripts by hand, and this is true about the one studying the manuscripts, even in modern times. The list used with possible forms in view of the palatalization processes and differences in spelling, would not be of help here. Furthermore, in facsimile editions, there is a possible, but not probable, chance of missing an occurrence if the Glagolitic letter Ѳ is retained instead of the Cyrillic Ѳ.

The confusion of Glagolitic and Cyrillic numerical values is not relevant for this study. Even so, it is interesting to note that there are differences between the ways in the two alphabets of denoting Ѣ and Ѡ, which frequently occur in the case endings. Ѣ has the numerical value of 2 in Glagolitic, but 3 in Cyrillic, and Ѡ has the numerical value of 80 in Glagolitic, but 70 in Cyrillic.

The possible errors of the confusion in marking jotation and palatality, and the confusion of nasals, when recoding from Glagolitic into Cyrillic, are considered to be of no relevance for this particular study.

Since the confusion of letters for consonants led to the scribe's confusion of entire words, this might have an impact on the outcome of the piece of research, since the words searched for might have been missed. В, М, Ч occur in the chosen eight substantives, and there is a possibility that the scribe confused В with Д, Л or Т, or М with Slavic Ч or Ч with Г or К.

The confusion of vowels is also a risk in the study as occurrences could be missed. The letters О, Е, Ы and Ъ occur in the chosen eight substantives. The scribe could confuse О with Е, О҃ and Ы/Ь, or Е with А, or Ы with А and Ъ, or Ъ with А and Ы. The scribes' dialects could lead to the confusion of Е with И and О with А. Furthermore, Ы/Ь in tense positions could be confused with И/Ы, and this possible confusion is relevant for this study, since the case endings in N.pl is -И and in A.pl. and I.pl. is -Ы for substantives belonging to the o-declension, thus making it possible to misinterpret the case. The occurrence ДОМЫ in *1073 Miscellany* was nearly missed due to the spelling, as it was believed to be in the A.pl.³⁴. In this study occurrences in the A.pl. are excluded, since -Ы is the case ending in both the ū- and o-declensions, and it is impossible to decide without a doubt to which declension an occurrence belongs. The process when OCS -Ы changed into -И in Bulgarian and Serbian CS is also relevant in this aspect, and the possible confusion of the letters О and Ъ in the L.pl. case ending -О҃ХЬ for the ū-declension, after the development of -ЬХЬ into -О҃ХЬ in Macedonia (but not in East Bulgaria where -ЬХЬ was retained) in the 10th century, and the L.pl. -ЬХЬ for the o-declension. According to Kuljbakin, this change of -ЬХЬ into -О҃ХЬ also took place in Serbia, when Macedonian manuscripts were copied (Kuljbakin 2008:39-51). Maybe these changes were not important for the scribes or the readers of the manuscripts, but they could have an impact on the results in a study on the ū-declension.

Confusion in epenthesis, i.e. insertion of a sound or a letter within a word, especially in clusters of consonants, is not relevant for this particular study.

Parablepses, on the contrary, are relevant for this study. There were no examples of anagrams, i.e. rearrangements of letters in a word, or haplograms, i.e. omission of repeated letters in a word, but there was one occurrence of ГРѢХОХОВЬ in the *Assemanian Gospel*

³⁴ The ending here is probably not a result of the confusion of vowels, but instead the development of case endings in Russia.

Lectionary, showing a tautogram, i.e. having another ending than it was supposed to due to a repetition.

As mentioned earlier, A.A. Alekseev examines the changes and errors, made by scribes when copying manuscripts, see section 3.7 (Alekseev 1999:43-47).

The changes and errors mentioned above, give the impression that there were differences even when scribes copied one and the same biblical verse in manuscripts. In order to illustrate these differences, a part of the verse St. Luke VII:48 was chosen, a verse that occurred in 12 of the 15 biblical manuscripts and twice in *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*.

The following 13 occurrences in St. Luke VII:48 were found in 12 of the 15 manuscripts, see table 9³⁵

Table 9: Occurrences of грѣси in part of St. Luke VII:48 in twelve manuscripts

ARC/131v: 01	рече же ки ѿпоуцають тї сѧ грѣси твои.
ASS/120r:16	рече же еи ѿпоуштажтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои.
DOB/57b:07	рече же ки ѿставаѣжтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои...
KOH/102r:19	рече же еи ѿпоуцажт сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои.
MAR/94v	рече же еи ѿтъпоуцажтъ ти сѧ грѣси
MIR/160a:09	рече же ди ѿпоуцають се тебѣ грѣси
MST/77b:23	рече же ки ѿтъпоуцают сѧ тебе грѣси.
MST/169b:02	рече же ки ѿтъпѣцают сѧ тебѣ грѣси.
OST/223d:13	рече же ки ѿтъпоуцажтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси
SAV/130v:17	рече же еи ѿтъпоуцажтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси
VAT/52r:23	рече же еи ѿтъпоуцажтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси
VUK/85c:20	рече же ки ѿпоуцають се тебѣ грѣси твои:
ZOG/157v:19	рече же еи ѿтъпоуштажтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси.

Clearly, the scribes have copied the verse St. Luke VII:48 in four different ways with varying spelling due to the CS variety:

³⁵ The reproduction of OCS/CS text is simplified, see section 5.7.

- 1) The verb **отъпоуцаѣтъ ѿ**, the pronoun **ти, тебѣ, тебе** = MAR, MIR, MST (bis), OST, SAV, VAT and ZOG
- 2) The verb **отъпоуцаѣтъ ѿ**, the pronouns **тебѣ** and **твои** = ASS, KOH, VUK
- 3) The verb **отъпоуцаѣтъ ѿ**, the pronouns **ти** and **твои** = ARC
- 4) The verb **оставлѣѣтъ ѿ**, the pronouns **ти** and **твои** = DOB

These differences are interesting, but will not be discussed further in this section.

So the answer is yes; occurrences could be missed if there is a retention of Glagolitic characters in the Cyrillic text when using electronic corpora if the scribe confused letters and there are risks of missing occurrences in the manuscripts if the scribes changed the spelling in accordance with their own orthographic regional norm or with different linguistic competence. The only way of reducing the risks is to use several sources, i.e. PDF versions of the manuscripts, electronic corpora, but most importantly, find word lists with grammatical explanations.

The condition of the manuscripts could also influence the outcome of the study as a result of stains, lacunae, later additions, palimpsests and fragments. Many manuscripts are in a bad condition, have lacunae, parts missing and later additions. One example of a manuscript consisting of parts from different periods is the *Sava's Book (Gospel Lectionary)*, which consists of four parts from different periods and/or places: the folios 1-24 were written at the end of the 13th or at the beginning of the 14th century in Russia. The oldest part is folios 25-153, written in the 11th century in Bulgaria. Folios 154-165 were written at the end of the 11th or at the beginning of the 12th century in Russia. Folio 166 was written in the 11th century in Bulgaria (Knjazevskaia et al. 1999:39).

The problem with stains in general is that it could be difficult deciding if the stains or holes were there before the copying, or if the stain or hole came later, i.e. whether what is written are the correct words, or if something has been erased or has disappeared by a later stain or hole. One example is St. Mark X:30 in the *Dobromir's Gospel* on folio 5v (Velčeva 1975:04-07):

·аще не имать приѣти сторицеѣхъ нынѣ.

въ врьѣмѣ се домовъ.и братиѣхъ и сестрь.и бѣца и матерѣ.

where there is a hole dividing the parts **домо** and **въ** and theoretically something else could therefore have been written there. But in connection with the Bible, it is easier to decide what is written, since the text of the biblical verse otherwise is in accordance with St. Mark X:30. It

was concluded that the stain was there before the copying, and that it is **ДОМОВЪ**, and the occurrence was included in the study. Two of the manuscripts are palimpsests, the *Vatican Gospel Lectionary Gr 2502* and the *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*. The text of the *Vatican Gospel Lectionary* from the 10th century was covered by a Greek Gospel from 12th or 13th century, and could only be studied by means of an infrared lamp (Krăstanov, et al. 1996:17-18). The text washed away from the *Kochno Gospel* was a Greek manuscript from the 10th century, making the later Bulgarian Gospel text visible³⁶. One example of a fragment is the *Undol'skij's Fragments (Gospel Lectionary)*, which only covers the biblical verses of St. Matthew XIII:24-30, 36-43 and St. Mark V:24-34³⁷.

6.3 The corpus of OCS and Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian CS

The 20 sources used in this study are presented in the following way: firstly, the 15 manuscripts of the Gospels and aprakos Gospel lectionaries in alphabetical order, secondly, the three menaea, and thirdly, the two miscellanies.

6.3.1 *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*

6.3.2 *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*

6.3.3 *Dobromir's Gospel*

6.3.4 *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*

6.3.5 *Marianus Gospel*

6.3.6 *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*

6.3.7 *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*

6.3.8 *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*

6.3.9 *Sava's Book*

6.3.10 *Turov Gospel Lectionary*

6.3.11 *Typograph Gospel*

6.3.12 *Undol'skij's Fragments*

6.3.13 *Vatican Gospel Lectionary*

6.3.14 *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*

6.3.15 *Zograph Gospel*

³⁶ www.hist.msu.ru/Byzantine.

³⁷ http://ksana-k.ru/cfl/05_und/und-karinsk.pdf.

6.3.16 *Menaеum of Dubrovskij*

6.3.17 *Putjatin Menaеum*

6.3.18 *Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)*

6.3.19 *1073 Miscellany*

6.3.20 *1076 Miscellany*

6.3.1 Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092

Occurrences in	The <i>Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092</i>
Source	Mironova 1997
Language	Cyrillic; Russian CS
Period	11 th century
Contents	It is copied from two originals, partly from a short aprakos Gospel, and partly from a full aprakos Gospel from a Glagolitic original
Folios	178; with lacunae and defects, 53 leaves are missing and 54 have defects
Comments	There are glossaries with grammatical information, starting on pp. 415, 635, 654 and 655
Information	Alekseev 1999:16, Garzaniti 2001:394, Lëvočkin 1997:11-12, Mironova 1997:05-40, Vinokur 2007:12, Žukovskaja 1997:18-37

6.3.2 Assemanian Gospel Lectionary

Occurrences in	The <i>Assemanian Gospel Lectionary</i> (or the <i>Vatican</i> , not to be confused with the <i>Vatican Gospel Lectionary Gr.2502</i>)
Source	The e-corpus at the portal <i>Manuskript</i>
Language	Glagolitic; OCS, written in Macedonia
Period	End of 10 th or beginning of 11 th century
Contents	Short aprakos Gospel; the oldest known OCS Glagolitic manuscript
Folios	158

Information Kurz 1966: LXXI, Kurz 1929-1955, Schenker 1996:189, 203, Sill 1972:15, *Staroslavjanskij slovar'* 1999:15, webpages³⁸

6.3.3 *Dobromir's Gospel*

Occurrences in The *Dobromir's Gospel*
Source Velčeva 1975
Language Cyrillic; the language is a mix of OCS and the Bulgarian CS, written in the CS, created in Preslav
Period 12th century
Contents Tetraevangelie; the Gospel according to St. Matthew and the parts I-II:1-7 from the Gospel according to St. Mark are missing
Folios Folios 1r-183v is the Leningrad part, and the folios 1rC-23vC is the Sinajskij part (the synaxarion is from the 15th century)
Information Altbauer 1973:07, Garzaniti 2001:370, Sokoljanskij 2004:333, Velčeva 1975:1-35, webpage³⁹

6.3.4 *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in The *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*
Source The facsimile edition Kossek 1986
Language Cyrillic; Bulgarian CS/East Bulgarian
Period Bulgarian CS, the end of the 12th or the beginning of the 13th century
Contents Aprakos Gospel, not stated whether full or short, condition not stated
Folios 120 folios, no beginning and no end
Information Kossek 1986:05-93

³⁸ <http://kodeks.uni-bamberg.de/AKSL/Quellen/AKSL.CdxAssemanianus.htm>, <http://www.manuscripts.ru>.

³⁹ <http://cyrillomethodiana.uni-sofia.bg>.

6.3.5 *Marianus Gospel*

Occurrences in	The <i>Marianus Gospel</i> .
Source	Jagič 1883, downloaded PDF
Alphabet	Glagolitic, OCS with influences from the Serbian, written in Macedonia
Period	10 th -11 th century
Contents	Tetraevangelie with lacunae. Parts added later are: the Gospel according to St. Matthews I:1-V:22, from the Dečanskij Gospel, and the Gospel according to St. John 1:1-22, XVIII:13-29, XXI:17-25, which have been added from the <i>Zograph Gospel</i>
Folios	173
Information	Ivanova 2005:14, Jagič 1883:618, Kuljbakin 2008:40-41, Kurz 1966:LXII + LXXII, Lunt 2001:06; Mirčev 2000:17, Sill 1972:14, <i>Staroslavjanskij slovar'</i> 1999: 14-15

6.3.6 *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	the <i>Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary</i>
Source	Online facsimile version, downloaded PDF ⁴⁰
Language	Cyrillic, one of the oldest Cyrillic manuscript in the Serbian CS
Period	the end of the 12 th century
Contents	one of the earliest full aprakos Gospels
Folios	181
Information	Alekseev 1999:16, Kuljbakin 2008:44, Rodić and Jovanović 1986:01, webpages ⁴¹

⁴⁰ <http://kodeks.uni-bamberg.de/Serbia/MiroslavGospel.htm>.

⁴¹ Ibid.

6.3.7 *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	The <i>Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary</i>
Source	the electronic corpus at the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS/East
Period	Before 1117
Contents	One of the earliest full aprakos Gospels
Folios	213
Comments	There are two versions of the letter <i>jery</i> in the e-corpus
Information	Alekseev 1999:16, webpage ⁴²

6.3.8 *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*

Occurrences in	The <i>Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057</i>
Source	Vostokov 2007
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS; the misuse of the nasal vowels shows that the manuscript is excluded from OCS
Period	11 th century
Contents	Short aprakos Gospel, copied from an East Bulgarian original
Folios	294
Information	Ivanova 2005:16, Izotov 2007:183, Kurz 1966:LXXII, Lunt 2001:05, Sill 1972:33, Vostokov 2007

6.3.9 *Sava's Book (Gospel Lectionary)*

Occurrences in	The <i>Sava's Book</i>
Source	Knjazevskaia et al. 1999 and the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, Bulgarian CS/East Bulgaria; morphologically there are features in the manuscript that are earlier than <i>Marianus</i> and <i>Zograph Gospels</i>

⁴² <http://www.manuscripts.ru>.

Period	It is the earliest Cyrillic text, written sometime during the period end of the 10 th century to the middle of the 11 th century
Contents	A copy of a Glagolitic manuscript. There are four parts in the manuscript: folios 1-24 were written at the end of the 13 th or beginning of the 14 th century, and have therefore been excluded from the study. Folios 25-153, the oldest part of the manuscript, and folio 166, were written in the 11 th century in Bulgaria, and folios 154-165 were written at the end of the 11 th or beginning of 12 th century in Russia
Folios	164 folios, of which the OCS folios are 25-153. The manuscript is incomplete
Information	Ivanova 2005:15, Knjazevska et al 1999:07, Kurz 1966:LXII-LXIII, Papazisovska 1970:317, Schenker 1996:189, <i>Staroslavjanskij slovar'</i> 1999:15-16, and Sill 1972:23-24, 33

6.3.10 *Turov Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	The <i>Turov Gospel Lectionary</i>
Source	The PDF version at Sofia Trondheim Corpus
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS/East Slavic, copied from Bulgarian
Period	one of the earliest Christian East Slavic manuscripts, written in the 11 th century
Contents	Short aprakos Gospel
Folios	10
Information	Alekseev 1999:16, Sill 1972:38, Tot 1985:26-30, webpage ⁴³

6.3.11 *Typograph Gospel*

Occurrences in	The <i>Typograph Gospel</i>
Source	The corpus at the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS

⁴³ www.turov.by/eparhia/articles/evangelie/.

Period	12 th century
Contents	Tetraevangelie
Folios	193, in a bad condition
Information	webpages ⁴⁴

6.3.12 *Undol'skij's Fragments*

Occurrences in	The <i>Undol'skij's Fragments</i>
Source	the PDF edition at Biblioteka Frontistesa
Language	Cyrillic, Bulgarian CS
Period	11 th century
Contents	Not possible to decide whether the manuscript is a short or a full aprakos Gospel, since the two folios found consist of biblical verses that are used in both types
Folios	Two
Information	Alekseev 1999:16, Kurz 1966:LXII-LXIII+LXXIII; <i>Staroslavjanskij slovar'</i> 1999:16; Sill 1972:27, webpage ⁴⁵

6.3.13 *Vatican Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	The <i>Vatican Gospel Lectionary (Gr. 2502)</i> /not to be confused with the <i>Assemanian Gospel Lectionary</i> , which is called <i>Vatican/</i>
Source	Krăstanov et al. 1996
Language	Cyrillic, OCS
Period	It is one of the earliest Bulgarian Cyrillic manuscripts, from the end of the 10 th or beginning of the 11 th century
Contents	Short aprakos Gospel, palimpsest
Folios	99
Information	Dzurova 2008:16, Krăstanov et al. 1996, webpage ⁴⁶

⁴⁴ http://mns.udsu.ru/gospel/SK_72.htm, <http://www.manuscripts.ru>.

⁴⁵ http://ksana-k.ru/cfl/05_und/und-karinsk.pdf.

⁴⁶ www.academia.edu/5324656.

6.3.14 *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*

Occurrences in	The <i>Vukan Gospel Lectionary</i>
Source	Vrana 1967
Language	Cyrillic, Serbian CS
Period	It is one of the earliest Serbian Gospels. T. A. Ivanova states the period to 13 th century and V. Mošin to around the year 1200.
Contents	Full aprakos Gospel, with lacunae; several leaves are missing from the middle part
Folios	1+189
Information	Ivanova 2005:16, Kuljbakin 2008:44, Mošin 1966:23, webpage ⁴⁷

6.3.15 *Zograph Gospel*

Occurrences in	The <i>Zograph Gospel</i>
Source	Jagić 1954 (1879), downloaded PDF
Language	Glagolitic, OCS from Macedonia
Period	The end of 10 th to the end of 11 th century
Contents	Tetraevangelie; parts missing are St. Matthew 16:20-24:20 (added later)
Condition	303 including 17 added later
Information	Ivanova 2005:14, Kuljbakin 2008:40-41, Kurz 1966:LXII, Sill 1972:12-13, <i>Staroslavjanskij slovar'</i> 1999:15-16

6.3.16 *Menaеum of Dubrovskij*

Occurrences in	The <i>Menaеum of Dubrovskij</i>
Source	the PDF version at Sofia Trondheim Corpus
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS
Period	11 th century; some claim that it was written in the 12 th century

⁴⁷ www.nlr.ru/eng/exib/Gospel/slav/21.htm.

Contents	Fragments of a menaeum for the month of June (Tot 1985:43-44).
Folios	15
Information	Tot 1985:43-46, webpage ⁴⁸

6.3.17 *Putjatin Menaeum*

Occurrences in	The <i>Putjatin Menaeum</i>
Source	the electronic corpus at the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS
Period	11 th century
Contents	A menaeum for the month of May, one of the earliest manuscripts of the Russian CS
Folios	135
Information	webpage ⁴⁹

6.3.18 *Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)*

Occurrences in	The <i>Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)</i>
Source	Zaimov and Kapaldo 1983
Language	Cyrillic, OCS, probably from Preslav, Bulgaria
Period	10 th century
Contents	A menaeum for the month of March; it is the largest OCS manuscript; the beginning and the end of the codex are missing
Folios	285
Information	Sill 1972:25, <i>Staroslavjanskij slovar'</i> 1999:22-24, Zaimov and Kapaldo 1983:02, webpage ⁵⁰

6.3.19 *1073 Miscellany*

Occurrences in	The <i>1073 Miscellany</i>
----------------	----------------------------

⁴⁸ www.hf.ntnu.no/SofiaTrondheimCorpus/index2.htm.

⁴⁹ http://www.manuscripts.ru/mns/main_sc?pl.

⁵⁰ <http://csup.ilit.bas.bg/node/5>.

Source	The PDF version at Sofia Trondheim Corpus and the portal Manuskript
Language	Cyrillic, East Slavic, reflecting both OCS and Old Russian; created in the literary centre of Preslav
Period	11 th century
Contents	Collection of texts, i.e. homilies, apocryphal texts
Folios	266
Information	Pavlova 2001:08-10, Schenker 1996:213-214, Sill 1972:35, webpage ⁵¹

6.3.20 1076 Miscellany

Occurrences in	The <i>1076 Miscellany</i>
Source	the corpus at the portal Manuskript and the PDF version at Sofia Trondheim Corpus
Language	Cyrillic, Russian CS, composed in Bulgaria or in Kievan Rus
Period	11 th century
Contents:	Compendium of articles and sermons; during restoration work were sequences confused
Folios	277; in a bad condition
Information	Pavlova 2001:10-11, Schenker 1996:213-214, Sill 1972:36, webpage ⁵²

7. Results

The excerpted occurrences are presented in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 shows where the chosen verses were found in the biblical texts. The lowest level of significance stated is $p < 0.05$; otherwise the abbreviation n.s. is used for “not statistically significant”.

Headlines, writing in the margins, etc., are not included in this research, since the syntactic role sometimes was unclear, and therefore the finding might differ from other researchers’ findings. The ways in which words have been abbreviated have not been of interest,

⁵¹<http://www.manuscripts.ru>.

⁵²<http://www.manuscripts.ru>.

e.g. **СѢИНОУЕ** has been abbreviated as **СѢОУЕ** or **СѢУЕ** etc. The reason for this is that it has no bearing for the results of this study. For some sources there are several ways of referring to them, e.g. the wordlist of *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*. When the abbreviation OST is used, it refers to the text in the manuscript, but when the entire title of the book is used, a reference is given to something in the printed book, e.g. wordlists, grammatical statements etc.

7.1 Results with comments

The results of my study are as follows. 636⁵³ occurrences were excerpted, 418 from the 15 chosen biblical sources and 218 from the five non-biblical sources. For the four substantives classified as ŭ-stem substantives (there were no occurrences of **ВРЪХЪ/ВРЪХЪ**, **ВЪРХЪ** or **МЕДЪ**) 96.4% of the case endings belonged to the ŭ-declension and 3.6% to the o-declension, and for the substantive classified as o-stem substantive (there were no occurrences of **ДЛЪГЪ/ДЪЛГЪ**) 76.1% of the case endings belonged to the o-declension, and 23.9% to the case endings of the ŭ-declension, see table 10.

Table 10. Occurrences of the chosen substantives in groups of ŭ- and o-stems

	-ŭ- case endings	-o- case endings	Σ	Statistical significance
six ŭ-stem substantives	295 (96.4%)	11 (3.6%)	306 (100%)	p<0.001
two o-stem substantives	79 (23.9%)	251 (76.1%)	330 (100%)	p<0.001
Σ	374	262	636	p<0.001

Since there were no occurrences in the plural N., G., I. or L. of the substantives **ВРЪХЪ** (**ВРЪХЪ**, **ВЪРХЪ**), **ДЛЪГЪ**, (**ДЪЛГЪ**) or **МЕДЪ**, these substantives have been omitted from being further discussion in this chapter, and the five occurrences found of **ПОЛЪ** seem to be a kind of adverbial construction. This substantive too has been left out even if the five occurrences are included in the calculations and appendices.

Thus, the substantives **СѢИНЪ**, **ДОМЪ**, **ВОЛЪ** and **ГРѢХЪ** will be discussed; **СѢИНЪ** and **ГРѢХЪ** arrived at 94.5% of the occurrences, see table 11.

⁵³ Some occurrences were excluded from the research, see appendix 4.

Table 11. Occurrences of the chosen substantives in total in N., G., I. and L. pl.

	-ŭ-	-o-	Σ	%
ВОЛЪ	6	0	6	0.9%
ГРѢХЪ	79	251	330	51.9%
ДОМЪ	23	1	24	3.8%
ПОЛЪ	0	5	5	0.8%
СЫНЪ	266	5	271	42.6%
Σ	374	262	636	100%

The largest number of occurrences in a biblical text were the 50 in *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*, and in a non-biblical text the 114 occurrences in the *1073 Miscellany*, see table 12.

Table 12. Occurrences in the 20 chosen sources

Source	ВОЛЪ	ГРѢХЪ	ДОМЪ	ПОЛЪ	СЫНЪ	Σ
<i>The Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092</i>	0	14	1	0	13	28
<i>The Assemanian Gospel</i>	0	13	1	1	13	28
<i>The Dobromir's Gospel</i>	0	10	1	0	9	20
<i>The Kochno Gospel Lectionary</i>	1	12	0	0	10	23
<i>The Marianus Gospel</i>	0	14	2	1	20	37
<i>The Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary</i>	1	18	2	0	25	46
<i>The Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary</i>	1	16	2	0	31	50
<i>The Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057</i>	0	14	1	1	16	32
<i>The Sava's Book (Gospel Lectionary)</i>	0	11	0	0	6	17
<i>The Turov Gospel Lectionary</i>	0	2	0	0	1	3
<i>The Typograph Gospel</i>	0	14	2	0	21	37
<i>The Undol'skij's Fragments</i>	0	0	0	0	2	2

<i>The Vatican Gospel Lectionary (Gr. 2502)</i>	0	10	1	1	8	20
<i>The Vukan Gospel Lectionary</i>	0	13	2	0	25	40
<i>The Zograph Gospel</i>	0	14	1	1	19	35
Σ <i>Biblical texts</i>	3	175	16	5	219	418
<i>The Menaеum of Dubrovskij</i>	0	2	0	0	0	2
<i>The Putjatin Menaеum</i>	0	20	0	0	2	22
<i>The Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov Sbornik)</i>	2	19	3	0	9	33
<i>The 1073 Miscellany</i>	1	73	5	0	35	114
<i>The 1076 Miscellany</i>	0	41	0	0	6	47
Σ <i>Non-biblical texts</i>	3	155	8	0	52	218
Σ	6	330	24	5	271	636

In consequence of the number of occurrences, and in the light of previous research, the presentation and discussion of the results will start with the ŷ-stem substantives **сѣинѣ**, followed by **домѣ**, **волѣ** and **грѣхѣ**.

7.1.1 сѣинѣ

There were 271 occurrences of **сѣинѣ** in the plural N., G., I. or L. found in the manuscripts, see Appendix 1. In 266 of these, the endings belong to the ŷ-declension case endings, and 5 to the o-declension case endings; two in the N.pl. in ZOG (nr. 542) and VAT (nr. 505), one in the G.pl. in MAR (nr. 594), one in the I.pl. in 1076 (nr. 634) and one in the L.pl. in 1073 (nr. 635), see table 13.

Table 13. Occurrences of сѣинѣ

Case:	ŷ-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	Σ	<i>Statistical significance</i>
N.pl.	213	2	215	p<0.001
G.pl.	51	1	52	p<0.001

I.pl.	1	1	2	n.s.
L.pl.	1	1	2	n.s.
Σ	266	5	271	p<0.001

The following can be said about the findings from based on my study in relation to previous research. According to C. Koch, there were 11 occurrences of **сѣиноѡе** in the N.pl. in ASS (19b:18a, 27b:24a, 27c:03a, 33d:21a, 37d:20a, 42c:28a, 52a:18a, 113d:05a, 126b:15a, 126b:16a, 127b:18a). Nine were excerpted in the current study. Two occurrences were excluded as one was part of a heading, and one as the text was difficult to understand and the syntactic role of the substantive was uncertain. C. Koch also found three **сѣиноѡѣ** in the G.pl. (42c:22a, 107b:20a, 148a:28a), all of which were found in my study. No occurrences in the I.pl. or L.pl. were found either by C. Koch or in this study (Koch 2000:653-654). M.M. Kozlovskij also says that **сѣиноѡе** was used in the N.pl. and **сѣиноѡѣ** in the G.pl. in OST without mentioning in which folios, and he says nothing about the I.pl. and L.pl. (Kozlovskij 1885-1895:67-77). However, there is a wordlist at the end of *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*, but the results of my study differ from what is written in this wordlist. In the N.pl. there would be four occurrences in folios 30b, 43a, 58b, 266v, but 12 occurrences were found in folios 31c:06, 43a:17, 43b:07, 58b:11, 64c:09-10, 72c:08, 92b:02, 212b:15, 215b:10, 241c:15, 241c:17, 266c:08-09. In the G.pl. the wordlist states one occurrence in 278b, but four occurrences were found, in 72c:01, 196d:05, 185b:15 and 278c:09. There were no occurrences in the I. or L. pl. S.M. Kuljbakin found ten occurrences of **сѣиноѡе** in the N.pl. (30b:13, 154a:06, 106b:23, 83a:20, 83a:21, 170b:09, 187a:07, 238a:02, 195b:08, 195b:16) and one occurrence of **сѣиноѡѣ** in the G.pl. (286a:18) (Kuljbakin 1925:50-51), but 22 occurrences were found in the N.pl. in my study (30b:13-14, 44b:03, 44b:09, 60a:15, 64a:11, 66b:02, 77a:16, 82b:13, 83a:20, 83a:21, 106b:23, 107b:12, 154a:06, 170b:09, 187a:07, 187a:08-09, 195b:08, 195b:16, 195b:17, 238a:02, 245b:07, 301b:10 and three in the G.pl., 107b:09, 286a:18 and 340a:05. There were no occurrences in the I. or L. pl. P. Lieli writes that **сѣиноѡе** occurs 17 times in the N.pl. in MAR. In my study 16 were excerpted, and in the G.pl. **сѣиноѡѣ** occurs three times and **сѣинѣ** once (Lieli 1991:12-14), which also had been included in my study. The wordlist for MAR shows 18 occurrences in the N.pl. of **сѣиноѡе**. Two of these have been excluded from my study as they were from a later manuscript (on pages 10:13, 14:01; folios not stated since these pages were a later addition). The four occurrences in the G.pl., three **сѣиноѡѣ** and one **сѣинѣ** had been included. A. Marguliés does not say anything about the total occurrences in SUP, but he draws attention

to one occurrence in the I.pl. in folio 562:21, which had been missed in the study, but has now been included (nr. 633) (Margulíés 1927:178, 191). L. Moszyński (1975:186-189) finds 14 occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** in the N.pl. in ZOG (without stating where) and one of **сѣини** in St. John XII:36, three occurrences of **сѣиноѳъ** in the G.pl. (without stating where); but no occurrences in the I. or L.pl. This study found the same number of occurrences. A. Minčeva and R. Pavlova do not make any mention of the total amount of occurrences, but there is a wordlist in volume two of the *1073 Miscellany*, edited by P. Dinekov, of the occurrences (Dinekov 1993:173). Two occurrences in the N.pl. were excluded as headlines. Of the eight occurrences in the G.pl. only seven had been found due to the spelling, and the eight occurrences were included in the study. The occurrence in the L.pl. had been found. Papazisovska says nothing about occurrences in SAV. T. Rott-Żebrowski finds four occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** in the N.pl. (14:11, 49:06, 225:11-12, 251:09), one occurrence of **сѣинѣ** (17:11) in the I.pl., and one occurrence of **сѣинѣхъ** (168:06) in the L.pl. in 1076 (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:150), all of which had been found in the study. U. Sill (1972:115-116 and a foldout) investigates ways of abbreviating **сѣинѣ** in *Zograph Gospel, Marianus Gospel, Assemanian Gospel Lectionary, Sava's Book, Codex Suprasliensis, Undol'skij's Fragments, Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057, Turov Gospel Lectionary, 1073 Miscellany* and *1076 Miscellany*, but there is no information on occurrences in unabbreviated forms. U. Sill's findings are as follows. There are fourteen occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** and one of **сѣини** in ZOG, 16 occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** in MAR, 19 occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** in ASS, no occurrences in SUP or UND; four occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** in SAV, six occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** in OST, one occurrence of **сѣиноѳе** in TUR, 16 occurrences of **сѣиноѳе** in 1073, one occurrence of **сѣиноѳе** in 1076. Since my study has found several occurrences in sources where U. Sill claims there are none, it must mean that U. Sill does not include occurrences in unabbreviated form.

There are differences also in the G.pl. (the findings will not be repeated here, see the chapter on previous research). Another problem is that U. Sill places the A.pl. and I.pl. in one and the same column. As mentioned earlier, this study found two occurrences in the I.pl. (nr. 633 and 634). In the L.pl. there is one occurrence of **сѣинѣхъ** in 1076 (Sill 1972:115-116 and a foldout). There are four different wordlists in *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*. The number of occurrences in the N.pl. in these wordlists is 11; one was excluded as it was a heading. The three **сѣиноѳъ** in the G.pl. had been included.

7.1.2 ДОМЪ

Twenty-four occurrences of ДОМЪ were found in the sources in the plural N., G., or L., see Appendix 1; 23 of these had case endings belonging to the ū-declension, and 1 to the o-declension case endings; the form ДОМЫ in the N.pl. in 1073, see table 14.

Table 14. Occurrences of ДОМЪ

Case:	ū-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	Σ	Statistical significance
N.pl.	2	1	3	n.s.
G.pl.	8	0	8	p>0,05
I.pl.	0	0	0	--
L.pl.	13	0	13	p>0,001
Σ	23	1	24	p>0,001

Previous research gives the following picture. C. Koch finds one occurrence of ДОМОХЪ in the L.pl. (143a:13a) in ASS (Koch 2000:167). M.M. Kozlovskij agrees about the one occurrence of ДОМЪХЪ in L.pl. (267) in OST (Kozlovskij 1885-1895:75). The wordlist of *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* also shows this only occurrence. M.M. Kozlovskij adds that the spelling is ДОМОХЪ in ASS, MAR and ZOG (Kozlovskij 1885-1895:75). This change of -ЪХЪ to -ОХЪ has to do with the vocalization of the reduced in a strong position and not with any contamination between the ū- and o-declension case endings. All these occurrences had been found and included in my study. S.M. Kuljbakin finds two occurrences of ДОМОВЪ in the G.pl. (128a:16, 136b:17), and one occurrence of ДОМОХЪ in the L.pl. (71b:12) in MIR (Kuljbakin 1925:50-51), but the occurrence in 128a:16 never was included, since the expression и шьдиши ДОМОВИ probably is an adverbial construction. P. Lieli claims that the spelling ДОМОХЪ in the L.pl. (8v) in MAR is the only form that "deviated" from the norm of the ū-stems", and also gives the probable explanation of vocalization of the reduced vowel, and he also finds one occurrence of ДОМОВЪ in the G.pl. (63r) (Lieli 1991:13-14). The wordlist of *Marianus Gospel* finds two occurrences; one in the G.pl. of ДОМОВЪ (156:26, folio 63r) and one in the L.pl. of ДОМЪХЪ (34:19, folio 8v). A. Margulíés writes that the ū-stem class is remains in SUP, giving

the example **ДОМОВЪ** in the G.pl., but he writes nothing about the total number of occurrences (Margulíés 1927:191). L. Moszyński finds only one occurrence of **ДОМОУХЪ** in the L.pl. (23r:23) in ZOG (Moszyński 1975:187). A. Minčeva, R. Pavlova or V. Papazisovska do not write anything about **ДОМЪ** in the plural in 1073 or SAV. T. Rott-Žebrowski finds no occurrences in the plural in 1076 (Rott-Žebrowski 1972:149-150). **ДОМЪ** is not one of the substantives studied by U. Sill. The wordlist of *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092* shows one occurrence in the L.pl. of **ДОМЪХЪ** (158:13). The wordlist in *1073 Miscellany* shows three occurrences in the N.pl., two of **ДОМОВЕ** (79c:26, 116b:09) and one occurrence of **ДОМЫ** (134d:03). In the L.pl there are two occurrences **ДОМЪХЪ** (69b:08, 84c:08). All these occurrences had been found and included, except **ДОМЫ** (134d:03), which at first was interpreted as a possible A.pl., but has now been included (nr. 339).

7.1.3 **ВОЛЪ**

Six occurrences of **ВОЛЪ** were found in the sources in the plural N., G., or L., see Appendix 1. The biblical verse St. Luke XIV:19 was incorporated late in the study, when it was found in an aprakos Gospel. The occurrence has **ВОЛОВЪ** is expressed as an adjective in many other sources, e.g. in *Marianus Gospel*, *Zograph Gospel*, *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary*, *Ostromir's Gospel Lectionary*. The case endings of the six substantives belonged to the ũ-declension case endings, see table 15.

Table 15. Occurrences of **ВОЛЪ**

Case:	ũ-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	Σ	Statistical significance
N.pl.	1	0	1	n.s.
G.pl.	5	0	5	n.s.
I.pl.	0	0	0	--
L.pl.	0	0	0	--
Σ	6	0	6	p<0.05

In relation to previous research on occurrences in the plural N., G., I. and L. the following is stated. S.M. Kuljbakin finds one occurrence has **ВОЛОВЪ** in the G.pl. (199a:18-19) in MIR

(Kuljbakin 1925:50). According to V. Papazisovska, there is one occurrence in the N.pl. written **ВОЛОВИ** instead of **ВОЛОВЕ** as a result of the contamination between the ů- and o-declensions (Papazisovska 1970:312), but neither the e-corpus Manuscripts.ru nor Titus.uni-frankfurt.de state any occurrence of **ВОЛОВИ**. C. Koch finds no occurrences in the plural N., G., I. or L.pl. in ASS (Koch 2000:766), and A. Marguliés says nothing about occurrences in SUP (Marguliés 1927:156-201), but there are two in the G.pl. (19:01 and 42:29). M.M. Kozlovskij, P. Lieli and L. Moszyński agree that there are no occurrences in the plural N., G., I. or L.pl. in OST, MAR or ZOG (Kozlovskij 1885-1895:72-76), Lieli 1991:14 and L. Moszyński 1975:186-189), and **ВОЛЪ** is not discussed by A. Minčeva, R. Pavlova or T. Rott-Żebrowski concerning 1073 and 1076, but there is one occurrence in the N.pl. in 1073 (208b:26), also identified in the wordlist. The study by U. Sill does not include **ВОЛЪ**.

7.1.4 **грѣхъ**

In the N., G., I. or L. pl. 330 occurrences of **грѣхъ** were found in the sources, see Appendix 1. Of these the case endings of 79 belonged to the ů-declension case endings, and 251 to the o-declension case endings. All of the 79 ů-declension case endings were only found in the G.pl., where also 52 o-declension case endings were found, see table 16.

*Table 16. Occurrences of **грѣхъ***

Case:	ů-declension case endings	o-declension case endings	Σ	
N.pl.	0	128	128	p>0.001
G.pl.	79	52	131	p>0.05
I.pl.	0	10	10	p>0.01
L.pl.	0	61	61	p>0.001
Σ	79	251	330	p>0.001

The previous research is as follows. According to C. Koch, there are fourteen occurrences of **грѣхъ** in the plural N., G., I. or L. in ASS. Seven of the eight occurrences in the N.pl. were included, one occurrence on folio 51c:04 with the spelling **грѣси** was not found due to the use

of the e-corpus⁵⁴, all three different occurrences in the G.pl. **грѣхъ** (131b:05), **грѣховъ** (137b:23) and **грѣхоховъ** (28c:18) were included; (footnote 47 gives the explanation that **грѣхоховъ** is composed of **грѣхо-ховъ**.) (Koch 2000:210). There are no occurrences in the I.pl., and the three occurrences in the L.pl. had been included. M.M. Kozlovskij mentions no occurrence in the N.pl. in OST, but four in the G.pl.; three **грѣховъ** (159, 255, 258), and one **грѣхъ** (248), adding that is this also found in ZOG, ASS, MAR and SAV (Kozlovskij 1885-1896:67-76). There is no mention made of any occurrence in the I.pl. but two in the L.pl. (28, 40). There are differences between what is written in the wordlist of *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057* and occurrences found in this study. There are only five occurrences in the N.pl. on page 92, but eight were found (67a:03, 67a:18, 130b:07, 130c:16, 91a:09, 91b:11, 223d:04, 223d:13). All these had been included in the research. P. Lieli states that **грѣховъ** is found twice in MAR (81r and 132v). The wordlist of *Marianus Gospel* shows nine occurrences in the N.pl., two occurrences of **грѣховъ** and also one of **грѣхъ** (page 3:10, folio numbers are not given here as the text had been added) in the G.pl., but this occurrence was not included since it came from a later manuscript. The occurrences in the A.pl. and I.pl. have been grouped together; there were three occurrences in the L.pl., which had been found and included (Lieli 1991:16-17). So were also the three occurrences in the G.pl. that A. Marguliés had found of **грѣховъ** in SUP (353:09, 390:25, 493:25), in addition to six occurrences of **грѣси** (108:11, 127:04, 135:19, 211:12, 395:16, 484:25), eight occurrences of **грѣхъ** in the G.pl. (03:30, 394:05, 108:20, 235:11, 436:24, 469:12, 483:05, 524:28) and two occurrences of **грѣхы** in I.pl. (390:11 and 525:06 (Marguliés 1927:156-201). The nine occurrences of **грѣси** that L. Moszyński had found in ZOG in the N.pl., as well as the one occurrence each of **грѣхъ** and **грѣховъ** in the G.pl. had been found and included in the research (Moszyński 1975:161-162). V. Papazisovska mentions one occurrence of **грѣховъ** in the G.pl. (146b:07) in SAV, but eight occurrences of **грѣси** were found (38v:12, 38v:18, 49v:07, 49v:15, 77v:10, 78v:01, 130v:15, 130v:17) (Papazisovska 1970:311) and besides the mentioned **грѣховъ** there was one more in folio 159r:03, and one occurrence of **грѣхъ** in folio 137v:09. A. Minčeva does not discuss **грѣхъ** in the plural in 1073, and the two occurrences of **грѣховъ** R. Pavlova had found in 1073 (Pavlova 1991:158), turned out to be the following occurrences, which have all been included in the study: 12 of **грѣси** (28c:02, 44d:08, 44c:24, 86c:15, 99c:27, 101c:09, 103b:24, 106d:13, 123a:29-123b-01, 139d:17-18, 141c:05, 193d:24), 24 of **грѣховъ** (30a:22-23, 37a:06, 37d:26, 45a:11, 50d:02, 53a:22, 63b:22, 63d:07,

⁵⁴ I have informed the portal Manuscript by email with an enclosed photograph of the folio with the spelling **грѣси** and a question on the correct spelling.

69b:29, 70b:04-05, 70b:08-09, 70b:10, 70b:15, 70a:25-26, 70a:28, 70d:11, 107a:14, 144d:04, 156a:06, 176b:08-09, 176c:15, 188b:23-24, 193b:08, 247d:25), 12 **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (28c:12, 33c:14, 44c:19, 46a:06, 48b:18, 54a:09, 59d:03, 99b:29, 99c:29-99d:01, 99d:29, 103a:17, 147b:21-22), five **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (44c:16, 171d:10-11, 193c:21 with the spelling **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ**, 200b:28, 211a:15) and 20 **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (29a:03-04, 32b:08, 36b:13, 42b:04-05, 44a:22, 48a:01, 48c:04, 50a:29, 50:15-16, 56c:12, 56d:13, 56c:28, 70d:22, 83a:22-23, 91c:29-91d:01, 99d:07-08, 102d:16, 146d:08, 159c:06, 182c:18). T. Rott-Żebrowski informs that the **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** on 209:12 in 1076 is a scribal error and should have been in the G.pl. (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:147). The occurrence has been excluded from the research. Furthermore, it is claimed under the heading of the I.pl, that there are 25 occurrences of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** but there seems to be none in this case. The 12 occurrences of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** had been found and included in the research, as well as 12 **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (37v:07, 178v:05, 142r:13-142v:01, 172v:05, 134v:04, 104r:01, 118r:10-11, 126r:06, 128v:13, 188r:02, 217v:03, 251v:12) and the 11 **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** mentioned by T. Rott-Żebrowski (Rott-Żebrowski 1972:147-149). S.M. Kuljbakin does not discuss **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** in the plural but in MIR nine occurrences of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** were found (92a:05, 92a:12, 112a:04, 152b:20, 153a:12, 160a:04, 160a:09, 219b:04, 219b:18-19), four of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (46b:04, 253a:02-03, 326a:22, 327a:23), two of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (316a:22-23, 342a:13) and three of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (28a:17, 28a:20, 41b:21). **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** is not included in the study by U. Sill. All four glossaries specify forms in the plural. In *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092* there are eight occurrences of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (32r:08, 32v:14, 47r:07, 49r:18, 79r:16, 79v:06, 131r:18, 131v:01), four occurrences of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (14r:12, 94v:19, 150r:15, 151r:06), and one occurrence of **ꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (174v:18), no occurrence of I.pl., but one **ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ** (10r:16) in the L.pl.

8. Summary and conclusions

The main focus of this thesis was to research the parallel occurrences of substantives in the chosen OCS manuscripts and CS, i.e. study occurrences with case endings of both the ŭ- and o-declensions of one and the same substantive in one and the same manuscript, with the aim of answering the following four questions:

- 1) Having studied 20 selected manuscripts and searched for occurrences of eight chosen substantives, how many of the occurrences belong to the ŭ- or o-declension respectively? Does any source have a strikingly higher percentage in some way?
- 2) Are there parallel occurrences, i.e. case endings of both the ŭ- and o- declensions for one and the same substantive in one and the same manuscript?

- 3) Are there any differences between the Preslav and the Ohrid texts concerning the use of ŭ- and o-declensions in G.pl.?
- 4) Could the parallel occurrences in the OCS and later CS manuscripts be a sign that the alleged demise of the ŭ-declension never fully took place in the plural, or could the parallel occurrences be explained by R. Lass' theory on exaptation and A.Ch. Vostokov's thoughts on the parallel use of the case endings of the ŭ- and o-declensions in different roles, i.e. in different sentence situations?

Summing up the results of this investigation of occurrences in the 15 biblical and 5 non-biblical sources, we get the following picture of the results (the tables presented in the previous chapter will not be repeated here).

8.1. Occurrences of the ŭ- and o-declensions

As already was mentioned in the chapter on the results, 418 occurrences of the 636 excerpted in the study were found in the 15 chosen biblical sources, and 218 in the non-biblical sources. The findings led to unexpected results. For the four substantives classified as ŭ-stem substantives as many as 96.4% of the occurrences case endings belonged to the ŭ-declension, and only 3.6% to the o-declension. This result makes it impossible to draw any general and reliable conclusions regarding these occurrences. For the substantives classified as o-stems, 76.1% of the case endings belonged to the o-declension, and 23.9% to the case endings of the ŭ-declension.

No occurrences in the N., G., I. or L.pl. were found of the substantives **връхъ** (**връхъ**, **вьрхъ**), **длъгъ**, (**дългъ**) **от мѣдъ**, and these substantives were omitted from further discussion. They have however been an important part of the study and are therefore presented in all other sections of this thesis. That there would be no occurrences in the plural was not expected. Furthermore, since the five occurrences found of **полъ** seem to be an adverbial construction, this substantive too has been left out even if the five occurrences are included in some calculations and the appendices.

The substantives **сынъ** and **грѣхъ** make up 94.5% of the occurrences. Of the 271 occurrences of **сынъ** 266 (98.2%) showed the case endings of the ŭ-declension. The results in the N., G. pl. and totally had a $p < 0,001$. Of the 330 occurrences of **грѣхъ** 251 had the case endings of the o-declension, and the 79 occurrences that had case endings of the ŭ-declension

were all in the G.pl. The results in the N., I., L., and totally all had $p < 0.001$. Unfortunately the results in the G.pl. were not statistically significant.

For further information on the results, see the previous chapter.

8.2. Parallel occurrences of case endings of both the ŭ- and the o-declensions

The parallel occurrences of case endings of both the ŭ- and the o-declensions, in the OCS and later CS manuscripts, of **сѣинѣ** are, despite the few occurrences, interesting, because they are found in very early manuscripts. In N.pl. there were 211 occurrences of **сѣиноуе**, and only two of **сѣини**, one in the palimpsest *Vatican Gospel Lectionary Gr 2502* and one in *Zograph Gospel*, two of the earliest extant manuscripts. The same applies to the occurrences in the G.pl: 49 occurrences of **сѣиноуѣ** were found and only one of **сѣинѣ** in *Marianus Gospel*, another of the few earliest extant manuscripts. The remaining two occurrences found with case endings of the o-declension, one in the I.pl. in 1076 and one in the L.pl. in 1073, belong to Russian CS, but as is well known, these manuscripts are copied from OCS originals.

8.3. Differences between Preslav and Ohrid

The differences between the Preslav and the Ohrid texts concerning the use of ŭ- and o-declensions were limited to the study on the case endings in G.pl. in constructions with prepositions or substantives. There were too few occurrences to draw any conclusions; there were only 21 occurrences of **гѣѣхѣ** and **гѣѣхѣуѣ**. It was not rational to divide the occurrences in groups of biblical and non-biblical texts, since the Ohrid group only had biblical texts and the Preslav group also included a menaeum. The aim was to confirm A. Ch. Vostokov's claim, and there were a few that did not. In the *Vatican Gospel Lectionary (Gr. 2502)* one substantive was found with the form **гѣѣхѣ** and in *Codex Suprasliensis* two substantives with the form **гѣѣхѣ**. Maybe this could be seen as a possible supplement to A. Ch. Vostokov's thoughts on the use of the declensions' case endings, which are valid otherwise. This part of the research can be further pursued in future research projects focused on this question.

8.4 The findings in relation to R. Lass and A. Ch. Vostokov

Questions that need to be answered are if the parallel occurrences of **гѣхъ** and **гѣховъ** in the G.pl. in the OCS and later CS manuscripts could be evidence that the ū-declension never really disappeared in the plural, or if these parallel occurrences could be explained by R. Lass' theory on exaptation and A.Ch. Vostokov's claim on the parallel use of the case endings of the ū- and o-declensions with different syntactic roles?

Despite the 636 occurrences found of both the ū- and o-declensions case endings, the problem is that 96.4% of the occurrences case endings of the six ū-stem substantives belong to the ū-declension, and only 3.6% to the o-declension, making it impossible to draw any conclusions. These results are disappointing, but nevertheless the true results, and must be presented as such. However, when it comes to the o-declension substantives (there were only occurrences in the N., G., I. and L. pl. of **гѣхъ**), the results give a different picture: in total 76.1% of the case endings belong to the o-declension, and 23.9% to the case endings of the ū-declension, and these were all in the G.pl., and in no other case. These results are interesting. Thus, the 128 occurrences in the N.pl, the 10 occurrences in the I.pl. and the 61 occurrences in the L.pl. all belong to the o-declension, and as was said above of the 131 occurrences in the G.pl., 79 belong to the ū-declension, and only 52 to the o-declension. This means that there were more occurrences of ū-declension case endings than o-declension case endings in the G.pl. for a substantive that is classified as a o-stem substantive. In this context it is possible to connect both the theories of R. Lass and A. Ch. Vostokov. The "exaptation" described by R. Lass is the re-use of the *-ov-* suffix in the G.pl., giving it a new semantic role. A possible relation between the ideas by R. Lass and A. Ch. Vostokov is easily seen when analysing the forms **гѣхъ** and **гѣховъ**, realising that it is not the re-use of the entire ū-declension substantive form, but the re-use of the suffix *-ov-* in the o-stem substantive, which happens to turn out as a homograph. One of the aims was to prove that the exaptation also spread to other declensions, a process that I gave the term "spread exaptation" at the beginning of this study. There are examples of the use of *-ov-* in other cases as well, for example the occurrence of **гѣховы** in I.pl. (nr. 273). But unfortunately the results did not show anything certain for the ū-declension substantives and their possible re-use of the ū-declension case endings.

Finally, one thing must be said. Even if the results signal that the alleged demise of the ū-declension never fully took place in the plural, there is the discovery that the few o-declension

case endings found with ũ-stem substantives are from the earliest extant texts: from the palimpsest *Vatican Gospel Lectionary Gr 2502* and *Zograph Gospel, Marianus Gospel*, 1076 and 1073, copied from OCS originals. What if we have had the wrong perspective all the time, trying to find out when and where the ũ-declension died out and the substantives from it took the o-declension case endings; what if this had happened a long time before, in the pre-writing period, and the few occurrences found with o-declension case endings prove that the ũ-stem substantives at this time had already come back to the ũ-declension case endings, were re-used as a result of exaptation, and that the o-declension case endings eventually disappeared in the scriptoriums, which can be seen from this study. This gives food for thought.

9 Suggestions for further research

As K. Mirčev puts it the question about which substantives belonged to the ũ-stem class is definitely not solved and needs more attention (Mirčev 2000:34). The following five questions are suggestions for further research into this subject:

- 1) Could the parallel case endings of both the ũ- and o-declensions in some manuscripts from the 10th and 11th centuries have anything to do with the fact that their antigraphs were first written in Glagolitic?
- 2) What are the linguistic results in apographs from the the 10th and 11th centuries being copied in one area, from an antigraph from another area, by a scribe from a third area, how will the manuscripts be contaminated?
- 3) Would it be possible to prove a hypothesis that the ũ-declension had disappeared already in the pre-writing period, and that the ũ-declension case endings were being reused in the OCS period when the o-declension case endings were standard?
- 4) Why could the ũ-declension, with so relatively few substantives belonging to it, have such an impact on other declensions?
- 5) What kind of changes and errors did the scribes produce in the 10th and 11th centuries in biblical texts when copying; it is well known that the copies are not direct and faithful copies, when the transmission should have been closed.

10 Material and references⁵⁵

10.1 Source material

Baranov, V.A. E-corpus of *Putjatin Menaem* at the portal Manuskript, accessed at <http://www.manuscripts.ru>, composed by V.A. Baranov, Udmurskij State University.

Bogdanova, S. E-corpus of *Menaem of Dubrovskij* at the portal Sofia Trondheim Corpus, accessed at www.hf.ntnu.no, composed by S. Bogdanova. Downloaded PDF.

Jagić, I.V. 1954 [1879]. *Quattuor Evangeliorum Codex Glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*. In *Editiones Monumentorum Slavicorum veteris dialecti*. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, accessed July 23, 2012 at Biblioteka Frontistesca, <http://ksana-k.ru>. Downloaded PDF.

Jagić, I.V. 1883. Ягич, И.В. *Мариинское четвероевангелие съ примѣчаниями и приложениями*. In *Памятникъ глаголическая письменности*. Санктпетербургъ: Императорская Академия Наукъ, accessed July 23, 2012 at Biblioteka Frontistesca, <http://ksana-k.ru>. Downloaded PDF.

Knjazevskaja, O.A. et. al. 1999. Князевская, О.А., Л.А. Коробенко, и Е.П. Дограмаджиева. *Саввина книга. Часть первая. Рукопись. Текст. Комментарии. Исследование*. Москва: издательство «Индрик».

Kokorina, T.V. and A.A. Sokolova. E-corpus of *1073 Miscellany* at the portal Manuskript, accessed at <http://www.manuscripts.ru>, composed by T.V Kokorina at the Iževskij State Technical University and A.A. Sokolova at the Udmurskij State University.

Kokorina, T.V. and O.V. Zuga. E-corpus of *1076 Miscellany* at the portal Manuskript, accessed at <http://www.manuscripts.ru>, composed by T.V Kokorina at the Iževskij State Technical University and O.V Zuga at the Udmurskij State University.

Kornilova, D.S. E-corpus of *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary* at the portal Manuskript, accessed at <http://www.manuskript.ru>, composed by D.S. Kornilova at the Udmurskij State University.

⁵⁵ Section 10.1 on the source material consists of e-corpora, facsimile editions and printed editions of the manuscripts used to study the chosen eight substantives. Section 10.2 on references consists of editions, webpages, etc., that have been used to find information about the manuscripts, even if these also include the source itself, i.e. Altbauer 1973, which is found in section 10.2.

Kossek, N.V. 1986. Коссек, Н.В. *Евангелие Кохно. Болгарский памятник XIII в. = The Kochno Gospel. Middle Bulgarian Cyrillic Monuments of the 13th century.* София: Издательство Болгарской Академии наук. Printed facsimile edition and downloaded DJVU, accessed November 13, 2016 at Biblioteka Frontistesа <http://ksana-k.ru>.

Krăstănov, T. et al. 1996. Кръстанов, Т., А.-М. Тотоманова, & И. Добрев. *Ватиканско Евангелие. Старобългарски кирилски апракос от XV в. в палимпсестен кодекс Vat.Gr. 2502 = Evangile de Vatican. Évangélique paléobulgare cyrillique du X^e siècle dans le Codex palimpseste Vat.Gr. 2502.* In *Библиотека Свети Наум and Balcanica*. София: СИБАЛ.

Online facsimile version of *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary* at <http://kodeks.uni-bamberg.de/Serbia/MiroslavGospel.htm>, accessed September 15, 2016. Downloaded PDF.

Mironov, A.L. E-corpus of *Sava's Book* at the portal Manuscript, accessed at <http://www.manuscript.ru>, composed by A.L. Mironov at the Udmurskij State University.

Mironova, T.L. (red). 1997, Миронова, Т.Л. (ред). *Архангельское евангелие 1092 года. Исследования. Древнерусский текст. Словоуказатели.* Москва: Научно-издательский центр «Скрипторий». Printed edition and downloaded DJVU, accessed January 19, 2013 at Biblioteka Frontistesа <http://ksana-k.ru>.

Rjabova, E.V. E-corpus of *Typograph Gospel* at the portal Manuscript, accessed at <http://www.manuscript.ru>, composed by E.V. Rjabova, at the Udmurskij State University.

Tubilova, P.F. and V.A. Baranov. E-corpus of *Assemanian Gospel* at the portal Manuscript, accessed at <http://www.manuscripts.ru>, composed by P.F. Tubilova at the Iževskij State Technical University, under the guidance of V.A. Baranov, at the Iževskij State Technical University and Udmurtskij State University.

Raleva, Tzv. E-corpus of *1076 Miscellany* at the portal Sofia Trondheim Corpus, accessed at www.hf.ntnu.no, composed by Tzv. Raleva. Downloaded PDF.

Raleva, Tzv., R. Stankov and Tz. Doseva. E-corpus of *1073 Miscellany* at the portal Sofia Trondheim Corpus, accessed at www.hf.ntnu.no, composed by Tzv. Raleva, R. Stankov and Tz. Doseva. Downloaded PDF.

E-corpus of *Turov Gospel Lectionary* at the portal Sofia Trondheim Corpus, accessed at www.hf.ntnu.no (composer unnamed). Downloaded PDF.

Online version of *Undol'skij's Fragments* at Biblioteka Frontistesа http://ksana-k.ru/cfl/05_und/und-karinsk.pdf accessed August 11, 2014. Downloaded PDF.

Velčeva, V. 1975. Велчева, Б. *Добромирово евангелие. Български паметник от началото на XI век*. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките.

Vostokov, A.Ch. 2007 (reprint, 1845). Востоков, А.Х. *Остромирово Евангелие 1056-1057 года*. Санктпетербургъ: Императорская Академия наукъ.

Vrana, J. 1967. Врана, Ј. *Вуканово јеванђље = L'Évangile de Vukan*. Београд: Научно Дело. Facsimile edition.

Zaimov, J. and M. Kapaldo. 1982-1983. Заимов, Ђ., М. Капалдо, *Супрасълски или Ретков Сборник*. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките. Facsimile edition. Online version of the manuscript at the Bulgarian Academy of Science, accessed March 31, 2013 at <http://csup.ilit.bas.bg/node/5>.

10.2 References

Alekseev, A.A. 1999. Алексеев, А.А. *Текстология Славянской Библии*. С.-Петербург: Российская Академия Наук = Textgeschichte der slavischen Bibel. In *Bausteine zur slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte Reiche*. Köln: Böhlau.

Altbauer, M. (red). 1973. Алтбауер, М. *Добромирово евангелие. Кирилски споменик од XII век. Том 1 = Evangelium Dobromiri A 12th Century Cyrillic Manuscript. Vol I*. Скопје: Македонска Академија на науките и уметностите.

Ambrosiani, P. 2005. "Textological, Orthographic, and Accentual Variation in Medieval Slavic Manuscripts". In *Scando-Slavica*. Vol. 51, edited by J. Nørgård-Sørensen, pp. 81-96.

Arumaa, P. 1985. *Urslavische Grammatik. Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der slavischen Sprachen. III Band. Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Černych, P. Ja. 1962. Черных, П.Я. *Историческая грамматика русского языка. Краткий очерк. Пособие для пед.институтов. Издание третье*. Москва: Государственное учебно-педагогическое издательство.

Chaburgaev, G.A. 1974. Хабургаев, Г.А. *Старославянский язык. Учебное пособие для студентов пед. ин-та по специальности № 2101 «Русский язык и литература»*. Москва: Просвещение.

Chodzko, A. 1869. *Grammaire paléoslave, suivie de textes paléoslaves, tirés, pour la plupart, des manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale de Paris et Du Psautier de Bologne*. Paris : L'imprimerie impériale. Google Books, accessed October 10, 2013. Downloaded PDF.

Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Portal Cyrillomethodiana, accessed November 19, 2015 at <http://cyrillomethodiana.uni-sofia.bg>.

Dinekov, P. (red). 1993. Динеков, П. (ред). *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.). Том 2. Речник-индекс*. 1993. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките.

Dobrev; I. 1982. Добрев, И. *Старобългарска граматика. Теория на основите*. София: Наука и изкуство.

Duridanov, I. (red). 1991. Дуриданов, И. (глав. ред.). *Граматика на старобългарския Език. Фонетика, морфология, синтаксис*. София: Българската академия на науките.

Džurova, A. 2008. Джурова, А. *The Messages of Cyrillic. 1st edition*. Republic of Bulgaria: State Institute for Culture, accessed September 28, 2016 at <http://sic.mfa.bg/images/events/43/cyrilic%203mb.pdf>. Downloaded PDF.

Eckert, R. 1959. Эккерт, Р. "К вопросу о составе группы имен существительных с основой на –й в праславянском языке". In *Вопросы Славянского Языкознания, Выпуск 4*, pp. 100-125.

Eckhoff, H.M. 2006. *Old Russian possessive constructions: A construction grammar account*. Dissertation. University of Oslo: Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages.

Feuvre le, C. 2009. *Le vieux slave*. In *Les langues du monde*. Leuven-Paris: Peeters.

Flier, M.S. 1974. *Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavic*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Garzaniti, M. 2001. *Die altslavische Version der Evangelien. Forschungsgeschichte und zeitgenössische Forschung*. In *Bausteine zur slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte*. Köln: Böhlau.

Gasparov, B. 2001. *Old Church Slavonic*. In *Languages of the world/Materials 338*. München: LINCOM Europe.

Gerd, A.S and W.R. Veder. 2003. Герд, А.С., В. Федер. *Церковнославянские тексты и церковнославянский язык*. С.-Петербург: издательство С.-Петербургского университета.

Gerd, A.S. 2008. Герд, А.С. *Лингвистическая типология древнеславянских текстов*. С.-Петербург: издательство С.-Петербургского университета.

Grković-Major, J. 2011. "The Development of Predicative Possession in Slavic Languages". accessed January 22, 2017 at http://src-h.slav.hokudau.ac.jp/coe21/publish/Nr24./21_Grkovic.pdf. Downloaded PDF.

Ivanova, T.A. 2005. Иванова, Т.А. *Старославянский язык. Учебник. 4-е издание, исправленное и дополненное*. Санкт-Петербург: Авалон.

Izotov, A.I. 2007. Изотов, А.И. *Старославянский и церковнославянский языки. Грамматика, упражнения, тексты*. Москва: Филоматис.

Jakubinskij, L.P. 1953. Якубинский, Л.П. *История древнерусского языка с предисловием и под редакцией акад. В.В. Виноградова*. Москва: Государственное учебно-педагогическое издательство.

Janda, A.L. 1996. *Back from the brink: a study of how relic forms in languages serve as source material for analogical extension*. In *LINCOM Studies in Slavic linguistics*. München – Newcastle: LINCOM Europe.

Koch, C. 2000. *Kommentiertes Wort- und Formenverzeichnis des altkirchenslavischen Codex Assemanianus*. In *Monumenta Linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris*. Vol. XLIII. Freiburg I.Br.: Weiher.

Kochno Gospel, accessed November 28, 2015 at www.hist.msu.ru/Byzantine.

Kolesov, V.V. 2009. Колесов, В.В. *Историческая грамматика русского языка. Учебник*. Санкт-Петербург: фак.фил. и иск., С.-П. гос.унив.

Kondrašov, N.A. 1962. Кондрашов, Н.А. *Славянские языки. Второе издание*. Москва: государственное учебно-педагогическое издательство.

Kozlovskij, M.M. 1885-1895. Козловский, М.М. "Изслѣдованіе о языкѣ Остромирова Евангелія". *Изслѣдованія по русскому языку. Томъ I*. Санктпетербургъ: Императорская Академия Наукъ, accessed July 18, 2016 at Google Books. Downloaded PDF.

Krys'ko, V.V. (red). 2000. Крысько, В.Б. (ред). *Историческая грамматика древнерусского языка. Том I. Множественное число именного склонения*. Москва: «Азбуковник».

Kuljbakin, S.M. 1925. S.M., Кульбакинъ, С.М. *Палеографска и језичка испитивања о Мирослављевом јеванђељу*. Сремски Карловци: Српска Манастирска Штампарија.

Kuljbakin, S.M. 2008. S.M., Кульбакинъ, С.М. *Славянская палеографія*. Бѣлград: Институт за српски језик сану.

Kurz, J. 1929-1955. *Evangeliarium Assemani. Codex Vaticanus 3 Slavicus Glagoliticus. Tomus II*. Prag: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie.

Kurz, J. (red). 1966-1983. *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae*. Praha: Academia Sumptibus Academiae Scientiarum Bohemoslovacaе.

Kuznecov, P.S. 2004. Кузнецов, П.С. *Историческая грамматика русского языка. Морфология*. Москва: УРСС.

Lass, R. "How to do things with junk: exaptation in language evolution". In *Linguistics, Vol. 17*, 1988, pp. 33-62, accessed August 4, 2015, at <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/spl/article/view/116604>. Downloaded PDF.

Leskien, A. 1919. *Grammatik der albulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*. In *Sammlung slavischer Lehr- und Handbücher*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Lëvočkin, I.V. 1997. Лёвочкин, И.В. "Архангельское Евангелие 1092 года среди древнерусских книг XI века". Article in Mironova 1997.

Lieli, P. 1991. "The Role of ŷ-stems and Their Contamination with the ѿ-stems in Codex Marianus". In *Slavica*. Vol. XXV, Debrecen, pp. 9-19.

L'vov, A.S. 1975. Львов, А.С. *Лексика «Повести временных лет»*. Москва: Наука.

Lunt, H. 2001. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar. Seventh revised edition*. Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lysaght, T.A. 1987. *Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) – Middle Greek – Modern English dictionary*. Second impression. Wien: Eigenverlag.

Marcialis, N. 2007. *Introduzione alla lingua paleoslava*. In *Manuali Umanistica*. Firenze: Firenze University Press. Accessed April 9, 2016 at www.fupress.com/Archivio/pdf%5C4284.pdf. Downloaded PDF.

Marguliés, A. 1927. *Der altkirchenslavische Codex Suprasliensis*. In *Sammlung slavischer Lehr- und Handbücher*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Matasović, R. 2011 “Slavic Possessive Genitives and Adjectives from the Historical Point of View”. Accessed January 22, 2017 at http://src-h.slav.hodudai.ac.jp/coe21/publish/no24_ses/11_Matasovic.pdf. Downloaded PDF.

Mathiesen, R. 1984. “The Church Slavonic Language Question: an Overview (IX-XX Centuries)”. Reference in Marcialis 2007.

Minčeva, A. 1991. Минчева, А. "Старобългарският книжовен език в Симеоновия сборник по преписа от 1073 г.". *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.)*. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките.

Mirčev, K. 2000. Мирчев, К. *Старобългарски език*, accessed September 17, 2011 at www.kroraina.com/knigi/pdf/mirchev_starobalgarski_ezik.pdf. Downloaded PDF.

Moszyński, L. 1975. *Język kodeksu Zografskiego. Część I. Imię nazywające (rzeczownik)*. In *Monografie slawistyczne*. Wrocław, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Mošin, V. 1966. Мошин, В. *Палеографически албум на јужнословенското кирилско писмо*. Скопие: Кочо Рацин.

Możejko, N.S. and A.P. Ignatenko. 1988. Можейко, Н.С., А.П. Игнатенко. *Древнерусский язык. 3е издание, дополненное*. Минск: Высшэйшая школа.

Nandriš, G. 1965. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar. Handbook of Old Church Slavonic, Part I*. In *London East European series (Language and Literature)*. London: University of London, the Athlone Press.

The National Library of Russia; accessed July 11, 2014 at <http://www.nlr.ru/exib/Gospel/> November 25, 2015 at http://www.nlr.ru/eng/exib/Gospel/SK_51.html, and November 18, 2015 at <http://www.nlr.ru/eng/exib/Gospel/slav/21.html>.

Olander, T. 2015. *Proto-Slavic Inflectional Morphology. A Comparative Handbook*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Parazisovska, V. 1970. Папазисовска, В. "За Савината книга". *Симпозиум 1100-годишнина од Смртта на Кирил Солунски. Книгв 2. 23-25 мај 1969 Скопје – Штип*. Скопје: Македонска Академија на науките и уметностите.

Pavlova, R. 1991. Павлова, Р. "Источнославянски езикови особености в Изборника от 1073 г.". *Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.)*. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на науките.

Pavlova, R. 2001. "Introduction. Corpus of Old Slavic Texts from the XIth century", accessed November 18, 2015 at <http://www.hf.ntnu.no/SofiaTrondheimCorpus/index2.html>. Downloaded PDF.

Pokorny, J. 2011. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Accessed November 25, 2013 at <http://indo-european.info/pokorny-etmological-dictionary/index.htm>.

Preobraženskij, A. 1958. Преображенский, А. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Москва: государственное издательство иностранных и национальных словарей.

Rodić, N. and G. Jovanović. 1986. Родић, Н., Г. Јовановић. *Мирославјево јеванђеље (критичко издање) = L'évangélaire de Miroslav. Édition critique*. Београд: Српска Академија наука и уметности.

Rott-Żebrowski, T. 1972. "Deklinacje rzeczowników w Izborniku Swiatoslawa z 1076 r." In *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska. Sectio F, Nauki Filozoficzne i Humanistyczne*. Vol. 27, pp. 137-160.

Schenker, A.M. 1996. *The Dawn of Slavic. An introduction to Slavic Philology*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press.

Seliščev, A.M. 1951. Селищев, А.М. *Старославянский язык. Часть первая. Введение фонетика. Часть вторая. Тексты. Словарь. Очерки морфологии*. Москва: государственное учебно педагогическое издательство. Accessed at April 23, 2016 at at Biblioteka Frontistesca, <http://ksana-k.ru>. Downloaded PDF.

Sill, U. 1972. *"Nomina sacra" im altkirchenslavischen bis zum 11 Jahrhundert*. Dissertation. Hamburg: Universität.

Slavova, T. 2012 (1989). Славова, Т. "Преславска редакция на кирило-методиевия старобългарски евангелски превод". Accessed August 1, 2017 at Biblioteka Frontistesа <http://ksana-k.narod.ru>. Downloaded PDF.

Sokoljanskij, A.A. 2004. Соколянский, А.А. *Введение в славянскую филологию: учеб. пособие для студ. филол. фак. высш. учеб. заведений*. Москва: издательский центр Академия.

Sreznevskij, I.I. 1903. Срезневский, И.И. *Материалы для словаря древне-русского языка по письменным памятникам. Том третий р-ѡ*. Санктпетербургъ: Типографія императорской академіи наукъ.

Staroslavjanskij slovar' 1999, *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X-XI веков)*. Москва: Русский язык.

Steensland, S. 1985. *Slavisk språkhistoria*. Fjärde upplagan. Uppsala: Slaviska institutionen vid Uppsala universitet.

The story on the Horror and Praise of the Holy Martyrs Boris and Gleb: Съказание и страсть и похвала Святою Мученику Бориса и Глеба, accessed May 21, 2011 at <http://ppf.asf.ru/drl/bg.html>.

Thorndahl, W. 1974. *Genetivens och lokativens –y/-ju- endelser i russiske middelalderstekster*. In *Studier Københavns universitets slaviske institut*. Thesis. Köpenhamn: Rosenskilde & Bagger.

Tot, I. 1985. Тот, И. *Руска редакция на старобългарския език в края на XI-началото на XII в. = Русская редакция древнеболгарского языка в конце XI-начале XII вв.* София: издателство на Българската Академия на Науките.

Traugott; E.C. 2004. "Exaptation and grammaticalization", accessed August 4, 2015 at <http://web.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/Traugott.Exapt.pdf>. Downloaded PDF.

Trubačev, O.N. 1978. Трубачев, О.Н. *Этимологический словарь славянских языков праславянский лексический фонд. Выпуск 5*. Москва: издательство Наука.

Trubačev, O.N. 1980. Трубачев, О.Н. *Этимологический словарь славянских языков праславянский лексический фонд. Выпуск 7*. Москва: издательство Наука.

Turov Gospel. Accessed November 8, 2015 at <http://www.turov.by/eparhia/articles/evangelie>.

Vaillant, A. 1958. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome II. Morphologie. Première partie: flexion nominale*. In *Collection les langues du monde*. Paris, Lyon: IAC. Google Books, accessed April 21, 2017.

Vasmer, M. 1953. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Erster band: A-K*. In *Indogermanische Bibliothek*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Vasmer, M. 1955. *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Zweiter band: L-Ssuda*. In *Indogermanische Bibliothek*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Vasmer, M. 1958. *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Dritter band: Sta-Y*. In *Indogermanische Bibliothek*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Vinokur, T.G. 2007. Винокур, Т.Г. *Древнерусский язык*. Москва: Лабиринт.

Vrana, J. 1961. *L'Évangélaire de Miroslav, Contribution à l'étude de son origine*. In *Slavic printings and reprintings*. Zagreb: S-Gravenhage.

Ziffer, G. 2003. "On the historicity of Old Church Slavonic". In *Obdobja*. Vol. 20, pp. 629-635. UDK 811.163(091), accessed April 11, 2016 at <http://centerslo.si/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/20-ziffer.pdf>. Downloaded PDF.

Žukovskaja, L.P. 1976. Жуковская, Л. .П. *Текстология и язык древнейших славянских памятников*. Москва: Наука.

Žukovskaja, L.P. 1997. Жуковская, Л. .П. "Текстология и лексия Архангельского Евангелия". Article in Mironova 1997.

Appendix 1. Occurrences

1.1 Occurrences of волъ

	Source	Text
N.pl.		
001	1073/208b:26	·не бо и конь хвалимъ ꙗко аште не бодеть ·нъ аште не пыхак хвалимъ ꙗко ·волове же аште не бодоутъ кротъкъы хвалимъ ·
G.pl.		
002	КОН/46v:06-07	·и дроугъи рече емоу ·сжпржгъ воловь коупихъ пать ·и градъ и искоусити ихъ ·
003	MIR/199a:19	·и дроуги ре дмю ·сюпржгъ воловь кюпихъ ·ε̄ ·
004	MST/97b:02-03	·и дроугъи рече кмоу сжпроугъ воловь коупихъ ·ε̄ · и градоу и искоуситъ ихъ ·
005	SUP/19:01	абик же приде стадо воловь из горы ·
006	SUP/42:29	·и скотоу иже пригонатъ и приносатъ отъ лѣта на стжжж и славыжжж памать · стада различъ воловь ·

1.2 Occurrences of връхъ/върхъ/врѣхъ

.		No occurrences were found in N., G., I. or L. pl.
---	--	---

1.3 Occurrences of грѣхъ

N.pl.		
007	ARC/32v:08	дързай чадо ꙗкоуцають ти са грѣси твои
008	ARC/32v:14	что бо ксть оудобеꙗ реши. ꙗкоуцаються грѣси твои. ли реши въстани и ходи.
009	ARC/49r:07	члвче ꙗкоуцають ти са грѣси твои
010	ARC/49r:18	что ксть оудобеꙗ реши ослабленомоу. ꙗкоуцають ти са грѣси твои. или реши въстани и ходи.
011	ARC/79r:16	чадо. ꙗкоуцаються тобѣ грѣси твои
012	ARC/79v:06	что ксть оудобеꙗ реши. ослабленомоу. ꙗкоуцають ти са грѣси. или реши въстани възми одръ свои. и ходи.
013	ARC/131r:18	кто же ради глгоу ти. ꙗкоуцаються грѣси ки мнози.
014	ARC/131v: 01	рече же ки ꙗкоуцають ти са грѣси твои
015	ASS/39b:17	·дързай чадо ·ꙗкоуштажтъ ти са грѣси твои ·
016	ASS/39c:03	что бо есть оудобеꙗ решти ·ꙗкоуштажтъ ти са грѣси ·ли решти въстани и ходи ·
017	ASS/51b:12	·члче ꙗкоуштажтъ са тебѣ грѣси твои ·
018	ASS/76a:01	чадо ·ꙗкоуштажтъ са грѣси твои ·
019	ASS/76a:22-23	·что есть оудобеꙗ решти ослабленомоу ·ꙗкоуштажтъ ти са грѣси ·ли решти въстани и възми одръ твои и ходи ·
020	ASS/120r:12	ꙗкоуштажтъ са еи мнози грѣси ·
021	ASS/120r:16	ꙗкоуштажтъ са тебѣ грѣси твои ·
022	DOB/47r:08	члвче ꙗкоуцають ти са грѣси твои.

023	DOB/47r:19	чѣто естъ оудовѣе реци.оставлѣжтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои.ли реци въстани и ходи.
024	DOB/57v:03	егоже ради гл҃ж ти.оставлѣжтъ сѧ еи грѣси мнози.
025	DOB/57v:07	·рече же ки. оставлѣжтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои.
026	DOB/01rC:08-09	чѣто естъ оудовѣе реци ославлен(..)моу отъпоуцажтъ ти сѧ грѣси.ли реци въстани.и в(о)зьми одръ свои и ходи.
027	DOB/06rC:14	·еда кодыга обратѣтъ сѧ.и отъпоустѣтъ сѧ имъ грѣси.
028	КОН/24v:17	·дръззи чѧдо Ѡпоуцаатъ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·
029	КОН/25r:01	·что естъ оудовѣе реци Ѡпоуцажтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·или реци въстани и ходи ·
030	КОН/42r:03	·члѣѣче Ѡпоуцаат сѧ грѣси твои ·
031	КОН/42r:12-13	что естъ оудовѣе реци ослабеномоу ·Ѡпоуцажтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·или реци въстани и иди ·
032	КОН/54v:15	·чѧдо отъпоуцажтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·бѣахъ же...
033	КОН/55r:04	·...цаат сѧ грѣси твои ·
034	КОН/102r:15	·Ѡпоуцаат сѧ грѣси еи мнози ·
035	КОН/102r:19	·рече же еи ·Ѡпоуцажтъ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·
036	MAR/04v	дръззи чѧдо отъпоуцажтъ сѧ грѣси твои.
037	MAR/05r	чѣто бо естъ оудовѣе рещи. отъпоуцажтъ сѧ грѣси твои. ли реци въставъ ходи.
038	MAR/46v	видѣвъ же исъ вѣрж ихъ. гл҃а ослабеноумоу. чѧдо отъпоуштажтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои.
039	MAR/46v	что естъ оудовѣе рещи ослабеноумоу. отъпоуштажтъ ти сѧ грѣси. ли реци въстани и възъми одръ твои и ходи.
040	MAR/49v	еда когда обратѣтъ сѧ и отъпоустѣтъ сѧ имъ грѣси.
041	MAR/88v	и видѣвъ вѣрж (ихъ) рече емоу. члѣѣче отъпоуштажтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои.
042	MAR/88v	что естъ оудо...вѣе рещи. отъпоуштажтъ ти сѧ грѣси твои. ли рещи въстани и ходи.
043	MAR/94v	егоже ради гл҃ж ти. отъпоуштажтъ сѧ еи грѣси мнози. ꙗко възлюби много.
044	MAR/94v	рече же еи отъпоуцажтъ ти сѧ грѣси.
045	MIR/92a:05	дръззи чѧдо ·Ѡпоуцають се грѣси твои ·
046	MIR/92a:12	·что асть оудовѣе реци · Ѡпоуцають се грѣси твои ·или реци въстани и ходи ·
047	MIR/112a:04	·еда когда обратѣтъ се и Ѡпоустѣтъ се имъ грѣси ·
048	MIR/152b:20	члѣѣче Ѡпоуцають се тебѣ грѣси твои ·
049	MIR/153a:12	что естъ оудовѣе реци ослабеноумоу Ѡпоуцають се грѣси твои ·или реци въстани и ходи ·
050	MIR/160a:04	Ѡпоуцають сѧ еи грѣси мнози ·
051	MIR/160a:09	рече же ди Ѡпоуцають се тебѣ грѣси ·
052	MIR/219b:04	чѧдо Ѡпоуцають се тебѣ грѣси твои ·
053	MIR/219b:18-19	что естъ оудовѣе реци ослабеноумоу · Ѡпоуцають ти се грѣси · или реци въстани възми одръ свои и ходи ·
054	MST/41b:05-06	дръззи чѧдо ·отъпоуцають сѧ грѣси твои ·
055	MST/41b:13	·что бо ксть оудовѣе реци · отъпоуцають сѧ грѣси твои · или реци въставъ ходи ·

056	MST/125c:13	·что бо ксть оудовѣк реци ослабкноуоумоу отъпоуцають ти са грѣси твои ·или реци въстани възми одръ свои и ходи
057	MST/58c:19	·еда кьгда обратат са и оставатъ са имъ грѣси
058	MST/74a:19-20	чловѣче ·отъпоуцають ти са грѣси твои ·
059	MST/74b:06	·что ксть оудовѣк реци ослабкноуоумж отъпоуцають ти са грѣси твои ·или реци въстани и ходи ·
060	MST/77b:19	·кго же ради глаю ти отъпоуцають са ки грѣси мнози тако...
061	MST/168d:22	·кго же ради глаю ти отъпоуцають са грѣси киа мнозии...
062	MST/77b:23	·рече же ки отъпоуцають са тебе грѣси ·
063	MST/169:02	·рече же ки отъпдшають са тебѣ грѣси ·
064	OST/67a:03	дърззи чодо отъпоуцайтъ са грѣси твои и...
065	OST/67a:18	чьто бо ксть оудовѣк реци ·ослабкноуоумоу отъпоуцайтъ са грѣси твои ·или реци ·въстани и ходи ·
066	OST/130b:07	· чодо отъпоуцайтъ са тебѣ грѣси твои
067	OST/130c:16	чьто ксть оудовѣк реци ослабкноуоумоу отъпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси или реци ·въстани възми одръ твои и ходи
068	OST/91a:09	чловѣче ·отъпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси твои...
069	OST/91b:11	чьто ксть оудовѣк реци ослабкноуоумоу · отъпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси твои ·или реци въстани и ходи
070	OST/223d:04	отъпоуцайтъ са ки грѣси мьнози ·
071	OST/223d:13	отъпоуцайтъ са тебѣ грѣси и начаша...
072	SAV/38v:12	чодо ·отъдадатъ ти са грѣси ·
073	SAV/38v:18	·что бо ѡдовѣ речеци ·отдайтъ ти са грѣси ·или реци въстани и ходи ·
074	SAV/49v:07	...рече емоу члче ·отъпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси твои ·
075	SAV/49v:15	·что есть оудовѣ реци ослабенѡмоу · отъпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси твои ·иъ...
076	SAV/77v:10	·чодо ·отъпоуцайтъ са тебѣ грѣси твои ·
077	SAV/78v:01	·что есть ѡдовѣ реци ·ослабенѡмоу · отъпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси ·ли реци ·...
078	SAV/130v:15	·егоже ради глж ти отъпдцайтъ са еи грѣси мнози ·
079	SAV/130v:17	·рече же еи отъпоуцайтъ са тебѣ грѣси ·и начаша...
080	TUR/09r:01	·и видѣвъ вѣрж ихъ ре кмоу ·чловѣче Ѱпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси твои ·
081	TUR/09r:11	·чьто ксть оудовѣк реци ·ослабкноуоумоу Ѱпоуцайтъ ти са грѣси твои ·ли реци ·въстани и ходи ·
082	TYP/16b:13	·дърззи чодо ·Ѱпоуцають ти са грѣси твои ·
083	TYP/16c:01	·что бо ксть оудовѣк реци ослабенжмѡ · Ѱпжцають ти са грѣси твои ·ли реци въставъ ходи
084	TYP/62b:21	·гла ослабленоуоумоу ·чодо Ѱпоуцають са тебѣ грѣси твои ·блахоу же...
085	TYP/62c:14	·что ксть оудовѣк реци ослабленѡмоу · Ѱпжцають ти са грѣси ·ли реци въстани i възми одръ твои ·
086	TYP/65c:24	·еда кьгда обрататъ са и Ѱпжстатъ са имъ грѣси ·и гла...
087	TYP/104b:13	· i видѣвъ вѣроу ихъ рече кмоу · члче · Ѱпоуцають ти са грѣси твои ·
088	TYP/104c:02	·что к оудовѣк реци Ѱпоуштають ти са грѣси твои ·ли реци въстани и ходи ·
089	VAT/08v:04	·гла ослабеноуоумоу · чодо отъпоуцайтъ са грѣси твои ·

090	VAT/08v:15	чьто естѣ оудовѣк реци ослабкнѣоумѣ ·отѣпоуцайтѣ ти сѧ грѣси ·ли реци вѣстани и вѣзьми одрѣ твои и ходи ·
091	VAT/52r:19-20	·егоже ради глаголю ти ·отѣпоуцайтѣ сѧ еи грѣси мнози ·
092	VAT/52r:23	·рече же еи отѣпоуцайтѣ сѧ тебѣ грѣси ·и начаша ...
093	VUK/42a:16	дръзави чедо ·ѡпоуцають ти се грѣси твои ·
094	VUK/42a:24	чьто бо ксть реци оудовѣк: ѡпоуцають ти се грѣси твои:или реци вѣставъ ходи
095	VUK/62a:14	къда когда вбратетѣ се и ѡпоустетѣ се имъ грѣси:
096	VUK/142b:13	чедо ѡпоуцають ти се тебѣ грѣси твои:
097	VUK/142c:03	что ксть оудовѣе реци: ослабленомѣ ѡпоуцають ти се грѣси:или реци вѣстани ·вѣзьми вдрѣ свои ходи
098	VUK/85c:14	кгоже ради глѣю ти ѡпоуцають се еи грѣси мнози
099	VUK/85c:20	рече же ки ѡпоуцають се тебѣ грѣси твои
100	VUK/81c:15	чловѣче ѡпоуцають ти се грѣси твои
101	VUK/81d:04-05	чьто ксть оудовѣе реци ослабленомѣ:ѡпоуцають ти се грѣси твои:или реци вѣстани ходи
102	ZOG/17r:11	·дръзави чедо отѣпоуштайтѣ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·
103	ZOG/17r:20	чьто бо естѣ оудовѣе решти ·отѣпоуштайтѣ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·ли решти вѣставъ ходи ·
104	ZOG/80 (74)v:15	·чедо отѣпоуштайтѣ сѧ тебѣ грѣси твои ·
105	ZOG/81(75)r:06	чьто естѣ оудовѣе решти ослабленомѣ ·отѣпоуштайтѣ ти сѧ грѣси ·ли решти ·вѣстани ·и вѣзьми одрѣ твои ·и ходи
106	ZOG/85 (79)r:05	·егда обрататѣ сѧ ·и отѣпоустатѣ сѧ имъ грѣси ·
107	ZOG/147r:07	·члѣе отѣпоуштайтѣ ти сѧ грѣси твои ·
108	ZOG/147r:20	чьто естѣ оудовѣе решти ослабленомѣ ·отѣпоуштайтѣ ти сѧ грѣси твои · ли решти вѣстани и ходи ·
109	ZOG/157v:14	егоже ради глѣю ти ·отѣпоуштайтѣ сѧ еи грѣси мнози ·
110	ZOG/157v:19	рече же еи отѣпоуштайтѣ сѧ тебѣ грѣси ·
111	SUP/108:11	и акы агньци посрѣдоу влѣкъ расхъштени быхомъ ·сѣключиша бо насъ грѣси свои ·
112	SUP/127:04	нѣ толико оуне кики вольнии грѣси неповольнымъ ·
113	SUP/135:19	·нѣ грѣси ваши растоатѣ посрѣдоу насъ и ба ·
114	SUP/211:12	·и гласъ из него бысть ·вѣстанѣ та глагола и покаита сѧ ·и грѣси ваю оставыайтѣ сѧ ·
115	SUP/395:16	отѣпоуштайтѣ сѧ грѣси ки мнози ·
116	SUP/484:25	·даша же и трѣсть въ рѣцѣ кго ·да выпишѣтъ сѧ грѣси ихъ ·
117	1073/28c:02	·и милостыми и вѣрами ·оучиштайтѣ сѧ грѣси ·
118	1073/44d:08	·да не и обличатѣ сѧ грѣси ихъ ·
119	1073/44c:24	·дрѣгънихъ члѣкъ грѣси прѣдинавакни соутѣ ведоуште на соудѣ ·
120	1073/86c:15	·милостынами рече и вѣрами оцѣштайтѣ сѧ грѣси милостынѣ же не таже... ·
121	1073/99c:27	·нѣ грѣси ваши растоатѣ межъ вами и бѣмъ ·
122	1073/101c:09	·оумножиша сѧ нѣ грѣси ихъ велици соутѣ зѣло ·
123	1073/103b:24	·охоуждаетѣ же пламена грѣси ·соутѣ же доуси иже... ·

124	1073/106d:13	·не бо кште рече исплѣниша сѧ грѣси аморѣисци доселѣ·
125	1073/123a:29-123b:01	въпросъ·ции грѣси праштажтъ сѧ по съмрѣти·
126	1073/139d:17-18	·кште не наплѣниша сѧ грѣси·аморѣисци·
127	1073/141c:05	·вечисла же грѣси соутъ твои·
128	1073/193d:24	·нѣ исходаштии грѣси отъ члѣка·то сквърннѣ члѣка·
129	1076/157r:08	ѧко оугъ на /мразѣ/ тако растають сѧ грѣси твои:
130	1076/189r:05	наводѣтъ ли сѧ оубо и доселѣ·грѣси оцъ на чѧда·
131	1076/189v:04	наидоутъ грѣси оцъ вашихъ на вы·
132	1076/189v:13	ѧко нехръштєннѣихъ наводѣтъ сѧ грѣси оцъ нечѣстивнѣихъ на снѣы зѣлѣна:
133	1076/200v:08	такѡ грѣси и отирають сѧ
134	1076/242r:09	такѡ и грѣси таимии·и дѣшо и тѣло оумарають·
G.pl.		
135	ARC/14r:12	и проповѣдати сѧ въ имѧ кго·покаяние въ Ѡпоущеник грѣховъ·въ всѣхъ ѧзыцѣхъ·
136	ARC/94v:19	се бо кстѣ кръвь моѧ·новаго завѣта·ѧже за многы проливаема·въ оставѧкнии грѣховъ·
137	ARC/150r:15	вы(с) іѡнѣ кръститель въ поустыни·проповѣдаѧ кръщеник·покаяннѣ въ Ѡпоущеник грѣховъ·
138	ARC/151r:06	и приде въ всю страну иорденскоу·проповѣдаѧ крѣщение на покаяник грѣховъ и въ Ѡпоущеник·
139	ARC/142v:18	тѣ спсєтъ люди своѧ Ѡ грѣхъ ихъ·
140	ASS/28c:18	·и проповѣдати сѧ въ имѧ его·покаяннѣ и отъпоуштєннѣ грѣховъ въ·всѣхъ ѧзыцѣхъ·
141	ASS/137b:23-24	·вѣы иоанѣ крѣста въ поустыни·проповѣдаѧ крѣщение въ оставление грѣховъ исхождаашє же къ немѡу·
142	ASS/131b:05	·тѣ бо спсєтъ люди своѧ отъ грѣхъ ихъ·
143	DOB/34v:03	дати разоумѣ спсєниѣ людємъ его·въ оставление грѣхъ нашихъ
144	КОН/9r:04	·и проповѣдати сѧ въ имѧ его·покаяние въ оставление грѣховъ·въ всѣхъ ѧзыцѣхъ·
145	КОН/70v:09	·се естѣ кръвь моѧ новаго завѣта·и проливаема за многы·въ оставление грѣховъ·
146	КОН/113v:02	·тѣ бо спсєтъ люди своѧ Ѡ грѣхъ ихъ
147	MAR/81r	дати разоумѣ спсєниѣ людємъ его въ отъпоуштєние грѣховъ ихъ·
148	MAR/132v	въ имѧ его покаяннѣ·и отъпоуштєннѣ грѣховъ въ всѣхъ ѧзыцѣхъ·
149	MIR/316a:22-23	·и тѣ спасєтъ люди своє Ѡ грѣхъ ихъ·
150	MIR/46b:04	·и проповѣдати се въ имє его·покаѣние Ѡпоущение грѣховъ·въ всѣхъ езыцѣхъ·...
151	MIR/253a:02-03	се дѣтъ кръвь моѣ новаго завѣта·проливаема за вы за многє·въ Ѡпоущение грѣховъ·
152	MIR/326a:22	вѣы иоанѣ крѣтеи въ поустыни·и проповѣдає крѣщение покаѣниѣ·въ оставление грѣховъ·
153	MIR/327a:23	и приде въ всю страну ерданьскоу·проповѣдає крѣщение на покаѣние·въ оставление грѣховъ·ѣкоже·...

154	MIR/342a:13	·дати разюмъ сп̄сениѣ людемъ его ·въ оставление грѣхъ ихъ ·
155	MST/209c:07	·и проповѣдати сѧ въ има юго покаанию въ оставленник грѣховъ ·
156	MST/142d:04	се ксть кръвь моя новааго завѣта ꙗже за многы проливаема въ оставленник грѣховъ ·
157	MST/185a:24	проповѣдаа кръщеник на покааник въ оставленник грѣховъ ·
158	MST/180a:22	·тѣ бо сп̄сеть люди слоа отъ грѣхъ ихъ ·
159	OST/159a:01	се ксть кръвь моя ·новааго завѣта проливаемаа за многы ·въ оставленник грѣховъ ·
160	OST/255c:14	бысть иоанъ кръста въ поустыни ·и проповѣдаа кръщеник покаанию ·въ отъпоушеник грѣховъ исхождааше... ·
161	OST/258a:16	·проповѣдаа кръщеник на покааник ·въ отъпоушеник грѣховъ · ꙗко... ·
162	OST/248a:03	тѣ бо сп̄сеть люди своа отъ грѣхъ ихъ
163	SAV/146r:07	проповѣдаа кръщение на покаане въ отъпоушеник грѣховъ ·
164	SAV/159r:03	·и проповѣдати сѧ въ има юго поканик въ отъпоушеник грѣховъ ·въ всѣхъ ꙗзыцѣхъ ·
165	SAV/137v:09	·тѣ бо сп̄сеть люди своа отъ грѣхъ ихъ се же все бысть ·
166	ТУР/100a:02	·проповѣдаа кр̄ще (folio 99 is without text in the e-corpus) ...ѡнъ ꙗкоааниа въ ѡпшеник грѣховъ ·
167	ТУР/136d:18	·и проповѣдати сѧ въ има юго покаанию ·въ ѡпшеник грѣховъ ·
168	ТУР/04a:18	·тѣ бо сп̄сеть люди свѡа ѡ грѣхъ ихъ ·
169	ТУР/96b:08	·дати разоумъ сп̄снѡа людемъ юго въ оставленик грѣхъ нашихъ ·
170	VAT/178v:11	·се естъ кръвь моя новааго завѣта · проливаемаа за многы ·въ отъданик грѣховъ ·
171	VAT/46v:07	·тѣ бо сп̄сеть люди слоа отъ грѣхъ ихъ ·
172	VAT/99r:16	·дати разоумъ съпасенѡа людемъ его въ отъпоуштеник грѣхъ нашихъ ·
173	VUK/161a:10	се ксть кръвь моя новааго завѣта:проливаемаа за въ и за многик въ ѡпоушеник грѣховъ :
174	ZOG/136r:02-03	дати разоумъ сп̄сеньѣ людемъ его въ оставленье въ отъпоуштенье грѣхъ нашихъ
175	ZOG/141r:02	...кр̄штение на покаанье ·въ отъпоуштенье грѣховъ · ꙗко... ·
176	DUB/03r:21	·моли х̄а б̄га грѣховъ оставление подати чьтоуимъ любѣвью памать твою:
177	DUB/06v:20	· ꙗкоже дроуга тѧ присна ·исва тѧ блажимъ ·варфаломѣ въпиюште ти ·грѣховъ оставление подати
178	PUT/08v:11	·молите сѧ оставленник дровати грѣховъ ·и велиа м̄сти:
179	PUT/10v:08	·боурю помышленѡа наитѡа грѣховъ ·и искжшеник боурьнок ·
180	PUT/12r:15-16	·стр̄пца х̄ва доблѡа ·грѣховъ оставленник испросита всѣхъ ·
181	PUT/57r:03	·и отъ жени мракъ грѣховъ нашихъ ·мольбами ти пр̄чстѣнаго... ·
182	PUT/60v:09	·просаште приимати оставленник грѣховъ ·твоя страсти... ·
183	PUT/82r:05	·д̄с̄ь праздноуоушемъ ·грѣховъ раздрѣшениа просимъ ·
184	PUT/95v:07	·прославленааго настѣвѡа оумрышеник грѣховъ ·прѣжде съмрѣти съвлече сѧ... ·

185	PUT/100v:17	·исповѣдаѣшимъ ти прѣта·грѣховъ просимъ раздрѣшеник оулоучити·
186	PUT/120v:07	·прѣдъ стоиши хѣви женихоу свокомоу·моли отъ грѣховъ ны избавити са·
187	PUT/122r:13	·въпикмъ комоу стрѣче великымъче·проси въсѣмъ грѣховъ очищеник:
188	PUT/134v:16	·стрѣче великыи·моли га грѣховъ оставкеник подати·
189	PUT/59v:05	...·молити са о насъ·да избоудемъ отъ грѣхъ·инъвъ вѣкы вса:·
190	PUT/59v:12	·просимъ проштениа отъ грѣхъ·прилѣжно молаште са·
191	PUT/64v:08	... отъ искоушениа и боура же искрѣви·и отъ грѣхъ избавити са·праздъноуѣштимъ...
192	PUT/77r:05	·рождьшиа свѣтъ·и оставкеник грѣхъ·и дшамъ спсѣник·
193	PUT/78r:05	·присно праздъноуѣштимъ тръжьство·и отъ грѣхъ избавите·
194	PUT/85r:02	·поточаште отъ гроба вашихъ·и отъ грѣхъ избаваѣѣще·вашими млтвами·
195	SUP/353:09	·се кетъ пльть моа за вьломимаа въ оставкеник грѣховъ·
196	SUP/390:25	·и възмати отъ него непогоненик грѣховъ нашихъ·
197	SUP/493:25	·то оубо въсталъ жъты смрътьныа растръгивъ·ни же въскрѣсилъ·пленица нашихъ грѣховъ раздрѣшивъ·
198	SUP/05:30	·недостоиномъ сжштем грѣхъ ради нашихъ·
199	SUP/394:05	·приходаштиихъ покааник строа·и сихъ грѣхъ праштаа·
200	SUP/108:20	·своими крѣвми очистите са отъ грѣхъ и кже пльтиж повѣждени бысте·
201	SUP/235:11	·и моли са за ма да избеждж грѣхъ моихъ·
202	SUP/436:24	·тъ же извънъ быстъ грѣхъ ради нашихъ·
203	SUP/469:12	·да разметаж твоихъ грѣхъ вѣма·
204	SUP/483:05	·истече бо крѣвь и вода из древръ хръстовъ·да и ржкофанък грѣхъ нашъ загладитъ·
205	SUP/524:28	·прости ма брате·капати себе и плакати великыих моихъ грѣхъ·
206	1073/30a:22-23	·нарицааи бо оца ба·и оставкеник грѣховъ·
207	1073/37a:06	·такоже и члкъ алъча отъ грѣховъ своихъ и пакы...
208	1073/37d:26-27	·тако аште и горькъ соудъ примемъ·отъ пьрвтиихъ грѣховъ·
209	1073/45a:11	·имъже подобоврѣдни сжтъ кдинъ бо бѣ можетъ·праштати грѣховъ·
210	1073/50d:02	·и обличати несамохотъныихъ вьратии грѣховъ нь прѣдати земли...
211	1073/53a:22	·и четыре десати днь мниши на очиштеник грѣховъ вьсего лѣта·
212	1073/63b:22	·оставленъ бы и лазаръ и раславленъи нь въ оставление грѣховъ·
213	1073/63d:07	·или еже хоулити себе·или прѣдъниихъ ради грѣховъ·
214	1073/69b:29	·а такоже своихъ грѣховъ сжтъ плоди своа зъли·
215	1073/70b:04-05	·тоже не грѣховъ оуто ради·йвъ бо женож...

216	1073/70b:08-09	·и тѣ же не грѣховѣ ради·
217	1073/70b:10	·нѣ имѣже є члѣкѣ боле грѣховѣ ради своѣ ратьникѣ...
218	1073/70b:15	·многашѣды же и дроузи въ враждю соу съвраштають са грѣховѣ ради·
219	1073/70a:25-26	·пытаѣ кѣихѣ бждоу грѣховѣ ради братиѣ ратьници не имѣже...
220	1073/70a:28	...ратьници не имѣже вси грѣховѣ дѣла отъ братиѣ ратьнмоуѣтѣ·
221	1073/70d:11	·ельмаже грѣховѣ ради многашѣды бѣ ꙗ вѣставлѣетѣ на ны·
222	1073/107a:14	·ѣвѣ кѣте обаче же не вси злоѣ съмрътиѣ оумираѣштиѣ грѣховѣ дѣла·
223	1073/144d:04	·иже ꙗко зѣлаѣ пооуштениѣ самовольныхѣ грѣховѣ·
224	1073/156a:06	·дасть намѣ ѣсти и пити·въ оставленнѣ грѣховѣ·
225	1073/176b:08-09	·ино же кѣтъ грѣхоу оставленнѣ да кѣждо оубо своихѣ грѣховѣ приобрѣтакѣ оставленнѣ·
226	1073/176c:15	...грѣха не могуѣтъ творити·въ оставленнѣ грѣховѣ по истинѣ крѣстатѣ са·
227	1073/188b:23-24	·и въ мечѣ и не оправѣди неправѣдѣ ихѣ·и грѣховѣ ихѣ отъ лица своѣго не заглади·
228	1073/193b:08	·бѣ бо вѣсть иже хоштѣтъ пытити грѣховѣ·
229	1073/247d:25	проповѣдати о имени своѣмъ показни·и оставленнѣ грѣховѣ·
230	1073/28c:12	·ни рѣци штедротѣ бѣжи многѣ да множество грѣхѣ моихѣ оцѣститѣ·
231	1073/33c:14	·ѣкоже да очиститѣ са·чловѣкѣ отъ грѣхѣ своихѣ·
232	1073/44c:19	·по съмръти и вѣждѣмъныхѣ·грѣхѣ и погыбѣштиихѣ дѣшѣ отъ зѣлаѣго своѣго оучениѣ тѣциѣ·
233	1073/46a:06	·мжѣ или жена·иже аште сътворитѣ отъ грѣхѣ члѣвчѣскихѣхѣ·
234	1073/48b:18	не обиди исповѣдати своихѣ грѣхѣ·
235	1073/54a:09	·ти ѣкоже всѣхѣ грѣхѣ всѣкѣ иже аште сътворитѣ чловѣкѣ кромѣ...·
236	1073/59d:03	·мѣтежѣ мнитѣ отъ грѣхѣ бывѣштиѣ·
237	1073/99b:29	·намѣ же лѣпо ꙗ вѣдѣти· ꙗко грѣхѣ нашихѣ дѣла·
238	1073/99c:29-99d:01	·и грѣхѣ вашихѣ ради обрати лице своѣ отъ васѣ·
239	1073/99d:29	·и разоумѣжѣтѣ всѣ страны·ѣко грѣхѣ своихѣ дѣлама·
240	1073/103a:17	·и пораждѣтѣ вы азѣ седмишѣды·въ грѣхѣ вашихѣ место·
241	1073/147b:21-22	·нѣ пленицами своихѣ грѣхѣ кѣждо вѣплитакѣ са·
242	1076/26v:03-04	·проштениѣ трѣвоуѣ грѣховѣ·
243	1076/98v:01	·большѣ себѣ врѣмена грѣховѣ събираѣ не чюкши·
244	1076/197r:06	·и ѣкоже бескрѣвнѣнаѣ жѣртѣ въ проштениѣ грѣховѣ нашимѣ приноситѣ са господоу боу·
245	1076/207r:01	ѣко оубо всѣсѣка жѣртѣ боу приносима въ отъпоуштениѣ грѣховѣ отъ ба члѣкѣмъ...

246	1076/210v:01	·дарова намъ бг различны жрѣтвы въ отъпоушеник грѣховъ ·
247	1076/212r:07-08	·не тъкмо отъпоушеник грѣховъ не дакъ сѧ имъ:
248	1076/221r:12	паче инѣхъ прочиихъ грѣховъ ксть:
249	1076/223v:07	·такъ простиъ и ксть бѣ грѣховъ кго:
250	1076/226r:02-03	·не бысть оубо свободнъ своихъ грѣховъ ·
251	1076/226v:01	·такъ истиньнок знаменик прощеник грѣховъ хрьстияноу се ксть:
252	1076/241r:05	:злат: ѡ исповѣдани грѣховъ:
253	1076/242r:13	·велико бо добро исповѣданик грѣховъ ·
254	1076/37v:07	·и моштышлапа вѣиноу ѡ мнѡжествѣ грѣхъ своихъ ·
255	1076/178v:05	·и въ врѣма грѣхъ вебрати сѧ къ гоу ·
256	1076/142r:13-142v:01	блгословеник гне:кже отъстоупити отъ грѣхъ ·
257	1076/172v:05	·ако крѣю сѧ грѣхъ ради моихъ ·
258	1076/134v:04	·и мнѡжество грѣхъ моихъ оцѣститъ милость бо и гнѣвъ оу него ксть ·
259	1076/104r:01	·ни же поносити вебраштаюштѧ сѧ отъ грѣхъ:
260	1076/118r:10-11	·о члвче сего дѣла бывають да сѧ очистити члвкъ отъ грѣхъ своихъ ·
261	1076/126r:06	·да некъли скърби ради оцѣштше сѧ отъ грѣхъ своихъ
262	1076/128v:13	·да бы въ семь мирѣ казнь приалъ и моукѣ грѣхъ своихъ дѣльма ·
263	1076/188r:02	кѣи ксть грѣхъ тажи и всѣхъ грѣхъ:
264	1076/217v:03	: и прочек не съдѣю древальнихъ моихъ грѣхъ ·
265	1076/251v:12	·не мозѣмъ небреци малыхъ грѣхъ да не въ великыа въпадемъ ·
I.pl.		
266	PUT/02r:01	·милости ма съподоби ·ненакамаго многыми грѣхы
267	PUT/59v:06	·просвѣти влѣце ·омрачено многыми грѣхы срѣце моѧ ·
268	PUT/60r:03	·просвѣти млстѣе ·омраченокми грѣхы срѣце твоѧ стѣсѧ писаюшѣте...
269	SUP/390:11	·оудовъ пержтъ къ творцоу и владыцѣ ·и своими грѣхы сами сѧ оцѣштавають ·
270	SUP/525:06	·и инѣми осквернивъ сѧ большимии того грѣхы ·
271	1073/44c:16	·а такоже съ своими грѣхы имоуть въслѣдъ градоуцы ·
272	1073/171d:10-11	·и жены събраны грѣхы ·водимы похотыи различныи ·
273	1073/193c:21	·и огла и нехоудѣ ·нъ великыи хоулами и грѣховы ·
274	1073/200b:28	·и въ злохытроу дшѧ не вълѣзеть моудрость ·ни въселитъ сѧ въ тѣло оуквернено грѣхы ·
275	1073/211a:15	·невѣдоуште тако своими грѣхы болии собѣ събирають огнь ·
L.pl.		
276	ARC/10r:16	въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъсѧ кси всь ·
277	ASS/18a:06 x)	·рѣхъ оубо вамъ ꙗко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ
278	ASS/18a:10 x)	ꙗко азъ есмь ·оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ

279	ASS/25d:21	·въ грѣсѣхъ тѣи родилъ сѧ еси весь ·
280	DOB/148r:17-18	ѣко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ:
281	DOB/148r:19-148v:01	аще бо вѣры не емлете ѣко азъ есмь:оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ:
282	DOB/153r:18	въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ сѧ еси весь ·
283	KOH/5v:06	·въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ сѧ еси весь ·
284	MAR/149v	рѣхъ оубо вамъ ѣко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
285	MAR/149v	аште бо вѣры не емлете ѣко азъ есмь · оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
286	MAR/152v	отвѣшташа и рѣша емоу · въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ сѧ еси весь ·
287	MIR/28a:17	рѣхъ бо вамъ ѣко въмрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
288	MIR/28a:20	аще оубо вѣры не имете ѣко азъ есмь ·и оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
289	MIR/41b:21-22	въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ се аси весь ·
290	MST/14b:07	·рекохъ оубо вамъ ·яко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
291	MST/20a:03	·отвѣщаша и рекоша кмоу ·въ грѣсѣхъ родилъ сѧ кси весь ·
292	OST/28c:01	рекохъ оубо вамъ яко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ
293	OST/40d:02	въ грѣсѣхъ родилъ сѧ кси весь ·
294	TYP/152a:17	·яко смрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
295	TYP/152a:19-20	·смрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
296	TYP/155a:01-02	...и рекоша кмоу ·въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ сѧ кси весь ·
297	VAT/66v:17	·рѣхъ оубо вамъ ако оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·аще бо вѣры не емкте ·ако азъ есмь ·
298	VAT/66v:18-19	... азъ есмь ·оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
299	VAT/44v:20	...рѣша кмоу · въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ сѧ кси весь ·
300	VUK/15d:21-22	рѣхъ оубо вамъ яко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
301	VUK/15d:24-25	яко азъ есмь ·оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
302	VUK/21d:02	Ѡвѣщаше и рѣше кмоу ·въ грѣсѣхъ ти родилъ се кси весь ·
303	ZOG/251r:14	рѣхъ оубо ѣко оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
304	ZOG/251r:16-17	...не емлете азъ есмь ·оумрете въ грѣсѣхъ вашихъ ·
305	ZOG/256v:15	отвѣшташа і рѣша емоу ·въ грѣсѣхъ ты родилъ сѧ еси весь ·
306	1073/29a:03-04	·ни каляжштоуоумоу сѧ въ грѣсѣхъ страстныхъ ·
307	1073/32b:08	иже бо въ грѣсѣхъ быше ти не покаавше сѧ ·
308	1073/36b:13	и въ грѣсѣхъ коже съгрѣши въ тѣхъ оумре ·
309	1073/42b:04-05	·смокъве обычаи ксть писанию нарицати ·соуштоуоу о грѣсѣхъ дшюу ·
310	1073/44a:22	·и не оустыди сѧ исповѣдати о грѣсѣхъ своихъ ·

311	1073/48a:01	·овомоу въ грѣсѣхъ живѣштоу кльмаже и велитии...
312	1073/48c:04	къ тѣчнѣимъ о своихъ грѣсѣхъ члѣкѣмъ не срамлѣи сѧ ·
313	1073/50a:29	·также оубо и намъ о грѣсѣхъ кажштаѧ сѧ отълоуцати подобѧ ·
314	1073/50d:15-16	·такъ соуште нѣ въ кнѣихъ грѣсѣхъ ·
315	1073/56c:12	·и до смърти обычаѧ ради зѣла ·въ грѣсѣхъ прѣбывѣша ·
316	1073/56d:13	въ грѣсѣхъ бо не видѣ пытаемъ ксть тѣчѣж грѣховнѣи ·
317	1073/56c:28-29	·кже бо съ оусърдиемъ жити въ грѣсѣхъ нравъ нѣкакъ зѣлочѣствѣ дшамъ вѣтваражеть ·
318	1073/70d:22	·хощеши ли видѣти падение борюштиихъ сѧ съ тобож покаи сѧ о грѣсѣхъ и врази твои падоуть ·
319	1073/83a:22-23	·такъ не послѣшаж тебе ·еще же и въ грѣсѣхъ бывѣши ·
320	1073/91c:29-91d:01	·иже такыѧ вины виноуажьтъ въ грѣсѣхъ своихъ ·
321	1073/99d:07-08	·и прѣсти ваши въ грѣсѣхъ ·
322	1073/102d:16	·ранами седмишѣды ·о грѣсѣхъ вашихъ и съкроушж роукъ величѣѧ вашего ·
323	1073/146d:08	·нѣ кѣждо въ грѣсѣхъ своихъ да оумроуть ·
324	1073/159c:06	·жрѣтвы и приноса не въсхотѣхъ въсесѣжигакмыхъ и кже о грѣсѣхъ не възиска ·
325	1073/182c:18	·также пристѣпажштаѧго къ моужж грѣшнѣоу ·и примѣшажштаѧго сѧ въ грѣсѣхъ ко ·
326	1076/12r:13	·скорви о грѣсѣхъ ·
327	1076/51v:09	·иже бо по всѧ часы отвѣтъ дати о своихъ грѣсѣхъ члѣкти ·
328	1076/154v:05	·и о грѣсѣхъ своихъ помоли сѧ ·
329	1076/87v:02	·нѣ живѣштоѧго въ грѣсѣхъ и въ печѣлѣнии ·
330	1076/87v:04	такъ аште о грѣсѣхъ болимъ и печалоукѣмъ сѧ ·
331	1076/87v:09	·да о грѣсѣхъ тѣчѣж болимъ ·
332	1076/87v:13	·такъ аште наоукъ имѣкши о грѣсѣхъ ·
333	1076/196v:04	аште въ грѣсѣхъ въпадъ кѣто състарѣкеть сѧ ·
334	1076/210r:09	·да понеже члѣци соуште плѣтѣни и немощѣни въ мнозѣхъ грѣсѣхъ соуште ·
335	1076/217r:10	аште въ грѣсѣхъ състарѣвъ сѧ члѣкъ ·
336	1076/241v:05	·и мы и къ тои тѣчѣно о своихъ грѣсѣхъ не срамлѣемъ сѧ къ чловекомъ ·

x) the occurrences are found at <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de> (April 12, 2016).

1.4 Occurrences of дѣлгъ

	No occurrences were found in N., G., I. or L. pl.
--	---

1.5 Occurrences of домъ

N.pl.	
-------	--

337	1073/79c:26	·чада же ихъ въ очиж·домове ихъ гобиньни·
338	1073/116b:09	·всѣмъ домове гроби бѣша·
339	1073/134d:03	·бѣ распытакъ·домы и храмъ бѣвакѣтѣ бѣжи и причастъникъ того црѣства·:
G.pl.		
340	DOB/05r:06	·аще не имать приати сторицежъ нѣнѣ·въ вѣмѣ се домовъ·и братиѣ и сестрѣ·и бѣца и матерѣ·
341	MAR/63r	аште не имать приати съторицежъ въ вѣмѣ се нѣнѣ домовъ и братрѣ и сестрѣ· и оѣца и матерѣ и чадѣ и селѣ·
342	MIR/136b:17	·аще не имать приети сторицею·нѣнѣ въ вѣмѣ се домовъ и брате и сестрѣ·
343	ТУР/79a:24	·аще не имать приати съторцею нѣнѣ въ вѣмѣ се·домовъ и братрѣ и сестрѣ·
344	VUK/119b:16	аще не имать приети съторицею·нѣнѣ въ вѣмѣ се домовъ и братрѣ и сестрѣ и ѡце и матерѣ·
345	SUP/35:08	·съ свѣштами исходаште из домовъ своихъ·
346	SUP/267:24	·то оуже к томѣ не помьнатѣ ни домовъ ни чада·
347	SUP/432:24	·то имѣниа ли въсхотѣ небрѣгъни имѣниа·домовъ ли штоуждиихъ·
L.pl.		
348	ARC/158r:13	иже макъка носатѣ· въ домъхъ ц(с)рихъ соутѣ·
349	ASS/143r:13	·се иже макъкаѣ носатѣ·въ домохъ црихъ сжтѣ·
350	MAR/08v	се иже макъка носатѣ· въ домохъ ц(с)рихъ сжтѣ·
351	MIR/71b:12	·се кже макъка носетѣ·въ домохъ црхъ сютѣ·
352	MST/34d:15	·се кже макъка носатѣ въ домъхъ цѣсарихъ соутѣ·
353	MST/192b:25	·се кже макъкаа носатѣ въ домъхъ цѣрихъ соутѣ·
354	OST/267b:02	се иже макъкаа носатѣ· въ домъхъ црихъ сжтѣ·...
355	ТУР/20d:22	·се иже макъкаа носатѣ· въ домъхъ цѣрихъ соутѣ·
356	VAT/67v:25	се иже макъкаа носатѣ· въ домохъ црихъ сжтѣ·:
357	VUK/36b:17-18	се иже макъкаа носетѣ въ домохъ црихъ соутѣ·
358	ZOG/23r:23	·се иже макъка носатѣ· въ домохъ црихъ сжтѣ·
359	1073/69b:08	·мнози оубо въ домъхъ рати имоутѣ·
360	1073/84c:07-08	·и бѣдетѣ гравленикъ въ домъхъ вашихъ·

1.6 Occurrences of медь

	No occurrences were found in N., G., I. or L. pl.
--	---

1.7 Occurrences of полъ

G.pl.		
361	ASS/153r:13	и клатѣ са еи·ѣко егоже просиши дамѣ ти·до полъ црѣства моего·
362	MAR/54r	егоже аште просиши дамѣ ти· до полъ црѣствитѣ моего·
363	OST/287d:03	егоже аще просиши дамѣ ти·до полъ црѣства моего·...
364	VAT/18v:10	·:яко кгоже аще просиши·дамѣ ти·до полъ црѣствитѣ моего·:

365	ZOG/92r:13	...ѣко е҃гоже аште просиши и дамь ти до полъ црсиѣ моего .
-----	------------	--

1.6 Occurrences of сынъ

N.pl.		
366	ARC/01v:03	и ть иж него пикть . и снѡве ю҃го . и скоти ю҃го .
367	ARC/12v:03	дондеже свѣтъ имате . вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да снѡве свѣтоу боудете
368	ARC/12v:08	дондеже свѣтъ имате . вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да снѡве свѣтоу боудете .
369	ARC/25r:07	да боудете снѡве оца̄ вашего иже ксть на нѣсѣхъ .
370	ARC/30v:10	а снѡве цр(с)твѣа изгнани боудоуть . въ тьмоу кромѣшиню .
371	ARC/37r:17	рече ю҃моу ісѣ . и҃бо свободни ли соуть снѡве .
372	ARC/50r:09	и боудеть мьзда ваша мьнога . и боудете снѡве вѣшьна҃го .
373	ARC/87v:21	дондеже свѣтъ имате . вѣроуите въ свѣтъ . да снѡве свѣта боудете .
374	ARC/178r:21	а доброк сѣма си соуть снѡве црства
375	ARC/178r:22	плевели соуть снѡве неприазни[н]ии .
376	ASS/19b:18	·и ть из него пть ·и снѡве е҃го и скоти е҃го ·
377	ASS/27b:24	·дондеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ ·да снѡве свѣта бждете ·:
378	ASS/27c:03	·дондеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ ·да снѡве свѣта бждете ·:
379	ASS/33d:21	·и изгонаштва вы ·да бждете снѡве оца̄ вашего иже естъ на нѣхъ ·
380	ASS/37d:20	·а снѡве свѣта изгнани бждѣтъ въ тьмѣ кромѣштнѣж ·
381	ASS/42c:28	·рече е҃моу ісѣ ·оубо свободъ сжть снѡве ·
382	ASS/52a:18-19	·и бждеть мьзда ваша мьнога ·и бждете снѡве вѣшьна҃го ·
383	ASS/113d:05	·блажени смѣрѣштен ѣко ти снѡве бжѣи нарежт сѧ ·
384	ASS/126v:15	·доброе же сѣма си сжть снѡве црствѣ ·
385	ASS/126b:16	·а пѣвели сжть снѡве неприѣзнии ·
386	DOB/02rC:04	е҃да могуць снѡве брачни постити се
387	DOB/51v:18	·и бждеть мьзда ваша мнѡга ·и бждете снѡве вѣшьна҃го ·
388	DOB/73v:07	аще же азъ о вельзеволѣ і зьгона вѣсы . снѡве ваши о комь изгонати
389	DOB/92r:06	ѣко мждрѣ сътвори . ѣко снѡве вѣка сего . мждрѣши паче . . . :
390	DOB/105v:09	равни сжть ан҃гломи ·и снѡве сжть бжѣи :
391	DOB/132r:01	і ть из него пть и снѡве е҃го ·и скоти е҃го
392	DOB/162v:20	·до колѣ свѣтъ имате (·в)ѣроуите въ свѣтъ ·да снѡве свѣто(у бжд)е(т)е ·
393	КОН/18v:07	·и изгонашѣа вы да бждете снѡве ѡца̄ вашего ·
394	КОН/42v:21	и бждеть мьзда ваша мнѡга ·и бждете снѡве вѣшьна҃го ·
395	КОН/95r:21	·блажени смѣрѣшци тако ти снѡве бѣи нарежт сѧ ·
396	КОН/108v:05	·доброе сѣма си сжть снѡве црствѣа
397	КОН/108v:06	а пѣвели сжть снѡве неприазнии ·
398	КОН/29r:04	·рече е҃моу ісѣ ·оубо свободъ сжть снѡве ·

399	КОН/7v:06	·дондеже свѣтъ имате вѣроуите въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣтоу бждете·
400	КОН/7v:12	·дондеже свѣтъ имате вѣроуите въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣтоу бждете·
401	MAR/03v	а снѡве [вѣ] цѣствиѣ изгнани бждѣтъ· въ тѣмъж кромѣштѣнѣжѣ.
402	MAR/05v	ѣда можѣтъ снѡве брачѣнии плакати сѧ.
403	MAR/10v	ѿ аште азъ о вельзѣволѣ изгониж вѣсы· снѡве ваши о комъ изгониатъ.
404	MAR/13v	а село естъ весь миръ· доброе же сѣмѧ се сѣтъ· снѡве цѣрствиѣ· (а плѣвелъ сѣтъ снѡве неприѣзнии.)
405	MAR/13v	(а село естъ весь миръ· доброе же сѣмѧ се сѣтъ· снѡве цѣрствиѣ·) а плѣвелъ сѣтъ снѡве неприѣзнии.
406	MAR/20r	рече емоу ѿс· оубо свободни сѣтъ снѡве.
407	MAR/31r	тѣмъ же сами свѣдѣтельствоуѣте себѣ· ꙗко снѡве есте избивѣшихъ прѣкы.
408	MAR/47r	рече имъ ѿсѣ· ѣда можѣтъ снѡве брачѣнии постити сѧ.
409	MAR/91v	и бждетъ мѣзда ваша мѣнога· и бждете снѡве вѣшнѣго·
410	MAR/104r	аште же азъ о вельзѣвоуѣ изгониж вѣсы· снѡве ваши о комъ изгониатъ.
411	MAR/114v	и похвали гѣ иконома неправеднааго· ꙗко и мждрѣ сътвори· ꙗко снѡве вѣка сего мждрѣише (паче снѡвѣ свѣта въ родѣ своемъ сѣтъ :-)
412	MAR/123r	и отвѣштавъ ѿс рече имъ· снѡве вѣка сего жетатъ сѧ и посагажѣтъ.
413	MAR/123r	ни оумьрѣти бо по томъ можѣтъ· равни бо сѣтъ анѣлмъ ѿ снѡве сѣтъ бжии· (вскрѣшению снѡве сѣще.)
414	MAR/123r	(ни оумьрѣти бо по томъ можѣтъ· равни бо сѣтъ анѣлмъ ѿ снѡве сѣтъ бжии·) вскрѣшению снѡве сѣще.
415	MAR/139r	ѿ тѣ из него питъ и снѡве его и скоти его·
416	MAR/158v	дондеже свѣтъ имате· вѣроуите въ свѣта· да снѡве свѣтоу бждете :-
417	MIR/30b:13-14	и тѣ из него питъ·и снѡва его и скоти его
418	MIR/44b:03	дондѣже свѣтъ имате·вѣрюите въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣтю бждете
419	MIR/44b:09	дондѣже свѣтъ имате·вѣрюите въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣта бждете·
420	MIR/60a:15	блжени съмирѣющеи ꙗко то снѡве бжи нарекутъ се·
421	MIR/64a:11	да бждете снѡве оца вашего иже дѣтъ на нѣсѣхъ·
422	MIR/66b:02	а да могутъ снѡве брачѣни плакати се·
423	MIR/77a:16	и азъ вельзѣломъ изгонию вѣсы·снѡве ваши ѡ комъ изгонетъ
424	MIR/82b:13	·а снѡве црства изгнани бюдѣтъ въ тмю
425	MIR/83a:20	·доброе же сѣме си сютъ снѡве црствиѣ
426	MIR/83a:21	а плѣвелъ сѣтъ снѡве неприѣзнии·
427	MIR/107b:12	рече дмю ѿс ѿбо свободни сютъ снѡве· нѣ...
428	MIR/106b:23	·и рече имъ ѿс·ѣда могутъ снѡве брачѣни·постити се·
429	MIR/154a:06	и бждетъ мѣзда ваша многа·и бждете снѡве вѣшинѣго· ꙗко

430	MIR/170b:09	.аще же азъ о вельзаволѣ изгону вѣсы·снѡве ваши о комъ изгонеть
431	MIR/187a:07	ѣко снѡве вѣка сего мюдрѣише·
432	MIR/187a:08-09	·паче снѡве свѣта
433	MIR/195b:08	·снѡве вѣка сего женеть се и посагають·
434	MIR/195b:16	·и снѡве сють вѣи·
435	MIR/195b:17	и въскрѣсеню снѡве·ѣкоже встають мрѣтви·
436	MIR/238a:02	·ѣко снѡве дсте избившихъ пррѣки
437	MIR/245b:07	дондѣже свѣтъ имате вѣройте въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣтлю бюдете·
438	MIR/301b:10	дондѣже свѣтъ имате·вѣройте въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣтоу бюдете·
439	MST/15b:05	·и тѣ из нѣго пии снѡве кго и скоти кго·
440	MST/21a:19	·дондѣже свѣтъ имате·вѣройте въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣта бюдете:
441	MST/21b:02	·дондѣже свѣтъ имаате·вѣройте въ свѣтъ да снѡве свѣта бюдете·
442	MST/139a:05	...дондѣже свѣтъ имате вѣройте въ свѣтъ да снѡве свѣта бдѣте·си гла ісѣ
443	MST/167b:22	·дондѣже свѣтъ имате вѣройте въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣта бдѣте·
442	MST/191c:19	·дондѣже свѣтъ имате вѣройте въ свѣтъ·да снѡве свѣта бдѣте:
445	MST/29c:25	·да бюдете снѡве оца нашего иже ксть на нѣсѣхъ·
446	MST/36c:19	·и сынове црѣства иженутъ сѧ въ тѣмоу кромѣшнюю·
447	MST/50b:11	·рече кмѣ ісѣ·свободѣ соутъ оубо снѡве нѣ...
448	MST/31b:11	·и рече ісѣ·еда могутъ снѡве чрѣтожьника желѣти·
449	MST/28b:17	·блажни съмѣрающии іако ти снѡве бѣии нарекут сѧ·
450	MST/188c:05	·блажени съмѣрающии іако ти снѡве бѣии нарекут сѧ·
451	MST/37b:01	·и аще азъ вельзовжлъмъ изгону вѣсы·снѡве ваши чимъ изгона·
452	MST/74c:17	·и будеть мѣзда ваша многа и бюдете снѡве въшьнаго·
453	MST/51d:16	·тѣмъ же послѣшествоукте себѣ іако снѡве ксте избивъшиихъ проркы·
454	MST/135b:14	·тѣмъ же послѣшествоукте себѣ іако снѡве ксте избивъшиихъ проркы·
455	MST/165c:20	·тѣмъ же послѣшествоукте себѣ іако снѡве ксте избивъшиихъ проркы·
456	MST/80c:24	·и аще бдѣтъ снѡве мира почикъ на нихъ миръ вашъ
457	MST/55c:03	·и рече имъ и ісѣ·еда могутъ снѡве брачнии алкати·
458	MST/40b:03	·добрѣ же сѣмѧ се соутъ снѡве црѣства·
459	MST/40b:04	·плевели же соутъ снѡве неприазнини·
456	MST/83a:17	·изгону вѣсы·снѡве ваши о комъ изгонати сего дѣлати вамъ бодоутъ соудиа·
461	MST/91c:09	...іако моудрѣ сътвори·іако снѡве вѣка сего моудрѣише
462	MST/97d:11	·и снѡве соутъ бѣии
463	MST/97d:11	и въскрѣсеніа снѡве соутъ·
464	OST/212b:15	блажени съмирающеи·іако ти снѡве бѣии нарекутъ сѧ

465	OST/58b:11	· да бждете сынове оца̄ вашего· иже ксть на нб̄сехъ
466	OST/64c:09-10	а сынове цр̄ствиа изгнани бждѣтъ въ тьмѣ...
467	OST/241c:15	доброκ же сѣма· сии сѣтъ сынове цр̄ствиа·
468	OST/241c:17	а плѣвели сѣтъ сынове неприазнни·
469	OST/72c:08	· рече кмоӯ ӣс̄ ибо свобода̄ ли сѣтъ сн̄ове·
470	OST/215b:10	тѣмиже свѣдѣтельствоӯкте о себѣ· ꙗко сн̄ове ксте·
471	OST/92b:02	· и бждеть мѣзда ваша мѣнога и бждете сн̄ове въшьнааго·
472	OST/30c:06	· и тѣ из нко̄ пи и сынове кго̄ и скоти кго̄...
473	OST/43a:17	дондеже свѣтъ имате· вѣроӯите въ свѣтъ· да сынове свѣтоӯ бждете ∴
474	OST/43b:07	дондеже свѣтъ имаате· вѣроӯите въ свѣтъ· да сынове свѣтоӯ бждете ∴
475	OST/266c:08-09	дондеже свѣтъ имаате· вѣроӯите въ свѣтъ· да сынове свѣтоӯ бждете ∴
476	SAV/32r:15-16	...она пастѣствѣжцихъ вамъ· ꙗко да бждете сн̄ове оцю̄ вашемоӯ· нб̄сноӯмоӯ·
477	SAV/37r:01	...въ цр̄ствии нб̄снѣмь· сн̄ове же цр̄ствиа ижденѣтъ сѣ·
478	SAV/125v:15	· блажени іс̄̄ миражци· ꙗко ти сн̄ове бжӣ нарежѣтъ сѣ блажени изгнани правды ради·
479	SAV/128v:14	· ходите дондеже свѣтъ имате· вѣроӯите въ свѣтъ да сн̄ове свѣта бждете·
480	TUR/10r:05	· и бждеть мѣзда ваша мѣнога· и бждете сн̄ове въшьнааго·
481	TYP/08b:17	· блажени съмираюци ꙗко ти сн̄ове бжӣ нарекоут сѣ·
482	TYP/10c:14	· изгонаца̄а вы· да бждете сн̄ове оца̄ вашего·
483	TYP/15a:11	· а сн̄ове цр̄ствиа изгнани боудѣтъ въ тьмѣ кромѣшьнюю·
484	TYP/17a:07	· еда̄ можѣтъ сн̄ове брачнии постити сѣ·
485	TYP/23b:10	· сн̄ове ваши о комъ изгонѣтъ·
486	TYP/26d:10	· доброκ же сѣма се соутъ сн̄ове цр̄ствиа·
487	TYP/26d:11	· а плѣвели соутъ сынове неприазнни·
488	TYP/34b:13	· рече ем̄ж̄ іс̄̄· оубо̄ свободо̄ни сѣтъ сн̄ове·
489	TYP/63a:18	· и рече имъ̄ іс̄̄· еда̄ можѣтъ сн̄ове брачнии постити сѣ·
490	TYP/106d:20	...многа· и боудете сн̄ове въшьнааго·
491	TYP/110c:23-24	...изгонӯ вѣсы· сн̄ове ваши о комъ изгонѣтъ·
492	TYP/120b:16	· ꙗко̄ сн̄ове вѣка̄ сего̄ моудрѣше
493	TYP/127d:16	· и ѡвѣштавѣ̄ іс̄̄ рече имъ̄· сн̄ове вѣка̄ сего̄ женѣтъ сѣ и посагаютъ·
494	TYP/128a:01-02	· равнӣ бо соутъ ангѡлмъ̄· и сынове сѣтъ бжӣи·
495	TYP/128a:03	· въскрѣшенью̄ сн̄ове сѣще·
496	TYP/142d:08	· и тѣ из него̄ пить· и сн̄ове кго̄ и скоти кго̄·
497	TYP/160a:14	· ходите дондеже свѣтъ имате· вѣроӯите въ свѣтъ да сн̄ове свѣта бждете·
498	UND/01r:19	· доброе̄ же сѣма̄ си сѣтъ сн̄ове цр̄ствивѣ·
499	UND/01r:20	· а плѣвели сѣтъ сн̄ове неприѣзнни·
500	VAT/30r:25	· блажени съмѣрѣжци· ꙗко̄ ти сынове бжӣи нарежѣтъ сѣ·
501	VAT/09r:13	· и изгонаца̄а вы· да бждете сн̄ове оца̄ вашего· иже естѣ на нб̄сехъ·

502	VAT/91r:09	·и ты из него пи□ и снове кго ·и скоти кго ·
503	VAT/14v:02	дондеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите в□ свѣт□ да сынове свѣтоу бждете ·
504	VAT/67v:02	дондеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ · да снове свѣтоу бждете ·
505	VAT/14r:24	дондеже свѣтъ имате · вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да снѣ стоу бждете ·
506	VUK/17a:01	и ты изъ него пить и снове кго и скоти его
507	VUK/22d:20	дондѣже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да снове свѣтоу боудете ··
508	VUK/23a:02	·те вѣроуите въ свѣтъ да снове свѣтоу боудете ·
509	VUK/29b:13	·сьм...рѣющеи се тако ти снове бжѣ нарекоутъ се:
510	VUK/30c:24	да боудете снове шѣа вашего кже ксть на небсѣхъ ·
511	VUK/32c:04	рече имъ исъ ·кда могоутъ снове брачны постити се:
512	VUK/92d:15	аще же азъ ѡ вельзаволѣ изыгоуу вѣсы: снове ваши ѡ комъ изыгонеть
513	VUK/37d:28	а снове црѣства изгнани боудутъ въ тьмоу...
514	VUK/41b:01	доброе же сѣме си соутъ снове црѣствиа ·
515	VUK/41b:03	·а плѣвели соутъ снове неприазнини
516	VUK/179c:11	доброе же сѣме си соутъ снове црѣствиа ·
517	VUK/179:12	·а плѣвели соутъ снове неприазнини
518	VUK/52b:24	рече кмоу исъ ·свободѣи оубо соутъ снове
519	VUK/38c:02	...ѡ вельзаволѣ изыгона вѣсы: снове ваши ѡ комъ изыгонеть ·
520	VUK/103d:19	ѣко мюдрѣ сътвори:ѣко снове вѣка сего мюдрѣиши (паче сновъ свѣта:въ родѣ свомъ соутъ)
521	VUK/111b:19	снове вѣка сего женеть се и посагають
522	VUK/111c:04	снове соутъ вжѣи:
523	VUK/111c:06	въскрѣсениа снове соутъ:
524	VUK/54b:02	·такъ снове ксте избившихъ прркъ
525	VUK/153b:01	·такъ снове ксте избившихъ прркъ
526	VUK/58c:08	·кда могоутъ снове брачны постити се
527	VUK/82a:24	·...и боудете снове въ...·
528	ZOG/4v:21	блажени съ миражшти ·ѣко ти снове бжѣ нарежтъ сѣ:
529	ZOG/8r:17	да бждете снове оца вашего ·ижъ естъ на небесехъ ·
530	ZOG/15r:08	а снове црѣствѣ изгнани бждтъ ·въ тьмѣ кромѣшнѣж ·
531	ZOG/27r:11	и аште азъ ·о вельзволѣ изгонѣ вѣсы ·снове ваша о комъ изгонѣтъ ·
532	ZOG/32v:07	доброе же сѣма естъ снове црѣствѣ · (а плѣвелъ сжтъ снове неприѣзнини ·)
533	ZOG/32v:08	(доброе же сѣма естъ снове црѣствѣ) ·а плѣвелъ сжтъ снове неприѣзнини ·
534	ZOG/42r:11	·рече емоу исъ оубо свободѣни сжтъ снове
535	ZOG/82 (76):02	и рече имъ исъ ·еда мюжтъ снове брачны постити сѣ ·
536	ZOG/152r:04	и бждетъ мѣзда ваша многа и бждете снове въшнѣаго ·
537	ZOG/192v:09	и похвали гнѣ домоу иконома ·неправдѣнааго ·ѣко мюдрѣ сътвори ·ѣко снове вѣка сего ·
538	ZOG/207v:06	·снове вѣка сего женѣтъ сѣ ·и посагажтъ ·

539	ZOG/207v:14	ни оумрѣти бо по томъ можтъ ·равни бо сжтъ дѣломъ ·и снове сжтъ бжї ·
540	ZOG/207v:15-16	·вѣскрѣшенью снове сжтъ
541	ZOG/232v:22	·и тѣ иж него питѣ и снове его и скоти его ·
542	ZOG/267r:06	дондеже свѣтъ имате ·вѣроуите въ свѣтъ · да снї свѣтоу бждете
543	PUT/79r:17	...Ѡ ветѣхаго длѣга раздрѣшивъше сѧ ·сынове блгдѣти павихомъ сѧ ·
544	PUT/86v:03	·и огнь моучениж прѣтрьпѣсте ·инѣна снѣвѣ вѣчноу мжцрствоу бысте ·
545	SUP/94:21	сии сжтъ овѣмъшии нашѣ странѣ ·пакже се сынове части ·
546	SUP/253:19	·сынове мои бога имжтъ пакже и азѣ ·
547	SUP/262:21-22	·имже трѣвѣкмъ юго вси сынове чловѣчстїи ·тѣ бо кстѣ крѣмаи въсѣ населенжж ·
548	SUP/262:25-26	·се же трѣвоукѣтъ отѣ насѣ да вѣмъ има господа нашего вси сынове чловѣчстїи ·
549	SUP/324:23	·аште да ксте сынове сиѡни ·
550	SUP/423:12-13	·блажени бо рече съмирожштии ·пак то сынове божиї нарежтъ сѧ ·
551	1073/30b:10	·ти соутѣ снове божиї ·
552	1073/14c:14	·пзъкомъ на разлоченик словѣ градѣи течетѣ въ же црѣвниї снове ·
553	1073/51d:28-29	·къ стѣнимъ кликоже аште освѣажтъ снове иизраилеви гѣи ·
554	1073/56b:11	снове безоумни сжтъ а не съмыслни ·
555	1073/67c:27-28	·камо ли поклонение се дѣвѣше мнѣти ·еже ем овѣштаваахѣ снове ·
556	1073/80a:04	·ихѣже снове ихѣ акѣ новѣ отѣрасли ·
557	1073/103d:06	·аште или сынове ихѣ и дѣштери гонезноутѣ ·
558	1073/107a:16-17	·се подѣкмяютѣ ·небонѣ иовови снове правдѣни соутѣ ·
559	1073/123c:06	·како к разоумѣти видѣвѣше же снове бжїи и дѣштери члѣскѣи ·
560	1073/134d:08	·:видѣвѣше же снове ·:бжїи дѣштери чловѣчскѣи ·
561	1073/135a:02	·къ имоуштааго бжїи снове видѣвѣше чловѣчскѣи дѣштери рекѣше... ·
562	1073/209d:16	·да оуже васнѣ свободо соутѣ снове ·
563	1073/135a:15	·пак видѣвѣше же снѣвѣ бжїи дѣштери члѣчскѣи ·
564	1073/135b:05	·видѣвѣше снѣвѣ бжїи дѣштери члѣчскѣи ·
565	1073/138a:09	·отѣ негоже еврѣи ·симви оубо соутѣ сынове
566	1073/138a:10	и сыновѣни сынове ·
567	1073/138c:02	·кѣлатѣ ·отѣ негоже гетѣлѣ ·хамоу же вѣторомоу снове и
568	1073/138c:03	и сыновѣниї сынове ·
569	1073/139a:10-11	·отѣ негоже рамене ·иафефѣ же третикму сынове и
570	1073/139a:11-12	и сыновѣниї сынове ·
571	1073/147a:20	·и въ корабли нокеѣ и снове юго вѣахоу ·

572	1073/147a:26	·да аще оцѣ за дѣти не моучатъ сѧ·ни снѡве за оцѧ·
573	1073/184a:09-10	·и сынове безоумливи соутъ такоже зло сътворити·
574	1073/202d:14-15	...кже сынове съплескажтъ и моудрость не паже...
575	1073/206c:20	·и иванъ бо и яковъ сынове зеведении прѣбывъшеи въ дѣвствѣ·
576	1073/216d:06	...отъ непаже роди сѧ кмоу шестеро дѣтин·четыре сынове·двѣ же дѣщери·
577	1076/14r:11	...къ нимъ и обеселиши сѧ·снѡве бо бес соутъ·
578	1076/49r:06	·не быша·снѡве мира сего распали га славы·
579	1076/225r:11-12	·азъ бо рѣхъ бози ксте и сынове вышняаго вси хоташтеи:
580	1076/251r:09	·тою бо любвѣю снѡве боу наречемъ сѧ·
G.pl.		
581	ARC/37r:14	Ѡ кыхъ приклють дани· или кинозъ· Ѡ своихъ снѡвъ или Ѡ тоуждихъ·
582	ARC/106r:10	·л· сребръникъ· цѣноу цѣннааго·его же цѣниша Ѡ сн(ѡ)въ извѣль·
583	ARC/116v: 09	·л· сребръникъ· цѣноу цѣннааго· его же цѣниша· Ѡ снѡвъ извѣль·
584	ASS/42c:22	приемлатъ дани ли кинос·отъ своихъ ли снѡвъ·ли отъ тоуждихъ·
585	ASS/107b:20	Ѣ сребръникъ·цѣнж цѣннааго·егоже цѣниша отъ снѡвъ извѣль·
586	ASS/148r:28	·многи снѡвъ извѣль обратитъ къ гоу боу ихъ·
587	DOB/92r:07	сего· мждрѣши паче снѡвъ свѣта сжтъ·
588	DOB/105v:03	и отвѣщѣвъ їссъ рече имъ:снѡвъ вѣка сего жетжтъ сѧ и посагажтъ:
589	КОН/74v:21	·л·сребръникъ·цѣнж цѣннааго·егоже цѣниша Ѡ снѡвъ извѣль·
590	КОН/29r:01	приемлатъ дани·или кинисъ·Ѡ снѡвъ ли своихъ·или Ѡ тоуждихъ
591	MAR/20r	цѣри земьсци отъ кыхъ приемлатъ дани· ли кинсѣ· отъ своихъ ли снѡвъ· ли отъ тоуждихъ
592	MAR/178v	и многи снѡвъ издрѣвъ обратитъ къ ги боу ихъ·
593	MAR/114v	паче снѡвъ свѣта въ родѣ своемъ сжтъ ·:
594	MAR/39v	и приасѧ три десѧти сребръникъ цѣнж цѣннааго· егоже цѣниша отъ снѡвъ извѣль·
595	MIR/107b:09	приемлютъ дани или киносъ· Ѡ снѡвъ ли своихъ или Ѡ туждихъ...
596	MIR/286a:18	·л· сребръникъ·цѣню·цѣннааго·егоже цѣнише Ѡ снѡвъ извѣль·
597	MIR/340a:05	·и многи снѡвъ излѣвъ обратитъ къ гоу боу ихъ·
598	MST/91c:10	паче снѡвъ свѣта въ родѣ своемъ соутъ·
599	MST/50b:08	·или кинсѣ·отъ своихъ ли снѡвъ или отъ шуждихъ·
600	MST/152d:18	·л· те сребръникъ цѣноу цѣннааго·егоже цѣниша отъ снѡвъ излѣвъ·

601	MST/157a:12	.л̣. сребръникъ цѣноу цѣненааго югоже цѣниша отъ снѣвъ излѣвъ .
602	MST/160b:22	.л̣. сребръникъ цѣноу цѣнкнааго югоже цѣниша отъ снѣвъ излѣвъ .
603	MST/199b:08	.и многы снѣвъ излѣвъ обратитъ къ гоу боу ихъ .
604	OST/72c:01	отъ кыихъ прикмажтъ дани или кинсѣ отъ снѣвъ ли своихъ .
605	OST/196d:05	.л̣. сребръникъ .цѣнж цѣнкнааго . югоже цѣниша отъ снѣвъ излѣвъ .
606	OST/185b:15	.и приаша три десате сребръникъ цѣнж цѣнкнааго . югоже цѣниша отъ снѣвъ излѣвъ... .
607	OST/278c:09	...мѣре свожа и мѣногы .снѣвъ излѣвы обратитъ къ гоу боу ихъ и тѣ .
608	SAV/43r:03	въземажтъ дань .ли оброкы .отъ своихъ ли снѣвъ .ли отъ тоуждихъ .
609	SAV/117v:02	.л̣. сребръникъ цѣнж цѣненааго .егоже цѣниша отъ снѣвъ излѣвъ .
610	ТУР/34b:08	.ли кинсѣ .Ѡ своихъ ли снѣвъ .
611	ТУР/55d:14	.цѣноу цѣнкнааго .егоже цѣниша Ѡ снѣвъ излѣвъ .
612	ТУР/93d:20	.и мѣногы снѣвъ излѣвъ .обратитъ къ ги боу ихъ .
613	ТУР/120b:17	паче снѣвъ свѣта въ родѣ свожмь сѣтъ .
614	VAT/79v:03	.и приаша три десати сребръникъ цѣнж цѣненааго . егоже цѣниша отъ снѣвъ илѣвъ .
615	VAT/19r:06	.и мѣногы снѣвъ излѣвъ обратитъ къ гю боу ихъ .
616	VUK/103d:20	паче снѣвъ свѣта: въ родѣ свожмь соутъ
617	VUK/52b:19	црик земляни: Ѡ кыихъ прикмаоутъ дани: или кинось .Ѡ снѣвъ ли своихъ или Ѡ чоуждихъ .
618	VUK/175c:06	.л̣. сребръникъ цѣноу цѣненааго: югоже цѣнише Ѡ снѣвъ излѣвъ:и даше... .
619	ZOG/42r:08	...приемажтъ дани ли кинсѣ .отъ снѣвъ ли своихъ ли от тоуждихъ
620	ZOG/132r:14	и многы снѣвъ илѣвъ .обратитъ къ ги бѣ ихъ
621	ZOG/192v:10	.мждрѣше паче снѣвъ свѣта .въ родѣ свожмь сѣтъ
622	ZOG/70v:10	и приаша и сребръникъ .цѣнж цѣненааго .егоже цѣниша отъ снѣвъ илѣвъ .
623	SUP/246:20	.тѣмь оубо пришедъ на проповѣдь паулъ апостолъ . и кѣного отъ сыновъ семоу обрѣтъ пишетъ .
624	SUP/436:07	.и не имѣаше вида .ни доброты .нѣ видъ юго вечьстѣнъ .изчазаша паче сыновъ чловѣчъ .
625	1073/50b:10	члѣвъкъ члѣвъкъ рече отъ снѣвъ иизраилевъ .
626	1073/103a:24	.и послю съмрътъ на вы .и гасте плѣтъ снѣвъ и дѣштерии вашихъ .
627	1073/135a:08-09	.въ сыновъ мѣста бжиа сыны божьскы и властельскы оуказа .
628	1073/137c:01	.рече бо моусисъ .вселеник же снѣвъ издраилевъ .
629	1073/139b:29	.симъ оубо изыкомъ сице отъ трии сыновъ .
630	1073/163c:21	.нѣ видъ юго .вечьстѣнъ .и погыбаа .паче сыновъ члѣвъкъ .
631	1073/182b:16	.неже тобѣ зрѣти въ роуцѣ сыновъ твоихъ .
632	1073/189d:24	рѣпѣташе же всь съборъ снѣвъ издраилевъ на моусиж .
I.pl.		

633	SUP/562:11, Z)	·доиде же мастира чловѣка б̄жыа ·съ женоѡ своеѡ и сн̄ѣми дъштерьми ·
634	1076/17r:11	·сн̄ы в̄ноукы прав̄ноукы дъштерьми ·
L.pl.		
635	1073/94a:05	·да не бѡдетъ бо блѡдѡштааго въ сн̄ѣхъ илѣвѣихъ ·
636	1076/168r:06	·и не весели сѡ о сн̄ѣхъ ненаказаньихъ ·

Z) the occurrences are taken from the e-corpus <http://titus.uni-frankfur.de> (12/4-16).

Appendix 2. Verses in 15 biblical sources

The findings in the 15 biblical texts that are included in this study are presented in this appendix according to the 41 selected biblical verses. The findings in the five non-biblical texts are excluded in this appendix.

2.1 *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*

2.2 *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary*

2.3 *Dobromir's Gospel*

2.4 *Kochno Gospel Lectionary*

2.5 *Marianus Gospel*

2.6 *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*

2.7 *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*

2.8 *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*

2.9 *Sava's Book*

2.10 *Turov Gospel Lectionary*

2.11 *Typograph Gospel*

2.12 *Undol'skij's Fragments*

2.13 *Vatican Gospel Lectionary*

2.14 *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*

2.15 *Zograph Gospel*

2.1 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Archangelsk Gospel Lectionary of 1092*

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (8)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 32v:08, IX:5 = 32v:14,

St. Mark II:5 = 79r:16, II:9 = 79v:06, IV:12 = —

St. Luke V:20 = 49r:07, V:23 = 49r:18, VII:47 = 131r:18, VII:48 = 131v:01

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (5)

St. Matthew I:21 = 142v:18, XXVI: 28 = 94v:19,

St. Mark I:4 = 150r:15,

St. Luke I:77 = —, III:3 = 151r:06, XXIV:47 = 14r:12

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (1) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = —; —; IX:34 = 10r:16

N.pl. домовѣ / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 158r:13

N.pl. полеве / поли (0), G.pl. полевъ / полъ (0) = St. Mark VI:23 = the substantive *полъцѣрства* is used

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (10)

St. Matthew V:9 = —, V:45 = 25r:07, VIII:12 = 30v:10, IX:15 = —, XII:27 = —, XIII:38 (x2) = 178r:21 + 178r:22, XVII:26 = 37r:17, XXIII:31 = —

St. Mark II:19 = —,

St. Luke VI:35 = 50r:09, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = —, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = —,

St. John IV:12 = 01v:03, XII:36 = 12v:03 + 12v:08 + 87v:21

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (3)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 37r:14, XXVII:9 = 106r:10 + 116v:09

St. Luke I:16 = A.pl., XVI:8 = —

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.2 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Assemanian Gospel Lectionary* (or the *Vatican*, not to be confused with the *Vatican Gospel Lectionary Gr.2502*)

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (7)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 39b:17, IX:5 = 39c:03,

St. Mark II:5 = 76a:01, II:9 = 76a:22-23, IV:12 = —,

St. Luke V:20 = 51b:12, V:23 = —, VII:47 = 120r:12, VII:48 = 120r:16

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (3)

St. Matthew I:21 = 131b:05, XXVI: 28 = D.pl.

St. Mark I:4 = 137b:23-24,

St. Luke I:77 = —, III:3 D.pl., XXIV:47 = 28c:18-19

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0),

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 18a:06, + 18a:10, IX:34 = 25d:21-22

N.pl. домовѣ / домаи (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —,

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 143r:13

N.pl. полеве / поли (0), G.pl. полевъ / полъ (1) = St. Mark VI:23 = 153r:13,

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (10)

St. Matthew V:9 = 113d:05, V:45 = 33d:21, VIII:12 = 37d:20, IX:15 = —, XII:27 = —,

XIII:38 (x2) = 126v:15 + 126b:16, XVII:26 = 42c:28, XXIII:31 = —,

St. Mark II:19 = —,

St. Luke VI:35 = 52a:18-19, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = —, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = — (x2),

St. John IV:12 = 19b:18, XII:36 = 27b:24 + 27c:03

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (3)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 42c:21, XXVII:9 = 107b:20,

St. Luke I:16 = 148r:28, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.3 OCCURRENCES IN: the <i>Dobromir's Gospel</i>
--

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (6)

St. Matthew IX:2 = missing, IX:5 = missing,

St. Mark II:5 = missing, II:9 = 1rC:08-09, IV:12 = 6rC:14,

St. Luke V:20 = 47r:08, V:23 = 47r:19, VII:47 = 57v:03, VII:48 = 57v:07

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (1)

St. Matthew I:21 = missing, XXVI: 28 = missing, St. Mark I:4 = missing,

St. Luke I:77 = 34v:03, III:3 = D.pl., XXIV:47 = D.pl.

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3)

St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 148r:17-18 + 148r:19-148v:01, IX:34 = 153r:18

N.pl. домове / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = 5r:06

I.pl. домъми / домы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ St. Matthew XI:8 missing

N.pl. сынове / сыни (7)

St. Matthew V:9 = missing, V:45 = missing, VIII:12 = missing, IX:15 = missing, XII:27 = missing, XIII:38 (x2) = missing, XVII:26 = missing, XXIII:31 = missing,

St. Mark II:19 = 2rC:04,

St. Luke VI:35 = 51v:18, XI:19 = 73v:07, XVI:8 = 92r:06, XX:36 = 105v:09,

St. John IV:12 = 132r:01, XII: 36 = 162v:20

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (2) = St. Matthew XVII:25 = missing, XXVII:9 = missing,

St. Luke I:16 = A.pl., XVI:8 = 92r:07, XX:34 = 105v:03

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.4 OCCURRENCES IN: the <i>Kochno Gospel Lectionary</i>

N.pl. волове / воли (0), G.pl. воловъ / волъ (1) St. Luke XIV:19 = 46v:06-07,
I.pl. волъми / волы (0), L.pl. волъхъ / волѣхъ (0)

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (8)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 24v:17, IX:5 = 25r:01,
St. Mark II:5 = 54r:15, II:9 = 55r:04, IV:12 = missing,
St. Luke V:20 = 42r:03, V:23 = 42r:12-13, VII:47 = 102r:15, VII:48 = 102r:19

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (3)

St. Matthew I:21 = 113v:02, XXVI: 28 = 70v:09, St. Mark I:4 = missing,
St. Luke I:77 = missing, III:3 = missing, XXIV:47 = 9r:04

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (1)

St. John VIII:24 (x2) = missing, IX:34 = 5v:06

N.pl. домове / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = missing,

I.pl. домъми / дома (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (0) St. Matthew XI:8 missing

N.pl. сынове / сыни (8)

St. Matthew V:9 = 95r:21, V:45 = 18v:07, VIII:12 = missing, IX:15 = missing, XII:27 =
missing, XIII:38 (x2) = 108v:05 + 108v:06, XVII:26 = 29r:04, XXIII:31 = missing,
St. Mark II:19 = missing,
St. Luke VI:35 = 42v:21, XI:19 = missing, XVI:8 = missing, XX:34 = missing, XX:36 (x2) =
missing,
St. John IV:12 = missing, XII: 36 = 7v:06 + 7v:12

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (2) = St. Matthew XVII:25 = 29r:01, XXVII:9 = 74v:21,
St. Luke I:16 = missing, XVI:8 missing

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.5 OCCURRENCES IN: the <i>Marianus Gospel</i>
--

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (9)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 04v, IX:5 = 05r,

St. Mark II:5 = 46v, II:9 = 46v, IV:12 = 49v,

St. Luke V:20 = 88v, V:23 = 88v, VII:47 = 94v, VII:48 = 94v

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (2)

St. Matthew I:21 = Part of the manuscript from the XIII c., XXVI: 28 D.pl.,

St. Mark I:4 D.pl.,

St. Luke I:77 = 81r, III:3 D.pl., XXIV:47 = 132v

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3)

St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 149v + 149v, IX:34 = 152v

N.pl. домовѣ / домаи (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = 63r,

I.pl. домъми / домы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 08v

N.pl. полеве / поли (0), G.pl. полѣвъ / полъ (1) = St. Mark VI:23 = 54r,

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (16)

St. Matthew V:9 = Part of the manuscript from the XIII c, V:45 = Part of the manuscript from the XIII c, VIII:12 = 03v, IX:15 = 05v, XII:27 = 10v, XIII:38 (x2) = 13v + 13v, XVII:26 = 20r, XXIII:31 = 31r,

St. Mark II:19 = 47r,

St. Luke VI:35 = 91v, XI:19 = 104r, XVI:8 = 114v, XX:34 = 123r, XX:36 (x2) = 123r + 123r,

St. John IV:12 = 139r, XII:36 = 158v

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (4)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 20r, XXVII:9 = 39v,

St. Luke I:16 = 178v, XVI:8 = 114v

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.6 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Miroslav's Gospel Lectionary*

N.pl. волове / воли (0), G.pl. воловъ / волъ (1) St. Luke XIV:19 = 199a:19,
I.pl. волъми / волы (0), L.pl. волъхъ / волѣхъ (0)

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (9)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 92a:05, IX:5 = 92a:12,
St. Mark II:5 = 219b:04, II:9 = 219b:18-19, IV:12 = 112a:04,
St. Luke V:20 = 152b:20, V:23 = 153a:12, VII:47 = 160a:04, VII:48 = 160a:09,

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (6)

St. Matthew I:21 = 316a:22-23, XXVI: 28 = 253a:02-03,
St. Mark I:4 = 326a:22,
St. Luke I:77 = 342a:13, III:3 = 327a:23, XXIV:47 = 46b:04,

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 28a:17 + 28a:20, IX:34 = 41b:21-22

N.pl. домове / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = 136b:17,
I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 71b:12

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ / полъ (0) = St. Mark VI:23 = singular,
I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (21)

St. Matthew V:9 = 60a:15, V:45 = 64a:11, VIII:12 = 82b:13, IX:15 = 66b:02, XII:27 =
77a:16, XIII:38 (x2) = 83a:20 + 83a:21, XVII:26 = 107b:12, XXIII:31 = 238a:02,
St. Mark II:19 = 106b:23,
St. Luke VI:35 = 154a:06, XI:19 = 170b:09, XVI:8 = 187a:07 + 187a:08-09, XX:34 =
195b:08, XX:36 (x2) = 195b:16 + 195b:17,
St. John IV:12 = 30b:13, XII:36 = 44b:03 + 44b:09 + 245b:07 + 301b:10

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (3)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 107b:09, XXVII:9 = 286a:18,
St. Luke I:16 = 340a:05, XVI:8 = N.pl.

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.7 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Mstislav's Gospel Lectionary*

N.pl. волове / воли (0), G.pl. воловъ / волъ (1) St. Luke XIV:19 = 97b:02-03,
I.pl. волъми / волы (0), L.pl. волъхъ / волѣхъ (0)

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (10)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 41b:05-06, IX:5 = 41b:13,
St. Mark II:5 = —, II:9 = 125c:13, IV:12 = 58c:19
St. Luke V:20 = 74a:19-20, V:23 = 74b:06, VII:47 = 77b:19 + 168d:22, VII:48 = 77b:23 +
169b:02

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (4)

St. Matthew I:21 = 180a:22, XXVI: 28 = 142d:04,
St. Mark I:4 = D.pl. + 185a:24,
St. Luke I:77 = —, III:3 = —, XXIV:47 = D.pl. + 209c:07

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0);

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (2) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 14b:07 + —, IX:34 = 20a:03

N.pl. домове / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = — ,
I.pl. домъми / дома (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (2) St. Matthew XI:8 = 34d:15 + 192b:25

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ / полъ (0),
I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (25)

St. Matthew V:9 = 28b:17 + 188c:05, V:45 = 29c:25, VIII:12 = 36c:19, IX:15 = 31b:11 +
80c:24, XII:27 = 37b:01 + 83a:17, XIII:38 (x2) = 40b:03 + 40b:04, XVII:26 = 50b:11,
XXIII:31 = 51d:16 + 135b:14 + 165c:20
St. Mark II:19 = 55c:03,
St. Luke VI:35 = 74c:17, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = 91c:09, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = 97d:11
(x2),
St. John IV:12 = 15b:05, XII:36 = 21a:19 + 21b:02 + 139a:05 + 167b:22 + 191c:19

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (6)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 50b:08, XXVII:9 = 152d:18 + 157a:12 + 160b:22
St. Luke I:16 = 199b:08, XVI:8 = 91c:10

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.8 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Ostromir Gospel Lectionary of 1056-1057*

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (8)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 67a:03, IX:5 = 67a:18,

St. Mark II:5 = 130b:07, II:9 = 130c:16, IV:12 = —

St. Luke V:20 = 91a:09, V:23 = 91b:11, VII:47 = 223d:04, VII:48 = 223d:13

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (4)

St. Matthew I:21 = 248a:03, XXVI: 28 = 159a:01,

St. Mark I:4 = 255c:14,

St. Luke I:77 = —, III:3 = 258a:16, XXIV:47 = D.pl.

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0),

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (2) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 28c:01; —; IX:34 = 40d:01

N.pl. домовѣ / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —,

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 267b:02

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ / полъ (1) = St. Mark VI:23 = 287d:03,

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (12)

St. Matthew V:9 = 212b:15, V:45 = 58b:11, VIII:12 = 64c:09-10, IX:15 = —, XII:27 = —,
XIII:38 (x2) = 241c:15 + 241c:17, XVII:26 = 72c:08, XXIII:31 = 215b:10

St. Mark II:19 = —,

St. Luke VI:35 = 92b:02, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = —, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = —,

St. John IV:12 = 31c:06, XII:36 = 43a:17 + 43b:07 + 266c:08-09

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (4)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 72c:01, XXVII:9 = 196d:05 + 185b:15

St. Luke I:16 = 278c:09, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0),

L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.9 OCCURRENCES IN: the <i>Sava's Book (Gospel Lectionary)</i>
--

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (8)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 38v:12, IX:5 = 38v:18,

St. Mark II:5 = 77v:10, II:9 = 78v:01, IV:12 = —,

St. Luke V:20 = 49v:07, V:23 = 49v:15, VII:47 = 130v:15, VII:48 = 130v:17

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (3)

St. Matthew I:21 = 137v:09, XXVI: 28 = D.pl.,

St. Mark I:4 = D.pl.,

St. Luke I:77 = —, III:3 = 146r:07, XXIV:47 = 159r:03,

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0),

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (0) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = —; —; IX:34 = —,

N.pl. домовѣ / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (0) St. Matthew XI:8 = —,

N.pl. полеве / поли (0), G.pl. полевъ / полъ (0) = St. Mark VI:23 = —,

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (4)

St. Matthew V:9 = 125v:15, V:45 = 32r:15-16, VIII:12 = 37r:01, IX:15 = —, XII:27 = —,
XIII:38 (x2) = —, —, XVII:26 = —, XXIII:31 = —,

St. Mark II:19 = —,

St. Luke VI:35 = —, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = —, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = —,

St. John IV:12 = —, XII:36 = 128v:14,

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (2)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 43r:03, XXVII:9 = 117v:02,

St. Luke I:16 = —, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.10 OCCURRENCES IN: the <i>Turov Gospel Lectionary</i>

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (2)

St. Matthew IX:2 = —, IX:5 = —,,

St. Mark II:5 = —,, II:9 = —, IV:12 = —

St. Luke V:20 = 09r:01, V:23 = 09r:11, VII:47 = —, VII:48 = —,

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (0)

St. Matthew I:21 = —, XXVI: 28 = —,

St. Mark I:4 = —,

St. Luke I:77 = —, III:3 = —, XXIV:47 = —,

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (0) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = —; —; IX:34 = —,

N.pl. домове / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (0) St. Matthew XI:8 = —,

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ / полъ (0) = St. Mark VI:23 = —,

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (1)

St. Matthew V:9 = —, V:45 = —, VIII:12 = —, IX:15 = —, XII:27 = —, XIII:38 (x2) = —; —
, XVII:26 = —, XXIII:31 = —,

St. Mark II:19 = —,

St. Luke VI:35 = 10r:05, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = —, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = —,

St. John IV:12 = —, XII:36 = —,

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (0)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = —, XXVII:9 = —,

St. Luke I:16 = —, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0),

L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.11 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Typograph's Gospel*

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (7)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 16b:13, IX:5 = 16c:01,
St. Mark II:5 = 62b:21, II:9 = 62c:14, IV:12 = 65c:24,
St. Luke V:20 = 104b:13, V:23 = 104c:02, VII:47 = —, VII:48 = —

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (4)

St. Matthew I:21 = 04a:18, XXVI: 28 = D.pl.,
St. Mark I:4 = D.pl.,
St. Luke I:77 = 96b:08, III:3 = 100a:02, XXIV:47 = 136d:18,

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3)

St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 152a:17 + 152a:19-20, IX:34 = 155a:01-02

N.pl. домовѣ / домаи (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = 79a:24,

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 20d:22,

N.pl. сынове / сыни (17)

St. Matthew V:9 = 08b:17, V:45 = 10c:14, VIII:12 = 15a:11, IX:15 = 17a:07, XII:27 =
23b:10, XIII:38 (x2) = 26d:10 + 26d:11, XVII:26 = 34b:13, XXIII:31 = —,
St. Mark II:19 = 63a:18,
St. Luke VI:35 = 106d:20, XI:19 = 110c:23-24, XVI:8 = 120b:16, XX:34 = 127d:16, XX:36
(x2) = 128a:01-02 + 128a:03,
St. John IV:12 = 142d:08, XII:36 = 160a:14;

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (4)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 34b:08, XXVII:9 = 55d:14,
St. Luke I:16 = 93d:20, XVI:8 = 120b:17

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.12 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Undol'skij's Fragments (Gospel Lectionary)*

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (0)

St. Matthew IX:2 = —, IX:5 = —,
St. Mark II:5 = —, II:9 = —, IV:12 = —,
St. Luke V:20 = —, V:23 = —, VII:47 = —, VII:48 = —,

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (0)

St. Matthew I:21 = —, XXVI: 28 = —,
St. Mark I:4 = —,
St. Luke I:77 = —, III:3 = —, XXIV:47 = —,

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (0) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = —; —; IX:34 = —,

N.pl. домове / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —,
I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (0) St. Matthew XI:8 = —,

N.pl. полеве / поли (0), G.pl. полевъ / полъ (0) = St. Mark VI:23 = —,
I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (2)

St. Matthew V:9 = —, V:45 = —, VIII:12 = —, IX:15 = —, XII:27 = —, XIII:38 (x2) =
01r:19; 01r:20, XVII:26 = —, XXIII:31 = —,
St. Mark II:19 = —,
St. Luke VI:35 = —, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = —, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = —,
St. John IV:12 = —, XII:36 = —,

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (0)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = —, XXVII:9 = —,
St. Luke I:16 = —, XVI:8 = —

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0),

L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.13 OCCURRENCES IN: *The Vatican Gospel Lectionary (Gr. 2502) (not to be confused with the Assemanian Gospel Lectionary, which is called Vatikanskoje)*

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (4)

St. Matthew IX:2 = —, IX:5 = —,
St. Mark II:5 = 08v:04 (82), II:9 = 08v:15 (82), IV:12 = —,
St. Luke V:20 = —, V:23 = —, VII:47 = 52r:19-20 (125), VII:48 = 52r:23 (125)

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (3)

St. Matthew I:21 = 46v:07 (140), XXVI: 28 = 178v:11 (98)
St. Mark I:4 D.pl.,
St. Luke I:77 = 99r:16 (163), III:3 D.pl., XXIV:47 = D.pl.

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 66v:17 (22) + 66v:18-19 (22), IX:34 = 44v:20 (34)

N.pl. домовѣ / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (0) St. Mark X:30 = —,

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 67v:25 (154)

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ / полъ (1) = St. Mark VI:23 = 18v:10 (168),

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (6)

St. Matthew V:9 = 30r:25 (117), V:45 = 09r:13 (43), VIII:12 = —, IX:15 = —, XII:27 = —,
XIII:38 (x2) = — + —, XVII:26 = —, XXIII:31 = —,

St. Mark II:19 = —,

St. Luke VI:35 = —, XI:19 = —, XVI:8 = —, XX:34 = —, XX:36 (x2) = — (x2),

St. John IV:12 = 91r:09 (23), XII:36 = 14r:24 (37) + 14v:02 (38) + 67v:02 (154)

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (2)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = —, XXVII:9 = 79v:03 (184),

St. Luke I:16 = 19r:06 (161), XVI:8 = —

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.14 OCCURRENCES IN: the *Vukan Gospel Lectionary*

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (9)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 42a:16, IX:5 = 42a:24,

St. Mark II:5 = 142b:13, II:9 = 142c:03, IV:12 = 62a:14,

St. Luke V:20 = 81c:15, V:23 = 81d:04-05, VII:47 = 85c:14, VII:48 = 85c:20

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (1)

St. Matthew I:21 = missing, XXVI: 28 = 161a:10,

St. Mark I:4 = missing,

St. Luke I:77 = missing, III:3 = missing, XXIV:47 = ---

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0),

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 15d:21-22 + 15d:24-25, IX:34 = 21d:02

N.pl. домовѣ / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = 119b:16,

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 36b:17-18

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ / полъ (0) = St. Mark VI:23 = St. Mark VI:23 was not excerpted early on in the work with the dissertation

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (22)

St. Matthew V:9 = 29b:13, V:45 = 30c:24, VIII:12 = 37d:28, IX:15 = 32c:04, XII:27 = 38c:02, XIII:38 (x2) = 41b:01 + 41b:03 and 179c:11 + 179c:12, XVII:26 = 52b:24, XXIII:31 = 54b:02 + 153b:01,

St. Mark II:19 = 58c:08,

St. Luke VI:35 = 82a:24, XI:19 = 92d:15, XVI:8 = 103d:19, XX:34 = 111b:19, XX:36 (x2) = 111c:04 + 111c:06,

St. John IV:12 = 17a:01, XII:36 = 22d:20 + 23a:02

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (3)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 52b:19, XXVII:9 = 175c:06,

St. Luke I:16 = missing, XVI:8 = 103d:20

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

2.15 OCCURRENCES IN: the <i>Zograph Gospel</i>
--

N.pl. грѣхове / грѣси (9)

St. Matthew IX:2 = 17r:11, IX:5 = 17r:20,

St. Mark II:5 = 80(74)V:15, II:9 = 81(75)r:06, IV:12 = 85(79)r:05,

St. Luke V:20 = 147r:07, V:23 = 147r:20, VII:47 = 157v:14, VII:48 = 157v:19

G.pl. грѣховъ / грѣхъ (2)

St. Matthew I:21 = missing, XXVI: 28 D.pl.,

St. Mark I:4 D.pl.,

St. Luke I:77 = 136v:02-03, III:3 = 141v:02, XXIV:47 = D.pl.

I.pl. грѣхъми / грѣхы (0)

L.pl. грѣхъхъ / грѣсѣхъ (3) St. John VIII:24 (x2) = 251r:14 + 251r:16-17, IX:34 = 256v:15

N.pl. домове / дома (0), G.pl. домовъ / домъ (1) St. Mark X:30 = A.pl.,

I.pl. домъми / домаы (0), L.pl. домъхъ / домѣхъ (1) St. Matthew XI:8 = 23r:23

N.pl. полове / поли (0), G.pl. половъ / полъ (1) = St. Mark VI:23 = 92:13,

I.pl. полъми / полы (0), L.pl. полъхъ / полѣхъ (0)

N.pl. сынове / сыни (15)

St. Matthew V:9 = 4v:21, V:45 = 08r:17, VIII:12 = 15r:08, IX:15 = missing, XII:27 = 27r:11, XIII:38 (x2) = 32v:07 + 32v:08, XVII:26 = 42r:11, XXIII:31 = missing,

St. Mark II:19 = 82(76)r:02,

St. Luke VI:35 = 152r:04, XI:19 = missing; a footnote explains that the text was added later in Cyrillic letters in the margin, XVI:8 = 192v:09, XX:34 = 207v:06, XX:36 (x2) = 207v:14 + 207v:15-16

St. John IV:12 = 232v:22, XII:36 267r:06

G.pl. сыновъ / сынъ (4)

St. Matthew XVII:25 = 42r:08, XXVII:9 = 70v:10,

St. Luke I:16 = 132r:14, XVI:8 = 192v:10

I.pl. сынъми / сыны (0), L.pl. сынъхъ / сынѣхъ (0)

Appendix 3. Vostokov's thoughts on the use of **грѣхъ** and **грѣховъ** in the G.pl.

In total, 131 occurrences of **грѣхъ** and **грѣховъ** were found, 79 of **грѣхъ** and 52 of **грѣховъ**, see Appendix 1. Of these 41 occurrences were found in connection with prepositions, see table 17.1, and 72 occurrences were found in connection with substantives, see table 17.2. Eighteen occurrences were excluded from this section, since their syntactic constructions either depended on verbs or because the context were unclear (nr. 179, 199, 201, 205, 210, 214, 227, 228, 232, 234, 235, 248, 249, 250, 263, 264, 265).

*Table 17.1. **грѣхъ** and **грѣховъ** in the genitive plural in connection with prepositions*

	грѣхъ (occurrences)	грѣховъ (occurrences)	Totally
дѣла, дѣла, дѣльма	3 (nr. 237, 239, 262)	2 (nr. 220, 222)	5
отъ	22 (nr. 139, 142, 146, 149, 158, 162, 165, 168, 171, 189, 190, 191, 13, 194, 200, 231, 233, 236, 256, 259, 260, 261)	3 (nr. 186, 207, 208)	25
ради	4 (nr. 198, 202, 238, 257)	7 (nr. 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 221)	11
	= 29	= 12	41

Table 17.2. *грѣхъ* and *грѣховъ* in the genitive plural in connection with substantives

Substantives:	грѣхъ	грѣховъ	Total
врѣмѧ	2 (nr. 203, 255)	1 (nr. 243)	3
исповѣданнѣ	0	2 (nr. 252, 253)	2
мѣсто	1 (nr. 240)	0	1
мракъ	0	1 (n. 181)	1
мъножество	3 (nr. 230, 254, 258)	0	3
непогоненик	0	1 (nr. 196)	1
оставленник	4 (nr. 43, 154, 169, 192)	23 (nr. 136, 141, 144, 145, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 159, 176, 177, 178, 180, 182, 188, 195, 206, 212, 224, 225, 226, 229)	27
отъданик	0	1 (nr.170)	1
отъпущеник	2 (nr. 172, 174)	19 (nr. 135, 137, 140, 147, 148, 150, 151, 160, 161, 163, 164, 166, 167, 173, 175, 242, 245, 246, 247)	21
очищеник	0	2 (nr. 187, 211)	2
пленица	1 (nr. 241)	1 (nr. 197)	2
покаяние	0	1 (nr. 138)	1
пущеник	0	1 (nr. 223)	1
прощеник	0	2 (nr. 244, 251)	2
раздрѣшеник	0	2 (nr. 183, 185)	2
ржкописаник	1 (nr. 204)	0	1
сѣмрьщеник	0	1 (nr. 184)	1
	= 14	= 58	= 72

Appendix 4. Excluded occurrences

The following 13 occurrences were not included in this study.

Source:	Folio:	Reason:
ARC	1) грѣхъ in I.pl. on 174v:18 2) сынъ in N.pl. on 128r:06	1) later notation in the margin, 2) in heading
ASS	1) грѣхъ in the N.pl. on 51c:04, 2) сынъ in N.pl. on 127v:18, 3) сынъ in N.pl. on 158r:15	1) the spelling грѣси was not included due to the use of the e-corpus 2) and 3) in headings
MAR	(on pages; folios not stated) 1) грѣхъ in G.pl. on p. 03:10 2) сынъ in N.pl. on p. 10:13 3) сынъ in N.pl. on p. 14:01	These sentences were added later from another manuscript.
MIR	1) домъ in G.pl. on 128a:16	1) considered to be an adverbial construction
1073	1) сынъ in N.pl. on 137d:27, 2) сынъ in N.pl. on 138b:10, 3) сынъ in N.pl. on 138d:15, 4) сынъ in N.pl. on 209d:16	1), 2), 3) in headings 4) context unclear

Through the activities of Cyril and Methodius

Byzantium won the Slav world
for the Eastern Church

(Nandriş 1965:02)